

THE IMMORTAL THRACIANS. GRAVES DISAPPEARANCE AT THE END OF THE IRON AGE IN THE CARPATHO-DANUBIAN AREA¹

LUCA-PAUL PUPEZĂ

Abstract: Over 3000 graves were discovered in the Thracian Carpatho-Danubian area of the 5th-3rd centuries BC, while only approximately 100 graves dating to the 2nd century BC - 1st century AD were identified. For the period of the maximum development of the Dacian Kingdom, in the 1st century AD, grave finds do not exceed 20. The disappearance of the traditional graves, namely pit cremation graves with urn and lid, may be the result of the shift in the archaeological research towards habitat and fortification elements. However, the graves' disappearance is rather a real historical phenomenon, the result of a radical change of the funerary behaviour.

Keywords: Dacians; graves; temples; fortifications.

Rezumat: În spațiul tracic carpato-danubian, pentru secolele V - III a. Chr. s-au găsit peste 3000 de morminte, în timp ce pentru secolele II a. Chr. - I p. Chr. s-au descoperit circa 100 de morminte. Pentru perioada de maximă dezvoltare a Regatului Dac, în secolul I p. Chr. descoperirile nu depășesc 20 de morminte. Dispariția mormintelor tradiționale, de incinerare în groapă cu urnă și capac, poate fi rezultatul orientării cercetării arheologice spre elementele de habitat și fortificații. Dar, mai degrabă dispariția mormintelor reprezintă un fenomen istoric real, rezultat al unei schimbări radicale a comportamentului funerar.

Cuvinte cheie: daci; morminte; temple; fortificații.

“But before he came to the Ister he conquered first the Getai, who make themselves immortal [...]. And their belief in immortality is of this kind, that is to say, they hold that they do not die, but that he who is killed goes to Salmoxis”².

The paragraph in Herodotus, beside other similar ancient information, shaped a complex image of the immortality of the Thracians, either called the Getae, Moesi, Odrisi or Dacians. The archaeological finds dated to the end of the Late Iron Age seem to “confirm” Herodotus’s accounts. By the end of the 2nd century BC, in the Thracian territories by the Danube and the Carpathians, as the number of settlements increased, the traditional graves, most of them pit cremations with urn and lid, seemed to disappear. Only an immortal population leaves no trace in the graves; the Thracians “became immortal”.

Obviously, the association between the two phenomena is apparent. However, tackled separately, the two phenomena are as real as they can get. The Thracians’

¹ The topic was partially discussed in Pupeză 2012a, 373-382.

² Herod. IV, 93-95, see the interpretation of the text in Dana 2011, 67-68.

immortality was a thoroughly analysed subject, the major interest of the ancient authors being equalled by that of the modern authors³. By contrast, the phenomenon of the disappearance of the traditional graves was rather statistically noted than interpreted⁴.

Traditional graves

The Thracians in the Carpatho-Danubian region practiced the cremation rite during the entire Iron Age. In the peculiar case of the Late Iron Age, cremation graves represent approximately 90% of the total discovered graves. For the 5th–3rd centuries BC there were identified over 3000 local graves, the majority clustering in the area of the lower Danube. The graves are both flat and tumulus type isolated or grouped in cemeteries. The great majority have the cremation remains placed in urns of specific shapes, some lidded, the deposition of the bones directly in the pit being rare. In general, bones are few, not mixed with ash or charcoal. Except for the urn and lid, other deposited vessels are rare. The meat offering is missing almost entirely⁵.

In the case of the local graves of the 2nd century BC – 1st century AD, cremation remains the predominant rite, exceptions being rare. The great majority of the graves are flat, rarely grouped in cemeteries⁶, most being isolated. Cremation remains are most often placed in an urn which no longer has a specific shape, common wares being used instead (biconical vessels, pots, bell-shaped vessels, cups, bowls). Grave inventories are modest, being composed of pottery and, rarely, metal objects, brooches or weapons⁷.

The great quantity of graves during the 5th–3rd centuries BC is no longer found after mid 2nd century BC, the graves dated to the 2nd century BC – 1st century AD being around 100⁸. Most of them were located in the south-east area of the Carpatho-Danubian region (Oltenia, Banat, south Transylvania, east Muntenia) and belonged to group Padea – Panagjurski Kolonii. The graves north the Danube belonging to this group were framed into the second half of the 2nd century BC – first half of the 1st century BC. The predominant funerary rite within these archaeological features was cremation, most often the cremation remains being placed directly in the pit. South the Danube, appear flat graves and tumuli, inhumation graves being very rare, while north the Danube the flat cremation graves are the only ones found. The funerary inventory consisted of pottery, long swords, daggers and belt chains of Celtic type, curved knives and horse bite of Thracian type. The origin of this group, either Celtic or Thracian remains uncertain⁹.

³ Petre 2004; Dana 2008.

⁴ Crișan 1986; Babeș 1988; Sîrbu 1993; Spănu 2002.

⁵ Sârbu 1993, 41–42; Sîrbu, Florea 1997, 41–43.

⁶ The cemetery at Zimnicea is different by both the long time of existence, the 4th–2nd centuries BC as well as its extensive use, with over 170 identified graves (cf. Alexandrescu 1980).

⁷ Sârbu 1993, 39–40.

⁸ Sârbu 1993, 39–40.

⁹ Wozniak 1974, 74–138; Sîrbu 1993, 24–26, 77–79; Sîrbu, Rustoiu 1999, 77–91; Rustoiu, Comșa 2004, 267–276; Rustoiu 2005, 109–119; Sîrbu, Arsănescu 2006, 163–186.

