

**Chapter IV**  
**Dacia after the Romans –**  
**Dacia before the Rumanians.**

The territory of Dacia did not turn into a wasteland following Roman withdrawal. We saw that its eastern areas were settled by Karps. By the mid-13th century, Aurelian made a short-lived attempt to restore the borders of the Province but it is unlikely that he would have disrupted these settlements. After he relinquished the Sucidava-Porolissum route (Celei - Mojgrád), it facilitated the further expansion of the Karps and created an opportunity for an influx of nationality groups, which had been living on the northern and western borders of the Province. Their immigration began after 271; a grave in Radnót attests to that. It has a large urn, typical of the Hungarian Great Plains Region, which held a medal portraying Empress Severina (271-275); it must have been interred subsequent to that date. The settlers had a culture characteristic of the Great Plains and of "Barbarians from the Imperial era". Examples of this culture could be observed at settlements from (Batos, Sinfalva) and in cemeteries (Maroscsapó). In addition to Karps and 'Great Plains Barbarians' German populations appear from the north-eastern parts of the Carpathian Basin, (Kisbács, Sepsibesenyő), as well as a small group (Magyarszovát, Csernáton, Kisekemező) which is different: they do not use cremation. In the meantime, the Karps occupy Oltenia (the former Dacia Inferior) (Locu<sup>o</sup>teni, Re<sup>o</sup>ca, Fărca<sup>o</sup>ele).

This archeological mosaic conforms to the deductions we can make on the basis of contemporary sources. Some time after 291 Mamertinus makes a speech lauding Emperor Maximian (285-308).

He says that the Tervingi - who belong to the Goths - and the Taifals allied in attacking the Vandals and the Gepidae. (*Tervingi, pars alia Gothorum, adiuncta manu Taifalorum, adversum Vandalos Gipedesque concurrunt* - Genethl. Max. 17, 1). Ever since the Markomann wars, the Vandals have lived along the northern borders of Dacia, i.e. the north-eastern area of the Carpathian Basin and the upper reaches of the Dniester river. However, on the basis of other data, in this instance "Vandals" really must have been Victovals who lived close to the Upper Tisza (Theiss) and in the valley of the Some<sup>o</sup> rivers. In 248, the Taifali and Goths take part in the devastation of the Empire's Black-Sea area; other sources place them at the Danube-delta. Tervingi are the western group of the Goths. Their name (forest dwellers) suggests that we look for their habitat in the vicinity of the Carpathians (within Gothic archeological context). In credible sources it is here that the Gepidae appear for the first time. Jordanes also writes about this (the Fastida-Ostrogoth war) and tells us that the Gepidae are locked in by mountains and forests. They must surely have been living in the Carpathian Basin (Iord. Get. XVII). In other words, all the nations who participate in this war have lived along the border of Roman Dacia and around 290 AD, at least the Victovals and the Gepidae in the territory of former Dacia. This is one of the reasons why this war cannot be placed northeast of the Carpathians, R. Harhoiu's contention notwithstanding. Eutropius writes in 360 that Dacia is inhabited by Taifali, Victohali and Gothic Tervingi (Eutr. Brev. 8, 2, 2 - *nunc Taifali, Victohali et Tervingi habent*). Excepting the Gepidae, all of them are peoples which participated in the war of 290 (or pre-290). In connection with this war, Jordanes writes that the Gepidae suffered defeat and withdrew:

(Regrettably, only this much can be used of Jordanes story. The royal name of *Fastida* is based on Latin *fastidium* (haughty, demanding) (*Fastida fuerat elationis erectus* - Jord. Get. XVII. 100): "Fastiva was bloated with arrogance". Thus, neither the town of Galtis nor the Auha river can be used to pinpoint more closely the location of the war - for all we know, it may have been near the Black Sea!). It is apparent that the war was fought for the possession of Dacia; the victors managed to grab a large portion of it, while the Victovali probably only held on to the territory they already had. Indeed, from the end of the 3rd century, a new archeological culture emerges in former Dacia, for the time being only in Transylvania. This new culture has links with the Goths and Taifali who have settled there. What Rumanian research calls the Sfintu Gheorghe culture and the (No. I) cemetery in Bratei, may be the remnants of these peoples. A replica exists of the trough-shaped graves of Bratei and the legacy of on-site cremation in (Danèeny, Etulija) Bessarabia, in the region where Taifali have presumably lived at an earlier time. One of the graves at Sfintu Gheorghe-Eprestetō can be linked to this legacy, while the other graves with similar relics could be linked to Goth Tervingi. As a result of the wars fought for the possession of Dacia, the Karpis are leaving their homes in the region between the Prut river and the Carpathians and the area of their Dacian Conquests. Galerius leads a campaign against them between 295-297. As per Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* VIII. 17, 3.) he took up the title of *Carpicus Maximus* six times and, at some point, during this time the Karpis resettled within the borders of the Empire. More correctly, they were being resettled; *Carporum natio translata Omnis in nostrum solum*, Aur. Vict. Caes. 39, 43; *Carporum gens universa Romania se tradidit*, Cons. Const. ad

