

## **Chapter II**

### **The Dacian kingdom.**

#### **Barbarian statehood in antiquity in the Carpathian region**

The history of the Dacians of the Boirebistas era dates back to about 1,000 BC. This was the tail-end of the late Bronze-Age, the time of the development of a vast archeological/cultural entity, which extended to the eastern part of the Carpathian basin, Galicia and Bessarabia. In this area we find the peoples of the Gáva-Holíhrad culture. They lived in wide-spread farming (peasant) settlements; their burial rites favored cremation - the ashes preserved in urns. Some of this population reached the Dnieper region and the environs of Kiev. As the yield increased from agriculture and animal husbandry, so did metal work; also, the development of bronze-crafts and the beginning of iron-works. The latter must be related to the appearance of an ethnic group which came from the East to the region inhabited by the peoples of the Gáva-Holíhrad culture, who must have been horsemen. This assumption is based on the pieces and fragments of riding equipment which came to light. There may be a link between these findings and other traces, - such as fortified settlements or the burial mounds of the rich - which were kept separate from others. These suggest a social hierarchy, evident in the Kurgans of Lăpu<sup>o</sup> (Hungarian Oláhlápos) and Bobda (Hung. Bogda).

It is, of course, difficult to provide exact information about peoples and languages existing at a time when there were no written records. Nevertheless, the bases for the unity of the Gáva-Holíhrad culture seem to be clear. This community has been growing since the turbulent period of the Great Migration of the 14th century BC, being shaped by a gradual fusion of the local population and the newcomers. In all likelihood, the center for this developmental process was the area bordered by the rivers Maros, Tisza (Theiss), Danube and the Southern Carpathians. It is from this area that the Gáva-Holíhrad culture spread far and wide; a population-spread but also a cultural expansion. This archeological/cultural entity has unmistakable links with the contemporary population of the Lower-Danube region and with the Babadag culture of today's Bessarabia and the peoples of the North-Bulgarian Pšenièevo culture. It would be logical to infer that those who settled in the region were people related to one another and that there also was a similarity between the languages they spoke. Yet, we know from early sources - in this case from Herodotos, - that, in the 6th century BC., Getae lived North of the Balkan mountains. These were the same Getae of whom Augustus' scribe, Strabon notes that they speak the same language as the Dacians. Strabon also writes that Getae intermingled with the Moesians and Thracians. V. Georgiev was able to make it probable from linguistic data that Dacians and Moesians spoke a similar language. During the period between the end of the Bronze Age and the first century, there is no evidence of extensive changes in the population which would have brought radical change to the ethnic configuration. Thus, in all likelihood, the population constituting the

Gáva-Holíhrad culture - and other related ethnic groups - must be recognized as the forebears of the Dacians, the Getae (and the Moesians).

Obviously, the above does not mean that the population in this region has stayed put since the first century and that there was no migration during the time. Among others, Strabon writes that Getae are wandering along both shores of the Danube. In the 8th century BC, at the time of the late bronze-age, ethnic groups from the East appear in the region, upsetting local conditions and resettling in the area some of their groups. We have concrete information about them; they were horsemen and they spoke an Iranian language. It is unlikely that they would be Kimmers, who played a significant role in the Middle-East. The personal and community names they use - such as *Sigünna*, *Agathürs*, *Spargapeithes*, attest that their language must have been related to the Scythians' from Eastern Europe. It is no rarity for Iranian speaking peoples to settle in the area. We find large groups of them, in the period preceding the Gáva-Holíhrad culture, in Transylvania and in the northeastern part of the Hungarian Plains (Noua-culture), and they are, beginning with the 7th century BC, also present in the Danube delta. The appearance of the Sigunnae and the Agathurs-es dating from the early Iron-Age creates far-reaching changes; especially in Transylvania, the central region of the Dacian Kingdom. There, the original population disappears almost completely. Our legacy of objects from the culture of the new arrivals is predominantly of those, which are so well-known in Scythian culture: unique arrowheads, Scythian daggers, akinakes-es, bronze mirrors, etc. Such great impact and such changes cannot be

found in other territories penetrated by the Gáva-Holíhrad culture. On the contrary: data at our disposal point to the continuity of the indigenous population in the region of the lower-Danube and the area of the Tisza (Theiss). Here migrant Scythians quickly begin a process of intermingling with the indigenous population. In cemeteries, cremation rites are taking precedence later when, in addition to a new Scythian influx, there came migrant groups from the central part of the Balkan Peninsula - from Moesian territory to settle along the Tisza river. Around 500 BC, on the turn of the early and late Iron Age, there emerged in the Carpathian Basin the Vekerzug - Hetény culture and beyond the Eastern and Southern Carpathians the Bírse<sup>o</sup>ti - Ferigile culture. All of these came about through an amalgamation of Scythian newcomers, Balkan settlers and the indigenous population. There will be diverse rates of acculturation and of specific characteristics: we rarely find burial mounds within the Carpathian basin but, outside the region, that will be the accepted form of interment. This evolutionary process will create a cultural entity by the late Iron-Age -similar to the Gáva-Holíhrad period - but there will be local differences, some of them significant. Within this context, the (self)segregation of the Transylvanian Agathurs-es is noteworthy as is the unique conservatism of their burial rites. So far, we have no clues why they disappeared without a trace at the end of the 5th century, BC. They will be replaced partially by the Dacian segments of the Vekerzug-Hetény culture from the Great Plains in the west. The cemetery at Băiþă (Hung. Szászbanyica) has vestiges of their early presence.

The history of the Wallachia region takes a very different turn in this era. The culture of the Getae - who inhabit the area of the Lower Danube - is increasingly being influenced by Greek colony settlements along the Black Sea; the most important among these cities is Histria, which was founded by settlers from Miletos in 657 B.C. The changes in the material culture of the Geta tribes is most evident near the Greek cities - such as Dobruja. However, similar traces of this cultural transformation can be found to the West, along the Lower Danube. For example, in Alexandria (Wallachia) in the 5th century, B.C. and even further north, albeit in an altered form. Much of Wallachia remained unpopulated in the 5th century, B.C. - and through most of the 4th century. Our substantiation comes from an absence of archeological evidence, and also from Herodotos and Arrianos, who describe this area as barren land. It is part of a strip of deserted land reaching to present day western Hungary (Dunántúl). The area becomes populated in the 4th century, B.C., after the disappearance of the Transylvanian Agathurs-es. The settlers on the western part of this land are Celts; not only do they take over the uninhabited area, but they overrun the Great Plains of present day Hungary and penetrate also into Transylvania. By the third decade of the 4th century, B.C. the Celts have also emerged in the central region of the Balkan Peninsula; by the end of the century they settle in all of Transylvania. Among them there is a sizable number of Dacians from the Great Plains but it is the Celts who impact the history of the region up to the 1st century, B.C., as seen in the minting process of Eastern Celts. This minting is now often called "Dacian". The tetradrachmae of Philip II. and Alexander the Great

were used as sample; the main area of these coins is the Carpathian Basin and also within the Dacian territory, most of them were discovered in Transylvania. Outside the Carpathians, they are much fewer. Around the middle of the 3rd century, B.C. Barbarian minting takes hold but has little to do with the work of Dacians. Up to the First century, B.C. we have no data which would indicate that Dacians engaged in politics. They had no political role up to the 1st century, B.C., since Celts dominated Transylvania from the 4th century on. Living there were several Celtic tribes: *Anartoi*, *Teuriskoi* and *Kotinoi* (erroneously described as *Koténsioi* by Ptolemaios); the first of these must have inhabited the Szamos-river region, the latter settled in Central Transylvania and South-East Transylvania, respectively. There is evidence that Celtic power extended beyond the Carpathians, as well.

Let us sketch a broad outline for the antecedents of the Kingdom (arkhé) of Burebista (a.k.a. Boirebistas). Dromikhaites (early 3rd century, B.C.), Oroles and Rubobostes (2nd century) are frequently thought to be Geta-Dacian kings. Those who believe so seem to forget that the former is known to be the ruler of the Thracian Odruses and the latter two constitute a misspelled version of the names of Burebostes and Rólés (1st century, B.C.). Burebostes was a great Dacian king and we know that it was during his reign that Dacian power expanded: the *incrementa Dacorum per Rubobostem regem* (Justinus, *Prolegomena* 32) can only refer to him.

The conditions which preceded the kingdom or realm of Boirebistas' coming into power, were as follows: within the Carpathian Basin power was in the hands of the Celts who gained mastery over

the native population of Dacians and their culture. Along the Lower Danube there were Geta peasant villages; passing through are Greeks from Pontus, merchants from Thracia in the south and adventurers, as well. In the 1st century, B.C. the southern part of the Balkan Peninsula is already under Roman rule (Macedonia became a Roman Province in 148, B.C.). The Greek towns along the Black Sea are the subjects or allies of Mithridates, King of Pontus. From the belt around what is today Belgrade Celt Scordisci threaten emerging Roman rule on the Peninsula. Finally, there are the Bastarnae, whom we have not mentioned before. Classical sources call them Germanic, Celtic, Getan or Scythian - a people which has its home near the rivers Dniester and Prut. It is from this region that they cross and re-cross the Danube. Boirebistas ruled in this environment (which included Iranian-speaking peoples from the Steppes - by then known as Sarmatians).

All of these diverse ethnic, political and cultural influences converged in the area which became the locus of Boirebistas' power: along the banks of the River Szeret (Rumanian Siret), among Dacians or the Getae or among related Dacian-Getae. They were living near the Celts, the Scythians and Sarmatians of the Steppes. The Greek towns of the Pontus (Black Sea) were more distant, but still within reach. The Romans were even further and so was Mithridates (who could no longer be considered Persian). Our records about the period are limited, but sufficient to reconstruct much of Boirebistas' background. An inscription was found in the Greek city of Dionysiopolis, in Pontus (Balèik, Bulgaria). From it we can learn that Akarniòn, a citizen of this town, traveled to Zargidava,

to meet the father of Boirebistas. Eventually, he became a trusted member of the court and was sent as envoy to Pompeius, with whom he met before the Battle of Pharsalos (in 48, B.C. on Aug. 8th). "Although we have only an incomplete document to rely on, we can be fairly certain that the aforementioned Zargidava was the seat of Boirebistas' court - after all, the record was written during his life and reign. Zargidava (Zargedaua on the inscription at Balèik). This Zargidava is also mentioned by Ptolemaios in cca. 170, B.C., as a town on the banks of the river Szeret, adjacent to Tamasidava and Piroboridava. According to N.Gostar's considered opinion the latter was Barbo<sup>o</sup>i (today: a district of Galapi) and Tamasidava must have been Mînăstioara. Zargidava - known from Ptolemaios (Ptolemy) and the inscription found in Dionysiopolis - must be identical with the most significant Moldavian settlement: Poiana. In the 1st century, B.C. a three meters high rampart was built around the settlement. Deep trenches around it further protected the castle from encroachment. Incidentally, it was the only Moldavian castle which contained such a large number of Greek goods from the colonies. Undoubtedly, Poiana - Zargidava was the seat of the court of Boirebistas. Other circumstances about his reign are uncertain. According to Iordanes, a historian from the 6th century, B.C. Boirebistas came to power at the same time as Sulla, in 82 B.C. However, other information suggests a later date. When Mithridates, King of Pontus, plans his campaign against Rome in 64 B.C., he has no knowledge as yet of the Dacians, but the Pannonians, whose emergence is concurrent with the increasing might of the Dacians, appear in his plans. In 59 B.C., the Roman senate named Julius Caesar Consul of Gallia and



Illyricum. Neither the Pannonians, nor the Scordiscans were important enough to justify such an assignment, only the Dacians. Thus, in 60 B.C. Boirebistas had to have been in power. The following year a group of Boi-s flees to the Helvetians. These Boii, as well as Taurisci from the region of the Upper Tisza (but not from Noricum) fought Boirebistas under the leadership of Kritasiros. They were defeated. The battle must have taken place in 60 B.C.

