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SAMIAN WARE IN EARLY ROMAN CONTEXTS
AT CAPIDAVA

ALEXANDRU RAȚIU,
IOAN CAROL OPRIȘ

ABSTRACT:
The present paper is part of a series of publications related to the research carried out in the last decade in the early Roman contexts from Capidava (Constanța County), as well. The subject of the article is a batch of 17 fragmentary ceramic vessels, belonging to the terra sigillata category. Of these, the first 16 items (Cat. nos. 1-16) are fragments of imported vessels produced in the famous ceramic production centre of La Graufesenque, in South Gaul. The last vessel, Cat. no. 17, is of local production, from the category called Pontic sigillata decorated by the barbotine technique. The entire batch of ceramic material was discovered during the archaeological excavation carried out at the Late Roman headquarters building (principia), during which the foundations of this building were also excavated. Beneath these foundations were discovered the ruins of an early Roman habitation level represented by military barracks-type buildings, a stone-paved street, a well, a rubbish pit and a waste drain that led to that pit. The material presented by us comes from this earliest context, respectively from all the urban planning elements listed above, especially from the waste drain and the rubbish pit. The dating of the material is early, namely the Flavian era until the end of Trajan’s reign. From this point of view, the ceramic material presented here completes the picture provided by other categories of material previously published from the same archaeological context.

REZUMAT: TERRA SIGILLATA ÎN CONTEXTE ROMANE TIMPUII LA CAPIDAVA
Lucrarea de față face parte dintr-o serie de publicații referitoare la cercetările din ultimul deceniu desfășurate și în contextele romane timpurii de la Capidava (jud. Constanța). Subiectul articolului este un lot de 17 vase ceramice fragmentare, aparținând categoriei ceramicii fine de tip terra sigillata. Dintre acestea primele 16 piese (cat. nr. 1-16) sunt fragmente din vase de import produse în importantul centru de la La Graufesenque, din Galia de Sud. Ultimul vas, cat. nr. 17, este de producție locală, din categoria sigillatelor pontice decorate în tehnica barbotinei. Întregul lot de piese a fost descoperit cu ocazia săpăturii arheologice desfășurate la clădirea comandamentului (principia) de perioadă Romană târzie, ocazie cu care s-au săpat și fundațiile acestei clădiri. Sub aceste fundații au fost descoperite ruinele unui nivel de locuire roman timpuriu reprezentat prin clădiri de tip barăci militare, o stradală pavată cu piatră, o fântână, o groapă de gunoi și un canal de scurgere a deșeurilor spre acea groapă. Materialul prezentat de noi provine din acest cel mai vechi context, respectiv din toate elementele urbanistice enumerate mai sus, în special din canal și groapa de gunoi. Datarea materialului este una timpurie, acoperind întreaga epocă flaviană și puțând ajunge până la sfârșitul domniei lui Traian. Din acest punct de vedere materialul ceramic prezentat aici completează imaginea oferită de alte categorii de material publicate anterior din același context arheologic.

KEYWORDS: South Gaulish pottery workshops, terra sigillata, Pontic sigillata, barbotine decoration, Early Roman castellum at Capidava, Roman military barracks.

CUVINTE CHEIE: atelierele ceramiștilor din Galia de Sud, terra sigillata, sigilat pontic, decor în tehnica barbotinei, castellum-ul roman timpuriu de la Capidava, barăci militare romane.

Introduction
This paper enters into a series of such endeavours that tries to put into a wider historical context the archaeological discoveries made at Capidava, while excavating the „Late Roman Principia” building. The archaeological research project of the „Late Roman Principia” was carried out between the years 2013 and 2019 and had as a main focus

1 Both our research and the resulting paper were realised within the Limes National Programme framework.
the excavation of the large building with an apse (*principia*), dating from the 4th century AD, and located in the south corner of the Late Roman Capidava Fort (Pl. I/2). *Capidava* is a Roman and later Early-Byzantine fort situated on the Lower Danube *limes*, as part of the province of *Moesia Inferior*, later *Scythia*.

