

## THE AUTOCHTHONOUS DISLOCATIONS AND THEIR EFFECTS UPON THE ROMANIZATION PROCESS IN DACIA

Dumitru Protase

Knowing the essence, the deep transformations, the general or local controversies about the Romanization, the effects or its disappearance in many geographical regions<sup>1</sup>, we are going to study a topic less revealed by researchers, historians and linguists, a subject well represented archaeologically in Dacia. On one side it is about the leaving or moving, by the Romans, of many Dacian communities from ancient settlements and their replacement in the new province. On another side we will investigate the report between these actions and the Romanization process.

It is necessary to underline, from the beginning, that according to the archaeological researches and studies, during the two conquer wars, after the military and political-administrative Roman rule was established in Dacia, the large settlements (*davae*), the Dacian fortresses and sanctuaries were destroyed, and the Dacian aristocracy and priests disappeared, being no longer mentioned in the literature. Archaeology shows that many civilian or military settlements, the fortresses, all types of strongholds ceased their existence with the Roman conquest or in a short time after that<sup>2</sup>.

The causes are obvious: the situation created by war, the measures taken by the Roman military and civilian authorities within the province. In Dacia and also in other Roman provinces, these actions were determined by strategic, political, military, socio-economical reasons. As we will further show, many Dacian settlements continued their existence during Roman time, in the same place, especially in Eastern parts of inter-Carpathians Dacia<sup>3</sup>. The dislocations of the autochthonous population from the area of the Dacian fortresses were an almost general rule, because the archaeological investigations show no Dacian fortress survived the conquest wars, and the settlements that depended upon some of these fortresses were too abandoned, in that time or later.

The Romans resorted to population removals from one area to another, within the conquered territories, also in other part of the Empire. The reasons were generally the same: strategic, military, political and economical. Some examples of removals would be the Cantabres and the Astures who were moved by Agrippa, in 19 BC, from the mountain regions to the plain<sup>4</sup>. It is also known that in 12 BC and 1 AD, Publius Sulpicius Quirinus, governor of Siria,

---

<sup>1</sup> A rich bibliography on this topic is available in our work *Autohtonii in Dacia*, vol I, București, 1980, p. 228, and also in *Istoria românilor*, vol. II, București, 2001, p. 267-277.

<sup>2</sup> See *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Protase 1980, p. 34-85.

<sup>4</sup> Cassius Dio, *Hist. Rom*, LIII, 29; Florus, *Epitome*, II, 33; Velleius Paterculus, *Hist. Rom*, II, 90; Horatius, *Epistulae*, I, 12, 26. According to Homo 1933, p. 117.

following the example of Pompeius, moved from the mountains to the nearby towns (in Gallatia) all the Homodenses capable of wearing a weapon<sup>5</sup>. In Gallia, Augustus constrained the inhabitants from Bibracte to move in Augustodunum and also determined the Eravisces from Aquincum and the surroundings to leave somewhere else in Pannonia<sup>6</sup>.

The evacuation of the native population from the fortresses in Orăștie Mountains and the Sebeș area, or from settlements in the territory of other Dacia fortresses (such as Piatra Craivii, Tilișca, Racoș, Covasna) was due, no doubt, to security causes, in order to prevent possible revolts, regroupings or hostile actions of the locals against the Roman regime. It is believed such evacuations are presented by Trajan's Column<sup>7</sup>.

The Roman order replaced the old Dacian realities. The Dacians were generally deprived from their lands and rights, being moved in order to create space for veterans, colonists, for tens of camps and military units, for *villae rusticae* and towns, for all the installations and institutional necessities required by the Roman system<sup>8</sup>. It is important to notice that the new colonial villages, the towns, *villae rusticae*, Roman garrisons and fortresses that appeared in Dacia after the conquest were not placed instead the old *davae* or the regular abandoned Dacian settlements – as it was believed especially in case of the towns<sup>9</sup> – but on new places, in the area or nearby. The researches have not encountered the superposition of new Roman settlements, urban or rural, civilian or even military, over Dacian ruins, autochthonous burnt settlements. Only at Sarmizegetusa Regia there is a particular situation. But there was Decebal's capital, the political, military and religious center of the Dacian kingdom, heroically defended during the war and conquered by the Romans after large preparations and intense military and strategic activities.