This was the only one of the battles or campaigns waged by Boirebistas, for which we have a date. But we do know that they were fought within a short time-span, "barely a few years". We also know that he subjugated the Scordiscans, forcing them to enter into an alliance with him and that he extended his domination to the Greek colonial cities along the Black Sea, up to Appolonia (today: Sozopol, Bulgaria). Olbia, at the estuary of the Bug river, has been razed by him 150 years before the end of the 1st Cent B.C., therefore, the conquest of the Greek cities is said to have occurred between 55 - 48 B.C. Given the political happenings at the time, it was most unlikely that this conquest would have occurred so late. The Greek-colonized cities were ruled by the King of Pontus, Eupatór Mithridates VI, until 63 B.C., as were the Bastarnae. After the King's death, the governor of Macedonia, C. Antonius Hybrida takes over; in 61 B.C. he is defeated by the Bastarnae in a battle near Histria. It is unlikely that Boirebistas would have abstained from responding to the power vacuum created by the death of Mithridates. Attempts to fill the vacuum were made by the Romans and also the one-time allies and subordinates of the King. In all likelihood, the Bastarnae later came under the jurisdiction of Boirebistas. We know of no wars against

them and, therefore, we can safely presume that it was Boirebistas who was leading the Bastarnae into battle in 61 B.C. (on the side of Histria) against C. Antonius. This does not mean that Boirebistas subjugated the Bastarnae prior to 61 but may suggest close ties with them. Just as we cannot separate the second half (*..bista*) of Boirebistas' name from that of the Bastarnae, a similar connection comes to mind as we examine the Bastarna-relics of the Poiane<sup>oti</sup>-Lukaševka culture along the river Szeret, which came to light in the castles and settlements adjoining the river. Records pertaining to the battle at Histria speak only of the Bastarnae. This may mean that they made up most of Boirebistas' army, these late allies of Mithridates, known as "the bravest".

War against the Boii and Taurisci followed the occupation of the Greek cities. They were separated from the Dacians by the River *Parisos*, according to our sources. *Parisos* is frequently revised to read as *Pathissos*, i.e., Tisza (Theiss). However, the paleogeography of the Greek text tends to validate the use of *Marisos* or *Marissos*. The Taurisci are later to be found East, then South of the Tisza, giving support to the usage of *Marisos*/*Marissos*. If the *Marisos* River is, indeed, the boundary of Dacian and Celtic power in the sixties, then existing archeological finds become more intelligible: between the 4th and 1st centuries, B.C. we find Celt traces exclusively; the characteristics of Dacian culture do not show up prior to the 1st century. It must be emphasized, however, that Celtic culture is not restricted to Celtic ethnicity, because Dacians living on the Great Plains adopted this culture, although they must have retained their language and ethnic identity. This may be behind the Dacian's

unusual declaration of war: "they asserted this land is theirs". The ethnic connection thus appears as the impetus for war, based on the premise that the population living in the region to be occupied speaks the same language as the attackers or one that is similar to theirs.

The defeat of the Scordisci is mentioned by Strabon prior to the Boius war, which would suggest that the campaigns of Boirebistas took place within a short period of time: the years 61 - 60 (or 59 if that was the date of his victory) - exact dates are hard to come by. After their defeat the Scordisci fought as allies of the Dacians: Boirebistas continued to wage war after his realm (arkhé) was established. We know about one of these campaigns. Iordanes reports on a campaign against the Germans residing in the Czech basin and Moravia, as a result of which Dacian jurisdiction extended to Carnuntum, opposite the Morva river. Dacian forces may have penetrated areas beyond that point. If, for instance, the City of Setidava on the Vistula river, did not represent an error made by Ptolemaios then this typical Dacian name for castles could point to a conquest in the North by Boirebistas. He also led campaigns on the Balkan Peninsula. On the inscription in Balèik he is called Thracia's "first and greatest" king. We have no evidence pertaining to eastern conquests but we know the Bastarnae were his subjects and that he destroyed Olbia. His power extended to the Dnieper river, or beyond.

The expansion of governmental institutions across the realm occurred after the first conquests, in the fifties. This must also have been the time for the establishment of the Dacian sanctuary site and power-center in Southern Transylvania, in the mountains of Oră<sup>o</sup>tie. These events must have taken place by 50 B.C. In the forties, Rome

sees the Dacians as a threat once more (an emissary of Boirebistas proposes an alliance to Pompeii in 48, B.C.) and we have no evidence of a large Dacian campaign in the latter part of the fifties. Regrettably, we also have very little data pertaining to Dacian power structure and government systems and there are some inconsistencies between earlier and later sources. As Boirebistas was "the first and greatest" king in Thracia (*prótos kai megistos basileus*), we can be certain that, beside him, there were other kings. To quote Jordanes: the king gave his Counselor and High Priest "nearly royal power" (*pene regiam potestatem*, *Jord.Got.XI, 67*). Boirebistas accorded Akornion the title of *prótos (kai megistos) philos*, "first and foremost friend". Among the descendants of Alexander the Great this is a proverbial aulic title in Hellenic courts. Boirebistas is then like the "King of Kings", the Persian and Hellenic rulers of one-time Persian territories. We find among his titles some which were also used in the Court of Mithridates. Not unusual, inasmuch as Boirebistas emerges on the North West shores of the Black Sea as heir to the rule and power of Mithridates. Also, proof that Boirebistas and his retinue were well-informed about the organization of Mithridates' Kingdom of Pontus.

Other sources attest to the existence of two separate strata among the Dacians. The Dacian name for one of these groups was Tarabostes also known as Pileati (*Pilophoroi* in Greek) after the headpieces (*pileus*) they wore. The other sector was subordinate to the former. These were called *capillati* (*Kométai* in Greek), or long haired. On Trajan's column, which commemorates the Dacian war, a description of both groups can be found: the head-piece wearing

Pileati and the long-haired, bare-headed Capillati. We know hardly anything about the latter, somewhat more about the Tarabostes. According to Iordanes, Dicineus (Dicaineos) ruled also over kings (*et regibus imperaret*), "selecting amongst them the noblest and wisest men, instructing them in theology ..... making priests of them and naming them Pileati" (Iord. Get.XI, 71). Kings and priests came from the ranks of Pileati. Other sources also describe them as the Dacian elite. The Dacian *pleistoi* (majority), whom Iosephus Flavius (*Antiquitates Judaicae* XVIII,22) compared to Jewish Essenes, may possibly have been a corrupted version of *Pileati* and the Tarabostes may have constituted a closely-knit egalitarian stratum. We have a reference from Kriton, Trajan's physician, alluding to the dual power-structure. "Some were entrusted with the supervision of those who work with oxen and others - belonging to the King's retinue - were responsible for the fortifications (Suid. Lex.II. 35,368). This report, dating from the 2nd century, is far removed from the age of Boirebistas. However, if we presume a continuity in Dacian statehood, then it must be evident that the roots of administrative structure go back to the time of Boirebistas, just as do the Pileati and Capillati. The two occupational strata described by Kritón would compare with the Tarabostes and Capillati. This would mean that the overseer of farmers (working with oxen) were comparable to the Capillati. The overlords of regions where "the castle" was in control (and who were responsible for the fortifications) were comparable to Tarabostes, Pileati. In other words: the Capillati were, in reality, village chiefs and the Pileati had jurisdiction over larger territories. There is evidence that in the Dacian Kingdom there were, indeed,

administrative areas the control-locus of which was the castle ("*dava*") and which carried the names of tribes (*Predavensioi*, *Buridavensioi*). The administration of the territory was, undoubtedly, built around decentralized control, encompassing smaller communities and villages and free of ethnic constraints. Our sources list only Pileati and Capillati among Dacians; in the Kingdom only members of the ruling class(es) were (true) Dacians. We can see that the realm of Boirebistas had a centralized state administration, partially modeled after Eastern, Hellenistic rule. It was built around regional units and had specific "Barbarian" characteristics, without regard to ethnicity, as was the case in the areas ruled by the Boius they settle ethnic groups to protect borders. Religion provided additional assistance to the centrally controlled state. South of the Danube among the Getae the Zamolxis religion was known as early as the 6th and 5th centuries it promotes belief in the immortal soul. This is the religion which Dekaineos propagated among the Dacians; he was to have assisted Boirebistas in "teaching the people obedience." We do not know much about this religion, only that Dekaineos studied in Egypt and passed on to the people what he learned there. We also know that they obeyed him unconditionally. Strabon (*Geographica* 7,3,11) reports that Dacians ate no meat and drank no wine. Iosephus Flavius (*Antiquitates Judaicae* XVII, 22) was apparently close to the mark when he wrote that Dacian Pileati live a life similar to the Essenes. Zamolxis means earth-god or earthly-god. He was a god who died and was resurrected and who gathered in all Dacians who died. As we are attempting to reconstruct this religion, it gives us much to contemplate. We lack sufficient factual data for reliable

hypotheses; it cannot even be excluded with certainty that they were monotheistic, as postulated by Rohde and Pârvan. This religion must have been forcibly disseminated - as suggested by written records (Dekaineos was to have conveyed the orders of God) and by a certain object found in all places of former Dacian habitation. This is a cup, shaped as a truncated pyramid, with or without a handle. It must have been used as a lantern, a sacral object used in religious rites.

As personification of a centralized state apparatus and of a forcibly disseminated religion, the Dacians created impressive and unique edifices in their seat of power, in the mountains of Orăştie. East of Hâtszeg (Rum. Haşeg), along the river Városvize (Rum. Apa Orăştii), which joins the Maros (Rum. Mureş) river at Szászváros (Rum. Orăştie), in an area almost uninhabited even today, we find castles and fortifications built of stone: unique in Europe for its time. The center of the defense-system is at an elevation of 1250 m (3700 feet) at Dealul Grădiştii, near Grădiştea Muncelului. The centrum is protected by fortifications; the castles were built in the valleys, along rivers. Walls of castles were adapted everywhere to the requirements of the local terrain - in this region their style is unique and quite unusual. Square stones are superimposed on the parapet, creating the effect of a mantle. Dirt and pulverized stone are embedded in the walls, the blocks of stones were braced by joints - a method of building used in the Greek cities of Pontus. Accordingly, we must assume this usage dates from the period which followed the conquest of Boirebista, i.e. after 61, B.C. There is a school of thought, which attributes an earlier date to the rampart of Costeşti -

Cetățuia- perhaps the end of the 2nd century, B.C. However, this is not supported by archeological findings; all of these are from the 1st century, B.C. The ramparts connect with the stone parapets. Even if they were not built at exactly the same time, the building style of both reflected a similar concept and they must have been built close to each other. Greek master-builders must have been on site at many places. In addition to the style, similar to the one used by Greeks in Pontus, we have other evidence, as well. The late edifices of Grădișteța Muncelului yielded carved stone fragments with Greek letters and letter-groupings. Unfortunately, none of these were found as part of the wall they came from. Consequently, all kinds of suppositions attach to them (Royal List, calendar, etc.) although the letters signify only the placement of the blocks in the wall, as was customary in Greek-style building, and as noted earlier by V. Pârvan.

