

DACIA

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE  
ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE

NOUVELLE SÉRIE

LX

2016

EN SOUVENIR D'ALEXANDRU VULPE



ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE  
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE « VASILE PÂRVAN »

# D A C I A

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE  
ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE

NOUVELLE SÉRIE

LX

2016



EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

## RÉDACTION

*Rédacteur en chef :*

EUGEN NICOLAE

*Rédacteur en chef adjoint :*

CRISTINA-GEORGETA ALEXANDRESCU

*Collège de rédaction :*

MARIA ALEXANDRESCU VIANU (Bucarest), ALEXANDRU AVRAM (Le Mans), DOUGLASS W. BAILEY (San Francisco), MIHAI BĂRBULESCU (Cluj-Napoca), PIERRE DUPONT (Lyon), SVEND HANSEN (Berlin), ANTHONY HARDING (Exeter), RADU HARHOIU (Bucarest), ATTILA LÁSZLÓ (Iași), SILVIA MARINESCU-BÎLCU (Bucarest), MONICA MĂRGINEANU-CÂRSTOIU (Bucarest), VIRGIL MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA (Iași), JEAN-PAUL MOREL (Aix-en-Provence), CONSTANTIN C. PETOLESCU (Bucarest) IOAN PISO (Cluj-Napoca), CLAUDE RAPIN (Aix-en-Provence), WOLFRAM SCHIER (Berlin), VICTOR SPINEI (Iași)

*Comité de rédaction :*

IRINA ACHIM, IULIAN BÎRZESCU, ADINA BORONEANȚ, ANDREI MĂGUREANU, ALEXANDRU NICULESCU, LIANA OȚA, ADRIANA PANAITTE, ANCA DIANA POPESCU, DANIEL SPÂNU, AUREL VÎLCU

*Secrétaire de rédaction :* RALUCA KOGĂLNICEANU

*Rédaction éditoriale :* OLGA DUMITRU, ANA BOROȘ

*Informatique éditoriale :* OFELIA COȘMAN

Toute commande sera adressée à :

**EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE**, Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, sector 5, 050711, București, România ;  
Tél. 4021-318 8146, 4021-318 8106, Fax 4021-318 2444, E-mail : [edacad@ear.ro](mailto:edacad@ear.ro)

**ORION PRESS IMPEX 2000 S.R.L.**, P. O. Box 77-19, sector 3, București, România ; Tél./Fax : 4021-610 6765,  
4021-210 6787, Tél. 0311 044 668, E-mail : [office@orionpress.ro](mailto:office@orionpress.ro)

**S.C. MANPRESS DISTRIBUTION S.R.L.**, Piața Presei Libere, nr. 1, Corp B, Etaj 3, Cam. 301-302, sector 1,  
București, Tel.: 4021 314 63 39, fax: 4021 314 63 39, E-mail: [abonamente@manpress.ro](mailto:abonamente@manpress.ro), [office@manpress.ro](mailto:office@manpress.ro),  
[www.manpress.ro](http://www.manpress.ro)

**SORIRORI SOLUTIONS**, Tel.: 0040765262077, 0040765166433; Internet: <http://www.sorirori.ro>; E-mail:  
[sorin.costreie@sorirori.ro](mailto:sorin.costreie@sorirori.ro), [rosana.guta@sorirori.ro](mailto:rosana.guta@sorirori.ro)

Les manuscrits et les périodiques proposés en échange, ainsi que toute correspondance seront adressés à la Rédaction : Institut d'Archéologie « Vasile Pârvan », 11, rue H. Coandă, 010667 Bucarest, Roumanie, Tél./Fax 4021 212 88 62, E-mail : [iab.redactie@gmail.com](mailto:iab.redactie@gmail.com)



© 2 0 1 7, E D I T U R A A C A D E M I E I R O M Â N E

[www.ear.ro](http://www.ear.ro)

ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE  
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE «VASILE PÂRVAN»

**DACIA LX, 2016**

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE  
JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANCIENT HISTORY  
ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ARCHÄOLOGIE UND GESCHICHTE DES ALTERTUMS  
ЖУРНАЛ АРХЕОЛОГИИ И ДРЕВНЕЙ ИСТОРИИ

SOMMAIRE  
CONTENTS  
I N H A L T

En souvenir d'Alexandru Vulpe (16 juin 1931 - 9 février 2016).....	7
<i>ÉTUDES</i>	
SVEND HANSEN, Kupferzeitliche Marmorobjekte aus Măgura Gorgana bei Pietrele an der Unteren Donau .....	17
CRISTIAN EDUARD ȘTEFAN, Playing with clay: anthropomorphic figurines from Șoimuș – <i>La Avicola (Ferma 2)</i> , Hunedoara County.....	31
GABRIEL BĂLAN, COLIN P. QUINN, GREGORY HODGINS, The Wietenberg culture: periodization and chronology.....	67
OLIVER DIETRICH, Tekirdağ und Troja. Zur Verbreitungsgrenze südosteuropäischer Tüllenbeile in der Türkei .....	93
ZOE PETRE, <i>Thucydides Mythistoricus</i> .....	103
JULIAN GALLEGO, La politique, une invention humaine ou divine ? La pensée de Protagoras et le regard platonicien.....	111
AUREL VÎLCU, EUGEN NICOLAE, Aspects de la diffusion des monnaies d'argent istriennes au nord du Danube à la lumière du trésor découvert à Ivancea.....	121
IULIAN BÎRZESCU, Das Perirrhanterion aus dem Tempel M von Histria .....	129
FLORINA PANAIT BÎRZESCU, The sons of Istros and the classical silver coins of Histria.....	137
STELUȚA MARIN, VIRGIL IONIȚĂ, Pseudo-autonomous coins minted at Callatis .....	147
ALEXANDRU AVRAM, OCTAVIAN MITROI, Un fragment de cadran solaire d'époque impériale découvert à Tomis .....	173
MIHAI BĂRBULESCU, Le mobilier et la vaisselle représentés sur les monuments funéraires de Dacie.....	183
ADRIANA PANAIT, CARMEN MIU (BEM), Roman roads identified on aerial and satellite images within the territory of the city of Tropaeum Traiani (Moesia Inferior).....	201
LUCREȚIU MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA, Le témoignage épigraphique des <i>villae</i> en Mésie Inférieure : remarques sur les propriétaires et sur le personnel administratif.....	221
DANIEL SPÂNU, MIHAI DIMA, ALIN FRÎNCULEASA, The Mălăieștii de Jos (Prahova County) silver craftsman's hoard from the end of the 3rd century AD.....	237
STEFFEN KRAUS, ERNST PERNICKA, Chemical analyses on Roman coins and silver objects from the Mălăieștii de Jos hoard, Romania .....	275
<i>NOTES ET DISCUSSIONS</i>	
ATTILA LÁSZLÓ, Cui bono? Thoughts about a "reconsideration" of the Tărtăria tablets.....	281
JEREMY M. HUTTON, NATHANIEL E. GREENE, A note on the Aramaic text of the bilingual Guras inscription (PAT 0251 = CIL III 3.7999 = CIS 3906).....	293

CONSTANTIN C. PETOLESCU, MIHAI POPESCU, Une contribution à PIR <sup>2</sup> , P 926 : <i>C. Prastina Messalinus</i> .....	301
GHEORGHE ALEXANDRU NICULESCU, On Florin Curta's attack.....	307
VIRGIL MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA, Numismatics and other sciences.....	329

*COMPTES RENDUS*

<i>Inscriptions de Scythie Mineure</i> , volume IV, Tropaeum - Durostorum - <i>Axiopolis</i> , recueillies, traduites et accompagnées de commentaires et d'index par Emilian Popescu, Editura Academiei Române, București - Editura Basilica, București - Diffusion de Boccard, Paris 2015, 412 pages, 17 planches avec photos des inscriptions. ( <i>Lucrețiu Mihailescu-Bîrliba</i> ).....	335
--	-----

*IN MEMORIAM*

Ion-Șerban Motzoi-Chicideanu (9. Dezember 1943 - 8. Oktober 2016) ( <i>Nikolaus Boroffka</i> ) .....	341
--	-----

<i>ABRÉVIATIONS</i> .....	349
---------------------------	-----

## CUI BONO? THOUGHTS ABOUT A “RECONSIDERATION” OF THE TĂRTĂRIA TABLETS

ATTILA LÁSZLÓ\*

**Keywords:** Nicolae Vlassa, Vladimir Miložčić, Tărtăria, pictographic clay tablets, forgery accusation, Neolithic, Vinča-Turdaş/Tordos culture

**Abstract:** This paper discusses the article published by the assyriologist Erika Qasim in vol. 58 (2013) of the prestigious journal of ancient studies *Das Altertum* in Berlin. In her article, the author accuses the Romanian archaeologist Nicolae Vlassa (1934-1984) that, more than fifty years before, in complicity with Professor Vladimir Miložčić (1918-1978) from the Heidelberg University, had falsified the pictographic clay tablets discovered in 1961 at Tărtăria (Transylvania) and published in 1963 in the journal of archaeology and ancient history *Dacia* in Bucharest. In spite of the complexity of the issue and the seriousness of the assertions, the superficial documentation of the article is surprising. Its author treats a very delicate matter lightly, without consulting the literature compiled over decades and, consequently, without knowing the state of the research and of the discussions on the controversial issue of the Tărtăria tablets. The serious charges of falsification are not supported by any factual argument, and all the less so by a possibly direct (re)examination of the tablets. The insinuations are built on mere bookish speculations, devised at the writing table, and – we may regretfully add – are inspired by a bad faith which is difficult to understand. By overview of discussions and of results of the researches, as well as of some laboratory investigations carried out in the last half century on the Tărtăria tablets, it results that (despite some uncertainties related to the conditions of discovery due to the lacunar documentation of the excavation and to the incomplete publication of the discoveries) the anciency of the tablets, their prehistoric character, their belonging to the category of artefacts related to the system of signs and symbols of the Neolithic Vinča-Turdaş/Tordos culture cannot be disputed. In this respect, apart from the older, macroscopic observations, the newer, microscopic investigations of the surface of the tablets are decisive. These attest, among others, to the existence of traces of soil inside the outlines of several signs incised on the tablets, which is an indisputable proof of the fact that the tablets had lain underground for a long time before their discovery.

**Cuvinte-cheie:** Nicolae Vlassa, Vladimir Miložčić, Tărtăria, tăblițe de lut pictografice, acuzație de falsificare, neolitic, cultura Vinča-Turdaş

**Rezumat:** Prezenta lucrare discută articolul publicat de asirologul Erika Qasim în vol. 58 (2013) al revistei *Das Altertum* din Berlin. În articolul său, autoarea îl acuză pe arheologul român Nicolae Vlassa (1934-1984) că, în urmă cu mai bine de cincizeci de ani, în complicitate cu profesorul Vladimir Miložčić (1918-1978) de la Universitatea din Heidelberg, ar fi falsificat tăblițele de lut cu semne pictografice descoperite în 1961 la Tărtăria (Transilvania) și publicate în 1963 în revista *Dacia* de la București. Față de complexitatea problemei și gravitatea afirmațiilor, surprinde documentația superficială a articolului, al cărui autoare abordează cu ușurință o problemă foarte delicată, fără a consulta literatura de specialitate acumulată în cursul deceniilor și, în consecință, fără a cunoaște stadiul cercetărilor și discuțiilor cu privire la problematica controversată a tăblițelor de la Tărtăria. Gravele acuzații de falsificare nu sunt susținute de nici un argument factic și cu atât mai puțin de o eventuală (re)examinare directă a tăblițelor. Insinuirile sunt construite pe simple speculații livești, născocite la birou, și – adăugăm cu regret – sunt inspirate de o rea credință greu de înțeles. Rezultă din parcurgerea discuțiilor și a rezultatelor cercetărilor, inclusiv din investigațiile de laborator, efectuate în ultima jumătate de veac asupra tăblițelor de la Tărtăria că (în ciuda unor incertitudini privind condițiile de descoperire, datorate documentației lacunare a săpăturii și a publicării incomplete a descoperirilor) vechimea tăblițelor, caracterul lor preistoric, apartenența lor la categoria artefactelor legate de sistemul de semne și simboluri

---

\* Professor emeritus, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași; arch\_atticus@yahoo.com.

al culturii Vinča-Turdaş nu poate fi contestat. Pe lângă observațiile mai vechi, macroscopice, sunt hotărâtoare, în acest sens, investigațiile mai noi, microscopice, care atestă, printre altele, existența urmelor de pământ în interiorul conturului unor semne incizate de pe tăblițe, dovadă incontestabilă a zacerii îndelungate în pământ a tăblițelor înainte de descoperirea lor.