Foreign graves

Inhumation graves are specific to the Scythian group (Ciumbrud group) of the 6th–5th centuries BC within the Carpathian Arch, however the burial rite would gradually change to a rite of pit cremation¹⁰. Funerary finds subsequent to the Scythians and just prior the Celtic presence are few, being broadly dated to the 5th–4th centuries BC¹¹. Any connection between these finds and the Scythian group from Transylvania is difficult to make. This could be related to the state of research or to the correlation of the late chronologies of the Early Iron Age and those of the Late Iron Age. West the Carpathians (Partium), funerary finds previous to the Celts are rather numerous. Graves dated to the 5th–4th centuries BC belong to Vekerzug culture, the north-west area, characterised by urn cremation graves being assigned to group Sanislău – Nir¹².

In the east of the Carpathian Basin (Transylvania, Banat, Crișana and Maramureș) there were found around 500 graves assigned to the Celts, dated to the 4th–2nd centuries BC¹³. The great majority of the graves come from cemeteries¹⁴, however, most sites with finds are isolate or incidental¹⁵. Over 60% of the graves are of pit cremations, 5–6% are urn cremations, the rest being of inhumation¹⁶. Grave inventories are relatively rich consisting of pottery, jewellery or weapons, frequently accompanied by meat offerings.

East the Carpathians (Moldavia) were found around 400 graves belonging to the Bastarnae, dated by the end of the 3rd century BC until early 1st century BC. The great majority of the graves come from cemeteries¹⁷, those from isolate finds being few. The funerary rite was almost exclusively the cremation, the cremation remains being placed most often in urns. In the majority of cases, the funerary urn was a pot covered with bowls as lids. The funerary inventory, most often burnt, can also contain jewellery, rarely tools and seldom weapons or pots other than the urn and lid¹⁸.

The disappearance of the traditional graves

The statistical difference amongst the funerary finds in the Carpatho-Danubian area is eloquent. For the 5th–3rd centuries BC over 3000 graves were found, while for the 2nd century BC – 1st century AD there were found ca. 100 graves. Most late graves come from peripheral areas, from cemeteries dated broadly to the 4th–2nd centuries BC or from finds belonging to group Padea – Panagjurski Kolonii of the 2nd – first half of the 1st century BC. Therefore, for the period of the 1st century AD, in the entire

¹⁰ Vulpe 1970, 198–203; Vasiliev 1980, 136.

¹¹ Ocna Sibiului (cf. Rustoiu, Berecki 2012, 161–181), Olteni (cf. Cavruc, Buzea 2005, 121–154; Sîrbu, Cavruc, Buzea 2008, 191–228) or Săvârșin (cf. Barbu, Hügel 1997, 91–92).

¹² Némethi 1978, 36–37; Curtuișeni (cf. Nanasi 1969, 85–90), Ghenci (cf. Némethi 1999, 64–70), Porț (Bejinariu, Pop 2008, 35–46) or Sanislău (Némethi 1972, 121–149; Némethi 1982, 115–144).

¹³ Dietrich, Dietrich 2006, 20–22.

¹⁴ Apahida – 50 graves (cf. Crișan 1971, 37–70; Zirra 1976, 129–166), Ciumești – 35 graves (cf. Crișan 1966; Zirra 1967); Fântânele – 100 graves (cf. Dănilă 1978, 267–276), Pișcolt – 185 graves (cf. Némethi 1987, 49–74; Némethi 1989, 75–114; Némethi 1992, 59–112; Zirra 1997, 87–137).

¹⁵ Berecki 2006, 66–71.

¹⁶ Berecki 2006, 54–56; Dietrich, Dietrich 2006, 9–56.

¹⁷ Boroșești – 150 graves, Lukașevka – 21 graves or Poienăști – 152 graves (cf. Babeș 1993, 32–52).

¹⁸ Babeș 1993, 32–52.

Carpatho-Danubian area there were found around 20 local graves¹⁹. The reduction/disappearance of the traditional graves is the more striking as, after mid 2nd century BC, there is a significant increase in the numbers of the settlements during the Dacian Kingdom²⁰.

The first hypothesis that would explain this rather paradoxical situation is that of an incipient stage of the archaeological research. The archaeology of the Early Iron Age and beginning of the Late Iron Age in the Carpatho-Danubian region is focused on funerary finds. For the 1st century BC – 1st century AD, archaeology is focused on habitat, especially on the Dacian fortified centres. Such a shift in the research orientation could cause the “disappearance” of the graves amongst the finds. Nonetheless, the mapping of a site with finds does not depend on the systematic archaeological research only, but also on fortunate finds, illegal excavations or surface researches. The nature of the archaeological research may determine the number of excavated sites however not the number of identified sites. Or, for the period of the 1st century BC – 1st century AD, not only the archaeological sites with investigated funerary complexes are lacking but also those identified.

In the capital area of the Dacian Kingdom, systematic archaeological research, fortunate finds, surface researches, illegal or dilettante excavations have been performed for over 300 years. However, until present day, the area of over 200 km², extensively populated in Antiquity did not yield any certain grave²¹. In fact, for the 2nd century BC – 1st century AD, in the entire area of the Mid course of Mureș river were identified very few points with funerary finds, while the identified settlements are over 100 in number²². Among the funerary finds, most seem to belong to group Padea – Panagjurski Kolonii and do not exceed the 1st century BC; the single later find is of a special nature, namely the inhumation of infants²³.

