

Sieht man schließlich über manche Ungenauigkeiten hinweg — wie beispielsweise die (S. 144) erwähnte Umsiedlung von 50 000 Geten, die anstatt Aellus Catus irrtümlich dem Cornelius Lentulus zugeschrieben wird, oder die (S. 143) fälschlich Rolos, Dapiges und Zirakos genannten Getenkönige, die bei Cassius Dio (I, 26, 1; 26, 2; 26, 5–6) Rho-

les, Dapyx und Zyraxes heißen — so soll diese der modernen kritischen Betrachtungsweise entsprechende historische Auswertung von Ovids Exil-Werk, insofern es sich um Grundsätzliches mehr als um historische Einzelheiten handelt, nur uneingeschränkt begrüßt werden.

Emilia DoruŃiu-Boilă

L. GOUNAROPOULOU, M. B. HATZOPOULOS, *Les milliaires de la voie Egnatienne entre Héraclée des Lyncestes et Thessalonique*, Meletemata, I, Centre de Recherches de l'antiquité grecque et romaine. Fondation Nationale de la recherche scientifique, Athènes, 1985 [Diffusion De Brocard, Paris] 106 S., XIII Taf. und 2 Karten

Dieser erste Beitrag aus einer Reihe von Studien über die Inschriften Makedoniens ist den Meilensteinen der Via Egnatia gewidmet. Es gehört zum in Ausführung befindlichen Projekt der Veröffentlichung des dritten und vierten Teils des Korpus griechischer und lateinischer Inschriften. Dafür sind erst umfangreiche Vorarbeiten geleistet worden, wozu Recherchen in Museen und Sammlungen sowie historisch-geographische Untersuchungen gehören.

Der westliche Teil der Via Egnatia wurde zuerst von Polybios (34, 12, 2 a, 8) mit diesem Namen genannt und beschrieben. Zur betreffenden Stelle bei Polybios wurden verschiedentlich Vorbehalte geäußert. Doch konnte durch verschiedene Funde und Entdeckungen des ältesten Meilensteins, der den Namen des Prokonsuls Cn. Egnatius trägt, sowohl Name wie Länge des beschriebenen Abschnitts (267 Meilen) bestätigt werden.

Die nach 1981 von den Verfassern durchgeführten Untersuchungen haben für den Abschnitt Heraklāa — Thessalonik zu einer beträchtlichen Zunahme des epigraphischen Materials geführt. Im Vergleich zum Katalog von P. Collart (BCH 100, 1976, S. 177–200), wo für denselben Abschnitt 5 Steine mit 12 Inschriften vermerkt sind, ist der heute bekannte Bestand auf 13 Meilensteine mit 25 epigraphischen Texten angestiegen.

Die Meilensteine der makedonischen Epoche, auf denen die Entfernungen in Stadien angegeben sind, zeigen, daß die römische Straße auf derselben Trasse verlief. Mit wenigen Ausnahmen, besonders aus der Zeit des Kaisers Konstantin, tragen die römischen Meilensteine griechische Inschriften. Für das Vorkommen an derselben Stelle von zwei oder mehreren Meilensteinen mit identischer Beschriftung geben die Verfasser die Erklärung, daß vor einer größeren Stadt zwei gleiche Steine rechts und links des Weges aufgestellt waren. Es wurden aber auch 3, 4 und 5 Steine mit gleichem Text gefunden, ein Indiz, daß besonders seit Septimius Severus die Meilensteine zu „Dedikationssteinen“ geworden sind, eine Abart die im späten Imperium noch häufiger sein wird. Aus demselben Grunde wurden bestehende Steine mit dem Namen des momentanen Herrschers beschriftet. (Ähnliche

Situationen in der DobruŃscha wurden durch Einsammeln der Steine in einer späteren Zeit zwecks anderwärtiger Verwendung erklärt).

