

DANUBIAN REVIEW

(DANUBIAN NEWS)

VOL. IV., No 6.
B U D A P E S T
NOVEMBER 1936

PUBLISHED BY THE HUNGARIAN FRONTIER
READJUSTMENT LEAGUE

SINGLE COPY 50 FILL.
SUBSCRIPTION:
ONE YEAR 6 PENGÓ

C O N T E N T S

- The Balkan Origin of the Rumanian People
and the Problem of its Settlement in
Transylvania *Dr. Lajos Tamás*
- What an Englishman Observed in the Hungary
of the "Age of Reform" *Dr. Alexander Fest*
- Political Mosaic
- How Minorities Live
- Political Economy
- Sports

THE BALKAN ORIGIN OF THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE AND THE PROBLEM OF ITS SETTLEMENT IN TRANSYLVANIA

by

Professor Dr. Lajos Tamás

In the following pages we would briefly outline the much-disputed question of the origin of the Rumanians, giving a summary of the results arrived at after many years of study the detailed documentation of which will be found together with the corresponding scientific apparatus in my book entitled „*Romans, Romance Peoples and Rumanians*”.¹

As is well known, the Rumanians endeavoured to justify their territorial claims on the basis of historical rights, employing all the available means of propaganda to engraft on the public opinion of the world the fable of the Rumanians being the autochthonous inhabitants of Transylvania — a fable without the remotest foundation in history. According to the so-called “Daco-Roman Theory” the aboriginal inhabitants of Transylvania were the Rumanians, who were subdued and deprived of their rights by the Hungarians (Magyars) when occupying Hungary in the ninth century. The Rumanians people itself — so that theory would have us believe — originated from an intermingling of the Dacians and the Romans that took place in Dacia Trajana during the century and a half of Roman occupation, that people having ever since (we are told) continuously lived in the territory of the said province — though, as is well known, until the coming of the Magyars no people succeeded in effecting more than a temporary settlement there.

That the Rumanians cannot possibly be a people originating from an intermingling of Dacians and Romans, has recently been admitted by Rumanian scholars too; but the Rumanian politicians are not so ready to acknowledge the fact. Pârvan, the Rumanian antiquary who died a few years ago, — who was in other respects a champion of Rumanian continuity —, when speaking of the possibility of Daco-Roman con-

nections, says: — “The Dacians, as a nation, never accepted Roman rule: those who had not fallen in the two great wars withdrew sullenly into Northern Dacia, a land untouched by Roman conquest, and from there either by themselves or in company with migrating bodies of Germans, made continual raids upon the province, as “free Dacians”.² Under such circumstances there can therefore not be any talk of a welding of the two divergent ethnic elements. It should be noted, further, that the Dacian inscriptions contain hardly any Dacian proper names; while we do not find mention of any Dacian gods on tombstones; and among the auxiliary troops of the legions the multifarious collection of conquered races only here and there includes small formations consisting of a few Dacians there for show.

But what about that Daco-Romanism itself? The prophets of continuity would fain make us believe that the inhabitants of Dacia were colonists of unadulterated Italian origin, — a malicious exploitation of the ignorance of this question which we must naturally expect in all but authorities. The truth is, however, that Italic elements were not to be found in any considerable number except among the officers of the legions and among the members of the State administration, colonists having been brought from divers provinces (according to Eutropius “*ex toto orbe Romano*”) to people the new province conquered by Trajan, — colonists who after settling in Dacia naturally continued to speak their native languages and to worship their own gods and were therefore not so well fitted to actively serve the cause of Latinisation as Italic colonists would have been. The fact should be stressed that these colonists included a particularly large proportion of persons origina-

¹ This book of ours has appeared also in French in Vols. I. and II. (1935/36) of the periodical “*Archivum Europae Centro-Orientalis*” devoted to the study of the scientific problems of Central and Eastern Europe. Parts 3—4 of Vol. II. — containing the concluding part of our work — is in the press.