Further on we will insist over situations – generally known by specialists – from within Roman Dacia, and then from similar conditions outside the province, in the free Dacians territories.

It is known that no Dacian settlement mentioned by Ptolemeus (he called them “cities”)<sup>10</sup>, more or less identified on the field, survived during the Roman time. None developed further, but they all disappeared. Only their names were taken and given, with small phonetical changes, to the towns they founded in Dacia. Of course, we refer to Sermizegetusa basileion, Apoulon, Porolisson, Napouca, Patrauisa (Potaissa), Tibiscon, Dierna, Droubetis. WE could add other important places mentioned by Ptolemeus, such as Ziridava (Pecica), Comidava (Râșnov), Aizis (Fârliug), Arcobadara (Ilișua ?), Argidava (Vărădia ?), Salinai (Ocna Mureș), Singidava (Cugir ?), Cedonia (Gușterita-Sibiu), who are known to cease their pre-Roman existence in their given area<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> Syme 1934, p. 232 et sqq. According to Mașkin 1954, p. 463.

<sup>6</sup> Bónis 1956, p. 156-157; Daicoviciu 1960, p. 314.

<sup>7</sup> Daicoviciu 1960, p. 314; Daicoviciu 1965, p. 236. For the Dacians in the Orăștie and Sebeș Mountains see Glodariu 2001, p. 727-745 with bibliography.

<sup>8</sup> Macrea 1969, p. 257-277; Protase 2001, p. 35-36, 151-152.

<sup>9</sup> A 1982, Roman towns in Dacia, sv.

<sup>10</sup> As for the large Dacian settlements mentioned by Ptolemeu in *Geographia* see B 1964, p. 545-546.

<sup>11</sup> Tudor 1968, passim; Macrea 1969, p. 116-148, 404-410; Protase 2000, p. 63-78; Protase 2001, p. 55-72.

## The Autochthonous Dislocations and their Effects upon the Romanization Process in Dacia

Beside the localities we have already mentioned, the archaeological investigations revealed a large number of different Dacian settlements that ended their evolution in their initial residence with the Romans. We will only mention a few of these cases whose end is more or less known (including some fortresses), in a geographical order.

From Eastern Transylvania (the present counties Braşov, Covasna, Harghita and Sibiu), we could quote the discoveries from: Alungeni, Angheluş, Cernat, Odorheiu Secuiesc, Olteni, Poian, Sfântu Gheorghe – Bedehaza, the fortresses from Zetea, Valea Seacă, Racu II, Ciceu (all Covasna type), the simple fortresses with ditches and earth walls, Comana de Jos, Şinca Veche, Şercaia, Teliu (Cetăţuia), Augustin, Arpaşu de Sus, and many more<sup>12</sup>.

From the middle stream of the river Mureş (counties Alba, Mureş, Hunedoara), there are few discoveries from this category. It was stated that along the middle stream of the river Mureş, from among hundred of places with traces of dwelling or civil settlements, coins and Dacian artefacts, most of them are dated in the I century BC, going until the Roman conquest<sup>13</sup>. In Mureş county there are known the discoveries from Sighişoara-Wittenberg, Albeşti, Cetăţuia (Covasna type) and Ghindari, that did not overcome the beginning of the II century AD<sup>14</sup>. In Alba<sup>15</sup> and Hunedoara<sup>16</sup> counties, beside the fortresses, fortifications and settlements from Orăştie and Sebeş Mountains, where the researches were more intense and whose end was mentioned above, no Dacian, pre-Roman civil place has been investigated so far. Otherwise, this is a general situation for the entire Dacia. Anyhow, from the existing, few and disputable data, it appears that no material evidence from the Dacian to the Roman time could be found in some 200 topographical points with traces of dwelling, settlements, earth works, stone careers or other arrangements<sup>17</sup>. The present situation is, for certain, relative.

