

The analysis of the 10th and 11th centuries' burial sites and stray finds in Banat, Partium and the Transylvanian Basin

Introduction

In the late 9th and the early 10th century the Magyar migration and conquest caused huge cultural changes in the Carpathian Basin. The 10th century's rich material culture and various burial customs are the archaeological and cultural results of this preliminary period. At the end of the 10th century it was followed by the beginning of the organization of the state and its particular material culture.

Studying the 10th and 11th century we should examine what the notion of *Carpathian Basin* meant to the people of that period. From an archaeological aspect the only thing that can help are the archaeological sites, especially graveyards which are culturally more specified. According to these archaeological sites it can be declared that the *Carpathian Basin* considered as a demographic notion is not equal with the actual geographical term. However this fact neither excludes nor proves the political-military authority over this land. It is also difficult to locate the area we are examining: Banat, Partium and the Transylvanian Basin. Most part of these areas are shown on the 10th century's dissemination maps as blank areas. This fact warns us to handle the existing or non-existing connections between the different geographical notions and the order of the settlements carefully, and also we should be very careful when drawing conclusions from these connections.

Besides it is also important to study from an archaeological point of view the integration or the possible cultural assimilation of the population that was found on the site, in other words, the ethnocultural, political and demographic processes of the 10th and 11th century.

We want to call the attention to the fact – as it is a still existing stereotype in the Romanian historical and archaeological literature (and several times similar thoughts can be found among Hungarian historians) – that it can or can not relatively be determined whether the archaeological sites show the *direction* of the Magyar conquest. Graveyards rarely or – mainly in the Transylvanian Basin – not at all show *the direction of a population's* migration, but they mark the population's presence here. On the other hand – as we deal with it in the 6th chapter – it is not possible to connect the graveyards with an exact date, not even with the *"early"* finds, as graveyards have their own life all over the world, that is that funerals mark a chronological process and they can not be connected with different military events, (an obvious exception is certainly the mass grave). The graveyards from the 10th and 11th century that are at our disposal can not be connected with different political-military events at all, but we can make connection between them and the more complex cultural or later political-military, or ethnic processes, for example the settlements after the conquest.

About the method

There have been written plenty of literature about the time and area of the Magyar conquest during the examination of the archaeological finds of the Banat, Partium and the Transylvanian Basin, but because of the one-sided methods, they have rarely striven for the complete collection of the archaeological finds, the systematization and analysis of the burial customs, and the introduction of the parallels of the material culture. Unfortunately, there is a total lack of literature that includes a throughout, modern analysis of the different graveyards.

Because of this, one of the main aims of this paper is to systematize and critically analyse the archaeological information that has been collected until now, to compare the three regions and to compare the information with the phenomena known from other parts of the Carpathian Basin. In the case of phenomena that point beyond this area the comparison should be expanded to the whole East and Central Europe and also to South-East Europe.

We have tried to compare the burial customs and the material culture of the three microregion and to analyse them independently from each other. We added some new remarks to the question of the different types of artefacts, we also tried to work out the chronological order of the finds, and relying upon it we got a more exact picture about the cultural characteristics of these areas, about the chronology of the conquest's finds, about the ethno-cultural processes and about the possible settlements or resettlements in the 10th and 11th century.

As a result of this work, the systematized burial customs and the observations about the material culture have thrown a new light upon the important cultural and political-military changes in Banat, Partium and the Transylvanian Basin in the 10th and 11th century. We also got some relative answers to the following questions:

1. the continuity and the cultural connections of the population in the 10th century;
2. the settlement of the new population in the 10th century, the West-East migration;
3. the archaeological characteristics of the 10th and 11th centuries' conquest and establishment of the state;
4. the division of the society in the 10th century; the question of the existence of the "military centres"; we also called the attention to think over the previous hypothesis. In the same time we used a new terminology to be beside *conquest (honfoglalás)* we suggest the term *the age of conquest* and also the notion *settlement*, as in this way it would be easier to clear up the misunderstandings – that occur quite often – between Hungarian and Romanian archaeology.

Unfortunately the primitive methods of the Eastern-European literature have left their marks on this paper as well. It can not be ignored that many conclusions are impeded by the insufficiency of the basic researches – the lack of the anthropological, paleozoological, and DNA examinations. Beside other type of information, earlier and later studies have given us a particular methodological help. Here we should mention Valeri Yotov from Bulgaria, Csanád Bálint, László Révész, Eszter Istvánovits from Hungary, Charlotte Hedenstierna-Jonson from Sweden, and Florin Curta from the USA.

Chapter 1: Geography

In the 1. chapter we dealt with the geography of the three regions. Nowadays they appear under one notion, namely Transylvania. However, it is a fallacy as the three regions are totally different geographically and also culturally, and it is true about the situation of the 10th and 11th centuries as well.

Geographically (and not politically or ethnically) the Transylvanian Basin is completely independent. The Basin is the range of the South-East Carpathians and the Transylvanian Alps. It spreads from the Alps of Bucovina, from the Alps of Maramureş, from the valley of the Upper-Tisa, and from the river-head of Suceava river to the valley of the Danube at the Porțile de Fier-Iron Gate. It spreads in a semicircular arch shape. At the western region of this huge geographical unit stands the Transylvanian Range (its Romanian name is Western Alps), and to the south you can find the Alps of Banat. This relief is opened to the west at two places: along the Mureş river at a narrower area, and along the Someş river at a wider area. Besides, the range of the Carpathians is dissected by saddles and gorges in the north-east and in the south as well (eg.: Radna-saddle, Bârgău-saddle, Tulgheş-, Bicz-, Ghimeş-, Bodza-gorge, Tatar-saddle, a Predeal-gorge, a Bran-saddle, Turnu Roşu-gorge). It should be noted that the width of the Eastern-Carpathians decreases towards south: in the north it is 170 km, at Deda it is 100 km, at Târgu Secuiesc it is 90 km. The 500-1000 m high areas are dominated by beech-woods, the higher mountains by pine-woods, in the lower hills there are mainly oak-woods.