² “*Dacia: an Outline of Early Civilisation of the Carpatho-Danubian Countries*” (Cambridge: 1928), pp. 189—190. Cf. with reference to this work the *critique* of R. Syme, who says: — “We notice an exaggeration of the Romanisation of the Danube lands, based at times on a disquieting lightheadedness in the use of evidence”. (“*The Journal of Roman Studies*”, 1929 — Vol. XIX. —, pp. 102—103.)

ting from Asia Minor and the Balkan provinces, — a circumstance allowing of our concluding that their knowledge of Latin was merely occasional and exceedingly primitive. For in the East Rome never troubled to Latinise so thoroughly as she did in the West. At the time of the conquest of Dacia the reserve of Italian emigrants was well-nigh exhausted; the imperialistic policy of the Empire had enticed so many inhabitants to leave the peninsula for the new provinces which had previously too shown a constant tendency to augment their territories, that after the days of Caesar *emigration from Italy was constantly being restricted or prohibited*: and we know that *Trajan himself issued prohibitive decrees of the kind*. We cannot be surprised, therefore, that the inscriptions should show that, apart from a mere sprinkling of Italian elements, the population of Dacia Trajana was recruited mostly from the following provinces, — Dalmatia, Greece, Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul, Cappadocia, Galatia, Caria, Bithynia, Paphlagonia, Syria, Asia (provincia), Commağene, Pontus, Spain, Africa.³ There was a considerable obstacle to the Latinisation of the province, — the continuous assaults made on Dacia by the "free Dacians", Quadi, Marcomanni, Sarmatians and Carpi and later by the Goths. We know that Hadrian himself in the first half of the second century already contemplated the evacuation of Dacia and a withdrawal to the Danube *limes*.

All these facts show us that there was practically no trace in Dacia of the conditions indispensable for the coming into being of a mixed Daco-Roman people. But even if there had been any such people, it would never have remained in the eccentrically situated province, the defence of which proved a most difficult task for the two legions stationed there. The elements which preferred greater security of life escaped to the provinces stretching south of the Danube before Dacia was evacuated; and we have a historical datum proving that the Emperor Galerius's mother was herself a refugee from Dacia.

About 270 A. D. the Emperor Aurelianus decided on the final evacuation of Dacia, withdrawing before the pressure of the Goths to the mighty natural frontier of the Danube — a line strategically much easier to defend.⁴ He naturally took with him, not only the legions and the surviving urban populations, but also the agricultural elements, whom he settled for the most part in Illyria and Moesia. The point must be stressed that the evacuation of Dacia was the deliberate and conscious act of a Great Empire at the height of its power, not a process of collapse such as was the disintegration of the West Roman Empire when it fell to pieces and yielded helplessly to the attacks of the Germanic peoples. That this was so, is proved beyond a doubt by the completeness of

evacuation; it was after a victorious campaign in which he had broken the power of the Goths that the Emperor Aurelianus arranged *with the utmost calmness and deliberateness* — and not in the hurry of a headlong flight — for the assembling of the surviving representatives of Dacian Latinism, whom he brought to safety beyond the new frontier. After the completion of the evacuation the attitude of the Empire now stationed on the Danube line was one of active offence against the barbarians; and in 311 A. D. the Emperor Galerius was by his own desire interred at *Romulianum on the Lower Danube*. And we need only think of the brilliant and consolidated age that followed early in the fourth century — the reign of Constantine the Great (323—53). We see then that there was full security of life and property within the new *limes*; so that the argument of the apostles of the theory of continuity to the effect that he reason why numbers of Romans remained in Dacia was that they could not have been in greater security even south of the Danube, shows either ignorance or tendentious perversion.

Nor are the champions of the theory of continuity very prone to air the fact that *Transylvania was at all times the chief gateway for the passage of the peoples migrating westward*, which poured in successive waves from Asia into Europe. As is well known, the Hungarians (Magyars) themselves — the first people since the days of Roman occupation which proved able to establish a properly organised and ordered State life of a permanent character in the Danube Basin and consequently in Transylvania too — suffered enormously even after their definitive settlement from the marauding inroads of Cumanians and Petchenegs and Tartars (Mongols); and it is probable that unless they had embraced the Christianity of the West the Hungarians too would have met the fate of the peoples of the great migration period already in the Middle Ages. Even more violent and destructive than the Mongols were the peoples that followed the invasion of the Goths which caused the loss of Dacia — the Vandals, Gepidae, Tadjals, Huns, and later on the Avars. These peoples in succession drove one another further west out of Transylvania (the Vandals, for instance, did not stop until they reached Africa), that province being constantly a battle-field and likely to encourage anything rather than the survival of a considerable body of Latins.

