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Abstract: The current paper presents the main lines of an investigation into the Romanization/Latinization of Dacia. The issues are mainly addressed from a social history point of view. What we have tried to find out is if talking about assimilation, acculturation and integration in the case of Dacia is really in accordance with what the realities of the province show us. These ‘realities’ that we took into consideration are the reflection of society in epigraphy/epigraphic habits, with the occasional references to literary and archaeological sources. The following pages will raise many questions – and not all of them can be answered at the present time. Nonetheless, we hope they will enlarge perspectives and form a solid base for future, deeper investigations on the topic.
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The current research focuses on the integration of province Dacia into the Roman Empire, on how the process is reflected by its epigraphy, on the implementation of political agency in a generally hostile environment and on the subtle differences between what we today call Romanization and Latinization.

The idea of the research originated from two main lines of interest: The first one is the study of Roman Dacia’s epigraphy in a social context and the inconsistencies one sometimes notices within the provincials’ ways of expression. The second is focused on the interactions between Roman colonists and the autochthonous population and the constantly arising question: where and who are the Dacians in the province? How did colonization work and did the newly formed Roman society integrate (in the deep meaning of the term), Latinize, the pre-conquest civilization, respectively population?

When carefully and comparatively looked upon, the written and archaeological sources reveal solid details indicating that the society of province Dacia was more multi-faceted than we tend to believe and that its Romanization actually highlights the limits of Roman multiculturalism.

ROMANIZATION, LATINIZATION AND PROVINCIAL HISTORY

The historiography of Romanization, in all its aspects, is quite vast and we will only mention a few milestones. Reference works on epigraphic
habits and epigraphic representativeness are those of R. MacMullen, J. C. Mann, E. A. Meyer, D. J. Mattingly and S. Pilhofer. Modern approaches on Romanization generally try to tackle several types of sources, with a focus on epigraphy and archaeology (not necessarily in this order); from this category, we only mention the works of M. A. Brucia and G. N. Daugherty, G. Woolf, P. Wells, R. Haussler, and L. Mihăilescu-Birila. A very important and rather traditional line of study concerns onomastics; the bibliography is vast and we will only refer to a few works regarding naming practices from a cultural perspective, namely those of B. Salway, S. Hornblower and E. Matthews, J. Finch, and N. Moncuniil. A line of study close enough to the one we are following in the present article is that regarding Latinization, subtleties of the contact-between-cultures phenomena and their linguistic and spiritual implications; this research trend can be well exemplified through writings authored by I. Haynes or A. Mullen.

At this point, we envision Romanization as the ‘from top to down’ implementation of Roman administration and social norms, the forms creating in this case the content. Latinization is rather the assimilation of the Roman culture at the deep, low levels of societies, as it has more to do with acculturation and the content tends to create the forms. Obviously, the presence of one phenomenon does not exclude the other, by the contrary, they take roots simultaneously in the Roman provinces. In our opinion, Gaulish language presumably surviving until the 6th C AD is a proof of Latinization, as the Roman administration and ways of life, so well developed in Gaul, integrated pre-existing forms and basically created a new culture.

As a fugitive case study, around 100 AD, at Vindolanda, on Britannia’s northern border, the decurio Masclus writes to the prefect Flavius Cerialis, asking for instructions regarding his men’s schedule. Politely, he also asks for more beer for his troop. Masclus bears a Latin name, but is a Batavian and drinks beer – a beverage preferred by Germans, but held in contempt by Romans and Celts alike. Local habits implanted into a Roman provincial environment go even deeper, as the decurio mesmerizingly calls Cerialis rex. Expectedly, there were hierarchiographic debates on the exact meaning and reason for employing this unusual title, but we believe that it refers to Cerialis’s appurtenance to the Batavian nobility and former ‘royalty’. Nonetheless, in our given context, the real question is how did this man’s world look like, how did it reflect acculturation and what luggage did he carry with him in Britannia?

Anecdotes aside, these small episodes are gate-openers for our understanding of the Latinization/Romanization phenomena and implied problematics. We will be faced with a constant need of going beyond appearances, of discovering the meta-messages of written texts and of seeing patterns – without being deluded by false tracks. One of the main stakes of the project is finding the similarities and differences between the ‘meta history’ written from afar, for a large and generally educated audience (ancient historical writing), and the ego-history, written by provincials for provincials, by R. Knapp’s ‘invisible Romans’, and transmitted through epigraphy.

