EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

XXII
2012

ROMANIAN ACADEMY
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF ART CLUJ-NAPOCA

EDITORIAL BOARD
Editor: Coriolan Horaţiu Opreanu
Members: Sorin Cociş, Vlad-Andrei Lăzărescu, Ioan Stanciu

ADVISORY BOARD
Alexandru Avram (Le Mans, France); Mihai Bărbulescu (Rome, Italy); Alexander Bursche (Warsaw, Poland); Falko Daim (Mainz, Germany); Andreas Lippert (Vienna, Austria); Bernd Päffgen (Munich, Germany); Marius Porumb (Cluj-Napoca, Romania); Alexander Rubel (Iaşi, Romania); Peter Scherrer (Graz, Austria); Alexandru Vulpe (Bucharest, Romania).

Responsible of the volume: Ioan Stanciu

În ţară revista se poate procura prin poştă, pe bază de abonament la: EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE, Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, sector 5, P. O. Box 5–42, Bucureşti, România, RO–76117, Tel. 021–411.90.08, 021–410.32.00; fax. 021–410.39.83; RODIPET SA, Piaţa Presei Libere nr. 1, Sector 1, P. O. Box 33–57, Fax 021–222.64.07. Tel. 021–618.51.03, 021–222.41.26, Bucureşti, România; ORION PRESS IMPEX 2000, P. O. Box 77–19, Bucureşti 3 – România, Tel. 021–301.87.86, 021–335.02.96.

EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

Any correspondence will be sent to the editor:
INSTITUTUL DE ARHEOLOGIE ŞI ISTORIA ARTEI
Str. M. Kogălniceanu nr. 12–14, 400084 Cluj-Napoca, RO
e-mail: choprean@yahoo.com

All responsability for the content, interpretations and opinions expressed in the volume belongs exclusively to the authors.

DTP and print: MEGA PRINT
Cover: Roxana Sfârlea

© 2012 EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE
Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, Sector 5, Bucureşti 76117
Telefon 021–410.38.46; 021–410.32.00/2107, 2119

ACADEMIA ROMÂNĂ
INSTITUTUL DE ARHEOLOGIE ŞI ISTORIA ARTEI

EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

XXII
2012

EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

SOMMAIRE – CONTENTS – INHALT

STUDIES

FLORIN GOGÂLTAN
Ritual Aspects of the Bronze Age Tell-Settlements in the Carpathian Basin. A Methodological Approach 7

ALEXANDRA GĂVAN
Metallurgy and Bronze Age Tell-Settlements from Western Romania (I) 57

DÁVID PETRUŢ
Everyday Life in the Research Concerning the Roman Army in the Western European Part of the Empire and the Province of Dacia. 91

CORIOLAN HORAŢIU OPREANU
From *"στρατόπεδον"* to Colonia Dacica Sarmizegetusa. A File of the Problem. 113

CĂLIN COSMA
Ethnische und politische Gegebenheiten im Westen und Nordwesten Rumäniens im 8.–10. Jh. n.Chr. 137

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

AUREL RUSTOIU
Commentaria Archaeologica et Historica (I) 159

VITALIE BÂRCĂ
Some Remarks on Metal Cups with Zoomorphic Handles in the Sarmatian Environment. 185

FLORIN FODOREAN
"Spa" Vignettes in *Tabula Peutingeriana*. Travelling *Ad Aquas*: thermal Water Resources in Roman Dacia. 211

DAN AUGUSTIN DEAC
Note on Apis Bull Representations in Roman Dacia 223

SILVIA MUSTAŢĂ, SORIN COCIŞ, VALENTIN VOIȘIAN
Instrumentum Balnei from Roman Napoca. Two Iron Vessels Discovered on the Site from Victor Deleu Street 235

IOAN STANCIU
About the Use of the So-Called Clay "Breadcakes" in the Milieu of the Early Slav Settlements (6th–7th Centuries). 253

DAN BĂCUEŢ-CRIȘAN
Contributions to the Study of Elites and Power Centers in Transylvania during the second Half of the 9th – first Half of the 10th Centuries. Proposal of Identification Criteria Based on archaeological Discoveries 279

ADRIANA ISAC, ERWIN GÁLL, SZILÁRD GÁL
A 12th Century Cemetery Fragment from Gilău (Cluj County) (Germ.: Julmarkt; Hung.: Gyalu) 301

ADRIAN ANDREI RUSU
Stove Tiles with the Royal Coat of Arms of King Matthias I Corvinus 313

REVIEWS

IULIAN MOGA, *Culte solare şi lunare în Asia Mică în timpul Principatului/Solar and Lunar Cults in Asia Minor in the Age of the Principate*, Editura Universităţii "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" Iași (Iași 2011), 752 p. (Szabó Csaba) 327

DAN GH. TEODOR, *Un centru meșteșugăresc din evul mediu timpuriu. Cercetările arheologice de la Lozna-Botoșani/An Artisan centre from the Early Middle Ages. The archaeological research from Lozna-Botoșani*, Bibliotheca Archaeologica Moldaviae XV, Academia Română – Filiala Iași, Institutul de Arheologie, Editura Istros (Brăila 2011), 200 p. (including 118 figures), abstract and list of figures in French (Ioan Stanciu) 331

CĂLIN COSMA, *Funerary Pottery in Transylvania of the 7th–10th Centuries*, Series Ethnic and Cultural Interferences in the 1st Millenium B.C. to the 1st Millenium AD. 18, Romanian Academy – Institute of Archaeology and Art History Cluj-Napoca, Mega Publishing House (Cluj-Napoca 2011), 183 p., 49 plates (Aurel Dragotă) 339

RESEARCH PROJECTS

Crossing the Boundaries. Remodeling Cultural Identities at the End of Antiquity in Central and Eastern Europe. A Case Study (Coriolan H. Oprean, Vlad-Andrei Lăzărescu) 343

Warriors and military retainers in Transylvania of the 7th–9th centuries (Călin Cosma) 349

Seeing the Unseen. Landscape Archaeology on the Northern Frontier of the Roman Empire at Porolissvm (Romania) (Coriolan H. Oprean, Vlad-Andrei Lăzărescu) 352

Abbreviations that can not be found in Bericht der Römisch-Germanische Kommission 363

Guidelines for "Ephemeris Napocensis" 366

EVERYDAY LIFE IN MILITARY CONTEXT. ASPECTS OF EVERYDAY LIFE IN THE RESEARCH CONCERNING THE ROMAN ARMY IN THE WESTERN EUROPEAN PART OF THE EMPIRE AND THE PROVINCE OF DACIA*

Dávid Petruţ[1]

Abstract: *The present paper intends to investigate the question of everyday life in the archaeological literature concerning the Roman army in different areas within the European part of the Empire. At the outset the historical context which led to the development of the specific conditions that determined the way of life of the Roman soldiers during the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD is briefly analysed. The discussion is structured within a general framework set up according to the sociological, anthropological and archaeological definitions available for the concept of "everyday life". The different aspects pertaining to the subject addressed here are presented according to the state of research and the various tendencies and methods of investigation applied in the study of the Roman army. Along with a review of the literature on the subject, a theoretical model for the investigation of everyday life in Roman military context is proposed.*

Keywords: *Roman army, military communities, auxiliary and legionary forts, supply system, military production*

1. Introduction

Developments in Roman archaeology throughout the last decades have brought about considerable change in the research related to the Roman army, the earlier emphasis on the study of institutions and organisation being gradually substituted by focus on "underlying social tensions and ties"[2]. In other words current tendencies are characterized by a gradual shift from the nearly exclusive study regarding the military exploits of the army towards a more complex approach centred on the way of life of the soldiers and on different aspects that governed the functioning of the various communities of soldiers which made up the Roman army. According to a key notion of this new approach, every unit stationed in a fort or fortress is above all a community with a specific way of life and a common identity manifested through clothing, use

* This work was possible with the financial support of the Sectorial Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007–2013, co-financed by the European Social Fund, under the project number POSDRU/107/1.5/S/76841 with the title "Modern Doctoral Studies: Internationalization and Interdisciplinarity". I also wish to express my gratitude towards the Domus Hungarica Scientiarum et Artium department of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for a grant offered in Budapest in November 2011, during which a large part of this paper was written. The same thoughts go to Dr. Mariana Egri, Silvia Mustaţă and Monica Gui for reading the paper and offering a series of helpful suggestions and observations concerning the subjects addressed here.

1 "Babeş-Bolyai" University Cluj-Napoca, 400084, Cluj-Napoca, Cluj county, RO; e-mail: petrutdavid@gmail.com.

2 See: HAYNES 1999a, 8.

of space, display on funerary monuments etc.[3]. By virtue of archaeological, epigraphic and iconographical investigations, numerous aspects of this military identity have hither to been pointed out (see below). The features of military everyday life were by no means constant throughout the period comprising the Late Republic and the age of the Principate[4], but were directly linked with the changes occurring in the Imperial policy regarding the army itself, the frontiers and the relations with neighbouring states and populations. The historical context which determined the major traits of the military way of life during the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, the period on which this paper focuses, can be identified in the evolution of the Imperial policy regarding the frontiers of the state starting with the end of the reign of Augustus. The unfavourable military events from Augustus, last years of rule, especially the loss of the three legions under the command of *P. Quinctilius Varus* in AD 9[5], brought to an end the period of rapid expansion of the Empire, determining the focus to be shifted on the defence of the conquered territories rather than on further sustained conquest[6]. In the context of the gradual stabilization of the Empire's borders, the system of temporary marching camps (*castra aestiva*) and semi-permanent winter quarters (*castra hiberna*) essential during active campaigns, was gradually replaced with a network of permanent auxiliary forts and legionary fortresses[7]. These military installations represented the setting for the everyday life of the soldiers, ensuring relatively stable environments for both the legionary and auxiliary troops. The permanent nature of these forts prompted a specific development of their architectural features, their use of space and the daily routine, which in turn determined the way of life of the soldiers who made up the garrisons of the forts.

