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Abstract. During the excavations carried out in 1803-1804 at Grădiştea Muncelului by the Austrian tax authority, regular reports were issued containing valuable information about the investigated site. At the same time, the cartographer Andras Szőts drew up the first known plan of the ruins. He delineated the fortress, placing it in the geographical context, but he also recorded the main excavated spots. The plan of 1804 has remained unused so far. This paper aims to bring to light archive data concerning this plan and to recover the information recorded on it, corroborating them with those of the reports. The importance of this approach is not only a historiographical one, but it also resides in the fact that the information from the beginning of the nineteenth century record a conservation status of the monuments sometimes higher than today.
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The first intentions of elaborating a plan containing the location of Grădiştea Muncelului’s ruins belong to the Transylvanian authorities, and came to light shortly after word began to spread about the discovery of hoards in the area. After the beginning of the official excavations, in the summer of 1803, the fulfilment of this plan became a priority. However, several delays stepped in and the first plan was elaborated only in the autumn of 1804, before the end of the excavations1.

1 In 1803 the excavation was carried out between 21 July and 1 September, and in 1804 between 5 May and 27 October. By the end of 1804, the Imperial Chamber decides to put the excavations to an end, arguing that the spent amount of money was greater than the profit. During the excavations reports were issued, they were bi-monthly during the first campaign, and weekly in the following year, published rather late by S. Jakó (Jakó 1968; Jakó 1971; Jakó 1972; Jakó 1973), but left unused until now. See Peţan 2012, p. 81-82.
Following the report of the tax procurator Paul Török, of 4 July 1803, the Mining and Monetary Treasury ordered, in the assembly of 7 July, the same year, that the mining supervisor, Bernard Aigler from Săcărâmb, should go to Grădiștea Muncelului accompanied by miners and day labourers, in order to begin the research. At the same time, Iosif Bodoki, a mining inspector, was ordered to go on-site, once every 14 days, in order to prepare the reports regarding the state of the research and to make a sketch of „what is worth seeing”. And if Bodoki would not have had drawing skills, says the document of 7 July, someone competent was to be sent at the right time. Following Aigler and Bodoki’s reports of 6 August, drafted after the first two weeks of work, the Treasury ordered again, on 25 August, sketches of the artefacts and of the ruins discovered.

Probably these kinds of sketches, more or less clumsy, were made from the first year of diggings, but only in the autumn of 1804 an expert cartographer arrived at Grădiștea Muncelului, namely the former artillery petty officer Andras Szőts, who, at that time, was mapping the forests of the Imperial domain. Following the talks carried out, during the month of August, by the director of the Imperial Collection of Antiquities, Franz de Paula Neumann, and the treasurer Joseph Bethlen, the Imperial Chamber insisted, in a document dating back to 26 September, on urging the elaboration of the plan and on 5 October the domain administration replied that these works were already in an advanced stage. The absence from the plan of the great stone „double circle”, which was excavated only following the Treasury’s orders of 12 October, gives us an insight on the date when Szőts was in Grădiște. Therefore, we can state that the cartographer finished the plan and the sketch before this date.

Szőts drew two plates. On one of these two he depicted, in its upper half, Grădiștii hill, the citadel’s disposition and the main areas where

---

2 Jakó 1968, p. 4.
5 Jakó 1973, p. 617. The Treasury demands him to carry out excavations there where „the forest cartographer Szőts was busy recording and drawing, where one can see those awkward pieces of columns, and there where a church was assumed to have been”. It does not mean that Szőts registered this monument as well, but that he was drawing in that area. It is likely for him to have stayed in the area of the great circular sanctuary when he draw the pentagonal tower, which is situated nearby, including, in one of the plates, both the plan and sections of this tower.
excavations had been carried out, and in the lower part, the building south of the precinct and the pentagonal tower, both being drawings in plan and section. The second plate includes objects found during the excavations: ceramic pipes, low-reliefs, „the inscription with arms”, stone shrines, scarps of columns, letters from wall blocks et al.

In this article I will only discuss the main plan of the ruins in Grădiştea Muncelului.