From what follows it will be seen even more clearly how absurd is the story of the Dacian Latins having remained in that province. For the position of Romanism in the East European provinces was quite different from that in the West. In the West, though the conquering barbarians proved victorious, they in time became completely absorbed in the Italian, Gallic and Pyrenean Romanism which represented a higher culture; and it is to this Germano-Roman synthesis that the French, Italian and Spanish nations ultimately owed their origin. We cannot even conceive of such a Roman-Barbarian synthesis in the territories of the East Roman Empire, for there Latin culture did not work with the intensity sufficient to Latinise the Slavs and the Germanic peoples of the Bal-

³ See in this connection Philippide, "*Originea Romilor*" (Origin of the Rumanians), Vol. I, pp. 335 seq. This Rumanian scholar says also that the number of Italic elements in the population and in the army alike was a *minimum* one. *Op. cit.*, p. 857.

⁴ These questions have been dealt with in detail by Professor A. Alföldi, the eminent Hungarian contributor to the "*Cambridge Ancient History*".

kans. If we glance at the map of present-day Europe, we find *neo-Latin* States existing in the areas of the Western provinces of yore, while on the other hand in the Balkans we find *Slavs* wherever in ancient times Latin was spoken. It is a remarkable fact, again, that the Greater Rumania of today lies, not south of the Danube, where down to the sixth and seventh centuries (on the Dalmatian seaboard indeed down to the beginning of the modern age) there were autochthonous Romanised inhabitants, but north of that river, where the Latin-speaking population had disappeared already at the end of the third century. The explanation of this strange fact is as follows: —

When we investigate the possibility of a survival of Balkan Romanism according to *domicile and occupation*, we find that occupations postulating permanent residence involved the danger of an inevitable Slavisation or Grecianisation respectively. Consequently, it was the inhabitants of the towns that had to become absorbed, — a fact proved most strikingly by the Slavisation of the towns on the Dalmatian seaboard. And even those Romanised urban elements which succeeded for a time in surviving in the interior of the Balkan Peninsula were still more effectually driven by their isolation to become Slavised. Nor could the fate of the Romanised agricultural islands — with inhabitants also plying an occupation requiring permanent residence in the same spot — be other; for these islands usually came into contact with the Serb and Bulgar conquerors who had also become agriculturists and also forgot their own language. Consequently, if the Balkans had contained only ethnic elements plying occupations postulating permanent residence in the same spot, *there could not be today in Eastern Europe any people speaking a language at all akin to the neo-Latin languages of the West.*

We cannot explain the interesting fact of the survival of the Rumanian (Vlach) language unless we take into account the *nomad* manner of life of the early Rumanians. For, as is well known, the nomadic state is the best means to enable peoples of the kind to permanently retain their languages. This statement — which hardly needs particular proof — may be supported by many examples. The few elements *linguistically and racially akin* to the Rumanians of Greater Rumania still to be found *sporadically in the Balkans and in the Istrian Peninsula* are bound to become absorbed by the peoples surrounding them, because they have either entirely or at least in part abandoned their occupation as nomad shepherds. In Istria today there are *scarcely* any persons speaking Rumanian, for the Croat-Slovene surroundings have almost completely absorbed the originally considerable Rumanian linguistic enclaves or islands once existing there. Having exchanged their original occupation for agriculture the Rumanians of Meglen started to become *completely* Bulgarised, while the last survivors have been transferred to Rumania. Having entered the commercial profession the Aurumuns very shortly became *completely* Grecianised; while those of them who have become agriculturists are becoming Grecianised practically before

our eyes. Only those Aurumuns may hope to preserve for any length of time their language *who have clung to their life as nomad pastors*. The same process may be observed in the history of other nomad peoples too. It is when they abandon the breeding of reindeer, changing their domicile and learning the Norwegian or Swedish language spoken by their surroundings, that the Lapps abandon also the language of their forefathers. The same process may be seen in the case of the gipsies too. Permanent settlement in any country in the case of gipsies too involves the loss of their mother-tongue, while those gipsies who cling to the older nomadic manner of life continue to speak Romany.