The study of the everyday life of the Roman soldiers has benefited in recent times from the interest of scholars and numerous approaches have been implemented based mainly on archaeological and sub-literary sources (see below). The intention of the current paper is to point out the main approaches and fields of enquiry pertaining to this subject in the western areas of the Empire and in the province of Dacia. The area termed generically "Western Europe" consists in this case mainly of Britain and Germany and was chosen for the reason that it is characterized by the most

[3] With respect to the significance of the notion of "community" (and "communities") in the context of the Roman military, see the introductory study of the volume: *The Roman Army as a Community* (1999), 7–9, by I. Haynes (HAYNES 1999a); see also JAMES 1999, 18 and COULSTON 2004, 134–135, regarding the multiple levels of communal identity of the Roman soldiers.

[4] See: LUTTWAK 1979, 7. The author argues that the first system of Imperial security originated from the time of the late Republic and persisted throughout the most part of the 1st century AD.

[5] In addition to the abandonment of the territories east of the Rhine (*Germania Libera*), caused by the defeat of Varus in the Teutoburg forest, the Pannonian revolt (eventually suppressed in AD 9) and the failure to conquer the Marcomanni can be mentioned here.

[6] See: JOHNSON 1983, 2–3. The author considers that the "frontier" concept developed only after the disastrous end of the German campaign of Augustus in AD 9. See also: LUTTWAK 1979, 49–50. The author argues that although the military establishment was able not only to defend the Empire but also to sustain expansion, due to the "economy of force" (consisting in the reduction of the number of legions) imposed by Augustus this could be managed only at the cost of massive concentrations of troops, which meant a risk that would be taken only on certain occasions. According to the same scholar the border defence system was elaborated in the period between the rule of Vespasian and Septimius Severus, during which the limes settled either along natural borders or along artificially created defensive lines (hence the notion of "scientific frontiers"), see: LUTTWAK 1979, 57–61. These views have been challenged on numerous occasions based mainly on the argument of the inexistence of a unitary concept developed to "defend and enhance the security of the Empire", moreover it was suggested that Roman frontier policy persistently aimed at expansion, throughout the 1st century AD and beyond, see: ISAAC 1992, 372–377 (referring to the situation on the eastern borders). For an in depth discussion with regard to the debate, see: WHITTAKER 2004, 28–32.

In any case, the relative and gradual stabilization of the frontiers and the deceleration of further expansion following the reign of Augustus is evident, and is also reflected in the gradual emergence of stone fortifications on the limes (e.g.: stone forts and fortresses, Hadrian's Wall and the *Fossatum Africae*) which started during the reign of Claudius and reached its climax under emperor Hadrian (see the discussion in: LANDER 1984, 5–67).

[7] JOHNSON 1983, 2–3; LANDER 1984, 11.

advanced state of research in this field. Consequently, the bulk of examples cited below come from the provinces of *Britannia*, *Germania Inferior* and *Superior* and *Raetia*. Occasionally, evidence from the Near East and North Africa in the form of sub-literary sources (papyri and *ostraca*) will be referred to, but only insofar as this documentary record was and still is employed as a rich source of analogies and complementary evidence for studies of this phenomenon concerning the European part of the Empire. The ultimate aim of this survey is to contribute to the better definition of this line of research which gained considerable ground in the last decades, becoming one of the main objectives in the study of the Roman army. In spite of this, few attempts have been made to define the concept of everyday life in the context of the Roman military. Furthermore, due to the complex nature of the subject, the line of research pertaining to it is characterised by a certain lack of cohesion between numerous dispersed topics of research.

2. The concept of "everyday life" in the context of the Roman military

The concept of "everyday life"[8] was originally introduced as a line of research within sociology by the exponents of phenomenological sociology and in ethnology by the adherents to ethno-methodology[9]. According to "*The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology (2006)*", the notion comprises the sum of regular and ongoing human activities, such as work routines, interpersonal demeanour, but also encompasses the items of material culture for instance clothing and decor[10]. Consequently, the term implies a contrast with extraordinary situations, such as holidays, days of mourning, war or disaster[11]. A further very important aspect of the investigation of everyday life in sociology is the emphasis on interpersonal relations, as opposed to other forms and levels of interaction, such as the relations between institutions or states[12].

The study of everyday life in archaeology is based mainly on a cultural-anthropological and sociological perspective, rather than on a historical viewpoint, investigating the way of life of people within certain cultural contexts and not according to particular historical events[13]. According to the "*Encyclopedia of Historical Archaeology (2002)*" the concept of everyday life in archaeology contains "the essence of culture", being both elusive and all-encompassing. As reported by the same work, it can be described as "the study of those activities and behaviours that support survival both biological and cultural"[14]. This vast area of research in archaeology comprises a considerable number of topics, such as: living quarters, architecture, furnishings, art and decoration, medical care and sanitation, culinary customs, religious and spiritual activity, clothing, leisure, manufacture and crafts etc. In contrast with the sociological perspective, the archaeological investigation of everyday life takes into account events and aspects that are not necessarily characterized by daily recurrence, hence are not part of the daily life of the individuals in a strict sense, such as war, holidays or disaster, however are essential components of the culture and way of life of the studied communities[15].

---

[8] The concept of "everyday life" is closely linked to the notion of "habitat" which can be defined as the milieu in which the ensemble of activities pertaining to the daily life of individuals and communities takes place, see: DSU, 141s.v. habitat.

[9] See: DSU, 337 s.v. viaţă cotidiană ("everyday life"). The most prominent authors in the field of the sociology of everyday life are Alfred Schütz (1899–1959) and Erving Goffman (1922–1982).

[10] CDS, 180 s.v. the world of everyday life (I. Cohen).

[11] CDS, 180 s.v. the world of everyday life (I. Cohen).

[12] DSU, 337 s.v. viaţă cotidiană ("everyday life").

[13] This line of research gained ground in the 1960s with the advent of *New Archaeology* (also termed as "processual archaeology"), which stated the need to study the lives of common people "forgotten by history", rather than to concentrate exclusively on the research of sites associated with particular historical events, see: EHA, 304–305 s.v. history of historical archaeology.

[14] See: EHA, 212 s.v. everyday life (L. B. R. Goodwin).

[15] See: EHA, 212 s.v. everyday life (L. B. R. Goodwin).

The everyday life of the Roman soldiers during the period discussed here is closely linked with the forts and fortresses (*castra*) of the Empire, which represented the regular milieu for the overwhelming majority of the soldiers in Imperial service. The interior architectural structures of the forts where the members of the garrison lived or spent considerable amounts of time in accordance with their specific duties, such as the barracks, the headquarters building (*principia*), the commander's residence (*praetorium*) or the turrets, represent separate, specific settings within the fort, and are essential in the assessment of the daily routine of the soldiers. In this case, the elements which offer clues with respect to the subject are the architectural features of the building, the interior use of space, the interior furniture, heating and cooking devices (hypocaust, hearths), elements of interior decoration (wall plaster, stucco) etc. The activities which comprised the daily routine of the soldiers as part of their specific work responsibilities varied according to the rank and pay grade of each member of the garrison[16]. The duties, the pay, and consequently, the way of life differed in the case of the unit commander, the centurions, *principales*, *immunes* or simple *milites*. Based on the analysis of the written sources (mainly the military records kept on papyrus) R. W. Davies in *"The daily life of the Roman soldier under the Principate (1974)*" listed the daily activities that must have taken place in and around the fort on a regular basis. According to the scholar, the list of activities included: military exercises, administrative work, parades and inspections, logistics and supply, manufacture of arms and equipment (as well as additional goods), animal rearing, preparation of foods and guard duty and various leisure activities[17]. It has to be emphasized that aspects related to logistics and supply of goods, as well as the activities linked to manufacture and crafts belong to the sphere of everyday life[18]. In this paper a somewhat inclusive approach has been adopted towards the study of everyday life along the line drawn by R. W. Davies, which contrasts with other attitudes on the subject that limit the concept of everyday life to the daily routine of the soldiers.

3. Topics and fields of enquiry pertaining to the investigation of military everyday life

As suggested above, the line of research referred to here as "military everyday life" is part of the wide area of investigation concerning the frontiers of the Roman Empire labelled as *Limesforschungen* by German and Austrian scholars and *Roman Frontier Studies* in the Anglo-Saxon archaeological literature[19]. The first works which are relevant, even if only tangentially, for the subject are the early fort monographs, which besides the discussion of the defensive and interior structures of the military installations, also contain the presentation of the archaeological material[20]. Over time the topics and methods specific to Roman Frontiers Studies have evolved and diversified, and, consequently, subjects like the way of life on the borders of the Empire, or the interaction between Romans and natives in these regions were integrated in

[16] See: BREEZE 1993, 11–12.

[17] See: DAVIES 1974, 310–320. To this we have to add other activities which took place outside the perimeter of the fort, mainly on outposts, such as: police work, judicial activity (guarding and escorting prisoners), scouting on the frontier, tax collection, building work etc. However these activities are difficult or impossible to detect archaeologically. See: DAVIES 1974, 321–330; CAMPBELL 1994, 110–111.

[18] DAVIES 1974, 332–333.

[19] The starting point of the systematic research regarding the frontiers of the Roman Empire is considered to be the foundation of the Reichs-Limes Komission in Germany in 1884, which was followed by similar initiatives in Great Britain and France, see: JOHNSON 1983, 13–41; FREEMAN 1996, 465. A further essential step in the evolution of this area of research is the International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies, hosted for the first time in 1949.