Wooded steppe can only be found on a small area on the Mezőség (to the north from Cluj – and this is important when examining the 10th century. The Basin is rich in rivers, its soil is rich in precious metal and salt, which could be a result of different political-military events and processes.

The other two regions, Banat and Partium, are actually the eastern part of the Great Plain, so there are fields and hills, which includes in the north Sathmar, Bihor, and the regions of the Criş rivers. These regions are parts of the steppe, just like the lower part of the Maros river, and the main part of Banat. As we have mentioned before, its eastern part is bordered by the Transylvanian Range (or Western Alps in Romanian), and by the Alps of Banat.

Chapter 2: The phase of the researches

2. 1. Dynamics of excavations and publishing of finds. Level of the basic researches in the three regions (see map 1)

The research of the Magyar conquest and of the early Arpadian age concentrates on the graveyard-excavations mainly. It is true generally in the Carpathian Basin, but more particularly in the Transylvanian Basin, the Partium, and Banat which were annexed to Romania after 1920. All together they are 103.000 km². There are many – primarily science historical – reasons of this casual relation. The different real or presumed conclusions (ethnological, sociological, chronological) that can be concluded from the graveyards, the richness and the variety of the available finds mainly influenced the researches of the graveyards. Beside of this fact, out of the 158 sites, which provide different information, there is only **one** (!!!) which is completely excavated.

For the first time in the Romanian early middle-age archaeology, we analysed the ***character of the excavations*** (systematic excavation, rescuing excavation) in details, and we examined ***the level, the quality and the applicability of the documentation and of the scientific conveyances***.

There have not been any DNA-examinations till now, and except the 10th tomb's horse-finds of Cluj and the horse-parts of Nădlac (we will cite Mátyás Vremir's examinations in this paper) there have not been any other paleozoological examinations.

As a conclusion we can say that beside the archaeological researches of the 10th and 11th centuries, other types of examinations (anthropological, paleozoological, DNA) of these three regions stay also behind the other regions of the Carpathian Basin, and for example the Germanian researches. Because of this fact, several archaeological theories were created without any archaeological, anthropological, or other evidences. As a result of this, it is very important to emphasize the relativism of the conclusions in any essays on the 10th and 11th centuries' archaeology that use its results.

2. 2. Theories of the archaeological literature and the history of the 10th and 11th centuries

Unfortunately, the nationalism of the 20th century influences the syntheses that use the archaeological researches. It is also obvious that this tendency appears oppositely in the Hungarian and Romanian archaeology: the Hungarian scientists would have liked to expand the list of the finds, while the Romanians tried to reduce it.

One of the reasons of the above mentioned fact is that the Romanian archaeology followed the theory of Hampel from the beginning of the 20th century. According to this theory someone is a Magyar conqueror if he was buried with his horse and weapon. On the contrary, the Hungarian archaeologists, following the theory of Béla Szőke, consider almost

everything to be Magyar that can be dated in the 10th or the 11th century and appeared from under the ground. These different approaches cause the misunderstanding between the Hungarian and the Romanian archaeology; and also the terminology is interpreted in a different way, e.g.: *conquest, settlement, foundation of the state, etc.*

Being aware of the above mentioned issues we tried to examine the literature on the 10th and 11th centuries from the beginning of the 20th century:

1. *The conquest and its direction in the archaeological literature.*
2. *Settlement: its sizes and chronological intensity in the archaeological literature.*
3. *The ethnic groups of the 10th century and archaeology.*
4. *The graveyards and archaeology, the examination of the graveyards in the literature.*

Chapter 3: The archaeological finds of the 9th century and their chronological connection to the archaeological finds of the age of the Magyar conquest

In the case of the Transylvanian Basin – in contradiction to the Carpathian Basin, and other parts of Partium and Banat – it was managed to reveal the culture, the peculiarities, the origin and the cultural connections of the 9th century's archaeology earlier. Political-military and ethno-demographic conclusions were drawn from them. By highlighting the parallels of the burial customs we managed to define the ethnocultural connections between the part of the population of this region (talking about the graveyards of Alba Iulia, Sebeş and Blandiana) and the population of the Lower Danube. In other words, the origin of one part of this population could be found and from this we can conclude the historical fact that the Bulgarian Czarism occupied the Transylvanian Basin in the 9th century. This fact is also proved by a written source from the late 9th century. However, we still do not know the date of these graveyards from which they can be dated.

The literature do not deal either with the connection between the population of the 9th century and the new conquerors of the 10th century or the possible cultural consequences of this connection. Unfortunately, at this point there are methodological inadequacies, as an example of this we can declare that nobody used the results of the previous researches, for example the observations about the avarization of the Gepids in the 6th and 7th century.

Maybe because of the above mentioned fact, two, chronologically different culture-groups are declared to exist without observing the burial customs and the finds of the graveyards, and their connections. On the other hand, in the light of the Bulgarian finds, the different sporadic finds, for example the spurs can be integrated as the relics of the Bulgarian Czarism's material culture.

