THE TOPOGRAPHY OF

**COLONIA ULPIA TRAIANA AUGUSTA DACICA SARMIZEGETUSA**

AND THE FIRST CENTURIATION IN DACIA

**FIRST MAPS OF SARMIZEGETUSA**

The colony at Sarmizegetusa (jud. Hunedoara/RO) was founded as *colonia deducta*, immediately after the Dacian wars. The location of the city in Hațeg area was not accidental, as it stood at the crossroads of two important Roman roads, one starting from Drobeta (modern Drobeta Turnu-Severin [jud. Mehedinți/RO]) and going up Jiu valley, and the other, from Dierna (modern Orșova [jud. Mehedinți/RO]) through the Timiș-Cerna valley, towards Tibiscum (modern Jupa [jud. Caraș-Severin/RO]), at c. 8 km from the Iron Gates of Transylvania (probably ancient *Tapae*) and c. 30 km from the Dacian capital in the south-western part of modern Transylvania (fig.1). Sarmizegetusa was first identified as an ancient city by Joannes Mezerzius, in the early 16th century, when a couple of inscription catalogues, which included Sarmizegetusa, were produced. However, a map of the medieval settlement, at that time called Britonia (fig. 2), is published in 1367 and later on, including the Roman city wall, in the 17th century when the village would be named Grădiștea (fig. 3). The first Roman city plan basing only on land observations, with a graphic scale and a few buildings correctly located, is drawn by Luigi F. Marsigli (fig. 4). Another plan is subsequently published by Sylvester J. Hohenhausen (fig. 5). Excavations started sporadically in 1832, being systematically continued in 1881, when the Society of History and Archaeology of the Hunedoara County was founded. Topographical plans were implemented, however not published in the 1970s, with scale of 1:2000, details and contours of the present village road network. Plans were publicized by Constantin Daicoviciu, Hadrian Daicoviciu and Dorin Alicu, recording the main ancient elements. Attempts were made to establish the colony *insulae*, and published in a plan by Robert Étienne, Ioan Piso and Alexandru Diaconescu. The following general topographical plans were developed by a team from the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) who worked over several years with modern and professional surveying instruments.

**THE CITY**

Shortly after the second Dacian war, probably in the summer of AD 106, *Colonia Ulpia Traiana Augusta Dacica* was founded, as the last *colonia deducta*, situated at a strategic position, at half-way between the two legionary fortresses of Trajanic Dacia, *Iii Flavia* and *XIII Gemina*, at Berzovia (jud. Caraș-Severin/RO) and Apulum (modern Alba Iulia [jud. Alba/RO]), and at a crossroad of two important commercial ways towards the Danube. Many of its colonists were veterans who had fought in the Dacian wars, with origins in Italy or the western provinces, as Hispania or Narbonensis. *Colonia Sarmizegetusa* has replaced the Dacian *Sarmizegetusa Regia*, but besides the name, nothing else was preserved or transmitted, not even the geographical position. The only element that dates from before the city’s foundation in AD 106, and before
any construction was erected, is an archaeological level on the placement of the future forum vetus, that contains lots of military finds, but its connection with the future city is only a symbolic one, and, in lack of other evidence, it is safer to assume that the colony was established upon a free and virgin land\textsuperscript{15}.

Here, the municipal concilium was convened, one of the reasons for the occurrence of the title metro-

Fig. 1  Map of the Roman province Dacia (modern Romania). – (After Piso 1993, 7).

Fig. 2  Map from 1367 of the medieval settlement Britonia (Sarmizegetusa, jud. Hunedoara/RO). – (After Popa 1984, fig. 4).
polis in the 3rd century. The economic and social evolution of the province has allowed a number of pagi in the territory of Sarmizegetusa to develop into cities: Apulum, Dierna, Tibiscum or Drobeta. In front of the forum several fragments of the founding inscription of Sarmizegetusa have been discovered. On the analogy of CIL VIII 17842, 17843, Thamugadi, the name and date of the founding of the city were established, in AD 106, immediately after the conclusion of the second Dacian war. The full name of the city was Colonia Ulpia Traiana Augusta Dacica Sarmizegetusa and was awarded ius italicum. Therefore, according to Roman civil law, land could be privately owned, claimed or sold, according to ius Quiritum, considering that ius italicum involved immunitas, thus the main tax exemption: tributum capitis, personal tax and tributum soli, the land tax. Therefore, the land had to be divided ex iure Quiritum to the settlers, based on a lex. The importance of land allocation for the Romans was obvious. It was a centralized procedure and a matter of public concern for local communities.

Sarmizegetusa had all the political institutions of Republican Rome, the magistrates, the senate (ordo decurionum) and the people. It was led by two Ilviri iure dicundo, aediles and quaestores. The municipal
priests were the sacerdos, the augur and the flamen. More than once, the emperor accepted the function of supreme magistrate of Sarmizegetusa, and then delegated a citizen as a praefectus pro imperatore. The city also held the praetorium of the financial procurator of the province: the consular governor had his praetorium in Apulum, but his tight connection with Sarmizegetusa is attested by numerous evidence of official high patronage. Also, Sarmizegetusa was the gathering place of the concilium III Daciarum, which marked the official celebration of the Imperial cult, and expressed the loyalty of the province towards Rome. All these merits have led to the occurrence of the title metropolis in the 3rd century.

