

PLACES OF WORSHIP IN FORTS¹

Ever since Augustus' reign, soldiers have been a social category having a well-defined religious calendar emphasising traditional religious festivals and the worshipping of the imperial family². It is still unclear to what extent they expressed themselves religiously, and especially what the soldiers' behavior was in relation to Gods, inside their fortification.

The central place, in which all religious symbols of a troop were preserved was undoubtedly the central room on the back side of the headquarter building, the *aedes principiorum*. Standards were stored here, and probably also the altars and images dedicated to Roman emperors or the Gods of the official Roman religion³. Tacitus confirms it while describing the retreat of the consul Munatius Plancus, at the beginning of the 1st century A.D. to the camp of the 1st legion where: *Illic signa et aquilam amplexus religione sese tutabatur ac ni aquilifer Calpurnius vim extremam arcuisset, legatus populi Romani Romanis in castris altaria deum commaculavisset* (Tacitus, *Ann.* 1, 39). The inscription found at Novae is dedicated to: *Dis militaribus Genio Virtuti aquilae sanct(ae) signisque leg(ionis) I Ital(icae) Severianae* (CIL III 7591)⁴. Many inscriptions dedicated to Jupiter, Minerva, Mars etc. have been also discovered in the proximity of the rooms at the back side of the headquarter building⁵. Tertullian also makes the precision that worshipping military standards before any God is the core of a Roman soldier's religious life. *'...religio Romanorum tota signa veneratur, signa iurat, signa omnibus deis praeposit...*' (Tertullian, *Apol.* 16.8)⁶.

There are numerous pieces of evidence attesting the fact that soldiers used or carried with them images or statues of the Gods, as well. Tacitus states that: *Dein paucis diebus interiectis magna utrimque specie inde eques compositus per turmas et insignibus patriis, hinc agmina legionum stetero fulgentibus aquilis signisque et simulacris deum in modum templi* (n.a. but it wasn't) *medio tribunal sedem curulem et sedes effigiem Neronis sustinebat* (Tacitus, *Ann.* 15, 29). We can thus conclude that soldiers were in possession of, or had the right to carry statues / effigies of Gods besides those of emperors, but a precise location of the place in which these were placed inside the fortifications is still uncertain. Moreover, two inscriptions from Aquincum are dedicated to the *dis militaribus* (CIL III 3472; 3473; 7591), referring to Jupiter, Mars and Victoria⁷. Consequently, A. v. Domaszewski, quoting Hyginus, suggests the existence in every temporary camp of a special zone where offerings are made to Gods, the *'auguratorium'*, located in the open space between the *praetorium* and the *via principalis*: *Aris institutis in*

¹ This paper has been partially realized while I was at the Ancient History Institute in Cologne, on a scholarship offered by the Fritz Thyssen and Alexander von Humboldt (Bonn) Foundations, in May 2005.

² B. Campbell, *The Roman Army 31 BC-AD 337. A Sourcebook*, London – New York 1994, p. 127 sqq.

³ About the *aedes* as a sacred place inside fortresses, see Domaszewski 1895, p. 9-10; Petrikovits 1975, p. 75, n. 80 with bibliography.

⁴ See Domaszewski 1895, p. 8.

⁵ Cf. Domaszewski 1895, *passim*.

⁶ Probably from the times of Marius, the eagle represents the continuity and individuality of every one of the legions, and the loss of this symbol in battle was considered to be the biggest possible disgrace; therefore the most important holiday was probably *natalis aquilae*, celebrating the day in which the troop was founded. See also B. Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

⁷ For explanations, see Domaszewski 1895, p. 2-4.

praetorii parte imae (Hyginus 11)⁸. Next to statues of Gods⁹ or to others erected to honor emperors, the soldiers that '*...aquilas et signa Romana Caesarumque imagines adorauit*' (Suet., *Calig.* 14) can erect statues of their commanders in *principia*, as well, but these are probably isolated cases: '*colique per theatra et fora effigies interque signa legionum sineret*' (about Aelius Seianus) (Tacitus, *Ann.* 4, 2) or *Syriacis legionibus quod solae nullam Seiani imaginem inter principia coluissent* (Suetonius, *Tib.* 48). Therefore, the statues of emperors, their consorts or of the commanders were in the *aedes* or even in the rooms around the courtyard¹⁰.

The questions we are asking ourselves here are: to what extent were there places of worship in fortresses or forts, besides the *aedes principiorum*, and can we still rely on the 100 year-old statement made by A. v. Domaszewski, who asserted, on the basis of the arguments that he had at that time, that the only sacred place in a fortress is inside the headquarter building¹¹. I will refer only briefly to the dedication of altars to divinities inside buildings that have a definite role, other than temples, such as hospitals, baths, granaries or headquarter buildings, and will insist mostly on those buildings inside forts in Dacia that had been registered as temples.

The cult of *Genii* was extremely popular among Romans; the most widely spread being that of *Genius Augusti* or *Genius Imperatoris*, the soldiers being those who set up most of these inscriptions. There is also a special series of *Genii*, comprised of many items, in relation to military units, military divinities, different officers or military buildings. There were *Genii* for all types of troops; the least attested are those of urban cohorts in Rome, consequently the *Genius exercitus*, those of the legions, *alae*, cohorts or of some *numeri*. The most attested are the *Genii centuriae* and the *Genius turmae*, as the soldiers were very much attached to their troops, but first and foremost identified themselves with the *centuria* or *turma* they were included in. At Lambaesis, the chapels of the *centuria's Genii* were situated next to the barracks of each *centuria*¹². On the other hand, as Domaszewski noted, *Genius legionis* or that of another troop can be worshiped anywhere, not only in the *sacellum*, as the sanctuary of the entire unit, just like votive statues can be found in profane spaces. Inscriptions dedicated to the *Genius* of the entire troop were discovered both inside and outside the fortresses, in the chapels of the *scholae* of centurions or *mensores*, in *thermae*, in some *stationes* or in veterans' colonies¹³. This only proves, like M.P. Speidel asserts, the fact that this cult of the *Genii* was spontaneous and not prescribed¹⁴, a theoretical distinction being thus made between '*the act of duty*', as a result of the official religion, and the '*personal devotion*', which depended on the preferences of every individual, to which G. Alföldy and E. Birley were referring¹⁵.

⁸ *Auguratoria* as independent buildings were even presumed to have existed at Vindonissa and Noviomagus, a proof being the existence of a *haruspex*, *victimarius* and *pullarius* in the legion's commander's *staff*, cf. Petrikovits 1975, p. 76-77, B. 15, n. 82. Or, the proofs of their existence are only theoretical, the buildings in the above-mentioned fortresses being characterized by a central courtyard surrounded by rooms that could have been workshops, private houses etc.

⁹ For evidence regarding their location in the *aedes* see Domaszewski 1895, p. 11-12.

¹⁰ *Divi* are honored with statues since the times of Hadrian, but especially beginning with the Severi, since when their wives began to be honored, as well, cf. Domaszewski 1895, 10, p. 71-72.

¹¹ The demonstration was based on some inscriptions from the construction or rebuilding of the *aedes*, probably, which was not named in the inscriptions quoted by the author, Domaszewski 1895, p. 17-18.

¹² R. Cagnat, *Les deux camps de la légion IIIe Auguste à Lambèse d'après les fouilles récentes*, *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 38, 1. Paris 1908, p. 55.

¹³ Domaszewski 1895, p. 96 sq.

¹⁴ Speidel, Dimitrova-Milčeva 1978, p. 1546.

¹⁵ G. Alföldy, *Geschichte des religiösen Lebens in Aquincum*, *AArchHung* 13, 1961, p. 103-124; E. Birley, *The Religion of the Roman Army: 1895-1977*, *ANRW II*, 16.2, 1978, p. 1515. D. Fishwick also argues

Consequently, an initial planning of an official building dedicated to these *Genii* in fortresses is out of the question. There is no doubt that the decision to erect such a building at a certain moment in time was made by soldiers or, more precisely, by military *collegia* interested in creating such worship places. This is the case for some *optiones* at Lambaesis in the 3rd C. A.D. who erected a reunion building decorated with statues and images of the divine household and having also protective gods (CIL VIII 2554 = ILS 2445). Or, this fact is also demonstrated by the inscription at Ilişua, from which we learn that a decurion (?) built a temple most probably for the *Genius* of the decurions' college: *P(ublius) Ael(ius) Pauli / nus templ(um) / instituit / pro se suorumque / salute / Genio sanc/to scholae de / curionum* (CIL III 7626).

Genii and possible *scholae* of several groups are known: *beneficarii* (CIL III 876, 7626; VIII 17628; XIII 6127; AE 1971, 218), *capsarii* (CIL XIII 11979), *centuriones* (CIL XIII 7631), *decuriones* (ILS 2545), *exploratores* (RIU 424), *immunes* (AE 1905, 241), *mentores* (CIL III 17796 = RIU II 391; AE 1973, 471), *optiones* (CIL XIII 6566), *praepositii* (*apud* Speidel 1978, n. 24), *secutores* (CIL XIII 11766), *signiferi* (AE 1927, 89 = RIB 451, AE 1958, 303), *speculatores* (CIL VIII 2603, IDR III/5, 426), *tectores* (ILS 9183), *veredarii* (CIL XIII 7439), *vexillarii et imaginiferi* (CIL XIII 7533). It is not very clear whether these are *Genii* of some *scholae*, although the above-mentioned inscription at Ilişua seems to demonstrate it, but it is quite obvious that there used to be associations of these categories of *principales*. Or, should the *Genii* have been worshiped in the framework of some *collegia*, the altar must have been placed inside a special building, a proper temple, or simply and most probably in a *schola*. Another question is whether the *Genii* belong to the *collegia* or to some buildings, like these *scholae*. The *Genii opt(ionum) coh(ortis) III Aquit(anorum) Philippianae* (CIL XIII 6566), and respectively *In h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae) Genio b(ene)f(iciarorum) co(n)s(ularis) G(ermaniae) s(uperioris) et loci...* (ILS 2401) are mentioned in two cases. Consequently, the first case can refer to a *schola* of the *optiones*, but the second case clearly refers to a *Genius* of consular beneficiaries. However, since the term *schola* can refer both to the members of a club and to a building, to the same extent, it is possible for the *Genii* of *scholae* to indicate soldiers and not a specific structure¹⁶.