Thus, it cannot be said that Dacians used writing (as a nation or in groups). This does not exclude the possibility that certain individuals may have been literate but Greek masons' inscriptions on building blocks do not attest to Dacians' ability to write. However, they do have significance: many of them were unearthed at Grădișteța Muncelului on the site (11th Terrace) where the older, larger shrine stood as did the smaller and larger round shrines as well. Greek master-builders must also have had a part in this building project, probably during the reign of Boirebistas - (or, based on archeological evidence, later). The spectacular sacral and secular edifices at the seat of the Dacian Kingdom must have been built at approximately the same time. These were magnificent symbols of its power, projecting evidence of ideology and the might which enabled this



empire to exist for nearly 200 years. If we can believe what Iordanes wrote much later (550 A.D.), the High Priest under Boirebistas, Decaineus "taught the Dacians almost all the philosophy... he taught them ethics, moderating their Barbarian morals; he taught them physics which enabled them to live in accordance with nature and their own laws; he lectured on logic, thus, in matters of thinking, they rose above other nations.... he taught them the meaning of the twelve signs (of the Zodiac) and how to observe the orbit of the planets and position of the stars.... he explained how the sun's fiery mass dominates the earth... One could observe how one Dacian would be engaged in scanning the sky, another would study the nature of bushes and plants; one would examine the waning and waxing of the moon, the other would watch the solar eclipse....." (Iord. Get XI.69). The reconstructed, so-called Large and Round Shrine at Grădiște Muncelului are relics of Dacian mentality, impacted by a combination of science and religion. The shrine's arch is segmented by blocks of stone - understandably in accordance with astronomical calculations. As to the Dacians' familiarity with botany: in addition to the writings of Iordanes, we have additional evidence. In a book by Dioscorides, the Greek physician of Emperors Claudius and Nero, a list of medicinal herbs also provides the Dacian name for many of these.

We have hardly any information regarding commercial life in the realm of Boirebistas. Through indirect sources (such as the Getae's grain production) we surmise that they engaged in agriculture along the Lower-Danube region to a significant degree. On the basis of the information that Boirebistas had the vineyards destroyed, we assume they also engaged in horticulture, although in those days

vineyards existed only in areas South of the Danube. The drab village settlements had simple huts, the few household goods and dishes left for posterity which were often roughly, unevenly made. What a striking contrast between those and the "davas", the stone buildings behind the castle-walls and their imported wares from Greece. The Dacians had an army of 200,000 and while it was not a standing army, they had to have major supply capability. It would be hard to imagine that this could have been provided by village-settlements and without a concentration of economic proficiency emanating from the seat of power in the mountain region of Orăştie. Later sources make reference to the great treasure owned by Dacian kings - especially gold. Yet, hardly any gold had been found in course of archeological excavations. Whether gold was really amassed in the royal treasury or has left the country in the form of payment for Greek and Roman imports, we must assume there was significant utilization of mineral wealth. We know for instance that iron ore was being mined by the Celtic Kotinoi, one of the tribes in the Dacian Kingdom (the 2nd century geographer, Ptolemaios - *Geographia* III.,8,3 - names them Koténsioi, after commonly used tribal names). Their habitat was in the northern part of the Carpathian mountains; they mined iron, according to Tacitus, to their "shame". In tribal societies it is not infrequent that ethnic groups are associated with certain specializations. Ore-mining and metal work was done mostly by the Kotinoi; in the Dacian Kingdom ironmongering showed Celtic influence. From Ptolemaios we also know of a Dacian tribe, the *Saldénsioi*, named after a place called: *Salda* (place of salt); probably their livelihood was related to this function.

It appears that the economic base of Boirebistas' kingdom was composed of low-level agriculture and animal husbandry but, primarily, of mining. We must also take into account that there was no counter-trade for imported merchandise. Greek wares in the possession of the Central Power(s) were plentiful; these were provided by Greek towns under colonial rule as their tax-payments. This kind of taxation was also levied against other regions of the realm - not only Greek cities, although it was more apparent in the latter case. We do not know whether this type of taxation was random or regulated. Certain characteristics of tribal societies and extreme poverty of rural communities in the Dacian kingdom suggest the application of the systematic exaction of taxes. Foreign trade was conducted only with the Roman Empire. As a result, the realm of Boirebistas was inundated with the *denarius* of the Roman Republic. What is more, it soon became the sole currency of the Kingdom. Evidence can be found at the castle of Tili<sup>o</sup>ca; punches - used in the minting of coins - were found there.

No small wonder that conflict – generated by multi-ethnicity, a labile economic base and harsh taxation – reached crisis proportions. In 45 B.C. Boirebistas is killed in an uprising. Julius Caesar wanted to take advantage of this opportunity; he prepared for war against the Dacians but he was killed (3/15/44,B.C.) before he could go into battle. Power in Dacia passed into the hands of the High Priest, Dekaineos; the kingdom broke up. Our sources once again refer to Bastarnae and the Getae of Dobruja also have their own sovereign. What used to be Dacian territory has diminished in size but there was still occasional evidence of their erstwhile power. It appears that they

attempted to intervene in the internal conflicts of Rome as allies of Brutus; this assumption is based on gold coins minted for the royal dynasty of Dacia which are copies of the denaria, minted in 42 B.C. by Brutus. They bear the inscription “*Kosón*” (possessive case) after the *Koso* dynasty. Dacians also intervened when, prior to the battle of Actium (31 B.C.), they had offered their support first to Octavius, then to Antonius. Presumably, they attempted to forge an alliance to counteract Octavianus' earlier (35 B.C.) thrust to Siscia on the River Drava in the Japod War. Subsequently, it was this assault which was considered to be the major inroad in the offensive against Dacia. We know that their King was still Dekaineos at this time. (Plutarch calls him :*Dikomés*) In a paper mocking Octavian, Anthony derisively calls him “*Coso*” the King of the Getae.

Dacians were a topic of conversation in Rome in 30 B.C. Not because they intervened in Romans' internal squabbles; after all, Dacian prisoners of war - who were captured as allies of Anthony - were sent by Octavian to fight in the circus as gladiators. In all likelihood, interest in the Dacians was re-kindled by the emergence of a new ruler. He must have acceded to the throne, after Cotiso Dekaineos had died, some time around 31 B.C. That year he launched several assaults from the Dacian stronghold in Transylvania against areas to the south. The Regent of Macedonia, Licinius Crassus defeats Cotiso's army in 29 B.C. We hear no more about Cotiso or about forays into Dacia until the middle of the 2nd century. The information is contained in a poetic reference of uncertain date about Appulus of Dacia, who can easily reach the Black Sea, the Pontus. (*.....et Dacius orbe remoto Appulus huic hosti perbreve*

*Pontus iter....*- Consolatio ad Liviam, Poetae Lat. min.I. 118). They make a foray into Pannonia during the Pannon War of 13 - 11 B.C. (in those days it meant the region along the Sava river and not the Trans-Danubian territory, later known as Pannonia; Hungarian *Dunántúl*). In reprisal M. Vinicius leads a campaign against them; it was he who conquered the Dacian and Bastarna armies (*Dacorum et Basternarum exercitum*). He also conquered and routed the Cotini, Cauci, Rataci, Teurisci and Anartii peoples and forced them to accept Roman sovereignty.

We were left with only a partial inscription attesting to Vinicius' actions. Therefore, we can be certain of only the Cotini and Anartii and that the second name on the list begins with a "C" or an "O". Every completion accounts for five names and a reference by Strabon, according to which the Dacians were divided into five (groups) when Emperor Augustus sent his army against them. In this campaign the Romans ferried military equipment over the Tisza and Maros rivers. Consequently, they first reached the Cotini in the area of the Munpii Apuseni (Hung.: Erdélyi Érchegység) (*Koténsioi* as per Ptolemaios), then the Cauci (Ptolemaios: *Kaukoénsioi*) in South-East Transylvania. Data from Roman times enable us to place the Anartii in the region of the springs of the Cri<sup>o</sup>ul Repede (Resculum vicus Anartorum - Bologa, Hung.: Sebesvára). The names of the Rataci (Ptolemaios: *Rhatakénsioi*) and Teurisci on the inscription can be reconstructed. The former lived along the upper reaches of the Mure<sup>o</sup> river, the latter along the Some<sup>o</sup> river. Records of the Vinicius campaign help us picture the ethnic composition of Dacia at the beginning of the 1st century A.D. They reveal that of the five parts of

the fragmented Dacian Kingdom three were Celtic. What is more, for reasons of geography the Dacian seat of power in the Orăştie mountain area was on Cotinus land. Another artifact pertaining to Celts is a sword from the castle in Piatra Roşie. It suggests that Celts were present in Boirebistas' time in the defensive belt around Sarmizegethusa, a center of religion as well as the seat of royalty. We cannot be certain as to what language and ethnic group they belonged to, but since Vinicius conquered Dacian and Bastarna armies, we can link them to the Bastarnae. Finally, we may assume that the tribe of Racatae are Dacians; we base this assumption on records which tell us about relations of theirs in Southern Slovakia, who bear the same name. The diminished and fragmented Dacian Kingdom retained its ethnic composition even after half a century beyond the era of Boirebista's conquest. However, the ethnic distribution of the area will change during the next few decades. The change is the result of Sarmatian migration from the Steppes of Eastern Europe to the region of the Lower Danube. In 11 - 12 A.D., attacking Dacians from the right-bank of the Danube are defeated by Sex. Aelius Catus and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus in Pannonia and Moesia; Catus resettles 50,000 Getae on Roman territory from the left bank of the Danube. Such actions will be repeated in the future in the Roman Empire but this is the first occasion for such a large-scale relocation.

Dacians lose the territory along the Danube. Not much is left of the former conquest of Boirebitas. The only way to retain some control over the fragmented kingdom is to establish a theocracy. Jordanes writes, referring to Dio Chrysostomos, that Comosicus (ruling until 29 A.D.) was the first to perform the roles of High Priest

and King simultaneously. Actually, his sovereignty extended to a small area only, probably no more than the seat of government in the mountains of Orătie and most likely the ore-mining areas. This is suggested by an increase of imported wares from the Roman empire in the 1st century A.D. and since we know of the loss of territory by Dacia, an increase in imports must have coincided with the increase in the exporting of mineral wealth from Transylvania, i.e. the Carpathian region.

Rumanian scientists pointed out that the resettlement policy of Catus depopulated the left bank of the Danube. We believe this resettlement project is only partly related to Rome's desire to create Roman provinces of territories along the right bank of the Danube. We must also consider the migration of a large number of Sarmatians from Eastern Europe to the region of the Lower Danube. They were nomads, needing vast areas of pasture land. Having been driven out of Eastern Europe, the Lower-Danube region's topography of groves and steppe-like grassland met their needs. It is, therefore, not surprising that Ovid, who was exiled to Tomi (until 17 A.D.) often referred to the Jazigs and the Sarmatians.