During the tipochronological analysis of the finds, it can be observed that some of the finds can be dated from a later time. According to this fact it can be declared that the graveyard of Ciumbrud can be dated from the late 10th century, as the spiral lockring was known in the Transylvanian Basin from only the 11th century (5th chapter) until now. It is similar to some parts of the X/8 graveyard of Orăştie where the chased-ornamented band bracelet with coiled terminals can be dated from the ***middle of the 10th century***. But from this period we know several graveyards from the age of the conquest in the Transylvanian Basin, therefore it can be said that they are parallel *archaeological cultures*, whose population was not swept away by the Magyar conquest but these populations were **integrated** by it.

If we believe in Uwe Fiedler's great ceramics tipochronology, we can say that the pottery from the graveyard of Blandiana can only be dated from the first part of the 10th century. So with the Magyar conquest the population of the area did not disappear, their graveyards were used in the first and presumably also in the second part of the 10th century.

A cultural assimilation could start as well. Its motive was not the military occupation but the demographic movements and the different settlements after these occupations. They were observed in other parts of the Carpathian Basin, too.

In the light of the statements above, it can be declared that the continuity of the material culture and the burial customs of the populations – that can be connected with the Bulgarian conquest – can be justified with data in the Transylvanian Basin as well. That is why that this century can be called from a cultural point of view "*the long century*".

However, in the case of the two other regions, the phase of the researches prevents us to make exact statements about these issues.

Chapter 4: The examination of the burial customs in the 10th-11th centuries

The *burial customs* are considered to be the most important part of the definition of the 10th-11th centuries' cultural connections and ethno cultural characteristics in Transylvania, Banat and Partium.

In the 10th century, as the sign of the cultural discontinuity, beside the still-existing cultural means new types of graveyards with new customs appeared in these regions. The burial customs that were registered in these graveyards differ from the previous ones, so the different origin of the population can be diagnosed quite easily.

Our first aim was to systematize the registered burial customs and to compare the burial customs of these three regions. It can be said that Banat and Partium had more or less similar burial customs in the 10th and 11th centuries. In the contrary, some quite different customs can be registered in Transylvania.

First of all we should note that in the 10th and 11th centuries there were **only skeleton-burying**. According to the researches we can state that the cremation disappeared in the 9th century, though it is possible that it was used until the 10th century. Unfortunately *it is totally impossible to verify the exact date of the change from the cremation to the skeleton-burying* as mainly in the case of the cremation tombs it is very difficult to date them because of the lack of the finds.

The *depth of the tombs* in Transylvania, Banat and Partium's graveyards does not differ from other regions' tombs. From the statistics it can be seen that the average depth of the tombs is between 50 cm and 130 cm, most of them is between 60 cm and 100 cm. It is in contrast with the 100 tombs of the Stația de Salvare, which started in the 9th century and had very good relations with the Lower Danube. The tombs' depths are between 150 cm and 17 cm, so there is a discontinuity here.

Unfortunately where it would have been possible to do a better collection, in the case of *the tombs' shape and size* it can be said that between the '50s and '90s the elder colleagues did not pay attention to this aspect.

The orientations of the tombs suggest a homogeneous afterlife concept as most of the tombs have west-east orientation or its varieties.

Neither Hungarian nor Romanian archaeological schools have dealt with *the "opposite orientations"*, so our very divergent database is in the first phase of the research.

In some graveyards there are tombs with an orientation that differs from the normal orientation. It can be noticed that there are orientations (east-west, north-south, and south-north) which differ from the west-east oriented Hungarian horse-weapon graves. István Dienes thought that the east-west, north-south, south-north oriented graves that can be found in the graveyards with horse-weapon graves were captives' tombs. He explains it with the small quantity of these differently oriented graves. Attila Kiss explained this phenomenon with the fear of death. In contradiction to Dienes we think that tombs like the relatively rich lonely female tomb of Dudeștii Vechi II. mound, which was buried in east-west orientation; or the similarly rich female tomb of Kunszentmárton with south-north orientation; or the north-south oriented male tomb with sword in Szeghalom can not be placed into the sociologically low category of captives.

Tombs with opposite orientation (east-west) can be found in a significant percent in Alba Iulia (Stația de Salvare, Brândușei Street). The case of the graveyard in Brândușei Street can be followed clearly: from the excavated tombs there are 25 with opposite orientations (that is not west-east). 23 of them are oriented in an east-west direction; there is one tomb with a south-north and one with a north-south orientation. But if we only examine the part of the tomb that was used in the 10th century, it turns out obviously from the 55 tombs 23 are with an opposite orientation, they are 41,81% of the tombs. Unfortunately the skeletons were not examined from an anthropological point of view, which could have helped us to decide if there were biological or gender separation.

The graveyard of Moftinu Mic in North-Partium is also particular as 9 tombs out of 13 have north-south orientation, which is 69, 23 % of the excavated tombs.

Tombs with east-west orientation are known mainly from Ibrány-Esbóhalom and Zalavár. There are some other sites but there are only one or two tombs.

There are obvious antecedents of the above mentioned phenomena in the 7th-9th centuries' biritual cemeteries of Transylvania, and in the graveyards of South-Slovakia, Slovenia, West-Hungary, and Lower-Danube. Similarly to this, according to some phenomena that were noted in the graveyards of Poland and Lithuania, the orientation is in connection with the gender, and in some cemeteries it is a tendency (e.g.: females are buried with an east-west orientation while males with a west-east in Lutomiersk and Końskie).