Nach dem ausführlich kommentierten Inschriftenkatalog folgt eine kurze Schlußfolgerung, wo im häufigen Vorkommen von Meilensteinen aus dem 4. Jh. auf einem eng begrenzten Raum kein Indiz einer zunehmenden Bautätigkeit sondern eher ein Zeichen der Kämpfe um die Macht gesehen wird. Die Dedikationen in Dativ und Akkusativ (die in griechischen Texten vorherrschen) zeigen, daß die entsprechenden Straßenabschnitte von lokalen Gemeinschaften gebaut wurden, eine Annahme die meistens auch für Dedikationen im Nominativ gilt.

Was die Bezugspunkte für die Berechnung der Entfernungen auf der Via Egnatia anbetrifft, wird auf zwei Systeme von *capita viarum* hingewiesen; das eine bei Dyrrachium und ein anderes das von der jeweiligen Stadt ausgeht, die mit der Beschriftung und Setzung des Meilensteins betraut war. Die Autoren vertreten die Ansicht, daß die aus Dyrrachium, ausgehende Zählung der Entfernung in *milia passuum* nicht durch das zweite von den jeweiligen Städten ausgehende System überlagert wird. Letzteres bildet eine Nummerierung der Meilensteine durch Gleichsetzung der Bezeichnung *μίλιον* mit dem Meilenstein selbst. Die Bedeutung dieser Bezifferung wird mit der Begrenzung des Stadtgebietes in Zusammenhang gebracht.

Nach einer längeren Zusammenfassung in Neu-Griechisch, folgen ausführliche Verzeichnisse und Tafel mit Aufnahmen von Landschaften, wo heute noch die Spuren der Via Egnatia zu sehen sind. Andere Abbildungen gelten der Meilensteine und ihrer Inschriften. Zwei nützliche Landkarten vervollständigen die Illustration.

Mit dieser Veröffentlichung der Meilensteine vom westlichen Teil der Via Egnatia haben die Verfasser einen wertvollen Beitrag zur Sammlung und Wiederveröffentlichung der Inschriften des antiken Makedoniens geleistet. Es bleibt zu hoffen, daß die angemeldeten Teilbände bald erscheinen werden.

Emilia DoruŃiu-Boilă

KURT HOREDT, *Siebenbürgen im Frühmittelalter*, Abh. zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte, zur klassischen und provincialrömischen Archäologie und zur Geschichte des Altertums: Antiquitas, Reihe 3 (Serie 4—), Bonn, HABELT VERLAG, 1986, 225 pages + 12 plates.

Professor K. Horedt's work *Siebenbürgen im Frühmittelalter*, Bonn, 1986, published in the Abhandlungen zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte, zur klassischen und provincialrömischen Archäologie und zur Geschichte des Altertums, Antiquitas, Reihe 3, which was founded by A. Alföldi, represents to a great extent, a synthesis of the author's already expressed

points of view on the history of Transylvania from the 3rd to the 13th century.

For instance, the history of Transylvania is permanently treated in a narrow provincial perspective, while the fact that some problems, aspects and processes are characteristic for the entire territory from the Carpathians to the Danube and which are not specific to Transylvania alone is being ignored.

Above all, the novelty of the book consists in the use it makes of the linguistic motivation in addition to the historical and archaeological ones, see chapters *Sprachwissenschaftliche Feststellungen* (p. 106 and ff.) and *Das Kontinuitätspro-*

¹ K. Horedt, *ContribuŃii la istoria Transilvaniei in sec. IV—XIII*, BucureŃti, 1958; idem, *Untersuchungen zur Frühgeschichte Siebenbürgens*, BucureŃti, 1958; idem, *Siebenbürgen in spät-romanischer Zeit*, BucureŃti, 1982.

blem (p. 170 and ff.), continuing an idea already presented in the author's paper *Die Völker Südosteuropas im 6. bis 8. Jahrhundert. Probleme und Ergebnisse* published in the volume *Die Völker Südosteuropas im 6. bis 8. Jahrhundert* (Südosteuropa Jahrbücher, 17, München, 1987, p. 11 and ff.). The other novelty which the book brings is the attempt to reconsider the relative and absolute chronology of the historical period brought forward by the author, suggesting solutions which from the historical and archaeological point of view seem to suit the subject better.