So the reason why the Rumanians were able to preserve their language through the blood-tempest of the migration of the peoples, was that they followed a nomadic life. In our book we explain in detail that *their ancestors were the Illyric-Thracian shepherd peoples* of the Balkan Peninsula which lived in the Latin-speaking provinces during the *six centuries* of Roman rule and eventually were Latinised themselves. In the Balkans too, of course, it was the people of the towns who were first Romanised, the inhabitants of the villages following; but *later on* the nomad pastor elements were Latinised too. In Dacia the Roman rule of roughly 150 years was not sufficient to Latinise the pastor elements; for in that province there was not time enough even for the assimilation of town and village colonists of very mixed languages and races. From what has been said it will be seen that the fable respecting the continuity of the Rumanian inhabitants of Dacia with permanent domicile is a veritable insult to history, seeing that *it is impossible to conceive of Rumanians with a permanent domicile, not only in Dacia, but even in the Balkan Peninsula itself.*

Indisputable linguistic arguments can be adduced to prove that until the tenth or eleventh century the range of the nomad life of the original Rumanian shepherds did not pass beyond the frontiers of the Balkan Peninsula. In the Rumanian (Vlach) language (alike in the dialects of Greater Rumania, of Istria, of Meglen and of Macedonia, all of which derive from a *common original Rumanian language*) there are numerous peculiarities which we cannot understand unless we take into account the other Balkan languages (Albanian, Bulgarian, Serbian, Greek) and which are entirely absent from the Romance languages of

All classes of Hungarian society sympathise deeply and sincerely with Sir Robert Gower on the occasion of the tragic death of Lady Gower.

At the funeral, which took place at St. James's, Tunbridge Wells, the Hungarian Government was represented by Dr. Constantine Masirevics, Hungarian Minister in London, who laid a beautiful wreath on Lady Gower's bier. The Revision League's wreath was laid by the League's London representative, Dr. Béla Póka-Pivny; that of Dr. Otto Légrády, Editor-in-Chief of the "Pesti Hírlap" — a wreath of red and white chrysanthemums and green laurels — by Dr. Louis Léderer, London correspondent of the "Pesti Hírlap".

— y —

the West. There are words in the vocabulary of the occupation of shepherding (the so-called "Balkan Words" or "Balkanwörter") not to be explained by any existing language; and we are therefore entitled to presume that they are remnants of the language of Thracian-Illyrian forefathers of the Rumanians. The Rumanian language contains, besides, lexical and grammatical peculiarities of *Albanian origin* which denote far-reaching connections, not with the Geg dialect of the North, but with *the Tosk dialect of the South*. Our readers may well ask how Albanian influences can have found their way into the language of the Rumanians, though today these two peoples are separated by an extensive Slav language area? The answer is quite simple. It all took place in the days of *Albano-Rumanian symbiosis*, when the ancestors of the two peoples lived as pastors in the same territory and were for centuries in the closest connection with one another. Nor must we forget to note that of the four Rumanian languages (dialects) the one nearest to Albanian is not either of the three Balkan varieties, but that spoken today north of the Danube.⁵ In view of the very numerous similarities between Albanian and Rumanian, we are entitled to presume that the "article postposé" (article placed at the end of a word) unknown in the Western Romance languages also originated from the language of the common Illyrian-Thracian ancestors. In this connection it may be noted that neither the French nor the Italians can possibly be *linguistically related to the Rumanians*, the peoples most akin to them linguistically being *above all the Albanians and the Slavs*, who have also exercised a very considerable linguistic influence on the Rumanians. The Rumanians found north of the Danube absorbed also a large number of *Petchenegs and Cumanians*; and it should be noted that it is the Rumanians that find least difficulty in absorbing gypsies.

The Slav linguistic influence of most importance is that of *Bulgarian*, this influence showing the same characteristic in the case of all four branches of the Rumanian people alike and being therefore of Balkan origin. But what is perhaps of even greater importance is that the whole culture of the Rumanian right down to the eighteenth century was in absolute dependence upon *Bulgar-Byzantine culture*, — except of course in the case of the Rumanians who had in the meantime migrated to Transylvania, who had from the days of the Reformation — through the mediation of the Hungarians — had free access to the culture of the West. A record of this dependence upon *Bulgar-Byzantine culture* is still in evidence in the fact that the Rumanians in general still belong to the *Greek Oriental (Orthodox) Church*. Ever since the Rumanians have been known to history, they have always been under the suzerainty of some Orthodox Balkan patriarch; and even the Wallachian waywodes enjoying Hungarian feudal rights of property in Transylvania dedicated their monasteries to the *Patriarch of Constanti-*