So, what could such a building have looked like? The simplest analogy is the *aedes* of *principia*. The acknowledged shape of this *aedes*, especially since the second half of the 2nd C. A.D., consists of a rectangular room with no partitionings, provided with an apse, at least from a certain moment on. Suggestive in this respect are also most of the rooms on the back side of the headquarter building at Lambaesis, which have a simple, rectangular plan ending in an apse at the short extremity opposite the entrance, and which have been characterized as *scholae* (Fig. 1.1)¹⁷. Any *schola* of any college could have looked exactly the same.

We find out what could have been the functional dimension of such a structure from the archaeological excavations in the shrine of the Augustals in Misenum (Fig. 1.2)¹⁸. In what Dacia is concerned, a room of this kind was researched in the north-eastern corner area of the forum at Sarmizegetusa, which used to be a reunion hall of

about the necessity of a clear distinction between the official religion and the religious preferences of the soldiers in a troop, and also about the possibility for a troop like the *coh. XX Palmyrenorum* from Dura, 'when off duty' to dedicate altars to their own gods, adding that 'private and public observances are separate categories that need not show any obvious interaction', D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*, Leiden 1991, p. 594.

¹⁶ Cf. Speidel, Dimitrova-Milčeva 1978, p. 1548-1549.

¹⁷ F. Rakob, S. Storz, *Die principia des römischen Legionslagers in Lambaesis*, MDAI (R) 81, 1974, p. 253-280; Petrikovits 1975, p. 78.

¹⁸ See Diaconescu 2005, p. 330-332.




Fig. 1.2.




Fig. 1.3.




Fig. 1.1.



Fig. 2.1.



Fig. 2.2.




Fig. 3.1.




Fig. 3.2.

Fig. 2. "Podiensaal" – Pergamon; Fig. 3.1. Schola iuvenum – Mactar,
3.2. The Fabri headquarter – Ostia.

college of the *fabri*, referred to in an inscription as *aedes fabrum* (Fig. 1.3)¹⁹. An entire *templum*-type complex was researched at Misenum, but we are only interested in the central room, as it was provided with a bench on the axis of which the statue of the college's genius was placed²⁰. More statues of Vespasian and Titus were placed here, in niches dug into the thickness of the apse wall. The ceremonial character of this room is quite obvious, since there was another room next to it, also an apsidal room especially designed for banquets. In contrast to this, the chapel of the Augustals at Sarmizegetusa most probably had a double role: of worship and also the role of a *triclinium*, a banquet hall.

It is therefore obvious that these *scholae* are not only proper places of worship, but first and foremost reunion places, even though the reasons that had called for these reunions had initially been of a religious nature. H. v. Petrikovits asserts that the first characteristic of the *scholae* was that of a pastime for the members of a college²¹.

An extremely illustrative example in this respect is the 'Podiensaal' from Pergamon, a hall 'equipped with podiums on which the guests would lie down' (Fig. 2.1, 2.2), in which the altar was placed in niches. Consequently, the role of these premises was that of a reunion place for the various *collegia* in order to celebrate²² and less that of a sanctuary, even though it had, at least theoretically, the role of an *aedes* (sacred chapel) and undoubtedly there were ceremonies organised there, dedicated to the college's Genius. However, Al. Diaconescu makes a distinction between *aedes* and *schola*, as the structure at Sarmizegetusa was classified in an inscription as the former, although the terms do not necessarily exclude one another. *Schola*, as a reunion place, can become an *aedes* as well (with the meaning of a sacred chapel) if there is a sanctuary placed inside it. Or, even Al Diaconescu finds at Mactar a plan analogous to the structure at Sarmizegetusa, where it was classified as being a '*schola iuvenum*' (Fig. 3.1)²³. The fact that the construction at Sarmizegetusa also has the role of a *schola* (understood as the headquarters of a college) is indicated by the existence of a bed designed for banquets (*accubitus*), as well as the existence of a kitchen (*culina*)²⁴.

Surely, there could have been a complex of structures similar to the *templum* and a *schola*, made of porticos, *aedes*, courtyard etc., just like the complex belonging to the Augustals at Misenum or the headquarters of the *fabri* in Ostia (Fig. 3.2)²⁵. Or, it is possible for the term *schola* to have been used only where there is a strict, specific reference to a separate building and not to rooms that are part of another complex – as is the case of the forum at Sarmizegetusa²⁶.

The *Genii* of parts of buildings or even of ordinary structures in fortresses are well-known, without them having a congregational role. The following are mentioned as such: *Genii* of the *campus*, *castra*, *domus*, *excubitorium*, *horreum*, *praesidium*, *praetorium*, *statio*, *tabularium*, *armamentarium* or *valetudinarium*²⁷, just like in civil

¹⁹ R. Étienne, I. Piso, Al. Diaconescu, *Les fouilles de forum vetus de Sarmizegetusa. Rapport général*, AMN 39-40/1, 2002-2003 (2004), p. 113-115, Ep. 10, Pl. XXXVI.

²⁰ Diaconescu 2005, p. 332.

²¹ Petrikovits 1975, p. 78, B. 16.

²² See for an analogy the case of the *fabri* at Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa, Diaconescu 2005, p. 340.

²³ Diaconescu 2005, p. 341.

²⁴ R. Étienne, I. Piso, Al. Diaconescu, op. cit., p. 114-115.

²⁵ Diaconescu 2005, p. 333; 344-345, fig. 180.

²⁶ However, the term *schola* is used, probably for the sake of convenience, by H. v. Petrikovits when he refers to the rooms in some of the *principia*, Petrikovits 1975, p. 78-79, *passim*.

²⁷ Speidel, Dimitrova-Milčeva 1978, p. 1549. For Dacia, see M. Macrea, *Viața în Dacia romană*, București 1969, p. 204-205; M. Bărbulescu, *Culte greco-romane în provincia Dacia, teză de doctorat*, Cluj-Napoca, 1985, *passim*.




Fig. 4.1.




Fig. 4.2.

Fig. 4.1. Pojejena; Fig. 4.2. Brza Palanka (Moesia Superior).




Fig. 5.2.

Fig. 5.1.

Fig. 5.1. Porolissum; Fig. 5.2. Mithraeum – Sarmizegetusa.

contexts, when a *Genius loci* is mentioned. As a consequence, an essential change occurs, M.P. Speidel reaching the conclusion that these collective *Genii* no longer represent a character, a personality, or even a '*Lebensgeist*' of a club as described by A. v. Domaszewski²⁸, but they become an objective divinity *per se* that protects the members of a particular group, though the subjective character of that group is not relevant²⁹. Consequently, unlike the case of standards or regardless of who the emperor was, the *Genii* were worshiped as real gods; the final outcome expected being their protection over the entire group³⁰.

Was the existence of worship places, small sanctuaries or altars possible in these buildings? What was the group members' behavior in relation to the *Genii*? They would just dedicate altars to them every now and then, and they would take advantage of the opportunity to celebrate, without necessarily dedicating a separate sanctuary to them. Most of the altars or statues of *Genii* or gods were undoubtedly placed in the *principia*, which can also be the location of some *collegia*³¹. When altars are dedicated to the *Genius* of a larger group – like the entire troop, as attested in the inscription *Genio sancto legionis et commanipulorum bonorum, Q(uintus) Caecilius Kalendinus, optio posuit* (ILS 2290)³², they are most probably placed in the *aedes principiorum*.

Or, some of the *Genii* must have been worshiped in special places of worship: like *scholae* or *praetoriae*, in the case of superior officers.

The fact that some gods are mentioned in some inscriptions discovered in fortresses does not automatically indicate the existence of a temple dedicated to them in that fortress. For instance, Mars is mentioned on an altar discovered at Novae, together with the *Genius armamentarii*³³. The association of some divinities that have a reduced protection range, like *Genii*, with Olympian gods among the *dii militaris* (Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, Mars or Hercules) having a larger protection range is normal, as we can see from several dedications in Africa (ILS 2400, 2399, 9102a), Germany (CIL XIII 6740a) or from Rome (CIL VI 31151)³⁴.

As we mentioned previously, buildings were excavated in several legionary fortresses, buildings with an obvious reunion role for some *collegia*, designated to be *scholae*. On the other hand, such buildings are lacking almost completely from auxiliary forts, as the existence was recorded of very few examples of buildings having an imprecise functionality designated as such.

As far as the area of Dacia is concerned, the existence of temples or worship places was presumed in three fortifications.

The existence of a sanctuary/temple was presumed inside the fort at Pojejena, as a consequence of the discovery of 14 fragments of Mithraic reliefs³⁵ in the tower in the north-east corner (Fig. 4.1). The 3.90 × 3.70 × 3.00 m tower has a trapezoidal shape³⁶. Its interior has been disarranged subsequently, the pieces being discovered in a

²⁸ Domaszewski 1985, p. 108.

²⁹ Speidel, Dimitrova-Milčeva 1978, p. 1550.

