

ACTA TERRAE SEPTEMCASTRENSIS

XII, 2013

Content

Sabin Adrian LUCA, Florentina MARTIȘ, Anamaria TUDORIE, Adrian LUCA, “THE RITUAL CONSECRATION” OF THE FIRST NEOLITHIC COLONISATION FROM ROMANIA THE PIT HOLES SANCTUARY FROM CRISTIAN I, SIBIU COUNTY PART III. THE ABANDONMENT	7
Attila Nándor HÁGÓ, János NÉMETI, ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCHES AT PIȘCOLT-LUTĂRIE (THE SATU-MARE COUNTY) 1986-1989	21
Raymond WHITLOW, Valerii KAVRUK, Dan-Lucian BUZEA, Björn BRIEWIG, RADIOCARBON DATA FROM THE CUCUTENI-ARIUȘD LEVELS AT PĂULENI-CIUC (CIOMORTAN) “DÂMBUL CETĂȚII”, HARGHITA COUNTY	37
Marius-Mihai CIUTĂ, RECOVERING THE PAST. THE CASE OF HERCULES APULENSIS	65
Beatrice CIUTĂ, ARCHAEOBOTANICAL DETERMINATION OF SEVERAL CHARRED SEEDS AND FRUITS RECOVERED FROM A LATE MEDIEVAL SITE (XVII-XVIII CENTURY)	85
Sabin Adrian LUCA: Sanda BĂCUEȚ CRIȘAN, <i>Cultura Starčevo-Criș în Depresiunea Șimleului</i> [The Starčevo-Criș culture in the Șimleului Basin], Editura Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2008, 183 pages	101
Sabin Adrian LUCA: Sanda BĂCUEȚ CRIȘAN, <i>Neoliticul și eneoliticul timpuriu în depresiunea Șimleului</i> [The Neolithic and Early Neolithic of the Șimleului Basin], in <i>Bibliotheca Brukenthal</i>, 23, 2008, Editura Altip, Sibiu, 340 pages	109
Nicolae GUDEA: Archaeological (9) and Methodological Corrections. to dr. I. Bejinariu from Zalău County Museum	125

Nicolae GUDEA:

Archaeological (9) and Methodological Corrections. To dr. I. Bejinariu from Zalău County Museum

Cuvinte cheie: *Îndreptări arheologice și metodologice (9). Pentru dl. dr. Ioan Bejinariu de la Muzeul din Zalău*

Rezumat: *Autorul îndreptărilor arheologice și metodologice face o trecere în revistă, superficială, la greșelile de fond și de amănunt apărute în lucrarea lui I. Bejinariu, Depozitul de bronzuri de la Brâglez, Cluj-Napoca 2007. Greșelile de fond constau în necunoașterea sistemului internațional (european) de prescurtări și deci folosirea unor prescurtări care fac opus-ul nefolosibil; iar greșelile de amănunt constau în: a. cuvinte din limbi străine scrise greșit; b. prescurtări nerespectate; c. prescurtări care nu au fost explicate.*

I se recomandă autorului să fie mai atent și când vorbește, dar mai ales când scrie.

Keywords: *Archaeological (9) and Methodological Corrections. To dr. I. Bejinariu from the Zalău County Museum*

Abstract: *This review briefly presents some errors of content and detail that appear in the work of I. Bejinariu, Depozitul de bronzuri de la Brâglez [The Bronze Hoard from Brâglez], Cluj-Napoca 2007. The errors of content are caused by the lack of knowledge concerning the international (European) abbreviation system, which, therefore, leads to the use of some abbreviations which make the opus unusable; the errors of detail mainly consist of: a. improperly written foreign words; b. incorrectly written abbreviations; c. abbreviations that have not been explained.*

The author is advised to be more attentive both in speaking and writing.

In February 2010, on the occasion of a double book launch – *Repertoriul arheologic al Județului Sălaj* [The Archaeological Repertoire of Sălaj County] (authors: Sabin Adrian Luca and Nicolae Gudea), and *Așezări arheologice în județul Sălaj* [Archaeological Settlements in Sălaj County], Oradea, 2010 (the pocket version of the previously mentioned repertoire, written by the same authors) – a furious group of museographers from the Zalău County Museum of History and Art, reacted violently and tearfully at the same time. They claimed the fact that the repertoire should have been written by them, that they have worked on a repertoire (which does not exist yet!!!), that the museum they belong to was not consulted, that the authors worked in secret and did not request their help, that the launch of these books is not moral etc. etc. They even used some technical words the meaning of which they did not know.