The areas where excavations had been carried out were numbered with capital letters, and the spots where the most important artefacts had been discovered, were numbered with lowercase letters, - all of them being explained in a very brief caption, which seems to have the same starting point as Anton Bögözi’s summarizing report of 1805. After the Court expressed, on 14 November, the desire to see again the plates, they were submitted to the Treasury, on 31 December 1804, by the tax procurator J. Zörnlaib and by A. Bögözi, having as prescription to be sent as soon as possible to Vienna, and mentioning the fact that a duplicate was retained. Lastly, the Baron von Reichenstein, the president of the Imperial Chamber, presented them to the Chamber on 13 February 1805, along with a short paper. The report signed by Bögözi, in which the elements on the plates were explained, arrived with delay, only on 25 April 1805.

Unfortunately, the two plates drawn by the cartographer have not come down to us (or at least they were not identified yet in the archives). However, there were at least two contemporary copies. One of them was made by a certain captain Kulyan, and it was a copy made of both plates, which reached Count Joseph Mitrovsky’s document collection (Count who was at that time supreme military commander of Transylvania), accompanying M. Péchy’s report, who was at that time major of the engineering corps and inspected the ruins from Grădiştea in 1805. The two plates are now at Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, in Vienna, in the war archive (Kriegsarchiv, Kartenabteilung KVIIk 403 I/2). A microfilmed copy of these plates is to be found in Bucharest, at the National Archives of Romania, copy obtained from the Viennese archives in the 1980s (Austria fund, roll 198). The second copy was

---

7 Jakó 1973, p. 628.
8 Jakó 1973, p. 636. The plates reproduced by Jakó are listed, in his article, as annexes of the report dating back to 31 December 1804. In fact they are annexes from M. Péchý’s report of 1805, and copies of the report of 31 December 1804.
made by a Chamber scribe named Friedrich Wagner, and it is located in the National Archives of Romania – Cluj County Directorate, Transylvanian Mining Treasury fund, but only the plate depicting artefacts is reproduced (original 2406/1805, microfilm roll 1238/1805). We cannot know if the duplicate in question, in the document dating back to 31 December, is the one made by Kulyan, or the one made by Wagner, or a third copy.

Jakó reproduced Kulyan’s copy, but its quality is so poor that almost nothing can be interpreted from the fortress plan. To this circumstance adds also the technique of cartographic representation of that time, tributary to the fashion of the Josephine maps, through which the wooded areas were represented by tree pictographs, drawn at a close range one from another, such as the structures situated in the forest were hardly distinguished on the plan. The caption is also illegible in this reproduction and Jakó did not provide a transcription of it. Şt. Ferenczi regretted, two and a half decades later, the poor quality of this reproduction9.

Doina Benea, paging through the excavation reports of the Austrian Treasury published by Jakó, mentions the information according to which the making of the map was requested, adding the fact that she regrets that this map has not yet been found, saying that one must look in the archives of the Kunsthistorische Museum10. The map was however published by Jakó in the same article quoted by Benea.

Kulyan’s plate is difficult to construe. I managed to recover the plan copied by Kulyan after having consulted the plates located in the Viennese archives and after processing the image’s contrast based on a scanned copy, of high quality, obtained due to the kindness of the Viennese archives (fig. 1).

This plate includes the entire Grădiştii hill, with the two water flows from north and south, denominated Râul Alb (currently Valea Albă) and Pârâul Alb (currently Valea Godeanului), with Muncel and Godeanu peaks situated roughly to the north and north-east and with other three mountains south the hill: Berg Mele, Berg Tyityava, Berg Stsava – probably Meleia, Titiana and Ştevia (or Şteaua, but this is located further north).

The fortress is situated in the upper part of the hill and occupies a very scant surface of the overall map, the cartographer allotting much

---

9 Daicoviciu et al. 1989, p. 131.
10 Benea 2004, p. 18.
more attention to the area’s geography than to the emplacement of the relics. This aspect is partially balanced by the plans of the two buildings, marked with B and D, represented under the map. Szőts saw the excavations exactly before they took an end; consequently his drawings rendered faithfully what had been excavated. Unfortunately, the copy which was preserved does not faithfully reproduce the original, fact suggested by the additional details in the caption, which make reference to points that are not on the map. Therefore, we cannot fully rely on the accuracy of Kulyan’s copy.

The Kulyan’s representation has an eastward deviation from true north averaging 8 degrees. On the map the precinct is oriented NNE-SSW and has an approximate and simplified contour. His shape is rectangular, with rounded corners (fig. 2). The total length of the walls is of 391 fathoms (= round 739 m), close to the real one. In fact the precinct is an irregular hexagon and is oriented NNW-SSE (fig. 4).