Subsequent to these events Dacian power continues to decline. According to Pliny, Sarmatian Jazigs chased the Dacians from the Mure<sup>o</sup> river to the Pathissus (Tisza). Additional sources place the action between 20 and 50 A.D. In all probability this occurred after 29 and around 40, since Iordanes tells us in reference to the Dacian King Coryllus (Scorilo) who ruled 29 - 60 that the Jazigs are separated from the Roxolans by the Aluta (Olt) river. It is unlikely that they could have lived for long in as small an area as that between the

Danube and the Olt. We believe Pliny's (hard to understand) text was misread, as his River Marus is customarily identified as the Moravian Morva river. Pliny claims that in the Hercynia forest between the Danube and Carnuntum (*usque ad Pannonica hiberna Carnunti*), on the plains, Jazigs are living, and in the hills and forests Dacians. These Dacians were by the Jazigs chased from the Marus river to the Pathissus (*inter Danuvium et Hercynium saltum..... campos et plana lazyges Sarmatae montes vero et saltus pulsi ab iis Daci ad Pathissum amnem a Maro* - Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* IV; 80-81). By Marus he must have meant the Maros (Rum. Mure<sup>o</sup>) and the lower part of the Tisza. In other words, the Jazigs took the B ans ag (Rum. Banat) from the Dacians. It would not be logical to identify here the *Pathissus* with the Tisza River, as is frequently done, unless we consider the location of *Partiskon* (Ptolemy) and the river *Parthiscus* (Ammianus Marcellinus). In this case it might be identical with the Upper-Tisza, but it is more likely to be a Transylvanian river, such as the Kis-Szamos (Some<sup>o</sup>ul Mic) or the K or os (Cri<sup>o</sup>). After the Jazigs appear on the scene, the Dacians are compelled to retreat to Transylvania. (They are separated from the Svebes and the Kingdom of Vannius by the Duria river - which could very well be the Tisza below the Maros (Mure<sup>o</sup>) estuary. We hear no more about them until the end of the reign of Scorilo in 69 A.D. but we know that Scorilo did not permit them to intervene in the civil war following Nero's death. The reason for this may be found in an earlier time. Between 62 - 66 Plautius Silvanus Aelianus freed the brother of Dacia's King from captivity and allowed him to return home - a sign of the good relationship between Dacians and Romans. Dacians attack Moesia at



the beginning of 69 and overrun several military installations; eventually Mucianus beats them off. Yet, the traditional relationship is not broken (there seems to be a continuous flow of Roman money into the Kingdom) and there is no repetition of Dacian forays into Roman territory. Friendship between the two countries flourishes until the mid-eighties. In the winter of 85 - 86 the Dacians unexpectedly attack Moesia. The assault scatters the armed forces of the province, the Viceroy, G. Oppius Sabinus also falls in battle. The Dacian attack threatened not only the borders of the Empire but also the legionnaires' encampments and the very survival of the province. The Emperor Domitianus appears in person as Commander-in-Chief; the Roman armies are led into battle by the Commander of the Praetorian Guard, Cornelius Fuscus. In 86 he routs the Dacians and retakes Moesia, the region south of the Danube.

We do not quite know why hostilities broke out. According to Jordanes the Dacians decided to break up their alliance (*foedus*) with Rome because of Domitian's greed. One assumes this meant that Dacians failed to receive their annual subsidy. However, it should be noted that Pannonian military capability has been systematically strengthened; the process began in 80 during the reign of Titus, with troop maneuvers in 80, 84 and 85. These could not have been directed against Dacia which was separated from the Province by the Jazigs who spread out along the Danube and up to the river-bend. In Dacia Scorilo was succeeded by Duras (a.k.a. Diurpaneus - 69 to 86). In the Dacian kingdom power may again have been consolidated in the hands of one ruler. Duras voluntarily relinquished his power to Decebal and does not appear to be the kind of person who would

have wanted to undertake major military conquests. Thus, the Dacians' forays into the Roman province must have had to do with Domitian's greed, after all - although not for the reasons proposed. During the reign of Augustus waterways of the Empire constituted ideal borders. The first modification occurs under Domitian: he advances beyond existing boundaries in the war against the Germans living along the Rhine. He occupies the area between the Rhine and the Danube and forces its resident to tithe (*agri decumates*). The concentration of army units in Pannonia may have been part of the strategy later to be used against the Markomans and Kvads. The campaign against the Dacians may very well have been part of overall military strategy. Caesar and Augustus were already planning to attack them - at least this is the word they spread; the Dacians must have retained the memory of this propaganda in their consciousness. Accordingly, the Dacian attack on Moesia could be viewed as a preventive maneuver, whatever Domitian's actual plans against them may have been.

The reorganization of Roman military forces made it possible to continue the war against the Dacians after they were forced to withdraw from Moesia. Cornelius Fuscus uses as his starting point the legionnaires' camp at Oescus (now Gigen, Bulgaria) near the Danube. He continues his campaign along the river Olt but suffers catastrophic losses at the Vöröstorony-pass (Rum: Turnu Roşu). The Dacians capture many Roman prisoners and military emblems; Fuscus is killed. By this time Decebal is the King of the Dacians, he succeeded Duras (Diurpaneus), who abdicated in his favor after the defeat suffered in Moesia. Our sources describe Decebal as a good

diplomat and excellent military strategist, but the record only covers his peace overture to the Romans and the defensive military action in which he was engaged. Following the victory he won in 87 all his martial skills are insufficient to fend off military attacks against Dacia in 88. The newly appointed military commander of the Roman forces is Tettius Julianus, who marches against the Dacians by way of the Bánság (Rum. Banat) and claims decisive victory at Tapae in Transylvania. He holds the key to the power-center of the Dacians but does not advance further. Decebal disguises fallen tree-trunks as soldiers to trick and scare the Romans.

Tettius Julianus halts the campaign. It is possible that events taking place in Pannonia played a part in the interruption of military action: Domitian decided to move against the Markomanns and the Kvads, angered by their failure to aid him in fighting the Dacians. However, the Markomanns defeat the Roman commander, who had refused Decebal's offer of peace in 89 but is now prepared to halt the fighting and reach a peace agreement with Decebal. This enables him to send part of the army, which had been fighting the Dacians, and can thus pass through Dacia to the battle front in Pannonia (*per regnum Deceballi regis Dacorum*, ILS 9200) to fight the Kvads, Markomanns and Sarmatians. The peace treaty turns Dacians into a client-state of Rome. To the commemorative ceremony of this event Decebal sends a man named Diegis, accompanied by a few Dacians. He also returns some of the Roman weapons and prisoners he was holding. Domitian places the diadem, given to client-Kings, on Diegis' head and the Dacians take home a great deal of money, a

significant amount of aid ("*Stipendium*") and many craftsmen whose skills can be used in peacetime, as well as in war.

A realistic analysis of these events is rather difficult in view of biased Roman historical reports, hostile to Domitian and influenced by Trajan's wars against the Dacians. These wars will also influence later historical writing, even though Trajan went to war against the Dacians without cause. (Dio Cassius writes that Trajan could not tolerate that Dacian's power and pride was increasing and that he had to pay them annual subsidies. Yet, all this is a natural adjunct of client-state status.) It should be noted that Domitian brought the Dacians under Roman rule as a client-state, although the Dacian Kingdom did not become an integral part of the Empire, as did the Territory (*agri decumates*) between the upper reaches of the Rhine and the Danube. There are no data to substantiate that Decebal would have demonstrated hostility against Rome between 88 - 101, when Trajan started his campaign against the Dacians. No "Dacian threat" existed; it was Dacia that was threatened from 98 on by Trajan's expansionist policies.

This is the ruler who wanted to follow in the footsteps of Alexander the Great and to advance to the Indian Ocean. While he did not achieve that goal, he did conquer the Kingdom of Dacia in a war he planned, just as Julius Caesar planned his campaign against the Galls. This planned conquest ran counter to rational political considerations and was quite senseless. His successor, Hadrian, wanted to relinquish already at the beginning of his rule the Dacian territory Rome occupied, just as he wanted to - and did relinquish - the lands in Asia which Trajan conquered.

Due to these circumstances it is almost impossible to validate data pertaining to the Dacian wars of Domitian. To wit: according to Jordanus, Domitian's adversary in this war is Durdaneus (Durdaneus = Duras) and it is Decebal who becomes his "client". At the same time, the only Roman inscription in Dacia referring to Decebal fails to describe him as a King (*Decebalus per Scorilo*). Nor does his title appear on the inscription pertaining to Titus Claudius Maximus, the Roman soldier, who cut off Decebal's head.

Yet, there is a record of an officer of Tettius Julianus - C. Velius Rufus - who proceeds to the Pannonian battle lines in 88 from Tapae through the Kingdom of Decebal, King of Dacia (*per regnum Decebalis regis Dacorum*; ILS 9200).

Notwithstanding the distortions of Roman historians regarding Domitian's rule, we can be certain that the Dacian Kingdom had twelve peaceful years as a client-state of Rome. Contributing to the prosperity of the Kingdom were the contributions of Roman craftsmen, as well as aid Dacia received from Rome. A great many of the edifices built in Boirebistas' time were reconstructed, such as the large, round shrine in Grădișteasa Muncelului. Castles and other important structures were also being rebuilt. Even though the products of Roman craftsmen remind us of the Greek cities of the Pontus (roof-covering, plumbing), we can be certain that these were put to use during the Domitian - Decebal *foedus* and should not be attributed to the era of Boirebistas. Especially, since the roof tiles are to be found on buildings and in areas which could not have been erected in pre-Decebal times, such as in Costești, Blidaru, Piatra Roșie, Grădișteasa Muncelului, Piatra Craivii, Barboși and Popești.

The import - export link between Rome and Dacia are not substantiated by Roman coins only. In Grădi<sup>o</sup>tea Muncelului a wagon-maker's tool was found, inscribed: HERENNI. The Herenni were a well known family of craftsmen from Aquileia in the 1st century A.D. This may be their only product which found its way into the Dacian Kingdom, although there were a great many nameless, unsigned implements made of iron that were unearthed.

In all likelihood the sources available to us today mirror the administrative structure of the Kingdom in its day. We assume these originated in Boirebistas' time. A substantiating reference might be the description of Kriton, physician to Trajan, of castles and the overseers of oxen, reflecting the two social classes known to us from the era of Boirebistas: the Pileati and Comati. What we know of the geography of the Dacian Kingdom and of its administrative units came to us from the Geography of Klaudios Ptolemaios. This geographer left to us many works written around 170 A.D. for which he used earlier works as reference, (basically: Marinus of Tyros) but he augmented these with current knowledge. This did not happen in the case of Dacia. Ptolemaios makes no mention of Roman colonies or legions, and he does not know the situation in the province - although he is familiar with the organization of every other province. He goes on to call Sarmizegethusa *basileion*, i.e. "Royal" which can't be possibly accurate, given the date of 105 - 106, after Trajan's 2nd Dacian war. Ptolemaios' description refers to the Kingdom of Dacia when it was a client-state - therefore, no later than 104. We cannot link Ptolemaios' data with Trajan's 1st Dacian war in 101/102 because of the Roman names to be found on his list of Dacian cities. These

include Praetoria Augusta or Ulpianum. It is evident that both names are linked to Trajan (Marcus *Ulpus* Traianus). Roman place - names must date from the garrisons which Trajan left behind in 102 in the Kingdom of Decebal. Consequently, Ptolemaios' description of Dacia must refer to 103/104 and is a reliable reflection of the organization of the Dacian Kingdom.