a. 295-MGH IX. 230). The Karps also leave their settlement in Oltenia (the late Dacia Inferior); they are most probably replaced by Goths (Almāj,Caracal). In spite of the emigration of the Karps which was due to the wars around 290, it is hard to believe that only Taifali, Tervingi and Victovali would have lived in the former Dacia. Written records also dispel this assumption. In 367 Emperor Valens starts out against the Goths from Daphne (in the Argyas-Danube delta). The Goths took refuge in *montes Serrorum*. "Serrus' mountains" appear in ancient references only once. However, as we learn of Sarmatians in this area at a later date, we presume the Serri may have been Sarmatians (the name corresponds to Avestic *sairima*). We already know of these Sarmatians from the campaign of Constanine in 358 AD. They must have populated a portion of Dacia, specifically its South-west area. We also think that the 4th century findings from Micia (Vecel) can be attributed to them. We believe that they do not relinquish this territory; after they suffer defeat in 376 from the Huns, Athanaric retreats to the hilly, mountainous CaucaLand (*ad CaucaLandensem locum*), chasing out the Sarmatians. *Montes Serrorum* and mountainous *CaucaLand* must refer to the Southern part of Transylvania.

From written references and from other evidence, we can gain a thorough understanding of the inhabitants of Dacia after 271. In the late Roman province there are no Romans - Latin-speaking Romans. We do not claim that no such individuals could have existed there; as the result of the Barbarians' forays masses of prisoners were abducted from the Empire. We do know, however, that on Dacian territory there were no Latin-speaking groups which constituted a community and which would have maintained contact with each

other. There was no ethnic group characterized by Romanism. No evidence to the contrary is presented in written records or through archeological finds. If K. Horedt is prepared to use the Daco-Roman adjective, based on archeological finds post-dating 271, his error is in not noticing how much of the same culture the Barbarians (from the vicinity of Rome) acquired. Yet, a great deal of material originating from the European borders of the Empire, from the mouth of the Danube to the estuary of the Rhine has become accessible. We no longer have to rely on calculated guesses - in most instances we also have evidence. It is a fact that, after 271, there are Barbarians in Dacia and that there is no trace of a Roman way of life and of Latin speakers.

When the Huns appear on the scene, they become a determining factor in the history of Europe. The Huns chased out the western Goths, and later defeat the Romans at Hadrianapolis (Aug. 9, 378). The ethnic and political landscape of the erstwhile Dacia changes during this period, and the same holds true for large sections of the Roman Empire. After 376 the Huns settle in along the Lower-Danube. They take possession of Oltenia (the late Dacia Inferior), together with Muntenia. This is not only nominal rule; around 400, and at the start of the 5th century this becomes the central seat of Hun power. Numerous findings of cauldrons (in Sucidava, Desa, Hinova, Hotărani, 'Oltenia') and a richly appointed grave in Co<sup>o</sup>veni attest to this. There is a population-shift in other parts of Dacia, as well. During the last quarter of the 4th century, the Ostrogoths - presumably Arianus Christians - (Marosszentanna culture) reach Transylvania. The Huns also resettle here Pannonian provincials at the start of the 5th century (Gyulafehérvár, Kolozsvár). In this period,

the knowledge of the Latin language may have been considerable in the territories of former Dacia Apulensis and Porolissensis. In the Christianization of the Goths a large role was played by those prisoners from the Roman Empire, whom they took around 260, during the time of their Middle-Eastern campaign. However, the majority of these enslaved people spoke Greek or some Middle-Eastern language, as demonstrated by the list of Goth saints (Sabas, Sansalas, Arpyla, etc.). According to Auxentius of Durostorum, the Goth Bishop, Vulfila (311-384) preached in Greek, Latin and Gothic. This however, cannot imply that he preached in Latin north of the Danube, because the Gothi minores, the people of Ulfila, settled in the Empire in 348. Among the Goths the sermons were preached in Gothic, as suggested by Vulfila's translation of the Bible into Gothic. The inscription on the hanging lamp in Beretfalva was actually written in Latin (*Ego Zenovius votum posui* - "I, Zenovius made the donation"- but its nearest likeness bears a Greek inscription and Zenovius also has a Greek name. Greek has as great a role in Christian conversion as does Latin. The whole period was characterized by polyglot nationalities. Priskos, in the court of Attila, writes about the Scythians - who were Attila's subjects - that they were a mixed population, speaking Gothic and Hun. Those, who associated with Romans also spoke Latin. In the middle of the 5th century, this was expected of the Huns, who ruled all of Pannonia by the mid-5th century and was especially true at Attila's court, located somewhere between the Danube and the Tisza (Theiss) rivers, opposite Aquincum. (Numerous kettles found in the area also indicate the location). It is noteworthy that Priskos makes no mention of Latinized people beyond the Roman Empire. Among the Scythians