[20] See the fourteen volumes of the series *Der Obergermanisch-rätische Limes des Römerreiches* published between 1894 and 1937. See also the monograph written in 1911 by J. Curle concerning the Roman fort at Newstead: "*A Roman Frontier Post and its People. The Fort of Newstead in the Perish of Melrose (1911).*

this area of research[21]. Currently the term *Limesforschungen* is not confined to the research of the military features of the subject, instead it comprises all aspects concerning the life of the inhabitants (both soldiers and civilians) as well as the infrastructure of the border areas of the Empire, including economic aspects and the communication system between the Empire and the *Barbaricum*[22]. A significant change of approach in the study of the Roman military occurred at the end of the 1960s and during the early part of the next decade. G. Watson in the book entitled "*The Roman Soldier (1969)*" observed the fact that research regarding the Roman military up to that point viewed the Roman army as a "collection of fighting units", and no work has dealt with the life in the army from the point of view of the soldier[23]. In 1974 R. W. Davies, in the work cited above, pointed out the fact that the study of the Roman army focused only on military aspects and events in which the army was involved, and ignored the aspects related to the way of life of the soldiers[24]. This was the case in spite of the fact that Roman soldiers during the Principate must have spent only a relatively small part of their military service in campaigns (see the discussion above) and many of them were never engaged in active service throughout their careers[25]. The work of G. Watson offered a somewhat more traditional perspective of everyday life, focusing more on official aspects of the soldiers' careers, for instance: structure of the army, conditions of service, the *Rangordnung*, promotion of the soldiers[26]. The book of R. W. Davies, based also on written sources, but focusing more on the sub-literary evidence, adopted a fresh view on the subject by introducing new topics in the research, such as: administration, logistics, leave and private life[27], that later would be addressed on a large scale through the analysis of the material culture of the forts[28].

It has been argued so far that the investigation of everyday life in the context of the Roman military is a vast area of research consisting of a suitably large number of aspects and intertwining research subjects. Due to its complex nature the subject is reflected in the archaeological literature as a group of wide-ranging research topics, which focus on different aspects related to the life in the Roman forts. Based on a review of the research in this field, the following classification can be set up: (1) supply of goods to the forts; (2) military architecture and use of space; (3) manufacture and crafts (military production); (4) "military diet"; (5) daily routine and recurrent activities within the forts; (6) military identity.

It has to be pointed out from the outset, that the classification is based on both thematic aspects, and aspects which are determined by the nature of the research. Consequently, a number of topics associated traditionally with the concept of everyday life have not been named here separately, mainly because they are part of one or possibly more of the larger categories[29]. The subject of "military diet" is addressed separately due to the fact that it received a remarkably large amount of attention from scholars throughout the last decades, thus developing into an

---

[21] See: FREEMAN 1996, 465. The author considers the work of E. Luttwak (LUTTWAK 1979) as a turning point in this regard.

[22] HÜSEN 1992, 33.

[23] See: WATSON 1969, 9–11.

[24] See: DAVIES 1974, 301–302.

[25] DAVIES 1974, 302–303; ISAAC 1992, 54.

[26] The titles of some of the chapters are edifying in this respect, e.g.: "Conditions of service", "Religion and marriage", "The soldier in society".

[27] See: DAVIES 1974, 299–301.

[28] E.g.: BREEZE 1977 (for the question of the supply mechanism).

[29] E.g.: military clothing and equipment, religion and spiritual activity, medical care, leisure. The question of military clothing and equipment is addressed in the topics regarding the supply of the forts, manufacture and crafts and military identity; religion and spiritual activity is discussed within the subjects of daily routine and recurrent activities as well as military identity; aspects regarding medical care can be found in all of the categories proposed, while leisure is discussed mainly with regard to daily routine and recurrent activities within the fort.

independent field of enquiry. The investigation of these topics is based on a wide range of sources, including archaeological, written sources (literary and sub-literary), archaeobotanical and archaeozoological wells as alternative sources[30]. The following part does not intend to offer neither an exhaustive review nor a summary of the literature and results in the aforementioned subjects, but rather to indicate the tendencies and the evolution of the research pertaining to these subjects, as well as to point out the main sources employed in the investigations. It also has to be mentioned that the choice of subjects discussed separately was decisively influenced by the amount of literature in the respective field.

1) The question of the supply system of the Roman army has been in the focus of debates for the past decades. Studies regarding this area of research are concerned with the provision of foodstuffs (mainly cereals, olive-oil, wine etc.), and secondly with the supply of other goods, such as pottery or military equipment and arms[31]. The requirements of an army settled in a pacified region were considerably different from the needs of the forces engaged in campaigns, consequently, the supply mechanism must have been different in the two cases[32]. In this respect the operational bases can be cited as an obvious distinctive feature which set apart the methods of supply in peacetime and on campaigns. These were places where the supplies were concentrated, usually near or within the conflict areas and were employed on a large scale during military campaigns, especially from the reign of Augustus[33]. The discrepancy between the two situations is recently, being reflected in the archaeological literature addressing this subject[34]. From the point of view of the present paper the peacetime supply of the army is of interest, which developed in the same historical context as the other features of military everyday life (see above)[35]. Investigations in this field have put forward two diverging models for the Roman military supply[36]. The first model is based on the existence of a centralised supply system established in the 1st century AD, composed of a hierarchical structure involving *frumentarii*, *beneficiarii*, the financial administration of the province (mainly the *procurator Augusti*) and in the case of extra-provincial supply, the *praefectus annonae* based in Rome[37]. The exponents of an alternative model argue against the existence of a centralised system of supply before the 3rd century AD, maintaining that in this period, the procurement of goods to the army was carried out at either a provincial level, or by the individual units[38]. Moreover, there are numerous documented instances in which soldiers individually managed the personal procurement of goods from family members and friends, as shown by some of the letters contained by the *Vindolanda* tablets[39]. The relationship between the supply of foodstuffs (mainly grain) and additional goods,

[30] According to the sources employed, the main types of studies which deal with the subject of military everyday life can be pinpointed: 1) fort monographs; 2) analysis of written sources (literary sources, papyri, ink tablets, *ostraca*, inscriptions on military equipment and on various utensils, *graffiti* and *dipinti* on pottery vessels); 3) material culture studies; 4) the analysis of architectural structures; 5) archaeobotanical and archaeozoological studies; 6) "thematic studies" (characterized by the use of integrated sources for the purpose of analyzing particular subjects, such as: the presence of women and children in forts or military diet).

[31] HERZ 2002, 20; BREEZE 2000, 59.

[32] EGRI 2008, 46.

[33] Regarding the role of the operational bases see: ROTH 1999, 169–177; EGRI 2008, 46–48.

[34] E.g.: ROTH 1999. Concerning the supply of the army during military campaigns.

[35] See also: JOHNSON 1983, 232; HERZ 2002, 19–20. Both authors argue that fundamental changes in the supply system of the army date from the reign of Augustus.

[36] See: EGRI 2008, 45–46.

[37] CARRERAS-MONFORT 2002, 76–83. The author argues that this centralized system functioned at two distinct levels, the supply from within the province being supervised by the *procurator Augusti*, while the provision of supplies from outside the province was coordinated by the *praefectus annonae*.

[38] ROTH 1999, 264; BREEZE 2000, 63; WHITTAKER 2002, 205–209.

[39] BIRLEY 1997, 277–279; PEARCE 2002, 933.

such as pottery, has been conclusively addressed in the case of Roman Britain by D. J. Breeze. According to the scholar the "official" supplies within the province, i.e. grain, were governed by regulations, while the "unofficial" supplies, as is the case of pottery, used the same trade routes and infrastructure to reach the army, but were regulated solely by the market[40].

2) The main objectives of the studies focused on the internal buildings of forts are the determining or reassessing of the functionality of certain architectural structures, furthermore the evaluation of the internal arrangement of these constructions, including aspects such as the interior furnishings and decoration, heating and sanitary installations as well as the construction technique of the respective buildings[41]. These studies are mainly based on the analysis of the structures from an architectural perspective combined with the detailed observation of the archaeological phenomena, sometimes without taking into account the archaeological material discovered within the edifices. Detailed architectural examination of these structures have led throughout the last decades to the reassessment of numerous constructions from a functional point of view, the most notable examples coming from the provinces of *Britannia*, *Germania Inferior* and *Raetia*. On Hadrian's Wall, investigations have revealed the presence of a type of building known until then only from the work of *Vegetius*, i.e. the *basilica exercitatoria* within the auxiliary fort from Birdoswald[42]. Through the comprehensive archaeological analysis carried out in the forts from South Shields and Wallsend[43] on Hadrian's Wall, as well as in Dormagen (*Germania Inferior*) and Heidenheim (*Raetia*)[44], the long-standing debate concerning the accommodation of the horses within the forts which garrisoned cavalry troops, debate known in the literature under the heading "Where did they put the horses", after being first addressed by C. M. Wells in 1978, was eventually brought to an end. The results showed that contrary to the assumptions generally accepted until then, horses were housed in "*stable barracks*" ("*Stallbaracken*"), i.e. in the same building as the troopers, and not in separate stables or outside the fort, as it was suggested before[45]. The research in this field has shown that our knowledge regarding the interior buildings of forts, based mainly on the results of old excavations and the information from the literary record, especially *Pseudo-Hyginus*, can be fundamentally revised by close observation of the archaeological and architectural features of these structures.

3) Studies included in this category address the issues of production of goods linked directly with the army and based in the forts or in the close vicinity of military installations[46]. The question of military manufacture and crafts was addressed hither to according to two aspects: the pottery production attributed to the so-called military *figlinae* and the production and/or repair of weapons and military equipment in the buildings conventionally referred to as *fabricae* within the forts. An important feature of military production which received considerable attention from scholars is the question of the so-called *"legionary ware"* (*"Legionswäre"*), i.e. the production of pottery for or by the military, based in the immediate vicinity of military installations, mainly (but not exclusively) legionary fortresses[47]. The investigation of this phenomenon, first reported as such by E. Ettlinger in 1951 on the subject of the pottery assemblage from the rubbish-heap ("Schutthügel") of the *Vindonissa* legionary fortress, was based on the observation

[40] BREEZE 2000, 62–63.

[41] Numerous works, both on a large scale and specific have been published on the subject, see: PETRIKOVITS 1975; SHIRLEY 2001; MANNING 1975; HOFFMANN 1995; WILMOTT 1997; HODGSON 2002.