As a conclusion we can say that the different orientations refer to cultural differences beside the gender separation. These irregular examples are typical of the 10th century, and there are only very few from the beginning of the 11th century in the examined regions. According to our observations it is a *characteristic of a transition period* which could affect the population who changed from the cremation, as there are not any weapons, harnesses or horse-burials in the 10th century's opposite orientation tombs in the Transylvanian Basin, Banat and Partium.

Similarly the analysis of the stone- or brick covered and framed tombs are not at an advanced phase. Sarolta Tettamanti's 30-year-old conclusion is still used nowadays. It says the following: "... *the Hungarians adopted the application of the stone-covering and other stone constructions from a foreign burial ritual*".

According to the research we did in our regions the first characteristic of the stone-covered graves is that the skeletons from the published graveyards excavated in Alba Iulia-Brândușei Street were buried in an east-west orientation in the 10th century. This custom lived on in the first decades of the 11th century. In the same time it can be said that stone-covering can not be found in the horse-weapon graveyards, although for example in the case of the graveyards of Cluj it can be said that there were not enough stone or brick as the ruins of Napoca must have been seen in the 10th century.

There are some antecedents of this stone-brick covering burial tradition in the 10th century, in the west and north part of the Carpathian Basin, mainly at the Lower-Danube. In our opinion, referring to the characteristics of the graveyards (mainly the big percent of the opposite orientations) at the Lower-Danube, the Transylvanian stone-covering burials are oriented to the south

The stone- brick covering burial traditions can be considered as a different custom that is foreign from the conquerors' customs. We can put the question whether the new conquerors of the 10th century adopted the mainly opposite oriented, stone-brick covering burial traditions. From an archaeological point of view we can answer *no* to this question. (It is for sure that in the case of the stone-brick covering burials the horse-weapon burials are not known).

The positions of the arms and legs, and the irregular positions are another part of our paper. According to them we can not highlight chronological or cultural differences relying on the available finds.

Skull-burying is a very rare phenomenon. The examples we have known till now are connected only to the Magyar conquerors, but the skull-burying of the graveyard of Pliszka at the Lower-Danube highlights that this burial custom should be examined on a wider cultural, chronological and geographical ground. Similarly, in some cases we could find burial customs that suggest punishment, witchcraft, etc. relying on the position of the skeleton (e.g.: Alba Iulia-Izvorul Împâraturului 86. tomb: the female skeleton's legs are spread, one of them is lifted and there is a sickle under it).

It is difficult to decide whether the coins that were found in different positions can be considered as oboluses or as accessories, in other words whether they can be seen as part of the burial customs or part of the clothing. Presumably the coins that were found on the chest, in the mouth or in the hand can be oboli. It was wide-spread in the 11th century, but the existence of the custom in the 10th century can be proved by the big amount of finds from this period, 56 cases have been registered in the Carpathian Basin. Referring to László Kovács's theory, the Magyar conquerors brought this custom from the East, probably it developed under a Byzantine influence, but not under the influence of the Byzantino-church. His suggestion that the obolus-custom appeared with the Magyar conquerors can be only partly accepted in the light of the tomb with obolus in Uivar with north-south orientation, and the finds at the Lower-Danube (e.g.: tombs with obolus in Sultana). However, we rather suggest a possibility of a custom that came from two directions: east (Magyar conquerors), south-east (cultural influence of Lower-Danube).

The horse-burial and its different varieties were typical, especially national, Hungarian burying custom of the 10th and 11th centuries. Only few finds are known and registered from Romania, but the finds have not been systematized. According to the available data we know about 91 tombs or sporadic finds that are examples of horse-burying. We can state that the III. and IV. types of Bálint are known only from the graveyard of Cluj-Zăpolya Street in the Transylvanian Basin, and that female horse-burying is still not known in the Basin.

The chronological end point of the horse-burying can be fixed, though not easily: in the case of the 3rd tomb of Hodoni it is obvious that the burying took place in the 11th century, in other words the custom can be justified with data, beside the written sources.

One aspect of the 10th-11th centuries' burial customs is the presence of the ceramics that contained food and drink in the tombs. The main characteristic of the tombs from the 10th century with ceramics is the *only one* pottery furniture. On the contrary, in the case of the burial customs of the Lower-Danubian cultures in the 9th and 10th centuries (Blandiana "A", Alba Iulia-Stația de Salvare-II. cemetery) there are pairs of potteries in the tombs quite often. According to the archaeological circumstances of the tombs it can be stated that one of the evidences of the food and drink sacrifices that were intended for the other world was revealed from tombs with poor furniture; but it can not be considered as general in connection with the unbelievably rich tomb from Teremia Mare.

Giving provisions for the journey to the other world should be mentioned among the rituals, not only the potteries but also animal-bones suggest that. Ceramics is mainly known from children's tombs or tombs with poor furniture, while animal-bones are known from tombs with weapon and horse.

The question of the 10th century's rituals in the 11th century

According to the generally used statement the burial customs that reflects the Magyar pagans' belief totally disappeared at the end of the 10th century or at the beginning of the 11th century. But if we look through the finds more carefully another theory can occur. The changes of the customs can be the result of a society's deep transformation process, but also

they can be the result of the change of fashion. A radical change of the customs in one graveyard can be the archaeological sign of the population-change and/ or the settlements of new comers (e.g.: Alba Iulia-Brândușei street).