only those speak Latin who have more contact with the Empire. This is what Priskos meant by "Romans". The rule of the Huns was a fatal blow to the Romanism of the provinces along the Danube. The critical event was not so much the period (432-434) when Pannonia fell to the Huns. There, the provincials were able to live in relative security albeit under changed conditions. It was the aftermath of the campaign of 447. The Huns razed the territory along the southern banks of the Danube, from Singidunum (Belgrade) to Nova (Svi<sup>9</sup>tov, Bulgaria); some 200 km-s or a five days' walk. Naissos (Ni<sup>9</sup>) became the Roman frontier-town. A wasteland was created along the frontier. All of Dacia Ripensis and the northern area of Moesia Superior became a no-man's land. Romanism, which flourished in the Danubian territory was wiped out, except for small traces in Pannonia and, in a few towns along the Danube in Moesia (which was primarily Greek). The areas which the Huns razed came under Roman rule temporarily one hundred years later, during the reign of Justinian. With respect to Daco-Roman continuity, these circumstances are significant also in terms of the Rumanian language. The ancestors of the speakers of the Rumanian language participated in the changes of late Latin (4th-7th Centuries), which do not appear even in the relatively isolated Sard dialect. This could only be possible if the assumed Latin language in Dacia had been in uninterrupted contact with Latin spoken on the Balkan peninsula. There was no opportunity for such contact between 447-551. Therefore, had the languages survived which were spoken by those who stayed behind after the fall of Dacia - or of Pannonian provincials, resettled here during Hun rule - this would now be very different from contemporary Rumanian. It is beside the point that neither Dacian, nor Pannonian Latin could have

been a predecessor of Rumanian - as we have seen earlier. The relationship of Romanism to the local population in this era is characterized by an object which came to light in Vecel. It was a ring made out of an inscribed/fibula which originally bore a Latin inscription, (*Quartine vivas*) an example of a behavior entirely different from Roman mentality.

Attila died in 453. The alliance of his sons is defeated at the battle of Nedao (the name of the Danube, distorted in a Goth epos to Denao, Dōnaws), which was won by the Gepidae and their allies. The Ostrogoths were in alliance with Attila's sons. They leave the battlefield in defeat and, thus, once again a complete population - exchange takes place on the territory of Dacia within a short time. The Ostrogoth settle in Pannonia in 456 (for 17 years only), when they leave we assume Pannonian provincials are leaving with them. We have no subsequent information about them. Dacia is taken by the victorious Gepidae. There can be no question about their possession of the northern part of the province (including the former Napocensis and Porolissensis). The family of Ardaric, King of the Gepidae, establishes a burial ground along the Some<sup>o</sup> river, at Apahida near Cluj, after the Goths are routed (Jord. Get 264). As victors and as heirs of the Hun power, the Gepidae are granted "peace" by the Imperium Romanum, i.e., the eastern Roman Empire and the annual payments due to an ally. A relic of these events was found in Ardaric's grave (I. grave in Apahida), a gold fibula. This brooch clasped a paludamentum (military cape) - a gift from the Roman Emperor. Ardaric's gold rings are also imperial gifts, one of them inscribed with the abbreviation: O M H A R V S (*Optimus Maximus Hunnorum Ardaricus Rex Votum Solvit*).... "Ardaric, the