[42] See: WILMOTT 1997, 582–585.

[43] HODGSON 2002, 887–889; HODGSON/BIDWELL 2004, 136–140.

[44] SOMMER 1995.

[45] See: HODGSON 2002, 887–889.

[46] In this case the army was directly involved in, or at least coordinated the process of production, consequently, this subject is treated separately and is reflected accordingly in the archaeological literature, from aspects regarding the supply from independent manufacturers (see above, point 1. of the classification).

[47] SWAN 2004, 260.

that pottery assemblages from numerous sites associated with the presence of legionary fortresses, or with a high concentration of auxiliary units, display highly similar features while differing completely from the ceramic material of the civilian sites belonging to the same region[48]. The term "legionary ware" refers mainly to the fine tableware found in and around legionary fortresses and in some areas with intense military presence, including auxiliary headquarters (e.g. the Wetterau region and Hadrian's Wall) from *Germania Inferior* and *Superior*, *Pannonia*, *Moesia*, and *Britannia*, displaying a series of common features[49]. This category of pottery is thought to have been developed by potters from Northern Italy with consistent Hellenistic influence, its production being spread first to *Vindonissa* (*Germania Superior*), followed shortly by Nijmegen (*Germania Inferior*) in the Flavian period. Its manufacture started in further legionary sites from Upper Germany (*Argentorate*, the Wetterau region) under the reign of Domitian, while later during the first part of the 2nd century AD it started to be produced in several sites from Roman Britain, as well as in the Danube region in *Pannonia* and *Moesia*[50]. These military workshops were also responsible for the production of tiles and other ceramic building material[51]. An interesting aspect of this subject is related to the archaeological investigations inside the auxiliary fort from *Carnuntum* which yielded a pottery workshop close to the north-western corner of the commander's headquarters building. Analysis showed that the products of the respective workshop are consistent with the category of "legionary ware", although it cannot be excluded that the short-lived *figlina* functioned in a period when the fort did not serve a primarily military role[52]. In addition, there is also relatively consistent epigraphic evidence for the existence of military potters, the ranks of *magister figlinarum* and *custos figlinarum*, as well as the collective status of *immunes figlinae*, being attested in several forts from *Germania Inferior* and *Superior*, thus supplying some information regarding the organisation of these pottery workshops[53].

One of the main questions regarding the subject of military equipment until relatively recently was whether the problem can be defined in terms of production or of supply, i.e. the workshops within the forts were responsible for the production of equipment or merely for repair and maintenance? In the latter case it was implied that the equipment would be supplied from the outside by independent manufacturers and merchants[54]. Through the correlated analysis of archaeological sources, consisting mainly of scrap metal and half-finished items, but also ingots, crucibles, moulds and tools discovered in and around forts, and sub-literary sources (papyri and the *Vindolanda* tablets) it could be determined that during the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD the military equipment was being produced locally in the workshops of the forts situated on the Rhine, furthermore on the "*Obergermanisch-Raetische Limes*" and in Roman Britain[55]. An essential role in this process was attributed to the recycling of scrap metal which ensured the necessary raw material for the activity of the *fabricae*[56]. The exceptional care towards this waste materialis shown by the careful deposition of scrap metal in pits and ditches upon the demolition and abandonment of forts in order to avoid its use by potential foes[57]. It has been

[48] ETTLINGER 1951, 105.

[49] For the main features and the distribution of "legionary ware" see: GREENE 1977, 113–114; GASSNER/JILEK 1997, 303; SWAN 2004, 260–261.

[50] GASSNER/JILEK 1997, 303.

[51] SWAN 2004, 260.

[52] GASSNER/JILEK 1997, 302.

[53] See: BREEZE 1977, 136–137. The following ranks are recorded on inscriptions: *cus(tos) castel(li) figlina(rum)* at the legionary fortress from Mainz; *mag(ister) fig(linarum)* at the legionary fortress from Nijmegen; *immunes figlinae* are mentioned by an inscription from Bonn.

[54] For the review of the debate, see: BISHOP 1985, 1–2; BISHOP/COULSTON 1993, 183.

[55] OLDENSTEIN 1977, 68–86; BISHOP 1985, 1–2; BISHOP/COULSTON 1993, 183

[56] OLDENSTEIN 1977, 68–86.

[57] BISHOP 1985, 8.

pointed out that additional production activity, for instance hide, processing was common place in military *fabricae*, as proven by the investigations at Hofheim in *Germania Superior*[58].

4) Food preparation and consumption in military context has received the attention of scholars of the Roman army with an ever increasing intensity starting from the landmark paper of R. W. Davies "*The Roman military diet*" published in 1971[59]. Studies in "military diet" are considerably more extensive then the term by which they are often designated (hence the quotation marks), besides investigating the components of the diet and the daily rations issued to the men, the questions of how the food was prepared (at all stages) and how it was consumed have been consistently addressed up to now (see below). Davies's study relied primarily on literary sources complemented by the selective evidence of animal bone assemblages, while the sub-literary record comprised of papyri, *ostraca* and wooden tablets was only sparsely employed[60]. Since then, the sources for the study have multiplied, with growing emphasis being placed on both sub-literary evidence as well as faunal and botanical data. Contrary to the approach employed in the aforementioned study, Roman "military diet" is now not regarded as a monolithic entity, a single phenomenon throughout the Empire[61], and emphasis is placed on regional and chronological variation[62]. Evidently, a series of (mainly Mediterranean) common features of the military diet can be accounted for, which are relatively constant on military sites throughout the Empire, extending beyond regional barriers by means of long-distance trade. This is the case of commodities such as wine, olive oil, seafood or exotic fruits. Evidence for the presence of these products is regularly present even in forts from the northern regions. A highly schematic reconstruction of the daily diet of Roman soldiers through the correlation of a wide range of sources comprises the "military bread" (*panis militaris*) described by Pliny the Elderand derived from the daily rations of wheat or other types of grain issued to the men as fundamental staple, furthermore a certain amount of meat, possibly cheese, olive oil, and potentially wine or some substitute such as the so called *posca* made from vinegar or sour wine and water or even beer on the northern frontiers[63]. It has to be noted that the analysis of the *Vindolanda* writing tablets by J. Pearce has revealed a high level of discrepancy between the written record and the faunal evidence in the case of the military sites from Roman Britain[64]. Consequently, a "standard military diet" is impossible to outline even in the case of a single province which incidentally provides both extremely rich archaeological and written evidence in this matter.

It is a well-known fact that Roman forts provided no central facilities for the preparation and the consumption of food, most evidence points to the fact that cooking, at all stages (starting from the grinding of the wheat), was carried out by the men at the level of the *contubernium* which also provided the location for dining[65]. Recent tendencies in the research emphasize the fundamental role as a social activity played by communal dining in this case. As noted by M. Carroll, the preparation, cooking and consumption of food and drinks in the company of their fellow soldiers from the *contubernium* (i.e. a total of eight men) "helped to structure and reinforce communal experience and group identity"[66].

---

[58] BISHOP/COULSTON 1993, 184.

[59] DAVIES 1971.

[60] At the moment of the respective paper's publication a series of essential sub-literary documents have not yet been made public, e.g.: the corpus of Roman military papyri: FINK 1971; R. Marichal, *Les ostraca de Bu Njem* (1992), or not least the *Vindolanda* wooden tablets of which the first one was discovered by R. Birleyonly in 1973, two years after R. W. Davies's paper was published.

[61] See: DAVIES 1971. The concept of a unitary "military diet" throughout the Roman Empire during the Principate is still in use, e.g.: JUNKELMANN 1997; CARRERAS-MONFORT 2002, 71–72.

[62] See: PEARCE 2002, 931–932.

[63] DAVIES 1971, 125; ROTH 1999, 42–44; PEARCE 2002, 941.

[64] See: PEARCE 2002, 939.

[65] ROTH 1999, 44; CARROLL 2005, 363–367.

[66] CARROLL 2005, 363.

5) The question of daily routine and recurrent activities within forts is at the centre of the investigation of military everyday life, and was the main theme of the earliest studies which targeted specifically the subject of daily life of the Roman soldiers[67]. Throughout the last decades, in the archaeological literature two methods of investigating this subject were put forward, based on the sub-literary record and on the analysis of the spatial distribution of the archaeological material. The sub-literary record comprised of papyri, wooden inscribed tablets and *ostraca*, offer the most conclusive evidence concerning life in the forts. To this, the *instrumentum domesticum inscriptum* has to be added, consisting mainly of *graffiti* on pottery vessels, inscriptions on military equipment or other utensils, which, although have a considerably lesser impact on the subject, offer nonetheless information on the ownership (communal or personal property) or way of use of the items, among other aspects[68]. Among the *papyri*, the most significant are the official reports concerning military operations, the duties of the men and the state of the troops which were drawn up periodically, the most detailed of these being the annual reports, the so-called *pridiana*[69]. The highest number of known papyri are concentrated in Egypt and the Near East, the most complete record being he archive of *cohors XX Palmyrenorum milliaria equitata* stationed at *Dura Europos* in *Syria*, which covers the years 219 and 222 AD[70]. An additional important *papyrus* is the *pridianum* of *cohors I Hispanorum veteran quingenaria equitata* stationed in *Moesia Inferior* (the so-called "Hunt's *papyrus*") referring to the year 105 AD[71]. A significant part of the wooden writing tablets from *Vindolanda* consist of "military reports", referred to in the texts as *renuntia*, which contain information regarding the daily tasks of the soldiers, the military operations and the state of the troops. Another part of these documents are comprised by the personal correspondence of the soldiers which contain equally valuable references to the life in the forts[72]. The analysis of these documents have revealed important aspects concerning the particular tasks and daily activities performed by the various ranks of soldiers and officers as well as aspects concerning the frequent missions involving detachments from the unit, often to other forts. The latter aspect had an important effect on the study of troop mobility within the provinces.

