

Bibliography and Comments

There are distinct difficulties related to research on a subject which has been neglected by the local scientific establishment during the past 40 years. (While Hungary was under Communist rule - translator). When the difficulty is compounded by limited resources, the outcome will be somewhat uneven. The recent publication (Budapest, 1986) of *Erdély Története* (The History of Transylvania) was of great assistance; in the first volume, there are several thematic references to the subject covered by this study. This enabled us to omit from this writing a detailed review of Dacia's history; *E. Tóth* provided a detailed summary of the subject in the History of Transylvania (although it lacks a more detailed description of Dacia Inferior, later Dacia Malvensis). Unfortunately, the same cannot be said with regard to source material pertaining to the Dacian Kingdom. On this subject, no comprehensive work has been done in Hungary since 1942 (*A. Alföldi: Zur Geschichte des Karpatenbeckens im I. Jahrtausendes v. Chr. AECO VIII. 1942*). In his later writings, Alföldi reiterated the views expressed in his major work of 1942. Subsequent studies left many questions unanswered, warranting a more detailed analysis of the Dacian Kingdom in this work. A great deal has been written about the period of the Great Migrations to which this work referred only insofar as it is related to the question of Daco-Roman continuity. We did take great care to describe the development of ethnic relations within Dacia.

Due to aforementioned reasons, this book does not include a review of the contemporary bibliography of the subject, as it would have to encompass Rumanian archeological and historical research and ethno-linguistics, as well. Readers with expertise in certain aspects of our study will have observed that we did not follow up on some hypotheses, such as E. Gamillscheg's theory regarding Rumanian "tribal territories". He uses dialectal manifestations to establish the continuum of Romanism where Rumanian is spoken today on the territory in the vicinity of the Danube. The flaws in this theory were pointed out at the time by *L. Gáldi* ("Zur frage des Rumänischen Kerngebiets in Siebenbürgen" AECO VIII. 1942). - We were unable to present a detailed analysis of the Blacks, or Volochs, who are mentioned in the gesta of Anonymous and in Russian annals, respectively. However, such a discussion seemed dispensable since these were not contemporary sources whose reports had already been subjected to research-scrutiny. Nevertheless, at some future time, we plan to re-examine that material, as well. We would also like to note that we did not report in detail on already established arguments disputing the theory of continuity, other than providing a summary in the section of the book which reports on existing research on the subject. Among these is the allegiance of Danubian Rumanians to the Orthodox Church - from late-Roman times on - this also establishes their long historical presence in the Byzantine Empire.

L. Tamás provided a significant overview of the theory of continuity from a perspective of the Middle Ages and the

Renaissance . "*Romains, Romans et Roumains dans l'histoire de la Dacie Trajane*" (Romans, Rumanians and Vlachs' in Trajan's Dacia) (Budapest, 1935 - AECO II. 1936). This work encompasses the whole subject and is the last comprehensive Hungarian work in this area. The value of L. Tamás's study is somewhat diminished by his excessive criticism of N. Drăganu's work (*N. Drăganu: Români în veacurile IX-XIV pe baza toponimiei și a onomasticeii*, București, 1933), which induces the author to some exaggerations. A. Philippide (*Originea românilor*, I., Iași, 1925) provides an extensive overview of research done on the origins of Rumanians. I.I. Russu has reviewed the pertinent bibliography (*Etnogeneza românilor*, București, 1981). Russu is prepared to make sharply-worded observations; calling Gergely Moldován "a Rumanian renegade" characterizes his viewpoint. (He describes Lajos Tamás "a Schwabian renegade"). Nowadays, such an approach sounds distinctly odd, even coming from Russu. His data reflect concerted effort, though. - A. Armbuster undertook to create a definitive study of the subject (*Romanitatea românilor*, București, 1972). A partially revised sequel is: *La romanité des Roumains*; București, 1977). This is a useful historiography but his conclusions are wrong because they do not follow from the facts exposed in the book. He claimed the awareness of Roman origin permeated Rumanian consciousness; this view was already challenged by C. Daicoviciu. - In addition to the above-mentioned works, there were many papers which aided this writer. Among Hungarian contributors we would like to mention L. Gáldi's numerous studies.

The chapter about the Dacians is novel in structure and concept; the reasons are simple. They include the realization that, in its study of the period, Rumanian historical analysis was focused on the concept of continuity. Consequently, there was a tendency to disregard self-evident historical conclusions (such as the relationship between Dacians and Iranian-speaking peoples - Scythians, Sarmatians - and what the consequences of such relationships might have been. The review and assessment of this period by Hungarians was not without error, either. This may have been due to Hungarian researchers' reliance on the work done by A. Alföldi, whose extensive studies on the subject were adopted without adequate familiarity with original references. The same also applies to the latest Hungarian treatise on the subject (A. Mócsy: "The Dacian Kingdom" (in: *History of Transylvania*, I. Budapest 1986) he paints with too broad a brush. - V. Pārvan's *Getica* is a seminal work in its summary of source material pertaining to the period and so is *Istoria Romîniei* (Bucure⁰ti, 1960) which lists sources not found in earlier works. In comparison, *I. H. Cri^oan* presents no new insights in: *Burebista oⁱ epoca sa*, (Bucure⁰ti 1977). Other studies were also published on the Age of Burebista, but they are mostly a collection of texts about Celts. On the other hand *H. Daicoviciu's* work: *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea romanã* (Cluj, 1972) makes full use of all known sources, - but without breaking new ground-except on minor points. A. Mócsy provides a useful guide to the early history of the Dacians, utilizing Patsch's hindsight, but offering little that is new in *Die Vorgeschichte Obermösians im hellenistisch - römischen Zeitalter* (The history of Upper-Moesia in the Greek-Roman period). The same can be said