³⁰ An example of the resemblance with the gods is provided by the inscription at León dedicated by a tribune to: *Genio [(legionis)] VII G(eminae) f(elicis) Tib(erius) Cl(audius) Pompeianus, tr(ibunus) ex iu(ssu) G(enii) v(otum solvit)* (AE 1971, 208).

³¹ For these, see Petrikovits 1975, p. 78-79.

³² Cf. Speidel, Dimitrova-Milčeva 1978, p. 1550.

³³ The inscription, although discovered in a secondary position, probably comes from the *principia* area, where the *armamentaria* is usually located.

³⁴ Speidel, Dimitrova-Milčeva 1978, p. 1553.

³⁵ N. Gudea, O. Bozu, *A existat un sanctuar mithriac la Pojejena?*, Banatica 4, 1977, p. 128; iidem, *New Mithraic Monuments from Pojejena, Romania*, JMS 2, 1977, 1, p. 69-73, iidem, *Descoperiri mithriace la Pojejena*, SCIVA 29, 1978, 4, p. 563-569.

³⁶ idem, op. cit., p. 569.

secondary position. Some of the materials have traces of mortar on their inferior side, as a consequence of their having been embeded into a wall, under the reserve that the pieces could have been thrown here later on by Christians³⁷. All these reasons make the excavations' authors doubt that the respective premises could have been used as a temple, but they come up with an apparently convincing analogy referring to the existence at Brza Palanka (Moesia Superior) of a temple of Jupiter Dolichenus whose dimensions are 3.80 × 3.50 m (Fig. 4.2), inside which many monuments and inscriptions have been discovered³⁸. But, however similar they might be from the viewpoint of their surface, the difference in what the planimetry of the two structures is concerned is quite obvious, the one in Moesia having an elliptical shape. At any rate, even though the construction at Brza Palanka has a worship character, it is rightfully characterised as being a sanctuary, unlike the tower in Pojejena, considered by some authors to be even a temple³⁹. Naturally, the difference is essential, but still, the question stands, whether there really are places of worship in the fortress. D. Alicu, who confirms the existence here of a temple, argues, on the other hand, that this is something 'unusual and not yet encountered' and 'against all the rules...'⁴⁰ Another argument following the excavations, mentioned only in 2002, is the information according to which the inside of the tower 'has been deepened (as compared to the other corner towers)'⁴¹, which suggests that the building had been a *mithraeum*. We can make out from this information that the walking level or the floor inside the temple has not been identified; therefore it is difficult to compare this walking level to the one in the other corner towers.

On the basis of the pieces of evidence from Pojejena and taking into account the character of the discoveries, we cannot state that this temple functioned here, especially since the place, the shape and the pieces discovered (in the fill material of a chronologically subsequent hole) do not confirm that. We are wondering who the worshippers might have been in that place, since the supervision or the guard were performed in shifts, therefore the tower was not destined to a limited, and not even to a fix number of soldiers, who could have arranged a small sanctuary here. However, the discovery of several worship objects in a place does not necessarily indicate the existence of a temple. Also, it cannot be argued that this structure has the role of a *schola*. For all these reasons, we do not believe that a temple – in this case a *mithraeum* – could have "functioned" at Pojejena, as we do not know of any analogy in this respect.

The building known as C3, located about 4 m to the left from the headquarter building in Porolissum (Fig. 5.1), was also considered to be an underground temple, therefore a *mithraeum*⁴². It has dimensions of about 6.00 × 30 m and an outer width of 7.50 m. Because the structure has only been archeologically verified by two parallel sections, S84 (95.50 × 1.50 m) and S85 (97 × 1.50 m), across the building and 10 m, respectively 20 m away from the *via principalis*, the structure's length is only presupposed by analogy to the neighbouring *principia*⁴³. The walls built in *opus incertum* are 0.80 × 1.00 m thick, therefore we can say that the building is quite solid. We do not

³⁷ *idem*, op. cit., p. 569, 571.

³⁸ Gudea 2002, p. 620, 621; B. Vučković-Todorović, *Svetilište Iupiter Dolichenus u Brazoi Palanci*, *Starinar* 15-16 (1964-1965), p. 1966.

³⁹ D. Alicu, *Addenda la repertoriul templelor romane din Dacia*, *Apulum* 39, 2002, or Gudea 2002, p. 621 (here, with reference to the sanctuary at Brza Palanka). Using the term 'sanctuar' employed by N. Gudea, O. Bozu, *A existat un sanctuar mithriac la Pojejena?*, *Banatica* 4, 1977, p. 129 and N. Gudea, O. Bozu, *Descoperiri mithriace la Pojejena*, *SCIVA* 29, 1978, 4, p. 569.

⁴⁰ D. Alicu, *Templul lui Mithras de la Pojejena*, *Sargetia* 28-29, 2000, p. 220.

⁴¹ Gudea 2002.

⁴² Gudea et alii 1986, p. 122; N. Gudea, *Castrul roman de pe vârful dealului Pomet-Moigrad. Porolissum 1*, Zalău, 1997, p. 70.

⁴³ Gudea et alii 1986, p. 122.

know if the fact that the partitions were not discovered is only due to the excavation system by trial trenches, the excavations' authors confirming that the brick floor was continuous, uninterrupted⁴⁴.

The attribution was made as a consequence of the discovery inside the construction of two Mithraic reliefs and of several small plates on which the Danubian knights were depicted, being thus considered a *mithraeum*⁴⁵. Mariana Pintilie's statement, made on the basis of some information provided by I. Bajusz, refers to the existence of a central corridor paved with a mosaic⁴⁶. Or, later on, N. Gudea – the real author of the excavation – criticised Mariana Pintilie's pieces of evidence, arguing that there is no central corridor, and that the interior of the entire building had been paved with bricks. However, the main argument for classifying the building as a temple is, besides the above-mentioned reliefs, the difference of levels inside the construction, as compared to the interior of the neighbouring commander's building (4.00-5.00 m) and also the fact that the walls had been painted with vegetal motifs⁴⁷. The difference of levels is quite impressing, and extremely difficult to explain, even in the case of an underground temple. Moreover, on the inside, the wall starts to bend in 1.25-1.50 m from the floor, forming what seems to be the beginning of a vault, whose height must have been around 2.00-2.50 m⁴⁸.

A *mithraeum* connected to an auxiliary fort on which we have information is the one situated in the immediate vicinity of the fort at Carrawborough, where the *coh. I Batavorum*'s prefect dedicates three altars to Mithras⁴⁹. The temple was built at the beginning of the 3rd C. and was really an underground cavern in which there was enough room for 10-12 people.

In the case of the building at Porolissum, although no more than two excavation samplings have been taken, no division of the building in partitions has been identified⁵⁰. On the other hand, the floor is usually about 1 meter deeper, just like in the case of the temple at Frankfurt-Heddernheim (Fig. 6.3)⁵¹. Therefore, the building does not seem to be a temple dedicated to Mithras, but it is difficult to classify, having in mind the existence of the painting on the walls and the deepened brick floor.

⁴⁴ Gudea 2002, p. 620.

⁴⁵ Gudea et alii 1986, p. 122; N. Gudea, *Castrul roman de pe vârful dealului Pomet-Moigrad. Porolissum 1, Zalău, 1997*, p. 70; D. Alicu, *Addenda la repertoriul templelor romane din Dacia*, Apulum 39, 2002, p. 231, 233; N. Gudea, D. Tamba, *Porolissum. Ein dakisch-römischen archäologischen Komplex an der Grenze des Römischen Reiches* III. Über ein Iupiter-Dolichenus Heiligtum in der municipium Septimium Porolissensium, Zalău, 2001, Abb. 17, 18; N. Gudea, D. Tamba, *Heiligtümer und Militär in Porolissum, Limes XIX. Proceedings of the XIXth International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies, Pécs, Hungary, September 2003*, Pécs 2005, p. 472.

⁴⁶ M. Pintilie, *Mithraea în Dacia*, EN IX-X, 1999-2000, p. 238.

⁴⁷ Gudea 2002, p. 619.

⁴⁸ Gudea et alii 1986, p. 122.

⁴⁹ The small dimensions of the *mithraeum* near the fortress at Carrawburgh reflect the belonging of the worshipers to a very small group, therefore suggesting the rather limited character of the cult, see E. Birley, *The prefects and their altars*, *ArchAel* 29, 1951, *passim*; I. A. Richmond, J. P. Gillam, *The temple of Mithras at Carrawburgh*, *ArchAel* 29, 1951, p. 53-54.

⁵⁰ This was noted by D. Alicu as well (D. Alicu, *Addenda la repertoriul templelor romane din Dacia*, Apulum 39, 2002, p. 233). He argued that it would have been normal for the traces of lateral benches to appear, as well. For further details, see also Gudea 2002, p. 620 where it is reasserted that there is no central corridor, and that the brick pavement was continuous, the width of the interior being 5.00-5.50 m. The plan of other *mithraea* known in the Empire is made of a portico, a pronaos and a naos crossed by a central corridor, M. Clauss, *Mithras. Kult und Mysterien*, München 1990, p. 54-55, Abb. 7, 8, 10, 11. The naos is not divided in three naves, but there were benches on both sides of the corridor, like it can be noted in the reconstruction of the temple in Sofia or Aquincum (Fig. 6.1, 2). The proper altar was located at the other end of the entrance, usually in an apse.

⁵¹ See M. Clauss, *op. cit.*, Abb. 6.




Fig. 6.1.




Fig. 6.2.




Fig. 6.3.

Fig. 7.1.




Fig. 7.2.





Fig. 7.3.




Fig. 7.4.

Fig. 7.1. Principia – Chester; 7.2. Principia – Benwell; 7.3 Aedes – Potaissa;
7.4. Aedes – South Shields.