nople. In the Wallachian and Moldavian principalities (waywodeships) established at the end of the fourteenth century Bulgarian became the official language of the chancellery and the Church, — that being equivalent to isolation from the culture of the Latin-speaking West. It is a characteristic fact that, whereas in the waywodeship the use of *cyrillic letters* was not abolished until about the *middle of last century*, the "oppressed" Rumanians of Transylvania wrote with Latin characters as early as the sixteenth century, using the same letters to print their Bibles. Those who take all these facts to mean that the Rumanians were in Transylvania during the whole of the Middle Ages, may be good patriots, but — would be ploughed in history.

May I be allowed to call the attention of the apostles of continuity also to the circumstance that the language of the Rumanians north of the Danube *could not possibly be identical in character* with those of the Rumanians of Istria, Meglen and Macedonia, unless the Rumanians living north of the Danube had also originally been settled in the Balkan Peninsula. We can quite understand why this *linguistic unity* is not stressed when writing for foreign countries; for that would involve supposing willy-nilly the existence of an original Rumanian mother country confined within narrow boundaries in which the original Rumanian language was formed and from which the "Daco-Romans" migrated northwards, the Istrians westwards and the ancestors of the Rumanians of Arumun and Meglen southwards.

We have also indirect proofs to show that the the Rumanians cannot be the autochthonous or aboriginal inhabitants of Transylvania. For, had they lived in Transylvania continuously ever since the days of Roman rule, we should find place-names remaining from Roman days north of the Danube, — and that in forms found also in the development of the Latin words of the Rumanian language. Such place-names as *Mediolanum = Milano, Lugdunum = Lyon, Colonia = Köln* are *not found at all* in Dacia; and in the Balkans only the *Slavs* — and not the Rumanians — have preserved a few. Indeed, the Rumanians could not have preserved such names; for, as already explained, they and their Albanian racial kin were pastors.

After the Great War the professors of the University of Kolozsvár (Cluj) wrested from Hungary made special efforts to save the theory of continuity by other means. They started from the supposition — correct enough in itself — that the territory of Dacia was inhabited for periods of varying length by Germanic tribes (Goths, Vandals, and Gepidae, the latter remaining longer than the others) which are said to have lived for centuries in peaceful communion with the Roman colonists alleged to have remained in that province. However, if Latin-speaking elements had really remained north of the Danube and we were entitled to identify those colonists with the ancestors of the Rumanians, there ought to be a *host* of words of Old Germanic origin in the Rumanian language. But those who are familiar with the Western Romance languages and with

⁵ See the book of the Rumanian scholar Philippide „*Originea Rominilor*”, Vol. II, pp. 629 and 761.

Rumanian, are at once struck by the fact that words like "guerra—guerre" ("war": in Rumanian "războiu"), "guadagnar" — "gagner" (in Rumanian "a căștiga"), "guardar — garder" (in Rumanian "a păzi", "a păstra"), etc. are not be found at all in the Rumanian of today. Of a number of words it has naturally been asserted that they are of Old Germanic origin; but of these words — to echo the verdict of a famous Yugoslav *savant* — we may say that "bad etymology is no proof". Our book shows in particular that our opinion respecting the futility of the hunt after Old Germanic words is shared also by several Rumanian *savants*; so we shall not deal with the question here in detail.

The theory of continuity is refuted also by the circumstance that there are *no* Rumanian words in the Hungarian or Ruthenian languages taken over prior to the twelfth or thirteenth century, a circumstance which — if there had really been Rumanians in Transylvania during the whole of the Middle Ages — would be just as incomprehensible as is the lack of Germanic words in Rumanian. However, seeing that that was not the case, the circumstance is quite comprehensible and natural.

Consequently, we have a whole series of positive and negative arguments constituting a coherent and irrefutable network of proofs of uniform tendency which reflect the original history of the Rumanians in its natural reality without any artificial moment.