All this frustration was and is caused by the fact that, for more than twenty years, the Museum of Zalău (with a slightly overcrowded so called department of archaeology) was not capable of finishing this “research plan” named “The Archaeological Repertoire of Sălaj” and suddenly realized that someone from the outside has written the repertoire both in a “classical” (A₄ size) and “pocket” form. Moreover, they were also scared by the perspective of publishing a more “elaborate” version of the repertoire, with rich illustration.

Among the furious critiques (each will receive a lesson of archaeology), there was also dr. Ioan Bejinariu (abbreviated as I.B. in the following) who mainly attacked two aspects: a. the presence of the Neolithic golden male idol from Moigrad (about which he asserts that it is not from Moigrad!) on the cover of the A₄ sized book; b. the “excessively large” erratum of the book.

As a native of Sălaj County, I love its history and, therefore, I read almost everything that is written about its history and culture, as well as note the “gains” and “problems”. This is the context in which I read the “work” of I.B. – *The Bronze Hoard from Brâglez*, Cluj-Napoca, 2007.

If I.B. had kept silent on the book launch (and it would have been better for him!), I would have never revealed the complex mistakes that the great critique made in his own “work”. Consequently, I am forced to do it. Maybe he will become more prudent when writing and especially when criticizing.

Therefore, in the following, we will discuss the two problems raised by dr. I.B. in a scientific manner:

1. Dr. I.B. is not a specialist in Neolithic, even if here we are talking about the Eneolithic, and, from a methodological point of view, he cannot differentiate an essay from a scientific work. J. Makkay’s statement (in this case, the mentor of I.B.) (“A tiszaszőlősi kincs” [The Tiszaszőlős Treasure], Budapest 1985, p. 54-96) seems to be quite hazardous. K. Horedt (*Germania* 55, 1977, p. 7-20), who was the first to publish the gold hoard from Moigrad, initially expressed his doubts concerning the origin of the hoard, but he finally ended in considering it comes from Moigrad. Perhaps I.B. did not read the work! Even before K. Horedt, renowned specialists in Neolithic, such as D. Berciu, Vl. Dumitrescu (*Arta preistorică din România* [Prehistoric Art in Romania], București 1974, p. 267, fig. 299), acknowledged prehistorians such as M. Roska (*Erdély régészeti repertórium. I. Őskor* [The Archaeological Repertoire of Transylvania. I. Prehistory], Kolossvár 1944, p. 184), famous historians such as Em. Condurachi, C. Daicoviciu (*Rumänien. Archaeologia Mundi*, Geneva 1972, p. 245, pl. 38-39), the treatise on Romanian history (1960) and even the more recent treatise, national exhibition catalogues: e.g. I. Miclea – R. Florescu, *Preistoria Daciei. Strămoșii românilor. Vestigii milenare de cultură și artă* [The Prehistory of Dacia. The Forefathers of the Romanians. Millenary Vestiges of

Culture and Art]. București 1980, p. 233; international exhibitions and catalogues: Fl. Drașoveanu – D. N. Popovici (Texts), Neolitische Kunst in Rumänien. Olten 2008 (Rome 2008), p. 134-135, 212, fig. 89-90, all consider that the Neolithic gold hoard was discovered at Moigrad.

In the above mentioned “work”, which is more an essay than a scientific work, J. Makkay speculates on the hoard’s place of discovery, arguing that its seller was a well-known antiquities dealer who was even accused of forgery, and that between 1872-1911 there were no news concerning the discovery of a treasure at Moigrad. In a previous study, “Problems concerning copper age chronology in the Carpathian Basin. Copper age gold pendants and gold discs in central and southeast Europe” (AAASH 28, 1976, p. 251-300), on pages 280-286 - “Problems of the Moigrad hoard”, J. Makkay states that the Neolithic golden objects are not false and that Moigrad can be accepted as their place of discovery. He was not speculating about Tiszaszőlős yet!!! Later, he even proved that the golden fork from the hoard (AAASH 35 1983, p. 313-344) is not a Gepidan artefact, but a golden product belonging to the Bodrogkeresztúr culture.

Therefore, it seems that I.B.’s readings are quite limited! And that apart from him – and in his case too, perhaps only because of the strong frustrations caused by the launch of the repertoire – no one took and takes into consideration the speculations of J. Makkay. Anyway – but this should remain between us –, around 1911 nobody really knew that Porolissum is at Moigrad!

Thus, the authors of the recent archaeological repertoire of Sălaj county (2010) could not take into consideration J. Makkay’s speculations, nor of his only supporter who, in this domain, is still ... a nobody! It is not worth discussing about a scientific comparison between those who state that the Neolithic hoard was discovered at Moigrad and the very few who claim something else. Until exact or more exact data concerning the origin of these pieces, the hoard continues to be known as found at Moigrad. Perhaps I.B. will read a bit more and enlightens himself.