It is not the aim of this review to cover all the problems raised by the lecture of prof. K. Horedt's latest synthesis. But it seems important that we should point to some ideas in his work which are not substantiated well enough.

It is doubtful whether the beginnings of the Early Middle Ages could be dated somewhere around the end of the 4th century and the early 5th century. In this case, the criterion taken into account, namely the Huns' invasion and the tremendous role played by the Germanic tribes, is no longer working.

It is obvious that nobody can deny either the confusion caused by the Huns' invasion or the effects produced by the Goths' movement to the South of the Danube.

But these events are not concomitant with the Roman Empire's decline, that is, the end of the Antiquity, not even after Alaric's triumphs in Italy or after the Goths' settling down as foederates in Thracia, Pannonia or South Gallia.

Anyway, nowadays, historiography makes no longer use of such a criterion in order to indicate the transition from one historical epoch to another.

Such a complex subject claims the use of a wide range of motivations,² including the military and political ones.

But, taking into account only a single defining element, confusion becomes more evident, especially when the author suggests a double solution for the dating of the West Roman Empire's decline³ or for the beginning of the Byzantine Empire⁴.

What is shocking, indeed, is the lack of a complete overlapping in the terminology used for an epoch, the outstanding political and military elements, and the aspects of material culture.

For instance, the term *Slawische Zeit* covers not only a very long period of time, but also a variety of cultural and political aspects which can not be subordinated to a unique criterion. Two examples seem to be enough in order to stress upon the difficulties raised by the adopted solutions.

For example, what the author calls the *Gimbas Group* of the Slav period (p. 16 and ff) is in fact a distinct culture belonging to the outstanding military and political element of the entire area from the eastern Carpathians to Pannonia⁵.

As a consequence, this fact should have determined the choice of terminology and not vice-versa.

And if the *Blandiana Group* (p. 72 and ff) represents the extension of the Proto-Bulgarian Empire in Transylvania, as prof. K. Horedt puts it, that means that the period of time referred to should have been better called the *Bulgarische Zeit*, in order to distinguish between an outstanding South Slavonic group and other Slavonic enclaves, as for example the *Ciumbrud Group* (p. 78 and ff).

Anyway, these two examples, which could be followed by others as well, call our attention to the real difficulties we are faced with in archaeological research when starting from strict material facts, especially when aiming to state precisely the ethnical origin of a cultural context and to reconstitute fragments of the political or ethnical history of a given territory.

² 476: Romulus Augustus' landing, 9 May 480: Death of Julius Nepos in Salona.

³ The oscillation between the reign of Justinian and that of Heraclius (629) which replaces the old Roman Imperial title by that of *basileus*.

⁴ It belongs to the series of monuments attributed to some groups of mounted nomads, namely the Avars.

It is obvious in the case that the choice was made in view of a unique idea — namely, the catastrophic effect produced by the Slavs' invasion in Transylvania and the incorporation of its territory and population into the vast mass of Slavonic-language speakers.

In fact, even prof. K. Horedt admits that in that stage, like in the previous one, the Germanic one "*Germanische Zeit*" (p. 7 and ff), the cultural environment was far more complex, and any attempt at bringing it to a common denominator may lead to false conclusions. The statement becomes even more clear if we appeal to an obvious example which underlines the existing difficulties.

For instance, the last form of settlement no. 1 in Bratei⁶, dated to about the second half of the 6th century and the beginning of the 7th century, bears some cultural features which prove the Slavonic influence but which can not be obviously traced in the cemetery placed 500 m away, attributed, according to its characteristics, to the 'lords of the salt', and we may say that, despite its topography, it did not lead to significant loans or contacts.

Naturally, we would ask ourselves which ethnical groups do these two communities belong to, and to what extent the presence of some allogeneous elements, regardless of their political status, was so overwhelming as to operate visible changes, not only upon the material culture but also upon the ethnical and even biological structure of a given geographic area⁷.