The publication of this material aims to bring further proof of the early Roman occupation level in the Lower Danube area, especially at *Capidava*. Recently our team published an article about the military equipment found in the same context with the pottery presented here. The dating proposed for the harness fittings was the second half of the first century AD. This paper will try to bring new proof supporting that dating. Until recently the information about the early beginnings of the military fort from Capidava were scarce and reduced to the epigraphical and numismatic evidence. During the last years the *balneum* (2nd - 3rd centuries AD) and the main gate of the fort (*porta principalis dextra, if not porta praetoria*) were re-excavated and published shedding new light on the subject. However, both excavations were very poor in small finds and conclusive artefacts in general for dating purposes.

The *terra sigillata* presented here is found in the first phase of construction of the fort from Capidava, in the area of the barracks blocks, located in the *retentura dextra*. These buildings were discovered during the exhaustive archaeological research of the Late Roman *Principia*. This fourth century large building overlapped the previous barracks, which were demolished to the level of the first course of elevation’s masonry.

**Archaeological context and dating of the finds**

The *Principia* excavation project was initiated by our team in the year 2013 and was initially planned as a five year excavation. Due to external factors the project was finished in 2019, with the exhaustive excavation of the building and its immediate surroundings. Also, during the year 2020 the building was part of a large restoration program, being thus restored at the level of the 4th century. The first excavations in this area of the fort were undertaken at the end of the 1950’s, when it was investigated a part of Early Medieval / Middle Byzantine context consisting of several sunken dwellings that were overlapping the building. At the end of the archaeological research, six different archaeological contexts were determined, dating from the 1st to the 11th c. AD (see Pl. II).

All the *terra sigillata* fragments were discovered in Context no. 6, the earliest context excavated until now at Capidava. This context is represented in this area by at least two (if not three) separate buildings, aligned to a paved street, also a circular structure (well?), a sewage ditch and other fragments of walls. All the context preserved only in a thin layer of maximum 0.40m, underneath the floor of the 4th c. *Principia*. In order to erect the larger Late Roman *Principia*, the ground needed to be levelled, and many of the former structures were destroyed on that occasion. However, some of the features were preserved at the ground level of these structures, mainly the clay floor and one or two courses of masonry.

The foundation of the barracks was constructed with a masonry made of earth-bounded stone, preserved at a height of a single course above the ground; the walls are 0.6m thick. The floor of the buildings is made out of 10 cm thick battered clay. The below-ground foundations are shallow, with one or two courses of smaller stones compared to those used for the elevation courses. South of the two barracks there is a paved street built on a layer of compacted sand that stands on the natural rocky soil.

The context is rich in artefacts, especially pottery shards, although the discoveries are not distributed evenly on the entire surface of the context. Among the finds from the barracks fragments of *terra sigillata* and other fine wares were found, along with the military equipment presented here and items such as a superb folded knife, glass fragments and a few bronze coins (the majority from Vespasian, but also some other dated to the reign of Claudius I).