Those who reflect on the arguments adduced above, which are fully substantiated in our book, will not be surprised to learn that historical records do *not* even mention Rumanians in Transylvania *until about 1210*; and as they only gradually penetrated northwards, the first records refer to the *southern* regions of Transylvania, viz. to the districts of Szeben and Fogaras. In the days prior to the Mongol invasion (1241) our records do not even mention Rumanians in any other part of Transylvania. This fact certain Rumanian scholars would like to explain as being due to the records having been destroyed by the Mongol invasion. The effect of this — at first sight specious — argument is however spoiled by the circumstance that, whereas we have only four records mentioning *only Rumanians*, we have no fewer than *seventy-eight* documents dealing with the Saxons which date prior to 1241. And we surely are not entitled to charge the Mongols with partiality or with Rumanophobia! It would seem, however, that even after the departure of the Mongols there was no great change in the number of documents mentioning Rumanians; for even between 1241 and 1300 we have *only nine* records dealing with Rumanians, while the number of documents dealing with Saxons during the same period is 285!! We would commend these data to the attention of all those are eager to obtain a correct idea of the historical truth. A circumstance of great importance is that these data referring to Rumanians do not speak of a people definitively settled or living in villages, but refer in general to the forest or the land of Rumanians (*terra, silva Blacorum*) or preserve a record of the earliest

attempts at settlement of this originally nomad people. In 1292 Andrew III., for instance, gave permission to a Hungarian nobleman to settle Rumanians in the villages of Elye, Szád a. d. Fenes (*olacos possit aggregare ac aggregatos retinere*). In this connection it should be emphasised that the names of all three villages are Hungarian; and these settlers were probably introduced to replace the Hungarian inhabitants who had perished during the Mongol invasion. Even more instructive is the deed issued by Andrew III. in 1293 which ordained that *all* the Rumanian (Vlach) vassals (serfs) who might be found settled on non-royal domains should be re-settled on the royal domain called Székes. The only exception made by the king was in favour of the Gyulafehérvár chapter, which he allowed to retain sixty domestic Rumanian vassals in service on its estates with Hungarian names (!) at Fülesd and Enyed. Therefore, if it was possible for the king at the end of the thirteenth century to assemble in a single royal domain all the Rumanians who had entered Transylvania and had received employment from the Hungarian landowners, their number must have been *exceedingly small*. No wonder that Rumanian science refrains from taking cognizance of this deed as a record of settlement and passes over it in silence.

The immigration of Rumanians on a large scale began in later centuries, assuming exceptionally formidable proportions in the age of the Phanariot hospodars of Wallachia. The fact that these Rumanians were settled in Transylvania in such large numbers, was due primarily to economic reasons. For the lack of vassals (serfs) in evidence on both secular and ecclesiastical estates was supplied both in Serbia and in Transylvania by recruits from the ranks of the Wallachian immigrants, that enabling the owners of the estates to secure the earning capacity of the forests, pastures and lands that had been made suitable for cultivation.

From what has been said above our readers will be able to guess that there is something seriously wrong about the Rumanian priority in Transylvania constantly stressed for the purpose of proving the historical rights of the Rumanians. The only unexceptionable way to decide the question of these alleged rights is to find out and ascertain definitively whether the Rumanians were aboriginal settlers in Transylvania who proved able to establish permanently any State or provincial organisation? Our answer to this question must be decidedly in the negative. When in the reign of St. Stephen a beginning was made with the Church and State organisation of Transylvania, there were as yet *no Rumanian settlers* there, — as indeed there were none in the Balkans either, seeing that in the eleventh century the Rumanians were still exclusively nomad pastors whose nomadic manner of life itself precluded the possibility of the establishment of any lasting or independent political formations in closed territories. In the twelfth century, indeed, the Chronicle of Anonymus notes that the Hungarian (Magyar) conquerors slew a certain Rumanian chieftain (*quidam Blacus*) of the name of *Gelou* in the neighbourhood of the brook Kapus; however, in the