The analysis of the spatial distribution of artefacts using the Geographic Information System (GIS) places artefacts within spatial, temporal and typological contexts, which in turn help translate the patterns resulting from the distribution map of the finds into social practices[73]. This type of analysis was performed at various levels in the case of the legionary fortress *Vetera* I in *Germania Inferior*, the Raetian auxiliary forts from Ellingenand Oberstimm[74], and at a somewhat smaller scale at the auxiliary forts from Birdoswald and South Shields on Hadrian's Wall[75]. The identification of certain patterns of artefact distribution in various points of the *Vetera* I fortress has made it possible to draw conclusions with respect to aspects such as food preparation, dress, the age, gender and status of the persons inhabiting the fortress, as well as to the state of occupancy of the site[76]. This method was also successfully employed in investigating the presence, movements and activities of women and children in forts by means of ascribing gender and status to artefacts. This helped confirm the hypothesis that contrary to our earlier understanding of the Roman army, the *castra* were places of constant interaction between

67 See: DAVIES 1974.
68 See: MACMULLEN 1960, 23–25.
69 See: FINK 1971, 1–4, 9–17; DAVIES 1974, 303.
70 FINK 1971, 1; DAVIES 1974, 303.
71 DAVIES 1974, 303.
72 See: BOWMAN/THOMAS 2003, 20–23, 102–117.
73 See: ALLISON 2005, 836–838; GARDNER 2007, 128–131.
74 ALLISON 2005; ALLISON 2006.
75 GARDNER 2007, 128–131.
76 ALLISON 2005, 836–837.

soldiers and civilians[77]. Furthermore, the possibility asserted before, that ordinary soldiers' families were housed inside the forts even before the lifting of the ban on soldier's marriage by emperor Septimius Severus, could be to some extent validated by the concentration of female and children-related artefacts in the soldiers' barracks, exposed by digitally plotting the archaeological material[78]. The question of the women's presence in the forts was addressed on several occasions based on a wide range of textual and material evidence, e.g. by analyzing the leather shoe remains from barracks within several auxiliary forts by C. van Driel-Murray which revealed considerable amounts of women's and children's footwear inside these structures[79], or even more eloquently by the discovery of a large number of infant burials consisting of perinatal skeletal remains in contexts pertaining to several periods of the fort at Ellingen, including the floors under the barracks, to cite just two examples[80].

6) The question of military identity is considered here primarily for the reason that both self-identity and, more essentially, the military group identity was displayed, like today at almost every level of the soldiers' lives. This comprises, among others, aspects such as: clothing and military equipment, culinary practices, use of space and funerary commemoration[81]. It seems fair to say that the expression of identity represented a significant component of the way of life of the members of the military. As suggested above, recent studies in military identity emphasize the coexistence of individual self-identities and of a military "communal" identity expressed at various levels, among which the collective identity shared by the members of the *contubernia* is characterized by the strongest degree of cohesion[82]. This in turn is followed by increasingly larger groups as the *centuria*, the unit itself, the regional army group and finally the entire Roman army, depending on the context in which each of them was emphasized at one moment[83]. Both types of identity are marked by specific ways of display, although the degree of overlap between the two is very high. Elements of personal self-identity can be traced most conclusively with respect to military clothing and equipment, respectively funerary commemoration and display. The importance of military clothing regarding personal identity lies in the relatively recent recognition that there was no central planning or design of the equipment, and the choice of equipment and its embellishment belonged, with some due restrictions imposed by rank (e.g. the *crista transversa* or the *vitis* worn exclusively by centurions), to the individual soldier and his financial potential. Consequently, the concept of "uniform" is dismissed in the case of the Roman soldiers[84]. Furthermore, the case of the so-called "parade armour" can be viewed as an instance of personal option in the matter of equipment embellishment, some scholars arguing that it is unreasonable to think that soldiers possessed two sets of equipment, emphasizing that the use of decorated equipment in battle was in fact practical for a number of reasons[85]. Funerary commemoration, more precisely the most visible aspect related to it, namely

[77] ALLISON 2006, 1–2.

[78] ALLISON 2006, 17–18; ALLISON 2007, 432–436.

[79] See: van DRIEL-MURRAY 1997. For further studies based on documentary and archaeological evidence, see: SPEIDEL 1997; ALLASON-JONES 1999.

[80] See: ALLISON 2006, 14–17; ALLISON 2007, 408–412. The case of the infant burials in the fort from Ellingen is not unique, similar situations were reported in a number of forts from Britain, namely in South Shields and Malton in contexts dating to the 3rd and 4th centuries.

[81] See: HAYNES 1999a, 7; CARROLL 2005, 363–364.

[82] CARROLL 2005, 364.

[83] JAMES 1999, 18.

[84] COULSTON 2004, 141–145. For arguments in favour of the "uniform" concept as an element of basic homogeneity, see: JAMES 1999, 19. The author attributed this phenomenon to the constant movement of the troops, exchange and copying of fashion, and not to a unitary concept at state level or to an element of central production.

[85] COULSTON 2004, 147. According to the author the use of this type of highly personalized armour in battle helped bolster courage and made possible individual acts of bravery to be recognized.

the gravestone, was an important medium for the display of both personal and communal identity. The funerary monument, by way of the epitaph, often transmitted facts in which the possessor of the monument took personal pride, such as place of origin, rank or individual acts of courage performed during the years of service.

It has been emphasized in the recent literature on the subject that there is a clear connection between the forming of the military communities, i.e. the groups of soldiers characterized by communal identity (see above) and the efforts of the army to alter the cultural identity of the recruits[86]. According to our current understanding, this was achieved by exposing the recruits to constant propaganda and special symbols, but also by introducing them to a new way of life, which, at least in the case of most auxiliaries, was totally unknown at the moment of enlistment. This included, among others, dietary and drinking habits, hygiene (bathing and grooming), new hairstyle, and generally accommodation to a new and thoroughly organised framework of life represented by the Roman fort[87]. Thus, it can be said that the way of life to which the soldiers from the legionary and auxiliary units were introduced in the forts contributed decisively to the shaping of the military communities, which in turn were fundamental to the functioning of the Roman army.

4. The case of Roman Dacia

Following the Roman conquest, the newly established province of Dacia gained high strategic importance which accounts for its intense militarization, the army asserting its presence at all levels in the life of the province. Furthermore, due to its geo-political position, namely the fact that it was bordered on three sides with territories of the *Barbaricum*, and not least because of its specific topography, it has been noted that the *limes* of Dacia does not display a linear layout such as in the case of other provinces[88]. According to the studies in the defensive system of Dacia, the *limes* was arranged in depth along three lines of defence[89], which accounts for the fact that contemporaneous military installations, consisting mainly of forts, were spread across the whole area of the province. Presumably this is one of the reasons why the Romanian archaeological research hither to focused mainly on the investigation of Roman military sites paying less attention to their civilian counterparts, albeit it can be said that the direct results concerning the way of life in the forts are relatively scarce so far. This is partly due to the fact that the studies regarding the material culture of the forts exhibit a high degree of positivism, being based on descriptive presentation and often lacking analysis of the material from an anthropological point of view[90]. This is best reflected by the research of pottery assemblages; in extremely few cases was there a quantitative approach adopted, consisting of the systematic analysis of complete assemblages, instead the research was mostly restricted to the so-called "special" categories such as *terra sigillata* ware and the so-called "Dacian pottery". The most characteristic types of publications concerning the Roman military in this area are the monographic studies of individual forts, which according to their integrated approach should, theoretically, provide a large amount of information relevant to the subject of everyday life. In the case of Roman Dacia a relatively large number of fort monographs have to be published[91]. In spite of this, it can be said that little effort has been made to interpret the results from the perspective of the daily life

[86] See: HAYNES 1999b, 165–167.

[87] JAMES 1999, 16–17.

[88] GUDEA 1997a, 2–3

[89] GUDEA 1997a, 2–3; GUDEA 2000, 356.

[90] See: SUCIU 2009, 2.

[91] From 1971 until the present day, a number of about 14 monographs were published for the following forts: Râşnov –*Cumidava*, Buciumi, Moigrad – *Porolissum*, Mehadia – *Praetorium*, Turda – *Potaissa*, Bologa – *Resculum*, Gilău, Romita – *Certie*, Românaşi – *Largiana*, Căşeiu – *Samum*, Feldioara, Răcari, Ilişua, Gherla.

of soldiers. The prospect of such an enterprise is hindered by the deficiencies in the analysis of the archaeological material, since most of these monographs lack finds catalogues and "specialist reports", the majority simply overlooking the presentation of the finds altogether, even under the form of illustration. The analysis of the archaeological material is the main source for the investigation of everyday life in the Roman forts, having the potential of illustrating both the common features derived from the relative homogeneity of the Roman material culture and the inherent particularities reflected both at provincial level and at the level of every community, such as that of an auxiliary or legionary fort.

Integrating the results of the research concerning the military everyday life in Roman Dacia into the framework presented above poses some difficulties given the considerable discrepancy in the state of research, but still, progress made especially in the last decade allows us to consider most of the above mentioned aspects. The only aspect within this framework that has not received any direct attention in the Romanian archaeological literature and therefore will not be considered in this review is the question of military identity.