Circumstances are not specific to only the area of the Dacian Kingdom capital. Another archaeologically well documented area is that lying north-west the Carpatho-Danubian area, in the Sylvania Depression. For the period of the 2nd century BC – 1st century AD, the number of identified settlements is of ca. 60, and only a single grave, otherwise uncertain being found²⁴.

Hence, for the Carpatho-Danubian area, the incipient stage of the research cannot provide but a partial or superficial explanation of the traditional graves disappearance amongst the finds. This is rather a real historical phenomenon, a radical change in the funerary beliefs of the Thracians. The nature of such change and especially the novel burial forms are difficult to identify archaeologically.

Temples, fortifications and graves – divergent elements?

The change in the funerary mindset occurring most likely by the end of the 2nd century BC takes place almost concurrently with the emergence of the first structures

¹⁹ Sîrbu 1993, 39–40.

²⁰ Daicoviciu 1972; Crișan 1975.

²¹ Likely a single grave, at Costești-Cetățuie (cf. Glodariu et alii 1998, 78; Gheorghiu 2005, 208).

²² Gheorghiu 2005.

²³ Sîrbu, Luca, Roman 2007, 155–179.

²⁴ Pop, Pupeză 2006, 183–212.

of the Dacian Kingdom. Once with the end of the Kingdom and the establishment of the Roman province of Dacia, by early 2nd century AD, traditional local graves resurface, over 1000 being identified with most certainty. Local cremation cemeteries, containing over 2000 graves, resurface in the 2nd–4th centuries AD also in territories that originally belonged to the Dacian Kingdom yet which the Romans did not control²⁵. At first sight, the funerary changes seem to be related to those political-military which led to the emergence and then dissolution of the Dacian Kingdom.

Even though one may not speak of a central structure in the modern meaning of the word, the control exercised from the Kingdom capital must have had a powerful echo in the organisation of the religious life. As the capital Sarmizegetusa reinforced its position compared to the other centres in the Carpatho-Danubian area, the number of traditional graves suddenly decreased in the 1st century AD, the most being found in peripheral areas. Funerary changes seem to have a reversed evolution compared to the other religious contemporary phenomenon: the construction of the first temples. Temples appear in the Carpatho-Danubian area by the end of the 2nd century BC or early 1st century BC and would disappear by early 2nd century AD, once with the Roman conquest and dissolution of the political and religious control of the centre at Sarmizegetusa. Noticeably, by early 2nd century AD, temples disappear even from the Dacian territories where the Romans exercised no control²⁶.

The emergence (end of the 2nd century BC)/disappearance (early 2nd century AD) of the temples and the disappearance (end of the 2nd century BC)/emergence (early 2nd century AD) of the traditional graves could be part of the same phenomenon. Once with the establishment of the Kingdom, past the political, military or economic aspects of this process, there might have occurred a religious reorganisation. The hypothesis of a religious reform initiated by Deceneus, according to some paragraphs in the ancient authors²⁷, seems to provide an explanation to this effect²⁸, however, for the lack of archaeological arguments, it is not yet sound enough²⁹. According to today's research, there is a chronology difference between the two phenomena: the graves' disappearance seems to be a phenomenon that commenced previous (end of the 2nd century BC) the aggregation of the Dacian Kingdom (first half of the 1st century BC).

Another phenomenon evolving symmetrically with the funerary one is the emergence of the fortifications. The novel significance assigned to the fortifications erected after the end of the 2nd century BC seems to have led to a mindset change in the funerary customs. In the Celtic world, prior the emergence of the fortified centres of *oppida* type, cemeteries were large, community cemeteries, so that later they would be rather small, family cemeteries. It is a sign of fragmented society, somewhat in contrast with the emergence of the fortified centres which seem to gather political, economic and religious resources³⁰. Cases when Celtic cemeteries appear near *oppida* are few and almost never inside the fortified area, regardless the surface they covered, sometime of

²⁵ Protase 1971; Bichir 1973; Sîrbu 1993, 26–27, 42–45.

²⁶ Florea, Pupeză 2008, 297–332.

²⁷ Iord. *Get.* LXXI.

²⁸ Lica 1980, 177–182; Babeş 1988, 3–31.

²⁹ Florea 2007, 99–105.

³⁰ Hatt 1956; Collis 1975; Fichtl 2000; Buchschenschutz 2007.

tens of hectares, or the inhabitancy density, sometimes very small, which would have allowed the use of the area as burial site³¹.

Past their political and military importance, fortifications were invested with other attributes too. Fortifications are most often rather the expression of peace and prosperity than of troubles of any sort³². Mobilising the constructional effort, organising and developing the works for the erection of the Dacian fortifications were impossible if at war, insomuch as gathering resources for such ample projects may take place only in the absence of immediate military pressure³³. The Dacian fortifications may also be regarded as transposition into practice of an elite ideology. According to a simplified definition, ideology is a system of ideas that make sense of the world. In order to serve as power source, ideology must be controlled. Materialising ideology in tangible and visible forms, monuments, objects or ceremonies, may provide such control³⁴. The public monuments are a good example to this effect since they convey to a large number of individuals a simple message: power, safety, wealth³⁵. Therefore, the fortifications seem to convey such a symbolic message³⁶. The location of fortifications in visible places, near access roads, amplifies this message. The purpose of such location may be that of overseeing a close area, but also that of being seen from such area³⁷.