about most of the latest literature on the subject (C. Patsch, M. Macrea).

Fortunately, this writer has been exploring this period for decades; a condensed version of the chapter on pre-history is included in Vol. I. of the History of Transylvania under the heading "Prehistory of Transylvania". A. *Vulpe's* work presents a basically similar outlook - although differing in parts - in *Die Geto-Daker, Geschichte eines Jahrtausends vor Burebista* (Dacia 31, 1987). This is already a response to certain data presented in the History of Transylvania. Also noted: V. *Dumitrescu-A. Vulpe: Dacia înainte de Dromihete* (Bucure^oti, 1988). - Some of our research on early Dacia and the Burebista or Boirebistas-age exists in manuscript form. This unpublished work on the Carpathian Basin prior to Roman occupation is known and used in Hungary as an integral part of the literature pertaining to this period. Our paper on the Prehistory of Transylvania has evolved from the above material.

Research of the period has failed to note that the Kingdom of Dacia came about as the result of an organized military establishment and independently of ethnic factors. G. *Widengren* develops the "Männerbund" concept in: "Le symbolisme de la ceinture." *Iranica Antiqua* 8, 1968. In addition, A. *Alföldi* writes about this in his work on the Carpathian Basin (mentioned earlier) and in "The Age of Rome; Budapest in Antiquity" (*History of Budapest*, I. - Budapest 1942). This theme recurs also in other papers, the subject of which is Dacia but he fails to see the essential issue. Boirebistas is connected to the

Bastarnae not only by his name but also due to a certain sequential logic. This is not negated by the circumstance that his Kingdom was established in a territory where Dacian was spoken - or a language akin to Dacian. The language of the Bastarnae is not known today, nor can it be reconstructed but we can ascertain that it had nothing to do with Dacian. Notwithstanding the differences in comparative structure and size, an apt analogy may be the Kingdom of the Franks - who ruled over the Gauls. Our text may not have sufficiently established that Boirebistas must have been an "allied soldier" in the army of Eupatór Mithridates. This may explain a great deal about Dacian governmental infrastructure, including the foreign sounding - Armenian? - name of the capital.

C. *Daicoviciu* developed a review of the period under study based on a large volume of source material ("Dakien and Rom in der Prinzipatzeit" from *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II; 6 - Berlin-New York 1977). His previous works should not be neglected, either; of special interest is *Dacica* (Cluj, 1969), a collection of his more significant works.

Although written in 1893-4 (Vienna) *W. Tomaschek's: Die alten Thraker* I-II (Ancient Thracians) is still a useful reference on the Dacian language, and other circumstances. His *Les restes de la langue dace* (Muséon, Louvain 1883) is a seminal work. - *D. Deèev* collected much of the source material in *Die thrakischen Sprachreste* (Vienna, 1957). *Xarakteristika na trakijskija ezik - Charakteristik der thrakischen Sprache*, (Sofia, 1952) in which he shows, for the first time, the AMTA features in the Thracian language. Another work of his deals with Dacian plant-names: *Die dakischen Pflanzennamen*

(Godišnik Sofijskija universitet, istor - filol. fakultet. XXIV, I. 1929). *I. I. Russu* also explores the Dacian language: *Limba traco-dacilor* (Bucure^oti, 1959) - *Die Sprache der Thraco-Daker* (Bucure^oti, 1969). Regrettably, his work reflects the (old) viewpoint, according to which the Dacian and Thracian languages are connected. Much of Russu's etymology is quite improbable, yet he tends to be very critical toward other researchers' work. The *Introduction to the History of the Indo-European Languages* is the last detailed study done by *V. Georgiev* (Sofia, 1981). It encompasses his earlier findings, which appeared in: *Trakijiskijat ezik* and "Albanisch, Dakisch- Mysisch und Rumänisch" (*Linguistique Balkanique* 2, 1960). - *C. Poghirc* developed a thorough study in: *Considerations linguistiques sur l'ethnogenèse paléobalkanique* (RÉSEE XIV - 2, 1976) and his other papers are also noteworthy. - *J. Hubschmid* extols the same theories as Georgiev in "Substrate in Balkansprachen" (in: *Kultur Südosteuropas, ihre Geschichte und ihre Ausdruckformen* (Culture of Southeastern Europe, her history and modes of expression, *Südosteuropa-Schriften* 6, 1964). - I did not know how to assess *G. Reichenkron's* collected articles: *Das Dakische (rekonstruiert aus dem Rumänischen)* (Heidelberg, 1966), (i.e. The Dacian language - reconstructed from Rumanian) - this title reflects his methodology. Reichenkron - who was E. Gamillscheg's pupil - assumes that the Rumanians are the successors of the Dacians. When he encounters Rumanian words of unknown etymology, he attempts to create Dacian words through the use of reconstructed radicals. It seems unnecessary to provide examples.