Fig. 8.1.



Fig. 8.2.



Fig. 8.3.

Fig. 8.1. – 8.3. Curia and aerarium – Sarmizegetusa.

On the basis of its characteristics, it is obvious that this structure fits among the exceptions encountered in forts – I personally don't know any other example of this kind⁵². Therefore, if we exclude the function as a temple of the structure to the left of the headquarter building, we are wondering what kind of function it might have had.

This building is one of the few that can be classified as a *horreum*, on the basis of the dimensions, shape and location, therefore its initial role as a granary cannot be excluded. Subsequently, the vaulted shape of the building's roof seems to indicate a basement or a cistern, like D. Alicu noted⁵³.

No buttresses can be identified, but having in mind the – only – 1.50 m wide sections⁵⁴, their existence in the upper part of these trenches is not impossible. On the other hand, taking into consideration the extremely deep construction, buttresses would not have been necessary to support the roof.

There is no doubt that the existence of the deepened floor where it should have normally been heightened, the existence of the painting and the discovery of artifacts like those identified here contradict the attribution of the storage function to this building.

Or, some of the characteristics of this building are similar to those of a room inside headquarter buildings or forums. Thus, the considerable depth of the building makes us recall instantly the only deepened and vaulted structure in legionary or auxiliary fortress: the *aerarium*. *Aeraria* are usually located under the *aedes principiorum*, the central room at the back side, the place where the troops' standards were stored. On the other hand, the location of these *aeraria* was not necessarily always under the *aedes*, as there are a couple of cases when they are placed under one of the rooms next to the *aedes*, like in the case of the legionary fortress at Noviomagus⁵⁵ or in the auxiliary fortress at Chesters (Fig. 7.1) or Benwell (Fig. 7.2) by Hadrian's wall⁵⁶. Likewise, the *aeraria* are presumed to be right under the *tribunalia* in the basilicas in Chesters or South Shields⁵⁷.

It is not very clear what exactly was stored in these 'safes', it is only certain that the soldiers' savings were kept here (Vegetius II.20)⁵⁸. In what legionary fortresses are concerned, the well-known case from Potaissa can be quoted, where a rectangular vaulted 10.50-11.80 × 5.30-5.40 m (60 m²) building was discovered under the *aedes* having 0.55-0.75 m thick walls and a floor about 1.95 m deeper than the walking level in the *aedes*, or about 1.00 m deeper than the one in the basilica, an interior height of about 2.30-2.50 m being thus created (Fig. 7.3)⁵⁹.

However, in auxiliary forts, the dimensions of these *aeraria* are much smaller, in some cases the storage place being nothing but a hole in the ground in which a wooden chest was deposited, as it is the case at Vindolanda⁶⁰. But usually there are even here

⁵² In Dacia, the only *mithraeum* fully researched is the one at Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa, whose dimensions were 44.23 × 12.44 m (fig. 5.2), A. Rusu-Pescaru, D. Alicu, *Templele romane din Dacia*, Deva 2000, p. 82. The plan of the temple is made of a pronaos, a naos (three naves) and a *cella*.

⁵³ D. Alicu, op. cit. But, even though the trenches' width is very small, the existence of a second cistern in the same fortress would have been pointed out by the authors of the excavations. Otherwise, the construction technique of the C3 building and of the B10 cistern must have been the same in the case of a similar functionality (see *infra*).

⁵⁴ Gudea et alii 1986, p. 122.

⁵⁵ Petrikovits 1975, p. 73.

⁵⁶ Johnson 1987, p. 136, fig. 89.

⁵⁷ See D. J. A. Taylor, *The Forts on Hadrian's Wall*, BAR B.S. 305, Oxford 2000, p. 28.

⁵⁸ H. v. Petrikovits is wondering to what extent the legions' savings were kept here, Petrikovits 1975, p. 73.

⁵⁹ M. Bărbulescu, *Din istoria militară a Daciei romane. Legiunea V Macedonica și castrul de la Potaissa*, Cluj-Napoca 1987, p. 159-160.

⁶⁰ Johnson 1987, p. 134, fig. 86.

proper rooms whose floor was 1.50-2.00 m deeper than the walking level in the *aedes*⁶¹. The average of these rooms' dimensions in the case of auxiliary fortresses is around 6.00 m²⁶². These rooms' dimensions are not directly related to the garrison troop, since in some of the *cohors*' fort, the dimensions are bigger than those of the fort occupied by the *ala*⁶³. The exception to these cases is 'the strongroom' at South Shields, that measures 16.72 m² (Fig. 7.4). The explanation of this *aerarium*'s existence resides in the character of the South Shields fortress, which contained a considerable amount of merchandise or valuables in transit⁶⁴.

Besides the troops' storage facilities, statues or altars could have been placed in the *aerarium*, like those dedicated to Jupiter at Murrhardt, to the *Genius* at Kapersburg or to the representations of Hercules at Königen⁶⁵.

The character of the fort at Porolissum, situated in one of the most important strategical places of Dacia, both from a military and economical viewpoint, as well as the big number of garrison troops suggest the existence here of bigger *aerarium*, just like in South Shields. Even so, the structure's length would be quite big as compared to the one at Potaissa, but the interval between the excavation trenches measures only 10 m; therefore it is possible for the building at Porolissum to have a similar surface to that from Potaissa.

The impediments – quite important, as a matter of fact – in what the attribution of the structure to an *aerarium* is concerned are as follows: the position of the building, explainable maybe because there might not have been enough space under the *aedes*, where no underground room was discovered. At Sarmizegetusa, where a bigger *aerarium* was necessary, this situation is solved by the means of an *aeraria* placed underneath the *curia* (Fig. 8), taking the shape of two deepened (3.70 m) vaulted compartments, each having dimensions similar to the 11.90 × 3.70 m *aerarium* at Potaissa⁶⁶.

Other impediments are the fact that Suetonius, Vegetius and Tacitus state that the money and the *signa* are in relation⁶⁷, but as we have seen, there are exceptions in which the rooms were not under the *aedes*; and also since they were not in the *aedes* area, they could not have been guarded by the same guardian that was necessary for the protection of the standards⁶⁸. Last but not least, the question is: if the structure was not in relation to a *sacellum*, why was it necessary to make it deeper? The only possible explanation is the fact that there was also a suprastructure that must have also had an official character. Maybe, just like in the old Roman republic, there was at Porolissum an *aerarium* divided in two parts: the common wealth where the regular taxes were deposited and the sacred wealth (*aerarium sanctum*)⁶⁹. Both treasures were located in Rome in the temple of Saturn, but in distinct parts of the construction. At Porolissum, taking into consideration the position of the fort along one of the most important

⁶¹ See the case of the fortress at Brough-by-Bainbridge, where the floor is placed 1.70 m deep, Johnson 1987, p. 137.

⁶² For a table containing the dimensions of several "strongrooms" see P. Bidwell, S. Speak, Excavations at South Shields Roman Fort I. Newcastle u.T. 1994, Tab. 3.2.

⁶³ Cf. P. Bidwell, S. Speak, op. cit, p. 81.

⁶⁴ This circulation of goods was connected to the campaigns of Septimius Severus, ibidem.

⁶⁵ Johnson 1987, p. 133. Not all of these were probably discovered *in situ*, it is possible for them to have fallen down from the *aedes* subsequently.

⁶⁶ R. Étienne, I. Piso, Al. Diaconescu, op. cit, p. 147-148.

⁶⁷ ...a quoquam ad signa deponi, Suetonius, Dom. 7; Vegetius 2.20 and ... cum fisci de imperatore rapti inter signa interque aquilas ueherentur, Tacitus, Ann. 1, p. 37.

⁶⁸ H. v. Petrikovis states that money was deposited here especially to be under permanent guard, Petrikovits 1975, p. 73.

⁶⁹ Tit. Liv. XXVII.10; Flor. IV.2; Caes., de Bello Civili, 1.14; Cic. Ad Atticum VII.21.

commercial roads, the construction near the *principia* could have had the role of a common treasury, also destined to fulfill the needs of the troop.

A final possibility would be for the deepened structure at Porolissum to have represented a *schola*. Thus, three of the rooms on the back side of the *principia* at Carnuntum were interpreted to be worship places⁷⁰. A statue of Hercules and an altar dedicated to the fortress' genius were discovered in one of the rooms. This partitioning, although endowed with a heating system, is deep into the ground, and the walls were painted similarly to the ones of the building at Porolissum⁷¹. As a consequence, this structure at Carnuntum was also interpreted as a *schola*⁷². A possible analogy for the existence of underground rooms (*cryptae*) in relation with a *schola* can be found within the monument of Ucuētis at Alesia, presumed to have been the location of a craftsmen's association. The construction is characterized by an interior courtyard surrounded by rooms. One of these divisions appears to be an underground room, but it is not very clear what its role could have been⁷³.

Or, it is possible for the building at Porolissum to have been a *schola*, the reunion place of a college in which the college's Genius would have been worshiped, and in which, like in several other cases, other divinities would have been worshiped as well.

Undoubtedly, only the archeological research of the entire building can prove which of the three variants is correct, but the lack of analogies having certain epigraphic attestations indicate the fact that this building was not a temple, but something else.