Under the circumstances, in a society born through harsh war, how does the change of perspective and agendas, of both narrators and targeted public, impact on the selection, interpretation and ultimately promotion of the events that became ‘historical facts’ for us?

**THE DACIAN WARS AND THEIR PECULIARITIES**

The Dacians, pre-Roman inhabitants of the province, were a Thracian population, speaking a satem language. Around 30 tribes are attested throughout their history, most of them by Ptolemy in his Itinerary – with some derived toponymes conserved and present in the provincial epigraphic sources. Dacian history is marked, from what we know, by two significant historical moments, which are fairly well documented. First, Burebista unites the tribes and forms a huge kingdom, possibly a theocracy; he dies in the same year as Caesar (44 BC), assassinated as well by a faction from his ‘court’.

The second historical landmark is Decebalus uniting the tribes again and waging war against Rome. For the Dacian wars, we do not have first-hand accounts (as Trajan’s lost description of the wars would have been), but we have sources close in time to the events (Suetonius writing on Domitian’s Dacian campaign, Juvenal’s allusions, Cassius Dio’s extensive accounts, etc.). The sources – Iordanes, Suetonius, Cassius Dio, Tacitus – are quite harsh on Domitian. His legati, Oppius Sabinus and Cornelius Fuscus, are killed in battle, in 86-87, and at least one legion (probably the Vth Alaudae) is annihilated; these are considered to be the emperor’s personal failures, due to his lack of tactical vision and subjective, biased, appointments of incompetent governors.

Trajan’s ‘storyline’ in the Dacian wars is very different. He also loses an important general, namely

---

17. Tak Vindol. III 628.
Longinus, but this is not a story of failure, but of courage and dignity. Unlike Fuscus, *qui vulturibus servabat viscera Dacis/Fuscus marmorea meditatus proelia villa*,30 Longinus was a former governor of Judea, Moesia Superior and Pannonia, who became ‘a terror’31 for the Dacians during the war. At the start of the second war (105-106 AD), Longinus is captured by Decebalus through deceit and kills himself heroically, in order to avoid being used by the Barbarian king in blackmailing the emperor. All accounts describe the war colourfully, with harsh confrontations, unexpected battle ways (the Dacian *falx* proved lethal, cutting through the Roman helmets, the Dacian noblemen seem to have been fighting drugged and half naked – archaeology supports this, at least partially)32 and a rather dramatic final showdown (Lusius Quietus’ Moorish cavalry fell on the Dacian capital from a 2.200 meters high unguarded mountain peak,33 Decebalus was betrayed, the fortress was lost and the king took his own life).34

By all indications, the Dacian aristocracy was military and/or sacerdotal; its defeat in war and the exclusion of the Dacian religion from the Roman pantheon became the equivalent of elite annihilation.35 Along with king Decebalus’ suicide, which basically marked the total lack of compromise possibilities, the disappearance of the social upper layers has come as a social trauma, marked Rome’s lack of desire to truly assimilate this population and made the integration of the Dacians in the new social and political structures of the Empire difficult and slow.

ULPIA TRAIANA SARMIZEGETUSA, BETWEEN REFLECTION OF DACIA FELIX AND IMPERIAL PROPAGANDA

One of Trajan’s most interesting acts after the ending of the Dacian wars is related to his choices regarding the new capital of the Roman province. Regarding its urbanization pattern after the conquest, Dacia is integrated in the general trend of Balkan and Danubian provinces, all being marked by a visible discontinuity of pre-Roman settlements. What it brings forth is an extreme manifestation of the general pattern,36 consequence of the most ruthless conquest war of the area.

The capital was moved 70 kilometres east (Fig. 1) and the old royal capital, Sarmizegetusa/Sarmizegethusa37 Regia/το βασίλειον,38 the political and religious centre of the former kingdom, was burnt to the ground. The name chosen for the new city, Colonia Ulpia Traiana Augusta Dacica Sarmizegetusa, conserves the Dacian element, as one can see, which seems to come at odds with the rest of the post-war actions, showcasing no benevolence towards the defeated.39