Ptolemaios' writings reveal that one of the kingdom's border check-points is in the Carpathian Mountains where the Dniester (*Tyras*) winds its way east. This is the area of Hotin (today's Ukraine), i.e. the mountain region of Maramure<sup>o</sup> and Rodna. From the west along the Timi<sup>o</sup> (*Tibiskos*) river, the Jazigs' land abuts Dacia and from the south it is the Danube to Axiopolis or to the southwest corner of Dobruja, where the Danube winds north. Ptolemaios also identifies the Siret River as Dacia's Eastern border (*Hierasos*). This area differs from the later Dacian Province inasmuch that the latter did not include the region bordered by the Southern-Carpathians and the rivers Olt, Danube, and Siret. According to one source, this territory which was brought under Roman sovereignty by Trajan between 103 - 106.

This Dacia is populated by the following peoples - starting at the region's North-West border:

Anartoi Teuriskoi      Koistobókoi  
 Predauénsioi Rhatakénsioi Kaukoénsioi  
 Biéphoi Buridauénsioi Koténsioi  
 Albokénsioi Potulaténsioi Sénsioi

## Sadénsioi Keiagiso Piephigoi

Of the 15 names, nine are names of peoples or tribes formed from place names (*Predauénsioi*, etc.) Even if we assume that in some of the cases *-énsioi* (Lat. *-enses*) was analogous to foreign usage (such may have been: *Rhatakénsioi*, *Kaukoénsioi*, *Koténsioi*) the frequency of this type of name is noteworthy. These names must be older than the place names they resemble. Neither the city-lists of Ptolemy, nor do later records refer to them and we have no record in Dacia of Predosa, Alboca, Potulata or Salda - Buridava being the one exception. We can trace these names to the time of Boirebistas along with the organizational system, emanating from fort-centric settlements. We have additional references which attest to this kind of jurisdictional system. Sarmizegethusa retained its title as the capital of Dacia but - in reality- it is located some 37 km from Grădiştea Muncelului, which can only be reached from Sarmizegethusa by detour. The Roman Apulum lies a distance of 17 km from its Dacian predecessor, Piatra Craivii. Many Roman settlements are somewhat removed from the native communities which preceded them but none of them are as far removed as in Dacia. These distances are the direct consequence of castle or fort-centric communities, wherein whole large areas were named after the castle which dominated them. We can also take for granted that each castle or "*dava*" had one master; community names bearing the name of the castle (and his owner) attest to that. Markodaua must have gotten its name from Mark3 (Lat. *Marcus?*); we are familiar with the inscription on a pot from the age of Augustus, which came from the Dacian castle at Ocnişă and states: ..... "by King Markos"



(ἈΑἸΕἸἸἸ...ἸΙΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ). Markodaua may have been named after him but its name-giver could also have been the Tarabostes who was the castle's "overseer". We can assume that, in the case of Ziridaua, Komidaua, etc. there was a similar situation. This territorial apportionment is quite similar to the county-jurisdictional system used in the period of Árpád in Hungary. We are also reminded of the Polish "*castellanatus*" and there are other analogous situations as well.

The Dacian state apparatus also had "early feudal" characteristics. The above-mentioned inscription from Ocnîpa appeared on a 1st century B.C. dish fragment (naturally incomplete): ἈΑἸΕἸἸἸ .ΙΑΜΑΡΚΟ. According to I.I. Russu: from these fragments one can reconstruct ἈΑἸΕἸἸἸ ἸἸἸἸἸἸ ἸἸἸἸἸἸ ΚΟΥ, which means 'Belonging to King Thiamarkos'. In the second group of works Ἰ could also be Ἰ. Thus, the text could also read: ἸἸἸἸ Ἰ ἸἸἸἸἸἸ, which bears a remarkable resemblance to the inverted cone of the ritual dish from Sarmizegethusa, with DECEBALVS/PER SCORILO inscribed on it (this is on what Cassius Dio must have based his story about a letter written on a mushroom - it has the shape of a mushroom jar and there is an inscription on it!). Several people considered this inscription to be Dacian, meaning: "Decebal, son of Scorilo" (V. Georgiev, C. Daicoviciu). However, Decebal's name has the regular Latin ending in the text written in Latin characters, thus it must be a Latin inscription; in which the name of Scorilo is not declinable. Therefore, the inscription on the vessel from Sarmizegethusa should be read as "Decebal, by way of Scorilo". The findings from Ocnîpa are similar: ἈΑἸΕἸἸἸ [ἸἸ...ἸἸ] ἸἸἸ ἸἸ ἸἸἸἸἸἸ - the reconstruction suggests: King by way of Marcos. For the missing

name of the King we may substitute Comosicus. On these inscriptions one name is that of the King and the other the name of the Tarabostes. This we deduced in the case of Marcos from a similar-sounding castle (place) name. As for Scorilo: he has the same name as one of the Dacian Kings and those came from among the Tarabostes. Thus, this leaves us to understand that the Tarabostes could act only in the name of the Dacian King and that there was a strong, interdependent relationship between the King and the overseers of the areas under suzerainty of the castle(s). It is conceivable that there also existed a multi-level dependency - the inscription from Sarmizegethus suggests that. Next to Decebal's name the designation of Rex (king) is missing, which implies that he was not a king. Let us remember that, in 89 Emperor Domitian invites Diegis as King of the Dacians with the diadem bestowed upon the ruler of a client-state. Thus, it becomes evident that, behind King Diegis (and High Priest?) stood Decebal, who did not use the royal title but held actual power. The food-container with the inscription could not have been made prior to 89 for the simple reason that Roman craftsmen came to Dacia only after the peace-treaty and the etched inscription bears the mark of a Roman master-craftsman.

The inter-dependent relationship which existed between the King and the Tarabostes, i.e. the king, Decebal and the tarabostes, must have been similar to the one found between the Tarabostes and the village chiefs, or comati. It is possible that this hierarchical chain was extended with an additional link: Cassius Dio Vezina, one of the Dacian notables, from the Battle of Tapae, is designated as the second in command after Decebal (Cass. Dio.67,10). It is also

possible that, in the text, we simply see the translation of the Dacian word: tarabostes; as we shall see the meaning is similar.

Ptolemy's list about different ethnic groups suggests these conclusions regarding the Dacian government and power structure. There are many names on the list, which derive from place-names but we can also identify names of tribal origin. At least half of these are Celtic (*Anarto*, *Teurisko*, *Koténso*, *Koténo*) the other are definitely not Dacian. As I.I. Russu pointed out: there was no "ph" in the Dacian language, thus *Biephoi* and *Piephigo* could not be Dacian although it is possible that the Greek "ph" was in this instance, signifying "f". The "au" diphthong is also missing from the language - that eliminates the *Kaukoénsioi*. The many different writings of *Keiagiso* make it extremely difficult to provide an explanation for this name. Yet, unless we wish to assume that we are talking about a few obscure and extinct groups we can assume that, excepting the *Kaukoénsio*, they are Iranian. We assume that both *Biéphoi* and *Piephigo* derive from Old Iran, *p pa* = father/*papaios* (Herodotos) Chief of the Gods. - *Ya-* and *-ya-ka* become suffixes. - *Sensioi* may also be of Iranian derivation (from *Senoi*; "King" in Old Iran. is *xšaya* (plur. = *xšay...n*). At the start of the 1st century B.C. "Royal Scythians" and "Royal Sarmatians" were frequently-used terms and, if the Scythians from Dacia are "like gods" that should not be surprising, either.

This would tell us that the "real" Dacian tribal names are not Dacian, but Celtic and Iranian. It must also be noted that these tribal names are to be found only in areas which, following the death of Boirebistas, drop out of the orbit of Dacian suzerainty in the Orătie mountain region. The Anartoi and Teuriskoi settle in the area of the

rivers Some<sup>o</sup> and Cri<sup>o</sup>, the Sensioi, Keiagisoï and Piephigoï between the Southern Carpathians and the Danube, while the Biéphoi inhabit the Bánság (Rum. Banat). They could not have returned to the Dacian Kingdom prior to Domitian's Dacian wars. If so, we should have found in the writings of Ptolemy from 103/104 regional designations derived from place-names. As an exception to the above we want to call attention to the tribe of the Koistobókoi-s which was demonstrably Dacian. However, this was a small ethnic enclave in the area of Rodna, - at present part of the Ukraine (and Maramure<sup>o</sup>) (Kurgans with burial mound in the region constitute their archeological legacy) which was never part of Dacia: not in the post-Boirebistas era, nor in Roman times.

Thus, immediately preceding the Roman conquest when Dacia was a client-state of Rome, Celts lived there, along with Iranians (i.e. Scythians and Sarmatians) and Dacians. Kaukoénsiosi, who must have been related to the Bastarnae lived alongside, (it is unlikely that they were Germanic as their name is related to Gothic *hauhs*). It is almost impossible to tell how many Dacians there were in the Kingdom. The ethnic lineage of the population in Dava-ruled territories is indeterminate; we can find Celts even in the hill-country center of Oră<sup>o</sup>tie. The Celtic sword from Piatra Ro<sup>o</sup>ie is only one of the artifacts found there; among the iron implements several others were unearthed. The Dava's archeological legacy became the legacy of the Dacian Kingdom. However, these objects cannot be viewed as ethnic identification, having come from a region which was a multi-cultural entity. We know very little about rural settlements but are aware of the existence of late-Celtic objects found even beyond the

Carpathian Mountains. Poverty was a characteristic feature of the settlements within the Carpathians. We might even call this the "state-culture" of the Dacian Kingdom: hand shaped utensils, lacking individual character. The mass-migration from Moldavia and the Lower-Danube region to the Mountain region of Orăştie during the reign of Boirebistas, was almost totally absent from other parts of Transylvania. (One of the best pieces of the characteristic artifacts of these people - typically slender-shaped dishes adorned with knobs - was found in Costeşti). From Ptolemy's list of peoples and from archeological data we can deduce: the Dacian Kingdom had a population of diverse ethnicity and not even the area of their power-center was exempt from this diversity. Celts, Iranians, Dacians and Bastarnae lived side by side - among them were also Greek and Roman traders and probably others, too. The Pontifex (High Priest) of Sarmizegethusa may have been a unifying force, although we take this to be only superficial unity. We posit that true concord was not possible, given the economic and cultural disparity among the people in the land.

Not too many conclusions can be drawn from Ptolemy's list of Dacian city-names. 14 out of 44 end in *daua*. Yet, it would be a mistake to assume this meant extensive presence of ethnic Dacians, any more than other words with the same meaning of city: Hungarian - *város*; Rumanian - *oraş* and Serbo-Croatian - *varoš*, although it might reflect cultural or governmental influences. There is another reason for not attaching ethnic significance to the - *daua* suffix. The names to which they are attached are mostly derived from family names and none of them is certainly Dacian (though several can

hardly be anything else.) There are two more original village names: *Porolisson* and *Patruissa* (misspelled version of *Potauissa*). They are definitely Dacian, the latter to be found on Dacian Rhataka territory, while strangely the former can be traced to a Celt habitat. (Names that are most definitely of Dacian origin do not end in *-on* or *-um* in Latin). The great number of Latin town-names is surprising: *Ulpianon*, *Salinai*, *Praitória*, *Augusta*, *Angustia*, *Pirum*, *Pinon* (cf. Latin *-pinus* - pinetree). There were also Greek names: *Triphulon*, *Hydata*, *Zeugma*, *Phrateria*. Among the latter *Triphulon* is unique because the name of this city of three tribes is not of the contemporary, regular Greek pattern, but is either transmitted by Latin or represents a very old Greek form. In case of the latter we can presume an old Greek settlement (from the time of Boirebistas) in the Dacian Kingdom - a reasonable presumption. However, in this case the Greek city-names pre-date Trajan's first Dacian War. Silver objects found in Sîncrăeni (Hung. Csík-Szentkirály) and Surcea (Hung. Szörce) are links to a Greek presence; while the items suggest the craftsmanship of Hellenistic-Roman goldsmiths, they weren't likely to be imported objects - much too unique for that. One third of the city names listed by Ptolemy are thus ethnically undefinable names of the *-dava* type, another third is Latin and Greek and the final third would be Dacian. However, some of these cannot be identified and others can definitely not be considered Dacian (example: *Akmonia*).