In the north-east corner of the big fort at Tibiscum (Fig. 9), a 28.80 × 6.80 m building oriented NE-SW and having a 196 m² surface was identified, characterized by the excavations' authors as a *schola*⁷⁴. The structure is 0.40 m away from the eastern precinct wall, therefore over the fort's *agger*, which is 5.50 m wide and partially over the *via sagularis* which has a considerable width: 5.75-7.00 m⁷⁵. It is very difficult to assess the chronology of this structure, which seems, judging from its position, from a later phase, as the excavation's authors also believed⁷⁶. The chronological data we have are not at all encouraging, the archaeological situation being quite ambiguous. The building really seems to have been built later, but it is not clear why the second precinct wall doubling the first, which was rudimentary, situated 0.40 m away from the main precinct wall, partially goes over the building's floor. This wall has been identified by M. Moga to be 5 m away from the eastern precinct wall, sustaining the existence of the wall only on the eastern side of the fortress, and only from the north-eastern corner to the *porta praetoria* of the big fortress⁷⁷. It should be briefly mentioned that D. Benea and P. Bona were arguing that M. Moga had uncovered the entire building down to its floor, so it could have probably been impossible to notice the second lining wall placed on the floor of the building at the moment the structure was being excavated the second time, after the 1980's. Moreover, M. Moga argues that this wall was discontinued opposite the east gate of the small ancient stone fort (fortr II), which we believe to be essential information. Although the excavation's authors insist that this gate had been blocked once the fort was extended⁷⁸, we believe the discontinuation of the second lining

⁷⁰ Domaszewski 1895, p. 49; H. Stiglitz, M. Kandler, W. Jobst, *Carnuntum*, ANRW II.6, 1977, p. 634.

⁷¹ Ibidem.

⁷² Petrikovits 1975, p. 176, Anm. 88.

⁷³ P. Gros, *L'architecture romaine*. 1. Les monuments publics, Paris, 1996, p. 382, fig. 436, 437.

⁷⁴ See the description of the building at Benea, Bona 1994, p. 50.

⁷⁵ For these measurings, see Benea, Bona 1994, p. 39.

⁷⁶ The precise dating of some artifacts discovered by M. Moga, whose description consists in the mere mention of the object type, seems a bit far-fetched, see Benea, Bona 1994, p. 50. For other pieces discovered here, see Piso, Benea 1999.

⁷⁷ Benea, Bona 1994, p. 39.

⁷⁸ Benea, Bona 1994, p. 39.




Fig. 9.1.

Fig. 9.2.

Fig. 9.1. Tibiscum; 9.2. The buildings in the North-Eastern corner – Tibiscum.

precinct wall to be significant, as we believe that this gate was still in use, at least for some time. This is undoubtedly justified by the big dimensions of fort IV, the distance from the north precinct to the *porta praetoria* being 150 m. Moreover, we do not believe the exact alignment of the buildings from the north-east corner along the ancient road going through the eastern gate of the small stone fort to be accidental. Besides, in older reports, archaeologists considered that this gate was still used in the times of the enlarged fortress 'as there were no traces attesting the gate being blocked'⁷⁹, therefore the subsequent change of opinion is bizarre.

The 2.60 m entrance into the building was on the short southern side, going through a small 3.20 m wide portico, and the inside floor was made of bricks fixed with mortar. The portico was made of two column bases, the ones to the extremes being located at the end of the building's longitudinal walls, stretching to the portico's exterior zone, making up a plan similar to an *in antis* temple. The foundations are pretty big (0,80 × 0,80 m), therefore it is not out of the question for them to have supported arches. Three entrances were thus created, a 2,60 m wide central one and other lateral entrances of about 1,80 m.

The structure seems to have been initially divided in two parts by a transversal wall built approximately in the middle of the building⁸⁰. Later on, the brick floor seems to overlap over the two walls; therefore the building becomes a basilica-type one, quite long and narrow. It is not certain whether it had the same role in all the phases in which the building was used. As long as the structure of the building was different, we would say that it did not. At any rate, keeping in mind the scarce information, it is hard to determine the function of this building. If the building had been used for the same purpose from the very beginning, it is possible for the respective walls to have been there to hold benches, thus creating a central corridor, similar to the plan of Mithraic temples or to some plans of *scholae*.

The building was dated – we do not know if its construction date was, too – mid 3rd C.; among the discovered archaeological material we can mention marble pieces decorated with vegetal motifs, 'votive plates' and bricks bearing the mark MID, some of them even on the bricks the building was paved with⁸¹, which suggests that some may have been reused⁸². As compared to other buildings to the west, this structure is a bit set back from the road to the north side, not aligned to the road going out through the east gate. The space between this road and the building is intermediary (3.40 × 2.60 m), almost completely paved with big standard stones. About 6.40 m south from the entrance portico, straight along the road from the building, but a little bit diverted to the east, a 2.40 × 2.00 m foundation made of limestone blocks was discovered, and was considered to be the basis of a statue⁸³.

The building's function is suggested by the building brick bearing an inscription identified in the portico (see *infra*) and by the inside finds.

Two marble hands and a horn of abundance were discovered inside the portico, and in the big room, several dedicated inscriptions: *[G]enio n(umeri) Pal(myrenorum) Tib(iscensium); Dis P[a]t(riis)* (IDR III/1, 136) (Fig. 10.1): the official character is quite obvious. Consequently, in the above-mentioned inscription dedicated to the Genius of

⁷⁹ Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 314.

⁸⁰ Actually, two parallel 1m-wide walls were discovered here, standing about 1.20 m from one another, Benea, Bona 1994, p. 50.

⁸¹ Benea, Bona 1994, p. 50-51.

⁸² Whatever the situation, the bricks must have been military, since other cases when other civil bricks were used in a military environment have not been discovered yet, see F. Marcu, *Military tile-stamps as a guide for the garrisons of certain forts in Dacia*, Orbis Antiquus. Studia in honorem Ioannis Pisonis, Cluj-Napoca 2004, *passim*.

⁸³ Cf. Benea, Bona 1994, p. 51.




Fig. 10.1.



Fig. 10.2.



Fig. 10.3.

Fig. 10. Tibiscum.

the troop and *Dii Patri*, the *pro salute Auggustorum nnostrorum* is also mentioned⁸⁴. The inscription was reconstructed by I. Piso and D. Benea as: *[G]enio n(umeri) Pal(myrenorum) Tib(iscensium) / [?et] hor(reorum) e[ti]a[m] dis p[ro]p[ri]is et pro / [sal]ute Augg(ustorum) [n]n(ostrorum) P(ublius) Ael(ius) [?Ser]uius uet(eranus) [ex] opt(ione) / [?cum suis] ex uoto [pos]uit⁸⁵*. Or, it is quite difficult to believe that the Genius was the Genius of a *horreum* at the same time, since a *Genius* had never been associated to more than one entity. In addition, there is not enough space left in the inscription to suspect that a second *Genius* could have been written at the beginning of the second line, before the *HOR*. We can also suspect that the name of another god – Palmyrene, as I. I. Russu assumed – appears here⁸⁶, but this is also something difficult to argue. On the other hand, the abbreviation and the space missing after the name of the *numerus* can suggest *[co]hor(tis)*; what is to be understood in this case is that the genius would have been common both to the *numerus* and to the second troop present in the fort at Tibiscum, probably *coh. I Vindelicorum*⁸⁷. Likewise, at Bremenium there is recorded an individual *Genius* of the *coh. I Vardullorum* and *numerus exploratorum Bremensium* (CIL VII 1030)⁸⁸. Some *scholae* at Corbridge were assumed to have been used by several troops⁸⁹.

Inscriptions that record Malagbel (IDR III/1, 142 + 149) were discovered in the same building (Fig. 10.2)⁹⁰.

We find out, from one of the bricks the portico at the entrance into the building was paved with, that *port[i]cum d / eum stra(uit) by Mar(?ius) Aurel(?ianus) / princeps n(umeri)* (Fig. 10.3)⁹¹. But this document also fails to solve once and for all the problem of the building's functionality, although the term *porticum deum* may suggest another function than that of a temple. However, it is finally decided that this structure probably had the role of a *schola*, the existence of temples in fort being considered quite improbable⁹². Still, if we were to compare the plans of the building with those of other buildings presumed to fulfill the role of *schola*, we would be inclined to believe that the structure in the immediate vicinity of the basilica-type building has this role (see *infra*). This idea is reinforced by the existence of a heating system in that place, a *schola* being theoretically meant to host reunions of a smaller group of people. It is quite difficult to establish the shape of the *scholae*, as the existence of many different plans is possible. At any rate, the most suitable plan seems to be the basilica-type one, with only one room

⁸⁴ The discovery of the pieces inside this building has been confirmed by I. Piso, who had at his disposal the excavation journals of M. Moga. A jug with fragments of molten lead inside was also discovered, together with decorated votive plates and fragments of marble paving.

⁸⁵ Piso, Benea 1999, p. 104, n. 61.

⁸⁶ IDR III/1, 136, 158.

⁸⁷ Information I. Piso.

⁸⁸ *G(enio) d(omini) n(ostri) et signorum coh(ortis) I Vardull(or)um et n(umeri) explorator(um) Brem(ensium) Gor(dianorum) Egnatius Lucillianus leg(atus) Aug(usti) curante Cassio Sabino trib(un)o*.

⁸⁹ Cf. I. A. Richmond, *Roman legionaries at Corbridge, their supply-base, temples and religious cults*, ArchAel 21, 1943, p. 136.

⁹⁰ See also I. Piso, *Epigraphica (XIV). Inscriptii din Apulum*, AMN 20, 1983, p. 107-109, nr. 6. The inscriptions IDR III/3, 143, 148 were probably also discovered in the building in the north-east corner, see explanations in Piso, Benea 1999, p. 105, n. 61.

⁹¹ It is rightfully presumed that the *numerus* mentioned is the Palmyrene one, since other inscriptions connected to the *numerus Palmyrenorum Tibiscensium* were discovered here, in this building, cf. Piso, Benea 1999, p. 105-106.