Sarmizegetusa’s territory is stretching up to the Mureș valley, including areas in the Western Carpathians and the Banat, until the Danube. It is obvious that the land had to be divided among the settlers through the limitatio or centuriation method. The Romans have their system implanted everywhere, from the western provinces of the empire to urbanized Greece and the provinces in North Africa or the Middle East. Ideological division of the land was needed, but the organization of urban space and particularly the countryside was made for practical reasons; the centuriation is useful for determining the legal status of the territory, of the population, and its relationship with the colony. The limitatio was proposed to develop a cadastre for taxable income, and the land left, was divided, sold and, ultimately, taxed, or remained subsecivum. There are two kinds of subseciva: one is whatever land falls outside allocated centuriae, because it is cut off by the line of the survey, the other is what is left over. Not all space would have been centuriated from the beginning, as a part could remain for further development according to Vitruvius.

TOPOGRAPHY OF SARMIZEGETUSA

At Sarmizegetusa (fig. 6), as in many other cases, the criteria followed in establishing the orientation were primarily topographical and hygienic, not religious. Here, the most important factor was the slope, from south to north, used to facilitate drainage. The colony had originally an area of 24 ha, being widened at one time up to 32.40 ha. The western enclosure in the first archaeological phase of the city has not been identified, thought to be c. 430 m east of the enclosure used in both phases. Following the topographic measurements of the team from MoLAS in 1999 and 2000, the areas are of 22.90 and 32.90 ha, the enclosure being extended westwards a further 190 m. It was undoubtedly the most accurate topographic plan of Sarmizegetusa so far.

The western enclosure was originally built at 430 m to the eastern one, because the Rausor valley must have had in ancient times the same alignment. Therefore, the north-western corner of the enclosure near the valley followed a path almost parallel to it. The enclosure will be stretched up westwards by c. 190 m, therefore, the Rausor valley will cross the city from south to north. We do not know why the city was not extended to the east, but perhaps because the land in this area was higher. Our measurements are similar to those of the British team, with minor differences: in the first phase the colony area measured 430 × 530 m (c. 23.20 ha) and in the second 620 × 530 m (33.90 ha). Our terminals have a deviation of c. 25 cm, but this may be due to the translation of the topography of the WGS system to the ST70 system used in Romania. Initially, the parameters are slightly different, but new measurements can be done in accordance with the modern cadastral system of Romania.

The east enclosure and the south one, also the north and west ones are only partially conserved. The gates of north, east and south can be distinguished on the ground. Topographic measurements have covered almost all the buildings unveiled to date in the Roman period, both inside and outside of the enclosure. The central insulae were occupied by public edifices, which included the forum and later the two fora. The
western adjacent *insulae* were also occupied by public buildings, especially temples\(^{31}\). Of course, as in the Pompeian model, not all of the main or public edifices would have been placed in the central area. The procurator’s residence is located, for instance, close to the northern gate.

The built-up area of the city, in the early 2\(^{nd}\) century seems already to have stretched beyond the enclosure, with an amphitheatre situated at 10 *actus* from the *groma*, and an area *sacra* with at least six temples, east of the amphitheatre.

Probably, some 13,000 people lived within the city area and 40,000 in the entire *territorium*\(^{32}\), at its largest in the 3\(^{rd}\) century when the city flourished.

**THE LIMITATIO**

During the new topographical measurements of all of the remains of Sarmizegetusa and the analysis of the old maps and orthophotoplans we observed traces of a systematic planning of the town and adjacent area. We will try to further identify the relationship between the regularity of orthogonal habitat and the urban and rural cadastral spine of Sarmizegetusa. Sarmizegetusa’s territory must have been defined from the beginning\(^{33}\), marking each plot, with the *groma* surveying the principal axes of the city, *limites*, etc. The granting of lots to veterans had a long cadastral experience, the parcels being coded according to some predetermined rules, and there were quite a lot of legal constraints\(^{34}\). So we wonder if there are any signs of the existence of regular Roman land allotment for Sarmizegetusa\(^{35}\). The centuriation is in general not well-preserved and visible. In other places there is an abundance of different orientations of land divisions, so that no certain identification of lands is easy to detect\(^{36}\). This is partially the case at Sarmizegetusa as well.

As a result of new excavations and of the analysis of maps or orthophotoplans, we have some indications that suggest the position of the *insulae* within the *colonia* and traces of a centuriation outside the colony, on a broader area north, east and south. Nobody doubted that Sarmizegetusa would probably have had a centuriation, as any other Roman settlement, but no remains were observed on the ground in the vicinity of the colony. The uncertainty of the archaeologists came mainly from the fact that too few traces of Roman cadastral have been identified in the provinces of the empire, much less in Dacia. However, the accuracy of Roman *agrimensores* must have been exquisite everywhere\(^{37}\).

*Agrimensores* were famous for their precision in the laying out the forts, urban and agricultural grids, some authors referred to an *ars agrimensoria*\(^{38}\). Centuriation usually takes the form of large squares or rectangles of land that are subdivided into smaller squares or rectangles\(^{39}\). The centuriation was made according to the laws for *limites* or *limes*, as access roads, described by Siculus Flaccus (T 122.21-3) and Hyginus II\(^{40}\). This system should also be applied in Dacia, but so far there have been no reports of a centuriation. The only attempt to identify a plotting, but within the city, was made by R. Étienne, I. Piso and A. Diaconescu, depending on the *locus gromae*, the *forum* and the *domus procuratoris*, probably\(^{41}\). It is visible in the plan that the first phase of the colony had 4 *insulae*, the east-west direction, measuring approximately 80×80 m, and 5 *insulae*, the north-south direction, each divided in other 4 *insulae*. In the second phase, of the enlarged enclosure, we are dealing with another row of 2 *insulae* westwards. However, we have no archaeological or other evidence to be sure of the division of the city in this form, although the *forum* position with regard to this division was possible. It had been assumed another row of *insulae* east of the city, but without further detailed information\(^{42}\).