The graves represent an image of the society of the living, which is most often distorted compared to reality. The deceased do not bury themselves, but are placed in the pit by the members of a community, the burial being an event organized by the living for the living. In fact, the burial is less of the dead and more of the death impact on the living. The image of the deceased, as he/she appears in the grave, does not mirror his/her life but the way he/she was seen in the community³⁸. Once with the emergence of the fortified centres, of a new elite and new hierarchy, the social system prior to their emergence must have suffered changes. Views regarding the prestige, standing or authority, basic elements in outlining an image within a community, shifted.

Regardless the inventory of the traditional graves, they mirror in one way or another prestige, standing or authority of the deceased. Prior the emergence of the fortified centres and, at some point, of the kingdom structures, prestige, standing and authority had a rather more personal nature, with multiple symbolic connotations³⁹. In the novel context, they lose their personal feature, being related to a novel collective power notion, established around the fortified centres and kingdom "institutions". All these changes might have generated a new view of the burial, which loses its central role in the community life, being replaced by other means of expressing prestige, standing or authority⁴⁰ (jewellery, stone tower-houses and hierarchical ranks).

³¹ Fichtl 2000, 135–137.

³² Daubigney 2002, 371.

³³ Florea 2011, 126.

³⁴ Butters, Demarais, Earle 1996, 4–6.

³⁵ Trigger 1990, 119–132.

³⁶ Fichtl 2005, 70.

³⁷ Pupeză 2012b, 81–85.

³⁸ Parker-Pearson 1999, 3–20; Hakenbeck 2004, 1–6; McCarthy 2004, 25–39.

³⁹ Fried 1967; Berreman 1981; Henrich, Gil-White 2001, 165–196; Ames 2009, 488.

⁴⁰ Egri 2012, 509.

The emergence of both the temples and fortifications by the end of the 2nd century BC within the broader frame of the establishment of kingdom institutions may have resulted in the disappearance of the traditional graves in the Carpatho-Danubian area. Likely not accidentally, there existed a very close connection between the construction of the fortifications and the emergence of the temples⁴¹: most temples in the Carpatho-Danubian area by the end of the second Iron Age emerged within fortified settlements.

Graves with no archaeological traces

Traditional burials disappear starting with the end of the 2nd century BC, nonetheless, the novel view towards the deceased is difficult to identify archaeologically. The few identified graves of the 1st century BC – 1st century AD, preserve cremation as funerary rite. Despite the disappearance of pits and urns, very likely cremation remained the dominant rite in this period, however the way that cinerary remains were treated changed. It is possible that cinerary remains had been placed in waters or thrown into the air, practices difficult to identify archaeologically⁴². In the event of such practices, the single archaeological traces may be supplied by the places where the bodies were burnt, however no complex of the type was identified with certainty until present⁴³. It is not excluded that the place where the cremation remains were deposited was completely moved, like for instance in caves, areas less investigated by the Romanian archaeology⁴⁴.

Another way that the body was handled does not necessarily require its burning. The discovery in various archaeological contexts of skeletons that seem mutilated or preserving only parts, may suggest there existed exposure/decomposition practices of the bodies⁴⁵. Such archaeological features appear sporadically as early as the 4th century BC, being practiced in parallel with traditional burials. Their ratio amongst the finds does not change significantly from the 2nd century BC until the 2nd century AD, hence one may not argue that the possible exhibition/decomposition practices replaced traditional burials. Very likely, they are funerary practices that continue to be used even after the 2nd century BC, in the way they were also used previously.

A possible broader view

In terms of geographical diffusion, the disappearance of the traditional graves was not limited only to the Carpatho-Danubian area. The southern Thracians between the Danube and the Balkans (Tribali, Odrii, Moesi) also used cremation as dominant rite. Statistically, in these areas a decrease of the number of traditional graves during the 3rd century BC⁴⁶ is noticeable, while later, during the 2nd century BC and in the period just prior the Roman conquest, were identified areas from where traditional

⁴¹ Florea 2007, 102.

⁴² Sîrbu 1993, 40.

⁴³ Such an *ustrinum*, likely at Conțești (cf. Vulpe, Popescu 1976, 217–226).

⁴⁴ Boroneanț 2000.

⁴⁵ Sîrbu 1993, 31–34.

⁴⁶ Măndescu 2010, 125–192.

graves disappeared completely, although the settlements continue to be present in finds⁴⁷.

By the end of the 2nd century BC, Celtic graves disappear from the Carpathian Basin while those belonging to the Bastarnae tribes are no longer found east the Carpathians. Hypotheses regarding the disappearance of the Celtic and Bastarnic graves are sensitively different from those regarding the disappearance/decrease of the Thracian traditional graves from the Carpatho-Danubian area. The disappearance of the Bastarnic graves is closely connected to the disappearance of their settlements, which may be related to the Bastarnae attempt to massively cross south the Danube⁴⁸ by the end of the 1st century BC⁴⁹. Assimilation by the natives, acculturation or departure of the Celts are the most frequent invoked causes for the disappearance of the specific graves, the phenomenon being most often regarded as local⁵⁰.

If in the case of the Bastarnae, the scenario is likely that of the mass departure from the Carpatho-Danubian area, the Celts' situation seems to have been more complex. Once with the end of the 2nd century BC, the Celtic traditional graves in broad areas of Central Europe (Hungary, Austria, Switzerland, Slovakia, Bohemia and south Germany) decrease or disappear⁵¹. Furthermore, the phenomenon is also visible in Western Europe (northern half of France, south of Great Britain)⁵². The Celtic Central and West European society undergoes during the 2nd century BC a similar process of deep change like that Thracian in Eastern Europe. This is the time when fortified centres of *oppida* type appear, when the large community temples are built and the cremation rite is adopted on large scale⁵³.