What do we actually know about the language of the Dacians? The answer should be easy if we rely on writers from ancient times. According to Strabon, Dacians and Getae speak one language and Iustinius states that the Dacians are the descendents (*suboles*) of the

Getae. Appianus believes Trans- Dunabian Getae are known as Dacians. Yet, some of these same writers claim that Getae are connected to the Thracians. Logically, then, the Dacian language had to be identical with Thracian, or one of its variants. Unfortunately, the sources which would validate these assumptions are limited and hard to interpret. Yet, this is what we have to rely on, trying to understand the Thracians' language. It is necessary to seek substantiation of the views of ancient writers; they called the Bastarnae: Celts, Germanics, Getae, and Scythians if this were accurate they would have to speak four distinct languages. We have other examples of misinformation: Hungarians, as late as the last century, were said to speak a Turkish language and Hungarian was considered a Slavic language before then. We know of no inscription or other text written in Dacian (the inscription on the dish at Sarmizegethusa was obviously in Latin). Ovid is to have written poems in the Geta language when he lived in Tomi as an exile, but these have not survived. The research material on which we rely for an understanding of the Dacian language is confined to personal names (*Boirebistas, Decebal*, etc.), geographical designations of places, rivers and mountains, and Dacian herbal names. The latter were included among the medicinal herbs, which Pedanios Dioskorides listed. He lived in Anazarba in the first century, A.D. His list gives the Greek and Latin names of herbs and in several instances records their equivalent in Egyptian, Punic, Syrian, Celtic and Dacian. Dioskorides' collection was drawn up in its final form toward the end of the 3rd century in alphabetical order. There is also a Latin version of this glossary. We know it as *Medicaminibus Herbarum* and it was

compiled by one Apuleius. The exact date of this work can not be determined since we know about six men named Apuleius who were botanists and who lived during the time spanning the 2nd - 4th Centuries. We do know for certain that at the turn of the 4th and 5th centuries this glossary was already in use. On both Diaskorides' and Apuleius' roster of herbs we find Greek and Latin names among those which were listed as Dacian. D. Deèev's explanation for this lies in Dacia Aureliana which was established South of the Danube after 271 and where, according to him, the herbal names were recorded. On the other hand, C. Váczy attributes the Greek/Latin names to merchants of like background. For reasons of chronology, Deèev's explanation is unlikely and Váczy's artificial. It is evident that the Greek and Latin names of Dacian herbs come from Dacia Traiana i.e. from Dacia between 106 and 271.

What we know of the Dacian language comes from sources of no real significance. It is barely worth noting that the glossary of herbs gives us a more realistic picture than family or place names. A description of the Dacian language had been attempted on the basis of the above a long time ago, but a more palpable knowledge of it we owe to W. Tomaschek whose definitive works on the subject (written in 1883 and 1884: *Die Alten Thraker*) earned him recognition as the Nestor of Thracology. As the title of his work (which is still valid) tells us, he linked Dacians, on the basis of the Antique sources, to the Thracians, as did all of those who wrote about the Dacian language after him (P. Kretschmer, D. Deèev). The publication of V. Georgiev's study in 1957 was a turning-point in this regard. Based on a voluminous research of facts, Deèev realized that, linguistically, the



“Thracian” region could be divided into two larger units. He concluded that place-names ending in *-dava* were not characteristic of areas which were historically Thracian and place-names ending in *-para*, *-bria* are not found in areas populated by Dacians. He was also able to substantiate a sound shift in the Thracian language (similar to Germanic), while the same cannot be found in Dacian. Thracian is a so-called AMTA-language; Indo-European *bh*, *dh*, *gh* became *b*, *d*, *g*; *b*, *d*, *g* became *p*, *t*, *k* and *p*, *t*, *k* became *ph*, *th*, *kh*. Such a sound change also exists in Frisian and in Armenian - (but here the Germanic link is less likely because these are satem languages and Germanic is a centum language). These sound changes are not characteristic of Dacian, where *b*, *d*, *g* and *p*, *t*, *k* remained unchanged and *bh*, *dh* and *gh* became *b*, *d*, *g*. These differences are similar to those which separate Germanic from Celtic or the Italic languages. Even if Georgiev's interpretation were to be challenged on some points, it is clear that Thracians and Dacians (also Getae and Moesians) cannot belong to the same linguistic entity. No wonder Georgiev's theory was accepted by scholars of extinct Indo-European languages and of linguistic history.

Contrary to the beliefs held by our sources on antiquity, the Dacians' language was distinct from the Thracians'. This we propose to illustrate, although we cannot do so extensively, given our limitations of space.

#### Personal names

*Boirebistas* (*Byrebistes, Byrbistas, Boirebistas, Beirebistas, Byrebista* - *indecl., Byrabeista* - *indecl., Byrebistas, Buruista, Rubobostes: Burobostes*).

In contemporary sources, the first part of the name is *büre, büra*; the second *bista, beista*.

The name of Dacia's first king (62 - 45 B.C.) was given different interpretations (Tomaschek, Deèev, Georgiev, Russu). The explanations are not sufficient and it is unlikely that the name can be made to fit into a known or reconstructible Indo-European language. The second half of the name cannot be separated from the name of the *Bastarna* people and we suspect that *bista, beista* is a superlative form of an adjective with an *-st* affix - this equates the indicator: *prótos, megistos* in the inscription at Dionysiopolis. (Cf. Old Ind.-*išp ha* Old Ir.- *išta*, Greek *-éóôïò* (, Gothic *-ists*). Thus, the name of the first Dacian king derives probably from the language of the Bastarnae.

*Decebalus (Decibalus, Decibalis)]*

The first half of the name of the last Dacian king (87 - 106, A.D.) is attributed by Tomaschek and Russu to "*-dek<sup>1</sup>*" take, receive, respect (Idg). The interpretation must be erroneous, though, if we consider that the second half of the name can scarcely be separated from Greek *öáëëüò* ( or Gaelic *ball* 'membrum, penis'. On the basis of similar names (such as *Triballi*), we have to consider (Idg) *dek<sup>1</sup>m<sup>2</sup>* 'horse', as the basis of the first part of this name. This explanation assumes that the name comes from a kentum language (the same

applies also to the theories put forward by Tomaschek and Russu); thus we must assume either that the word comes from an extinct language or from the language of the Celts, who were dwelling in the Dacian kingdom.

*Dekaineos (Dicineus, Dikomés)*

*Idg.*-*dek*<sup>1</sup>- take, receive, respect, cf. Lat. *doceo*, Greek =ἀΐειιάέ (ref. Tomaschek, Russu). Once again, not satem language. Quoting Tomaschek: "schlägt dies die thrak, çatam Theorie über den Haufen". (It makes the Thracian - çatam theory a shamble), \_ i.e., it negates the satem-theory. Yet, in this case this does not apply; reliably Dacian words leave no doubt that Dacian was a satem language.

*Vezina*

*Idg.* *u*<sup>3</sup>*edh* = to lead, to carry - is a past participle with the affix *-nt*, thus, it means "leader, commander". This explanation is supported by Vezina's role: according to Cassius Dio, he was 2nd in command to Decebal. The *di* > *zi* change is a characteristic feature of the Dacian language.

*Geographical terms:*

*Akmonia*

It would be difficult to equate the term with Agnaviae mansio. *Idg.* *akhmen*-/*akhmen*-; Lithuanian *akmuõ*, *akmueñs*; Old Slavic - *Kamy*, Old Ind. - *akman* 'stone'. The Baltic and Slavic equivalents prevent its use as centum-specific, but it is an example of the Dacian - Baltic connection.

*Aizisis (Azizis)*

Idg, *aice-* 'goat' Armenian *ayc* etc. Satem type.

*Alboka (Albokénsioi)*

Idg. *albo-* 'white'. A typically European word.

*Apo*

A river (probably the Karas). Idg.: *ap-* = water. In this territory, we cannot exclude the possibility of a Sarmatian origin, given the extensive use of the word in Iran.

*Karpatés*

Ptolemy used the name as we currently use it. Idg. *sqer-*, - *qer-* 'to cut?', Alb. *karpë* 'rock'. The Indo-Germanic etymology (proposed by Deèev) is very dubious, but there is little doubt about the link with Albanian. The name is important because of the Dacian-Albanian relationship.

*Dierna (Tierna, Zernés, Zernis, Tsierna, etc.).*

The most frequently analyzed place name, because of its position at the mouth of the Cerna river. The word's Slavic meaning is "black" and an early Slavic connection has been assumed. However, Dierna is one of the "entrances" to Dacia. Therefore, cf. Idg. *dh<sup>h</sup>er-*, Gothic *daúr*, Old English *dor*, Old French *tor*, Greek *ἄθῆνα*, Latin *fores* 'gate, door, entrance'. The sound changes *e* > *ie* and *d* > *z* are characteristic of Albanian. The place name then means "gate",

"passageway" and has nothing to do with the later name: *Cerna* river, which is an independent Slavic word. The Dacian-Albanian line is apparent in *Dierna*, too.

*Germizera* (*Germigera*, *Germisara*, *Germizirga*, *Zermizerga*, *Zermizirga*)

Known today as Algyógy (Roman settlement, hot-springs, and stone quarry). The first part of the word means "heat" in Idg. (*gh<sup>h</sup>erm*), Old Ind. ved. (*gharmá*) "hot" Av. (*garāma*), Arm. (*j<sup>4</sup>erm*) and Greek (ἄϊϋϋϋ), "fire" in Alb. (*zjarr*), etc. - Regarding the second part of the word, cf. Armenian *eZR* (<*e hero*), meaning "bank". It is also compared with a Slavic word: Russ. *ozero*. The variations create some uncertainty but the meaning is likely to be "hot water". Cf. also Arm. *jur* 'water'. Independently from the proposed etymologies, this word is in agreement with the satem character of Dacian and shows also its Albanian connection.

*Marisos* (*Maris*, *Marisos*, *Parissos*: *Marissos*, *Marus*, *Marisia*)

Today the river Maros, (Rum. Mure<sup>o</sup>). Idg. *marī-*, Lat.- *mare* etc. A European Idg. word. The affix is probably *-sk<sup>1</sup>h-*, cf. *Tibiskos*, *Partiskon*, etc. Old Eng. - *merisc*. Mid.(lower)German - *marsch* and German - *Marsch* 'marsh, swamp'. (Idg.) *sk* becomes *sh* (š) in Alb. Dacian sound-characteristics are present here, as in the name of many other rivers in the Eastern part of the Carpathian Basin. In Hungarian, the river is called *Maros*. Several hypotheses analyzed the Dacian context. - The only tenable one assumes an indirect transfer, as posited by Melich J., and G. Schramm. Of course, this

does not permit us to conclude how long the Dacian language continued to exist in the region.