1) The question of the supply of goods to the forts of Roman Dacia has seen little progress so far, mainly because of the reasons underlined above. In a study concerning the consumption and necessities of the Roman army in *Dacia Porolissensis*, N. Gudea has drawn attention to the fact that Roman army studies in Dacia have ignored totally the subject of necessities and supply of the military, admitting that one of the major deterrents in this case is the inappropriate knowledge regarding the forts from Dacia in terms of internal structure (especially the function of some buildings) and their garrisons[92]. In addition, the insufficient and sometimes improper studies in the material culture of the forts, especially of the pottery assemblages, can be viewed as significant disincentive as well. The aforementioned author attempted to estimate the requirements of the Roman army in the province based on the size of the forts, the type and size of their presumed garrisons on the one hand, and the estimated daily rations of the Roman soldiers, reflected by the sub-literary records on the other[93]. The results, although clearly intended to be preliminary, are prone to a series of potential inaccuracies due mainly to the strongly relative nature of the components of this investigation, (a fact acknowledged by the author), namely the information regarding the Dacian forts and our knowledge of the rations of the Roman soldiers (see above)[94]. One of the main conclusions of this investigation is the assertion that the Roman army garrisoned in this province was forced to rely on imports to supplement its necessities in foodstuffs and fodder, the hinterland of the province (i.e. *Dacia Porolissensis*) being incapable of providing for the needs of its army[95]. Considering our general knowledge about the supply system of the Roman army, this is a highly expectable result in view of the fact that none of the border regions of the Empire were self-sufficient[96]; moreover the nature of the Roman "military diet", as far as we understand it, being based partially on a Mediterranean diet (including olive oil) accessible directly only in the respective region, theneed for imports seems evident.

The import of amphora-borne commodities was a significant part of the military supply. According to D. Bernal Casasola's investigation, the high presence of Hispanic *amphorae* in Dacia, used for transporting wine and fish sauce (*garum*) from *Baetica* and *Lusitania* is directly connected

[92] GUDEA 2005, 185–186.

[93] GUDEA 2005, 187–189.

[94] Our insufficient data regarding the auxiliary forts poses serious difficulties in this type of investigation, the author of the aforementioned study admitting that among the 15 forts from *Dacia Porolissensis* only two exhibit a more or less complete plan of their internal structure (Buciumi and Bologa – *Resculum*), however it has to be said that even in these two cases there are numerous unanswered questions, especially concerning the function of some of the internal buildings.

[95] GUDEA 2005, 190–192.

[96] See: HERZ 2002, 20–23.

to the supply of the Roman army from this province. However, in the respective study this question is approached more in terms of future lines of research rather than of tangible results[97]. As the author admits, the prospect for future conclusive results is only possible once a substantial amount of material is published. An important aspect of this field of enquiry is the question of the *tituli picti* displayed by the *amphorae*. In this respect, a fragment of a Dressel 20 *amphora* discovered in the *canabae* of the legionary headquarters from *Apulum*, bearing a painted inscription with the name of the *legio XIII Gemina*, is highly significant from the point of view of our knowledge regarding the military supply in Roman Dacia[98]. The respective type of *amphorae* contained olive oil produced in *Baetica*, the occurrence of the inscription containing the name of the legion, as in the case of a few other similar discoveries from the neighbouring provinces, shows the fact that individual units were directly involved in the procurement of supplies[99].

2) Correlated with the other subjects addressed here, the investigation of the internal structures of the forts from Roman Dacia has received considerably more attention in the Romanian archaeological literature. Studies in this field aimed to determine the internal structure of the forts, the function of various buildings, as well as the construction techniques and their chronological phases. The assessment of the function of the internal structures was based on archaeological and architectural analysis in which a key role was attributed to the extra-provincial analogies. However, the examination of the archaeological finds and their spatial distribution within these buildings was only sparsely employed so far, thus, making the functional evaluation prone to uncertainty. Relatively recently a synthesis was published, which drew together the data available until now regarding the internal organisation of the auxiliary forts from Dacia[100]. Emphasis was placed on establishing the function of uncertain structures and the comparative analysis of particular building types both within Dacia and from other provinces, based mainly on architectural observations. Nevertheless, it has to be reiterated that the functionality of some buildings, especially those which are not clearly defined in the literary record, cannot be established based solely on their plan[101]. Following the line established by C. S. Sommer and later by N. Hodgson (see above), the existence of "stable-barracks" was asserted in the auxiliary fort from Căşeiu – *Samum* based on the correlation between the archaeological information, namely the discovery of elongated pits (interpreted as urine pits as in the case of the examples cited from *Britannia* and the Germanic provinces) and the exposing of archaeological material indicative of the presence of cavalry units and their mounts, namely spurs and a cavalry *spatha*[102]. Along the same line of investigation a method only recently applied for Roman Dacia, i.e. the archaeological phosphate measurement, has lead to the identification of structures within the fort from Breţcu, potentially employed as stables[103]. A series of studies concerning various building categories from the forts of Dacia, such as the *principia*, *praetorium* and the *horrea* have been published although emphasis in all cases was placed on aspects other than the detection of patterns of activities which had taken place within the respective edifices[104]. The barracks of the forts, as buildings which housed the soldiers, have the highest potential for the study of everyday life. Conversely, they are the most poorly investigated among the internal structures of the forts

[97] BERNAL 2006, *passim*.

[98] See: EGRI/INEL 2006.

[99] EGRI/INEL 2006, 192.

[100] See: MARCU 2009.

[101] See: ISAC 2006, 437–438. The author drew attention on the fact that the publication of the archaeological material from various architectural units in Roman Dacia did not always lead to the elucidation of their functionality, although there are a few cases in which buildings were defined functionally based on the archaeological finds, the most numerous examples being cited from *Porolissum*.

[102] ISAC 2006, 444–447.

[103] See: POPA ET ALII 2010, 69–70.

[104] E.g.: STANCIU 1985; PETCULESCU 1987; ISAC/HÜGEL/ANDREICA 1994.

in Dacia, the emphasis being placed hitherto by the excavators on the defences and the central buildings placed in the *latera praetorii*[105]. The case of the auxiliary fort from Buciumi (*Dacia Porolissensis*) can be cited as a singular exception, both in terms of archaeological fieldwork and publication. Here a total number of four barracks were entirely excavated, with a further two partially uncovered; additionally these structures have benefited from a consistent archaeological and architectural analysis aimed at the graphic reconstruction of these buildings[106].

3) The question of military production has been addressed hitherto mostly at the level of assertions based on hypothesis. Field investigations have led to the identification of no more than a few hypothetical *fabricae* within the forts, among which the best documented is the so-called "barrack no. 5" (building B5) from the fort from Buciumi (*Dacia Porolissensis*)[107]. Further hypothetical military workshops have been reported in the large auxiliary fort from Moigrad – *Porolissum* and Bivolari – *Arutela* (*Dacia Inferior*)[108], although the lack of a systematic analysis of the finds and the archaeological contexts hinders any precise identification. A particular aspect of military production in Roman Dacia, namely the subject of "legionary ware", has attracted some attention in the archaeological literature. Old excavations dating to the period 1939–1940 in the auxiliary fort from Drajna de Sus (Prahova county), built probably at the start of the first Dacian War in AD 101 and abandoned around the time of the death of emperor Trajan, have produced ceramic assemblages which almost 30 years after the publication in 1948[109] have been found to be consistent with the phenomenon called "legionary ware"[110]. From an administrative point of view the fort never belonged to the province of Dacia, but its establishment and brief period of operation is closely tied to the occupation and organisation of the province. K. Greene suggested that the Roman army from the beginning of the 1st century AD employed potters to ensure the pottery supply of the legions and reduce reliance on civilian contractors, as was the case with the legions operating in the Lower Danube area, where the aforementioned fort was established during the Dacian campaigns[111]. These views have since been revised in the more recent literature (see above, the discussion on the subject). Relatively recently, the publication of a pottery assemblage from the legionary fortress of *Apulum* has revealed a series of interesting aspects regarding the material culture in the military environment of Roman Dacia[112]. First of all, the study showed that a considerable part of the investigated assemblage, from the point of view of the style and repertory, belonged to the category of "legionary ware"[113]. Furthermore, it drew attention on the fact that the local pottery production, attributed largely to the workshops from the nearby Partoş district followed the *Norican – Pannonian* tradition, accounting for the fact that the Legion XIII *Gemina* was previously garrisoned in Pannonia and craftsmen from the neighbouring province most likely pursued the legion onto its new location[114].

4) Aspects concerning the "military diet" in Roman Dacia were addressed recently by means of archaeozoological analysis of animal bone assemblages from various Roman military sites[115]. The analysis has shown that, through a deliberate process of importing improved species

[105] MARCU 2009, 14–15.

[106] See: GUDEA/LANDES 1981.

[107] GUDEA 1997b, 29, 70.

[108] See: GUDEA 1997c, 26, 64–65(*Porolissum*) and MARCU 2009, 185–186 (Bivolari – *Arutela*).

[109] The assemblages together with the results of the excavations were published by Gh. Ştefan, see ŞTEFAN 1948, 125–135.

[110] See: GREENE 1977, 116–123.

[111] GREENE 1977, 124.

[112] CIAUŞESCU 2006.

[113] CIAUŞESCU 2006, 146.

[114] CIAUŞESCU 2006, 143.

[115] See: GUDEA A. 2009. The animal bone assemblages from the following forts were included in this investigation: Veţel – *Micia*, Bologa – *Resculum*, Românaşi – *Largiana*, Brâncoveneşti, Răcari.

and selective breeding, the animal population was considerably improved in a relatively short period compared with the situation from pre-Roman Dacia. Dramatic improvement was achieved especially in the case of the bovines, with changes highlighted for other species as well, such as the caprine-ovines, although not on such an intense level[116]. Based on the nature of the evidence, it was inferred by the author that the Roman army benefited primarily from these changes. As concerning other elements of the diet, in both the abovementioned study and in earlier works it was assumed from the outset that the results from investigations concerning other provinces (see above) can be applied completely and without any critical appraisal to the case of Roman Dacia[117]. Further aspects related to the subject have been underlined sparsely in studies concerning the supply of foodstuffs to the forts (see above), although there was no attempt so far to analyze the material culture of the forts, especially the pottery assemblages from the point of view of eating and drinking habits in the Roman military environment of Dacia.