An alternate explanation of the phenomenon was that of the migration of the Celtic populations. Thus, it was supposed that the earliest graves from one area date the time when the Celts arrived, while the later funerary complexes date the time when they left. This arrival-departure pattern seems to provide an explanation of the disappearance of the graves from one region, including the Carpathian Basin. However, seen in detail, this scenario has many flaws, which may be related or not to the early state of research: groups of populations and not entire populations are in movement, the archaeological disappearance from one area does not mean the appearance in another, the association settlement – cemetery represents rare cases, the connection between the number of graves and the effective control of the territory is difficult to make⁵⁴.

Past the possible similar causes leading to such a phenomenon in both the Thracian and the Celtic world, one may not entirely exclude the hypothesis that various influences were conveyed from one population to another in the funerary field. A unity element facilitating such changes is that of the funerary rite, both Celts and Thracians

⁴⁷ Ghetov 1980, 97-123.

⁴⁸ Dio Cass. LI, 23-25.

⁴⁹ Babeş 1993, 128-154.

⁵⁰ Crişan 1966, 75-84; Zirra 1975, 47-63.

⁵¹ Filip 1961; Stahli 1977; Waldhauser 1979, 117-156; Szabó 1988; Drda, Rybova 1995; Sankot 2007, 111-120.

⁵² Wilson 1981, 127-169; Baray 2004; Barral 2011.

⁵³ Kruta 2000; Haselgrove 2006; Buchschenschutz 2007.

⁵⁴ Rapin 2004, 21-36.

cremating themselves by the end of the Late Iron Age. There is no identical funerary rite, the Celts preferring pit cremations, while the Thracians the urn cremations. How the Celts adopted cremation is a phenomenon not entirely known. The causes of the dominant rite change, from inhumation to cremation, were of either domestic nature, specific to the Celtic world, or subsequent to influences coming from the outside⁵⁵. It is possible that behind these external influences stood precisely Thracian origin populations, practicing cremation during Early Iron Age. The Celts entered in contact with the Thracians in the 5th century BC or in the 4th century BC in both the centre as well as the east of Europe. The first to adopt cremation at large scale are precisely the Celts in these contact areas, in the 4th–3rd centuries BC⁵⁶.

One may not exclude either the hypothesis of a phenomenon of Mediterranean influence, from the Greek-Roman world. The Greek influence of the 5th–3rd centuries BC was consistent in both the Celtic⁵⁷ and the Thracian⁵⁸ worlds. The funerary beliefs of the Greeks were dominated by cremation, funerary practices which resulted in the “disappearance” of the proper graves⁵⁹ being also recorded. Such funerary practices may have well diffused from the Greek world into the Celtic or Thracian worlds. In what the Romans are concerned, they themselves adopted the cremation rite late, during the 2nd–1st centuries BC⁶⁰. The rite shift is part of a more extensive process occurring in the Italian peninsula once with the 3rd century BC, generalising as well with populations outside the Etruscan or Latin worlds, like with the Ligurii⁶¹, Venetii⁶² or the Celts⁶³ there.

Peculiar and general

The disappearance from the archaeological landscape of the traditional cremation graves is a phenomenon especially visible during the period of the Dacian Kingdom. The lack of funerary finds may be the result of a peculiar situation of the archaeological research focused almost exclusively on habitat and fortifications. However, the graves’ disappearance is more likely the result of a real historical phenomenon occurring in the Carpatho-Danubian area, caused by a radical change of the funerary beliefs. Such change might have entailed the special handling of the cremation remains, which is not easily identified archaeologically. In the current state of the archaeological research, it is hard to establish if this was a local phenomenon, limited to the Thracian populations by the Danube and the Carpathians, or if it was part of a general phenomenon, which included several populations of the Antiquity in the European area.

⁵⁵ Brunaux 1996, 21.

⁵⁶ Kruta 2000, 679.

⁵⁷ Ellis 1997; Roure 2007.

⁵⁸ Glodariu 1974; Ruscu 2002.

⁵⁹ Kurtz, Boardman 1971; Morris 1992.

⁶⁰ Toynbee 1996.

⁶¹ De Marinis, Spadea 2004.

⁶² Capuis 1993.

⁶³ Kruta, Manfredi 2000.