In Sarmizegetusa, as in the cities of Britannia or Gaul\(^{43}\), the first impression is that of uniformity. A key theme for the towns in Britain is the varied social backgrounds of the people who built the urban centres\(^{44}\).
Fig. 6 Orthophoto of Sarmizegetusa (jud. Hunedoara/RO). – (Illustration Agentia Nationala de Cadastru si Publicitate Imobiliana).

Fig. 7 Orthophoto of Sarmizegetusa (jud. Hunedoara/RO) with visible and supposed lines of centuriation. – (Illustration F. Marcu / G. Cupcea).
Sarmizegetusa’s design represents veterans as well, so it must have been more homogeneous. We know from Siculus Flaccus that land was not distributed equally to everyone, but it was granted according to military rank. Therefore, rank and file soldiers will receive a single allocation, some ranks one and a half allocations, some ranks double allocations. For instance, the domus procuratoris inside of the colonia would take 3 insulae of 2×1 actus, then the adjacent horreum another 3 insulae of 1×1 actus. Nonetheless, it is impossible to know how much have been distributed to everyone.

The modern village overlaps only a part of the western half of the Roman city. The usage of the Roman road network by the 13th-14th centuries, indicates an important habitat in this area before the medieval village has been mentioned in written sources. An official act from 1377 shows that the Romanian village Gradiște, then named Britonia, lays on top of the Roman ruins in the north-western corner of the former city, with households located on both sides of a main road that divides the settlement into two equal halves. Initially, C. Daicoviciu observed the partial overlap of modern roads over cardo maximus and decumanus maximus, without discussing other details. Eventually, archaeological surveys have shown that the streets in this part of the village strictly overlay the main streets of the Roman city. Indeed, there is a modern way, but meandering, in front of the Roman forum, which seems to overlap decumanus maximus, and another road from south to north, appears to be contiguous to the cardo maximus, making a loop to bypass the forum to the east and continuing to the south over another cardo II east. Undoubtedly, there must have been a Roman road west of the Roman city enclosure and this is evidenced by the current road from the southern exit of the present village towards Hobița, an extension that is practically over the Roman road. Later, with the widening of the Roman city enclosure, the road is shut down, another one being built, now superimposed by the existing village road, which bypasses the village today, but
connects with the road previously mentioned. Road orientation is similar to the enclosure sides, therefore, perpendicular to the *decumanus maximus*, and C. Daicoviciu actually observed, that the pattern is partially kept in the current road network. However, south of this road can be identified at approximately regular intervals, of c. 70 m, two almost parallel paths, which must have partially overlapped two south *decumani* II and III. The second artery to the south, appears to be a *decumanus* extension that ran behind the timber *forum*, still on east-west direction. A third artery is at a distance of 70 m, therefore, it can be another *decumanus* between it and the one behind the *forum* being possible to exist 2 *insulae*, the north-south direction, 120 *pedes* each. Another road, perpendicular to the road leading to Hobita village, south of Sarmizegetusa, which again may be a *decumanus* that separates 2 *insulae* and lays at c. 35 m from the first road described, is the one near the northern enclosure. Given the reuse of Roman roads in principle every 70 m (240 *pedes*), it is possible that these roads were larger in antiquity, the main module for *limitatio* within a colony being 1 *iugerum* or 1 *heredium*. Also, in the plans of modern cities in Gallia cisalpina the ancient planimetry is largely preserved, as evidenced by Guido Mansuelli with reference to Cremona: overlapping and intersecting streets at right angles, the dimensions corresponding to those of *decumani*. The same is partially valid also for Orange (Gallia Narbonensis; today dép. Vaucluse/F), as the latest analysis proves.

In Sarmizegetusa it is clear that the centuriation started with the *locus gromae*, after the position of the *forum*, located at the intersection of *cardo maximus* with *decumanus maximus* in front of the *forum vetus*. The streets were oriented according to the compass points and the perimeter consists of a regular polygon. The *forum* is on the axis of the first enclosure, of the northern and southern gates. We find numerous examples of civil settlements with the *fora* lying on the axis, both in Gaul and Germany, pointing here Ticinum, Vicetia and Novara, except Britain where the *fora* often were not axially aligned.

The first timber *forum* measures 46.30 × 42.00 m, and is described in detail by the excavators. It has a *principia* -like plan, this being the main argument for those scholars who claim that there was a fortress at Sarmizegetusa (see above). The situation is quite complicated and has been cleared by R. Étienne, I. Piso and A. Diaconescu, with all the arguments in favour of a civil settlement from the outset. In this representation, at about 19 m south of the southern *forum* edge, appears another *decumanus*, called *decumanus* I south (actually II south). South to this was discovered »d’une moitié d’*insula* divisée en quatre maisons«. As it appears in the topographic analysis, this is likely to be the *decumanus*, the extension of which is found in the road westwards the *forum* and identified for the later phase, but also in the modern roads described above. So, this is another proof that the centuriation was made at the outset, not inside a legionary camp, but in an urban-type settlement. As in Greece, the rural network orientation was identical to that described by the city limits and the enclosure. This is similar at Sarmizegetusa, at least near the enclosure.

Regarding the building of the city by soldiers, the apparent homogeneity of design should not surprise us, similar to cities in Britannia or to Orange, and it shows that also here »the military ordered ethic was being replicated«.

There is mixed evidence, primarily archaeological, to prove a *limitatio* of Sarmizegetusa’s land. It appears from the archaeological evidence that the urban colony was designed to be of a certain size and shape initially, and when the town was enlarged the same units and proportions were kept. The Roman preference for square *insulae* is obvious, but elongated blocks in the Hellenistic manner did continue to be used, as in the case of Carthage in 35-15 BC. This could have been the situation at Sarmizegetusa as well.