From the succinct caption on the plan it results that the main areas where excavations took place are:

A. The interior of the precinct, where an earthenware pipe was said to have been found (m-n) and a wall fragment (o), both of them being absent from the plan; the dimensions of the enclosure’s sides are:
   \[ ab \] (= the northern side) 56 fathoms (105.84 m);
   \[ ac \] (= the western side) 132 fathoms (249.48 m);
   \[ cd \] (= the southern side) 95 fathoms (179.55 m);
   \[ db \] (= the eastern side) 108 fathoms (204.12 m).

B. The building south the citadel, passed subsequently for a Roman bath by archaeologists, represented in a more detailed manner under the general plan.

C. The granary area, where burnt cereals were found (x) and a beautifully worked stone block (y), with a length of 2½ feet (0.75 m) and the thickness of 62 inches (1.57 m).

D. The pentagonal building with the adjacent walls which elongate significantly towards north and west; below the map it is figured in detail, in plan and in section.

---

11 I have not found in modern papers the precise dimensions of the precinct. In Daicoviciu et al. 1951, p. 100, the dimensions are set out only for two of the fortification’s sides (240 m, respectively 152 m). Călinescu 1982, p. 17 says that the length of the wall is “about 800 m”. The measurements I took with a GPS Garmin Montana 650 provided me round 784 m for the enclosure’s perimeter (measured on the interior).
E. The swampy area, where excavations were made (today known under the name of “at Tău”).

On the inside of the citadel, the highest terrace, on which assiduous excavations were carried out in 1803, but also in 1804, is as well highlighted.\textsuperscript{12}

The access routes represented on the map are:

1) a footpath (\textit{Fussweeg}) which begins at the confluence of two valleys, crosses over the civilian settlement, passes south the pond, arrives at the enclosure, it cuts it, passing through two gates (western and eastern), then it goes eastwards, crossing what today is known as the sacred area and leading to \textit{Godeanu} mountain;

2) the ancient road (\textit{der alte Weeg}) which comes from the \textit{Valea Godeanului} and also crosses the civilian settlement on a route that largely coincides with the modern path, but passes south building \textit{B}, arrives at the eastern gate and joins the footpath mentioned above;\textsuperscript{13}

3) a path leads to building \textit{B}, east the citadel, intercrossing the two foregoing roads;

\textsuperscript{12} „Plan von der Berg GRADISTE und den alten ausgegrabenen Gebauden samt ein Theil von den umliegenden Gebirgen. ERKLÀERUNG:


\textit{In diesem eingeschlossenen Raum in \textit{m} und \textit{n} örter sind die in der Reihe noch gut zusammen verbundenen Wasserröhre ausgegraben worden, und in \textit{o} ein stuck Mauer.}

\textit{B.} Ist der ort wo das nach grösserem Maßstabe im Grund und Durchschnitt samt dem rund gezeichneten Gebau Fig. B steht. Dieses ist von quadrat hin und herlänglichen, und blatten sandsteinen auf gestellt worden.

\textit{C.} Ist der ort wo das verbrannte Frucht in der Erde \textit{y} vergraben dann in \textit{x} 2 ½ W. Schu. lang 62 Zoll in quadrat diecke schön aus gearbeiten Steinen in der Reihe nur aufgestellt gefunden worden.

\textit{D.} Das nach grösserem Maßstabe im Grund und Durchschnitt gezeichnetes Gebau in Fünfeck von gleichen quadrat Stein aufgeführt.

\textit{E.} Ein samtiger ort wo auch gegraben worden ist.

Alle sonst mit Carmin bezeichneten Orten am Situations Plan bedeuten vorragen der alten Mauerverke, die mit hochen und jungen Buchenbaumen vermachen sind. G.d.C. Ku\textit{lyan},“ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Kartenabteilung KVIIk 403 1/2.

\textsuperscript{13} This important Dacian road is represented only here and on Finály’s map (Finály 1916, p. 36, fig. 7). The unique published modern map of the civilian settlement does not differentiate between the Dacian road and the recent footpath (Daicoviciu et al. 1952, p. 303, fig. 26). For the ancient access ways to Sarmizegetusa Regia see Glodariu et al. 1996, p. 85-88.
4) a road which sets off from the eastern wall of the citadel, from its northern half, and leads in a straight line eastwards, to Godeanu mountain.