The archaeological finds relatively support the continuance of the above-mentioned burial customs: e.g.: horse-burial can be registered in Hodony in the 11th century; the knives from the tombs of Alba Iulia and Moldovenești are also from the pagan ages, and the horse-burial of Deva, too. Burials with opposite orientation disappeared in the first decades of the 11th century, at least in the political centres.

Though isolated, pagan rituals lived on in the Christian age. The spread of Christianity obviously appeared in the burial customs. It is highlighted by mentioning the pagan graves in the early charters.

Our conclusions about the ethno-cultural and social division are written in chapter 7. These conclusions also use the data of the burial customs.

Chapter 5 A: The analyses of the finds from the 10th and 11th centuries

Pressing the chronological scale of the different artefacts into obvious and often very stiff time limits influenced the research of the Transylvanian early Middle Ages. Unfortunately, the Hungarian and Romanian archaeologists from Romania date an artefact (jewellery, weapon, or harness) with its parallel from a big distance, and they build it to the literature in this way. Methodologically it is absolutely wrong as in the case of the dating the usage of an object it is dangerous to compare two or more artefacts, which were found far from each other. However, the context of the finds should be examined thoroughly. To this it would be necessary to have completely excavated graveyards, and detailed analyses of them. Relying on them we would be able to examine the context of the finds from a microregional point of view.

Another bad method of our archaeological practice is dating an artefact relying on an other essay and not on the context of it. If we think of the complexity of everyday-life it turns out that the chronology of the usage of an ordinary artefact (e.g.: jewellery, tool) had never operated on the basis of mechanical rules. The reason of it is that the usage of an ordinary artefact is defined by complex sociopsychological phenomena which can be arranged into a very relative chronological order. It is also important that the usage of an object was absolutely person- or society-dependent, so every case should be examined on its own.

We put the finds from the burial sites and the sporadic finds into the following groups: **clothing accessories, weapons, personal belongings, harnesses, ceramics and other artefacts (coins)**. We followed the same method in the case of every type: first we divided the groups into subtypes and we analysed their quantity statistically and their geographical spread. As a second step we examined the occurrence of the different types in the male or female tombs, and we tried to define if an object can be considered as characteristically male or female. Finally we collected the parallels of the different types and tried to arrange them into a chronological order. Relying on that we managed to separate the material cultures of the 10th and the 11th centuries.

In the first part of this chapter we dealt with the clothing accessories (*lockrings, hairpins, earrings, neckrings, braid ornament, pendant, amulet, caftan mounts and shift ornaments, bracelets, fingerings, buttons, rattles, beads, ankle rings*). During the analyses we could make some remarks about the geographical spread, the cultural context and the chronology of them. We managed to make clear that the *S-terminalled lockring* spread in the Transylvanian Basin only at the end of the 10th and at the beginning of the 11th century, and a bit earlier in the two other regions. The usage of the *coiled lockring* can be found until the end of the 11th century; the *earring with grape bunch pendant* can be dated from the middle of the 10th century; the *earring with cast-beadrow pendant* is not known in the Transylvanian

Basin. With the examination of their position in the graves it can be stated that bracelets were worn not only around the wrist but also around the elbow. We tried to work out a new systematisation of the bracelets by verifying their weight and by their typology. About the buttons we could prove that mainly they are furniture of horse-weapon graveyards. We managed to systematize *pearls*, *shirt-* and *caftan-mounts* for the first time in the case of the three regions.

In the second part we dealt with the weapons. The armament in the graves is natural result of the military prestige, (which had a very important role in the picture of the other world at this age), and the tied social position in the militarized society of the 10th century. The quantity, quality, and category of the weapon(s) can suggest the person's social position. During the examination of the *sabres* we found that *around Cluj their concentration is the highest in the Carpathian Basin; similar concentration can not be found in South-Transylvania; and there is almost none in Banat*. Similar sabre finds concentration can be seen at the Upper-Tisa.

The geographical dissemination of the swords covers a much bigger place in our regions. It can be explained with the chronology and beside this there is a political-historical result as well. The other weapon-categories' (bow, arrow, axe) dissemination is even, except a few weapons. The parallel of the bowcase's suspension mount of Cluj is known from the Upper-Tisza, and its identical analogy is from Tabajevka.

The double-pole-axe is known from South-Transylvania, its only parallel in the Carpathian Basin was found at Mureş-Criş-Tisa. When examining the weapons it turned out that they were put into the tombs until the first half of the 11th century.

In the third part we deal with everyday tools as knives, awls, whetstones, strike-a-lights, and firestones. During the typological analyses of the knives we managed to find a type which is known only from the graves of Alba Iulia. This type has a very long hilt and very thin blade. It is totally unknown in the horse-weapon graves where knives with shorter hilt and wider blade were found.

We analysed the harnesses (the bit as part of the bridle, bridle ornaments, the saddle ornaments and fragments of saddle, girth buckles, stirrups) in the fourth part. According to the mounts on the *bridle* and on the *crupper* it can be decided about the harnesses if they characterize male or female graves. Rosetta ornamentation characterizes the harness in the female graves, while in the male graves it is more varied. The two female graves with rosette ornamented harnesses were found on the plain. During the analyses of the stirrups we suggested a new classification for the so called *pear-shaped stirrups*, and we expanded the typological scale of the *trapezoid-shaped stirrups*. The following question occurs in connection with the single mouthpiece horse bit, which is a special characteristic of South-Transylvania: could there be an eastern migration towards South-Transylvania in the 10th century.