---

2 For the historical overview, see Opriș and Rațiu 2017, 13-24.
3 Rațiu and Opriș 2021.
4 Opriș, Rațiu and Potârniche 2018; Opriș and Rațiu 2019a (Early Roman *balneum*).
5 Opriș and Rațiu 2019b, 127 (main southern gate); Rațiu and Opriș 2021.
6 See Florescu et al. 1959, pl. I. This first plan ever published included the short side of the *horreum* with the L-shaped corner pillar of its portico, part of the NE long side of the Late Roman headquarters and half of the building’s southern pentagonal apsis and some 28 Middle Byzantine sunken dwellings excavated during the 1957 season. See also the general plan of the fort in the first monograph, Florescu, Florescu, Diaconu 1958, pl. I-II. Other important observations on the same *principia* building prior to the systematic research undertaken starting from the 2013 season belong to Radu Florescu, see Florescu 1975, especially 368-371.
7 The pottery is still in the documentation stage, an ample study is forthcoming.
8 Courtesy of Mihai Dima, the numismatic expert involved with this project at Capidava. The coins are still under research and will be an important part of the general publication strategy.
Outside the barracks, about six metres to the south-east, near the fountain (see Pl. III/2), a large quantity of amphora fragments was discovered (about 35 vessels) and judging by the rim and neck features most of the transport containers belonged to Shelov B type. Among them were found also the Catalogue Numbers (Cat. Nos.) 12-15. The context in which they were found is a shallow garbage pit, or more precisely a garbage area, with a depth of 0.4 m and a diameter of approximately 2.5 m. It is situated near a well, of some sort and at the end of a sewage ditch. The content of this ‘area’ varies from animal bone fragments, large quantities of pottery shards, glassware fragments and scraps of metal etc.

Cat. Nos. 1-11 were found north from the garbage pit/area in a sewage ditch which runs on a north-east to south-west axis. The ditch is parallel with barracks B1, B2 and with what could be the B3 barracks. The ditch is lined on both laterals with slabs of limestone, having in the same time an earthen bottom. Other fragments of pottery were found in the same ditch, along with the ones presented here. The orientation of the ditch coincides with the orientation of the natural slope and the so-called garbage area was at the end of this canal. Unfortunately, the later interventions such as the construction of the principia by the end of the 3rd c. or the beginning of the 4th c. AD, but mostly the sunken hovels from the 9th-10th centuries, have all disturbed the stratigraphy of the first two centuries of habitation from Capidava.

Fragment Cat. No. 16 was found on the paved street between the barracks, which probably explains its poor preservation state. The bowl had a plain-surfaced body, nevertheless both fabric and slip suggest the same early South-Gaulish production.

The most interesting discovery story is that of the Pontic Sigillata Krateroid vessel type Ivanov 2, namely Cat. No. 17. It was found in three successive archaeological campaigns, broken in 34 shards, spread on a surface of approx. 64 sqm. The restored vessel still keeps the main impact point where it was broken. We included this last item in this paper to illustrate that the fine ware used in this first occupational level from Capidava could be also locally produced, along with the other imported fine merchandise.

**Stratigraphy**

The general stratigraphy of the Building C1 is relatively simple and representative for the entire stratigraphy of Capidava. The recording of the vertical stratigraphy during the archaeological research of the site was made by defining several archaeological contexts. Thus, we have established six different contexts (Pl. II), counted chronologically from the newest to the earliest one. The terra sigillata fragments were found in the sixth context (Context No. 6), the first one in chronological order.

**Typology and use**

The majority of the vessels in our paper are Gallic Samian wares. The first nine (Cat. Nos. 1-9) are actually parts of a well-documented table set (Type A) produced in the famous South Gaulish workshops from La Graufesenque. Such table sets contain bowls Dragendorff (Drag.) 35 = Conspectus 39, dishes Drag. 36 = Conspectus 43, plates with pedestal Drag. 50 = Hermet 29 and Hermet 9 deep bowls, all decorated en barbotine with small leaves and tendrils or berries on the rim. In fact, six different table sets were produced at Condatomagus from the early-Flavian to the Trajanic period. Out of the 4 forms belonging to table set A, the first two could be identified in the Early Roman contexts at Capidava and the same situation was recorded at Dinogetia, as well. Bowls and plates Drag. 35/36 from Southern Gaul were known so far along the Lower Danube at Beroe, Noviodunum, Aegyssus and Carsium in connection to the same military milieu. Both forms enjoyed a high popularity in all Danubian provinces, where they were reproduced in local workshops during the 2nd-3rd c. AD.