Half a century after the publication of the pictographic clay tablets, discovered by Nicolae Vlassa at Tărtăria in 1961<sup>1</sup>, when the once heated controversies about them seemed to have been forgotten already, the Assyriologist Erika Qasim suggests a “reconsideration” (Neubewertung) of these archaeological findings, without disclosing what or who determined her to reopen the debates on this topic<sup>2</sup>. In the introductory part of her study, E. Qasim makes a short presentation of the history of the archaeological research at Tărtăria: the location of the site, Professor Kurt Horedt’s older researches (1942-1943) and the results of Nicolae Vlassa’s archaeological excavations of 1961, which revealed, among other things, the much debated tablets. Some inaccuracies that we detected in this introduction made us believe that the author drafted her paper after a hasty documentation. For instance, we draw the attention to the fact that the complete name of the recognized archaeologist and former professor at the University of Cluj, K. Horedt, is Otto Kurt (and not Carl von) Horedt; at Tărtăria, he excavated trenches A-F (and not only C-F) in 1942-1943, whereas Vlassa excavated trenches G-H (and not only G) in 1961; layer I, Turdaş (-Vinča), containing the “ritual pit” with the tablets was not overlapped by a Proto-Tisza (“Proto-Theiss”) cultural layer, but by a layer which Vlassa called Turdaş-Petreşti, taking into consideration the occurrence there of the first elements of the painted pottery belonging to the Petreşti culture, also called the Central Transylvanian or Western Romanian painted pottery (mittelsiebenbürgische/westrumänische bemalte Keramik); according to the author’s knowledge at the time, that layer also included “imported” items of the Bükk, Boian and Cucuteni A2 cultures<sup>3</sup>. As concerns the tablets, it is argued that, according to Vlassa 1963, they were discovered in a pit of the Vinča culture (phase A or B1), together with human bones and different small objects (Kleinfunde), and dated to *circa* 2600 BC, based on the parallels drawn between the Tărtăria tablets and the clay tablets of the Early Dynastic I period in Mesopotamia. In fact, considering the generally accepted dating of the Uruk-Warka IV and Djemdet Nasr periods, as well as the time required for the circulation of such objects, Vlassa suggested a dating ranging between 2900 and 2700 BC. The date 2600 is suggested only as the possible date for the *end* of the Tărtăria layer I, if we were to choose a lower chronology of the Mesopotamian periods mentioned above<sup>4</sup>. Through this data manipulation, E. Qasim probably wished to highlight, somehow forcibly, the low chronology envisaged by Vlassa. E. Qasim then mentions that, two years later, in 1965, the renowned archaeologist Vladimir Milojević relied on Vlassa’s photographs and drawings and enlarged on the importance of the Tărtăria tablets for the South-Eastern European Neolithic, as they proved the assumption related to the short chronology of the Balkan Neolithic, assumption which the Heidelberg professor unfailingly supported<sup>5</sup>. In the next sentence, it is stated that the two publications, that is Vlassa’s and Milojević’s papers, did not raise any special interest (“...erregten kein Aufsehen”) and, to the best of E. Qasim’s knowledge, it was only two years later that Sinclair Hood noticed that the shape of the tablets did not exactly fully match the shape of the Djemdet Nasr tablets<sup>6</sup>. It is inexplicable why E. Qasim fails to mention the fact that the same issue of the journal *Germania* that published Professor Milojević’s paper also contained a study by the prestigious Assyriologist Adam Falkenstein, where the author re-examined Vlassa’s conclusions, compared the signs on

<sup>1</sup> Vlassa 1963.

<sup>2</sup> Qasim 2013.

<sup>3</sup> See Vlassa 1963, p. 486 and fig. 1: Tărtăria. The plan of the site and of the excavations. The term *Proto-Theiss* is used by Milojević 1965, p. 263-264 to signal the fact that layer I from Tărtăria preceded the period of the Tisza culture. Kurt Horedt’s basic biographical data are found in Filip 1966, p. 502; Filip 1998, p. 145, *s.v.* In more detail, see Harhoiu 1992; Soroceanu 1999; 2014.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Vlassa 1963, p. 492, 494. It is worth mentioning that, following the analysis of the dating possibilities, A. Falkenstein 1965, p. 273 suggested the very near time frame 2850-2750 BC to date Uruk IIIb; based on this dating, V. Milojević 1965, p. 267-268 appreciated that the Vinča A phase and the contemporary cultures, the Tărtăria tablets, respectively, could not date prior to 2800±50 BC.

<sup>5</sup> Milojević 1965.

<sup>6</sup> Hood 1967.



the Tărtăria tablets with the early Mesopotamian writing signs and made a series of remarks worthy of a specialist in the field<sup>7</sup>. E. Qasim includes *pro forma* this paper in the references accompanying her research, yet she completely ignores it in the body of the paper, where she does not mention it even once (yet tacitly and fully exploits it!). The fact is doubly odd as Milošević himself quoted from and used in his paper Falkenstein’s main conclusions (and notes that “...Auf unsere Bitte hat A. Falkenstein diesen Vergleich Vlassas überprüft und in dem anschließenden Bericht seine Beobachtungen niedergelegt”)<sup>8</sup>. Unfortunately, E. Qasim also ignores the tens or even hundreds of contributions (studies, papers, monographs) published after 1963 on the issue of the Tărtăria tablets (chronology, cultural belonging, nature of the signs, problems of the connections with the Near East, etc.) and states that these findings supposedly aroused interest in international scientific research only after the fall of the Iron Curtain (meaning, after 1989)<sup>9</sup>. In this respect, E. Qasim refers to the exhibitions on the topic of the history of writing held in Würzburg (2002) and in Graz (2003), and to the substantial catalogues published on these occasions<sup>10</sup>. In these exhibitions, notices Qasim, the tablets were displayed next to spindle-whorls, loom weights and ceramic shards, bearing small incised motifs, often resembling writing signs (it is inherent that most of these objects belong to the Vinča-Turdaş/Tordos culture). Greatly simplifying a complex matter, with a “history” of about one and a half century long, during which very different opinions have been expressed concerning the pottery signs and symbols of the Tordos/Turdaş-Vinča culture,<sup>11</sup> E. Qasim finally argues, in short, that the sign system of the Vinča culture as a whole was “elevated” by the Sumerian nature of the Tărtăria signs and thus, the birth of the Danube Script concept was rendered possible (“Durch den sumerischen Charakter der Tărtăria-Zeichen *schin* das System der Vinča-Zeichen insgesamt geadelt. Der Terminus “Donauschrift” konnte entstehen”)<sup>12</sup>. She then continues by emphasizing some results of Gheorghe Lazarovici’s and Marco Merlini’s investigations, who tackled again the topic of the tablets following the two above mentioned exhibitions. She states that, just like Vlassa before them, they only photographed the front (the inscribed side) of the tablets. If she had read other papers published by Lazarovici and Merlini on the same topic after 2005, she would have seen other photographs too<sup>13</sup>. Also, they supposedly established that the tablets were cleaned using a hydrochloric acid solution and, for preservation purposes, they were treated using nitro varnish and then re-fired. The truth is that, although with a certain delay, Vlassa himself admitted that both the tablets and the idols, which had been covered by a calcareous crust, were immersed in a hydrochloric acid bath, and it was only after this treatment that the signs incised on the tablets became visible, subsequently undergoing an air-free impregnation process of the tablets in an autoclave, using a reversible impregnating agent, for preservation purposes<sup>14</sup>. Contrary to Mrs. Qasim’s claims, who reiterated an old, yet unfounded accusation against Vlassa, the tablets were *not* re-fired, but placed *in a drying chamber at a low temperature*, as also stated in the paper which E. Qasim quoted but read superficially<sup>15</sup>. E. Qasim also claims that the bones found together with the tablets (without specifying

<sup>7</sup> Falkenstein 1965.

<sup>8</sup> See Milošević 1965, p. 264-267.

<sup>9</sup> It is not our intention to review, in this paper, the vast literature written on the Tărtăria tablets; however, we will cite below some of the most important papers from the viewpoint of this discussion. The complete bibliography before 1990 can be found in Makkay 1990, p. 124-160 (References) and 161-175 (Literature). The literature from the last quarter of a century was cited in Lazarovici, Merlini 2005; Lazarovici, Merlini 2008; Merlini 2009; Lazarovici, Lazarovici, Merlini 2011; and by the authors of the following collective volumes: Marler 2008; Marler 2009; Marler 2014.

<sup>10</sup> See Sinn 2002; Seipel 2003.

<sup>11</sup> The first considerations regarding the symbols and signs on the ceramic objects from the Tordos/Turdaş and their Aegean-Oriental analogies were formulated by the amateur archaeologist Zs. Torma beginning in 1879 (summarized in 1894), followed by the studies of specialists such as A. Voss (1895), P. Reinecke (1899), H. Schmidt (1903), M. Roska (1941), etc. After publishing the new discoveries from Vinča, Banjica, etc., a genuine system of signs of the Turdaş-Vinča culture was determined (see Makkay 1969; Winn 1981). The multiplication of the discoveries of this kind also in other Southeastern European Neolithic cultural environments led to the emergence of views about the Old European Writing, Danube Script, etc.; see details in Makkay 1990; Haarmann 2008a; Haarmann 2008b; Merlini 2009, *passim*.

<sup>12</sup> See Qasim 2013, p. 308 and footnote 6 referring to Lazarovici, Merlini 2005, which leaves the impression that these authors supposedly “invented” the idea of a prehistoric script in the Danube area.

<sup>13</sup> See, for instance, Lazarovici, Lazarovici, Merlini 2011, p. 162-163 and fig. VII.C.3: tablet 1, face and reverse.

<sup>14</sup> Vlassa 1972, p. 371.

<sup>15</sup> See Lazarovici, Merlini 2005, p. 211-212.

what kind of bones they were) were radiocarbon dated to 5469-5077 Cal BC (with 95.3% probability). But, the quoted source of information (referred to in footnote 11) talks about the date 5370-5140 Cal BC (1  $\sigma$  probability) for the human skeleton bones found in the ritual pit and the date 5280-5060 Cal BC (1  $\sigma$ ) for the animal bones found in the pit house nearby<sup>16</sup>. Anyhow, in E. Qasim's opinion, that was the moment after which the Tărtăria settlement site and findings were no longer dated using the clay tablets (meaning, if we understood it correctly, at the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium BC, by chronological synchronization with Mesopotamia), but by the radiocarbon dating of the bones: it was established that the site and objects (Fundort und Kleinfunde) belonged to the Vinča A or B1 phase and were dated to the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> millennium BC. E. Qasim overlooks the fact that the supporters of the high chronology objected from the very beginning against the dating of the findings in the Tărtăria layer I based on the presumed Mesopotamian connections of the tablets and they chose their dating depending on the existing <sup>14</sup>C age determinations related to the various sites of the Vinča culture period<sup>17</sup>. So, the new data mentioned above, obtained for the Tărtăria findings, only confirmed the high chronology data estimated previously on the basis of the <sup>14</sup>C measurements.