same chronicle we find the *Cumanians* also figuring among the peoples encountered by the Hungarian conquerors, whereas according to the testimony of authentic sources the Cumanians too were late comers, as were the Rumanians. Anonymus *reflects the conditions of his own time in the mirror of an earlier age*, thereby doing what most medieval chroniclers did; and it is a characteristic fact that he drafts the text of the *Blood Compact*, for instance, — the Agreement concluded between the Magyar chieftains acting under Árpád —, under the influence of the legal conceptions and style in use in the contemporary chancelleries. Authentic records inform us, further, that the supreme control in Transylvania in the period of the Magyar Conquest was in the hands of the "reeves" of Oldamur, Czar of the Bulgars, and not in those of the legendary "Gelou", who is unknown to any Hungarian or other Western or even Byzantine chronicler but Anonymus. So the only possible conclusion to be drawn from Anonymus's Chronicle — if any conclusion may be drawn at all on this point — is that in the second half of the twelfth century or early in the thirteenth there were Rumanians already in Transylvania; and that would tally also with the date of the oldest record of Rumanians in that province dating from 1210.

The Székely people too entered Transylvania long before the settlement of the Rumanians there; chauvinistic Rumanian historians would fain suggest with the aid of forged arguments that the Székely people were in reality Magyarised Rumanians, the object of this endeavour being to palliate their efforts to Rumanise by force by the use of a historical "beauty spot". The proclaimers of this dilettantish theory leave out of account entirely the circumstance that the historical records most decidedly differentiate between these two peoples (e. g. under date 1256: "*ex parte Siculorum et Olacorum*"; 1262: "*ab Olachis et Siculis*"; and so on); a circumstance which in itself is sufficient refutation of the theory advanced by men suffering from a pitiable lack of historical training. These men are evidently unfamiliar with the ancient clan and family organisations of the Székely people on the basis of which serious historical science finds that people to be of *Turkish* origin. And indeed there is not a single Rumanian scholar living today who possesses the turcological knowledge without which it is impossible to deal with this problem; it is therefore only natural that the public opinion of Rumania should accept this forgery in its entirety just as it does the stabilised fable respecting the "Rumanian continuity". Under such circumstance we believe it is quite superfluous to inquire into the sources from which Rumanian politicians derive their views respecting the Székely question.

Nor do people in Rumania make any mention of the *attitude of rejection* adopted by *Gaston Paris*, the world-famed Romance scholar, in respect of the theory of "Rumanian continuity in Transylvania". Yet Gaston Paris did believe it possible that certain *nomad* Wallachian pastors may have appeared occasionally in Transylvania even prior

to the Magyar Conquest in the ninth century. He naturally adds that this *purely theoretical* possibility cannot be made into a historical authority or source; for — as is well known — nomad Wallachian pastors penetrated some time or other as far north as Poland, as far west as Istria, as far east as the Caucasus (passing through Southern Russia) and as far south as the very heart of Greece. In these territories, however, the Rumanians never became permanent settlers, only passing through them. And the moments in the development of the Rumanian language and the Rumanian people explained in our summary treatment of the question show beyond a doubt that the ancestors of the Rumanians living today north of the Danube formed a territorial unit in the Balkans right down to the late tenth or early eleventh century, their dispersion having begun only in the closing centuries of the Middle Ages and having carried them to all quarters of the world — to Transylvania too. Seeing that Transylvania also shared in this process of dispersion only as did the territories of many Balkan countries and South Russia and indeed other territories too, the "historical" claim put forward by the Rumanians should entitle them to claim the whole of Eastern Europe, the whole Balkan Peninsula and even a bit of Asia too. What would happen if the peoples of Europe were all to claim "*by historical right*" all the territories *through* which their ancestors happen some time or other to have *passed*!?!? And if the Rumanians lay no claim to South Russia, to the southern regions of Poland, to Istria, to Greece and above all to Yugoslavia, — which latter country has within its frontiers the scene of the actual development of the Rumanian language and the Rumanian people —, we cannot understand why they confine their "historical" claims to Transylvania. We must in this connection emphatically stress the fact that it was *not until the fourteenth century* that the Rumanians proved able to bring into being *independent* and *permanent* political organisations; the result being that there cannot be any conceivable legal basis for claims of the Rumanians dating from earlier times.