We have been able to measure starting from *cardo maximus*, *decumanus maximus* and *groma* to a road identified along the western edge of the *forum novum*, *cardo* II west, and then to *cardo* III, IV and V west. The surveyed length in between these *cardines* is of 35.50 m (1 *actus*). The distance between *decumanus*...
maximus and the only other known decumanus, II south, is of 71 m (2 actus). Accordingly, it results a unit of 2×1 actus. The other modern evidence are the four modern village roads which tend to overlay Roman decumani, not perfectly all of them, but neither the modern road which overlaps cardo maximus, nor the one corresponding cardo II east seem to completely overlay Roman limites. The insula interval has been identified to be constant throughout the entire urban settlement, also within the area of the enlarged town. Therefore, at first sight, the evidence supports that the overall urban grid design is based on a per strigas plan with a total of 10 cardines and 6 decumani in the first phase of the town, and 14 cardines and 6 decumani when the town was enlarged westwards. Consequently, there should have been at first 60 insulae of 2×1 actus plus a row in the northern part of another 10 insulae of 1×1 actus, with a total of 70 insulae. In the second phase there will be another 30 insulae of 2×1 actus and 5 insulae of 1×1 actus, a grand total of 105 insulae. The existence of rectangular insulae, with the ratio of 1/2 are recently supposed at Orange, Aix-en-Provence (dép. Bouches-du-Rhône/F) and Fréjus (dép. Var/F) in a grid composed of insulae of 1×2 actus. A similar grid, with insulae and streets located on intervals of 1 iugerum, but on larger scale, has been lately found at Corinth. However, there are only suggestions that this is true (fig. 7).

The cardines and decumani between the insulae would not have been included in the 1 actus wide insulae, because the Roman legal term iter populo non debetur was in use and important in the urban land division system. It meant that the streets are measured outside the insula blocks, as in Corinth and other places mentioned in the Libri Coloniarum. If in Sarmizegetusa we had insulae of 1 actus quadratus, then the rectangles imagined by us should be divided in two halves, and the streets should be narrowed. In general, we agreed on a road wideness of at least 3.5 m, although they could have been wider. Theoretically, every fifth main street was made wider than the intermediate ones, to ensure that it would be a usable road. The main streets could have been of about 12 pedes (3.50 m), a quintarius (20 pedes), with a minimum width of limites of 8 pedes (2.40 m), as prescribed by Hyginus II. For decumanus maximus and cardo maximus Hyginus I recommends a wideness of 12-30 pedes, though it was at the discretion of the founder. In Sarmizegetusa cardo maximus is 11 m wide, and decumanus maximus 12 m wide, therefore 40 pedes. The main buildings occupied more than 1 insula, but it was Roman practice that whenever needed, some streets were suppressed. The dimension of limites inside the Roman town can only be speculative since it is impossible to know for certain the original width of a street that may have been modified many times over the centuries.

The internal planning at Sarmizegetusa reveals buildings oriented with reference to the forum in all phases. The location of the edifices suggests that the architects of the second phase of the colony were fully aware of the Trajanic system of centuriation in and near the city, and the buildings orientation was invariable. Regarding the first phase the only uncertainty is why the internal space was not organized with two axes to divide the colonia in four equal parts, on every side of the central point, comparable to the most of the colonies. But this is, however, insufficient to prove an initial fortress. Or, there are examples of civil settlements of the 2nd century with a plan similar to a fortress, i.e. a cardo shape plan, to mention here only Timgad (prov. Batna/DZ) founded in AD 100 for veterans of III Augusta. The similarity is traced by Brian Campbell to a common origin of sources and methods of the military and civilian surveyors. Plus, at Sarmizegetusa and Timgad the soldiers were the builders of the settlement. Rectangular planning, with two main streets and insulae divisions can also be found at Ostia in the 4th century BC, or in other two early coast cities in Italy, namely Minturnae and Pyrgi, important for the evolution of the Roman orthogonal planning, and in Verona and Milan as well. The military character of early colonies was obvious, even if, fortresses as we know them did not exist. Frontinus (IV, I) tells us specifically that it was only after over-running the camp of Phyllus, in 275 BC, that the Roman armies began to adopt the sort of a formal
encampment which was been developed and standardized. The plan of the first colonies reflects the contemporary encampments of the Roman armies in the field. The relation between the internal planning of a fortress and that of a city becomes very tight. Similarities are distinguished in the military provinces, where soldiers and veterans were often the best available source of surveying and building skills, as in Sarmizegetusa. The social background of the founders was essential. The implication of the military surveyors in civilian projects is obvious. They are even involved in the settlement of boundary disputes, and in land division.

Evidence suggests that the *limitatio* also included the urban and rural elements. Outside the *colonia*, the orientation of the land divisions into units of multiple of an *actus* at the orientation of 9° west of north direction, is attested north, east and south of the city. It is possible, as we shall see below, that a more appropriate module for the Sarmizegetusa centuriation could have been 10 *actus* (with a value of 355 m). Overall, the centuriation started from modules of 20 × 20 *actus*, but there are many examples of other types of grid.

Therefore, roads or borders of agricultural parcels today, the west-east direction, are evident in maps, but especially in the orthophotomap, and seem to be a product of the same project of a cadastral strategy. Cardo maximus intersects with the imperial road out of the city. Today, the imperial road is only partially preserved, on a portion to the east, towards the village of Ostrov, being called «Trajan's way» (Trajansweg) (figs 7-8).

Road orientation is the same like that of the streets that start in the Roman city, all with the direction of the main city axes. Moreover, one can distinguish a distance equal to a module or a multiple of an *actus* between these roads, clearly indicating a cadastre. The orientation takes into account the axes of the Roman city, so this clearly proves that we are dealing with traces of Roman centuriation, sometimes preserved until today.

If the Sarmizegetusa centuriation existed since the beginning, as it seems, then, obviously, it was founded as a colony, and the territory was divided accordingly.