⁹² Benea, Bona 1994, p. 50-51; Piso, Benea 1999, p. 106. *Contra*, S. Sanie, *Die syrischen und palmyrenischen Kulte im römischen Dakien*, ANRW II 18, 2, Berlin – New York, 1989, p. 1234. But the temple of the Palmyrene gods at Sarmizegetusa (Idem, op. cit., fig. IX) has a pronaos, a naos and three, or even four *cella*, whereas the building at Tibiscum only has a naos with a portico in front.

whose dimensions varied, which ended in an apse at one of its short ends⁹³. Therefore, the rectangular building with a portico in the vicinity of the east side of the precinct can be an *aedes* of the Genius of the Palmyrene troop stationed at Tibiscum.

The fact that the building was tall is proved by the partial thickening of the wall on the short side to the north – evidence of the considerable pressure of the roof that was only supported by the exterior walls. Undoubtedly, it would have been more natural to strengthen the longitudinal walls, the pressure being stronger in those areas. Maybe the wall that can be noticed in the plan, parallel and at a short distance from the eastern longitudinal wall of the building was used precisely for that. But the fact that this wall does not touch the walls in the short ends makes us believe that the role of this rudimentary wall was to support a bench on which the guests could lie down, thus confirming the fact that this building had a clear reunion purpose.

In the immediate vicinity of the basilica-type building, 2 m to the west, M. Moga uncovered another 18.40×10.70 (196.88 m^2) construction⁹⁴. This construction also has a small – 50×3.20 m – portico on its short side, this time with columns probably placed on a *stylobat*⁹⁵. It is interesting that a 2.60 m wide 'brick paving' was identified in front of the portico⁹⁶. Therefore, we believe that it is possible for these bricks to actually come from steps leading to the portico. Initially, the building had been made of this portico and a 10.90×7.50 m room.

The chronological relationship between this structure and the one standing near, to the east, seems quite obvious; therefore, the buildings must have been contemporaneous at least at some point. Thus, the big stone slabs forming the pavement in front of the basilica-type building are stuck to the east wall of the apsed building. It is therefore obvious that the basilica-type structure together with the paved space were built afterwards, maybe immediately after the erection of the apsed building. If the buildings' chronology were inverse, it would be impossible for the above-mentioned slabs to stay adjacent to the east wall of the structure.

⁹³ On the other hand, *scholae* having very complex plans are known to have existed in a civilian environment. This is the case at Mactar (Fig. 3.1) where the '*schola iuvenum*' is made of a peristyle courtyard bordered on two of the sides with various rooms, among which one with a worship role and some sanitary installations. The reunion hall situated on the west wing has a basilical plan, divided into three naves and with an apse on the short side, opposite the entrance (P. Gros, op. cit., p. 384, fig. 438). In theory, this apsed structure looks like a proper *schola*.

⁹⁴ Archaeologists have dated the building to the beginning of the 3rd C A.D., on the basis of the new research, of the material discovered and of the construction technique, Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 319. Regarding the dimensions, it is odd that in the plan drafted by the authors (Benea, Bona 1994, fig. 23), the basilica-type building and the apsed building are similar in width, although the former is 6.80 m wide, and the latter almost 11 m.

⁹⁵ It is rather curious that the authors of the excavations consider the space 'added' to the south end of the building as being a new division, although they specify that the walls are less than 0.65 m thick and have no foundation, all that is left being two rows of stones, Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 318; Benea, Bona 1994, p. 52. The alignment of the portico along the road going out of the old east gate of the small fortress is obvious, as we argued, therefore we do not believe that this small division/compartment was added subsequently, but was a part of the initial construction plan. Or, it is obvious that the entrance should have been through this part of the building, the long sides being almost completely blocked by the buildings in its immediate vicinity, and the other short side had an apse, at least at some point.

⁹⁶ The authors of the excavation believe that a corridor could have existed here, Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 319. Even though what we consider to be the entrance or the portico would really be a room, as the authors of the excavations mean, it is hard to believe that a corridor's dimensions would be something between those of the building's width and those of a possible entrance.

The construction has an apse leaning against it on the north-east side⁹⁷, which seems to have been added later, because the ends of the apse walls start neither from the north corners of the building nor from the end of the walls that are forming the corner with the longitudinal sides of the same structure⁹⁸. But what could be the reason for which the north wall was not demolished the moment the apse was attached? Probably the heating system was also installed at that moment, and a fragment of the wall was left right there in order for the elevated floor to find support on it. Or, the interior of the apse was elevated and the respective wall really is a basis for the stairs.

Although the building's dimensions and those of the non-partitioned space seem quite big, the entire surface could have been heated by the means of a heating system with a channel⁹⁹. It is odd, however, that this channel does not cross the room longitudinally or crosswise, as it is located only in its north-east corner. The narrow lining wall standing along the longitudinal east wall of the building is also interesting, because normally it should have been connected to the heating system, although we can see from the plan that this wall blocks the main heating channel at some point. Probably this wall was also the base for a bench that should have been located along both longitudinal sides of the building. Although the existence of a heating system is not ruled out, this channel having a pretty bizarre direction could have had the same purpose as the channels identified in an almost identical building at Corbridge, where they are characterized as 'sacrificial soak-drain', and consequently were used in religious rituals¹⁰⁰.

70 arrowheads with three and four edges were discovered inside the last of the channels mentioned. Besides the arrowheads found in the area of this building, a 'short sword' with a bone handle and a fragmentary bronze scabbard were identified¹⁰¹. Therefore, it was considered that this construction had the role of a weapon storage facility¹⁰², which is obviously hard to believe since there was a heating system in place¹⁰³.

All the construction details of this structure make us believe, like we have already mentioned, that this construction was a *schola*, in certain relation with the neighbouring basilica-type building. An almost perfect analogy can be found in the case of one of the *scholae collegii* at Corbridge, where the mentioned building with a channel has the plan and dimensions almost identical with those of the apsed building at Tibiscum¹⁰⁴.

It is not impossible that in Tibiscum we should be dealing with the more complex premises of a college or colleges made of the members of a Palmyrene troop, which

⁹⁷ The apse is considered to be another room (Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 318), although probably there was no other partitioning. Without this apse, the building is only 13.40 m long, see Benea, Bona 1994, p. 51-52.

⁹⁸ These two very short walls seem to have formed a single wall at some point, as the initial north limit of the building.

⁹⁹ Fragments of *suspensura* bricks were discovered also in the channel of the hypocaust and in the apse area, Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 318; Benea, Bona 1994, p. 51-52, n. 72.

¹⁰⁰ I. A. Richmond, op. cit., p. 133, fig. 3, 1.

¹⁰¹ Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 319; P. Bona, R. Petrovsky, M. Petrovsky, *Tibiscum – cercetări arheologice (III)*, 1976-1979, AMN 20, 1983, p. 413, nr. 21.

¹⁰² Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 319. Subsequently, a confusion was made when it was stated that the authors of the excavations considered that this building had the role of a 'guards' headquarters' (Benea, Bona 1994, p. 52), but they were referring to the building to the west from the apsed structure, see Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 318-319.

¹⁰³ The authors of the excavations argue, without arguments, that the hypocaust system was abolished at some point, Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982, p. 319.

¹⁰⁴ The dimensions of the structure in the British fortress are about 11, 50 × 6,00 m. The difference is that the apse in the fortress at Tibiscum has a wider opening, but the construction has even a small portico on the short side, see I. A. Richmond, op. cit., (n. 89), p. 133, fig. 3, 1.

should have had several reunion places for the members of some colleges. The last structure could have had a place reserved for a *triclinium*. Just like a *templum*, a *schola* could also be a complex of structures, made of porticos, *aedes*, courtyard, etc., like in the case of the complex belonging to the Augustals at Misenum, or in that of the fabric at Ostia¹⁰⁵. For instance, at Misenum, there was a smaller apsed room which had the role of a *triclinium* right next to the sacred chapel where the Genius of the Augustals was worshiped¹⁰⁶. At Tibiscum, the space between the three buildings in the fortress' north-east corner area could very well have had the role of a courtyard or of a garden. Thus, the entire complex of buildings in the north-east corner at Tibiscum represented, just like Corbridge for instance, a group of *scholae* of some *collegia* of Palmyrenes, in the first case.

It is not impossible for the above-mentioned buildings at Tibiscum to be characteristic to the 3rd C. A.D., as M. Popescu connected them to Septimius Severus' reforms to the benefit of worship inside other buildings, especially *principia*, and not temples. This is also of soldiers, which could have played an important role in the cultural turnaround and for the identity of the community of Orientals at Tibiscum¹⁰⁷.

Consequently, the epigraphic and archaeological proofs gathered so far entice us to believe that the existence of some *scholae* that had a place of worship attached but without forming a temple, is a reality. This is demonstrated by the finds coming from fortresses in general and confirmed by the excavations in some of Dacia's fortresses. Apart from these sacred places usually dedicated to some *Genii* of *collegia* owners of a *schola* and where altars were dedicated to other divinities as well, the place of worship inside a fortress *par excellence* is the *aedes principiorum*. Consequently, we have no certain proof attesting, at least in the Principate period, temples dedicated to a divinity inside fortresses.

The official character of these *scholae* is also demonstrated by the fact that emperors could have been worshiped here, together with other gods, according to an inscription at Lambaesis (CIL VIII 2554). This is the case of several inscriptions¹⁰⁸ where the name of emperors is written in the Dative case, which proves that they were also the gods of those *scholae*, together with the *dii conservatores*¹⁰⁹.

The many inscriptions that mention gods in fortresses (should they not be reused) may indicate, at best, small places indicated by the inscription discovered at Porolissum-Pomet, in the *via decumana* area, which mentions Volcanus¹¹⁰. It was related to a *fabrica*, and this role was attributed to the neighboring C9 building, without many arguments¹¹¹, but it is really possible for the inscription to have been in a *fabrica*.