In the fifth part during the analyses and classification of the ceramics we tried to separate the ceramics of the 9th from the ceramics of the 10th century. We also suggested a typological system for the ceramics of the 10th and 11th centuries.

In the last part we dealt with the coins, which were found mainly as oboluses in the tombs. Coins from the 10th century are hardly known except one Byzantine find in Banat. Coins of the Arpad Dynasty were excavated in the three regions' graveyards. During the analyses of the coin-finds we mentioned the coin depots of the 11th century.

After looking through the finds we noticed the following: the finds of the graveyards in North-Transylvania show connection mainly with the finds at Upper-Tisa and/or at Kijev, or they are without parallels within the finds of the 10th century. On the contrary, the finds of Middle- and South-Transylvania have connection at Mureş-Criş-Tisa within the 10th century's finds. The possible historical reasons of it can be found in the Chapter 7 of the *Conclusions*.

The typical female finds (*earring with cast-beadrow pendant, pressed braid ornaments, harness ornaments with rosettes*) of the conquerors' steppe culture, and the following male finds, bezelled finger ring are unknown from the Transylvanian Basin. They are known only from Banat and Partium. It can suggest differences in clothing or cultural differences.

The finds of the 11th century is more homogeneous, sometimes shift ornaments, belt mounts in secondary function, arrowheads occur, but we could find mainly elements of the new age's fashion in the graves.

Chapter 5 B: Regions and the chronological system of the archaeological finds

If we make a cursory examination we can divide the 10th and 11th centuries' finds between the first and the following generations of the conquerors. But that's not a correct approach as the usage of the objects depends on many conditions. So it is difficult to separate the finds of the first and of the following generation. That is why we should deal with the question of the definition: *the first conqueror generation*. The traditional answer is that they are the people who were born in Etelköz and were buried in the Carpathian Basin. Nobody has mentioned in the Hungarian or other archaeological literature that these people could belong to different generations from a biological point of view, from infans to senilis. Because of this a juvenilis who was born in Etelköz could die in 900, but could also live until 930-940, and during this period his material culture could change a lot till his death, new artefacts could appear beside the old ones, etc. however, from a biological point of view he belonged to the generation from Etelköz. Because of this we should separate the biological aspect from the aspect of the material culture. Under material culture we mean the typo chronology of the artefacts. In the future more attention should be paid to anthropological and DNA-researches, and to micro regional analyses.

We worked out our chronological system with a micro regional division. There are nine micro regions: *North-Partium, Bihor region, South of the Criș, Lower-Mureș, North-West-, Middle- and South-Banat, North- and South-Transylvania*.

During the research it could be stated that the graveyards of the horse-weapon steppe culture which can be dated in the first part of the 10th century appear in the following regions: *Bihari region, Criș region, Lower-Mureș and a few of them in North-Partium and North-Transylvania*. Beside the typical graveyards of the steppe culture there are some other graveyards on the *salt* route between North-Partium and North-Transylvania which can be the results of settlements from the middle of the 10th century: e.g.: Zalău-Palvar, Sălacea.

Horse-burials appear later, from the second third of the 10th century in the *Middle- and South-Banat* and in *South-Transylvania*, supposedly – according to the burial customs – beside or with other populations.

According to the finds of the graveyards with many tombs that were excavated at the middle part of Mureș, we can conclude that people with different origin started to use these graveyards from the middle of the century: (Alba Iulia-Brândușei Street, Izvorul Împăratului, -Stația de Salvare III. cemetery, Gâmbaș, Lopadea Ungurească, Orăștie). One part of the population from the graveyards that were excavated at Izvorul Împăratului and Stația de Salvare seems to come from the West after the second third of the century. The population of Brândușei Street and the other part of the population of the Stația de Salvare were settled down that time, or they were found and subjugated there; it is not possible to state as the graveyards have not been completely excavated, but it is sure that they have different origin than the Hungarian conquerors.

The burial site of Alba Iulia-Brândușei Street and the third cemetery of the Stația de Salvare were used also in the 11th century. The published graveyard of Alba Iulia-Brândușei Street the appearance of the new finds and the change of the burial customs at the beginning of the 11th century suggest the occurrence of a new population in the centre of the future

voivod (see: III. map). In the same time new graveyards were opened (Păclîşa, Băile Romane).

The situation seems to be different in Banat. The sites that can be dated from the first third of the 10th century can be located at the bank of Tisza and at the Lower-Mureş. To the east of them there were graveyards with the graves of simple soldiers (Ciacova, Hodoni, Timișoara, Voiteni). They can be dated from later, in the second part of the century. There were also some graveyards where other populations' tombs can be found (Deta). It is still a question whether these graveyards were in use during Christianity or not (*see map 2*).

The pagan graveyards with horse-weapon burials have different chronological evolution depending on the region:

1. In *Bihor region, in North- and South Transylvania* this kind of burials disappeared at the beginning of the 11th century, partly as a result of Saint Stephen's conquests.

2. In *Criș region, Lower-Mureş, Middle-Banat, South-Banat* where *Ajtony* and *Vata* resided this kind of burials lived on in the 11th century (e.g.: Hodony-3. tomb, Dudeștii Vechi-Dragomir halma-4. tomb?).