5) As concerning the daily routine within the Roman forts of Dacia, very little information based on factual evidence from this province has been put forward in the archaeological literature. Regarding the medical care in the Roman army of Dacia, recently the entire, hitherto published body of evidence, relevant to the subject was collected and analyzed in context[118]. The study underlined that there is no conclusive evidence for an organised and constant medical system in the forts from Dacia, relying on a professional medical staff, instead the archaeological material illustrates a prevalence of personal care and hygiene which among others could be connected to a possible strategy of preventing illness[119]. It is relevant from this point of view that a high number of toiletry implements have been discovered in the soldiers' barracks[120]. A further important subject, is the question of female presence in the forts of Dacia. The investigation of this phenomenon was undertaken along the line set by Western European scholars who examined this subject (see above)[121]. The respective study was based on the analysis of artefacts potentially associated with women such as jewellery and adornment items, dress accessories and objects associated with female activities[122]. The study showed that the concentration of female-related artefacts mainly in the barracks and the buildings considered to be officers' residence is indicative of constant female presence in the forts of Dacia[123].

5. Conclusions

Owing to the developments in the field of Roman provincial archaeology throughout the last decades, the study of the everyday life of the Roman soldier can be defined according to the following aspects and research topics: 1) supply of goods to the forts, 2) military architecture and use of space, 3) manufacture and crafts (military production), 4) "military diet", 5) daily routine and recurrent activities within the forts, and 6) military identity. In the vast research domain concerning the Roman army, two somewhat distinct methods of investigation can be linked to the study of military everyday life. The individual monographic studies of military installations (mainly forts and fortresses) generally provide a detailed analysis of the archaeological finds in the form of specialist reports, but only in few cases they go beyond this "primary" stage of investigation. The studies directly aimed at investigating one of the aspects of military everyday life cited above are based on a wider range of methods including the correlation of

[116] GUDEA A. 2009, 110–113.
[117] See: GUDEA 2005, 189–190; GUDEA A. 2009, 93–94.
[118] See: GUI 2011.
[119] GUI 2011.
[120] GUI 2011.
[121] See: VASS 2010.
[122] VASS 2010, 130.
[123] VASS 2010, 139.

the respective finds with information offered by alternative sites and areas, but also a wide range of sources pertaining to the archaeological and sub-literary record. The review of the archaeological literature from Western Europe, consisting in this discussion mainly of Britain and Germany, displays a complementary relationship between the monographic studies, in which the archaeological finds are discussed by means of finds catalogues and detailed specialist reports, and the studies which investigate the different aspect of everyday life listed above, often relying on the information provided by the monographic works. In the case of Roman Dacia, in spite of tangible progress made in recent years, the study of military everyday life is hindered both by the relatively small amount of published archaeological material from forts and by the deficient manner in which this material was often dealt with in the publications, especially the lack of specialist reports. Given these conditions, the analysis of the various aspects of military everyday life is prone to considerable difficulties and often attempts to consider these aspects are based primarily not on the quantitative analysis of archaeological assemblages, relying instead on the arbitrary adoption of results and hypothesis from the Western European archaeology. In order to achieve further progress in this field the need to re-evaluate the archaeological finds from previously investigated military sites seems essential. Based on a detailed analysis of this material, the investigation of the various aspects of military everyday life, according to the classification put forward here, is made possible. This investigation, made at the level of individual forts, relies primarily on the quantitative analysis of the archaeological assemblages pertaining to the respective sites and the information provided by alternative sites and regions of the Empire as well as the complementary data provided mainly by the sub-literary record.

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

CDS
B. S. Turner (Ed.), The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology (Cambridge 2006).

DSU
F. Gresle/M. Panoff/M. Perrin/P. Tripier, Dicţionar de ştiinţe umane: antropologie/sociologie, Trad. I. Negrea/M. Gabriel-Florin (Bucureşti 2000).

EHA
Ch. E. Orser (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Historical Archaeology (London/York 2002).

ALLASON-JONES 1999
L. ALLASON-JONES, Women and the Roman army in Britain. In: A. Goldsworthy/I. Haynes (Eds.), The Roman Army as a Community. Journal Roman Arch. Suppl. Ser. 34 (Portsmouth/Rhode Island 1999), 41–51.

ALLISON 2005
P. ALLISON, Mapping artefacts and activities within Roman forts. In: Zs. Visy (Ed.), Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Pécs, Hungary in September 2003 (Pécs 2005), 833–846.

ALLISON 2006
P. ALLISON, Mapping for gender. Interpreting artefact distribution inside 1st and 2nd century A.D. forts in Roman Germany. Arch. Dialogues 13/1, 2006, 1–20.

ALLISON 2007
P. ALLISON, Artefact distribution within the auxiliary fort at Ellingen: evidence for building use and for the presence of women and children. Ber. RGK 87, 2006, 387–452.

BERNAL 2006
D. BERNAL-CASASOLA, Alimentos béticos, cerámicas y militares en Dacia. Reflexiones y lineas de investigación. In: D. Bondoc (Ed.), In honorem Gheorghe Popilian (Craiova 2006), 97–115.

BIRLEY 1997
A. R. BIRLEY, Supplying the Batavians at Vindolanda. In: W. Groenman-van Waateringe/B. L. van Beek/W. J. H. Willems/S. L. Wynia (Eds.), Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Kerkrade, The Netherlands1995. Oxbow Monograph 91 (Oxford 1997), 273–280.

BISHOP/COULSTON 1993
M. C. BISHOP/J. C. N. COULSTON, Roman Military Equipment from the Punic Wars to the Fall of Rome (London 1993).

BISHOP 1985
M. C. BISHOP, The military fabrica and the production of arms in the early Principate. In: M. C. Bishop (Ed.), The Production and Distribution of Roman Military Equipment. Proceedings of the Second Roman Military Equipment Research Seminar. BAR Intern. Ser. 275 (Oxford 1985), 1–42.

BOWMAN/THOMAS 2003
A. K. BOWMAN/J. D. THOMAS, The Vindolanda Writing Tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses III.), Volume III (London 2003.)

BREEZE 1977
D. J. BREEZE, The fort at Bearsden and the supply of Pottery to the Roman army. In: J. Dore/K. Greene (Eds.), Roman Pottery Studies in Britain and Beyond. BAR Suppl. Ser. 30 (Oxford 1977), 133–145.

BREEZE 1993
D. J. BREEZE, The organisation of the career structure of the immunes and principales of the Roman army. In: D. J. Breeze/B. Dobson (Eds.), Roman Officers and Frontiers, MAVORS. Roman Army Researches X (Stuttgart 1993), 11–58.

BREEZE 2000
D. J. BREEZE, Supplying the army. In: G. Alföldy/B. Dobson/W. Eck (Hrsg.), Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in der Römischen Kaiserzeit. Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley. Heidelberger Althist. Beitr. u. Epigr. Stud. 31(Stuttgart 2000), 59–64.

CAMPBELL 1994
B. CAMPBELL, The Roman Army 31 BC–AD 337. A Sourcebook (London/New York 1994).

CARRERAS-MONFORT 2002
C. CARRERAS-MONFORT, The Roman military supply during the Principate. Transportation and staples. In: P. Erdkamp (Ed.), The Roman army and the economy (Amsterdam 2002), 70–89.

CARROLL 2005
M. CARROLL, The preparation and consumption of food as a contributing factor towards communal identity in the Roman army. In: Zs. Visy (Ed.), Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Pécs, Hungary in September 2003 (Pécs 2005), 363–372.

CIAUŞESCU 2006
M. CIAUŞESCU, A Roman pottery assemblage from the legionary fortress at Apulum. In: D. Bondoc (Ed.), In honorem Gheorghe Popilian (Craiova 2006), 142–162.

COULSTON 2004
J. C. N. COULSTON, Military identity and personal self-identity in the Roman army. In: J. De Ligt/E. A. Hemelrijk/H. W. Singor (Eds.), Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives. Impact of Empire 4. Proceedings of the fourth workshop of the international network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 B.C.–A.D. 476), Leiden June 25–28, 2003 (Amsterdam 2004), 133–152.

DAVIES 1971
R. W. DAVIES, The Roman military diet. Britannia 2, 1971, 122–142.

DAVIES 1974
R. W. DAVIES, The daily life of the Roman soldier under the Principate. In: H. Temporini (Ed.), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II/1 (Tübingen 1974), 299–334.

EGRI/INEL 2006
M. EGRI/C. INEL, Inscriptions on amphorae and the military supply. In: D. Bondoc (Ed.), In honorem Gheorghe Popilian (Craiova 2006), 191–195.
EGRI 2008
M. EGRI, Roman campaigns in the Danube region. The olive oil supply from Augustus to Trajan. Ephemeris Napocensis 18, 2008, 45–56.
ETTLINGER 1951
E. ETTLINGER, Legionary Pottery from Vindonissa. Journal Roman Stud. 41/1–2, 1951, 105–111.
FINK 1971
R. O. FINK, Roman military records on papyrus. Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association 26 (Albany 1971).
FREEMAN 1996
PH. FREEMAN, Roman frontier studies: what's new? Britannia 27, 1996, 465–470.
GARDNER 2007
A. GARDNER, Artefacts, Contexts and the Archaeology of Social practices. In: R. Hingley/S. Willis (Eds.), Roman finds: Context and Theory. Proceedings of a conference held at the University of Durham (Oxford 2007), 129–139.
GASSNER/JILEK 1997
V. GASSNER/S. JILEK, Zum Problem der 'Legionswäre' und ihrer Verbreitung von Germanien bis Moesien. In: Groenman-van Waateringe/B. L. van Beek/W. J. H. Willems/S. L. Wynia, Proceedings of the 18th International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Kerkrade, The Netherlands1995. Oxbow Monograph 91 (Oxford 1997), 301–309.
GREENE 1977
K. GREENE, Legionary pottery and the significance of Holt. In: J. Dore/K. Greene (Eds.), Roman pottery studies in Britain and beyond. BAR Suppl. Ser. 30 (Oxford 1977), 113–132.
GUDEA/LANDES 1981
N. GUDEA/A. LANDES, Propuneri pentru o reconstituire grafică a castrului roman de la Buciumi III. Barăcile. Acta Mus. Porolissensis 5, 1981, 247–271.
GUDEA 1997A
N. GUDEA, Der Dakische Limes. Materialen zu seiner Geschichte. Jahrb. RGZM 44/2, 1997, 1–113.
GUDEA 1997B
N. GUDEA Castrul roman de la Buciumi/Das Römergrenzkastell von Buciumi (Zalău 1997).
GUDEA 1997C
N. GUDEA, Castrul roman de pe dealul Pomet-Moigrad/Das Römergrenzkastell von Moigrad-Pomet. Porolissum 1 (Zalău 1997).
GUDEA 2000
N. GUDEA, Dacia Porolissensis I. Contribuţii la o bibliografie a istoriei militare și la un scurt istoric al cercetărilor. Rev. Bistriţei 14, 2000, 355–78.
GUDEA A. 2005
N. GUDEA, Despre consumuri ale armatei romane din Dacia Porolissensis. Necesităţi, producţie locală și importuri – Studiu preliminar. In: C. Cosma/A. Rustoiu (Eds.), Comerţ și civilizaţie. Transilvania în contextul schimburilor comerciale și culturale în antichitate. Interferenţe etnice și culturale în mileniile I a. Chr. – I p. Chr. VII (Cluj-Napoca 2005), 211–268.
GUDEA A. 2009
AL. GUDEA, Soldatul roman în Dacia. Studiu arheozoologic privind creșterea animalelor și regimul alimentar în armata romană. Interferenţe etnice și culturale în mileniile I. a. Chr. – I p. Chr. IX (Cluj-Napoca 2009).
GUI 2011
M. GUI, Evidence for medical and personal care in the case of the Roman army in Dacia. Ephemeris Napocensis 21, 2011, 115–130.