In fortresses, the distribution of epigraphic pieces, altars, reliefs, gems, pottery, bricks, votive plates, oil lamps, statues or other objects recording gods or on which gods are represented are scattered randomly in every building in the fortresses. M. Popescu has recently drafted a diagram indicating the places where the worship material was

¹⁰⁵ Diaconescu 2005, p. 333; 344-345, fig. 180.

¹⁰⁶ The situation is quite clear, since a *triclinium* is mentioned in the very inscription in the pavement made of black *tesserae*: Q. Baebius Natalis August. / Immun. Triclin. Constantiae / sua peq. strauit et dedicavit, A. De Franciscis, Il sacello degli Augustali a Miseno, Napoli, 1991, p. 45, fig. 65-66 (*apud* Diaconescu 2005, p. 333).

¹⁰⁷ Popescu 2004, p. 207.

¹⁰⁸ Domaszewski 1895, p. 89, nr. 177, 178, 181, 184, 185.

¹⁰⁹ CIL VIII 2554 – Pro salute Aug(ustorum) optiones scholam suam cum statu et imaginibus domus [di]vinae, item diis conservatoribus eorum...

¹¹⁰ N. Gudea, E. Chirilă, Al. V. Matei, I. Bajusz, D. Tamba, Raport privind cercetările de la Porolissum, 1988-1991, AMP 18, 1992, p. 145, fig. 12.

¹¹¹ See Popescu 2004, p. 229. Other buildings in the *latera praetorii* could also have fulfilled the role of a *fabrica*.

discovered in Dacia's fort (Fig. 11)¹¹². A relative accumulation can be noticed in the distribution of altars, without them being necessarily attributed to only one god, in the *latera praetorii* area and especially in the *principia* and *praetorium*¹¹³. Consequently, the erection of altars can have firstly a public and secondly a private character, connected to the commandant's family¹¹⁴. It is obvious that officers of equestrian rank behaved just like any other high-rank official, as it can be noted in the case of the financial procurator at Sarmizegetusa, where there was an *area sacra* in the *praetorium* area, in which governors of equestrian rank dedicated votive statues and altars to an impressive diversity of gods¹¹⁵. This can be illustrated also by the words of Tacitus: *...conuiuium bucina dimitti et structam ante augurale aram subdita face accendi, cuncta in maius attollens admiratione prisca moris adfecit* (Tacitus, *Ann.* 15, 30). Or, the existence of votive statues and altars in private environment was an obvious reality¹¹⁶.

The small places of worship referred to are located inside buildings that have a precise or recorded functionality, the divinities worshiped there being the protective divinities, with attributes closely connected to the activities practiced in the respective structures. For instance, this is the case of Ceres, not accidentally connected to the *horrea*, the most well-known case in Dacia being that of two statues and that of the base of statues discovered in the granary to the left from the *principia* at Cășei¹¹⁷. The same could be noted in the case of *Aesculapius* and *Hygia* in legionary fortresses in the entire empire: Carnuntum, Vindobona¹¹⁸ or Novae¹¹⁹, whose altars have been discovered exclusively in hospitals. Moreover, the *Campestres* – celtic divinities clearly connected to cavalry troops whose statues or altars are in the training fields' area of these units¹²⁰. Images of gods can also be found in *thermae* or in the vicinity of fountains¹²¹.

On the other hand, reliefs or the representations of deities on smaller items are especially connected to the soldier's private life, discovered inside of in the vicinity of barracks. They are not indicators or proper places of worship, just like in the case of the representations of Venus having the most numerous finds (11 pieces in the forts in Dacia), most of them in soldiers' barracks (5 pieces).

Consequently, it can be stated that there are sacred places in fort, but they are located inside buildings that have an initial or primary functionality, other than that of sanctuary or temple¹²², many altars being erected on the occasion of religious ceremonies in buildings that undoubtedly have other functionality than that of a temple.

¹¹² Popescu 2004, pl. II-VI.

¹¹³ Popescu 2004, pl. V.

¹¹⁴ For the relationship between the troop's commander and the gods, see *Hyginus* 11, 12; Domaszewski 1895, p. 8-9, where the temporary camp is mentioned, where the commandant's tent was in the middle of the camp, therefore fulfilling the role of *principia*.

¹¹⁵ About the rights of the governors, legati, tribunes or even centurions to dedicate altars, see Domaszewski 1895, p. 111; I. Piso, *Epigraphica* (XIV). *Inscriptii din Apulum*, AMN 20, 1983 and I. Piso, *Inscripții von Prokuratoren aus Sarmizegetusa (II)*, ZPE 120, 1998. The only person in the auxiliary troops that had the right to dedicate altars was the troop's commander, cf. Domaszewski 1895, p. 112. This happened with the exception of some officers, members of a college.

¹¹⁶ See I. Piso, *Epigraphica* (XI), Potaissa 2, 1980, p. 125-127. It is important that these altars 'are not gifts made as a consequence of an oath, because they do not end in the *ex voto* formula, or *votum solvit libens merito* so they had an ornamental role and that of a self introduction, in a way', cf. Diaconescu 2005, p. 347.

¹¹⁷ D. Isac, *Castrul roman de la SAMVUM – Cășeiu. The Roman auxiliary fort SAMVM – Cășeiu, Cluj-Napoca*, 2003, p. 172-173, pl. VII, 3-4.

¹¹⁸ Petrikovits 1975, p. 78, n. 88.

¹¹⁹ P. Dyczek, *The valetudinarium at Novae – new components*, Limes 16 Rolduc 1995 (1997), p. 203.

¹²⁰ Domaszewski 1895, p. 50-51.

¹²¹ Petrikovits 1975, p. 78.

¹²² D. Isac also presumed the same thing in the case of the headquarter building and of one of the granaries at Cășei, D. Isac, op. cit., p. 147, 173.




Fig. 11. The discovery places of the religious artifacts (based on Popescu 2004, Pl. II-IV).

The inexistence of temples inside fortifications is also proven by inscriptions mentioning *ad legionem* temples or by the above-mentioned inscriptions dedicated by the troop's prefect in the temple near the fortress at Carrawborough. The same thing is indicated by the already-mentioned inscription at Ilişua (CIL III 7626), whose place of discovery indicates the area of the *thermae* outside the fortress, under which C. Torma had identified an apsed building. Even theoretically, the existence of temples inside cities or fortifications was prevented, since they did not benefit from an *inauguratio*, as there was not a dedicated place, built and oriented, – the *templum* being understood as a defined place, separated by the Augurs from the rest of the field through a certain solemn formula, conceived as a *un liberatus et effatus*¹²³. Varro clearly points out that *locus effatus* was always outside the city (Varro, *De Ling. Lat.*, VI.7), so outside the *pomoerium*, since the interior of a city or fortification were, by their very nature, similar to a *templum*, a place in which the auspices could be taken.

Otherwise, the *aedes principiorum* did not benefit from an *inauguratio* either, as it was only consecrated, thus becoming *sacrum*, *sacrarium* or *sacellum* or *aedes sacrae*, without being a temple in itself.

The inscriptions mentioning the existence of temples in relation to some legions also prove the existence of temples in the vicinity of the fortress, and not inside the fortress. Two inscriptions at Apulum mention priests or sacred places in connection to *leg. XIII Gemina*. The inscription (IDR III/5 221) where *Flavius Bar/hadadi s(acerdos) I(ouis) D(olicheni) ad leg(ionem)* is recorded is significant, the phrase *ad legionem* being similar to *ad canabas legionis*, meaning in the vicinity of the legionary fortress¹²⁴. Similarly, Aurelius Ingenuus *nat(us) provinc(ia) Dacia leg(ione) XIII Gem(ina)* (CIL VI 2425 = ILS 2042) had not necessarily been a member of the above-mentioned legion¹²⁵, but is only mentioned to have been born in the *canabae* of the legion in Apulum¹²⁶. The *sacerdotes dei et coh(ortis) s(upra) s(criptae) [t]emp[li] (um) cum / tabernis (a)ere suo feceru[nt]* are more clearly mentioned, on the ones in question are obviously the temple dedicated to Jupiter Dolichenus, situated in the immediate vicinity of the fortress at Porolissum-Pomet¹²⁷. It is also here that *numerus Palmyrenorum* dedicates the *tem / plum ui ignis consumptum* to Bel, also near the fortress at Porolissum and not inside.

One of the most important criteria in this discussion must be the issue of the right to erect altars. On the basis of epigraphic pieces of evidence, A. v. Domaszewski denies the 'peregrine troops' right to benefit from a collection of religious instruments or worship building, stating that the only one who had this right was the commander of the troop¹²⁸. If the soldiers did not have this right, who would

¹²³ P. Catalano, *Aspetti spaziali del sistema giuridico-religioso romano*, ANRW II.16.1, 1978, p. 473-478.

¹²⁴ See J. Jung, *Inscript aus Apulum*, JÖAI 12, Bbl. 139, n. 1. This is also confirmed by the name of the person making the dedication, who proved to be a traveller, so it is theoretically impossible for him to have been a soldier in a legion, cf. IDR III/5, 172. Also L. Iulius Leuganus *custos* of a sanctuary, probably of the Roman citizens in the *canabae* (*qui consistunt ad legionem*), cf. IDR III/5, 286.

¹²⁵ C.C. Petolescu, *Varia Daco-Romana* (XII), TD 8, 1-2, 1987, p. 200-202.

¹²⁶ Cf. I. Piso, *Prosopographia Coloniae Daciae Sarmizegetusae*, AMN 24-25, 1992 with bibliography.