---

31 CASSIUS DIO, *Historia Romana*, 68, 12, 1-5.
32 SARBU 1993.
33 CASSIUS DIO, *Historia Romana*, 68, 8, 3.
34 AE 1985, 721.
35 FLOREA 2006, 2-3.
36 DONEV 2019, 38.
38 PTOLEMEUS, *Geographia* III 8, 4.
39 MITTHOF 2014.
From what we can assume, this action was not meant for the local society, it was not a real integrative effort, but relates to the big-scale, imperial propaganda. The message, transmitted through the whole Empire (whose inhabitants obviously couldn’t have known the details of local realities and the profound biases of Dacian society) is that Dacia has been pacified, violence forgotten and Roman order established. The same message is transmitted through the
first monetary emissions with the new province: it depicts the personification of Dacia seated comfortably, with symbols of abundance around it (Fig. 2). Trajan had just conquered and pacified a rich province, which was now, in 112–114 AD, perfectly integrated into the Empire – more or less, this is what the emperor wants to transmit to the Roman world, leaving aside the tribulations of integration and assimilation that were to mark Dacian society.

Administratively, Sarmizegetusa was founded as a 
\textit{colonia deducta}, presumably through a now lost \textit{lex provinciae}, and all its epigraphy, architecture, municipal and priestly functions, as well as the Latinity of its onomastics, truly show it as being a small reflection of Rome, as Aulus Gellius deemed this type of cities. The city was managed by \textit{duumvires iure dicundo}, thus enjoyed a high degree of autonomy in municipal life, as well as in administering a vast \textit{territorium}, which engulfed almost all the future Dacia Superior.\\footnote{RIC 622; BMC III 204, 960.}

Surely, founding a citizens’ \textit{colonia} in the geographical centre of the former kingdom transmitted a message to the local community as well: Dacia was now officially a \textit{provincia Caesaris}, governed by a senator appointed by the emperor – \textit{legatus Augusti praetore} and old times needed to be forgotten.

\section*{THE DACIANS OF DACIA}

One of the most delicate problems one faces when analysing the society of province Dacia, which made historians constantly question the nature of its \textit{Romanization} and of the imperial dominion, is the very vague attestation – almost absence – of a Dacian population integrated within provincial society and life. While the situation of the Dacians has often been compared to that of the Jews,\\footnote{RIC 2008, 301.} we consider the cultural and geo-political realities much too different for a fruitful mirrored investigation. Dacia is a case in its own. The trauma of the war and the lack of local, pre-Roman, elites to mediate contacts and relationships with the Romans left its mark, creating some of the province’s most striking and individualizing features: the almost complete absence of Dacian names from Dacia’s written sources and a vivid sensation that it is hard to talk about real acculturation, but rather about layers and social gaps.

Eutropius famously says that \textit{Dacia enim diuturno bello Decibali viris fuerat exhausta}.\\footnote{ILD 32.} The term \textit{exhausta} is radical in nature and it un-figuratively means ‘draw liquid off or away’. Nonetheless, the 4th century historian surely knows his previous figurative employments, which refer to depriving a territory/city of possessions, resources, manpower – to drain, to exhaust. This use of the word is always to refer to communities defeated by Rome in various conflicts. Thus, linguistically, the harsh ending of the Dacian conflict is sanctioned. Nonetheless, one shouldn’t understand that all Dacians, or Dacian men, were physically eliminated after the wars, but the paragraph is rather an allusion to elite annihilation and the lack on immediate post-war integration of the natives.

One of the main issues of post-wars Roman administration, in general, was to organize the local communities. In Dacia, we have no clues on the juridical status of the conquered population. For sure, the existence of \textit{civitates}-like settlements, co-administered by local elites and Roman magistrates, is out of the question, as no proof of such forms actually exist. A hypothesis which was appealing to some is that the Dacians became \textit{dediticii}, thus lacking any legal rights or protection, or \textit{peregrine nullius civitatis}, tolerated inhabitants, again with no juridical rights.\\footnote{PISO, RUSU 1990.} Even if apparently well-reasoned, these theories have no support, no written source mentioning or even alluding to such a state of facts. We are more inclined to believe that the local population simply got peregrine status – and most probably most of them continued their lives as before, in rural communities.\\footnote{PISO 1995, 70 details on this theory}