The situation is similar in the North and North-West of the future province, in Bistriţa-Năsăud, Cluj and Sălaj counties. As far as we know, no precise statements can be made about the existence of some autochthonous settlements during or after the wars<sup>18</sup>. In these regions, as well as in other parts, no Dacia settlement was completely studied through systematic archaeological investigations, although there are many signs and discoveries related to such objectives. Only the two Dacian fortresses from Sărăţel<sup>19</sup> and Beclean<sup>20</sup>,

---

<sup>12</sup> For the discoveries in this county see the following papers: Cavruc 1998, sv; Crişan 2000, passim; Costea 2002, passim; Costea 2004, passim; Luca et alii 2003, passim; Popa 2002, passim. Viorica Crişan (Crişan 2000, p. 85-87) definitely considers that the Dacian settlements in South-East Transylvania that ended in the I century AD overcome a hundred, and this situation is also met in other parts on the inter-Carpathians Dacia. We underline that this is a situation very common in many parts of Dacia.

<sup>13</sup> Gheorghiu 2005, passim (and sv.).

<sup>14</sup> Lazăr 1995, passim (and sv.); Crişan 2000, p. 43.

<sup>15</sup> Moga, Ciugudean 1995, passim.

<sup>16</sup> Luca 2005.

<sup>17</sup> Gheorghiu 2005, p. 95-96

<sup>18</sup> For Cluj county see the *Repertoire* from 1992, passim.

<sup>19</sup> Daicoviciu 1972, p. 172, 225.

<sup>20</sup> Florea, Vaida, Suci 2000, p. 221-230

archaeologically investigated, did not overcome the Dacian-Roman wars, and this situation is quite general.

In Banat<sup>21</sup>, there are several discoveries of coins, ceramics, different types of artifacts, traces of late Latène Dacian settlements, but no Dacian civil settlement was thoroughly studied in order to be able to make the required considerations upon its end. Only for the fortress from Divici (Caraș-Severin county)<sup>22</sup>, years and years archaeologically investigated, we might say it lasted until the beginning of the II century AD, when it was conquered and destroyed by the Romans.

As for South-Carpathians Dacia, the actual data and knowledge related to our topic are important and useful in many ways, but unfortunately not enough. We take into consideration the researches at Ocnîța (Vâlcea county)<sup>23</sup>, at the Geto-Dacians from the lower basin of the river Olt (*dava* from Sprâncenata)<sup>24</sup> and also other Geto-Dacian settlements and fortresses traced and partially studied in Oltenia<sup>25</sup>, where the situation is quite similar to the one in central Transylvania.

Our short review of the pre-Roman Dacian habitat (fortresses, civilian settlements) underlines that during the two conquering wars and in the following decades there were large Dacian population dislocations. Some Dacian inhabitants were taken prisoners I and moved in different parts of the Empire<sup>26</sup>, other moved or were moved, by constraint, in other parts of the Province. It is possible that those who established in Dacian free regions were not few.

Although our intention was to present only the events from the Roman province to be, we cannot fail to mention that in the territories of the free Dacians (Muntenia, Moldova, North-West regions) there are similar situations. The phenomenon of destruction of fortresses and large Dacian settlements is general in all the Geto-Dacian North-Danubian territories crossed by the Roman army. These include Muntenia<sup>27</sup>, Southern and central Moldavia with the discoveries from Galați-Barboși<sup>28</sup>, Poiana<sup>29</sup>, Brad<sup>30</sup>, Răcătau<sup>31</sup> and others, as well as the North-Western part of Dacia with the fortresses and settlements from Marca, Clit, Sărăcsău, Șimleu Silvaniei, Stârci (Sălaj county), all abandoned during of the wars<sup>32</sup>.