If we accept these early data, any insistence on the presumed direct Mesopotamian connections of any kind with the Tărtăria clay tablets (and the Vinča-Turdaş finds, in general) loses its meaning and any debate actually becomes purposeless. Disregarding this evidence, E. Qasim forcedly (and *post festa*, we may add) reopened the debate on the time gap between “the spindle whorls and loom weights of the Vinča culture from the 6<sup>th</sup> millennium BC and the Sumerian signs on the clay tablets of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium BC” and argues that it is still unclear what connections one could establish between Vinča/Tărtăria and Djemdet Nasr/Fara-Şuruppak. Mrs. Qasim disregards the fact that, despite some reserves expressed over time, we may safely state today that the relative and absolute chronological position of the Tărtăria tablets has been satisfactorily clarified by establishing the archaeological background (*i.e.* the Vinča-Turdaş culture) to which they belong. Thus, E. Qasim's question becomes purely rhetorical and is a see-through pretext for building a case of indictment containing serious accusations against Nicolae Vlăssă and Vladimir Milojević alike. As, in anticipation of what will be discussed hereunder, in her paper, Mrs. E. Qasim aims solely at *accusing Nicolae Vlăssă of forging the Tărtăria clay tablets, having Vladimir Milojević as accomplice* (!), in order to provide proof that would have supported the Heidelberg professor's assumptions of a low chronology of the South-Eastern European Neolithic.

It is well known by the specialists in this matter (yet apparently ignored by E. Qasim) that there were suspicions related to the circumstances of the discovery, origin and chronology of the tablets from the very beginning, yet it is just as true that several archaeologists strived in the last half century to clarify (although not always in Tacitus' spirit, “sine ira et studio”, nevertheless in good faith), with arguments and in the interest of the academic research, the “enigma” of the Tărtăria tablets<sup>18</sup>. We find it very odd that now,

<sup>16</sup> See Lazarovici, Merlini 2005, p. 208. In Lazarovici, Merlini 2008 (not quoted by E. Qasim), fig. 5, we find the following dates for the human bones: 5370-5140 cal BC (68.2%), 5470-5060 cal BC (95.4%), 5480-5030 (99.7%).

<sup>17</sup> See Quitta 1967. Vlăssă himself was aware of the fact that the dating resulting from the oriental analogies of the tablets were too low compared with the existing <sup>14</sup>C age determinations (e.g. the conventional/uncalibrated data 4010±85, proposed for the end of the Vinča A phase), see Vlăssă 1963, p. 494 and note 18, with the reference to Quitta 1960, p. 164 and chronologic table, p. 184.

<sup>18</sup> See above, note 9. In the last decade, in particular Gh. Lazarovici and M. Merlini deserve our acknowledgement for clarifying many of the controversial issues related to the recovery circumstances and interpretation of the tablets, including carrying out expertise and laboratory analyses (see Lazarovici, Merlini 2005; Lazarovici, Merlini 2008; Merlini 2009; Lazarovici, Lazarovici, Merlini 2011). Unfortunately, beyond the repeated references to the results of these analyses, neither the *analysis report* resulting from the petrographic investigations on the raw material of the tablets, nor the *report* regarding the anthropological and paleopathological expertise carried out on the human remains discovered by Vlăssă in the “ritual pit”, have been published thus far. We refrain from commenting upon the amazing story created on Milady Tărtăria, “reborn” from disparate human bones discovered by Vlăssă in the “ritual pit”, which became her sacred grave, as the humble pit house nearby was advanced as the former residence of this Lady, priestess or sorcerer. The papers cited also make reference to various excavation documents and other unpublished documentary materials, kept in the Vlăssă archive, including his PhD thesis. It is not the disparate, “step by step” mention of these documents that would be fair and worthy of the memory of the too early departed archaeologist, but the full publication, in a volume, of Vlăssă's scientific heritage. In our turn, we also tried to contribute to clarifying some controversial issues related to the Tărtăria excavations from 1961, also motivated by the fact that, as a student, I participated in these excavations alongside Vlăssă; see László 2009; László 2011. Most of the conclusions drawn then are still valid today.

50 years later, it is possible to publish in a prestigious journal extremely serious accusations (and, let us add, in the absence of convincing evidence) against two archaeologists who are no longer alive and cannot defend themselves in this unfair debate.

First, E. Qasim notes that Vlassa found it important to point out the correspondence with different Mesopotamian finds and that he reached the conclusion that the best analogies for the signs on the Tărtăria tablets were to be found among the signs on the archaic tablets of the Uruk IVa and Djemdet Nasr period. In order to support those analogies, Vlassa quoted examples from the Assyriology literature<sup>19</sup>. Thus, in addition to the “standard” work in the field<sup>20</sup>, he also referred to other six works, some of which were not strictly specialized, but belonged to the category of literature designed for the wider audiences. This does not escape E. Qasim’s vigilance who also notes that Vlassa did not quote in detail Falkenstein’s book, but used for comparison purposes, together with the photographs and drawings of his own pieces, reproductions of the tablets dated to the Uruk Age, according to A.I. Tjumenev and S.N. Kramer<sup>21</sup>. She then argues that nine of the approximately twenty signs on the Tărtăria tablets have direct correspondence only in the drawings appearing on the tablets reproduced in such a piece of “secondary literature” (*i.e.* by Tjumenev), which, E. Qasim claims, could be in itself a signal to the possible forgery of the Tărtăria tablets: “Von ca. zwanzig in den Tărtăria Tafelchen zu isolierenden Zeichen finden neun direkte Entsprechungen in den Umzeichnungen jener Tjumenevschen Tontafeln (Abb. 3 und Tab. 1). Damit geriet eine mögliche Fälschung der Tărtăria-Tafelchen ins Visier”<sup>22</sup>. In what these remarks are concerned, it is worth mentioning that indeed Vlassa did not find in the Romanian libraries of the 1960’s specialized Assyriology literature, since there were no Romanian specialists in this discipline then<sup>23</sup>. As a good expert in the field noted, Vlassa quoted, but probably did not use Falkenstein’s fundamental work (1936). Thus, contrary to the malicious remark of E. Qasim, one may consider it a true performance that, relying solely on comparisons with the Assyriology literature for the wider audiences, Vlassa succeeded to find parallels for the signs on the Tărtăria tablets<sup>24</sup>.

As regards the proper theme of her paper, E. Qasim discusses the similarities and differences between the technique, shape, size and partition of the surface of the tablets from Tărtăria and Mesopotamia, and continues with the analysis and comparison of the signs identified on the Tărtăria tablets. It should be noted once again that E. Qasim ignores the contributions of those who dwelt on this issue in the past, and especially the study of A. Falkenstein, the first Assyriologist who thoroughly checked Vlassa’s conclusions and who comparatively examined, one by one, the signs from the Tărtăria tablets and their early Mesopotamian parallels. He established the existence of certain similarities in terms of the form of the tablets, the division of the surface in columns and partitions (Fächer), in which the signs were then inscribed. He noticed that, from the 20 (or 24, with variants) signs on the second and third Tărtăria tablets, precise analogies were drawn for five, and similar forms were found for six among the archaic texts from Uruk (in German, *Archaische Texte aus Uruk*, abbreviated: ATU)<sup>25</sup>. All the 11 correspondences belong to the Uruk IIIb period (Jemdet Nasr), which can be dated to the time frame between 2800 and 2750 BC, also representing the chronological reference for dating the Tărtăria tablets. In Falkenstein’s opinion, the correlations established between the Tărtăria clay tablets and the Sumerian ones indicate an impulse (Anregung) from Mesopotamia. At the same time, he stressed the fact that, unlike the Mesopotamian written clay tablets, the Tărtăria tablets were made from coarse material, were perforated (in order to be suspended?) and fired, the signs were incised (not impressed), the signs for numbers (characteristic to the Mesopotamian tablets, having an economic character) were (partially?) missing, etc. We should also evoke another fact ignored by E. Qasim, namely, that after 1965, the starting point of the debates on the possible links of the Tărtăria tablets with the Mesopotamian writing was Adam Falkenstein’s analysis, carried out from the perspective of a renowned Assyriologist, and not the general discoveries of the young prehistorian Nicolae Vlassa. As Emilia Masson underlined,

<sup>19</sup> Vlassa 1963, p. 492, footnotes 13-14.

<sup>20</sup> Falkenstein 1936.

<sup>21</sup> Vlassa 1963, fig. 9-10: archaic tablets at Uruk-Warka IV and Djemdet Nasr, after Tjumenev 1956 and Kramer 1962.

<sup>22</sup> Qasim 2013, p. 309.

<sup>23</sup> See also Masson 1984, p. 116.

<sup>24</sup> Makkay 1990, p. 28.

<sup>25</sup> Falkenstein 1965, p. 271-272, Abb. 1.

A. Falkenstein's fundamental study also represented a "bailment" for the Tărtăria tablets, and an impulse for a series of other articles (we quote: "...l'étude fondamentale du grand sumérologue A. Falkenstein, parue dès 1965 [...] a apporté une certaine caution à ces documents et donné l'impulsion à une série d'articles"; "...A. Falkenstein qui donne une analyse fondamentale aussi bien des aspects matériels que paléographiques de ces documents, avec un examen détaillé de chaque signe séparément...")<sup>26</sup>. It is no less true that the tablets could be studied *directly* by the specialists only in exceptional cases. Thus, most researchers were required to make do in their considerations with the photos and drawings published by Vlassa. Even Milojević and Falkenstein used, as reference material, the illustration published by Vlassa. E. Masson (one of the few researchers who had the possibility to study the original tablets in Cluj<sup>27</sup>) did not fail to mention that it was regrettable that Falkenstein had not seen the tablets, but used Vlassa's not entirely accurate copies and, as such, the information he had provided was second-hand<sup>28</sup>.

We do not have any clues pointing to the fact that E. Qasim studied the Tărtăria tablets directly and made new personal observations, justifying her opinion on the forgery of these objects. The same as Milojević, Falkenstein and many other specialists, E. Qasim also used the illustration published by Vlassa as the starting point in her approach<sup>29</sup>. However, unlike Falkenstein's methodical study, E. Qasim did not proceed to an orderly analysis of the Tărtăria tablets, which would have entailed studying the material of the tablets and the "writing" technique, presenting/determining the signs, inventorying them, discussing the recorded signs and signalling (if need be) the Mesopotamian analogies. In her attempt to demonstrate the falsity of the tablets, E. Qasim proceeded exactly the other way around: she selected those signs from the available comparative material presented by Vlassa which also appeared on the Tărtăria tablets. By applying an intricate logic, she thus attempted to demonstrate that the signs represented on the Tărtăria tablets were rendered (= were copied!) following the model of some Mesopotamian signs which were reproduced as an illustration in the popularizing works which were at the disposal of the Transylvanian archaeologist. To support her assertions, alongside the drawings of the second and third Tărtăria tablets, E. Qasim also reproduced in the illustration of her article the comparative material used by Vlassa, marking with her hand (*Freihandzeichnen*), through the same numbers, those signs that were present both in the Mesopotamian comparative material, and on the Tărtăria tablets<sup>30</sup>. Those signs were also introduced in a table which indicated, in a separate column, the analogies from the Archaic Texts from Uruk<sup>31</sup>. In Qasim's opinion, five signs (nos. 10, 6, 8, 7, 5, according to her own numbering) had direct correspondences in the Tjumenev 1 tablet; the signs 3a and 11a were derived from signs no. 3 and no. 11 (through their intentional truncation) on the same tablet. Sign no. 4 was the imitation of a damaged sign from the Tjumenev 1 tablet. Sign no. 6 also appears on the Tjumenev 2 tablet, from where sign no. 17 was taken. A variant of sign no. 17, as well as signs 3a and 18, can also be found on the Blau tablet. To sum up, it results that there is a direct correspondence between 11 signs from the Tjumenev transcriptions (*Umzeichnungen*), taken over by Vlassa, the Blau tablets, and the two Tărtăria tablets. E. Qasim also states that in the case of the Tărtăria tablets the position (straight or rotated at 90°) of the signs from the model-tablets is disregarded, and the signs are combined arbitrarily. At this point of the discussion, E. Qasim does not hesitate to reiterate her accusations: in her opinion, the high number of

<sup>26</sup> Masson 1984, p. 112, note 60; p. 117, note 76.