HAYNES 1999A
I. HAYNES, Introduction: the Roman army as a community. In: A. Goldsworthy/I. Haynes (Eds.), The Roman Army as a Community. Journal Roman Arch. Suppl. Ser. 34 (Portsmouth/Rhode Island 1999), 7–14.

HAYNES 1999B
I. HAYNES, Military service and cultural identity in the *auxilia*. In: A. Goldsworthy/I. Haynes (Eds.), The Roman Army as a Community. Journal Roman Arch. Suppl. Ser. 34 (Portsmouth/Rhode Island 1999), 165–174.

HERZ 2002
P. HERZ, Die Logistik der Kaiserzeitlichen Armee. Strukturelle Überlegungen. In: P. Erdkamp (Ed.), The Roman army and the economy (Amsterdam 2002), 19–46.

HODGSON/BIDWELL 2004
N. HODGSON/P. T. BIDWELL, Barracks in a New Light: Recent Discoveries on Hadrian's Wall. Britannia 35, 2004, 121–157.

HODGSON 2002
N. HODGSON, 'Where did they put the horses?' revisited: the recent discovery of cavalry barracks in the Roman forts at Wallsend and South Shields on Hadrian's Wall. In: Ph. Freeman/J. Bennett/Z. T. Fiema/B. Hoffmann (Eds.), Proceedings of the 18th International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Amman, Jordan in September 2000. BAR Int. Ser. 1084(II) (Oxford 2002), 887–894.

HOFFMANN 1995
B. HOFFMANN, The quarters of legionary centurions of the Principate. Britannia 26, 1995, 107–151.

HÜSEN 1992
C. M. HÜSEN, Grabungen und Forschungen der letzten 40 Jahre im obergermanischen und rätischen Limesgebiet. In: Der römische Limes in Deutschland: 100 Jahre Reichs-Limeskomission (Stuttgart 1992), 33–70.

ISAAC 1992
B. ISAAC, The Limits of Empire. The Roman Army in the East. Revised version (Oxford 1992).

ISAC 2006
D. ISAC, Archaeological interpretations: the relationship between artefacts and the functionality of some of the buildings within the forts (*spatha* and the spurs from a *stabulum* of the fort from Samvm-Căşeiu). In: C. Gaiu/C. Găzdac (Eds.) Fontes Historiae. Studia in honorem Demetrii Protase (Cluj-Napoca 2006), 437–453.

ISAC/HÜGEL/ANDREICA1994
D. ISAC/P. HÜGEL/D. ANDREICA, Praetoria in dakischen Militäranlangen. Saalburg-Jahrb. 47, 1994, 40–64.

JAMES 1999
S. JAMES, The community of the soldiers: a major identity and centre of power in the Roman Empire. In P. Baker/C. Forcey/S. Jundi/R. Witcher (Eds.), Proceedings of the 8th Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, held at the University of Leicester (April 1998) (Oxford 1999), 14–25.

JOHNSON 1983
A. JOHNSON, Roman Forts of the 1st and 2nd centuries AD in Britain and the German provinces (London 1983).

JUNKELMANN 1997
M. JUNKELMANN, Panis militaris. Der Ernährung des römischen Soldaten oder Grundstoff der Macht (Mainz 1997).

LANDER 1984
J. LANDER, Roman Stone Fortifications. Variation and Change from the First century A.D. to the Fourth. BAR Intern. Ser. 206 (Oxford 1984).

LUTTWAK 1979
E. N. LUTTWAK, The Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire. From the First Century A.D. to the Third. 2nd edition (Baltimore/London 1979).

MACMULLEN 1960
R. MACMULLEN, Inscriptions on Armour and the Supply of Arms in the Roman Empire. Am. Journal Arch. 64/1 1960, 23–40.
MANNING 1975
W. H. MANNING, Roman military timber granaries in Britain. Saalburg-Jahrb. 32, 1975, 105–129.
MARCU 2009
F. MARCU, Organizarea internă a castrelor din Dacia. Bibl. Mvsei Napocensis 30 (Cluj-Napoca 2009).
OLDENSTEIN 1977
J. OLDENSTEIN, Zur Ausrüstung römischer Auxiliareinheiten. Studien zu Beschlägen un Zierat and der Ausrüstung der römischen Auxiliareinheiten der ogergermanisch-raetischen Limesgebietes aus dem zweiten und dritten Jahrhundert n. Chr. Ber. RGK 57, 1976 (Mainz 1977), 49–284.
PEARCE 2002
J. PEARCE, Food as substance and symbol in the Roman army: a case study from Vindolanda. In: Ph. Freeman/J. Bennett/Z. T. Fiema/B. Hoffmann (Eds.), Proceedings of the 18th International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Amman, Jordan in September 2000. BAR Int. Ser. 1084(II) (Oxford 2002), 931–944.
PETCULESCU 1987
L. PETCULESCU, Roman Military Granaries in Dacia. Saalburg-Jahrb. 43, 1987, 66–76.
PETRIKOVITS 1975
H. von PETRIKOVITS, Die Innenbauten römischer Legionslager während der Prinzipatzeit (Düsseldorf 1975).
POPA ET ALII 2010
A. POPA/Vl. LĂZĂRESCU/A. DOBOS/R. ZĂGREANU, Vorläufige Ergebnisse der Phosphatkartierung im römischen Kastell von Breţcu. Rev. Bistriţei 23, 2009, 69–74.
ROTH 1999
J. P. ROTH, The Logistics of the Roman Army at War (264 B.C.–235 A.D.) (Leiden 1999).
SHIRLEY 2001
E. SHIRLEY, Building a Roman Legionary Fortress (Gloucestershire 2001).
SOMMER 1995
C. S. SOMMER, "Where did they put the horses?" Überlegungen zu Aufbau und stärke römischer Auxiliarttruppen un deren Unterbringung in den Kastellen. In: W. Czysz/C.-M. Hüssen/H. P. Kuhnen/C. S. Sommer/G. Weber (Hrsg.), Provinzialrömische Forschungen. Festschrift für Günter Ulbert zum 65. Geburtstag (Espelkamp 1995).
SPEIDEL 1997
M. A. SPEIDEL, Frauen und Kindern beim römischen Heer. Jahresber. Ges. Pro Vindonissa 1997, 53–54.
STANCIU 1985
I. STANCIU, Consideraţii asupra clădirii comandamentului (*principia*) castrelor auxiliare din Dacia. Acta Mus. Porolissensis 9, 1985, 219–246.
SUCIU 2009
L. D. SUCIU, Habitat și viață cotidiană în Dacia secolelor 1 a. Chr–1 p. Chr (Cluj-Napoca 2009) [PhD Thesis].
SWAN 2004
V. G. SWAN, The historical significance of "Legionary Wares" in Britain. In: F. Vermeulen/K. Sas/W. Dhaeze (Eds.), Archaeology in Confrontation. Aspects of Roman Military Presence in the Northwest. Studies in honour of Professor Em. Hugo Thoen. Arch. Reports Ghent University 2 (Ghent 2004), 259–286.
ŞTEFAN 1948
GH. ŞTEFAN, Le camp romain de Drajna de Sus. Dacia 11–12, 1945–1947 [1948], 115–144.

VAN DRIEL-MURRAY 1997
C. van DRIEL-MURRAY, Women in forts? Jahresber. Ges. Pro Vindonissa 1997, 55–62.
VASS 2010
L. VASS, Women in a man's world? Female related artefacts from the camps of Dacia. Marisia 30, 2010, 127–152.
WATSON 1969
G. R. WATSON, The Roman Soldier. Aspects of Greek and Roman Life. General Editor: Professor H. H. Scullard (London 1969).
WHITTAKER 2002
C. R. WHITTAKER, Supplying the army. Evidence from Vindolanda. In: P. Erdkamp (Ed.), The Roman army and the economy (Amsterdam 2002), 204–234.
WHITTAKER 2004
C. R. WHITTAKER, Rome and its Frontiers: the Dynamics of Empire (London/New York 2004).
WILMOTT 1997
T. WILMOTT, A new building type in an auxiliary fort: the Birdoswald basilica and its discovery. In: Groenman-van Waateringe/B. L.van Beek/W. J. H. Willems/S. L. Wynia (Eds.), Proceedings of the 18th International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Kerkrade, The Netherlands1995 (Oxford 1997), 581–586.