mightiest king of the Huns, is honoring his vow"). According to Iordanes, the Gepidae occupy all of Dacia (*Nam Gepidi Hunnorum sibi sedes viribus vindicantes totius Daciae fines velut victores potiti*, Jord. Get. L, 264). Numerous archeological sites attest to this in the northern part of the province (Cege, Mezőszopor, Marosnagylak, Kissink, Magyarkapus etc.). Our picture of the erstwhile Dacia Inferior or Malvensis (Oltenia), is less clear. However, as some of the Huns who were defeated by the Gepidae settled on the opposite side, in Dacia Ripensis, in the territory bordering the Vit, Lom and Isker rivers, it is conceivable that Oltenia was left as a barren borderland. The northern part of Moesia was overrun by a mixed and scattered population. Iordanes tells us about Mundo, a descendant of Attila. (For reasons of chronology: it was more likely his father, Giesmos). This 'Mundo' brought robbers (*scamarae*) and vagabonds to this barren and uninhabited area from the vicinity and ruled as their King. (Iord. Get. 301). This "kingdom" of Mundo's allies itself with the Gepidae or the Ostrogoths - depending on the political situation - until 529, at which time Mundo offers his services to Emperor Justinian. During this period, (prior to 535) an attempt is made to reestablish Roman sovereignty along the Danube and we can find Roman towns along its left bank (Litterata-Lederata, Recidiva-Arcidava). Conceivably, Oltenia may have been under the rule of Giesmos and Mundo. Mundo had a close relationship with the Herul people who settled in 512 in Dacia Ripensis and the western part of Moesia Inferior. Justinian resettled them in 535 in the vicinity of Singidunum (Belgrade), at the time of the reestablishment of Roman power in the area. The above reflects the ambiguous situation of Oltenia during the second half of the 5th century. At the beginning of the 6th this

may also be the reason for the absence of archeological material in the region.

While their Kingdom stood, the Gepidae have most certainly had possession of Oltenia, and more than that. Going back to Cassiodorus, Iordanes wrote (Iord. Get. 33-34) that 'in the western part of Scythia lives the Gepida nation, surrounded by big and noted rivers. The Tisza (Patthissos-Theis) flows along its N-NW part, the mighty Danube along the South and the Flutausis river intersects it from the east. Beyond, there is Dacia protected by steep mountains which frame it wreath-like. - *In quo Scythia prima ab occidente gens residet Gepidarum, que magnis opinatisque ambitur fluminibus, nam Tisia per aquilonem eius chorumque discurrit; ab africo vero magnus ipse Danubius, ab eo Flutausis secat.... introrsus illis Dacia est, ad coronae speciem arduis Alpibus emunita.* This description reveals that Gepida-land extended beyond the Carpathians up to the Danube and the Flutausis rivers. The latter is frequently identified as the Olt, as a truncated version of Aluta. Iordanus' text tells us, however, that this river is to be found beyond the Carpathians. This is also what Schuchardt and Daicoviciu declare. In various manuscripts the river also appears as *Flutaus*, *Flutausi*, *Flutasi* and we assume this is the Alanian name of the Prut river. Flut-av reflects customary Alanian usage, *av* means 'water' (and 'river').

Gepida dominance continues to spread. They occupy the majority of towns in Aurelian Dacia (Ripensis and Mediterranea) (Procopius, *De bello gotico* III. 33, 8). This occurs after 535 and is probably related to Mundo's death in 536. The Gepidae gained as allies the Heruls who had been resettled in the vicinity of Singidunum. They also took possession of the northern area of Moesia Superior,

which they held until 551. Between 473-504 and 536-567, the Gepidae also ruled the territory between the Drava and Sava rivers, (in between it was under the Goths of Italy) the possibility exists that Latin-speaking groups would enter the Gepida Kingdom, the former Dacia. This deserves serious consideration. Gepidae occupy an area which is under the hegemony of the archbishopric of the Justiniana Prima, founded in 535. It encompasses the provinces of Dacia Mediterranea and Ripensis, Moesia Prima, Dardania, Praevalitana, Macedonia Secunda and Pannonia Secunda. M. Friedwagner sees the possibility of the emergence of a new neo-Latin language within the archbishopric; the Gepidae occupied an area of this very region. In the charter of the archbishopric, we note the expectation that " both banks of the Danube would be populated with our citizens and that we would again rule over Viminacium, Recidiva and Litterata which are beyond the Danube. "(... *ut utraque ripa Danubii iam nostris civitatibus frequentaretur, et tam Viminacium quam Recidiva et Litterata, quae trans Danubium sunt, nostrae iterum dicioni subactae sint'*... Cod. Iust. Nov. XI.).

All of this remains an expectation. At best, we might conclude that this was the central seat of power which Mundo relinquished. The Gepida-occupation resulted in a further southern shift of Romanism from the central portion of the Balkan Peninsula. Friedwagner may be correct in assuming that the founding of the archbishopric (in the context of Gepida campaign thrusts) started the development of the Rumanian language.