<sup>27</sup> See Masson 1984, p. 102, 116.

<sup>28</sup> Masson 1984, p. 112, note 60. On the other hand, according to another piece of information, till 1971, the Tărtăria tablets were examined directly by two Assyriologists, *i.e.* A. Falkenstein and S.N. Kramer, but the latter did not publish his observations; see Makkay 1990, p. 29 and note 3 (p. 129-130), where the author refers to a verbal piece of information received from N. Vlassa, without offering more precise data. It would be interesting, for the history of the research, to clarify whether or not Falkenstein ever had direct access to study the tablets.

<sup>29</sup> Qasim 2013, Abb. 1.

<sup>30</sup> See Qasim 2013, Abb. 2-3-4: the drawing of two Mesopotamian tablets, taken from Tjumenev 1956, and the image of a so-called Blau tablet. We make a point also of the fact that E. Qasim is not consistent in numbering the Tărtăria tablets, sometimes using Vlassa's numbering, other times E. Masson's, thus creating confusion.

<sup>31</sup> Qasim 2013, p. 212-213, Tab.1. We remind the fact that the correspondences between the signs from the Tărtăria tablets and the signs of the archaic texts from Uruk (ATU) were established by Falkenstein in 1965, but the results of the famous Assyriologist were not mentioned by E. Qasim!

correspondences between the analogies cited from the secondary literature and the signs from the Tărtăria tablets show that we are facing a forgery: “Die Anzahl der Übereinstimmungen zwischen den transskribierten Referenzobjekten aus der Sekundärliteratur und der Tărtăria-Täfelchen lässt so weit auf eine Fälschung schliessen”.<sup>32</sup> Among the differences between the signs on the Tărtăria tablets and the ones on the Mesopotamian tablets E. Qasim notices the fact (already remarked by Falkenstein in 1965) that the signs for numbers, which are constantly present on the compartmentalized Mesopotamian tablets (which contain economic texts), cannot be identified on the Tărtăria tablets. However, Qasim finds that the sign in the form of the letter D, followed by two small circles (marked with no. 7 on the Tiumenev 1 tablet and on the second Tărtăria tablet) can be identified with the conventional sign used in the Assyriology literature for the graphic transcription of the signs impressed on the clay tablets, corresponding to the numbers 1 and 10. In order to perfect her “indictment”, E. Qasim appreciates that those two signs (in fact: two simple motifs, a semicircle or half-moon and circle), which do not have correspondences in the real Mesopotamian signs, were imitations of the conventional transcriptions of certain signs copied from the secondary Assyriology literature, constituting another “proof” of the falsity of the tablets published by Vlassa (“Übereinstimmungen mit und Abweichungen von den Zeichen des sumerischen Schriftzeicheninventars erklären sich aus den Umschriftveröffentlichungen der in den 60<sup>er</sup> Jahren des vorigen Jahrhunderts verfügbaren Sekundärliteratur. Der Befund deutet auch diesmal auf eine Fälschung hin”)<sup>33</sup>. No comment!

In the closing part of her article, E. Qasim states that Vlassa would have postulated the “migration” (Wanderung) of some Sumerian model-tablets to Transylvania and, as such, the signs started to be used there too, and the Tărtăria tablets would have been dated around 2600 BC. In actual fact, Vlassa spoke, prudently, only as a *working hypothesis*, about the *circulation of the objects or influences* from Mesopotamia, and dated the tablets to *circa* 2900–2700 BC (see above). After asking the rhetorical question *Cui bono?* E. Qasim states, without proof or embarrassment, that there are several things that indicate the collaboration of the young archaeologist Nicolae Vlassa and the older scientist Vladimir Milojević (it goes without saying, in falsifying the tablets), in order to confirm the Heidelberg professor’s conception regarding the late neolithisation of the Balkans, a phenomenon that would have taken place around 3000 BC only: “Manches spricht für eine Zusammenarbeit des 27jährigen N. Vlassa und des älteren V. Milojević, dessen These von der späten, erst um 3000 v. Chr. erfolgten bäuerlichen Besiedlung des Balkans so bestätigt werden konnte”<sup>34</sup>.

Even in the light of what has been discussed above, we believe that, for any unbiased reader, Qasim’s accusations are as serious as they are unfounded and irresponsible; they have no basis apart from the unwarranted speculations regarding the copying of the signs from the “secondary literature”.

The accusations at Vlassa’s address, whose publications were received from the very beginning with some reservations by some of the specialists, are not as surprising as those malicious suspicions harboured in relation to V. Milojević’s complicity to the alleged falsification of the Tărtăria tablets. Milojević made it clear, in the introduction of his paper, that he became aware of the discoveries from Tărtăria (the same as Falkenstein, for that matter) from Vlassa’s preliminary report, published in the *Dacia* journal<sup>35</sup>. Those from Milojević’s entourage at Heidelberg, who are still alive, could confirm it. In any case, E. Qasim does not bring any argument to support her conspiracy theory.

In this regard, we only stress the fact that not only some complicity between the two archaeologists was not possible, but quite the contrary, Vlassa held a certain resentment against Milojević (and Falkenstein), which he maintained until the end of his life. In 1981, he confessed to a colleague that certain circles intentionally delayed the English publication in the *Dacia* journal of his article on the Tărtăria discoveries, with the intention to give the credit related to highlighting the importance of these discoveries in front of the international scientific world to Falkenstein and Milojević, through their studies published in *Germania*. This displeasure is allegedly the reason Vlassa did not publish the full results on the 1961 Tărtăria excavations and did not continue his research at this archaeological site<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> Qasim 2013, p. 316.

<sup>33</sup> Qasim 2013, p. 315.

<sup>34</sup> Qasim 2013, p. 316.

<sup>35</sup> See Milojević 1965, p. 261.

<sup>36</sup> Makkay 1990, p. 15; see also Vlassa, 1972, p. 368, note 5.

It is interesting that, while making accusations at Miložčić's address, E. Qasim avoids any allusion to Falkenstein's role, the one who checked Vlassa's initial conclusions, and confirmed the Mesopotamian character of some of the signs on the Tărtăria tablets, and admitting the existence of Djemdet Nasr influences on the Transylvanian Neolithic, thus supporting Vladimir Miložčić's view. Falkenstein's professional authority represented a guarantee for many specialists in the interpretation of the tablets, his study being the starting point for new discussions. The tablets were recorded as far back as 1965 in the Bibliography of cuneiform script (*Keilschriftbibliographie*, published in *Orientalia*, periodical of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome)<sup>37</sup> and a long series of studies concerning these discoveries began to be published<sup>38</sup>. Some specialists followed the path opened by Falkenstein, appropriating the idea of the Mesopotamian influences and the chronological value of the tablets, in the sense of supporting the later dating of the Southeast European Neolithic<sup>39</sup>. J. Harmatta and others even attempted to "translate" the text of the tablets<sup>40</sup>. J. Makkay gathered the whole information that had been accumulated starting with Zsófia Torma's activity (second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century), defining the *system of signs* of the Vinča-Turdaş culture ("the Tordos group of signs"), which appeared, in his view, under the influence of the early Mesopotamian writing, and then wrote a monograph on the issues of the Tărtăria tablets<sup>41</sup>.

Other specialists did not exclude the Mesopotamian influences. However, given the long chronology of the European prehistory (based on the <sup>14</sup>C measurements), they believed that the tablets and the dating resulting from the connections with the Sumerian texts (beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium BC), would be linked to a later period (especially the Coţofeni Chalcolithic habitation level) of the Tărtăria site<sup>42</sup>.

Another significant group of researchers did not doubt the belonging of the tablets to the Vinča-Turdaş culture, but rejected their alleged Mesopotamian connections, considering that the similarities between the Sumerian pictograms and the signs on the Tărtăria tablets (and on other objects from the Vinča-Turdaş period) were too general and could not prove the existence of a chronological contact. Hans Quitta was very clear in this respect, from the very beginning: "Dabei liegen unsere Zweifel weniger auf der Zeitstellung der Tărtăria-Funde, die durch die Vinča-Idole und Verwandte Symbolritzungen auf der Keramik anderer Vinča-Siedlungen (und auch der Linearbandkeramik!) hinreichend gesichert erscheint, als vielmehr auf dem Versuch, diese Zeichen auf Einflüsse der frühsumerischen Schrift zurückzuführen [...] Die von A. Falkenstein festgestellten Parallelen zu den djemdet-nasrzeitlichen Texten aus Uruk Schicht IIIb betreffen [...] nur sehr allgemeine Übereinstimmungen, die einen zeitlichen Kontakt mit den älteren Vinča-Kultur keinesfalls schlüssig beweisen"<sup>43</sup>. D. Berciu, after some hesitation, also rejected the idea of the influences of the Mesopotamian writing, and argued that the signs on the Tărtăria tablets were abstract signs<sup>44</sup>. Neither did C. Renfrew recognize the validity of the comparison between the Sumerian signs and those on the Tărtăria tablets, thus the Eastern origin of the Vinča writing, respectively: "To me, the comparisons made between the signs on the Tărtăria tablets and those of the proto-literate Sumer carry very little weight"<sup>45</sup>. S.M.M. Winn, same as Makkay, spoke of a *sign system* of the Vinča (-Turdaş) culture, similar to a "pre-writing" phenomenon in Southeast Europe but, unlike the Hungarian archaeologist, he believed that it occurred independently, without any Mesopotamian influence<sup>46</sup>. Emilia Masson also remarked the fact that the signs on the Tărtăria tablets had often been commented upon based on their similarities with the archaic Sumerian signs, disregarding the fact that most of them had common features, widespread in time and space, characteristic to the "proto-literate" periods : "[les signes] sont toujours commentées en fonction d'une

<sup>37</sup> See *Orientalia* 34, 1965, p. 134; *Orientalia* 35, 1966, p. 90, quoted *apud* Makkay 1990, p. 29 (text) and 129 (note 1).

<sup>38</sup> See above, note 9. In what follows, we will cite only a few examples.

<sup>39</sup> Gelb 1967; Hood 1967; Makkay 1967; Makkay 1968.

<sup>40</sup> Harmatta 1966.

<sup>41</sup> Makkay 1969; Makkay 1990.

<sup>42</sup> Thomas 1967, p. 37; Höckmann 1968, p. 65-66; Neustupný 1968; Dumitrescu 1972; Whipp 1973; Zanotti 1983, p. 211-212; Dumitrescu, Bolomey, Mogoşanu 1983, p. 88-89.