C. Váczy contributed a detailed analysis of Dacian plant-names: "Nomenclatura dacică a plantelor la Dioscorides și Pseudo-Apuleius" (*Acta Musei Napocensis* V-VI; VIII-IX, 1968-72), with an extensive bibliography. The significance of this work is that it corrects earlier, erroneous plant definitions; it has only limited applicability in linguistics.

V. Georgiev and his followers share my theory about the Dacian language. Yet, even though every one has been treating linguistic material pertaining to the Dacian language as one unit, I strongly believe that we have clear evidence of several languages. This is also more logical historically, since on Dacian territory there were also a large number of Celts. Other groups have also lived there but their identification is more difficult.

We cannot list all Indo-Germanistic works and papers which we consulted as this book was being written but, we do want to single out P. Kretschmer's still valid study: *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen, 1896) (Introduction to the history of the Greek Language). - The literature of Daco-Albanian relations (and references to the Albanians' more original, Northern residence) includes several noteworthy works. In 1925 J. Melich published (in Budapest): *Hungary at the time of the Conquest*, where he wrote that the names of *Abrud* and *Ompoly* may have been transferred into Hungarian directly from Dacian. Because of these and other words, G. Schramm shares this hypothesis (*Eroberer und Eingesessene - Conquerors and Inhabitants - Stuttgart, 1981*). Both exclude from this category the names of the *Szamos*, *Kőrös*, *Maros*, and *Temes* rivers. However, Niš has prompted N. Jokl (*Real-lexikon der Vorgeschichte*,

I. Albaner) to identify the $s < \check{s}$ change as Albanian. If so, then we should be able to draw the same conclusion about the above - mentioned rivers; G. Schramm also pointed this out. - Note also: *H. Bariæ: Lingvistièke studije* (Sarajevo, 1954). *I. Popoviæ: "Bemerkungen über die voroslavischen Ortsnamen in Serbien"* (*Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 28, 1960). *Geschichte der Serbokroatischen Sprache* (Wiesbaden, 1960), "Quel était le peuple pannonien" ... (*Zbornik radova Vizantinoloskog instituta* 7, 1969), *L. A. Gindin: "Kronologii i karakteru slavjanyizacii Karpato-balkanskovo prozstranstva"*, in: *Formirovanyije rannjefeodalnich szlavjanszkih narodnosztyej* (Moscow, 1981). At the same time, the Dacian etymology of *Abrud* and *Ompoly* are open to question but - alongside *Popoviæ* and *Gindin* we would find it difficult to conclude that, in the territory, there would have been Slav presence in the 5th Century.

The above mentioned works provide information about the material culture of Dacians; *K. Pink* explored coin mintage: *Die Münzprägung der Ostkelten und Ihrer Nachbarn* (Diss Pann II. 15, Budapest, 1939). So did *C. Preda: Monedele geto-dacilor* (Bucure^oti, 1973). *I. Glodariu* described commercial practices: *Relapii comerciale ale Daciei cu lumea elenisticã 9i romanã* (Cluj-Napoca 1974) = Dacian Trade with the Hellenistic and Roman World - (BAR Suppl. 8. Oxford 1976). While we cannot enumerate all papers and monographs written on the subject, special mention is due to *M. Babe^o: "Descoperirile funerare 9i semnificaþia lar în contextul geto-dace clasice"*, (*SCIVA* 39, 1988). At long last we get a comprehensive look at Dacian burial customs, although most of the questions still remain unanswered.

We are better informed about the Roman period. In the *History of Transylvania*, Vol. I., *E. Tóth* provides an overview of the whole bibliography of the period, which should suffice as reference. Nevertheless, *P. Király's* work on the history of the Roman Province, and of the Dacian Wars continues to be of value: *Dacia Provincia Augusti* (Nagybecskerek, Hungary - 1893). Another significant work is *C. Daicoviciu's: Siebenbürgen im Altertum* (Transylvania in Antiquity) (Bukarest, 1943). Of great importance are *A. Alföldi's* papers "Dacians and Romans in Transylvania" (Budapest, *Századok*, 1940) = *Daci e romani in Transilvania*, "Zu den Schicksalen Siebenbürgens im Altertum"; (Transylvania's Destiny in Antiquity) (Budapest, 1944); "Keletmagyarország a Római Korban" (Eastern Hungary in Roman Times) (published in Budapest, 1943 in *Magyarok és románok* (Hungarians and Rumanians - edited by *J. Deér - L. Gáldi.*) - Our references to Trajan's Column came from *C. Cichorius: Die Reliefs der Traianssäule* (Berlin, 1896). In "Der Forschungsstand zur Kontinuität der bodenständigen Bevölkerung im römischen Dazien (2-3. Jh.)" (The Status of Research on the Continuity of the Autochthonous Population in Roman Dacia in the 2nd-3rd Centuries, *D. Protase* offers a detailed analysis of the hypothesis of Dacian continuity (published in Berlin-New York, 1977 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischer Welt* (The Rise and Fall of Rome). He also wrote: *Autohtonii în Dacia* (Bucure^oti, 1980) and: *Problema continuității în Dacia în lumina arheologiei și numismaticii* (Bucure^oti, 1966). The latter work occupies itself also with the period which follows the relinquishment of the province. We believe, the survival of