Bibliography

- Alexandrescu 1980 Al. D. Alexandrescu, *La Néropole gète de Zimnicea*, Dacia, N. S., XXIV, 1980, 20–56.
- Ames 2009 K. M. Ames, *The Archaeology of Rank*. In: R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner, Ch. Chippindale (eds.), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, Lanham 2009, 487–514.
- Babeş 1988 M. Babeş, *Descoperiri funerare şi semnificaţia lor în contextul culturii geto-dacice clasice*, SCIVA, 39, 1, 1988, 3–31.
- Babeş 1993 M. Babeş, *Die Poienesti – Lukasevka – Kultur*, Bonn 1993.
- Baray 2004 L. Baray (ed.), *Archéologie des pratiques funéraires*, Bibracte 2004.
- Barbu, Hügel 1997 M. Barbu, P. Hügel, *Şantierul arheologic Săvârşin*, CCA. Campania 1996, Bucureşti 1997, 91–92.
- Barral 2011 Ph. Barral (ed.), *L'âge du Fer en Basse-Normandie – Gestes funéraires en Gaule au second âge du Fer*, Franche-Comté 2011.
- Bejinariu, Pop 2008 I. Bejinariu, H. Pop, *Funerary Discoveries Dated at the End of the First Iron Age from the South-Eastern Region of the Upper Tisa Basin (Sălaj County, România)*. In: V. Sirbu, D. L. Vaida (eds.), *Funerary practice of the Bronze and Iron Age in Central and South-Eastern Europe*, Cluj-Napoca 2008, 35–46.
- Berecki 2006 S. Berecki, *Rite and Ritual of the Celts from Transylvania*. In: V. Sirbu, L. Vaida (eds.), *Thracians and Celts*, Cluj-Napoca 2006, 51–76.
- Berreman 1981 G. D. Berreman, *The politics of truth: Essays in critical anthropology*, New Delhi 1981.
- Bichir 1973 G. Bichir, *Cultura carpică*, Bucureşti 1973.
- Boroneanţ 2000 V. Boroneanţ, *Arheologia peşterilor şi minelor din România*, Bucureşti 2000.
- Brunaux 1996 J. L. Brunaux, *Les religions gauloises. Rituels celtiques de la Gaule indépendante*, Paris 1996.
- Buchsenschutz 2007 O. Buchsenschutz, *Les Celtes*, Paris 2007.
- Butters, DeMarais, Earle 1996 L. J. C. Butters, E. DeMarais, T. Earle, *Ideology, Materialization and Power Strategies*, *Current Anthropology*, 37, 1996, 1–31.
- Capuis 1993 L. Capuis, I. Veneti, *Società e cultura di un popolo dell'Italia preromana*, Milano 1993.
- Cavruc, Buzea 2005 V. Cavruc, D. Buzea, *Vestigii dacice timpurii de la Olteni. Raport preliminar*, *Angustia*, 9, 2005, 121–154.
- Collis 1975 J. Collis, *Defended sites of the late Latène*, London 1975.
- Crişan 1966 I. H. Crişan, *Materiale dacice din necropola şi aşezarea de la Ciumeşti şi problema raporturilor dintre daci şi celţi în Transilvania*, Baia Mare 1966.
- Crişan 1971 I. H. Crişan, *Necropola celtică de la Apahida*, *ActaMN*, VIII, 1971, 37–70.
- Crişan 1975 I. H. Crişan, *Burebista şi epoca sa*, Bucureşti 1975.
- Crişan 1986 I. H. Crişan, *Spiritualitatea geto-dacilor*, Bucureşti 1986.
- Dana 2008 D. Dana, *Zalmoxis de la Herodot la Mircea Eliade. Istorii despre un zeu al pretextului*, Iaşi 2008.
- Dana 2011 D. Dana, *Izvoare privitoare la Zalmoxis şi alte pasaje referitoare la religiile tracilor, geţilor şi dacilor*, Iaşi 2011.
- Daicoviciu 1972 H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea romană*, Cluj-Napoca 1972.

- Daubigney 2002 A. Daubigney, *Territoire, pouvoir et société en France et en Europe occidentale, du Bronze final au Hallstatt C*. In: D. Garcia, F. Verdun (eds.), *Territoires celtiques, Espaces ethniques et territoires des agglomérations protohistoriques d'Europe occidentale*, Paris 2002, 363–399.
- Dănilă 1978 Șt. Dănilă, *Primele săpături în necropola de epocă La Tène de la Fântânele*, SCIVA, 29, 2, 1978, 257–276.
- Dietrich, Dietrich 2006 L. Dietrich, O. Dietrich, *Locuirea celtică din Transilvania, Banat și Crișana*, SCIVA, 57, 1–4, 2006, 9–56.
- Drda, Rybova 1995 P. Drda, A. Rybova, *Les Celtes de Bohème*, Paris 1995.
- Egri 2012 M. Egri, *A warrior never dies. The manipulation of tradition in early funerary contexts from Pannonia*. In: S. Berecki (ed.), *Iron Age rites and rituals in the Carpathian Basin*, Târgu Mureș 2012, 503–529.
- Ellis 1996 P. B. Ellis, *Celt and Greek: Celts in the Hellenic World*, Philadelphia 1996.
- Fichtl 2000 S. Fichtl, *La ville celtique: les oppida de 150 av. J.-C. à 15 ap. J.-C.*, Paris 2000.
- Fichtl 2005 S. Fichtl, *Murus et pomerium: réflexions sur la fonction des remparts protohistoriques*, *Revue Archéologique du Centre de la France*, 44, 2005, 55–72.
- Filip 1961 I. Filip, *Die keltische Zivilisation und ihr Erbe* Verlag der Tschech, Praga 1961.
- Florea 2007 G. Florea, *O religie sau religii dacice?* In: S. Nemeti, F. Fodorean, E. Nemeth, S. Cociș, I. Nemeti, M. Pîslaru (eds.), *Dacia Felix. Studia Michaeli Bărbulescu oblata*, Cluj-Napoca 2007, 99–105.
- Florea 2011 G. Florea, *Dava et Oppidum. Débuts de la genèse urbaine en Europe au deuxième âge du Fer*, Cluj-Napoca 2011.
- Florea, Pupeză 2008 G. Florea, P. Pupeză, *Les dieux tués. La destruction du chef-lieu du Royaume dace*. In: I. Piso (ed.), *Die Römischen Provinzen. Begriff und Grundung*, Cluj-Napoca 2008, 297–332.
- Fried 1967 M. H. Fried, *The evolution of political society: An essay in political anthropology*, New York 1967.
- Gheorghiu 2005 G. Gheorghiu, *Dacii de pe cursul mijlociu al Mureșului*, Cluj-Napoca 2005.
- Ghetov 1980 L. Ghetov, *Observations sur le rites funéraires des Thraces aux époques hellénistique et romaine*. In: *Actes du IIe Congrès International de Thracologie*, II, București 1980, 97–123.
- Glodariu 1974 I. Glodariu, *Relații comerciale ale Daciei cu lumea elenistică și romană*, Cluj-Napoca 1974.
- Glodariu et alii 1998 I. Glodariu, G. Florea, E. Iaroslvaschi, G. Gheorghiu, *Grădiștea de Munte-Sarmizegetusa Regia, jud. Hunedoara*, CCA. Campania 1997, București 1998, nr. 78.
- Hakenbeck 2004 S. E. Hakenbeck, *Reconsidering Ethnicity: an introduction*. In: S. E. Hakenbeck, S. G. Matthews (eds.), *Reconsidering Ethnicity: Material Culture and Identity in the Past*, Cambridge 2004, 1–6.
- Haselgrove 2006 C. Haselgrove (ed.), *Les mutations de la fin de l'âge du Fer*, Bibracte 2006.
- Hatt 1956 J. J. Hatt, *La tombe gallo-romaine*, Paris 1956.
- Henrich, Gil-White 2001 J. Henrich, F. J. Gil-White, *The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference as a mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission*, *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 22, 2001, 165–196.