In conclusion we must not forget to note that the theory of a Rumanian continuity in Transylvania is regarded as a fable, not only by Hungarian scholars (as the Rumanian propaganda which falsifies the facts never tires of proclaiming before the public opinion of the world), but by a whole list of foreign (and indeed — *horribile dictu!* — of *Rumanian*) *savants* too. The formidable list of non-Magyar scholars who have taken this view includes, among others, the following names: Sulzer, Engel, Kopitar, Miklosich, Roessler, Tomaschek, Drinov, Fisher, Jireček, Miletič, Peisker, Kadlec, C. de la Berge, Gaston Paris, G. Meyer, Weigand, etc.; that of the Rumanian *savants* including the following names: — Eudoxie Hurmuzaki, H. Tiktin, M. Gaster, and A. Philipide, who *devotes two ponderous volumes to an exhaustive treatment of the subject*. The answer

given by official Rumanian science to the arguments contained in these works consists generally — in default of better arguments — of derisive *jeering and leering and sneering* and of simply refusing to take cognizance of the facts, while at

the same time continuing to proclaim its fallacies. The question as to how far such an attitude is in keeping with the postulates of international scientific etiquette, we leave to our readers to decide.

WHAT AN ENGLISHMAN OBSERVED IN THE HUNGARY OF THE "AGE OF REFORM"

by

Dr. Alexander Fest

Reader in Budapest University

(Continued.)

The second part of Paget's book deals chiefly with Transylvania, — with that wonderful little Transylvania of which many Englishmen had probably never heard even the name, although it had once been the ally of the King of England (James I.), — with that country so richly endowed with divine blessings which in the extreme east of Europe — at a point where Western civilisation ended — had for ages possessed institutions, constitutional and religious liberties and political rights which might well excite the envy of the great nations of Western Europe. At every step was to be seen a wealth of scenic beauty and an endless variety of landscapes and of popular life. Our English traveller takes us everywhere, — from the wretched Rumanian cottage to the splendid life in the aristocratic mansions of Kolozsvár. "Kolozsvár!", he cries in ecstasy; people accustomed to the rigid manners of England cannot conceive the character of the reception accorded in the houses of the educated inhabitants of Kolozsvár. Yet it should not be forgotten that this high standard of culture was not a recent development: of the golden days of this principal-ity something was known in England too. And, though people in England might have forgotten the ancient ties between the two countries, the memory of those ties still lived in the hearts of the grateful Transylvanians. At Enyed, Professor Szász, the eminent *savant* whose name was known far and wide, had told Paget that on one occasion, when it had proved almost impossible to maintain the famous old College there, a deputation had been sent to England to arrange for a collection to be made among the co-religionists in that country. A large sum had been raised; and the Bank of England still sent them every year L 1000 as interest on the capital collected for the purpose. About this Paget says as follows:

"During a period of temporary distress — I forget the exact time — when the college was in danger of perishing from the want of funds, a deputation was sent over by the Protestants of Transylvania, to request pecuniary aid from their brethren in England. The call was generously

answered, and a fund was formed, which is still deposited in the Bank of England, and from which the college of Enyed receives an annual revenue of 1,000 L. It is wonderful what a feeling of friendship, what a sentiment of brotherhood with England, this gift, though now completely forgotten among us, still maintains among the Transylvanian Protestants. The revenue derived from this source has been expended for some years past on the erection of a range of new buildings for the residence of the students, which, when finished, will make a very respectable appearance." (Vol. II. p. 308.)

Paget was interested in the lower classes too, in particular in the Székler and the Rumanian lower classes. Both were poor; only the Székler had something in him that reminded Paget of the Scotch, — the same industry and perseverance and the same enterprise as was to be found in Scotland. The Széklers he found well educated, their schools being on a surprisingly high level. There were hardly any Széklers unable to read and write. The Rumanian, on the other hand, was lazy and inclined to indulge too much in drink. As Paget tells us, when the harvest work was at its height, the Rumanian might be seen sleeping in the sun, — a proceeding which pleased him particularly, seeing that he knew he ought really to be working. He actually kept putting off reaping even his own corn, which he very often left rotting on the ground, though he knew he would have to face the want and privations of winter. He speaks rather commiseratingly of their backwardness and their poverty. To give his own words: —

"That the Wallack is idle and drunken it would be very difficult to deny. Even in the midst of harvest you will see him lying in the sun sleeping all the more comfortably because he knows he ought to be working. His corn is always the last cut, and it is very often left to shell on the ground for want of timely gathering; yet scarcely a winter passes that he is not starving with hunger. If he has a waggon to drive, he is generally found asleep at the bottom of it; if he has a message to carry, ten to one but he gets drunk on the way,