the native population was put into the proper light by the examples given in the text. A summary of written records was provided by *I. I. Russu*: *Daco-gepii în imperiul roman* (Bucure^oti, 1980). He also summarized the inscriptive material of "regio Ans.": "Materiale epigrafice în muzeul raional Dej". *Activitatea Muzeelor* (Cluj, 1956). *I. Mitrofan* developed a study of the Dacian castrum of Vármező: *Castrul roman de la Buciumi* (Cluj, 1972), etc. and a summary: "A^oezare ale populației autohtone în Dacia Superioară" (*Acta Musei Napocensis* IX, 1972). Romanism in the Danubian Region was explored by *D. Tudor*: *Oltenia romană* (Bucure^oti, 1978). His work contains data of the whole region and continues to be a valuable source. We refer to *R. Syme* on Roman rule in Muntenia and the "Hunt-papyrus" in *The Lower Danube under Traian* (*JRS* 49, 1959) and in other papers.

Dacian family names are an important link in the matter of continuity. *A. Kerényi* provided the first summary of this subject: "A dáciai személynevek" (Dacian Family Names) (*Diss. Pann.* I. 9, Budapest, 1941). *A. Alföldi* provided an analysis of this material in: "Zu den Schicksalen Siebenbürgens", *idem*. These names - as well as additional ones - were also reviewed by *I. I. Russu*: "L'Onomastique de la Dacie romaine", in *Onomastique Latine*, Paris, 1977. *L. Balla* added exhaustive studies to the subject: "De la romanisation de la Dacie" (*Acta Classica Debreceniensis* XIV. 1978) and "Recusantes provinciales in Dacia" (*Oikumene* I., Budapest, 1976). He also explored the population-history of Roman Dacia: *Tanulmányok Erdély Történetéről* (The History of Transylvania - Studies); Debrecen, 1988; therein he also refers to papers which we

are not describing here. Balla also recognizes the orientalization of the Province at the turn of the 2nd and 3rd Centuries. - A. Mócsy attempted a novel system of the analysis of family names: "Lateinische Cognomina als Geschichtsquelle: Zwei Typen der provinzialrömischen Kultur", *Acta Archaeologica* 36, 1984 (Latin family names as historical sources - Two Types of Roman Provincial Culture); also Budapest, 1985. Dacian names of plants are used here for the first time in assessing linguistic manifestations in the Province; applicable references are to be found in this text. A. Mócsy also explores Romanization in general: *Gesellschaft und Romanisation in der Römischer Provinz Moesia Superior* (Budapest, 1970), and so does E. Tóth in *The History of Transylvania*, Volume I.

H. Mihăescu wrote about the language of inscriptions in: *La langue latine dans le Sud-est de l'Europe* (Bucure^oti-Paris, 1978). About regional differences in Vulgar Latin, A. Tovar's work is noteworthy: "Das Vulgärlatein in den Provinzen", which was published in: *Die Sprachen im Römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit* (Languages in the Roman Empire), Köln, 1980. Including his previous works, J. Herman contributed to a study of the development of Romance languages: *Új eredmények, új kérdések a román nyelvek kialakulási folyamatának vizsgálatában*. (New results and new questions in the developmental assessment of the Romance languages), Budapest, 1985. These works do not provide material about Dacia, because there are no inscriptions to study from the mid-3rd Century on. Yet, this is the very period in which differentiation becomes an issue.

N. Gostar writes about perceived Dacian indigenous cults: *Culte autohtone în Dacia Romană* (*Anuarul Institutului de Istorie* ^oi

Arheologie, Ia^oi II. 1956) but fails to take into account that there are no data which would substantiate identification with earlier indigenous cults.

A. *Alföldi* provides the most thorough account of the evacuation of the Province: "*A gót mozgalom és Dácia feladása*" (Gothic activity and relinquishment of Dacia). (*EPhK* 53-54, 1929-30) and further analysis of data in subsequent studies. - G. *Bichir* summarized the bibliography pertaining to the Karpis in: "Carpis în istoriografia română ^oi străină" (*SCIV* 22, 1971), and in *Cultura carpică* (Bucure^oti, 1973). He describes the Barbarians in Wallachia in: *Geto-dacii din Muntenia în epoca romană* (Bucure^oti, 1984). This work contains the inscription on a bowl from Socetu: *Aurelius Silvanus fecit pataelam bonam*: the text in this form, and the lettering suggest contemporary fabrication.