The situation in Bratei calls our attention to the cohabitation phenomena within some communities over small areas which essentially differ from the viewpoint of their cultural heritage and the external influences exerted upon them.

But, what contributes even more to the false picture already created, is the permanent reference to some incompletely known archaeological piles.

In most of these cases we can not speak about a deliberate choice but about a natural result of the present stage of researches.

Objective reasons prevent us from recreating the whole diversity of some well-known cultural environments on the territory of this country.

For instance we are not acquainted with the funeral monuments belonging to the banal stage of settlements no. 1 and 2 in Bratei. That is to say, it is not possible to reconstitute the evolution of funeral practices between the moment represented by cemetery no. 1 in Bratei⁸ and that which prof. K. Horedt calls the *Medias Group*⁹.

To what extent did fundamental changes take place in this field is simply a matter of conjecture.

The clear-cut distinction between inhumation, an outstanding rite from the 4th century to the 7th century, and cremation or the co-existence of the two forms from the 7th century until the 10th century or even until the 11th century in the extra-Carpathian territories is based on the comparison made between the cemeteries and the tombs belonging to some outstanding Germanic or international groups and the cemeteries of some communities which had inherited totally different traditions — Roman, Romanic or possibly Slav ones.

That is to say, a completely false criterion. We may speak about a double mistake. On the one hand, the method is wrong because it makes use of comparisons and references which lead one to historical conclusions derived from facts which can not supply other information than those capable of defining incompletely in most cases, some contemporary or successive cultures.

On the other hand, it is a question of erroneous outlook as the aim of this argument is not to clarify things but to

⁵ Based on some iron arrows shaped like a swallow's tail in bone combs with four rows of cogs, and with a handle decorated with animal stylised heads, buckle of the Corinth type in the 6th–7th centuries.

⁶ We take into consideration prof. G. Schramm's *Südosteuropa Jahrbücher*, 17, München, 1987, p. 85 and ff.

⁷ L. Birzu, *Continuitatea populației autohtone în Transilvania în secolele IV–V*, București, 1973.

⁸ K. Horedt, *Siebenbürgen*, p. 60.

demonstrate a preconception, in this case the groundlessness of the Roman continuity North of the Danube.

The basic mistake consists in the permanent tendency to define groups and cultural contexts in spite of the flimsiness and the indefinite character of the elements which the demonstration is based on.

This is the case with the Sfintu Gheorghe culture⁹, a concept based on the discovery of some collages in Hârman¹⁰ and of a tomb, in fact Sintana from Sfintu Gheorghe — Epreștetu¹¹. These elements are totally insufficient to prove scientifically the peculiar cultural evolution in the East of Transylvania even after 275.

The reasons for which cemetery no. 1 in Bratei was re-included in this complex¹² were the external features, because according to the rite and its funeral elements, this monument would rather belong to the western characteristics of Transylvania.

The same obscure situation appears when an attempt was made to define the ethnical belonging of the complex attributed to the post-Sintana period and to the group I—IV within the *Germanische Zeit*¹³.

It is obvious that overlooking the events which took place in the areas outside the Carpathians throws a delusive light upon the reality of Transylvania.

Because, no matter whether there is or not a probability that some Vizigoth groups, might have separated from the large mass of the Goths who asked for assylum in the Empire and took part in the Goths' adventure in the West, it is clear enough that the last quarter of the 4th century does not record, from the archaeological and historical viewpoint any monument which could be attributed to this hesitating people.

On the other hand, all the archaeological researches, especially those looking into funeral matters, dating from the 4th—5th centuries until the first half of the 6th century¹⁴ limit themselves to some isolated tombs, groups of tombs and small cemeteries.

In all the cases, by means of ritual details, the nature of offerings, the flamboyance of personal garments and objects of harness or by some particular customs underlining the social status of a person, the deformation of the skull or even by onomastics¹⁵, we can perceive an outstanding stratum, polyethnical or cosmopolite, which gravitates either around the Huns' sphere of influence or around the imperial court's influence.