- Lica 1980 V. Lica, *Reforma sacerdotal-religioasă a lui Deceneu*, Istros, 1, 1980, 177-182.
- Kruta 2000 W. Kruta, *Les Celtes. Histoire et dictionnaire*, Paris 2000.
- Kruta, Manfredi 2000 V. Kruta, V. M. Manfredi, *I Celti d'Italia*, Milano 2000.
- Kurtz, Boardman 1971 D. C. Kurtz, J. Boardman, *Greek burial customs*, London 1971.
- De Marinis, Spadea 2004 R. De Marinis, G. Spadea (eds.), *I Liguri. Un antico popolo europeo tra Alpi e Mediterraneo*, Genoa 2004.
- Măndescu 2010 D. Măndescu, *Cronologia perioadei timpurii a celei de-a doua epoci a fierului (sec. V - III a. Chr.) între Carpați, Nistru și Balcani*, Brăila 2010.
- McCarthy 2004 J. McCarthy, *Extraordinary use of ordinary objects*. In: S. E. Hakenbeck, S. G. Matthews (eds.), *Reconsidering Ethnicity: Material Culture and Identity in the Past*, Cambridge 2004, 25-39.
- Morris 1992 I. Morris, *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge 1992.
- Nanasi 1969 Z. Nanasi, *Morminte hallstattiene târzii de la Curtuișeni*, StComSatuMare, I, 1969, 85-90.
- Németi 1972 I. Németi, *Necropola hallstattiană de la Sanislău*, StComSatuMare, II, 1972, 121-149.
- Németi 1978 I. Németi, *Nord-vestul României de la Hallstatt-ul târziu până la Letene-ul mijlociu*, PhD Thesis, Cluj-Napoca 1978.
- Németi 1982 I. Németi, *Das späthallstattzeitliche Gräberfeld von Sanislău*, Dacia, N. S., XXVI, 1982, 115-144.
- Németi 1987 I. Németi, *Necropola celtică de la Pișcolt. I*, Thraco-Dacica, VIII, 1987, 49-74.
- Németi 1989 I. Németi, *Necropola celtică de la Pișcolt. II*, Thraco-Dacica, X, 1989, 75-114.
- Németi 1992 I. Németi, *Necropola celtică de la Pișcolt. III*, Thraco-Dacica, XIII, 1992, 59-112.
- Parker-Pearson 1999 M. Parker-Pearson, *The archaeology of Death and Burial*, Texas 1999.
- Petre 2004 Z. Petre, *Practica nemuririi. O lectură critică a izvoarelor grecești referitoare la geți*, Iași 2004.
- Pop, Pupeză 2006 H. Pop, P. Pupeză, *Dacians and Celts in the Northwestern Romania*. In: V. Sîrbu, L. Vaida (eds.), *Thracians and Celts*, Cluj-Napoca 2006, 183-212.
- Protase 1971 D. Protase, *Riturile funerare la daci și daco-romani*, București 1971.
- Pupeză 2012a P. Pupeză, *Veacul Întunecat al Daciei. Arheologie și istorie în spațiul carpato-danubian de la sfârșitul sec. III a. Chr. până la începutul sec. I a. Chr.*, Cluj-Napoca 2012.
- Pupeză 2012b P. Pupeză, *To see or to be seen. The Dacian fortresses from the Orăștie Mountains*, *Annales D'Université "Valahia" Târgoviște, Section d'Archeologie et d'Histoire*, XIV, 2, 2012, 81-85.
- Rapin 2004 A. Rapin, *Pratiques funéraires des cultures du deuxième âge du Fer laténien. Le problème des cartes archéologiques*. In: L. Baray (ed.), *Archéologie des pratiques funéraires*, Bibracte 2004, 21-36.
- Roure 2007 R. Roure, *La Gaule méditerranéenne et les grecs. Approche historiographique de la notion d'hellénisation au XXe siècle*, Montpellier 2007.
- Ruscu 2002 L. Ruscu, *Relațiile externe ale orașelor grecești de pe litoralul românesc al Mării Negre*, Cluj-Napoca 2002.

