

- abstract -

In the absence of explicit sources a modern historian has to use all kind of information to restore pictures from the past. For the beginning of Dacia province we find, among old and new historians, the idea of the Dacians' extermination during the conquest wars, and, consequently, the realities of this new province explained without taking into account the presence of indigenous population and their social structure. The lack of any kind of information about the indigenous districts on the inscriptions is interpreted as a complete absence of the native *civitates peregrinae*, i. e. any kind of Dacian administrative structures that inherited the tribal organisation within the Dacian Kingdom before 106 A. D. This scenario proceeds to explaining the administrative organisation of Roman Dacia taking into account this absence, without assuming that all the Dacian people was exterminated (just the decimation of the elite is retained). The second scenario based on the idea of the presence of the natives, of their elite and their administrative structures in the Roman province of Dacia, brings as main proof the list of the Dacian "tribes" from Ptolemy's *Geography*. In Ptolemy's work one could find, besides the list of the settlements from Dacia (with Dacian and Roman names), also a list of 15 "peoples" which living in Ptolemy's Dacia. The task of analysing and demonstrating this idea (the Dacian "tribes" from Ptolemy's list are in fact *civitates peregrinae* from Roman Dacia) was assumed by Ioana Bogdan- Cătănciu. In her opinion, the toponyms and the names of the "tribes" from Ptolemy's *Geography* belong to the first half of the II century AD.

In fact, we know very little about the regime of the soil in Dacia after the wars. Excepting the territory of *colonia Ulpia Traiana*, what profs do we have on the administrative organization? What were the names of new founded villages, heads of some administrative units? Rearranging the few data contained by epigraphic inscription and literary texts in the lights of a new interpretation of the Ptolemy's list of towns, we will try to draw a picture of Dacia after the Roman conquest.

A nowadays historian could retain that in Dacia, during Trajan's reign, there were some districts with names derived from settlements (*Predavenses*, *Potulatenses*, *Albocenses* etc.) and, maybe, some neighboring tribes (*Anarti*, *Teurisci*, *Coestoboci* etc.). The *poleis'* names and the *tribes'* names are indigenous, so we can conclude that the natives were still living in the province at this time. It is hard to say if these districts are under military control, but we are able to answer positive by means of comparison with the Moesian districts of *Tricornenses*, *Picenses*, *Dimenses* or *Appiarenenses*. These districts co-existed with the territory of *colonia Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa*, and we don't have any kind of information on them after Hadrian's re-organization of Dacian provinces. Beside new *municipia* like *Napoca*, *Drobeta* and maybe *Romula*, from this Trajanic districts are born also some rural self-governing communities, called *territoria* or *regiones* having as *chef-lieux* some *Auxiliarvici*: the territory of *pagus Micia*, *territorium Sucidavense*, the territory around *Samum* called *regio Ans(amensium)*. The absence of explicite sources restrains the possibility to emphasize the role played by the natives within this Roman administrative structures.