*Salda (Saldénsioi)*

Idg. sal- 'salt' and its declination: *sal-d*, cf. German *Salz*. Its location is around the So. West Carpathians. It cannot be traced to Dacian since its Albanian links would necessitate an "h" or "ÿ" as a starting letter.

*Sarmizegethusa (Zarmesegethusa, Zermizegethusa, Sarmategte, Sarmazege)*

Name of the capital and cultural center of the Dacian kingdom and of a nearby provincial seat. This place-name has successfully resisted analysis (despite by the Tabula Peutingeriana's or Geographus Ravennas' misperceived etymology). Yet, it can be parsed as *sar-mize-gethus(a)*. *Sar* means "head" in Idg. *k<sup>1</sup>her-*, cf. Gr. *êÛñá*, Hom.Gr. *êÛñç*, Old.Ind. *śaras-*, Old.Icel. *hjarni* 'brain'; Lat. *cerebrum*, Arm. *sar* 'mountain'; *mize* means 'center', cf. Idg. *medh<sup>5</sup>o-*, Old.Ind. *mádhya*; 'mid' Arm. *m j* - 'inside, amid'; *geth* means water: Idg. *u<sup>3</sup>ed-*, cf. Arm. *get* 'river'. Thus, the meaning of Sarmizegethusa's name is simply 'Chief (summit) (among the two) rivers'. Grădi<sup>0</sup>tea Muncelulni is indeed between two rivers, the Valea Godeanului and the Valea Albă; Castle Hill (Dealul Grădi<sup>0</sup>tei) is a mountain peak bordered by two waters. The name fits. Just the same, it is not congruent with our knowledge of the Dacian language, in spite of the ending of the name: (dual genitive (Idg. – ou<sup>3</sup>s) this is to be expected from this structure. The -a is a designator, which we

find in many Dacian names as *-e, -a*; probably *-Ä, Ä<sup>7</sup>* (G.Schramm). Our analysis is supported by the name of the *Sargetia* river, cited by Cassius Dio (Cass.Dio 68,14); it is the river - at the central seat of power - where the royal treasure is hidden. In all likelihood the word derives from a more original form: *sar-get*. This clarifies that here *sar* really means "chief"(major):(Hauptort, Hauptsitz) and not "mountain" or "peak". Therefore, *Sargetia* really means "chief (city) river" and *Sarmizegethusa* is "chief (city) (between 2) rivers". The characteristics of the name point to an AMTA-type language, such as Thracian, Frisian or Armenian. It would be difficult to disregard the latter two: Frisian may be considered as the forerunner of Armenian. The equivalent of *sar* we find only in Armenian. (It is *geg krýe*, *tosk kríe* in Albanian but this is a foreign word, adopted from Latin). Once more, this is where we come across *get* and *mize* which cannot be Dacian either (cf. Alb. *mjet*). There are two possible explanations. Either we are misinterpreting Dacian language-data, or the name of the capital of Dacia (and the river which joins the Maros) are not in Dacian. We will adhere to the latter hypothesis. Our sources assert that the High Priest of Boirebistas came from a foreign land and that the spread of faith and language were concurrent. Archeological findings also reveal the existence of foreign elements in the Orãtie mountain region at the start of the reign of Boirebistas. We presume that the Dacian seat of power had a significant population from the eastern part of the Middle-East - this is what the name of the capital city conveys to us. In the end, we find a common thread which connects the death of Mithridates and the appearance of Boirebistas.

*Tibiskos (Tibisis Her..? v\_, Tibiskon, Tibiscum, Tiviscum)*

The Temes River - on the Western border of the Dacian Kingdom at the beginning of the 2nd century. - Idg. *tibh-* cf. Gr.  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$  (= marshlands) (Deèev, Georgiev, Russu). Use of affixes is likely to be the same as in the case of the Maros. The Hungarian name *Temes* (Old Hung. *Timis* > Serbian *Tamiš*) contains an *m* in the place of *b*, a sound change that existed in Dacian and exists in Albanian. This is one of the circumstances which indicate that the name was transferred directly from Dacian to Hungarian.

*Names of Plants.**Seba* - elderberry

Both Tomaschek and Georgiev base it on the Lith. *šėivà* 'tube, pipe'. (Idg. *keywâ*). The similarity between the Dacian and Lithuanian words suggest that the Dacian is a compound word: *sew - ba*, cf. Lith. *šėiva - medis*.

*Duódela (diodela, Ziodela) 'camomile'.*

Deèev's interpretation for the first part is "shining" but one of the Greek names of the plant is *parthenion* "Jungfernkraut", i.e. "virgin's grass" and that leads us to consider the O.Slav. *dĭv â* (Idg. *dhei-wâ, dhoi-wâ*) 'virgin'. The second part of the word, *-dela*, appears in the Dacian names of many plants, as *-dela, -dila, -zila, -tila*. From Tomaschek on this word has been interpreted in re. to Idg. *hel* = greening (flowering) and including O.Slav. – *zel;je* 'cabbage', Russ. *zel'e* '[herbal]grass, poison'. In view of the above it must mean



´grass, herb´. It is worth noting that we know of Armenian words, meaning "grass, plant, herb, medicine": Mid-Arm. - *delo-*, O.Arm. *deloy* ´grass, plant, medicinal herb, medicine´. Could *dela* and *zila* be two separate words? The Armenian connection is, once again, apparent.

*Amolusta (amalusta, amulusta) ´camomile (anthesis)´*

We find it only in the writings of Pseudo-Apuleius, in addition to *thusci ambolicia, amolusta, amolacia, campani amolocia*. Thus, these names were used also in Etruria and Campania. Georgiev would associate it with Alb. *ambël, ëmbël* ´sweet´ but - as Váczy states - this does not apply to the plant. One of its Greek names is "dwarf - apple", bringing it in line with the Idg. variants of apple.

*mantia (manteia, mantua) ´blackberry´*

Alb. *man* dialectally *mand, mën* ´strawberry´. Thomaschek has already linked the two words, it would be hard to dismiss the Dacian - Albanian tie.

*kinuboila ´white grape´*

Thomaschek called attention to its relationship with the Lith. *šūn-obuolas*. Georgiev calls it "dog-apple" (*kun- ābōlo-s*. Idg. "dog" = *k<sup>1</sup>huon/k<sup>1</sup>hun*) - this word doesn't fit into the satem character of Dacian. - The second part of the word most resembles O.Iran. *ubull* and Lith. *óbuolas, óbalas* ´apple´ among the words for apple the Idg. languages. The antecedent must have been the Celtic *ablu* (cf. Gallic *avallo*). In looking at Celtic roots we note that *kin* for dog is unusual (error or dissimilation? cf. O.Ir. *cu*). The name of this plant comes up only with Dioskorides ( we exclude Apuleius as he uses the word in

relation to the Bessae.) It must date from the time of the Dacian Kingdom and can be seen as undisputed evidence of the Celts' presence in the Kingdom - a people speaking a kentum language.

*Skjaré (skithe)* 'Dipsacus laciniatus, Teasel (Split - tear)' Tomaschek pointed out the connection with Alb. *shqer* 'to cut'. Georgiev reconstructed an original *skerā*. Yet, the equivalent of the *skher* - root exists only in Germanic and Celtic languages (cf. O.Ir. *scara(im)* 'I divide'). Therefore, we view the Albanian word as the adaptation of a foreign word (*shq-* cannot be original). Thus, if there is a connection between *skjaré* with Alb. *shqer*, Old German *sceran*, etc., it must originate from the Celtic languages of the Dacian Kingdom.

*dielleina (dieleian, dielian, dielia, dieleia)* 'henbane, stinking nightshade; *Hyosciamus niger*'

It must be related to "white", given the Celtic *belenuntia* and also the Slavic designation of the name. Deèev and Tomaschek explain this word from Idg. *dhel* 'shines, lights'. However, the word bears such strong resemblance to the Bulg. (etc) *blin* and Celtic *belenuntia*, that it seems more realistic to assume a more original form of the word: *dibleina, dibeleina*; the *dielleina* version could be the result of an error in the writing or of mispronunciation. The word is *hyoskiamon* 'broad bean; *Vicia faba*' in Greek - compounded of *di - bleina, dibeleina*. *Di* should be compared to Alb. *thi* 'pig' and the second part of the word can be related to Bulg. *blin* (\**sû-bhçl-no*).

*dyn* 'big nettle'

Idg. *du - nt* 'burning'. An old but valid explanation.

*dakina*

Its Greek name, among others is "wolf's leaf" and can clearly not be separated from the name of the Dacians, which can be linked to the Frizian *dhâu<sup>3</sup>kino* as per Georgiev.

*propodila* (*propedila, propedula, prepudula, procila, procedila, probedula, pempedula, pongaidula, pompedula*) 'potentilla, garden valerian'.

This name may be related to Celtic Galii *pompedula*. In several languages this plant is called "5-leaf"; in the second half of the word "leaf" and not "grass" should be sought. (kymr *dail* 'leaves', O.Cornwall *delen* 'leaf', *procila, procedila* would permit us to conjure up the Dacian word for "five" \**pâ k'e-* Alb.- *pésë*) but it is more likely that the word stems from the Celts of the Dacian Kingdom. Other explanations are improbable.

*diesema* (*diessachel, diasathel, diesapter*) 'mullein; *Verbascum*'

In ancient times the plant was used as a torch; its name reflects this usage in several languages (cf. German *Himmelbrand*). The etymology proposed by Georgiev appears to be right (cf. Tomaschek, Deèev). Idg. *di(y)es-ews-mn<sup>8</sup>*: "celestial fire".

*Mizela* (*mozula, mizola, mizula*) 'thyme'

The plant has been used for the treatment of diseases in the urogenital system. The etymology proposed by Tomaschek seems to be right: *m(e)iuæhe-ûæhel(i)yo* - cf. *meyæh* - 'urinates' (Georgiev).

*salia* (*Tragopogon? Hypochoeris*)

This plant has several names (*tragon, tragokerós, cornulaca*), all of which allude to "horn". The root of the word is probably Idg. *k<sup>1</sup>her-* or *k<sup>1</sup>her-u<sup>3</sup>* 'horn, deer', affixed by *-yâ* cf. Av. *srû, srvâ* 'horn', etc. Because the sound change *-ry- > -l-* is characteristic also of certain

Sarmatian dialects, we cannot exclude its origin from Iranian, but that would require \**sala*. However, the *r>l* alteration is characteristic of Albanian, thus, this plant-name points to Dacian-Albanian links, conforming to existing data.