<sup>43</sup> Quitta 1967, p. 120.

<sup>44</sup> Berciu 1967, p. 49 and 161-162: Postscriptum.

<sup>45</sup> Renfrew 1973, p. 204.

<sup>46</sup> Winn 1981.

resemblance avec des caractères archaïques sumériens, sans tenir compte du fait que la plupart d’entre eux présentent des tracés ordinaires qui constituent, comme on l’a observé, le lot commun d’un bon nombre de répertoires...”<sup>47</sup>. She observed with regret that Falkenstein’s study was not based on a broader comparative material, but started *a priori* from the idea that the Tărtăria tablets were the result of Sumerian impulses and thus he neglected many of the discrepancies occurring even among his own comparisons: “On regrettera surtout que l’étude fondamentale de Falkenstein [...] n’ait pas été fondée sur un registre plus large : partant a priori de l’idée que les tablettes de Tărtăria résultent d’une « impulsion » sumérienne, il semble négliger les nombreuses divergences qui apparaissent pourtant à travers ses propres comparaisons”<sup>48</sup>.

It seems that one of the main causes behind the differences of opinion regarding the interpretation of the signs on the Tărtăria tablets (a kind of “original sin”), was *an incorrect identification of the shape for a number of signs*<sup>49</sup>. The various analyses, wax imprints, macro-photographies and microscopic studies recently carried out highlighted the fact that it was very difficult to establish the exact form of the signs. The coarse clay composition the tables were made from, as well as the “writing” instrument which was not fine enough, did not allow for the drawing of precise lines. To this adds the clumsiness of the “scribe” who also made involuntary scribbles, and “unfortunately, a number of those scribbles had been recognized as true signs of literacy by some scholars”<sup>50</sup>. Following the treatment with hydrochloric acid, the surface of the tablets was altered; some signs were deformed, cracks appeared here and there, which were interpreted as incisions, and thus some authors “discovered” signs that did not actually exist. Most researchers could not study the tablets directly and, consequently, used the low quality photos and the not entirely accurate drawings published by Vlassa. To all these, the observer’s subjectivity, one’s tendency to see only what one expects to see, is also added; for example: “...scholars who have in mind the script choice connected with the Sumerian pictograms are inclined to point to the similarity in shape with those early signs of literacy”<sup>51</sup>.

The lack of precision of the copies published by Vlassa, serving then as a work tool for those who later dealt with the tablets (including E. Qasim) was also remarked upon by E. Masson, who had the possibility to personally study those items: “Un examen minutieux de ces inscriptions m’a permis de constater que les copies publiées dans *Dacia*, lesquelles ont servi d’instrument de travail aux spécialistes qui les ont étudiées depuis, manquent de précision et même ne reproduisent pas complètement le dessin de certains signes (voir analyse paléographique)”<sup>52</sup>. It was also Masson who summarised the suspicions formulated over time on the discovery circumstances and the authenticity of the tablets (*i.e.* were they indeed discovered in Tărtăria, or somewhere else, close by; did they come from Turdaş or even from the Zsófia Torma collection; were they fakes of the 19<sup>th</sup> century or more recent ones, surreptitiously introduced in the excavation, etc.), suspicions which were the consequence of the poor documentation of the excavations and the incomplete publication of the discoveries. In her opinion, even though the location, date and conditions of the discovery of the tablets remain uncertain until further clarifications, the careful examination of the tablets, the existence of the wear traces on their surface, for example, *attest to the fact that they were not fakes*: “...on observe notamment sur les tablettes 1 et 2 des traces d’usure, des parties de signes un peu effacées ou des fissures fréquentes autour des gravures. De tels phénomènes témoignent en faveur de l’ancienneté ; s’il s’agissait de faux, leur fabrication serait à attribuer à un grand expert dans la matière, en même temps fin connaisseur des écritures archaïques qu’à ma connaissance la Roumanie ne possède pas”<sup>53</sup>.

Another fact can be added to these observations: in the case of a fake, the forger would have striven to produce an object as faithfully similar as possible to the Mesopotamian model which he wanted to imitate, would have taken care to choose quality raw material, and to respect the format of the tablets (which should not have been perforated and fired), to apply the corresponding writing techniques (by impression), and to

<sup>47</sup> Masson 1984, p. 122.

<sup>48</sup> Masson 1984, p. 122, note 95.

<sup>49</sup> Lazarovici, Lazarovici, Merlini 2011, p. 239.

<sup>50</sup> Lazarovici, Lazarovici, Merlini 2011, p. 240.

<sup>51</sup> Lazarovici, Lazarovici, Merlini 2011, p. 239-244; by comparing Fig. IX.1-3, the differences between the drawings of the tablets published by Vlassa, Winn and Masson can be noticed.

<sup>52</sup> Masson 1984, p. 116.

<sup>53</sup> See Masson 1984, p. 114-117.

reproduce some of the most characteristic signs. He would also have taken care to ensure the proper excavation documentation in order to prevent later suspicions regarding the circumstances of the discovery. Beyond these logical arguments, *the factual observations attesting to the authenticity (ancient character) of the tablets*, some of which have already been mentioned above, are decisive. It should also be noted that the existence of a calcareous coating on the surface of the tablets, which had to be removed in order to make the signs visible, was an actual proof of the fact that the objects had lain underground for a sufficiently long period of time to be able to form the lime accumulation. Given that it was established (see above) that the tablets had not been re-fired by Vlassa (but they had been fired in ancient times), it would also be possible to carry out a TL (Thermoluminescence) test in order to establish their age. Recent laboratory investigations showed that the paste from which the Tărtăria tablets were modelled also contained organic materials<sup>54</sup>. This way, it would be possible to carry out <sup>14</sup>C measurements, using the AMS (Accelerator Mass Spectrometry) technique, and the dating thus obtained for the Tărtăria tablets could be compared with the already existing radiocarbon dating of the human and animal bones collected from the ritual pit and from the pit house, belonging to layer I from Tărtăria. The microscopic investigations also highlighted the existence of some fingerprints on the surface of the tablets<sup>55</sup>; by studying them, we could find out information on the person who actually created the tablets (*e.g.* gender, age).

Until such analyses are carried out, the observation resulting from the recent microscopic investigations on the surface of the tablets, according to which, in the grooved outline of some of the signs on the tablets, traces of soil have been found, remains decisive: “The close examination of the tablets indicates remains of soil inside the contour of several signs [...] The humus mixed with rocks and minerals can only come from the ritual pit-grave. This is another factual element in favour of the statement concerning the authenticity of the inscribed artefacts. The presence of the encapsulated soil *excludes the accusations that they are a modern fake not identified by N. Vlassa, or just a “game” of the discoverer*”<sup>56</sup> (my underlining, A. L.).

We hope that the lack of any basis of E. Qasim’s irresponsible accusations addressed at two renowned archaeologists, no longer among us, namely Nicolae Vlassa and Vladimir Milojević, who, in complicity, would have allegedly falsified the much discussed clay tablets from Tărtăria, has become obvious for any reader who perused our paper in good faith. Apart from the scientific impact of the issue, the moral side of such an approach, disgraceful for a researcher, is also difficult to overlook. We can also ask the question: *Cui bono?*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berciu 1967 – D. Berciu, *Romania before Burebista*, London, 1967.  
 Dumitrescu 1972 – V. Dumitrescu, *Turdaş - Mesopotamia*, SCIV 23, 1972, 1, p. 93-109.  
 Dumitrescu, Bolomey, Mogoşanu 1983 – V. Dumitrescu, A. Bolomey, F. Mogoşanu, *Esquisse d’une préhistoire de la Roumanie*, Bucarest, 1983.  
 Falkenstein 1936 – A. Falkenstein, *Archaische Texte aus Uruk. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka*, Bd. II, Leipzig, 1936.  
 Falkenstein 1965 – A. Falkenstein, *Zu den Tontafeln aus Tărtăria*, Germania 43, 1965, p. 269-273.  
 Filip 1966; 1998 – J. Filip (ed.), *Enzyklopädisches Handbuch zur Ur- und Frühgeschichte Europas*, Prag, 1, 1966; 3, 1998.  
 Gelb 1967 – I.J. Gelb, *Comment upon C. Renfrew’s note*, Nestor 112, April 1967, p. 488.  
 Haarmann 2008a – H. Haarmann, *A comparative view of the Danube Script and other Ancient Writing Systems*, in J. Marler (ed.), *The Danube Script: Neo-Eneolithic Writing in Southeastern Europe. Exhibition Catalogue*, National Brukenthal Museum, Sibiu - Institute of Archaeomythology, Sebastopol (USA), 2008, p. 11-22.  
 Haarmann 2008b – H. Haarmann, *The Danube Script and its Legacy: Literacy as a cultural Identifier in the Balcanic - Aegean Convergence Zone*, in J. Marler (ed.), *The Danube Script: Neo-Eneolithic Writing in Southeastern Europe. Exhibition Catalogue*, National Brukenthal Museum, Sibiu - Institute of Archaeomythology, Sebastopol (USA), 2008, p. 61-76.  
 Harhoiu 1992 – R. Harhoiu, *Otto Kurt Horedt*, Dacia N.S. 36, 1992, p. 5-11.

<sup>54</sup> Lazarovici, Merlini 2005, p. 211, fig. 20.

<sup>55</sup> Lazarovici, Lazarovici, Merlini 2011, p. 240.

<sup>56</sup> Lazarovici, Lazarovici, Merlini 2011, p. 244.