---

<sup>21</sup> Luca 2004; Luca 2006.

<sup>22</sup> Luca 2004, p. 60.

<sup>23</sup> Berciu 1981.

<sup>24</sup> Preda 1986.

<sup>25</sup> Gherghe 1997.

<sup>26</sup> Bodor 1999, p. 55-63.

<sup>27</sup> Vulpe 1966; Babeș 2001, p. 260-262; Conovici 1985, p. 71-80; Conovici 1986, p. 61-84; Sârbu 1996.

<sup>28</sup> Sanie 1987, p. 103-111; Sanie 1988, p. 53-103.

<sup>29</sup> Vulpe 1953, p. 191-230.

<sup>30</sup> Ursachi 1995.

<sup>31</sup> Căpitanu 1992, p. 131-192.

<sup>32</sup> Dumitrașcu 1993, p. 46-47. It is very interesting that many settlements from the territories of the free Dacians in the Western part of Romania (Arad and Bihor counties) appeared in the II century AD, developing in the following century, with no previous history in that area before the conquest of Dacia. This is the situation at Cicir, Moroda, Șiria, Sântana, Cociuba Mare, Girișul de Criș, Rohani,

## The Autochthonous Dislocations and their Effects upon the Romanization Process in Dacia

Although there are not enough Dacian settlements systematically archaeologically investigated in the Roman province, the existing data show that during the two wars and after them many Dacian communities left their ancient locations. We naturally wonder where these communities left or forced to move by the Roman authorities. No doubt the captivities and the refugees in the extra-provincial territories is only a partial explanation. We believe the new state of things in the new province offers a general explanation.

As it is known, in the rural environment all over the province after 106, many new settlements appeared, in areas that had never been populated before. Some of these belong to colonists, the new-comers, and many others belong to the autochthonous population. Due to the fact that the separation between the two types of settlements is still being made in studies and investigations, with no notable difficulties, we may today claim that in the province there are over 50 autochthonous settlements that started their existence right after the conquest or in the first decades after this event<sup>33</sup>. Such are the Lechința de Mureș<sup>34</sup>, Obreja<sup>35</sup>, Stupini<sup>36</sup>, Locusteni<sup>37</sup>, Cârcea<sup>38</sup> (Dolj County) settlements.

Beside the autochthonous settlements starting under the Romans, pre-Roman settlements were discovered and studied, and they continue existing in the same place in the provincial period. They are situated in different areas, especially in Eastern intra-Carpathians Dacia. Thus are the settlements from Șura Mică, Slimnic, Gușterița-Sibiu<sup>39</sup>, Doboșeni, Feldioara, Felmer, Baraolt, Cernatu de Jos, Simonești<sup>40</sup> and others.

Placing on a map the new Dacian settlements, we notice they are everywhere they had good conditions for living, but especially in the territory of the legions and Roman auxiliary units, of towns and *villae rusticae*, in the vicinity of important roads or in economic areas. Although this is not certain, we might consider a large part of these settlements to be the ones the Romans moved. Their new placements inside the province, connected to the socio-economical and political-military life, where Roman daily-life activities were intense and Latin was used in public could not have direct linguistic consequences and also implications upon the behavior and way of life of those people. The short time necessary for the autochthonous dislocated villages to adopt and use the Roman material culture is a strong sign of their Romanization, as a result of their general receptivity, of the better surveyed placements, of the more intense contact with the Roman civilian and military authorities. The

---

Râpa that could have appeared, as others of that type, due to the Dacian refugees from the territories occupied by the Romans and included in the Roman province.

<sup>33</sup> Protase 1980, p. 34-84. Others, discovered in the last two-three decades might be added, such as the settlements from Bistrița, Buza (Cluj county), Copăcel (Brașov county), Gârlești (Dolj county), Stupini, Vermeș (Bistrița-Năsăud county).

