

texte n'offre pas la moindre difficulté, comme non plus son explication. Pour commencer, les éditeurs des *RIU* ne disent pas un traître mot de l'interprétation du texte. Pour ne relever que quelques détails, l'a. n'a pas compris que le légionnaire était originaire de Vienne (dont le nom est écrit *Viana*), dont les habitants étaient inscrits dans la Voltinia; la vérification de l'origine du personnage est importante pour l'histoire sociale, un sujet central pour l'a. Venons-en aux affranchies: Pompeia Arbania serait l'affranchie de Pompeia Fusca; en réalité, c'est tout le contraire. Pompeia Fusca est l'affranchie de P. Pompeius Colonus, dont la dalle a été posée *arb(itratu) Pompeiae Fuscae l(ibertae)*. *Arbania* est un nom fantôme, un caprice étrange de l'a.

Je suis désolé, ce cas n'est pas le seul ; mais il est inutile de continuer en énumérant d'autres exemples. Le cas analysé ci-dessus suffit pour montrer que l'a. manque d'une solide critique historique et philologique. La même chose vaut aussi pour l'exploitation des données onomastiques, comme le montrent les listes des cognomina faites selon l'appartenance linguistique du nom (pp. 130 ss. ; deux exemples seulement : à la p. 144, *Ionica* est enregistré comme un nom latin, mais il s'agit du grec Ἴωνική; à la p. 149 *Homuncio* est en revanche enregistré comme grec, bien qu'il s'agisse d'un bon nom latin, formé de l'appellatif *homuncio*). Et que dire encore de cas comme celui qui apparaît à la p. 227, où l'a. donne *Helpidutis* comme nominatif au lieu de *Helpidus* ; le même problème se répète à la p. 277, où le surnom *Nobilinis* est créé de toutes pièces et sa rareté discutée, alors que la femme en question s'appelait *Nobilis*.

Dans ces conditions, il n'y a pas de sens à continuer l'examen des chapitres précédant les listes onomastiques et le catalogue des inscriptions. Les matériaux intéressants qui forment le sujet du volume mériteraient un traitement fondé sur une solide explication des sources.

Heikki Solin

IOANA A. OLTEAN: *Dacia. Landscape, Colonization and Romanization*. Routledge, Abingdon – New York 2010. ISBN 978-0-415-59482-0. XII, 248 pp. GBP 22.50.

Dacia, with its reputation of being a somewhat anomalous Roman province, has in the past been regarded as emblematic of many problems concerning the impact of the Empire in its society and landscape, but just as in the case of Britain (arguably another anomaly among the provinces), these problems are to a remarkable extent a creation of modern scholarship. And just as in Britain, whatever the archaeologists and classicists have managed to dig up from the soil or from the written sources, has until astonishingly recent times had to undergo the interpretative crucible of national debate where the "native" roots, substrata, and influence have been posited against "Romanisation" or some of its aliases. This all notwithstanding the fact that both "native traditions" and "Romanisation" are hardly self-evident or self-containing phenomena at all; the latter, in particular, has been extensively re-examined and to some extent dismantled as a straightforward explanatory device (for instance cf. Woolf's essential *Becoming Roman*, 1998). In her monograph on Dacia, Ioana Oltean, a specialist in Roman provincial archaeology and particularly its aerial methods, aims to take a comprehensive look into what the use of landscape in pre-Roman and Roman Dacia can tell us about the habitation, colonisation, and "Romanisation" in the area.

The Introduction sketches out both the current status and potential biases regarding Dacian studies, and comments upon the politicised nature of much of earlier scholarship regard-

ing the area of modern Romania. This is connected with one of the undeniable achievements of the monograph under review, namely that while being itself comparatively free from the interference of historicism and politicism of much of earlier studies of its field, it nonetheless manages to siphon a considerable amount of earlier Romanian archaeological research and transmit its crucial contents in a more approachable form. The archaeological methodology and the limitations of aerial survey are also fully covered. It may be pertinent to note, however, that not all of pre-Roman, or indeed even Roman, Dacia is covered by the book and its surveys; nearly the whole of Dacia Porolissensis northwards from around Potaissa is omitted. Chapter 2 gives an account of the physical topography of the Dacian heartland. Chapter 3 does the same regarding the area's history, setting off by combing the ancient sources for the Greeks' and Romans' knowledge about its inhabitants, even though substantial parts of this "knowledge" should be regarded as highly topical in nature. After a brief look into the Greek sources, the Roman written testimonies are used to structure the narrative up to the time of the Trajanic wars of conquest, which leads to the description of the provincial administration and the province's later history.