- Rustoiu 2005 A. Rustoiu, *The Padea-Panagjurski Kolonii Group in Southwestern Transylvania (Romania)*. In: H. Dobrazanska, V. Megaw, P. Polenska (eds.), *Celts on the Margin*, Krakow 2005, 109-119.
- Rustoiu, Berecki 2012 Rustoiu, Berecki 2012, „*Thracian*” warriors in Transylvania at the beginning of the Late Iron Age. The grave with Chalcidian helmet from Ocna Sibiului. In: S. Berecki (ed.), *Iron Age rites and rituals in the Carpathian Basin*, Târgu Mureş 2012, 161-181.
- Rustoiu, Comşa 2004 A. Rustoiu, A. Comşa, *The Padea-Panagjurski Kolonii Group in Southwestern Transylvania. Archaeological, Historical and Paleo-Anthropological Remarks*. In: A. Pescaru, I. V. Ferencz (eds.), *Daco-geții. 80 de ani de cercetări arheologice sistematice la cetățile dacice din Munții Orăștiei*, Deva 2004, 267-276.
- Sankot 2007 P. Sankot, *Le rite funéraire de nécropoles laténiennes en Bohême*, ActaTS, 6, 1, 2007, 111-120.
- Sîrbu 1993 V. Sîrbu, *Credințe și practici funerare, religioase și magice în lumea geto-dacilor*, Galați-Brăila 1993.
- Sîrbu, Arsănescu 2006 V. Sîrbu, M. Arsănescu, *Dacian settlements and necropolises in southwestern Romania*. In: S. A. Luca, V. Sîrbu (eds.), *The Society of the living - the Community of the dead*, Sibiu 2006, 163-186.
- Sîrbu, Cavruc, Buzea 2008 V. Sîrbu, V. Cavruc, D. Buzea, *A Dacian necropolis from 4th-3rd Centuries BC, found in Olteni (South-Eastern Transylvania)*. In: V. Sîrbu, D. L. Vaida (eds.), *Funerary Practices of the Bronze and Iron Ages in Central and South-Eastern Europe*, Cluj-Napoca 2008, 191-228.
- Sîrbu, Florea 1997 V. Sîrbu, G. Florea, *Imaginar și imagine în Dacia preromană*, Brăila 1997.
- Sîrbu, Luca, Roman 2007 V. Sîrbu, S. A. Luca, C. Roman, *Tombs of Dacian Warriors (2nd-1st c. BC)*, ActaTS, 6, 1, 2007, 155-179.
- Sîrbu, Rustoiu 1999 V. Sîrbu, A. Rustoiu, *Découvertes funéraires géto-daces du sud-ouest de la Roumanie (±150-±50 av. J. C.)*. In: M. Vasić (ed.), *Le Djerdap/ Les Portes de Fer à la deuxième moitié du premier millénaire av. J.-C. jusqu'aux guerres daciques*, Beograd 1999, 77-91.
- Spânu 2002 D. Spânu, *Un mormânt de epocă târzie Latène de la Dubova*, SCIVA, 52-53, 2001-2002, 83-132.
- Stahli 1977 B. Stahli, *Die Latènegräber von Bern-Stadt*, Berna 1977.
- Szabó 1988 M. Szabó, *Les celtes en Pannonie*, Paris 1988.
- Trigger 1990 B. Trigger, *Monumental architecture: a thermodynamic explanation of symbolic behavior*, World Archaeology, 22, 2, 1990, 119-132.
- Toynbee 1996 J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World*, London 1996.
- Vasiliev 1980 V. Vasiliev, *Sciții agatârși pe teritoriul României*, Cluj-Napoca 1980.
- Vulpe 1970 A. Vulpe, *Archäologische Forschungen und Historische betrachtungen über das 7. bis 5. Jh. im Donau-Karpatenraum*, Memoria Antiquitatis, 2, 1970, 115-213.
- Vulpe, Popescu 1976 A. Vulpe, E. Popescu, *Une contribution archéologique à l'étude de la religion des Géo-Daces*, Thraco-Dacica, I, 1976, 217-226.
- Waldhauser 1979 J. Waldhauser, *Beitrag zum stadium der keltischen siedlungen, oppida und gräberfelder in Böhmen*. In: P. M. Duval, V. Kruta (eds.), *Les Mouvements celtiques du V^{ème} au I^{er} siècle avant notre ère*, Paris 1979, 117-156.

- Wilson 1981 C. E. Wilson, *Burials within settlements in southern Britain during the pre-Roman Iron Age*, Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology, 18, London 1981, 127-169.
- Wozniak 1974 Z. Wozniak, *Wschodnie pogranic kultury latenskiej*, Wrocław-Gdańsk 1974.
- Zirra 1967 V. Zirra, *Un cimitir celtic în nord-vestul României*, Baia Mare 1967.
- Zirra 1975 V. Zirra, *Influence des geto-daces set leurs voisins sur l'habitat celtique de Transilvanie*, Alba Regia, XIV, 1975, 47-63.
- Zirra 1976 V. Zirra, *La nécropole La Tène d'Apahida. Nouvelles considérations*, Dacia, N. S., XX, 1976, 129-166.
- Zirra 1997 V. V. Zirra, *Contribuții la cronologia relativă a cimitirului de la Pișcolt. Analiză combinatorie și stratigrafie orizontală*, SCIVA, 48, 2, 1997, 87-137.

Luca-Paul Pupeză

National History Museum of Transylvania, Cluj-Napoca
paulpupeza@yahoo.com