<sup>34</sup> Protase 1966, p. 36-37; Protase 1980, p. 52.

<sup>35</sup> Protase 2002.

<sup>36</sup> Gaiu 1999, p. 84-88.

<sup>37</sup> Popilian et alii 1977, p. 365 ; Protase 1980, p. 53-54.

<sup>38</sup> Nica 1975, p. 28

<sup>39</sup> Glodariu 1972, p. 119-140 ; Glodariu 1977, p. 99; Protase 1980, p. 69, 71-73, 75.

<sup>40</sup> Costea 2002, sv.

population dislocations, without being considered by the authorities as a factor of Romanization, had a positive effect in this ethno-cultural and linguistic mutation<sup>41</sup>.

Always keeping the limits of relativity imposed by the state of research, we might say that the Romanization of the material culture in the relocated autochthonous villages was more intense than in those who continued their existence in the initial places. This difference could have other explanations, such as the socio-economical situation of each village, the keeping or losing traditions and habits, changing or holding ways of thinking, and last but not least, the less or more favorable geographic position. The relocations of Dacian from the mountain, peripheral or remote areas in central and better surveyed parts of the province brought an important contribution to the Romanization process.

### **Dislocările de autohtoni și efectele lor în procesul de romanizare din Dacia** (Rezumat)

Autorul prezintă dislocările de comunități dacice – atestate prin sfârșitul așezărilor lor – datorită războaielor de cucerire a Daciei (101-102 și 105-106) și datorită măsurilor de securitate luate de autoritățile civile și militare romane în primele decenii ale provinciei.

Se consideră că aceste transferuri de populație dacă în teritoriile orașelor și ale unităților militare, zone mai bine supravegheate, au contribuit la progresul general al romanizării autohtonilor în Dacia.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- |               |  |
|---------------|--|
| A 1982        | <i>Enciclopedia civilizației romane</i> , București  |
| B 1964        | <i>Izvoare privind istoria României</i> , București  |
| Babeș 2001    | Babeș, M., in <i>Istoria Românilor</i> , vol. I, Ed. Academiei, București  |
| Berciu 1981   | Berciu, D., <i>Buridava dacică</i> , București   |
| Bodor 1999    | Bodor, A., <i>Sclavii și liberții daci în Imperiul Roman și soarta prizonierilor de război daci</i> , in <i>Napoca 1880 de ani de la începutul vieții urbane</i> , Cluj-Napoca, p. 55-63 |
| Bónis 1956    | Bónis, Eva B., in <i>Archaeologische Funde in Ungarn</i> , Budapest  |
| Căpitanu 1992 | Căpitanu, V., <i>Dava de la Răcățău</i> , in <i>Carpica</i> 23, 1, p. 131-192  |
| Cavruc 1998   | Cavruc, V., <i>Repertoriul arheologic al județului Covasna</i> , Sfântu-Gheorghe   |
| Conovici 1985 | Conovici, N., <i>Așezări fortificate și centre tribale geto-dacice din Muntenia (sec. IV î.e.n – I e.n)</i> , in <i>Istros</i> 4, p. 71-80   |

---

<sup>41</sup> For the general Romanization process in Dacia and its consequences see Protase 1980, p. 228-252 and Protase 2001, p. 159-168 (with the bibliographical references).