To the sketchy data from the caption adds the information included by Bögözi in his report of 25 April 1805\(^4\). Hence, we find out that the enclosure’s wall has a thickness of 2 ½ feet (0.75 m)\(^5\) and a height of 5-9 feet (1.5-2.7 m)\(^6\), and its total length is indeed of 391 fathoms. On the inside of the precinct, close to the wall, a pipe made out of well burnt clay was found, boarded with 10-12 inches (25.40-30.48 cm) planks. The depth at which it was found is of 4-5 feet (1.20-1.50 m), the conduits have 3 feet (0.90 m) in length, the thickness of the wall is of 1 ½ inches (3.81 cm), and the inner diameter is 15 inches (38.10 cm). The total length of the excavated pipe, which was found undamaged in the ground, is of 11 fathoms (20.79 m)\(^7\).

At B, says Bögözi, are the remains of a building covered by earth, where no gate was identified, but which had the entrance from the upper side. On the inside of the building much lead ore, cinder, blast vessels, broken glass, bricks of different sizes, ceramic fragments and human bones were found. Hereunder, several stone blocks were found, on which there were letters, nicely polished columns and stones with drawings and symbols.\(^8\)

\(^4\) Jáko 1973, p. 629 sqq.

\(^5\) This size is definitely wrong. Four decades later, Andras Fodor, who undertook excavations there, gave 9 feet (2.70 m), much closer to the real size (Fodor 1844, p. 302). According to the measurements made at the beginning of the systematic excavations, the wall thickness was of 3.20 m (Daicoviciu et al. 1951, p. 162). Today the wall is rebuilt.

\(^6\) If these numbers are correct, it means that at that time the walls were preserved significantly higher than today. In 1980 the maximum height of the wall was of three rows of stone blocks (round 1.20 m), see Câlinescu 1982, p. 17. However, in 1851 it is mentioned only a height of 6 feet (1.80 m), see Neigebaur 1851, p. 99, no 2.

\(^7\) The information is extremely valuable and until now it was left unused by archaeologists. It proves the fact that in the precinct there is a third water catchment, besides the one from the sacred area and the one at Tău, fact assumed already by Iaroslavschi 1995, based on the finding of a pipe fragment south the precinct, close to the building considered as a thermal edifice, and later proved by the discovery of some pipe fragments on terraces III (Glodariu et al. 2003; Glodariu et al. 2004) and IV (Florea et al. 2012, p. 63). Iaroslavschi placed the catchment on terrace IV, but further discoveries show that the source must have been placed on an upper terrace. See the debate at Pețan 2013.

\(^8\) Regarded as Roman bath by M. Péchy (Jakó 1973, p. 634), as theatre by F. Neigebaur (Finaly 1916, p. 27) and M. Ackner (Ackner 1856, p. 98), as temple
At C and E burnt cereals were found, at a depth of 2-3 feet (0.60-0.90 m) under the earth.\textsuperscript{19}

Either in area B, either in area C and E (Bögözi’
’s account is not clear)\textsuperscript{20} potsherds of great dimensions with walls having the thickness of a finger, and a maximal capacity of 20-24 measures were found, as well as Lysimachos and Koson coins\textsuperscript{21}. The two places where burnt cereals were found are situated at 400 fathoms (756 m) one from another and the cereals were found directly on the ground, without traces of jars or storehouses, at a depth of 12-20 inches (30.48-50.80 cm). Between the cereals there were also some burnt peas and beans\textsuperscript{22}.

At D we are only told that it is a building with five corners and the side of 2 fathoms (3.78 m).\textsuperscript{23}

These are the information which adds up to Szőts’ map, preserved only in the copy of Kulyan. We cannot know how much did Kulyan leave out or distorted while transferring the information.

There is another sketch, very similar to Szőts’ plan, copied by count Jozsef Kemény and kept in the manuscript collection (fig. 3). It was published by Finály Gabor in 1916 and it was attributed to Abbot Eder\textsuperscript{24}.

\textsuperscript{19} Further researches have confirmed the existence of burnt grains and vegetable beads in the two areas, but also on other terraces, see Suciu 2009, p. 353, with the associated bibliography. The swamp area, where there is one of the Dacian water catchment, was investigated in detail later, see Daicoviciu et al. 1951, p. 121-122; Daicoviciu et al. 1952, p. 296-297; Glodariu et al. 2003.