- Harmatta 1966 – J. Harmatta, *Neolitikori írásbeliség Közép-Európában?* [Neolithic writing in Central Europe?], *Antik Tanulmányok* 13, 1966, 2, p. 235-236.
- Hood 1967 – M.S.F. Hood, *The Tartaria Tablets*, *Antiquity* 41, 1967, 162, p. 99-114.
- Höckmann 1968 – O. Höckmann, *Die menschengestaltige Figurplastik der südosteuropäischen Jungsteinzeit und Steinkupferzeit*, I-II, Hildesheim, 1968.
- Kramer 1962 – S.N. Kramer, *Istoria începe la Sumer*, București, 1962 [= *History begins at Sumer*, London-New York 1959].
- László 2009 – A. László, *Some aspects of the Tărtăria issue*, in J. Marler (ed.), *Proceedings “Signs and symbols from Danube Neolithic and Eneolithic”*, *International Symposium The Danube Script: Neo-Eneolithic Writing in Southeastern Europe*, Bibliotheca Brukenthal 35, Sibiu, 2009, p. 57-66.
- László 2011 – A. László, *Tartariáról, majd’ötven év után – On Tărtăria, fifty years later*, in Sz. Horváth, M. Kiss, M.H. Rauert (eds.), *„...eleitől fogva”. Régész—tanár—ember: A 75 éves Makkay János köszöntése* [Papers presented to János Makkay on his 75<sup>th</sup> birthday], Pécs, 2011, p. 247-264.
- Lazarovici, Merlini 2005 – Gh. Lazarovici, M. Merlini, *New archaeological data referring to Tărtăria tablets*, *Documenta Praehistorica* 32, 2005, p. 205-219.
- Lazarovici, Merlini 2008 – Gh. Lazarovici, M. Merlini, *New informations and the role of the Tărtăria discoveries*, in J. Marler (ed.), *The Danube Script: Neo-Eneolithic Writing in Southeastern Europe. Exhibition Catalogue*, National Brukenthal Museum, Sibiu - Institute of Archaeomythology, Sebastopol (USA), 2008, p. 39-51.
- Lazarovici, Lazarovici, Merlini 2011 – Gh. Lazarovici, C.-M. Lazarovici, M. Merlini, *Tărtăria and the sacred tablets*, Cluj-Napoca, 2011.
- Makkay 1967 – J. Makkay, *Die in Tărtăria gefundenen piktographischen Tafeln und die Jüngere Steinzeit Südosteuropas*, *MFMÉ* 1966-1967, p. 21-24.
- Makkay 1968 – J. Makkay, *The Tărtăria tablets*, *Orientalia* 37, 1968, 3, p. 272-289.
- Makkay 1969 – J. Makkay, *The Late Neolithic Tordos group of signs*, *Alba Regia* 10, 1969, p. 9-49.
- Makkay 1990 – J. Makkay, *A tartariai leletek* [The Tărtăria findings], Budapest, 1990.
- Marler 2008 – J. Marler (ed.), *The Danube Script: Neo-Eneolithic Writing in Southeastern Europe. Exhibition Catalogue*, National Brukenthal Museum, Sibiu - Institute of Archaeomythology, Sebastopol (USA), 2008.
- Marler 2009 – J. Marler (ed.), *Proceedings “Signs and symbols from Danube Neolithic and Eneolithic”*, *International Symposium The Danube Script: Neo-Eneolithic Writing in Southeastern Europe*, Bibliotheca Brukenthal 35, Sibiu, 2009.
- Marler 2014 – J. Marler (ed.), *Fifty Years of Tărtăria Excavations. Papers presented at the International Symposium “50 Years of Tărtăria Excavations”*, Coronini-Pescari, Romania, 1-5 September 2011, Institute of Archaeomythology, Sebastopol (USA), Suceava, 2014.
- Merlini 2009 – M. Merlini, *An Inquiry into the Danubian Script*, Bibliotheca Brukenthal 33, Sibiu, 2009.
- Masson 1984 – E. Masson, *L’écriture dans les civilisations danubiennes néolithique*, *Kadmos* 32, 1984, 2, p. 89-123.
- Milojčić 1965 – V. Milojčić, *Die Tontafeln von Tărtăria und die absolute Chronologie des mitteleuropäischen Neolithikums*, *Germania* 43, 1965, p. 261-268.
- Neustupný 1968 – E. Neustupný, *The Tărtăria tablets: a chronological issue*, *Antiquity* 42, 1968, 165, p. 32-35.
- Qasim 2013 – E. Qasim, *Die Tărtăria-Täfelchen – eine Neubewertung*, *Das Altertum* 58, 2013, p. 307-318.
- Quitta 1960 – H. Quitta, *Zur Frage der ältesten Bandkeramik in Mitteleuropa*, *PZ* 38, 1960, p. 1-38, 153-188.
- Quitta 1967 – H. Quitta, *Radiocarbonaten und die Chronologie des mittel- und südosteuropäischen Neolithikums*, *Ausgrabungen und Funde* 12, 1967, 3, p. 115-125.
- Reinecke 1899 – P. Reinecke, *Tordos és Trója* [Tordos and Troy], *ArchÉrt* 33, 1899, p. 115-123.
- Renfrew 1973 – C. Renfrew, *Before Civilisation. The radiocarbon revolution and prehistoric Europe*, London-New York, 1973.
- Roska 1941 – M. Roska, *A Torma Zsófia-gyűjtemény az Erdélyi Nemzeti Múzeum Érem- és Régiségtárában – Die Sammlung Zsófia von Torma in der Numismatisch-Archaeologischen Abteilung des Siebenbürgischen Nationalmuseums*, Kolozsvár [Cluj], 1941.
- Schmidt 1903 – H. Schmidt, *Tordos*, *ZfE* 35, 1903, 438-469.
- Seipel 2003 – W. Seipel (ed.), *Der Turmbau zu Babel. Ursprung und Vielfalt von Sprache und Schrift* (see especially Band IIIA: Schrift), Graz, 2003.
- Sinn 2002 – U. Sinn (ed.), *Schrift, Sprache, Bild und Klang. Entwicklungsstufen der Schrift von der Antike bis in die Neuzeit*, Nachrichten aus dem Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität Würzburg, Reihe A, Antikensammlung 4, Würzburg, 2002.

- Soroceanu 1999 – T. Soroceanu, *Kurt Horedt. Eine Persönlichkeit in bewegten Zeiten*, in N. Boroffka, T. Soroceanu (eds.), *Transsilvanica. Archäologische Untersuchungen zur älteren Geschichte des südöstlichen Mitteleuropa. Gedenkschrift für Kurt Horedt*, Rahden/Westf., 1999, p. 11-17.
- Soroceanu 2014 – T. Soroceanu, *Kurt Horedt. La centenarul nașterii – Kurt Horedt. Zum hundertjährigen Jubiläum seiner Geburt*, in S. Cociș (ed.), *Archäologische Beiträge. Gedenkschrift zum hundersten Geburtstag von Kurt Horedt*, Cluj-Napoca, 2014, p. 9-15.
- Thomas 1967 – H.L. Thomas, *Near Eastern, Mediterranean and European chronology*, SMA 17, 1-2, Lund, 1967.
- Tjumenev 1956 – A.I. Tjumenev, *Gosudarstvennoe hozjajstvo drevnego Šumera*, Moskva – Leningrad, 1956.
- Torma 1894 – Zs. (S. von) Torma, *Ethnographische Analogien. Ein Beitrag zur Gestaltungs- und Entwicklungsgeschichte der Religionen*, Jena, 1894.
- Vlassa 1963 – N. Vlassa, *Chronology of the Neolithic in Transylvania, in the light of the Tărtăria settlement's stratigraphy*, Dacia N.S. 7, 1963, p. 485-494.
- Vlassa 1972 – N. Vlassa, *Zona balcano-asiatică și Transilvania. Răspuns unei note polemice* [The Balkan-Asian area and Transylvania – reply to a polemical note], ActaMN 9, 1972, p. 367-373.
- Voss 1895 – A. Voss, *Siebenbürgische und bosnische Funde (Tordosch und Butmir)*, Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, Berlin, 1895, p. 125-135.
- Winn 1981 – S.M.M. Winn, *Pre-writing in Southeastern Europe: the sign system of the Vinča culture*, Calgary, 1981.
- Whipp 1973 – D. Whipp, *The Tartaria tablets*, Antiquity 47, 1973, 186, p. 147-149.
- Zanotti 1983 – D.G. Zanotti, *The position of the Tărtăria tablets within the Southeast European Copper Age*, AJA 87, 1983, p. 209-213.

## ABRÉVIATIONS

- AA – Archäologischer Anzeiger. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Darmstadt, München, Tübingen – Berlin  
AAIN – Annali dell’Istituto Italiano di Numismatica, Roma  
AARMSI – Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice, București  
Academica – Academica. Revistă editată de Academia Română, București  
ACSS – Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia, Bordeaux – Moscow  
ActaArchCop – Acta Archaeologica, Copenhagen  
ActaArchHung – Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Budapest  
ActaMM – Acta Moldaviae Meridionalis, Vaslui  
ActaMN – Acta Musei Napocensis. Muzeul Național de Istorie a Transilvaniei, Cluj-Napoca  
ActaMP – Acta Musei Porolissensis. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Artă, Zalău  
ActaMV – Acta Musei Varnaensis, Varna  
ActaMT – Acta Musei Tutovens, Muzeul „Vasile Pârvan”, Bârlad  
ActaPraehArch – Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica, Berlin  
ActaTS – Acta Terrae Septemcastrensis. Institutul pentru Cercetarea Patrimoniului Cultural Transilvănean în Context European, Sibiu  
AÉ – L’Année Épigraphique, Paris  
AEM – Archäologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn, Wien  
AISC – Anuarul Institutului de Studii Clasice, Cluj-Napoca  
AJA – American Journal of Archaeology, Boston  
AJS – The American Journal of Sociology, Chicago  
Alba Regia – Alba Regia. Annales Musei Stephani regis, Székesfehérvár  
Aluta – Muzeul Național Secuiesc, Sfântu Gheorghe  
Alt-Hildesheim – Alt-Hildesheim. Jahrbuch für Stadt und Stift Hildesheim, Hildesheim  
AM – Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung, Athen  
American Anthropologist – American Anthropologist. Journal of the American Anthropological Association, ([http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1548-1433](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1548-1433))  
American Antiquity – American Antiquity. Society for American Archaeology, Washington  
Anatolia Antiqua – Anatolia Antiqua, Istanbul  
AnB – Analele Banatului, Muzeul Banatului, Timișoara  
Ancient Philosophy – Ancient Philosophy, Duquesne University, Pittsburg  
AncWestEast – Ancient West & East, Leiden  
AnnalesESC – Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations, Paris  
AnnalesHSS – Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales, Paris  
Annals of Science – Annals of Science, Taylor and Francis Online (<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tasc20>)  
ANSNS – American Numismatic Society. Numismatic Studies, New York  
AnUA-SH – Annales Universitatis Apulensis, Series Historica, Alba Iulia  
AnUBucurești – Analele Universității București, București  
Angustia – Angustia. Arheologie, Etnografie, Sfântu Gheorghe  
ANSMN – American Numismatic Society; Museum Notes, New York  
AntCl – L’antiquité Classique, Revue interuniversitaire d’études classiques  
Antik Tanulmányok – Antik Tanulmányok. Studia Antiqua, Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest  
Antiquitas – Antiquitas, Museo Historico Municipal de Priego, Cordoba  
Antiquités Nationales – Antiquités Nationales, Musée des Antiquités Nationales, Saint-Germain-en-Laye  
Antiquity – Antiquity. A Review of World Archaeology, Durham  
AO – Arhivele Olteniei, Craiova  
APS News – The American Physical Society News  
Apulum – Apulum. Acta Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii, Alba Iulia  
Archaeological Dialogues – Archaeological Dialogues, Cambridge

- Archaeometry – Archaeometry, The Society for Archaeological Science, Gesellschaft für Naturwissenschaftliche, Associazione Italiana di Archeometria, University of Oxford, Wiley
- ArchBulg – Archaeologia Bulgarica, Sofia
- ArchÉrt – Archeológiai Értesítő, Budapest
- ArchHung – Archaeologia Hungarica, Acta Archaeologica Musei Nationalis Hungarici, Budapest
- ArchKorr – Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt, Mainz
- ArchRozhledy – Archeologické Rozhledy, Praha
- ArheologijaSSSR – Arheologija Soyuz Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik, Moskova
- ArhMold – Arheologia Moldovei. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie, Iași
- ArhSofia – Arheologija. Organ na Arheologičeskija i Muzej, Sofia
- Arqueologia y Territorio Medieval – Arqueologia y Territorio Medieval, Universidad de Jaén, Jaén
- Ausgrabungen und Funde – Ausgrabungen und Funde, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Sektion für Vor- und Frühgeschichte; Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR. Zentralinstitut für Alte Geschichte und Archäologie
- BARIntSer – British Archaeological Reports, International Series, Oxford
- BerRGK – Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Frankfurt am Main
- BCH – Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, Athènes – Paris
- BHAUT – Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Universitatis Timisiensis, Timișoara Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Universitatis Timisiensis, Timișoara
- Bibliotheca Ephemeris Napocensis – Bibliotheca Ephemeris Napocensis, Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei al Academiei Române, Cluj-Napoca
- Bibliotheca Historica Romaniae. Monographies – Bibliotheca Historica Romaniae. Monographies, Academia Republicii Socialiste România, Secția Științe Istorice, București
- Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis – Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis, Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei al Academiei Române, Cluj-Napoca
- BJb – Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums in Bonn, Bonn
- BMC, I – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, I, Augustus to Vittelius*, London, 1923.
- BMC, II – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, II, Vespasian to Domitian*, London, 1930.
- BMC, III – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, III, Nerva to Hadrian*, London, 1936
- BMC, IV – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, IV, Antoninus Pius to Commodus*, London, 1940.
- BMC, V – H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, V, Pertinax to Elagabalus*, London, 1950.
- BMC, VI – R. A. G. Carson, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, VI, Severus Alexander to Balbinus and Pupienus*, London, 1962.
- BMI – Buletinul Monumentelor Istorice, București
- BMJT – Buletinul Muzeului Județean Teleorman, Alexandria
- BMTAGiurgiu – Buletinul Muzeului „Teohari Antonescu”, Giurgiu
- Bosporskie issledovanija – Bosporskie Issledovanija (Études bosporaines), Académie nationale ukrainienne des sciences, Simferopol
- BSFN – Bulletin de la Société Française de Numismatique, Paris
- BSNR – Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române, București
- BTM Mühely – BTM Mühely, Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, Budapest
- Budapest Régiségei – Budapest Régiségei, Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, Budapest
- BulBOR – Buletinul Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București
- Buridava – Buridava. Muzeul Județean Vâlcea, Râmnicu Vâlcea
- CA – Cercetări Arheologice. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, București
- CAB – Cercetări Arheologice în București, Muzeul Municipiului București, București
- Caiete ARA – Caiete ARA. Arhitectură, Restaurare, Arheologie. Asociația ARA, București
- Cahiers des Sciences Humaines – Cahiers des Sciences Humaines, O.R.S.T.O.M. (Agency: France)

