

Chapter VI

Dacians, Romans, Rumanians

It may not be necessary to reiterate all the conclusions we reached on the basis of the evidence examined in previous chapters. We only have "negative" data pertaining to the Romanization of the multi-ethnic, multi-lingual indigenous population of the Dacian Kingdom. Therefore, we cannot even hypothetically discuss Daco-Roman continuity. Our sources also revealed that the Latin spoken in Dacia could not have been the forerunner of the Rumanian language but it could well have been the basis of Dalmatian. Yet, historical data preclude this possibility. Of course, we do not claim that no single Dacian Roman could have become part of Rumanian ethnogeny, but a Sarmatian or Germanic individual could have done the same thing. Specific cases can be examined historically but they will prove the exception, rather than the rule.

As we could see, there were frequent population exchanges within the territory of the former Dacian Kingdom, or Roman Province in the 270's, 370's, 450's and probably, something similar occurred in the 890's. Yet, these movements do not support the survival of an earlier population, even if we were to assume that this might be the case. There is no ground for such assumptions. The geographical designations of the former Dacia do not include a single Roman place name and, the Rumanians who settled here in the Middle Ages, adopted the overwhelming majority of their waterway and place-

names from Hungarians, Slavs and even Saxons (excepting a few insignificant waterways and names of villages which were late settlements). This could not have come about, had they been continuous residents of the region from Roman times. One can try to refute the evidence reflected by place names (such as claiming "they were translated") but to translate the names of waterways and place names which have no meaning is not only not customary but also impossible.

Let us assume that - contrary to all data at our disposal - a Romanized population continued to exist on Dacian territory during the period of the Great Migrations, who would have been the ancestors of Rumanians. In this case, we would find in contemporary Rumanian a large number of words of Germanic (Gothic and Gepida) as well as of Turkish (Avar and Bulgarian, later Petcheneg and Cuman) words. Furthermore, these words would have to be present in at least as large numbers as those which the Rumanian language shares with Albanian. Yet, such are not found, which is illustrated by the unsuccessful attempts of K. Gamillscheg, who tried to show Old Germanic words in the Rumanian language. Especially striking is the absence of Cuman words; this suggests that Cumans were no longer present in large numbers in the territory by the time Rumanians arrived in significant numbers. This happened in the period following the Tartar invasion, thus the settlement of a substantive number of Rumanians north of the Danube can be traced to the second half of the 13th century.

We are left with negative data regarding the survival of Romanism in the former Roman territory of Dacia. However, a wide

variety of data exists to substantiate how the ancestors of Rumanians evolved into a nation in the southern region of the Balkan Peninsula. We also ascertained that the ancestors of the Rumanians did have some links with Dacians; they did live together for some time with their tribal kin, the Karpis, in the area between the lower-Danube and the Balkan Mountains. The Rumanian and Albanian languages constitute proof of this earlier intermingling. Latin-speaking Romans from Moesia Inferior who were the ancestors of Rumanians inhabited a territory, the original population of which spoke Geta: a language related to Dacian. Thus, a connection between Dacians and Rumanians does exist, but it is a tenuous connection. Therefore a link can be acknowledged but under no circumstances does this support Daco-Roman or Daco-Rumanian continuity. The humanistic theory of such continuity belongs to the history of science.

Nevertheless, we realize that this humanistic theory - and the sequels that followed - is not likely to be soon discarded. There will be those who will continue to consider Anonymus an authentic and reliable source. Likewise, credit will be given to the reference in Russian annals, pertaining to ancient history, wherein white Ugrians (*Ugri bi lii*) chased the "Volochs" from the land of the Danubian Slavs. They will fail to note that this confusing story in Russian annals speaks of 'Norici' (*Norci*). These Norici are described as Slavs. It is true that these Slavs were attacked by the Voloch (Romans). If white Ugrians drove them away they must have been Huns, considering the modernized use of names employed by this source. From this same source we also hear of Hungarians (*Ugri*) chasing out Volochs at the time when they conquered the territory. We believe this assumption is

220

based on the tendency to link a well-known event to a similar name. Analysts of historical data know of many such examples. Thus, the existence of Rumanians along the Danube during the period of the Hungarian Conquest was not mentioned by late-Russian chronicles.

Facts can be misrepresented through rationalization but they nevertheless remain facts. Even if we are reluctant to acknowledge them.