Because of the above mentioned reasons the graveyards that characterize the 11th century appeared earlier in the *Bihor region, in North- and South-Transylvania* (graveyards that can be dated with Saint Stephen's coins: Sântimreu, Dăbâca, Moldovenești, Noslac, Alba Iulia, Hunedoara), and later in Middle- and South Banat, and at Lower-Mureş. Here the continuity of the pagan graveyards can be observed in the first few decades of the 11th century. For example Saint Stephen's coins were found in pagan graves (e.g.: Hodoni-2. and 4. tombs).

Following the disposals of the Hungarian kings, *churchyards* appeared at the end of the 11th century. They are signs of Christianity.

Chapter 6: Issues of cultural history and archaeology. Social differentiation and separation in the 10th and 11th centuries. On the assumed social differences among the people of the Transylvanian Basin's, Partium's and Banat's cemeteries

According to the written sources the alliance of the Magyar tribes was led by *chiefs* who would inherit their positions. Apart from this there might have existed the so-called 'big man model', i. e. leaders who gained their positions by their personal achievement, the spoiling raids could give opportunities to them. One of the Magyar military leaders might have been such a *big man*, namely the 'Bogát', who is called by a Slavonic name and makes the hypothesis likely that people of Slavonic origin could have been integrated into the Hungarian political and military elite at the beginning of the 10th century and that they might have participated in the attacks against Byzantium and the West.

The question is yet to be cleared how the information relating to the '*chiefs*' and the '*big men*', gleaned from the contemporary records, could be connected with the archaeological evidence. In which grave can we assume a *chief* and which graves hide a *big man*? To give a correct answer to this question is practically impossible because defining different social structures is a relative task, the only things one can distinguish is which grave is wealthier and which is poorer.

It can be dangerous to try to reconstruct legal status as it cannot be detected or at least it is difficult to detect with archaeological tools. However, in our opinion these could have been a military unit accompanying the military leader in the Carpathian basin too like the Viking *hird* or the Rus *drujina*.

But it also has to be asserted that the single personalities buried in these sites belonged to different social groups therefore a burial site cannot correspond to a social stratum or group because there certainly were social differences and different positions. It seems to be clear that people from different social strata were buried in the same sites, which is supported by

the archaeological evidence too. For instance, the rich warriors who were buried in Biharea-Somlyóhegy, Cluj Plugarilor street and Cluj Zápolya street stood at a level different from the other warriors buried with poorer belongings, not to mention the graves without any supplementary weapons, is known from sites with many graves such as Alba Iulia Izvorul Împăratului, Timișoara Cioreni, Vârșand Laposhalom. Therefore one must consider that the *social differences should be examined within a cemetery, which in some cases might indicate ethnic-cultural differences*.

Besides the social differences between the skeletons of the graves, we tried to examine the differences between the burial sites in a methodological aspect. Such a methodological approach was the measuring of the rare metal content of the graves or that of the cemeteries, which ruled out some misconceptions. Unfortunately, because of the widely dispersed strange finds only a few could be indicated on our map.

The graves excavated in our area could be divided into five groups (groups A, B, C, D and E) out of which we have paid special attention to the burying sites of the so-called 'military escort' type.

A characteristic of the burying sites in *group A* is the great number of the graves of military horsemen and this characteristic is also emphasized by the *vast percentage of sabres*. On the other hand, to our mind, one must make a distinction between the *burying sites of the military retinue*: they might have been the cemeteries of either a more or less important military centre, in the case of the more important ones we can assume a higher percentage of sabres. Therefore it is likely that the three necropolises in Cluj belong to this type (there were sabres in 10 graves out of 40) and the horse-men's graves excavated in Arad-Ceala, Biharea and presumably Alba Iulia Castle must have been of similar importance or at least one might assume it. The cemeteries in the junctions of the transport system in Șiclău or those that are dated later in Deva, Orăștie and Gâmbaș must have belonged to some centres of less importance. At the same time it is worth mentioning that these burial sites are outstanding in terms of their *concentration of weapons* and **not rare metals**.

The single graves and the group of graves are the characteristic grave types in the Banat and the Partium forming the two subunits of *group B*. The characteristic feature of the first subunit is the *richness or relative richness of women's graves* (Galoșpetreu, Teremia Mare, Szeged-Bojárhalom near Szeged) and that the men's graves are supplied with little or no furnishings. Therefore it would only be proper to ask how these rich woman graves were connected to the poor men's graves. The cemeteries containing graves provided with men's archery tools, horses and women's graves with rich furnishings must have belonged to free communities, they were found mostly in the Hungarian Great Plain.

But the necropolises of poorer communities also appear beside these graves and burial sites. Burial sites without horsemen's graves or no furnishing *have been excavated practically all the necropolises that were used for burying the member of the military retinue* (Cluj-Kalevala II, Biharea-Cetate, Alba Iulia Brândușei street, Aradu Nou). In quite a lot of cases, as it has pointed out in the analysis of burial customs, people of a different ethnic-cultural origins might have been buried here (Alba Iulia Brândușei street).

In several cases the same holds for the surroundings of the graves belonging to *group B*, here along with the graves relatively rich furnishing there can be found poor cemeteries (e. g. Galoșpetreu Sălacea-Vidahegy, etc).

In many cases the chronological gap between the cemeteries containing a great number of graves and those with only a few graves are conspicuous. These can be explained with the late settlement and organization of a particular region (it can be noticed in the case of Tomnatic, Dudeștii Vechi, etc). *Group E* contains the cemeteries with poor grave goods, no weapons or horses, which could belong to people of different origins in the different

regions could be comprised in the mass of common people in the 10th century along with the common people of the Magyars conquerors.