The Dacian names from the province are extremely rare.\\footnote{CIRJAN 2006.} The most “notorious” of them certainly is Decebalus Luci; the discovery of the best known Dacian royal name on a gold leaflet within a thermal basin raised huge interest.\\footnote{A short overview on their ‘traditional’ archaeological attestations, see VARGA 2017, 118-120 and for an update on the matter, NEMETI 2019.} The plaque, along six others, was discovered in 1987, in the large thermal basin of Germisara (Geoagi Băi), where they had been discarded as \textit{ex voto}. The gold offerings were ‘accompanied’ by more than 600 coins, a marble statue of Diana (mentioned above), and four stone inscriptions.\\footnote{CIL III 7635.} In this context, Decebalus dedicated to the all-potent, tutelary Nymphs from Germisara. We believe it is not completely wrong saying that the name was “fashionable” at a certain time. Even more so in Dacia, the name must have been seductive after the war became a mere memory, whether it was for Decebalus, slave of Lucius or for the son of a Romanized family. Nonetheless, one must keep in mind that the ethnicity of the bearer remains hidden to us, a name not vouching for any type of real blood connection.

Another Dacian name comes from a military diploma: Diurpa Dotu(... \textit{filia}, wife of Didu Cuttius, from \textit{Cohors II Augusta Nerviana milliaria Pacensis}).\\footnote{PISO RUSU 1990.} Diurpa is not found spelled like this as a Dacian name but in the Greek form of Diourpa and neither is it found as a female name.\\footnote{PISO 1995, 70 details on this theory} A name recently identified as Dacian comes from Čășeiu (\textit{Samum})\footnote{PISO 1987, in \textit{ILD} 32.} and is reconstructed as Dablasa or Zuroblasa.\\footnote{AE 1992, 1484; AE 1992, 1485; AE 1992, 1486; AE 1992, 1487.} Associated with another Dacia name from the same epitaph – Aurelia
Tsinta – Dacian as well, the reconstruction seems very plausible. Dacian names and Dacian natives (explicitly denominated as such) are attested in other parts of the Empire, such as Moesia, Egypt, or Britannia, but their quasi-absence from Dacia is still difficult to place socio-psychologically.

The hypothesis of Dacian onomastics disappearing from the province lacks plausibility. Even if one were to accept a wide-scale adoption of Latin onomastics during the second generation after the conquest, it would still not be a sufficient explanation for the almost complete absence of Dacian names. The hypothesis of an epigraphy in wood is very alluring, but even considering it deductively as a probability, the proofs of its existence still elude us.

Independent of the many and multi-folded explanations one can find for this phenomenon, it seems that the native population resisted acculturation to a certain degree; in absolute terms, one cannot completely deny even a hostility felt after the end of the wars, an end that was probably more severe than necessary.

In order to analyze and demonstrate the above statements, we will go into the details of the province’s epigraphy, macro analyse it and focus on what it tells us explicitly and implicitly, as well as on – very important – what is lacking, through a comparative perspective (geographically, source-related and intrinsically).

DACIA’S PROVINCIAL EPIGRAPHY, BETWEEN HABITS AND REALITY

When looked upon superficially, in a short while, Dacia apparently became one of the best Romanized European provinces, with high epigraphic density and numerous displays of Roman culture. Too numerous, perhaps. While G. Woolf’s calculations of epigraphic density do not mirror today’s figures of epigraphic finds, his proportions are still valid. Regarding Dacia, they illustrate the fact that the province has a comparatively high epigraphic density – when equating it with other provinces, given the short period of Roman dominion. There are explanations for this, and one of the most solid is its intensive militarization, which doesn’t only mean the presence of a huge number of soldiers, but also implies the development of adjacent civilian settlements and communities and – not least – a constant influx of money.

The raw data regarding the epigraphic presence of Dacia’s people were extracted from the open access resource Romans1by1. Overlooking Dacia’s epigraphy quantitatively, we have 4,354 attested individuals attested, coming from 2,645 inscriptions (Fig. 4). The types of inscriptions are diverse: 1,226 votive monuments, 758 epitaphs, 387 instrumenta, 117 honorific stones, 66 construction inscriptions (in various forms: dedications, plaques, even benches), 62 military diplomas, 19 wax tablets, 10 lists (alba) and 2 unknown monuments (the stones are so badly deteriorated that one cannot establish their original purpose).

Regarding the distribution on the three administrative circumscriptions of Dacia, there are 234 persons in Dacia Inferior (DI in the above mentioned database), 3,031 in Dacia Superior (DS in the database) and 1,039 in Dacia Porolissensis (DP in the database); the rest of 43 persons come from inscriptions (mainly diplomas) from the Trajanic period, when the province was not yet administratively divided.