D. *Protase* summarized the data on continuity in his works cited above, his latest work on the subject was: "Die dakisch-römische Bevölkerung nördlich der Donau in der Periode von Aurelian bis zu den Slawen (7th cent.) im Lichte der aktuellen Dokumente" (The Daco-Roman population north of the Danube from the period of Aurelian up to the 7th Century). The study appeared in: *Die Völker Südosteuropas im 6. bis 8. Jahrhundert* (*Südosteuropa Jahrbuch* 17, Berlin 1987). (Published in: Southeast-European Peoples in the 6th-8th Cent.) Protase's extreme viewpoint becomes quite apparent in comparison to other, not altogether unbiased works such as K. *Horedt's: Siebenbürgen in spätrömischer Zeit* (Bucure^oti, 1982) and O. *Toropu's: Romanitatea târzie ^oi străromânii în Dacia Traiană sud-Carpatică* (Craiova, 1976); as well as D. *Tudor's* above-mentioned *Oltenia romană*. A critical analysis by E. *Tóth* of Horedt's work is to

be found in *Acta Archaeologica*, 1985: "Zur frühen Völkerwanderungszeit von Siebenbürgen" (The early period of peoples' migration in Transylvania.) The above works have at least some material basis in contrast to *L. Bârzus: Continuitatea creșterii materiale și spirituale a poporului român pe teritoriul fostei Daciei* (București, 1979). (Continuity of the material and spiritual culture of the Rumanian people within the territory of former Dacia). Two other works in this category are: C.C. Giurescu's: *Formarea poporului român* (București, 1971) and N. Stoicescu's: *Continuitatea românilor* (București, 1980).

In my research of the most important source materials on Dacia's history I made use of the best available editions: *Eutropii breviarium ab urbe condita*. Recognovit C. Santini (*Teubneriana*, Leipzig, 1979). It appears clearly from Santini's Foreword that Paulus Diaconus' text must be given preference over other interpretations.

K. Horedt provided the most detailed study of material elements of the early Great Migration-period. *I. Bona's* voluble account of the same period can be found in *The History of Transylvania*, Vol. I: "Dáciától Erdőlvéig. A népvándorlás kora Erdélyben" (From Dacia to Erdőelve: The era of the Great Migration in Transylvania.) *K. Horedt* reviews the later relics of the period in a more object-related manner *Siebenbürgen im Frühmittelalter* (Bonn, 1986) (Transylvania in the early Middle Ages). The present writer's critical review of the latter appeared in: *Danubian Historical Studies*, 1, 4, 1987. *R. Harhoiu* criticized Bona's outline: "Die Beziehungen Zwischen Romanen und Barbaren in Siebenbürgen in der Sicht einer ungarischen Geschichte Transilvaniens" (*Dacia XXXI*, 1987) (Relations between Romans and

Barbarians in Transylvania from the perspective of Hungarian history of Transylvania). Although, the critique is in some respects exaggerated, much of it is valid because the applicable chapter in the History of Transylvania overrepresents the historical significance of material data. G. Vékony provides a short survey of this historical period, based on all accessible source material: "A dák-római kontinuitáselmélet a középkori Erdély történetének tükrében" (*Életünk*, 1988/3-Szombathely) = The Theory of Daco-Roman Continuity (NHQ XXIX, 110, 1988).

Horedt and Bóna have provided a detailed bibliography of the period. We will only list the most important references. L. Bârzu writes about the Baráthely (Bratei) cemetery: *Continuitatea populației autohtone în Transilvania în secolele IV-V* (București, 1973). J. Bóna already called attention to parallels between burials here and in Moldova in the History of Transylvania, Vol. I. (Second edition). See also I.A. Rafalovics: *Dancseny. Mogilnyik cernahovskoy kulturi III-IV. vv. n.e.* (Kisinyov- 1986). The cemetery at Etulija in the Prut-delta has more in common with the cemetery at Bratei than the one cited by Bóna. Also: T.A. Scserbakova's "Mogilnyik pervih vekov nasej eri u s. Etulija" (in *Archeologicheskije isledovanyija v Moldavii* (1974-1976 g.g. (Kisinyov 1981). The topography of these cemeteries call for identification with the Taifals. 4th Century records must have been collated on the basis of data provided by Horedt (*Siebenbürgen...*, see above). Bóna failed to consider this as he attributed to the 4th Century cemeteries like those of Marosszentanna in spite of chronological evidence to the contrary. All researchers - Bóna excepted - maintain that subsequent findings cannot be assigned to

pre-mid 4th Century. Chronological data permit the assumption that cemeteries of the Maroszentanna-type date from the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th Centuries. Therefore, these must be viewed as part of the legacy of Ostrogoths who were resettled here by the Huns, just as the Pannonians who were found in Cluj and Alba Iulia. The findings at Alba Iulia were first reported by *K. Horedt*: *Gräber des 4. und 11-12. Jahrhunderts aus Karlsburg; Untersuchungen zur Frühgeschichte Siebenbürgens* (Bucharest, 1958) (4th, 11th and 12th Century graves in Karlsburg [Gyulafehérvár - Alba Iulia]). The latest report on the sarcophagi in Cluj came from *D. Protase*: "Observații privind inscripția 'creștinată' de la Napoca" (*SCIVA* 36, 1985). Protase asserts that the cross carved in the letter O has been made later, in spite of the testimony of the photograph of the relic, published in the article, which clearly indicates the contrary.