¹²⁷ The result of this is not that the *sacerdos dei* was part of the troop, the mention of the unit proving the affinity of the troop for a certain god, see I. Piso, *Studia Porolissensia* (I). *Le temple Dolichénien*, AMN 38/1, 2001, p. 228-229. However, there is no doubt that the troop could also include priests, since a *sacerdos* mentioned in the papyri *PDur* 89 was part of the *coh. XX Palmyrenorum*, see R. O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus*, London, 1971, p. 193. For the plan and the details regarding archaeological excavations in the temple at Porolissum, see N. Gudea, D. Tamba, op. cit., (n. 45) p. 233, pl. 5, 7, 9.

¹²⁸ Cf. Domaszewski 1895, p. 112.

1. ILS 2090: *D(is) M(anibus) / T(ito) Ael(io) Malco tectori eq(uitum) praetorian(orum) / coh(ortis) III pr(aetoriae) qui et urb(anae) item antistes (!) / sacerdoti temp(li) Martis castror(um) / pr(aetorium) / fecit ben(e) merenti coniugi dul(cissimo) suo / Roscia Sucessa (!) cum quo vixit ann(os) XL / decessit annor(um) LXVI.*

2. CIL VI 428: *Pro salute et reditu d(omini) n(ostr)i imp(eratoris) Caesaris C(aio) / Iulio Vero Maximino pio felici invicto Aug(usto) Domitius Bassus (centurio) / fr(umentarius) agens vice principis peregrinorum templum Iovis Reducis / c(astrorum) p(eregrinorum) omni cultu de suo exomavit.*




Fig. 12. Carnuntum.

be interested in such a big temple dedicated to Mithras inside a fortress like that in Porolissum¹²⁹?

Only some of the officers, like in Carrawburgh? That would be hard to believe!

Even the worship of the Genius had a limited character, since military law only allowed the officers (*principales*) to benefit from the right to found *collegia*, probably starting with Hadrian's reign, most of them being known since the times of Septimius Severus¹³⁰. Surely common soldiers were forbidden to dedicate altars and form *collegia*¹³¹, but it is obvious that the officers or subofficers had the right to dedicate inscriptions to divinities, *Genii* for instance. If *optio*, for example, dedicates an altar to the *Genio legionis et centuriae* or the *Genius* of an auxiliary troop¹³², then he probably acts as the representative of all the soldiers.

We have few obvious attestations of temples connected to the interior of some fortifications in Rome. Regarding the fortress of Praetorian cohorts, we learn that '*...item antistes sacerdos templi Martis castrorum pr(aetorium)*' (CIL VI 2256), and in the case of '*castra peregrina ...Domitius Bassus (centurio) fr(umentarius) agens vice principis peregrinorum templum Iovis reducis c(astrorum) p(eregrinorum) omni cultu de suo exornavit*' (CIL VI 428)¹³³. As protective gods of the respective fortresses, it is most likely for the temples dedicated to them to be located in the *principia* as well, the official character of these cults being expressed quite obviously through their names, usually using the formula *Aug(ustorum)*¹³⁴ and being associated to the *Genio imp(eratoris)* or the *Genius* of the troop, like in the case of Hercules¹³⁵. But even in this case it is difficult to explain the existence of temples inside fortresses, if, as we were noting, no building here benefited from an *inauguratio*, but the entire fortification. Consequently, either the respective temples were in the proximity of the fortresses mentioned, or there were exceptions in the case of Rome, just as the temple of Mars Ultor was placed along the line of the forum of Augustus in Rome, although the cities were in an obviously different situation. That *sacerdos templi* does not indicate, as it is the case elsewhere, that the character was part of the military unit garrison of the fortress here, but only that he held this function outside the fortress, where the temple was. The inscriptions that mention temples here do not indicate that they would be inside the fortification, their existence being more probable in the proximity of the fortification. Another illustrative example is the location of the temples in the legionary fortress at Corbridge, where the precinct of the fortification itself was modified in order to provide the necessary space for the placement of the temples in the immediate vicinity of the fortress, with an opening to one of the main roads, fortification that becomes sinuous in this area.¹³⁶ Here, the entire area was reconstructed at some point in the 3rd C. A.D., and the organization of the buildings

¹²⁹ In the *mithraeum* discovered near the fortress at Carrawborough, there was enough space for 10-12 people, and altars were only dedicated by prefects, I. A. Richmond, J. P. Gillam, op. cit. (n. 49), *passim*; E. Birley, op. cit. (n. 49), p. 45-49.

¹³⁰ See B. Campbell, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 136 sqq.

¹³¹ Emperors ordered the governors of the provinces not to allow the existence of corporations' clubs, not to permit soldiers to form clubs inside the fortifications, cf. *Dig.* 47.22.1 (Marcianus III – in the times of Caracalla).

¹³² See Domaszewski 1895, p. 111.

¹³³ Domaszewski 1895, p. 47, nr. 87, 88,

¹³⁴ Like for example *Herculi Aug(ustorum)* at Aquincum (sec. III), Domaszewski 1895, p. 113.

¹³⁵ Domaszewski 1895, p. 47, nr. 89, 91. A similar situation is noted also in the case of the *Campestres*, Celtic divinities connected to cavalry troops associated for instance to the *Genio alae H[is]panorum Asturum* (CIL VII 510), see Domaszewski 1895, nr. 94.

¹³⁶ The areas with temples identified at Corbridge were named, due to their particular character, sacred enclaves in close connection to the military installations in the fortress, cf. I. A. Richmond, op. cit. (n. 89), 1943, p. 136-146.

inside the fortress, including those in its immediate vicinity, was modified¹³⁷. As a consequence, it could be argued that nothing could have stopped the legionaries from building the respective temples inside the precinct. On the contrary, that would have made easier the rather strange diversion of the fortress precinct, so as to make room for the sacred areas, as it was obvious from the very beginning that they must have been placed in the immediate vicinity of the fortification.

Other pieces of evidence that have been connected directly to the existence of temples are the finds in three rooms in the area of the second courtyard, actually a basilica, of the building headquarter at Carnuntum (Fig. 12)¹³⁸. A statue of Hercules and an altar dedicated to the genius of the fortress were discovered in one of the rooms (C). The so-called 'temples'¹³⁹ at Carnuntum were rightfully interpreted by H. v. Petrikovits as being *scholae* or reunion places¹⁴⁰, and have never been referred to as *templum*.

Or, all the above-mentioned examples are dated towards the end of the 3rd C. A.D., and the location of only a few of them is known (e.g. Carnuntum), this being, once again, inside the headquarter building. Therefore, after the Principate age, there is evidence of the existence of sacred places where altars were dedicated, but which could not be proper *aedes*, similar to an *aedes principiorum*.

Bibliographic abbreviations

ArchAel	= Archaeologia Aeliana 4 th Series, Newcastle u. Tyne.
Benea, Bona 1994	= D. Benea, P. Bona, Tibiscum, Bucureşti 1994.
BICS	= Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. School of Advanced Study. University of London.
Bona, Petrovsky, Petrovsky 1982	= P. Bona, R. Petrovsky, M. Petrovsky, <i>Tibiscum. Cercetări arheologice (I) 1976-1979</i> , AMN 19, 1982, p. 311-330.
Diaconescu 2005	= Al. Diaconescu, <i>Statuaria majoră în Dacia</i> , Cluj-Napoca 2005.
Domaszewski 1895	= A. von Domaszewski, <i>Die Religion des römischen Heeres</i> , Trier 1895.
Gudea 2002	= N. Gudea, <i>Îndreptări arheologice. 1. Note la "Mithraea în Dacia"</i> , Apulum 39 2002, p. 618-621.
Gudea et alii 1986	= N. Gudea, E. Chirilă, Al. V. Matei, I. Bajusz, D. Tamba, <i>Raport preliminar privind săpăturile arheologice și lucrările de conservare și restaurare executate la Porolissum în anii 1983-1985</i> , AMP 10, 1986, p. 119-155.
Johnson 1987	= A. Johnson, <i>Römische Kastelle des 1. und 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. in Britannien und in den germanischen Provinzen des Römerreiches</i> , Mainz a. Rhein 1987.
Limes 16 Rolduc 1995 (1997)	= Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies, Rolduc 1995 (Oxford 1997).

¹³⁷ Idem, op. cit., p. 146. The legal position of temples is defined as follows: *Sacra loca ea sunt, quae publice sunt dedicata, sive in civitatem sint sive in agro. Sciendum est locum publicum tunc sacrum fieri posse, cum princeps eum dedicavit vel dedicandi dedit potestatem* (Dig. 1, 8, 9.).

¹³⁸ See R. Fellmann, *Die Principia des Legionslagers Vindonissa und das Zentralgebäude der römischen Lager und Kastelle*, Brugg 1958, p. 132-133, Ab. 55; H. Stiglitz, M. Kandler, W. Jobst, *Carnuntum*, loc. cit. (n. 70)

¹³⁹ Domaszewski 1895, p. 49.

¹⁴⁰ Petrikovits 1975, n. 88.

- Petrikovits 1975 = H. von Petrikovits, Die Innenbauten römischer Legionslager während der Prinzipatszeit, Düsseldorf-Opladen 1975.
- Piso, Benea 1999 = I. Piso, D. Benea, *Epigraphica Tibiscensia*, AMN, 36, I, 1999, p. 91-108.
- Popescu 2004 = M. Popescu, La religion dans l'armée romaine de Dacie, Bucarest 2004.
- Speidel, Dimitrova-Milčeva 1978 = M.P. Speidel, Al. Dimitrova-Milčeva, *The Cult of the Genii in the Roman Army and a New Military Deity*, ANRW II, 16.2, 1978, p. 1542-1555.