We also possess archeological evidence pertaining to the expansion of Gepida power south of the Danube (Arèar, Iatrus, etc.). It is more surprising that no such evidence comes to light in the area

between the Lower-Danube, the Carpathians and the Prut. Except for one shard from <sup>a</sup>innic there is no trace of the characteristic Gepida relics from the Great Plains region and from Transylvania. We know of an Ipote<sup>o</sup>ti-Cînde<sup>o</sup>ti culture in the region; even Rumanian researchers link it to the Transylvanian Gepida culture. The objects which came to light (ceramics, lanterns and metal objects) also reflect this connection, - in addition to evidence of local characteristics. To illustrate: a bronze strap-end found at the site of the Ipote<sup>o</sup>ti-Cînde<sup>o</sup>ti culture's site at Soldat Ghivan, has an exact duplicate in the Gepida cemetery at Tiszaderzs; a similar object was found at Marosveresmart and in a Pécs (Hungary) cemetery from Avar times (public cemetery - Pécs). Pieces unearthed in Carièin Grad (Iustiniana Prima) and Kizlev (at the Dnieper) attest to a more distant relationship. We are led to this region by additional characteristics of this archeological material. In 594, a Christian Gepida guides the Byzantines who are ready to attack the Slavs inhabiting the Ialomija (Ilivakia) region. In the Ipote<sup>o</sup>ti-Cînde<sup>o</sup>ti culture there definitely are traces suggesting a Christian presence; we can assume that in a wider context, the peoples of this culture can be considered Gepidae. They cannot be assumed to be Slavs; with their objects-relics we are familiar. The assertion that the peoples of this culture are "Roman" (i.e. Neo-Latin), because they show Dacian traditions and Byzantine connections (!) is obviously false.

The post-Hun, Gepida era is characterized by the retreat of Romanism along the Danube; South of the Danube in particular. We do not deny that Latin speakers may have entered Gepida territory in former Dacia. They may have come as prisoners or as merchants etc., but Gepida archeological findings of bent-legged fibulae or iron

pins are no evidence of their legacy. Regarding the Romans of the Balkan peninsula and their alleged contact with Dacia: the fact that Moesia Superior and the areas along the Danube of Dacia Aureliana were, between 447 and 551 AD, wastelands or dominated by Barbarian peoples, excludes a continuous connection during the late Latin period between the north and the south. In a language which developed along separate lines for 100 years, we cannot search for the characteristics of Balkan-Latin, - yet, these do exist in the Rumanian language.

In the vicinity of former Dacia, the expansion of east-European populations dominates during the period which follows the Gepida Kingdom. In 567 the Avar-Langobard alliance defeats the Gepidae. Thereafter, for 350 years this was a territory which is known as Avaria, land of the Avars, - up to the early 9th century. However, we do not note significant changes in the former Roman province at this time. Although early Avar findings make their appearance here by the end of the 6th century (Korond, Erzsébetváros), long-time Gepida settlers have stayed put. Cemeteries of the Avar-age up to the 7th century bear such evidence - Mezőbánd, Marosveresmart. There are numerous findings in Oltenia - the former Dacia Inferior - of the Ipotești-Cîndești culture which seem to date from the post-Avar occupation (Făcăi, Fărcașul de Sus, etc.). As the same time, the Slavs make an appearance in Wallachia's eastern and Transylvania's south-east. region. We have no archaeological data on the Slavs from the territory of former Dacia prior to the middle of the 7th century (Nagyekemező). However, thereafter they will become long-term, continuous settlers of the hilly, mountainous region. Ethnic interrelationships of the era are revealed to us by written records and

through archeological finds. A geographer from Ravenna describes Dacia in 800, using data from Jordanes as well as more ancient references. He writes that "Dacia which is now known as Gepidia, is populated by the Huns ....". *Dacia ..... que modo Gipidia ascribuntur; in qua nunc Unorum gens habitare dinoscitur* - An. Rav. I, II). He goes on saying: "Dacia, also called Gepidia, is now inhabited by Huns who are also called Avars".. *Dacia .... que et Gipidie apellatur, ubi modo Uni, qui et Avari inhabitant*' - An. Rav. IV. 14). This agrees with archeological data which substantiate the settlement of the peoples of the Avar Empire on the territory of the former Dacia. We have evidence as to the identity of those peoples. In 600 the Byzantines initiated a campaign in the area of the Tisza river. During this foray they destroy three Gepida villages and take 3000 Avars prisoner: 800 Slavs (according to the 'Historia' of Theophylaktos Simokatta the number was 8000) 3000 Gepidae (none, according to the above source) and 2000 Barbarians (6200 as per T. S.). Independent sources validate this picture, augmenting it with Bulgarians. We might add that, in this age, Huns and Avars were considered to be eastern nomads, Bulgarians included. The 'Barbarians' showing up on the roster of prisoners cannot be identified as Bulgarian; they are the 'byproduct' of the final tally of prisoners taken. But then, we cannot turn them into anything else, either. To see them as "ancient Rumanians" would exceed the limits of any hypothesis.