\textsuperscript{20} After displaying the area B, Bögözi describes the finds from C and E, then he comes back to B, in order to discuss about the stones with signs, then he says that “in this area as well” the potsherds and the coins were found.

\textsuperscript{21} For the monetary findings during the campaigns of the Austrian Tax Authority from 1803 to 1804, see Peţan 2012.

\textsuperscript{22} Peas are well documented at Grădiştea de Munte, but common beans are unknown: it might have been mistaken for broad beans, also found there by archaeologists, see Suciu 2009, p. 353.

\textsuperscript{23} The pentagonal tower was excavated between June and October 1804 (see the reports from Jakó 1972 and Jakó 1973) and later investigated by the team of C. Daicoviciu, see Daicoviciu et al. 1952, p. 291-292. The archaeologists were very surprised to discover in 1966 the two adjacent walls, without knowing that they had already been unearthed in 1804 and recorded on this map (Daicoviciu et al. 1973, p. 68).

\textsuperscript{24} Finály 1916, p. 18, fig. 1. Daicoviciu et al. 1989, fig. 34, wrongfully credits Eder with a different plan, mentioning the same manuscript of Kemény; however that plan belongs to I. Marţian, see Marţian 1921, fig. 26.
Before seeing Kulyan’s plates in the Viennese archives, I considered that the plan published by Finály must have fundamentally had a version made by Bögözi and afterwards attached to his report of 25 April 1805. Since Eder wrote in 1803, Bögözi should have drawn that plan in 1803 as well, during the first excavation campaign. Bögözi’s plan is now lost, Jakó did not succeed to find in the archives but the report’s text, in which it was said that a plan is attached.

After having consulted Kulyan’s plates, I have determined that the plan published by Finály, and ascribed to Eder, is very similar to the one drawn by Szőts in the autumn of 1804. We might have assumed that Szőts used a sketch prior to Bögözi’s, made in 1804 and known also by Eder, and attached subsequently to the 1805 report, but it would have been less likely that Bögözi, a metalworker, could have made alone that plan, and the cartographic expert copied only Bögözi’s plan. An examination of Kemény’s manuscripts confirmed me the fact that the mistake lay in Finály’s text: the plan copied by the count does not belong to Eder, but it actually represents precisely the subsequently lost annex of Bögözi’s compendious report of 25 April 1805. Eder’s text is placed, in Kemény’s manuscript, 3 leaves before the Bögözi’s report, between the two being inserted the texts of Aigler, Bodoki and Pribila, and the plan is drawn at the end of Bögözi’s report. There is no doubt that this is the plan copied by Bögözi in 1805 after Szőts’ plate.

In Bögözi’s plan the names of the rivers and mountains, the orientation of the enclosure, the numbering of the excavation spots and the main access ways are the same as in Kulyan’s map. The outline of the enclosure is rendered a little more precisely, in a pentagonal shape. It is possible that the inspector have reproduced the Szőts’ drawing more accurately than Kulyan. The pentagonal tower is also clearly drawn, but without the two extended walls.

The Austrian plan of 1804 remained unknown and unused in the age. Not even the sketchy copy made by Bögözi, saved by Kemény and published by Finály, was used by those who researched, before the

---

25 Pețan 2012, p. 82, n. 8.
27 Mss. J. Kemény, Collectio Maior Manuscriptorum Historiorum, vol. XXXIV, Varia, fol. 135, Romanian Academy Library, Cluj-Napoca Department, the Kemény collection. It is possible that the confusion was not due to Finály, but to an error intervened during the preparation of the manuscript for printing. Reproducing Bögözi’s report, Finály makes reference to fig. 1 for the report’s annex, but below fig. 1 he quotes Eder.
Second World War, the relics at Grădiştea Muncelului\textsuperscript{28}. The plan was ignored after the opening of the systematic excavations as well, even though it had already been published by Jakó (it is true, in poor graphic conditions) and was brought microfilmed in Bucharest. A thorough research of this plan, together with the information in the summary report of 1805, may provide archaeologists valuable supplementary information. Furthermore, it would be of great importance to find the original plan drawn by Szőts, which includes the emplacement of the pipeline and, possibly, some other details left unknown until now.
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Fig. 1. The map of A. Szőts (copy by Kulyan). Source: Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Kartenabteilung KVIIk 403 I/2.
Fig. 2. Detail from the map of A. Szőts (copy by Kulyan). Source: Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Kartenabteilung KVIIk 403 I/2.
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