This tendency of the archaeological fact to avoid any attempt at being defined ethnically is underlined by prof. K. Horedt, too¹⁶. What remains outside this thin and frail horizon looks like a net with very large meshes, represented by ensembles differing in structure and inherited cultural background, felt in the funeral traditions preserved in cemetery no. 1 in Bratei and in the settlements (the early a-b phase) in Bratei; Sighișoara¹⁷, Tașu from the inside areas of the Carpathians, in Cireșanui¹⁸, Costișa-Botoșana¹⁹ etc., outside the Carpathians. Within all these ensembles there is a tendency to estrangement from the provincial Roman background or from the inherited Dacian one, and a tendency

to assimilating some alien cultural elements as well as a gradual decrease of the contacts with the Roman and Byzantine civilisation. We may admit that the last striking characteristic of the 5th—6th centuries, gives us a hint for distinguishing between the allogens, who were on special terms with the Empire and the Daco-Romans or the Dacians who had an inferior status that no longer gave them a free access to the Romano-Byzantine cultural values.

A more attentive and detailed judgement may help us find obvious criteria able to distinguish between natives and allogens, instead of continuing a hypothetical search for the natives under or among²⁰ the Germanic or cosmopolite groups, especially when studies of contrastive anthropology can not be outlined yet among other things because of the scarcity of the osteological material excavated so far.

This idea does not elude the fact that the Daco-Romans and the free Dacians lived in alien environments.

The problem is whether this cohabitation does or not represent the unique solution for the natives' continuity in that area.

Such an approach would throw light also upon the process of gradual changes, which was identified in the area from the Carpathians to the Danube during the stage preceding the Avar-Slav invasion and during the next stage, when a considerable mass of Slavs gradually moved towards the Danube.

These are shocking changes if we use as elements of comparison the Gepidae cemeteries and those prior to the Slavonic antiquity acknowledged for the moment only in the provinces outside the Carpathian Mountains, but which, from such a perspective, naturally insert themselves becoming part of the gradual changes which ended in the period between the 6th—7th centuries and in the first half of the 7th century.

This idea does not deny the cultural decline or the return to some prehistorical aspects of life caused by the Slavs' invasion and their settling down in the south of the Danube, dislocating a large mass of Latin native speakers²¹, practically breaking the linguistic unity which existed North of the Balkans, or causing even the dispersion of some Greek native speakers²².

The so-called Balkan linguistic unity was broken, with the only difference that at the archaeological level the catastrophic image, as it appears with prof. K. Horedt²³ and G. Schramm²⁴, is blurred when taking into account some comparable elements.

Nevertheless, these problems require a complex and tactful approach and some explanations are needed. But we cannot find a way out either simply by multiplying hypotheses unsupported by any certain facts or by using arbitrarily linguistic motivations.

For instance, prof. K. Horedt makes use of the alternative that the Slavs found in Transylvania, in the 7th century, Germans or possibly Romans, or maybe, to be sure, Dacians who were in short time assimilated, the Daco-Slavs being also incorporated among the Romanians who migrated somewhere in the South of the Danube in the 9th—10th centuries due to the political environment created by the outstanding extension of the Bulgarian czardom. The motivations seem to be of a linguistic nature rather than an archaeological one.

In fact, we can speak about the Dacians' presence, which has been definitely acknowledged due to archaeological proofs either in primary contexts (the free Dacians)²⁵ or secondary ones (the province's civilisation²⁶ or the alien ensem-

²⁰ K. Horedt admits a possibility of the Romans' survival only under the form of partially melting in the mass of the allogens.

²¹ S. B. Bernstein, *Gramatica comparată a limbilor slave*, București, 1963, p. 76 and ff.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 77.

²³ K. Horedt, *op. cit.*, p. 171 and ff.

²⁴ G. Schramm, *op. cit.*, p. 85 and ff.

²⁵ Gh. Bichir, *Gelo-Dacii din Muntenia în epoca romană*, București, 1984, p. 104 and ff.; N. Vlăssă, *SCIV*, 16, 1965, 3, p. 500 and ff.