In view of the ethnic composition of the era of the Huns, one cannot assume a Slavic presence based on rhetor Priskos' words of *medos* 'bragget', and *strava*, 'wake', quoted by Iordanes. There were actually Alan dialects in which the Iranian *a>e* change is found, cf. Hung. *méreg*, 'poison' Oset *marg*, Hung. *üveg*, Oset *avg* 'glass'. Thus, Priskos' *medos* could well be an Iranian word from the Carpathian Basin and Iordanes' *strava* is likely to be a "hapax legomenon". With reference to the Omharus-ring: the VS, which is in a separate line, clearly indicates that it is an abbreviation. We know of no such name for the period; we cannot attach any meaning to the word. Therefore, our explanation, or a similar one, is most plausible.

The latter phase of the Great Migration is amply covered by those works of Horedt and Bóna to which we have referred earlier. O.

Toropu is one of the sources for the extra-Carpathian region (Romanitatea..., see above). Another source is S. Dolinescu-Ferche's summary (citing earlier literature, as well): "La culture 'Ipotești-Ciurel-Cîndești' (V-VII siècles). La situation en Valachie" (*Dacia* XXVIII, 1984).

K. Horedt believes that Rumanians migrated "upward" (north) in the 9th Century - this theory would be hard to support. Findings from that period have lately become more numerous - as in the case of the Danubian-Bulgarian cemetery from Maroskarna. A monstrous example of the theory of continuity is E. Zaharia's *Populația românească în Transilvania în secolele VII-VIII* (București, 1977): the author classifies an Obârștia-type cemetery as Old-Rumanian through the simple device of attributing to Christianity graves which contain skeletal and cremated remains! (For reference to Obârștia-type cemeteries see: O. Toropu-O. Stoia: "La nécropole préféodale d'Obârștia- Olt", *Dacia* XVI., 1972). With their Avar and Danubian-Bulgar connections and Slavic cremation practices, Obârștia-type cemeteries/graves bear witness to 9th Century Bulgarian rule. From this period, we have unequivocal data about Dacias' population - (or a segment thereof) in *Annales regni Francorum ad a: 824: "Praedenecenti contermini Bulgaris Daciam Danubio adjacentem incolunt"*. In other words, during that period of time Danubian Dacia was inhabited by a Slavic people, the Praedenecenti, also called Abodrits. Since written records from this period refer, besides the above population, to the Bulgarians, we can only attribute to the Abodrits the burial mounds of Nagyfalva-Szamosfalva, which were

foreign to the region. (See also: G. Vékony: "Spätawarenzeitliche Messer mit Volutengriff" (in: *Urzeitliche und frühhistorische Besiedlung der Ostslowakei in Bezug zu den Nachbargebieten*, Nitra, 1986) (Settlements in Eastern Slovakia during antiquity and the early Middle Ages as they relate to adjacent lands.)

J. Deér writes about Vlachs mentioned by Anonymous in *Magyarok és Románok I.* (Budapest, 1943) (Hungarians and Rumanians). On the other hand, *Pascu's Voievodatul Transilvaniei I.* (Cluj, 1971) is a caricature of historical writing. Deér's analysis augmented by this writer's modifications offers an unequivocal interpretation of the above source. Studies referring to the Volochs mentioned in Russian annals include: M. Gyóni: *Les Volochs des Annales primitives de Kiev (Études slaves et roumaines II.* 1949) and Gy. Kristó: "Rómaiak és vlachok Nyesztornál és Anonymusnál", in: *Tanulmányok az Árpád-korról*, Budapest 1983 ("Romans and Vlachs as they appear in the works of Nyestor [Nestorius] and Anonymus", in *Studies of the Árpád-period*). At the time the Norici are identified as Slavs by the *Ipat'evskaja letopis*, the Volochs mentioned above can't possibly be considered Franks. They must be viewed as Romans - as confirmed also by I.V. Jagiè.

In addition to the literature cited above, Dacia's settlements of the 10th Century were explored by G. Vékony, who wrote about runic inscriptions from the mid-Migration-period in the Carpathian Basin: *Későnépvándorláskori rovásfeliratok a Kárpátmedencében* (Szombathely, 1987). In the same study there is a short description of Murfatlar and Bulgarian inscriptions on a vessel from Capidava. The

sittings of Murfatlar alphabet-markings on a vessel from Bucov (cf. *M. Com^oa: Cultura materială veche românească*, Bucure^oti, 1978) testify that the settlement's inhabitants were Bulgaro-Turkish and not Old-Rumanian.