There are some changes in ethnic inter-relationships in Avar times; as we understand them, these changes result in the strengthening of the Turkish element from the east. When Byzantine frontier-defenses collapse along the Danube in 602, these events help to eradicate the last remnants of Romanism which had managed

to survive in a few towns of the territory, most of which have become Hellenized. Let us note that there existed groups speaking late-Latin within the Avar Empire, - but not in Dacia. This has been supported by archeological evidence from the vicinity of Keszthely, Hungary. In addition, we have the legacy of place-names in Trans-Danubia's western and south-western area (of Hungary) - Zala, Zöbern, Lafnitz, Rába - (names of rivers). We can include in this group those Romans who were made captive by the Avars in course of their Balkan campaigns and who repatriated to Byzantine territory in the 630's. However, many of them were Greek. The defenders of Sirmium also prayed to God in Greek when the Avars occupied the town in 582. The Avar occupation of the Carpathian basin ends - for a long time to come - free contact between territories lying north and South of the Danube (military campaigns and the repatriation of prisoners of war do not count as 'natural connections'). The process is also strengthened by the immigration of Bulgarians and the establishment of their statehood in the northern part of (contemporary) Bulgaria in 681.

The territory connects the northern and southern banks of the Danube but creates a final separation between the territories of the eastern Roman Empire (originally: Imperium Romanum) and "Barbarian" Europe. It is at this time that the Roman Empire becomes Byzantium, and is obligated to acknowledge the 'de facto' emergence of another power within its borders. The period between 567-795 (or to 803, when the Avar empire actually ceases to exist) brings about the complete liquidation of Romanism along the Danube. For the beginning of the epoch G. Schramm also concurs with this view and

substantiates the retreat of Romanism from the whole of the Balkan Peninsula to merely its Southern tip.

In 811, following the collapse of Avar hegemony in the Carpathian basin the former Dacia comes under Bulgarian rule (Dacia Inferior - Oltenia - was already theirs) and will remain so until the time of the Hungarian conquest of the territory. The conditions in existence among different folk groups - as we knew them - underwent a change in response to the determined and aggressive resettlement policy of the Bulgarians and the transformation generated by their institutions. The Bulgarian Krum Khan resettles 12,000 men and their families (different sources quote different figures) across the Danube (ἄλλο Ἄϊ<sup>σα</sup> Ἐε Ῥεῖ ἕ ὄ · ἔεῖι ) after he takes Hadrianopolis in 813. This comes to 40,000 people - according to the source with the highest quote. Even without this reference, we could ascertain from archeological evidence that ethnic groups from Bulgaria - south of the Danube - migrated to Wallachia and Transylvania. The bi-ritual cemetery at Bratei is a relic of these times, and so is its replica in Oltenia (Izvoru, Obîr<sup>o</sup>ia, etc.). This cemetery reflects the coexistence of the old-time population and the large number of Slavs who migrated to this region or were resettled here from the Danube delta. (The former were identified by their characteristic 'avar' graves.) The migration also points to a N.W. shift (from S. E.) of the population and also of these ethnic groups. Along with the Slavs, who are resettling here, Bulgarians also arrive: the Onogundurs (Maroskarna, Kézdi<sup>o</sup>polyán) who still speak Turkish at the time, a so-called Bulgarian-Turkish. In the 820's a sizable Slav group arrives from eastern Europe. They settle along the Szamos River. These were originally western Slavs (Abodrits) and were later known as



Predenecent peoples (Szilágynagyfalu, Szamosfalva, Apahida). Their name comes from the Donyec river. A significant ethnic mix has taken place in the former Dacia. The remaining population of the Avar Empire, Bulgarians and different Slav groups intermingle in the former Dacia, and here we can enumerate three groups: those already here, those who were resettled from the vicinity of the Danube-delta and the Abodrits. It also is possible that ancient Rumanian groups - from the Southern part of the Balkan peninsula - were among them. They might come with those who were resettled by the Bulgarians, or simply as a result of opportunities for travel and movement within territory under Bulgarian rule. K. Horedt and L. Makkai assume that Rumanians migrated and settled northward in the 9th century. They engaged in transhumance between the Danube and the Carpathians. These assumptions are well-intentioned but lack substantiation. Completely so in the case of Makkai whose starting point is the Latin identity of the cities along the Danube during Justinian's reign but such settlements did not occur. At any rate such settlers would not have become shepherds; we also know that transhumance is bound to a given locale, where summer and winter grazing areas are interchangeable. Thus, more distant settlements are not logical. Horedt refers to Hungarian sources, Kézai and Anonymus. He misinterpreted Kézai who acknowledged Szekler presence in the Carpathian Basin prior to the Hungarian conquest, but he also stated that they settled in Transylvania only after the conquest (SHR I. 162-163). This is important, inasmuch as Horedt ties Rumanian presence in the region during the 9th century to Kézai's comment that the Szeklers and the Rumanians (*blacki*) lived together in the alpine region. Anonymus is harder to explain. Not only