- CAJ – Cambridge Archaeological Journal  
 CANT – Cercetări arheologice în aria nord-tracă, București (I – 1995, II – 1997, III - 1999)  
 Carpica – Carpica, Carpica. Complexul Muzeal „Julian Antonescu” Bacău, Bacău  
 CCA, campania ..... – Cronica Cercetărilor Arheologice din România, București  
 CCDJ – Cultură și Civilizație la Dunărea de Jos, Muzeul “Dunării de Jos”, Călărași  
 CCGG – Cahiers du Centre Gustav-Glotz, Publications de la Sorbonne, Paris  
 Centaurus – Centaurus, European Society for the History of Science, John Wiley & Sons Ltd  
 CercIst – Cercetări Istorice, Iași  
 Chiron – Mitteilungen der Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, München  
 Chronica Valachica – Chronica Valachica. Studii și materiale de istorie și istorie a culturii, Târgoviște  
 Chronométriphilia – Chronométriphilia, La Chaux-de-Fonds  
 CICSA – Centrul de Istorie Comparată a Societăților Antice, Universitatea București, București  
 CIL – *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin, 1862-.  
 CIS – *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881-.  
 Classica et Christiana – Classica et Christiana, Centrul de Studii Clasice și Creștine al Facultății de Istorie a Universității „Al.I. Cuza”, Iași  
 CIQ – The Classical Quaterly, The Classical Association, Cambridge  
 CN – Cercetări Numismatice. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, București  
 CNM – Corpus Nummorum Moldaviae  
 Collection de la Maison de l’Orient méditerranéen. Série Épigraphique – Collection de la Maison de l’Orient méditerranéen. Série Épigraphique, Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux, Fédération de recherche sur les sociétés anciennes, Université Lumière Lyon 2 - CNRS  
 Communications – Communications. EHESS/CNRS-Centre Edgar Morin, Paris  
 Comparative Criticism – Comparative Criticism, Cambridge University Press  
 Corviniana – Corviniana. Acta Musei Corviniensis, Hunedoara  
 CRAI – Comptes Rendus des Séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris  
 Crisia – Crisia. Muzeului Țării Crișurilor, Oradea  
 Critica Storica – Critica Storica, Associazione degli storici europei, Firenze  
 CSA – Current Swedish Archaeology, Swedish Archaeological Society  
 Current Anthropology – Current Anthropology. University of California, Merced  
 Dacia N.S. – Dacia (Nouvelle Série). Revue d’archéologie et d’histoire ancienne. Académie Roumaine. Institut d’archéologie « V. Pârvan », București  
 Danubius – Danubius, Revista Muzeului de Istorie Galați, Galați  
 Das Altertum – Das Altertum, Berlin – Amsterdam – Oldenburg  
 Das Mittelalter – Das Mittelalter, UTB GmbH, Stuttgart  
 Der Anschnitt – Der Anschnitt, Vereinigung der Freunde von Kunst und Kultur im Bergbau, Bochum  
 DHA – Dialogues d’Histoire ancienne, Université de Franche-Comté, Paris  
 Die Kunde – Die Kunde. Zeitschrift für niedersächsische Archäologie, Hannover  
 DissArch – Dissertationes Archaeologicae ex Instituto Archaeologico Universitatis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae, Budapest  
 DissPann – Disertationes Pannonicae. Ex Instituto Numismatico et Archaeologico Universitatis de Petro Pázmány nominatae Budapestensis provenientes, Budapest  
 DIVR – D.M. Pippidi (ed.), *Dicționar de istorie veche a României (Paleolitic – sec. X)*, București, 1976.  
 Documenta Praehistorica – Documenta Praehistorica, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Department of Archaeology  
 Documenta Valachica – Documenta Valachica. Studii și materiale de istorie și istorie a culturii, Târgoviște  
 Drobeta – Drobeta. Muzeul Regiunii Porțile de Fier, Drobeta-Turnu Severin  
 EAIVR – Enciclopedia Arheologiei și Istoriei Vechi a României (ed. C. Preda), București, 1994  
 EJS – European Journal of Sociology  
 Epigraphische Studien – Epigraphische Studien, Rheinisches Landesmuseum Bonn, Köln  
 EphemDAC – Ephemeris Dacoromana. Annuario della Scuola Romana di Roma  
 EphemNap – Ephemeris Napocensis. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei, Cluj-Napoca  
 Ethnic and Racial Studies – Ethnic and Racial Studies, London : Routledge & Kegan Paul

- EurAnt – Eurasia Antiqua. Deutsche Archäologisches Institut, Berlin
- FI – File de Istorie. Muzeul Județean Bistrița-Năsăud, Bistrița
- FolArch – Folia Archaeologica, Budapest
- Fontes I – V. Iliescu, V. C. Popescu, Gh. Ștefan (ed.), Izvoare privind Istoria României, vol. I, București, 1964.
- Fontes II – H. Mihăescu, Gh. Ștefan, R. Hîncu, V. Iliescu, V. C. Popescu (ed.), Izvoare privind Istoria României, vol. I, București, 1970.
- FrühMitAltSt – Frühmittelalterliche Studien. Jahrbuch des Instituts für Frühmittelalterforschung der Universität Münster, Münster
- Gerión – Gerión. Revista de Historia Antigua
- Germania – Germania. Anzeiger der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Frankfurt am Main
- GlasnikSarajevo – Glasnik Zemlinskog Muzeja u Sarajevu, Sarajevo
- Greece & Rome – Greece & Rome, Classical Association, Cambridge University Press
- HispAnt – Hispania Antiqua. Revista de Historia Antigua (digital journal: <https://revistas.uva.es/index.php/hispaanti>)
- Hesperia – Hesperia. The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens
- Historia – Historia. Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart
- History and Anthropology – History and Anthropology, Taylor & Francis (Routledge)
- History and Theory – History and Theory. Studies in the Philosophy of History, Middletown
- History Compass – History Compass, Wiley-Blackwell
- Histria Antiqua – Histria Antiqua, Institut društvenih znanosti IVO PILAR, Zagreb
- HNE – M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, Weimar, 1898.
- HPQ – History of Philosophy Quarterly, University of Illinois Press
- IDR II – G. Florescu, C.C. Petolescu, *Inscripțiile Daciei Romane*, vol. II: *Oltenia și Muntenia*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1977.
- IDR III/1 – I.I. Russu, N. Gudea, V. Wollmann, M. Dușanic, *Inscripțiile Daciei Romane*, vol. III/1: *Dacia Superior. Zona de sud-vest*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1977.
- IDRE – C.C. Petolescu, *Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae. Inscriptions externes concernant l'histoire de la Dacie*, I-II, București, 1996-2000.
- IG XII 6.2 – K. Hallof, A.P. Matthaiou, *Inscriptiones Graecae XII 6. Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassiis Icariaque. Pars 2. Inscriptiones Sami insulae. Dedicaciones. Tituli sepulcrales. Tituli Christiani, Byzantini, Iudaei. Varia. Tituli graphio incisi. Incerta. Tituli alieni. Inscriptiones Corassiarum. Inscriptiones Icariae insulae*, Berlin – New York, 2003.
- IGB – G. Mihailov, *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria Repertae*, 5 vol., Sofia, 1958–2001.
- IGLN – V. Božilova, J. Kolendo (eds.), *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Novae (Mésie inférieure)*, Ausonius, Bordeaux, 1997.
- IGLR – E. Popescu, *Inscripțiile grecești și latinești descoperite pe teritoriul României*, București, 1976.
- IGLS VI – J.-P. Rey-Coquais, *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie. VI. Baalbek et Beqa'.* Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 78, Paris, 1967.
- IGLS XVII.1 – J.-B. Yon, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie. XVII/1. Palmyre* Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 195; Beirut, 2012.
- ILB – B. Gerov, *Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria Repertae*, Sofia, 1989.
- Il Mar Nero – Il mar nero: annali di archeologia e storia, Roma
- ILS – H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, Berlin, I (1892), II (1902), III (1916).
- ISSJ – International Social Science Journal
- Interpretation – Interpretation. A Journal of Political Philosophy, Waco
- ISM I – D.M. Pippidi, *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor*, vol. I. *Histria și împrejurimile*, București, 1983.
- ISM II – I. Stoian, *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor grecești și latine*, vol. II. *Tomis și teritoriul său*, Bucarest, 1987.
- ISM III – A. Avram, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Scythie Mineure*, vol. III. *Callatis et son territoire*, Bucharest–Paris, 1999.
- ISM IV – E. Popescu, *Inscriptions de Scythie Mineure*, vol. IV. *Tropaeum – Durostorum – Axiopolis*, Bucharest–Paris, 2015.