Still considered a seminal study of the Rumanian language is O. Densusianu's: *Histoire de la langue Roumaine*, I-II (Paris, 1901, 1914, 1932), as well as A. Philippide: *Originea românilor*, I-II (Ia^oi, 1923, 1925) which refutes the theory of continuity. A. Rosetti's: *Istoria limbii române* (Bucure^oti, 1968) proved to be an invaluable reference to the Latin, Balkan and Slavic phases of Rumanian, each of which is subjected to thorough individual analysis. - *The Early History of the Rumanian Language* (Lake Bluff, 1977) by A. Du Nay was also written to be a general survey. He provides a detailed analysis of the theory of continuity and offers its rebuttal. [A thoroughly revised version was published in 1996: *The Origins of the Rumanians*, Matthias Corvinus Publishing, Toronto-Buffalo – editor's note.] In addition to the works mentioned above, the Albanian connection is explored by H. Bariè in: *Albano-Rumänische Studien* (Sarajevo, 1919) and: "Albanisch, romanisch und Rumänisch" (Godišnjak I, 1975). I.I. Russu's *Etnogeneza* (cited earlier) analyzes all parallel words. The finding of territories where variants of Vulgar Latin in the Balkan peninsula were spoken is a new development, although such a division is indicated by the data provided by J. Herman, as well as the network of relationships between Albanian, Dalmatian and Rumanian.

The linguistic characteristics of Common Rumanian were surveyed by *E. Petrovici* ("Unitatea dialectală a limbii române", in: *Studii de dialectologie și toponimie*, București, 1970). Also: *M. Caragiu Mariopeanu et alii: Dialectologie Română* (București, 1977). Regarding the Aromân dialect, important for the study of the history of the Rumanian language, see *T. Capidan: Aromânii. Dialectul aromân* (București, 1932), and more recently: *A. G. Lazarou: L'aroumain et ses rapports avec le grec* (Thessaloniki, 1986); although well-informed, he asserts the Arumun are of Greek origin. Considering the theory of Daco-Roman continuity, this unique, but impossible theory is to some extent understandable.

The Slavic connection is explored by *A. Rosetti: Istoria limbii române* and "Les plus anciens mots slaves méridionaux du romain", in: *Mélanges linguistiques* (București, 1977), as well as: *E. Scărlătoiu: Relații lingvistice ale aromânilor cu slavii de sud* (București, 1980), and *The Balkan Vlachs in the Light of Linguistic Studies (RÉSEE XVII., 1979)*. *A. Du Nay* also deals with these relationships in: *The Early History*, but his data are often to be checked because of the typographical errors.

There are many monographs of varying length which could be cited but most of the data they present are also to be found in the works we used as reference.

With respect to the origin of Rumanians *K. Sandfeld's: Linguistique balkanique* (Paris, 1930) is of key importance, as is *M. Friedwagner's: Über die Sprache und Heimat der Rumänen in ihrer Frühzeit (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 54, 1934) = On the Early History of Rumanian language and Homeland*

(Journal of Romanistic Philology). Another suitable reference would be *G. Reichenkron: Das Ostromanische* (in: *Völker und Kulturen Südosteuropas* (Südosteuropa-Schriften, I. München 1959). His conception is similar to *Gamillscheg's (Romania Germanica* II. (Berlin-Leipzig, 1935) Zur rumänischen Frühgeschichte in: *Die Kultur Südosteuropas. Ihre Geschichte und ihre Ausdruckformen* (Südosteuropa-Schriften 6, Wiesbaden 1964). He assumes that some archaic aspects of certain dialects bear traces of surviving Daco-Romans: Using his analogy, we would place the Csangos of Moldova into the ancient Hungarian homeland on account of their linguistic archaisms.

B. Gerov surveyed the perimeters of Balkan-Latin: *Die Lateinisch-griechische Sprachgrenze auf der Balkanhalbinsel*, in: *Die Sprachen im Römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit* = (Languages spoken in Imperial Rome: Latin Greek linguistic frontiers on the Balkan Peninsula.) (Cologne, 1980). Interestingly, this border thrusts southward along the rivers Utus and Asamus; this is where the inscription came to light which includes the verb: *mergo* in its altered form, providing a (different) meaning which is characteristic of Rumanian and Albanian. See: *C. Daicoviciu: A merge; Fossatum-sat* (*Dacoromania* 5, 1927-1928). There is a detailed analysis of the place-names mentioned by Prokopios in the work of *A. Philippide: (Originea)* which we have already cited. *V. Bešerliev* responds to the topographical aspects of the issue: *Zur Deutung der Kastellnamen in Procops Werk 'De aedificiis'* (Amsterdam, 1970), *Geografijata na Balgarija u vizantijskite*

avtoru (*Izvestija na Narodnija Muzej Varna* 23 (38) 1987) = An Interpretation of Castle-names in Procop's Works.