because of the anecdotal narrative of the 13th century chronicler but because his unsubstantiated statements spawned a large volume of literature. Many researchers have viewed his work as an accurate source for the 9th century. Anonymus claims to have knowledge of Rumanians (*Blaci*) along the Szamos river at the time of the Hungarian conquest in 896. However, he also claimed to know of Czechs in Nyitra, Bulgarians in Zemplén, Greeks in Titel and Belgrad, Kumans in the Bánság, Germans (*Romani*) in Veszprém, Hungary. Contemporary sources - i.e. close to the time of the Conquest - assure us that *none of these* peoples were in the area to which Anonymus attributes them, not even the Germans and the Bulgarians. How did this 13th century chronicler come to identify these groups as inhabitants of the area at the time of the Conquest? According to J. Deér, (and I. Z. Tóth, Gy. Györffy and L. Makkai agree): the writer "populated" these areas with nationalities who were neighbors of 13th century Hungary. We would like to modify Deér's premise with the observations that Anonymus only selected nationalities with whom Hungarians had waged war. Russians, Poles, and Serbs were not included. In other words if Anonymus lists the *Blaci* (Rumanians) as 9th century inhabitants of the Carpathian Basin that could only mean that, in the 13th century they were not a significant population in that region. Credible sources substantiate this - in the mid 13th century they only know of Vlachs (Rumanians) beyond the Carpathians.

During the period of Bulgarian rule in the 9th century we are therefore unable to verify that groups of Rumanians would have entered the former Dacia from the Southern region of the Balkan peninsula. Some findings were made in a Wallachian settlement

(Bucov) which had Glagolite and Cyrillic letters and so-called Murfatlar symbols. It seems to be without foundation to attribute these to (rural) Rumanian writings, when we know that these symbols were being used by the Bulgarians at the time. Today we already know that the Murfatlar writing came into being in 893, or very soon thereafter. It was the by-product of anti-Greek measures taken by Simeon, and (legible) inscriptions were, therefore, written in the Bulgar-Turkish of the Danube region. One cannot take a 10th century vessel from Dobrudja (Capidava) and identify thereon the 'Rumanian name' of *Petre* - read left to right - when all the inscriptions on the object are written right to left and the above is meant to be read as *ertep*. The word means 'I write' in (Danubian) Bulgaro-Turkish. An ethnic identification of archeological finds is frequently difficult to make, and when this happens with the *sole aim* of showing Rumanian origins then we must disqualify both hypothesis and results. Verifiable data have not established the resettlements of ancient Rumanians from the Balkan Peninsula to the former Dacia; the groups resettled by Krum from Hadrianapolis did not stay either. Given the first opportunity - after 25 years - they returned to their original home, with Byzantine (and Hungarian) military assistance. Other groups which were made to resettle there may have had similar histories.

At the time of conquest of this territory in 895, Hungarians found Danubian Bulgaro-Turks, eastern and Southern Slavs in the former Dacia. The tribal population of the late Avar empire may have dominated the region's southern area, Oltenia. (Izvorul, etc.) The defeat of Bulgarians enabled the Hungarians to occupy Dacia's Transylvanian area in the late 9th and early 10th Centuries. Their cemeteries date back to the first half of the 10th century on Zápolya-

St. in Kolozsvár (Cluj), and in Marosgombás. Early Hungarian chronicles attest to the occupation of Transylvania, which was among the first such areas in the Carpathian Basin. We learn that "they reached the borders of Hungary, i.e. of Transylvania" (a.k.a. Erdély) *deveniunt in confinium regni Hungarie scilicet in Erdely*, SRH I. 286.). Apparently, Anonymus was unaware of this reference. After the fighting for the new land died down, the allied Kavars settled in Transylvania. Place-names in the area do not reflect the names of the conquering tribes, and the *only places where these can be absent* in conquered territory would be those where the allied Kavars lived. Transylvanian cemeteries dating from the period of the Hungarian Conquest indicate a burial ritual (stones under the head) which differed from those in Hungary, and this implies that we must view this population as unique in the Carpathian basin of the 10th century. As additional verification, we can point to the inscription in the Kazar style and language about a process of construction in Alsószentmihályfalva, near Torda. The Kavars were Kazars and the inscription has probably come from their ruler, the "*gyula*". In the first half of the 10th century this was the site of his headquarters. The oldest Transylvanian fortress, Tordavár (Várfalva), was built here, but transferred in the middle of the century to (today's) Alba Iulia.) A characteristic of the period: the ruler transfers his seat of power from one Roman center (Potaissa) to another Roman site (of ruins): Apulum. In 952, the then ruler - or "*gyula*" - accepts Christianity in Constantinople and is assigned a bishop (Hierotheos) who erects in Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia) the first house of worship, known as the "round church". It is unlikely that Hierotheos would have come by himself. We do not know who accompanied him but we do know that,