- ISM V – E. Doruțiu Boilă, *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor*, vol. V. *Capidava – Troesmis – Noviodunum*, București, 1980.
- IstMitt – Istanbuler Mitteilungen, Istanbul
- Istros – Istros, Muzeul Brăilei „Carol I”, Brăila
- IzvestijaSofia – Izvestija na Nacionalnija Arheologičeski Institut, Sofia
- JAMT – Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory, Springer
- JHS – Journal of Hellenic Studies, London
- JIES – Journal of Indo-European Studies, Washington
- JFA – Journal of Field Archaeology, Boston University, Taylor & Francis
- JMC – Journal of Material Culture, SAGE Publications Ltd.
- JNG – Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte, Bayerische Numismatische Gesellschaft, München
- JÖAI – Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien
- Journal of Value Inquiry – The Journal of Value Inquiry, Springer
- JRA – Journal of Roman Archaeology, Portsmouth, Rhode Island
- JRAI – Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute, London
- JRAI (N.S.) – The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, London
- JRAI-GBI – Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, London
- JRGZM – Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz, Mainz
- JRS – Journal of Roman Studies, London
- Kadmos – Kadmos. Zeitschrift für vor- und frühgriechische Epigraphik, Berlin
- Klio – Klio. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte, Berlin
- La Cultura – La Cultura. Rivista de Filosofia, Letteratura e Storia
- LIMC – Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae, Zürich, 1981-1999
- Lucerna – Lucerna. The Roman Finds Group Newsletter, Stevenage, UK
- Marmația – Marmația, Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Arheologie Baia Mare, Baia Mare
- MASP – Materiali po Arheologii Severnogo Pričernomorja, Odesa
- MCA – Materiale și cercetări arheologice. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- MemAnt – Memoria Antiquitatis, Acta Musei Petrodavensis, Complexul Muzeal Județean Neamț, Piatra-Neamț
- MFME – A Móra Ferenc Múzeum évkönyve. Móra Ferenc Múzeum, Szeged
- MIA – Materialy i issledovanija po arheologii SSSR, Moskva – Sk. Petersburg
- MitteilungenBerlin – Mitteilungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, Berlin
- Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft – Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig
- MN – Muzeul Național, București
- MonographRGZM – Monographies des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums, Mainz
- Montana II – V. Velkov, G. Aleksandrov, *Epigrafski pametnitsi ot Montana i raiona*, Montana, 1994.
- Mousaios – Mousaios. Buletinul Științific al Muzeului Județean Buzău, Bacău
- MSȘIA – Academia Română. Memoriile Secției de Științe Istorice și Arheologie, București
- MusHelv – Museum Helveticum: schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica, Schwabe-Verlag
- NAC – Numismatica et Antichità Classiche. Quaderni Ticinesi, Lugano
- Nestor – Nestor, University of Cincinnati, Department of Classics, Cincinnati
- NC – Numismatic Chronicle, London
- NNM – Numismatic Notes and Monographs, New York
- Novensia – Novensia, Antiquity of Southeastern Europe Research Centre, University of Warsaw, Warsaw
- NZ – Numismatische Zeitschrift. Österreichische Numismatische Gesellschaft, Wien
- Oltenia – Oltenia. Studii și comunicări, Craiova
- Orientalia – Orientalia, Pontificio Istituto biblico, Roma
- Pact – Pact. Journal of the European Study Group on Physical, Chemical, Biological & Mathematical Techniques Applied to Archaeology, Strasbourg
- PAS – Praehistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa, Berlin

- PAT – Patrimonium Archaeologicum Transylvanicum  
 PAT – D.R. Hillers, E. Cussini, *Palmyrene Aramaic Texts*, The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project, Baltimore, 1996.
- PBF – Prähistorische Bronzefunde. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Seminar für Vor- und Frühgeschichte der Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a. M, Abteilung für Ur- und Frühgeschichtliche Archäologie des Historischen Seminars der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität, Münster
- PCPhS – Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Cambridge
- Peuce – Peuce. Studii și Note de Istorie Veche și Arheologie. Muzeul Delta Dunării / Institutul de Cercetări Eco-Muzeale „Simion Gavrilă”, Tulcea
- Peuce S.N. – Peuce, serie nouă. Studii și Cercetări de Istorie și Arheologie. Institutul de Cercetări Eco-Muzeale „Simion Gavrilă”, Tulcea
- Philosophie – Philosophie, Les Éditions de Minuit, Paris
- Phronesis – Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy, Leiden
- PIR<sup>2</sup> – *Prosopographia Imperii Romani, saec. I-III*, ed. II, Berlin–Leipzig
- PNAS – Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, Washington DC
- Poetics Today – Poetics Today, Duke University, Columbus, USA
- Polis – Polis. The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought, Exeter
- Pontica / Pontice – Pontica. Muzeul de Istorie Națională și Arheologie, Constanța
- PPS – Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society, Cambridge
- PZ – Praehistorische Zeitschrift. Freie Universität, Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie, Berlin
- QS – Quaderni di storia, Roma
- RAN – Repertoriul Arheologic Național (<http://ran.cimec.ro/>)
- RE – *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften*, Stuttgart, 1893-
- REA – Revue des Études Anciennes. Maison de l'Archéologie, Université Bordeaux Montaigne, Pessac
- RES – *Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique*, Paris, 1900-1968.
- RÉSEE – Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes. Academia Română, Institutul de Studii Sud-Est Europeene, București
- RevBistr – Revista Bistriței. Complexul Muzeal Bistrița-Năsăud, Bistrița
- Review of Metaphysics – The Review of Metaphysics. A Philosophical Quarterly, Washington DC
- Revista Arheologică – Revista Arheologică, Academia de Științe a Moldovei, Institutul Patrimoniului Cultural, Centrul de Arheologie, Chișinău
- Revista d'arqueologia de Ponent – Revista d'arqueologia de Ponent, Unitat d'Arqueologia, Prehistòria i Història Antiga del Departament d'Història de la Universitat de Lleida, Lleida
- RevMuz – Revista Muzeelor, București
- Révue d'Alsace – Révue d'Alsace, Fédération des Sociétés d'Histoire et d'Archéologie d'Alsace, Colmar
- Revue d'Archéométrie - ArchéoSciences, revue d'Archéométrie, Presses universitaires de Rennes
- Revue du Louvre – La Revue du Louvre et des musées de France, Conseil des musées nationaux (France), Paris
- Revue du Nord – Revue du Nord. Archéologie de la Picardie et du Nord de la France, Université de Lille, Villeneuve D'Asco
- RGA – *Reallexicon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, Berlin
- RGZM – Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz, Bonn
- Rhetorica – Rhetorica. A Journal of the History of Rhetoric, Berkley
- RI – Revista Istorică. Academia Română, Institutul de Istorie „Nicolae Iorga”, București
- RIB – Roman Inscriptions of Britain, London
- RIC, II – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, II, Vespasian to Hadrian*, London, 1926.
- RIC, III – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, III, Antoninus Pius to Commodus*, London, 1930.
- RIC, IV/1 – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, C.H.V. Shutherland, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, IV/1, Pertinax to Geta*, London, 1936.
- RIC, IV/2 – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, C. H. V. Shutherland, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, IV/2, Macrinus to Papienus*, London, 1938.



- RIC, IV/3 – H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, C. H. V. Shutherland, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, IV/3, Gordian III-Uranus Antoninus*, London, 1949.
- RIC, V/1 – P. H. Webb, *The Roman Imperial Coinage, V/1*, London, 1927.
- RIS – E. Weber (ed.), *Die römischen Inschriften der Steiermark*, Graz, 1969.
- RIU III – L. Barkóczi, S. Soproni, *Die römische Inschriften Ungarns, 3. Liefereng: Brigetio (Fortsetzung) und die Limesstrecke am Donauknie*, Budapest–Bonn, 1981.
- RMD – *Roman Military Diplomas*, London, I (M.M. Roxan, 1978), II (M.M. Roxan, 1985), III (M.M. Roxan, 1993), IV (M.M. Roxan, P.A. Holder, 2003), V (P.A. Holder, 2006)
- RMM-MIA – Revista muzeelor și monumentelor. Monumente istorice și de artă, București
- RPC I – A. Burnett, M. Amandry, P.P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage, I. From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC-AD 69)*, London – Paris, 1992.
- RPC II – A. Burnett, M. Amandry, I. Carradice, *Roman Provincial Coinage, II. From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69-96)*, London – Paris, 1999.
- SAA – *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica*. Universitatea „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași
- SAI – *Studii și Articole de Istorie*, București
- Sargetia – *Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis. Muzeul Civilizației Dacice și Romane*, Deva
- SchwNumRu – *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau*, Bern
- Science – *Science*, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington DC
- SCIV(A) – *Studii și cercetări de istorie veche (și arheologie)*. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- SCN – *Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică*. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- Scripta Valachica – *Scripta Valachica, Studii și materiale de istorie și istorie a culturii*, Târgoviște
- SEG – *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden 1923-1971, Alphen aan den Rijn 1979-1980, Amsterdam 1979-2005, Boston 2006-
- Semitica et Classica – *Semitica et Classica. Revue internationale d'études orientales et méditerranéennes. International Journal of Oriental and Mediterranean Studies*, Paris – Turnhout
- SlovArch – *Slovenská Archeológia*, Nitra
- SMA – *Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Series*
- SNG Copenhagen 2 – *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Copenhagen. The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals. Danish National Museum, Volume 2. Macedonia and Thrace*, reprint of original edition, New Jersey, 1981.
- SNG BM Black Sea – *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Great Britain, Volume IX, British Museum, Part 1: The Black Sea*, London, 1993.
- SNG Stancomb – *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Great Britain, Volume XI, The William Stancomb Collection of Coins of the Black Sea Region*, Oxford, 2000.
- Southwestern Journal of Anthropology – *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, University of Chicago, Chicago
- SP – *Studii de Preistorie*, București
- Starinar – *Starinar, Arheologskog Instituta*, Belgrade
- StCl – *Studii Clasice*, București
- StComPitești – *Studii și Comunicări, Pitești*
- StComBrukenthal – *Studii și Comunicări, Muzeul Național Brukenthal*, Sibiu
- StComSatuMare – *Studii și Comunicări. Muzeul Județean Satu Mare, Satu Mare*
- Stratum plus – *Stratum, Vysshaya Antropologicheskaya Shkola*, Chișinău
- Studia Palmyreńskie – *Studia Palmyreńskie, Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology*, University of Warsaw, Warsaw
- Studia Troica – *Studia Troica, Universität Tübingen, University of Cincinnati, Mainz am Rhein*
- Südost-Forschungen – *Südost-Institut München, Deutsches Auslandswissenschaftliches Institut (Berlin, Germany), Leipzig*
- Symbolae Osloenses – *Symbolae Osloenses. Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies*, Oslo
- SympThrac 1 – *Symposia Thracologica, I, Institutul de Tracologie, Craiova*, 1983
- SympThrac 2 – *Symposia Thracologica, II, Institutul de Tracologie, Drobeta-Turnu Severin*, 1984
- SympThrac 5 – *Symposia Thracologica, V, Institutul de Tracologie, Miercurea Ciuc*, 1987

- SympThrac 7 – Symposia Thracologica, VII, Institutul de Tracologie, Tulcea, 1989  
Terra Sebus – Terra Sebus. Acta Musei Sabesiensis, Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeş  
The Antiquaries Journal – The Antiquaries Journal, Society of Antiquaries of London  
Theory, Culture and Society – Theory, Culture and Society, Universitz of London, London  
*ThesCRA* – *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum*, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Museum: I-II (2004), III-V (2005), VI (2011), VII-VIII (2012), Index (2014)  
The Numismatist – The Numismatist, The American Numismatic association  
Thracia – Thracia, Bŭlgarska akademiia na naukite, Institut po trakologia, Serdica  
Thracia Pontica 4 – M. Lazarov *et alii* (eds.), *Thracia Pontica. Quatrieme Symposium International, Sozopol 6-12 Octobre 1988*, Sofia, 1991.  
Thraco-Dacica – Thraco-Dacica. Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, Bucureşti  
TIR – Tabula Imperii Romani, Romula-Durostorum-Tomis, Bucarest, 1969.  
TPAPhS – Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Society. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore  
TÜBA-AR – Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi  
Tyche – Tyche. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Wien  
Tyrageia – Tyrageia. Anuarul Muzeului Naţional de Istorie a Moldovei, Chişinău  
Tyrageia International – Tyrageia International, Muzeul Naţional de Istorie a Moldovei, Chişinău  
UPA – Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie, Bonn  
Valachica – Studii şi cercetări de istorie şi istoria culturii, Târgovişte  
VDI – Vestnik Drevnej Istorii, Moskva  
World Archaeology – World Archaeology, Taylor & Francis  
ZfE – Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, Berlin  
ZfN – Zeitschrift für Numismatik, Berlin  
ZPE – Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Bonn  
ZSav – Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung, Wien