The events of 587-588 - the "*torna, torna frater*" - glossa - have an extensive literature. The latest summary was compiled by A.G. Lazarou (*L'Aroumain*, see above) who has incorporated many earlier references. - We believe that V. Beševliev erred in the locale he assigned to the Kalvomuntii: *Bemerkungen über die antiken Heerstrassen im Ostteil der Balkanhalbinsel (Klio* 51, 1969) = Observations pertaining to military roads in the eastern region of the Balkan peninsula. Earlier literature on this subject includes P. Hunfalvy's *The history of Vlachs (Az oláhok története)* I. (Budapest, 1894), which is still a useful reference. Also, the frequently quoted *Originea* of A. Philippide. A Hungarian glossary of place-names was developed by Szádeczky-S. Kardoss -T. Olajos: *Sources of Avar History (Az avar történelem forrásai)* IV. 2 (*Archeológiai Értesítő*, 1980 = Archeological Bulletin).

For references to the Balkhorekhinos, see: P. Uspenskij: *Istorija Afona*, IV. (Petrograd, 1892, 311) and A.G. Lazarou. - We know that, in this form, the Slavic name for Rumanians could not have been incorporated into the Greek language due to reasons of native wordstock-patterns (which would have ordained *Balkhos* in lieu of *Blakhorekhinos*). Our data come from late sources and can be traced no further back than the 10th Century. Therefore, many questions remain unanswered but there is a great deal which remains beyond dispute. (see: G. Schramm: *Eroberer...*).

There is extended literature dealing with names for the Danube, and versions thereof. The latest may be G. Schramm:

Der rumänische Name der Donau (*Dacoromania* 1, 1973) = The Rumanian name for the Danube. - His explanation for the name is a perceived secondary internal Rumanian development, - quite inconceivable. The name for the Danube - *Danuvius* - could have been lost by Romanism moving south of the Danube-region because they could not very well have been near the Danube as Attila created a no-man's land in an adjacent strip of land in 447. For another study of the history of the region, see *Szádeczky-S.Kardoss: Geschichte des Attila-Abkömmlings Mundo und ihre Chronologie bei Theophanes (Acta Classica Debreceniensis X-XI, 1974-75)* Until now, no Turkish connection has been considered.

The data that follows has long been common knowledge. (History of Rumanians - edited by *L. Gáldi* and *L. Makkaï*), as well as summaries by *A. Philippide* and *Lazarou*. Also, *G. Murnu: Studii istrice privitoare la trecutul românilor de peste Dunăre* (Bucure^oti, 1984); *M. Gyóni: A legrégibb vélemény a román nép eredetéről*, Budapest, 1944. (The oldest view re. the origin of the Rumanians); *La première mention historique des Vlaques des monts Balkans (Acta Ant. I, 1951-1952). L'évêché vlaque de l'archevêché bulgare d'Achris aux XI-XIV siècles (Études slaves et roumaines, I. 1984).*

In his above-mentioned work, *M. Gyóni* writes in detail about Kekaumenos' narration, presents an erroneous view of the two branches of Rumanian ethnogenesis: *Folklór és etnográfia* 24 (Debrecen, 1986) and: *A dunai balkán térség romanizációja = The Romanization of the Danubian-Balkan region (Világtörténet,*

1987/3). Mócsy is to have discovered some Rumanian traditions - M. Gyóni offers a substantiated counter-claim.

One of the best segment-analyses of the Balkan history of the Rumanians was done by A. Dragomir: *Vlahii din nordul peninsulei balcanice în evul mediu* (Bucure^oti, 1959). L. Makkai gives a detailed description of their northward trek in *The History of Transylvania I*. (Transylvania in the Hungarian Kingdom during the Middle Ages). Also: Two Books - Two Different Views on the Hypothesis of Daco-Roman Continuity in Transylvania (*Danubian Historical Studies* 1, 3, 1987). This northward settlement cannot be separated from the same type of migration of Southern-Slav groups speaking the št-type of Slavic; the forebears of contemporary Bulgarians arrive north of the Balkan-Mountains at the same time. - Rumanian penetration into the Carpathian-Basin during the 13th Century occurs in two phases. One precedes the Tartar (Mongolian) invasion (1214) when groups of considerable size turn up at the end of the 12th and the start of the 13th Centuries. Their presence is substantiated by their take-over of the Kerc region between 1202-1209 and their participation in the 1208 campaign of Joachim, Commander of Szeben. (see: L. Makkai: *Transylvania*). The Tartar invasion destroyed their settlements, as a result of which no large-scale Rumanian communities could be found in this region by the end of the 13th Century.

This settlement-history of the region has found an important source of reference in J. Kniezsa's: The place-names of Eastern-Hungary (in: *Hungarians and Rumanians*, I.); Names of

Transylvania's rivers (in: *Yearbook, Transylvanian Scientific Institute*, 1942) and in *E. Moór's* : The Matter of Place-Names in Eastern Hungary (*Századok* [Centuries] 1945-46). The latest study on the name of the Küküllő river was done by *L. Ligeti: Turkic associations of the Hungarian language prior to the Conquest of Hungary and during the age of Árpád*. (Budapest, 1986). The latter assumes the name is of Avar origin but we believe it may have been *Kükül* its original form. This is underscored by the Saxon Version of *Kokel (Kockel)* and *cuculiense* as an adjective.

A final point of emphasis: we could only list a portion of the literature used as references; we did not identify the handbook-type references. For additional information, the reader may turn to the bibliographies listed in the reference works we have cited.