2. Concerning the “excessively large” erratum of the Archaeological Repertoire of Sălaj County (2010), we can only say that it is relatively correctly worked out, with a series of errors that sometimes are unavoidable. However, it would have been better if dr. I.B. had remained silent in this case too. When you know you can be guilty, it is better to keep silent. When you criticize loudly in public you can be contradicted at any moment. Fury is not useful to science!

And here is the answer: in his work concerning the hoard from Brâglez, there are numerous errors both in the text and especially in the referencing system. I

will only present the errors of the referencing system (the “nerve” of the scientific work), which are both archaeological and methodological. The rest will follow.

There are two types of errors: 1. of content; 2. of detail.

1. errors of content

- as any minor provincial archaeologist, dr. I.B. does not know that since 15 years, the European archaeology has adopted and tries to apply a unitary system of abbreviations (let’s say European). This system was initiated through the “Germania” journal of the Römisch-Germanische Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, so that the archaeological studies could have general access. Perhaps the “Richlinien” brochure did not reach Zalău. As a result, I.B.’s title from p. 79, “Bibliography” is improper. Actually, there are abbreviations and bibliography;

- the abbreviations used or created by dr. I.B. do not correspond with the ones accepted by the entire scientific community specialized in archaeology (even the Romanian one!). Some abbreviations are even personal innovations that hitherto have been unknown – e.g. the German journal JahrbRGZM is curiously written as Jahrbücher and abbreviated as J. des R-GZm Mainz (p.97);

- some works that he cites were initially written in a foreign language, but later translated into Romanian. Normally and methodologically, we should indicate the name of the translator: e.g. Mauss 1997 ... The Gift; Eliade 1992 ... However, in I.B.’s work, the name of the translator is unknown. Perhaps this information is secret!

2. errors of detail

- the German word Herausgeber = is correctly abbreviated as Hrsg. In case of dr. I.B., this word appears in 25 works and 25 titles written as hrsg, thus wrongly: p.79, 80, 81 x, 82, 83, 84 x, 86 x, 87, 88 x, 89 x, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95 etc. If he had written herausgegeben von ... then he could have also abbreviated as hrsg. von. But he did not!

other improperly written foreign words (I am not sure I have found all of them, but if he asks me, I might search some more!): p. 83 Frankreid not Franchreich; p.86 Kenntnis not Kentniss; p. 86 beiderseits not beidseis; p.94 emlékei not emplékei; p.94 történetéhez not Történetéhez; p.80 Kultur not kultur; p.83 zur not Zur; früher not Früher; jüngeren not Jungeren; karpatischen not Karpatischen (in German, adjectives do not begin with capital letters); späten not Späten; p.82 Kr(eis) not kr(eis). And many more!

incorrect abbreviations: AAASH in the list of abbreviations and AAH as abbreviation: p. 79 ActaMP and AMP in the list; Revista Bistriței in the abbreviations and Rev. Bistriței on p.88; the Sargetia and Marmatia journals are

written as Sargeția și Marmația (p. 79, 90, 92); even our national journal is incorrectly abbreviated: we have Dacia (the old series) Recherches et découvertes archéologiques and we have the new series (SN) Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne;

incorrect abbreviations which do not appear in the list of abbreviations!

- p. 85 Regensburger Beitr, Praeh. Arch, and on p.83, 88 Regensb. Beitr, Zur Praeh. Arch.

- p. 87 Festschrift von Brunn is written as Festschrift V Brunn on p. 92. I believe that he did not even see the homage-volume the title of which is actually Festschrift für Wilhelm Albert v. Brunn. Hrsg. H. Lorenz, Mainz 1981... and this is how it should be correctly written!

numerous abbreviations that have not been explained

- p. 91 Mon. RGZM ?; p.93 Vorg. Forsch. 19 ?; p. 93 Inv. Arch. ?; p. 79, 85, 87, 90, 91, 92 PBF ? p. 79 BMP ?; p. 80, 84, 95 UPA ?; p. 81 MAN; p. 81 BMA ? p. 83 PAS; p. 84 UFZ. Some specialists know them, but most of them not or do not know all of them. Thus, they should have been explained!

Conclusion: among the 85 titles of the so called "Bibliography" (p.79), there are mistakes in 45 places, so in more than 50% of it.

And, curiously, the great erratum critique does not have an erratum. Therefore, I advise him: keep silent!