at this time, a segment of the local population came from the Southern territories of the Balkan Peninsula. An eastern-rite Christian cemetery in (Csombord near Nagyenyed) is the counterpart of others from the turn of the 9th-10th Centuries found in today's South-Bulgaria south of the Balkan mountains; the inhabitants of Csombord must have immigrated from there. This population might have been Rumanian, - or there could have been Rumanians among them. They came from that portion of the Balkan Peninsula which has written evidence of the existence of Rumanians there. However, Csombord is too far removed from the Barcaság in the Carpathian Basin, where Rumanians appeared between 1202-1209. They must have been there earlier, though: (the land which was given to the Cistercian monastery at Kerc was taken from them). Also, the period from the second half of the 10th to the end of the 12th century is too long a time to establish a connection between the Rumanians of the 10th century and latter-day ones. In addition, those words in the Hungarian language which are of Bulgaro-Slav origin (*rozsdá*-rust; *mostoha*-stepparent; *mesgye*-lane) are too numerous to infer a connection other than a direct Bulgaro-Hungarian one. As this Bulgaro-Slav language initially was only in usage South of the Balkan mountains, the presence of their words in the Hungarian language suggests a settlement of Bulgarians in the territory. Some of the words, which became part of Hungarian usage (*pap*-priest, *kereszt*-cross) have a religious connotation. These we can attribute to Christian conversions taking place in eastern territories such as the baptism of the 'Gyula' (Chieftain). Therefore, the newcomers from Csombord must have been Bulgaro-Slavs but we wish to repeat: the arrivals could have included Rumanians. This can neither be proven, nor disproved.

In 1003, St. Stephen, King of Hungary goes to war against the Supreme Chief (Gyula) Prokuj (who was his uncle) and occupies his land. Transylvania becomes an integral part of Hungary of the Middle Ages, but the separate development of Transylvania during the preceding 100 years left its mark. The suzerain lord of the territory retains the inherited title of Vajda (voivode), originating in the 10th century, as were the Supreme Chiefs - including the Gyula - in earlier times. Populating this voivodship, which suffers repeated forays from eastern nomads - the Petchenegs, Uzes and the Kumans - continues to be difficult. There is no other territory within Hungary in the Middle Ages with such a large portion of the colonized population: the Saxons, the Szeklers and - temporarily - even the German Order of Knights (Knights Templar). It almost resembled Trajans' forced resettlement of his veterans into Dacia. This diverse group of settlers is augmented at the end of the 12th century by Rumanians as frontier guards along the Southern Carpathians. The number settling in the Transylvanian Basin is small, and in 1290 the Hungarian King, András III, intends to gather all Rumanians on royal property but three years later he relinquishes the plan.

The above illustrated that we cannot ascertain a legacy of Romanism in Dacia subsequent to the cessation of Roman hegemony. There are no communities left - large or small - where Latin is spoken. By the end of the 3rd century, the new settlers drove out even the Karps; the population has completely changed in the province. The same thing happens one hundred years later, after 375; with the arrival of the Huns, the earlier inhabitants leave the territory. They are replaced by Ostrogoths, resettled by the Huns (or they might have come on their own). Following the Battle of Nedao in 454 a third

population-exchange takes place. The Ostrogoths move to Pannonia and Dacia is occupied by the Gepidae. Only from this time on can we consider any continuity in the region; the presence of the Gepidae in the Carpathian Basin is recognized for a long time, up to the 9th century. We do not know what effect the Hungarian conquest had on the ethnic relations in the region. Archeological data is sparse but we cannot exclude the possibility that once again it brought about a population displacement in Dacia.

These historical events reveal that, in this territory, we cannot assume the existence of Roman - Rumanian continuity - or up to the end of the 5th century, that of any other peoples. This may be clear by now. With regard to additional references: rivers, which do not leave Transylvania do not bear names of ancient origin. The name of smaller rivers have Hungarian or Slavic origins. The largest among them, the Küküllő has a name of Turkish origin. As it cannot have derived from Bulgaro- Turkish, Petcheneg or Cumanian, the process of elimination leaves the Kavars who could have named the river *Küküllő*, which means *Kökényes* in Hungarian or *Tîrnava* in Rumanian (which is a word of Slavic origin). This bears witness to the likelihood of population movements in wake of the Hungarian Conquest. On Dacian territory we may assume to have witnessed four such migrations, i.e. population exchanges. Romanism could only be a recurrence in this region, as indeed happened 900 years later when Rumanians made their presence known on the borders of the former Roman Province.