The relationship between the *colonia* and the area outside the walls is evident. In principle, the distance between roads is maintained at 120 *pedes* or multiples of an *actus* (1 *actus* = 35.48 m) that is the chief measurement of length used by Roman land surveyors for plots. This is the distance oxen yoked to a plough were driven before they were turned. The first signs of land division on 20 × 20 *actus* come from the 3rd century BC, however, the division of land into squares constructed on a smaller scale may have existed from much earlier. The distance of 10 *actus* from the *groma* to the entry in the amphitheatre is further evidence that the centuriation was implemented at Sarmizegetusa from the beginning. The space dedicated to the games had an important symbolism in the Roman world, therefore, the position of the amphitheatres (sometimes theatres) was not by chance. The structures are essential in articulating the Roman cadastre and urban space as one of the most important elements in the city’s development, a real spacial and temporal pattern, necessary for the surveying of the main axis.

The 10 *actus* module is an essential unit in the genesis of the Roman cadastre. Originally designated as *decumanus*, it means the axis drawn every 10 *actus*. This length, equal to 5 *iugera*, is the so-called *modus triumviralis* that the triumvirs used in the distribution of land in Italy (Frontin. 30.20 – Hyg. 170.19) as a way to subdivide the *centuriae* in 200 *iugera*, as both Hyginus (170.19) and Siculus Flaccus (159.14) witness. It is how the land was allotted in the first *coloniae deductae*, as Bononia (Bologna), Aquileia, Terracina or Cures. Traces of Roman centuriation have been further identified in Italy, France, Britannia, Dalmatia and Tunisia (the most spectacular and extensive signs of Roman land division), at Augusta Emerita in Lusitania, Corduba and Carmo in Baetica, also in Tarraconensis, and in the same province near Basí, at Murcia and possibly near Castellón de la Plana.
All ancient authors, especially Hyginus II, emphasize the importance of land division based on the *limites*. It is how the Romans defined the world they conquered and a conceptualization of space. Land was pledged and divided among the soldiers, in Sarmizegetusa, a common practice at the time, also mentioned by Horace who asks about the land allocations (praedia) that the emperor (Augustus) promised to the soldiers. Hyginus I talks about the allocation of land to the soldiers in Pannonia during the reign of Trajan. A centuriation as evident as in Sarmizegetusa and the relationship between the groma (forum), cardines, decumani and the amphitheatre outside the walls can only indicate the Roman cadastre implemented from the beginning of a settlement, which must have been an urban one, not a fortress. The orientation of Sarmizegetusa’s rural centuriation started at the city limits, the route beginning even at the city enclosure. Undoubtedly, the measurements started at the centre of the colonia and the forum was designed as the topographical centre of the urban colony, precisely like in Corinth. Sometimes, even if the limitatio was an operation theoretically independent of the laying out of the town itself, the city and the territorium had a common base point, and Hyginus II speaks about a centuriatio initiated in the same point, either for the town or for the territory, but in other places the locus gromae was offset, however, as Siculus Flaccus wrote, the orientation of the limites could have been similar.

As in other colonies of veterans, agricultural land was divided, allocated partly in iugera, and the rest remained as strips, or unsurveyed. Maybe that is why we distinguish the traces of limites in Sarmizegetusa surviving only in the north, east and south, because this land is suitable for agriculture. In the west only a small portion is flat, but then the land becomes hilly.

The connecting roads outside of the colonia have the same orientation as the streets in the settlement. We have observed an area of 6×11 km (almost the entire modern communal area, except the hilly land), in order to see which features of the modern landscape fitted in a grid.

The village roads which border the agricultural fields at present time, on the east-west direction, are obvious on the maps, but especially on the orthophotomap, they seem to be the product of the same project of a cadastral strategy. *Cardo maximus* intersects, when exiting the city, the imperial road. At present day only a part of the imperial road is preserved, eastwards, to Ostrov, called, even since the 19th century »Trajan’s Road« (Trajansweg). This road lies at about 220 m, meaning 6 actus from decumanus maximus. However, we have insufficient information to establish here the imperial road. This could have entered the town through the western and eastern gates as in many other Roman towns being thus decumanus maximus.

The modern road orientation is identical to that of the Roman main axes of the city. Moreover, an equal distance is observable, a module, equal or multiple of an actus, between these roads, indicating a cadastral regularity. The fact that they follow the orientation of the Roman city axes tells us that they are the traces of the ancient centuriation, preserved in some places until present day.

Parallel with the road going towards east from the amphitheatre, the most northern sector can be seen in the same direction, where the modern path may indicate the direction of a Roman road, at about 695 m, i.e. almost 20 actus. There would have been the northern limit of the cadastre as here it starts the abrupt hills and the forest.

Roman roads do not always overlap perfectly with modern utilities, as evidence found in archaeological excavations shows, e.g. in the case of the eastern cemetery, where the ancient way is adjacent to the road today. Modern roads are not really roads, but only earth pathways, sometimes reinforced with stone and used today as field lines or property lines. After the demarcations kept until today, nobody doubts about the Roman limites, the distances between them are 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7 actus, which does not mean that the properties were unequally divided. The clearest modern way, adjacent to the Roman road, can be distinguished from the eastern gate of the amphitheatre on a length of 327.47 m, also indicating the module
used in Sarmizegetusa. From the entry into the amphitheatre to locus gromae, there are exactly 10 actus, as mentioned above. Starting from the amphitheatre limit to the south, at about 4 actus the Roman imperial road is partially overlapped by a modern communal way. From it, to the road that exits the city through the eastern gate, there are about 6 actus, c. 10 actus resulting from the road in front of the amphitheatre to the road that extended decumanus maximus. For the latter, there are again 10 actus to the road extra muros adjacent to the southern enclosure corresponding to a modern communal road a few meters to the north. Midway between these roads a modern way overlaps the extension of decumanus III south to the east. South of the way located along the southern enclosure six other modern roads are visible, all parallel. The first is 14 actus, the next 20 actus, 24 actus, 29 actus, 35 actus, and 39 actus, respectively to decumanus maximus.