The last three chapters constitute the most valuable part of the book. Chapter 4 is dedicated to the study of central Dacia's pre-Roman societal structure on the basis of settlement patterns and other archaeological evidence. Much of the structural evidence accessed through aerial photography appears broadly similar to the broader European Iron Age with individual homesteads and fortified hilltop structures, but Oltean finds new evidence and intriguing further routes of interpretation, particularly regarding the locally well-represented category of tower houses, which henceforth cannot be seen simply as having had a defensive purpose. Chapter 5 carries the examination of archaeological evidence on to the Roman period and uses this to tease out a history of settlement patterns, use of natural resources, and the relationship of all this with the social landscape of provincial Dacia. Finally, Chapter 6 takes a look at the "Romanisation" promised in the book's title, with eventually perhaps slightly less engagement with the current debate regarding the validity and proper semantics of that concept as might have been hoped for. Nonetheless, the well-structured earlier part of the monograph makes the treatment in the chapter appear entirely appropriate, and contributes meaningfully to the whole. Aerial photography throughout the book is obviously well represented and prominent, its bibliography is up-to-date, and the index helpful and meticulous.

As the Roman period in Dacia lasted only for some 170 years, less than in any other non-ephemeral province, there exists a definite danger (perhaps augmented by the famous Augustan dictum discouraging trans-Danubian expansion) of falling into an ahistorical and teleological fallacy that imagines the province as somehow destined to be just an episodic experiment or a failed imperial fancy. On the other hand, the sheer scale of archaeological remains of the provincial period have been interpreted as pointing toward a very decisive drive to incorporate the area into the Empire, and high investment into its settlements. The old notion of heavy Roman colonisation is, however, found by Oltean to be not quite as straightforward as previously has been supposed: the old re-populationist view has been partly based on the Imperial written sources, such as Cassius Dio 68,14,4 and Eutropius 8,6,2. The notion of the Dacian population being fundamentally restructured and partly superseded by immigrants from all over the Empire may to a large extent simply be based on a literary tradition arising in the context of the 2nd century. Needless to say, modern interpretations either resisting or endorsing "Romanisation" have muddled the picture further.

Oltean's comparisons between Dacia and other Roman provinces bring the study much-needed perspective, particularly as this is augmented with extensive comparison between pre-Roman and post-conquest patterns of the area. Despite the undeniable natural riches of Dacia, it seems that positing an analogy with Roman Britain could have some validity with regard to the *political* involvement of the area within the Empire: neither province has produced any conclusive evidence of native senators (Fishbourne Palace should not be regarded as testifying to the contrary). The prominent role of the army, on the other hand, compares well with the similar preponderance of military economies in the Roman Germanies. In whatever forms the Roman influence worked in Dacia, however, Oltean envisions the native Dacians responding to it on the whole enthusiastically, with no clear evidence for local resistance of either physical or ideological nature, and an ensuing swift integration of the province. This reasoning, of course, is based upon the notion that "Romanisation" was a conscious and concrete trend which could effectively be resisted or rejected, and which moreover both aimed and resulted in an "integration" of any given province to an increasingly homogeneous and centrally cohesive Empire. Yet some widespread markers of Roman provincial identity, such as epigraphic commemoration, do not seem to testify to any significant participation of Dacian "natives"; this remains a problem, though hardly a crucial one, in Oltean's vision of Roman Dacia.

If her results, such as finding evidence for an intermixture of continuity and change in provincial Dacia, seem at times to be rather predictable, it is not necessarily the result of self-affirming research hypotheses; though hardly revolutionary, such data needs to be spelled out at some point. Hence, and particularly when considering the past studies of Dacian archaeology of both pre-Roman and provincial periods, Oltean's book is a clear success even by the merit of its conception. The most interesting results may still stem from Oltean's view of the ways that the particular circumstances in Dacia affected the way Romans interacted with their province. According to her it was this, perhaps more than anything else – obviously together with the very short timespan of the Roman rule – that fundamentally explains the surprisingly vigorous evidence for a multifarious continuum of pre-Roman patterns. So we have a combination of provincial particularities conditioning a relatively uniform Roman approach towards their provinces: to disagree would be very difficult. The work's contribution for the field of landscape studies is naturally to be welcomed as well, as is the shift (of course symptomatic of much of Roman provincial archaeology today) away from the urban centres and towards the countryside.

Antti Lampinen

NICOLAE GUDEA – THOMAS LOBÜSCHER: *Dacia. Eine römische Provinz zwischen Karpaten und Schwarzem Meer*. Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie. Orbis Provinciarum. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 2006. ISBN 978-3-8053-3415-0. IV, 115 S. mit 37 Farb-, 14 SW- und 32 Strichabb. EUR 24.90.

Con questo volume la preziosa serie di Orbis provinciarum raggiunge la provincia romana di Dacia. Gli autori descrivono con competenza la storia e l'archeologia della regione a partire dai tempi preromani fino al ritiro romano sotto Aureliano e oltre. I temi maggiormente trattati riguardano il militare, l'economia, la demografia e la religione, e non poteva mancare un reso-