Chapter 7: Conclusions

At the beginning of the 10th century the Magyars conquering the Carpathian Basin, occupied many parts of our region, mainly on the plains, in river valleys and on the edge of these regions.

But the archaeological finds show different characteristics in each area.

The cemeteries near Cluj in Northern-Transylvania with connections to the Upper-Tisa region and Kijev show that the Magyars already conquered Northern-Transylvania at the beginning of the 10th century and they set up a *military centre*. This military centre could have served as a defence against the attacks from the east and it could control the mining and transport of salt. It has to be mentioned that the military retinues' cemeteries in Cluj were found along the *Roman road*, which might lead us to the conclusion that these roads were still used in the 10th century.

The finds in South Transylvania are significantly different. The typological connections between the finds in South Transylvania and those in the southern region of the Great Plain might refer to the fact that the *settlement* of South and Northern Transylvania and the *organisation* of these regions must have happened in different times from different directions. If Northern Transylvania became inhabited from the Upper Tisa immediately after the Magyar conquest, then the cemeteries in South Transylvania must date from the middle third of the 10th century. It cannot be determined from the archaeological finds when the South Transylvanian region was occupied but *major settlement* could only have happened in the middle or the second half of the century. We cannot answer the question put by historians so many times whether the Bulgarian hegemony prevailed or not and if so, how long it lasted, but one thing can be stated for sure: the cemeteries in the Mureş valley which had been used from the 9th century on and whose finds are identical to those found in the Lower Danube region, were still in use in the first decades of the 10th century.

So the question of whether the Hungarians extended their way immediately after 896 over South Transylvania cannot be answered upon the examination of the archaeological finds. However, based upon the finds it can be stated that in the middle of the 10th century *major settlements* started from the west, the Great Plain. At the same time in the cemeteries in Alba Iulia people of another origin were buried, as for their burial customs they were just changing from the *cremation* to *inhumation* burying. This theory is supported by the great number of Slavonic place names around Alba Iulia. Presumably, along with the Southern Slavonic masses having come with the Bulgarian conquest there were Slavs settled down by the Avars, which resulted in widespread Slavonic settlement in the mountainous regions of Transylvania. These people were not *destroyed* but *integrated* by the Magyar conquest. Certainly, it is difficult to point out the pace and extent of the assimilation of the people in the occupied region in the first and second thirds of the century by archaeological evidence. One might assume on the evidence of the burial customs that the man with a sabre in the grave at 4 Zápolya Street was of *Slavonic origin* and the man with a sabre in grave No. 11 in Blandiana cemetery "B" might have been a descendent of the assimilated people who integrated in the military-political system set up by the new conquerors in the 10th century. The cemeteries in Alba Iulia Brândușei street and Stația de Salvare must have belonged to the people who were conquered and settled down around Alba Iulia, where Magyar elements also appear. In the second half of the 10th century the territory of settlement spread towards the east, but massive *influx* could only have happened in the first half of the 11th century after the Gyula had been defeated and the territory had been integrated into the Hungarian Kingdom. The huge cemeteries appearing in the 11th century, other elements of the material culture and the

different burial customs may lead us to the assumption that masses of new people came to the Transylvania Basin, this process can be observed on the *eastward expansion* of the settlements.

It seem to be likely that *military centres* in the 10th century of this kind also existed in the Partium, which theory supported by the cemeteries in Biharea and Arad, this latter is also remarkable for a solidus found there from the time Constantinos Porphyrogenetos. In the Banat it is clear that the Tisa valley and the lower reaches of the Mureş belonged to of the territory of their settlement in the first six decades of the 10th century, but they only began to settle down in the eastern parts of the region in the second half of the 10th century. This settlement can be connected to the name of Ajtony who is well known from the written records.

Like in Transylvania these might have been people of other origins in the cemeteries of the new conquerors in the territory of the Partium and Banat too (Şiclău-grave 6, Tărian-grave 4, 7). In some cases even whole communities of other origin may be presumed, so one must count with the presence of *late Avar people* in the Northern Partium (Moftinu Mic) and the *descendants of the Bulgarian conquerors* prevailed in the southern parts (Uivar).

The burial site in Zalău with furnishings containing nailed coffins and earrings of Köttlach style may also belong to a foreign folk. The burial site in Sălacea might have been used by people transported here from the Transdanubian region in the second half of the century similarly to the nearly burial site in Ibrány-Esbóhalom, where the presence of Avar people has been pointed out by the anthropological analysis.

In conclusion, based upon archaeological evidence, one can firmly state that the Hungarian tribal alliance, which conquered the Carpathian Basin, established military bases in the eastern part of the basin (Upper-Tisa region, Cluj, Biharea) where strong military potential was concentrated. Contrary to the stereotypes that have prevailed up to these days, they did not destroy these territories but integrated them and with the help of eastern commerce the cultural features in these regions, as well as in the whole of Eastern Europe, as far as Scandinavia, were changed. Moreover, by conquering the people who had been here as a result of the historical events of the previous period, they made the mass of common people in Group C larger, mainly in the peripheral regions of the basin such south Slovakia or the Transylvanian Basin.

The organising activities of King Stephan I, which aimed to establish a western type state, were based upon existing structures. As a result of his activity the Carpathian Basin began to be united into a political entity under the banner of western Christianity. The archaeological characteristics of the policy of Stephan I, are the *castles* and *castle necropolises* and the *village cemeteries* accompanying the formation of the *village system*.