The words noted above characterize sufficiently the Dacian language and also a view of the linguistic circumstances and - to some extent - the peoples that existed in the Dacian Kingdom. Nevertheless, we need to mention additional words such as the Dacians' name: in Greek: *Dakos*, *Dakoi*, Lat. *Dacus*, *Daci*. We are also familiar with other versions: Gr. *Dauos*, *Daoi*, Lat. *Davus*. It is also logical for us to consider *daos* (Friz. - 'wolf'), as did Kretschmer. Words such as *dhâuo-s*, *dhâu-ko-s* mean 'predatory': O.Sl. *daviti* 'to strangle', Idg. *dheu-*. It is not unusual for animal names to be used as names for peoples. Especially the wolf, which frequently recurs in many nations' history of origin. In this case, however, we can be more specific: in the Indo-Iranian societies, communities of young men, associations of males played an important role, as described by Wikander and Widengren. These young warriors were called "wolves" (Ir.-*mairya*, Ind. - *marya*, Av. *vâhrka-*). Their symbol is a black flag (*drafša*) decorated with a dragon- emblem; or it is the symbol itself, which is dragon-shaped. They wear their hair long or braided (Ir. *gaçsu*, Ind. - *keœava*) and they fight naked or half-naked. These associations have provided the upper strata in several Indo-Iranian, i.e. Iranian states, where they were among the movers and shakers of society.

We know that the martial symbol of the Dacians was the *draco*, a dragon made of linen. It had a wolf-like head which was carried on a

stick. The Iranian origin of this symbol has already been pointed out (we have descriptions of Sarmatian and Parthus martial symbols with dragons - the Romans took it from here). In contrast to the Romans, in the case of Dacians there is more to observe than the Parthus regimental symbol. It is not by chance that one of Dacia's social strata are called *kométai*, *comati*, *capillati* i.g. "hairy" or "long-haired", the same as the warriors of Iranian men's associations. The ruling class of the Dacian society (their Dacian name may have been *koso*, cf. O.Ind. *keœa* 'hair' came from Iranian male brotherhoods; this is why the Dacians had the name "wolf". We really do not know when, exactly, this occurred, but it was probably not before Boirebistas' time.

The name of the Dacians has been linked etymologically to the Dacian name for castle: *dava* (*deva*). The meaning of this word is confirmed by local place-names and a Greek glossary. "City" should be *leba* (sic!) to the Thracians (Hesych.). We have a valid interpretation for the word: *dhç-u<sup>3</sup>-â-*, cf. Idg. *dhç-* 'puts, places'. *Leba*, in the Greek glossary, is a misspelled form of the original *deba* (ääââ. - In addition to "dava", we have a word for another type of settlement: *vis*. This we find in Porolissum and Potaissa (Patavissa) (-*iss*, -*viss*). The word refers to a village-type settlement (Lat *vicus*, Slov. *ves*, etc.) and roots in Idg. (*\*ueikh*).

Thus, according to the testimony of language, prior to the Roman conquest in Dacia there existed 3 types of settlements. One of them is *sar*: 'capital, (administrative) center'. It consisted of a castle, an adjoining ritual center and quarters for craftsmen. Second: *dava*, the castle or city and, finally, *vis*: the village-type settlement.

This triad corresponds to the stratification of (the Dacian) ruling class. The capital is the seat of the king and the High Priest, the "davas" are the power-base (centrum) for the Tarabostes; the comati are village-chiefs. Let us pay attention to this word: *tarabostes*. When we analyzed the name *Boirebistas*, we pointed out that the second half of the name is a superlative, meaning "grandest", or something similar. Presumably, the Dacians identified their king with this (non-Dacian) word. The second half of *tarabostes* must also have a meaning related to kingship. The Albanian *tara* is very close to *tër* "beyond, behind". *Tarabostes* would then mean: "behind the king". The pileati, the tarabostes did actually rank just behind the king; their name accurately defines their position.

Finally, we need to look at the chief god of the Dacians. Several theories circulated about *Zamolxis* (or *Zalmoksis*). The most likely is Russu's; he assumes that *zamol* is related to the Frizian *zemelo* "earth", in which case it is of Idg. origin: *\*dh(e) hom-el* (cf. O.Sl. *zemlja*, Latv. *zeme*, Lat. *humus*). The second part of the name has to do with Ir. *xšaya-* "king" and the name of *Zamolxis* would then mean 'king of earth'. This explanation presupposes that the first part of the word does not mean "man" (cf. Frizian: *zemelen* 'slave'). In any event, the name of the god would be of compound derivation, as the second half is of Iranian origin. The question becomes even more complex if we take into consideration the opinion of Herodotos (*Historiae* IV., 94). He states that the god's other name is *Gebeleizis* (or that many Getae believe in *Gebeleizis*). As in the case of *Zamolxis*, the first part of *Gebeleizis* has to do with the Idg. *\*dh(e)-hom-el-*, but it does not show the feature of the satem languages

and its construction is not clear. Also, it shows the alteration of *m* and *b*, characteristic of the Thracian (and Dacian) languages (cf., among others, *Tibiscos* > *Temes* [river-name]). Whether we presume the existence of centum folkgroups in the 5th century B.C. (the age of Herodotos) among the Getae, or consider the termination of palatality for specific reasons, in the case of *Gebeleizis* we can look for examples in satem languages. Here the explanation would focus on a variant with metathesis: \* *hdhom-el*. In any event, we are faced with linguistic deviations which make understanding impossible.

We have outlined a linguistic profile - what findings does it present? It establishes, first of all, that Dacian belonged to the stem group of Indogermanic languages. In addition, there is a connection with Baltic and Slavic languages, as noted before (cf. for example *dela*, *zila*: "grass", *sebâ* 'elderberry', etc.) Quite noticeable are connections with Albanian. The identical or similar Dacian-Albanian sound changes have already been compiled by V.Georgiev, which are convincing, although several incorrect etymologies are included. We can find surprising similarities in Dacian and Albanian vocabulary - surely, no coincidence. Dacian *mantia* - "blackberry", Alb. *mand* "strawberry"; "pig" - Dacian *dj*, Alb. *thi*, "rock" -Dacian *Karpatés*, Alb. *karpë*. We might add the name of some rivers, too. The - *š* at the end of *Maros*, *Temes* can only be explained from Albanian, in which Idg. *s* corresponds to *sh*. As these rivers are in the region where Dacian had been the dominant language we can be certain that the Dacian language was a factor as we consider the *š* at word's end. I. Popoviè, et al. have also pointed this out. As we examine pertinent linguistic data, we note that many of the words do

not belong to the satem group. We not only see this in personal and place names, but also in the names of plants - the vocabulary which is considered to be most rooted in Dacian. We disagree with C.Poghirc who believed that Dacian - being on the borderline of the satem and centum languages - is an amalgamate language. We are of the opinion that in the Dacian Kingdom there was a diverse group of nationalities and languages to be found. Some linguistic co-mingling cannot be excluded, (as we illustrated with *Zamolksis*), but it is no accident that centum words are frequent - especially in personal names (*Decebal, Dikaineos*). One could assume that this was merely the fashion of the day. However, we note the same phenomenon among place- and plant-names, i.e. a preponderance of centum (non-Dacian) words (*Salda, Akmonia, Kinuboila*, etc.). Words of unknown or uncertain etymology might also belong to this group as does the toponymy of the Dacian capital and their Religious Center (*Sarmizegethusa, Sargetia*). The Dacian Kingdom was host to a rich variety of languages - or so we assume from the data at our disposal. In this kaleidoscope Dacian stands out most vividly. Celtic is also very visible and we need to take into account one satem and one centum language. The former has a link to Armenian and the latter has possible ties to the unknown language of the Bastarnae.

If we are to analyze the picture shown above about the Dacians in the context of Dacian-Roman continuity, we may say the following. Up to the time that Boirebistas forged his realm, mostly Celts were found in the region, which later became a Roman province. Also, Celticized Dacians; it was the latter's material culture which absorbed the Celtic influence. After Boirebistas assumes power, the southern



area of Transylvania is settled by peoples from Moldavia and from the region of the estuary of the Danube. We assume the settlers included Gatae, Dacians (broadly defined) and Bastarnae.

We also need to consider the presence of a sizable population from (the eastern part of ) the Middle-East. However, Celts continue to predominate in the central part of the realm - as substantiated by artifacts found there. Subsequent to the death of Boirebistas many of the peoples in his late domain became autonomous and the sovereignty of the Dacian king was reduced to a small area. The kingdom retains Transylvania's southern and - partially - central area and the outer region of the South and South-East Carpatians. Even so, part of this territory remains theirs only for a short time. Around 10 B.C. the Kotini, Anartii, Teurisci, and the Bastarna-Caucus-people achieve independence. Later Decebal unifies the area. However, during his time it is not the Dacian element that dominates - among other things, his own non-Dacian name bears witness to this. As we can see, in Decebal's Dacian Kingdom the Dacians are a minority in relation to the Celts, Iranians and Bastarnae. We cannot tell what their ratio is in relation to the other ethnic groups, the names of dava- districts do not reflect ethnic realities. In this context not much can be deduced from the names of plants (which indeed, are frequently of Dacian origin); we assume these names were told by priests to merchants visiting the religious centrum and the local clergy naturally spoke Dacian. It may be more noteworthy that, even in this center of Dacian life, several herbs/plants had non-Dacian names. (This does not include the glossary, dating from Roman times). The Romans conquered Decebal's kingdom. If we observe the

substratum of Romanization, we find that it was not predominantly Dacian - it was also Celtic, Bastarna and Iranian. Therefore if this population had really undergone Romanization, then we should not talk about Dacian-Roman continuity but continuity involving Dacians, Celts, Bastarnae, Iranians - and Romans. Furthermore, if the result of Romanization is a Neo-Latin language which preserves the languages of the substrata, then we should find Celtic, Iranian, etc. words. Yet, we know of no such Neo-Latin language (in Rumanian there is no such substratum). What is clear to us is this: if Romanization of the substratum did indeed occur under the Roman occupation of the erstwhile Dacian Kingdom - we do not know their descendants.

It may be said against the above reasoning that the Dacian and Albanian languages are related and that it is well known that a close relationship also exists between Albanian and Rumanian; in vocabulary, among others. We shall return to this question when we begin to analyze the Albanian-Rumanian connections. I only would like to point out that ethnic Dacians - and those who spoke a similar language - remained outside of Roman-occupied territory for the most part (such as the Costoboci who lived in the Dacian Kingdom). Furthermore, the areas encompassed in the Roman Province did not have a Dacian majority (in all truth only the Ratacae can be genuinely considered as Dacian). On the other hand, the Getae (related to the Dacians) living in the area of the lower Danube and in Dobruja, may have been Romanized, as also the Moesae, who were also related to the Dacians and who lived in the region of the border-area which would now correspond to the contemporary frontier-area between

Serbia - Bulgaria. In the context of history and the ethnic relations of the Dacian Kingdom, a Dacian-Albanian, i.e. Albanian-Rumanian linguistic connection suggests that the locus of the latter was not the Roman province of Dacia. There, the linguistic substratum was much too complex and therefore, a Neo-Latin language originating from that territory would not show *only* Albanian connections.

#### NOTES:

<sup>1</sup> - denotes the letter *k* with a '^' over it

<sup>2</sup> - denotes the letter *m* with a 'o' under it

<sup>3</sup> - denotes the letter *u* with a '^' under it

<sup>4</sup> - denotes the letter *j* with a 'v' replacing the dot over it

<sup>5</sup> - denotes the letter *i* with a '^' replacing the dot under it

<sup>6</sup> - denotes the letter *i* with a '~' replacing the dot over it

<sup>7</sup> - denotes the character *ä* with a '^' over it

<sup>8</sup><sup>8</sup> - denotes the letter *n* with a 'o' under it

<sup>8</sup>(These symbols could not be created by any Font set at the editor's disposal)