²⁶ Bratei, in cemetery no. 1; Sighișoara — the levels from the 3rd—4th centuries, Hârman, Verbița.

⁹ Idem, *Siebenbürgen*, București, 1982, from p. 70.

Idem, *Siebenbürgen*, Bonn, 1986, from p. 2.

¹⁰ M. Marcu, *Cumidava*, 1973, from p. 45.

¹¹ Z. Székely, *Aluta* 1, 1969, p. 71.

¹² K. Horedt, *Siebenbürgen*, București, 1982, from p. 81.

¹³ Idem, *Siebenbürgen*, Bonn, 1986, p. 14 and ff.; for the argument regarding the period see R. Harhoiu, *Dacia*, N.S., 31, 1987, p. 119 and ff.

¹⁴ J. Werner, *Beiträge zur Archäologie des Altla Reiches* München, 1956, p. 5.

¹⁵ K. Horedt, *Siebenbürgen*, Bonn, 1986, p. 21, regarding no. 1 in Apahida.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 20 and ff.

¹⁷ Gh. Ballag, *Marisia*, 9, 1979, p. 17 and ff.

¹⁸ V. Teodorescu, *Anuarul Muzeului de Istorie și Arheologie*, Prahova, 1, 1984, p. 11 and ff.

¹⁹ D. Gh. Teodorescu, *Civilizația romană la est de Carpați în sec. V—VII e.n.*, București, 1984, p. 63 and ff.

bles of the Spanțov²⁷ or Birlad–Valea Seacă type²⁸) a presence which is obvious until the end of the 4th century, possibly until the beginning of the 5th century.

Except for some traditions in pottery and maybe some unidentified archaeological aspects²⁹, the presence of the Dacians can no longer be traced beginning with the 5th century.

It is obvious that no one can deny the possibility that some marginal groups which had earlier come into contact with the Slavs, and for a longer period of time, were finally assimilated. Subsequently, relating the situation in Birlad–Valea Seacă to some information we possess³⁰, entitles us to considering that the free Dacians in Moldavia or those in the east of Muntenia accustomed themselves to the Gothic lifestyle, and were, more or less, assimilated by other social, political or military alien structures³¹.

But, for the Romanians, these groups of Dacians did not matter because they had entirely lost their physiognomy and melted within a completely foreign ethnical entity.

What is still important for the fate of the Roman world north of the Danube is those Dacians who were Romanized as part of a process concluded, according to the archaeological discoveries, by the end of the 4th century.

To use linguistic data, in order to support the idea that the entire Transylvania was totally Slavonized and that only beginning with the 9th and 10th centuries a Roumanization process had been taking place, represents not only a hazardous attempt which lacks a solid argumentation, but also an example of mistifying facts.

For instance, the total Slavonization of Transylvania (we may add of the entire territory between the Carpathians and the Danube) in the 7th–9th centuries is not supported by any concrete proofs of course. Neither could it be. Generally speaking, the oldest Slavonic language monuments are not prior to the 9th–10th centuries.

It is a mere hypothesis based on elements of a glottis chronology which are doubtful since in the Romanian language there are no terms which can be pertinently attributed to the periods which had preceded the change of liquid vowels, a phenomenon dated to around 800³².

Anyway the main argument on which prof. K. Horedt based his work, namely the presence of nasal vowels in toponymy and hydronymy, is groundless.

The phenomenon mentioned by prof. Em. Petrovici³³, used more or less exactly by prof. K. Horedt, does not have a very strict chronology. Its beginnings can not be specified because the Slavonic languages were not recorded in any written form until the 9th century. But it is sure that the phenomena could be found in all the Slovenic languages by that time³⁴.

The evolution was not synchronous, the nasalisation of the vowels disappearing in the 10th century with the excep-

tion of the Bulgarian language where the process continued until the 13th century even the 14th century³⁵. Besides, the toponymy and hydronymy which preserve the nasal vowels mentioned by prof. Em. Petrovici are not all originating from Transylvania, but also from Banat³⁶ or Muntenia³⁶. Prof. Petrovici himself calls our attention to the fact that he included the Banat also in the ex-Austrian province.