## The Autochthonous Dislocations and their Effects upon the Romanization Process in Dacia

- Conovici 1986 Conovici, N., *Repere cronologice pentru datarea unor așezări geto-dacice*, in *Cultură și civilizație la Dunărea de Jos*, 2, Călărași, p. 61-84
- Costea 2002 Costea, F., *Dacii din sud-estul Transilvaniei*, Brașov
- Costea 2004 Costea, F., *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Brașov*, Brașov
- Crișan 2000 Crișan, Viorica, *Dacii din estul Transilvaniei*, Sfântu-Gheorghe
- Daicoviciu 1960 Daicoviciu, C., in *Istoria României*, vol. 1, București
- Daicoviciu 1965 Daicoviciu, H., *Dacii*, București
- Daicoviciu 1972 Daicoviciu, H., *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea romană*, Cluj-Napoca
- Dumitrașcu 1993 Dumitrașcu, S., *Dacia apuseană, Oradea*
- Florea, Vaida, Suciu 2000 Florea, G., Vaida, L., Suciu, Liliana, *Fortificațiile dacice din nord-estul Transilvaniei*, in *Istros* 10, p. 221-230
- Gaiu 1999 Gaiu, C., *Așezarea daco-romană de la Stupini (jud. Bistrița-Năsăud)*, in *Napoca 1880 de ani de la începutul vieții urbane*, Cluj-Napoca, p. 84-88
- Gheorghiu 2005 Gheorghiu, Gabriela, *Dacii pe cursul mijlociu al Mureșului*, Cluj-Napoca
- Gherghe 1997 Gherghe, P., *Așezări și cetăți geto-dacice din Oltenia*, Craiova
- Glodariu 1972 Glodariu, I., in *Acta MN* 9, p. 119-140
- Glodariu 1977 Glodariu, I., in *Acta MN* 15
- Glodariu 2001 Glodariu, I., in *Istoria românilor*, vol. 1, Ed. Academiei, București
- Homo 1993 Homo, L., *Haut-Empire*, Paris
- Lazăr 1995 Lazăr, V., *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Mureș*, Târgu-Mureș
- Luca 2004 Luca, S.A., *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Caraș-Severin*, București
- Luca 2005 Luca, S.A., *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Hunedoara*, Alba-Iulia
- Luca 2006 Luca, S.A., *Descoperiri arheologice din Banatul românesc. Repertoriu*, Sibiu
- Luca et alii 2003 Luca, S.A et alii, *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Sibiu*, Sibiu
- Macrea 1969 Macrea, M., *Viața în Dacia Romană*, București
- Mașkin 1954 Mașkin, N.A., *Principatul lui Augustus*, București
- Moga, Ciugudean 1995 Moga, V., Ciugudean, H., *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Alba*, Alba-Iulia
- Nica 1975 Nica, M., in *Dacia NS* 19
- Popa 2002 Popa, D., *Așezări rurale din Dacia romană intracarpatică*, București
- Popilian et alii 1977 Popilian, G et alii, in *Dacia NS* 19
- Preda 1986 Preda, C., *Geto-dacii din bazinul Oltului inferior*, București
- Protase 1966 Protase, D., *Problema continuității în Dacia în lumina arheologiei și numismaticii*, București
- Protase 1980 Protase, D., *Autohtonii în Dacia*, vol 1, București

## Dumitru Protase

---

- Protase 2000 Protase, D., *La genèse des villes dans la Dacie Romanie*, in Bibliotheca Musei Apulensis 15, Alba-Iulia, p. 55-72
- Protase 2001 Protase, D., in *Istoria românilor*, vol. 2, Ed. Academiei, București
- Protase 2002 Protase, D., *Obreja. Așezarea și cimitirul daco-roman*, Cluj-Napoca
- Sanie 1987 Sanie, S., *Cetățuia geto-dacică de la Barboși*, in ArhMold 11, p. 103-111
- Sanie 1988 Sanie, S., *Cetățuia geto-dacică de la Barboși*, in ArhMold 12, p. 53-103
- Sârbu 1996 Sârbu, V., *Dava getică de la Grădiștea, jud. Brăila*, I, Brăila
- Syme 1934 Syme, R., in Klio
- Tudor 1968 Tudor, D., *Orașe, târguri, sate în Dacia romană*, București
- Ursachi 1995 Ursachi, V., *Zargidava. Cetatea dacică de la Brad*, București
- Vulpe 1953 Vulpe, R., *Șantierul Poiana*, in SCIV III, 3, p. 191-230
- Vulpe 1966 Vulpe, R., *Așezări getice din Muntenia*, București