Unfortunately, cardines and roads parallel to the cardo maximus, in the space extra muros are less visible on the orthophotomap, probably because the properties today are oriented north-south, on the direction of cardines. The clearest is one that must have continued a cardo VIII west, to the south, and overlapped today a communal road that leads from Sarmizegetusa to Hobita, the southern village, located at 8 actus from the locus gromae. At 390 m from the southern enclosure, a short portion of a field road parallel to the way to Hobita, is visible in the orthophotomap, 4 actus eastwards, probably corresponding to the extension of cardo IV west. At 8 actus east of the cardo maximus extension to the north, there is a portion of 300 m field line leading to the current motel in the area. In the same direction, at 15 actus, the rural road leading to the village Breazova can be distinguished, probably also overlapping a Roman limes. Along the western Roman enclosure stands the way to the village Hobita, located at 12 actus of the groma, the road which now connects to the one described above as overlaying the extension to the south of the cardo VIII west.

The only form of limites we have identified are the roads and paths – no other type of lines were observed\textsuperscript{102}. It is clear that the function of the roads did not change much; as early as in antiquity the limites were mainly used for the transport of the harvests. Scamna seems to be the dominant pattern for the subdivision of centuria, however, there are quite a number of strigae also identified. The centuria at Sarmizegetusa would have been also divided or subdivided in 6/8 scamna (strigae), a model also used for the plain of the Rhone indicating »la massivité des distributions «\textsuperscript{103}

How the limitatio looked like in the other parts of Sarmizegetusa’s land is difficult to establish. However, the similar orientation of the limites inside and outside of the town indicates, as at Augusta Tricastinorum, contemporaneous action\textsuperscript{104}. The discovery from Sarmizegetusa is suggestive, as the pattern is typical for the colonies of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century until the Flavians, and it shows an organized and strong colonization.

**LEGAL STATUS**

As in any other places of Gaul, Italy or Greece we can observe at Sarmizegetusa signs of a scamnatio and strigatio in centuris\textsuperscript{105}. The cadastre is modulated in relation to the ratio scamnatio/strigatio\textsuperscript{106}. Soldiers and veterans were granted parcels in equal amount in proportion to the unit\textsuperscript{107}. These were measured and aligned using the ferramentum. Not all properties were equal, as Hyginus II emphasized the flexibility of the land surveyors’ measurement, each field having its own statute\textsuperscript{108}. In Sarmizegetusa only a few traces of this centuriation have been preserved, the usage of the actus as a module being important, and the orientation of the centuriation according to the city enclosures, and then to the imperial road. Why only here these limites were conserved, we do not know, but the marks of the properties could have been executed.
in many ways, visible in the centuries following the abandonment of the province. There were many methods of dividing the land: *centuriatio*, *strigatio* or *scamnatio*. The first was used when large amounts of land had to be distributed. For this the drawing of lines on the ground was essential in order to delimit territorial boundaries. The *centuriae* were divided by *limites intercisivi* or *mensurae intercisivae* to provide lots or other subdivisions by means of: balks, roadways, small trenches, trees, streams, or anything else that could mark a limitation.

Sarmizegetusa, as any other Roman city, had regular street patterns enclosed and framed new types of buildings in which one can dispense justice, sacrifice or bathe. The layout shows more centralized design than organic growth, normal for a colony of veterans, where the military ordered ethic was being replicated. There are several significant aspects to this discovery. First, this is primary evidence of the work of the Roman *agrimensores* in this area. How much of the total territory of Sarmizegetusa was included in this *limitatio*, as a part of a *lex agraria*, it is not clear, but what we have seen is definitely part of a regular and organized Roman division of land in the area immediately to the north, east and south of the former city. Maybe not all of the *territorium* of Sarmizegetusa was divided from the very beginning, and this would lead to a different orientation of the *limites* in the eastern area of the city. Anyway, here the orientation of the lines are aligned or perpendicular to the Roman imperial road which turns left exactly where the *limites* are more westwards inclined. The elements of the Trajanic plan are still being utilized as modern streets or field lines and property lines.

The accuracy of the Roman *agrimensores* is comparable to ours, disregarding their instruments, not as sophisticated as our modern electronic survey instruments. On balance, variations and mistakes in survey sometimes happened. The *centuriatio* is a mixture of traditionalism and flexibility, that explains the many differentiations between similar towns, with no two towns identical in design. Nevertheless, the mathematical relationships between the actual roads of Sarmizegetusa indicate that the links were planned, and suggest that a centuriated cadastre existed. That is the first step for a coherent municipalized or urbanized Sarmizegetusa from the beginning. The linkage unlikely occurred by chance, and seems to have been related with the Roman units of measurements and a unified vision of the future.
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4) After Mezerzius, St. Zamosius; Analecta lapidum vetustorum et nonnullarum in Dacia antiquitatum (Padova 1593).