A second idea developed by prof. K. Horedt, using well-known arguments, is that of the Balkan linguistic unity and of the Daco-Romanian formations South of the Danube.

Two details seem strange. The calculation made on p.109 gathers together in an unusual manner all the basic words from all the Romanian dialects and from Albanian; by means of a completely arbitrary summation there results a southern preponderance in the language substratum (120–123 words)³⁷.

It seems that prof. K. Horedt overlooks the fact that it is not possible to make such general judgements, and that it is necessary to distinguish between aspects which are common to all the dialects, those that are characteristic of the Daco-Romanian language only and of other dialect³⁸ forms common to Albanian and to Daco-Romanian, etc.

A more accurate research, taking into account all the details, would have revealed that only 1/3 of the words in the substratum belong to the Daco-Romanian language, the rest being unequally divided between the southern dialects³⁹, and that not even by summing this southern stock can we arrive at the author's figures.

A second detail consists of a reference made to D. Onciul in order to support the idea of the Romanians' migration to the South of the Danube.

No doubt, the reference is a quotation from memory; Otherwise he would have remembered that D. Onciul⁴⁰ makes a clear-cut distinction between the admigrations caused by the Slavs' invasion in the Balkans or the transmutation of Roman prisoners North of the Danube and the mass migration of the Daco-Romanians.

He also rejects categorically the idea that these larger or smaller groups of admigrated Romanized population played any fundamental role in the Romanians' ethnogenesis. At the most, he admits that they strengthened the Romanity North of the Danube, considering that outside this area the birth of the Romanian people is unconceivable.

Starting from these problems raised by prof. K. Horedt's work we can conclude that one assumes a great risk attempting an approach to such a complex and delicate field like ethnogenesis by using groundless and unchecked hypotheses.

It is far better to admit existing difficulties, and the need for further researches and pluridisciplinary studies instead of trying to mystify already available data to serve some preconceived points of view.

Ligia Bârză

²⁷ B. Mitrea–C. Preda, *Necropole din secolul al IV-lea*, București, 1966, p. 22, fig. 19/2, p. 214; Gh. Diaconu, *Thraco-Dacia*, I, 1976, p. 309 and ff.

²⁸ In order to preserve some pottery belonging to the Dacians, in Ipotești-Cindefști contexts: S. Dolinescu-Ferche, *Dulceanca*, București, 1974, p. 128 and ff.; Dan Gh. Teodor, *Dodești-Vaslui*, Iași, 1981, p. 126 and ff.; idem, *Botoșana*, p. 63 and ff.

²⁹ The Carpatho-Gothic coalition.

³⁰ With respect to the specific type of the integration phenomena in an alien environment see: M. Rouche *Peregrinatio gothica*, Polonia, 84/85, 1986, p. 386 and ff.

³¹ K. Horedt, *op. cit.*, p. 106 and ff and 171 and ff.

³² Gh. Mișailă, *Imprumuturi vechi sud-slave în limba română*, București, 1960; idem, *Studii de lexicologie și istorie*

a lingvisticii românești, București, 1973; I. Colcanu-M. Sala p. 118 and ff.

³³ Em. Petrovici, *Balkanica*, 6, 1943, p. 498 and ff. *Balkanica*, 7, 1944, p. 474 and ff. *Balkanica*, 8, 1945, p. 228 and ff.

³⁴ S. S. Bernstein, *op. cit.*, p. 218 and ff.

³⁵ Lindina in the former Caraș county.

³⁶ Andolina in the former Ialomița county.

³⁷ See the latest synthesis of I. I. Russu, *Etnogeneza românilor*, București, 1980, p. 118 and ff.; idem, *Dacoromania*, Freiburg, I, 1973, p. 184 and ff.

³⁸ I. I. Russu, *Etnogeneza*, p. 136–137.

³⁹ K. Horedt, *Südosteurop. Jahrbücher*, 17, 1987, p. 23.

⁴⁰ D. Onciul, *Opere complete*, I, București, 1946, p. 323 and ff.