The predominance of the data from Dacia Superior is the first point to be highlighted. The fact is explained by the presence of the two greatest urban centres of the province: Sarmizegetusa, capital and seat of the financial procurator and the conurbation from Apulum, where the Legio XIII Gemina was stationed and the provincial governor resided from 168 AD on. On this point, we must take into account who manifested themselves epigraphically in cities, which is definitely not only the political elites, but the potentes in the larger acceptance of the term, including – for example – merchants, who had social relevance through wealth. The north is represented by the highly militarized area of the limes (Porolissum being the most important centre from the military area) and by Potaissa, an urban settlement which

---

53 VARGA 2017, 117
54 WOOLF 1998, 82.
55 The province doesn’t feature on Woolf’s density map, but we have calculated a density of 50-55 inscriptions/1.000 sq.km. This places Dacia among the provinces with a mid- to high level of density, along Numidia, Gallia Cisalpina, Dalmatia (VARGA 2014, 55).
56 PISO 1993 37-38, 82-93. For the seat of the governor see: VARGA/RUSU-DUMITRACHE/CURCĂ 2020, 74.
57 SLOOTJES 2009.
58 http://romans1by1.com/.
59 VARGA et al. 2018, 40. The figures have slightly increased, due to the publication of new epigraphic materials, but the percentages and conclusions are obviously the same.
60 BOLINDEȚ 2016, 115-126
61 SLOOTJES 2009.
62 DUMITRACHE/CURCĂ 2020, 74.
grew larger and richer after the Legio V Macedonica was stationed here, in 168 AD. Thus, we find Dacia’s epigraphy as mostly an urban, elite phenomenon, often associated with official acts and local administration.

Some of the most striking results are connected to the ways in which epigraphy was employed for communicating in society, thus, Dacia massively brings forth a type of urban epigraphy, but even more, heavily intertwined with social promotion (the massive predominance of votive monuments illustrates that), while, for example, Moesia Superior’s epigraphy is mainly represented by epitaphs. Actually, in most of the European Roman provinces the ratio votive : funerary is either more or less 50% : 50%, or it inclines towards the latter. The predominance of votive monuments alludes to the preponderantly social role of epigraphy for Dacian society and to the fact that these habits responded to a social need – obviously perceived by a minority.

Dacia’s epigraphy, Latin to its core, does not appear to be a reflection of acculturation, at all, but rather a faithful mirror of Roman habits, employed by those who represented Roman society, and not necessarily a mixed version of Roman and local communities intertwining. Eutropius – again – states that when he abandoned Dacia, Aurelian removed all Roman citizens and relocated them: Romanos ex urbibus et agris Daciae in media Moesia collocavit appellavitque eam Daciam. Of course, this line stirred hot debates, often being politicized and idealized, on whether or not Dacia was, once again, ‘emptied’ of its inhabitants. When put this way, the supposition seems ridiculous and Eutropius actually didn’t state this, as he refers to Romans exclusively. But relating this statement with the analyses undertaken above, we do believe, metaphorically speaking, that all those who erected inscriptions left. Because Dacian society had at least two main layers, with little in common: the Romans of the cities, the army and the administration and a rural population on which we have few archaeological data and almost no written sources.

ENDING REMARKS

What do we see and understand so far? We see a rift between sources (epigraphic – archaeological), which reflects a provincial social rift and alludes to a multi-layered character of Dacian society. And so, was it acculturation? Not really, as the Latin and Dacian cultures don’t seem to mix in order to produce new, original features. Was it assimilation? Of the very few, for sure, but not of the majority. Was it integration? Definitely a very good one at an administrative level. The province as an administrative and state entity was integrated in the empire, Romanized from numerous points of view (army, urbanization, religion, a consistent layer of Romans who lived a Roman life). In the more profound meaning of the term, was it Latinization? No as far as we can see, maybe linguistically – but this is a complicated matter in itself, worthy of a completely different discussion. A new culture is built on assimilation and inter-twined traditions, not on separated layers - and the latter seems to be Dacia’s reality.

This is not the time to draw conclusions on most of the question raised through the present study. Deep investigations on each topic touched in the pages above are necessary and will be hopefully undertaken in the future. This kind of analysis is rather meant for a collective effort, not an individual small research.
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