6) Marsigli 1726.
7) Hohenhausen 1773.
8) Ibidem.
9) Daicoviciu 1924. – Daicoviciu 1974, 615.
10) Daicoviciu / Alicu 1984, passim.
11) Etienne / Piso / Diaconescu 2004, fig. 1.
12) General plan published by Eck / Lobüscher 2001. Short survey was also made by Dorin Ursut, in the eastern cemetery, and Dan Ţefer in the central area of the town.
15) Ibidem 437.
18) Ulp. dig. 50, 15, 1, 8-9.
22) See Piso 2005, 448-449.
25) On ancient landscape organization and the mental role of the individual in this, on the agrarian morphology, which is »organic and profound orthogonal«, see Chouquer / Favory 1991, 69ff.
26) See Jung 2009, 90. The last would have been any public area or any infertile ground, see Siculus Flaccus, T 119.15.
29) Team of Peter Rauxloh, David Bentley, David Mackie, Sophie Lamb and Duncan Lees.
30) Eck / Lobüscher 2001, 263.
33) Traces of a centuriation are still presumed in Dacia at Micia and Sarmizegetusa in Oltean 2007, 180.
34) See Chouquer / Favory 1991, 139-152.
35) In Britannia, against all odds, John Peterson managed, in 1988, to prove the existence, in all the provinces of the empire (by reference to Britannia) of a genuine Roman cadastrae (Peterson 1988, 166. – Peterson 1992, passim).
37) For a short introduction to the Roman laws concerning land allotment to veterans, and »une nouvelle phase de turbulences agraires«, see Chouquer / Favory 1991, 133ff.
38) Ibidem 139. For building features of the forts of Dacia and their internal planning see Marcu 2009.
39) The agrimensores’ accuracy is comparable to ours (Romano 2006, 65). However, surveyors’ experience was based on express rules established in compliance with laws, records and registers, maps, edicts, letters or other imperial decisions, definitions of territorial area and jurisdiction, lists of subseciva and the book of beneficia, as are the examples of Agennius Urbicus, Hyginus I, Siculus Flaccus and Hyginus II, see Campbell 1996, 88 n. 55. For the history of agrimensores, see Hinrichs 1974, 76-92. 158-170.
41) Etienne / Piso / Diaconescu 1990, fig. 2.
42) »Vers l’est, au-delà d’une rangée d’insulae, s’étend, au long de la route romaine vers Ostrovo« (Piso 2005, 438).
43) Insula blocks and the public buildings seem to be organized on homogenous basis, see Creighton 2006, 70.
44) Ibidem.
47) In the given plan, the two roads exiting the city by the eastern and northern gates, are called via romana, without any apparent archaeological evidence, but claiming that »der Strassenzug dieser beiden Haupt-viae kann noch heute bei den jetzigen Wegen und Strassen des modernen Dorfes verfolgt werden« (Daicoviciu 1974, 613. 615).
48) Chicideanu et al. 1979, 316.
49) Étienne / Piso / Diaconescu 2004, pls II-III, 73.
50) Heredium is the unity of landscape and property in an orthogonal structure, as described by Frontinus, see Chouquer / Favory 1991, 72.
51) Mansuelli 1971, 67 pl. II. In the plans it can be noticed that in many other cases of modern cities, the Roman roads are used: Rimini (Ariminum) pl. I; Piacenza (Placentia) pls III-IV; Aquileia pl. V; Aosta (Augusta Praetoria) pls VII-VIII; Torino (Augusta Taurinorum) pl. IX; Vicenza (Vicentia) pl. XII; Como (Novum Comum) pl. XIII, Albenga (Albingaunum) pl. XIV; Brescia (Brixia) pl. XV; Milano (Mediolanum) pl. XX. For late Republican colonies see Aristot. pol. 7.11.1330.
53) For locus gromae at Sarmizegetusa see Piso 2005, 439.
54) For its position, but considered deviated from the axis, see also Eck / Lobüscher 2001, 263-264.
55) Mansuelli 1971, 72.
56) Nevertheless, in Britannia, all the colonies, except York, were erected on top of former legionary fortresses (Creighton 2006, 72. 76).
57) Étienne / Piso / Diaconescu 2004, 60-69.
58) Ibidem 86-94. The main arguments for a fortress before cities are based on the shape of the enclosure and forum, with analogies in Britannia: Daicoviciu 1974, 612. – Rusu 1979, 49-50. – Alicu 1980, 25-26. – Benea 1983, 156. – Bărbulescu 1987, 156-157 n. 105. – Alicu 1993, 29-30. – Alicu / Oprea 2000, 116. 146. Not always the internal planning of the former fortress is preserved in the city, the fora of Britain, unlike most of them in Gaul and Germany, often are not axially aligned: in Silchester what seems like a principia it is an
older forum, and in Colchester the old principia is demolished, and via praetoria unites with via decumana, but the barracks are kept, like in Gloucester and Wroxeter. See Creighton 2006, 67. 75ff. – Blagg 1984, 253.

59) Étienne / Piso / Diaconescu 2004, 91 n. 64.

61) Apparently, the dimensions of the first forum are not harmonized with the proposed length for the insulae, as it in the similar situation at Orange (Mignon 2009, 116), but the larger forum in stone would fit much more in the general plan, with the decumanus through the basilica.

63) On the urban ideal of the people who lived inside and their interpretation of humanitas: Creighton 2006, 121. The first cadastrer of Orange is connected with the veterans of legio II Gallica (Chouquer 1994a, 54).

66) Mignon 2009, 115 fig. 36.
67) Romano 2003, passim.

68) See ibidem 288 n. 53.
69) Varro (Ling. 5.34) mentions that this is the base unit in surveying the civil rectangular grid system, based on around orthogonal axial streets.

70) Minimal recommended width of subbruncivi was 8 pedes (Campbell 1996, 85). At Orange was established a module of 8.90 m (30 pedes) for each road, see Mignon 2009, 115.
71) Also called actarius, wider than the other streets, with a recommended width of 12 pedes, see Campbell 1996, 85. 93 fig. 28. – Hyg. II, T 155.14.25-31. – Sicus Flaccus T 121.38-41.
72) Hyg. I, T 71.6-7.
73) Étienne / Piso / Diaconescu 2004, 120. 126.
74) See for instance the example of the baths at Augusta Raurica (Ward-Perkins 1974, 35 fig. 75).
75) Campbell 1996, 82-83.
76) Ibidem n. 15.
77) Millett 1991, 278 underlines the existence of a model for a Roman fort.
78) The same idea in Dobson 2008, 72: »The camp system was substantially based upon the civil scheme, if not actually directly inherited from it«.
79) Stratagemata IV, 1,14.
80) Campbell 2000, Li.

81) In Corinth the orientation of land divisions north of the city was of 3°, but in other places it was over 20°, see Romano 2003, 281. – Chouquer / Favory 1991, 11-13. 19. In the regions of northern Italy and southern France there seems to be a pattern in the angle orientation of the land division of 11° (Chevallier 1958, 636).
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Die Topographie der Colonia Ulpia Traiana Augusta Dacica Sarmizegetusa und die erste Centuriation in Dakien

The topography of *Colonia Ulpia Traiana Augusta Dacica Sarmizegetusa* and the first centuriation in Dacia

The paper deals with advanced topographical and ancient landscape research at the *Colonia Ulpia Traiana Augusta Dacica Sarmizegetusa*, the capital of the Roman province of Dacia. Even if topographical surveys had been conducted previously as early as in the 16th and 18th centuries, excavations here were not undertaken until the 19th century. In the mid-20th century, scientific research was established at the site. Subsequently, topographical plans were elaborated and published in the 1970s and 1990s. However, the latest topographical survey was led between 2008 and 2010 by the authors of this paper, with state-of-the-art equipments, and overlapping the measurements on the satellite photography, revealed interesting features of the ancient landscape and cadastre. It is now sure that these are the first traces of Roman centuriation in the province of Dacia.

La topographie de la *Colonia Ulpia Traiana Augusta Dacica Sarmizegetusa* et la première centuriation en Dacie


Topografia Colonia Ulpia Traiana Augusta Dacica Sarmizegetusa și prima centuriație din Dacie


Schlüsselwörter / Keywords / Mots clés / Cuvinte-cheie

Rumänien / römische Kaiserzeit / Landschaftarchäologie / Kataster / Centuriation
Romania / Roman Principate / landscape archaeology / cadastre / centuriation
Roumanie / époque romaine / archéologie du paysage / cadastre / centuriation
România / Imperiul Roman / topografie aheologică / cadastru antic / centuriație

Felix Marcu
Muzeul Național de Istorie a Transilvaniei
Str. Constantin Daicoviciu 2
RO - 400020 Cluj-Napoca
felixmarcu2004@yahoo.com

George Cupcea
Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai
Centrul de Studii Romane
Str. Napoca 11
RO - 400088 Cluj-Napoca
george.cupcea@gmail.com

Kontakt für Autoren: korrespondenzblatt@rgzm.de

Abonnement beginnend mit dem laufenden Jahrgang; der Lieferumfang umfasst 4 Hefte pro Jahr; ältere Jahrgänge auf Anfrage; Kündigungen zum Ende eines Jahrganges.

Kontakt in Abonnement- und Bestellangelegenheiten: verlag@rgzm.de

Preis je Jahrgang (4 Hefte) für Direktbezieher 20,– € (16,– € bis 2007 soweit vorhanden) + Versandkosten (z. Z. Inland 5,50 €, Ausland 12,70 €)

**HIERMIT ABONNIERE ICH DAS ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN KORRESPONDENZBLATT**

Name, Vorname _______________________________________________________________________________________

Straße, Nr. ________________________________________________________________________________________

PLZ, Ort ________________________________________________________________________________________

Sollte sich meine Adresse ändern, erlaube ich der Deutschen Bundespost, meine neue Adresse mitzuteilen.

Datum ______________________ Unterschrift _____________________________________________________

Ich wünsche folgende Zahlungsweise (bitte ankreuzen):

- Bequem und bargeldlos durch Bankabbuchung (innerhalb von Deutschland)

  Konto-Nr. ________________________________________ BLZ __________________________________________

  Geldinstitut ________________________________________________________________________________________

  Datum _________________________ Unterschrift __________________________________________________

- Durch sofortige Überweisung nach Erhalt der Rechnung (Deutschland und andere Länder)

  Ausland:

  Nettopreis net price prix net 20,– €

  Versandkosten postage frais d'expédition 12,70 €

  Bankgebühren bank charges frais bancaires 7,70 €


 Das Römisch-Germanische Zentralmuseum ist nicht umsatzsteuerpflichtig und berechnet daher keine Mehrwertsteuer.

 If you use the European standard money transfer with IBAN- and BIC-numbers there are no bank charges from our part (IBAN: DE 08 5519 0000 0020 9860 14; BIC: MVBM DE 55). This is also the case if you transfer the money from a Post office current account or with an international Post office money order.

 The Römisch-Germanische Zentralmuseum does not pay Sales Tax and therefore does not charge VAT (Value Added Tax).

 L'utilisation de virement SWIFT avec le numéro IBAN et SWIFT supprime nos frais bancaires (IBAN: DE 08 5519 0000 0020 9860 14; SWIFT: MVBM DE 55); ils peuvent aussi être déduits en cas de règlement postal sur notre CCP (compte courant postal) ou par mandat postal international.

 Le Römisch-Germanische Zentralmuseum n’est pas imposable à la taxe sur le chiffre d’affaires et ne facture aucune TVA (taxe à la valeur ajoutée).

 Senden Sie diese Abo-Bestellung bitte per Fax an: 0049 (0) 61 31 / 91 24-199

 oder per Post an:

 Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Forschungs institut für Vor- und Frühgeschichte, Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt, Ernst-Ludwig-Platz 2, 55116 Mainz, Deutschland