---

9 Šelov 1986, 396-397.
10 Vernhet 1986, 99, fig. 3.
11 Vernhet 1986, 100.
12 Personal communication, Viorica Rusu-Bolindeț (National Museum of Transylvanian History, Cluj-Napoca). A recent notable contribution regarding this subject is that of Viorica Rusu-Bolindeț, Alexandru Barnea, Adriana Panaite, The Supply of Terra Sigillata from Western Mediterranean Markets at Dinogetia (Moesia Inferior) in the Early Roman Time (1st-3rd Centuries AD), 32 Congres of Rei Cretariae Romanae Fautores (September 25-30, 2022, Athens). During the 1st-3rd c. AD the army units stationed at Dinogetia were supplied with various Samian ware produced in Italy, Southern and Central Gaul, but also with similar products manufactured in the Eastern workshops (Eastern Sigillata A, B and C).
13 Mocanu 2021, 72-73; Baumann 2008, 220/7, 9, pl. 1/7-9; Honcu and Chiriac 2015, 256-257, pl. II.3.
14 Conspectus, 120, 128 (Forms 39 and 43); Rusu-Bolindeț 2007, 159.
Cat. No. 10 could be of type Hermet 23, usually a plain-surfaced bowl\(^{15}\), if not a Drag. 37 one, given that sometimes the South Gaulish Drag. 37 examples have spouts\(^{16}\). Moreover, the example from Capidava is a high gloss relief decorated one. One can distinguish the design in panels, with the continuous egg-and-tongue (ovolos) and row of beads above; the central part belongs to low relief foliate features. Nos. 11-12 are deep bowls with plain upright rim Drag. 37, the most common of all Western Sigillata in Roman Dobrudja\(^{17}\). Along with the ones from Capidava, the other finds are also associated with the military environment (Novidunum, Troesmis, Dinogetia and Carsium).

It is impossible to accurately assign No. 13, which could be the thick base of a Drag. 30\(^{18}\), a high bowl with flaring knobbed foot, yet form Hermet 4 should not to be also excluded\(^{19}\). Nos. 14-16 are fragments of bases and of a plain-surfaced body. They could not be assigned typologically, given their preserved dimensions and lack of any decorative element.

Cat. No. 17 belongs to Pontic Sigillata decorated en barbotine. The form of Cat. No. 17 – Krateroid vessel type 2 is known in Moesia Inferior at Varbovski Livadi near Pavlikeni, from the excavations of Bogdan Sultov and was dated to the third quarter of the 2\(^\text{nd}\) c.\(^{20}\). Compared to the orange-red to orange-brown fabric of the ware produced at Varbovski Livadi, the buff white kaolinic fabric and light orange slip of Cat. No. 17 are noteworthy. Taking into account the fabric, a soft white one, the vessel (an earlier variant of Krateroidal vessel type 2) could have been produced on the Lower Danube. One has suggested the figlinae at Durostorum as production centre\(^{21}\). Kaolin common pottery or LDKW (Lower Danube Kaolin Ware)\(^{22}\) is met in all legionary sites on the Lower Danube (Novae, Durostorum and Troesmis)\(^{23}\) and further upstream, and that is why it was also addressed as ‘legionary pottery’. But its incidence is far greater than the river line, and it covers ‘practically all the known sites in the Lower Danube region’\(^{24}\). The main area of concentration along the Lower Danube is nevertheless that between Axiopolis and Durostorum, which corresponds to the identified Kaolinic clay deposits in Central Dobrudja\(^{25}\). Piotr Dyczek even proposed Axiopolis as a production centre\(^{26}\), yet the known kaolinic pottery from there is exclusively coming from stray finds\(^{27}\). On the other hand, his legionary pottery considerably dating ranges from the 1\(^{\text{st}}\) to 4\(^{\text{th}}\) c.\(^{28}\) perfectly matches a Late Roman kaolinic pottery production in the settlement (and fortification) from Castelu, along the Carasu Valley between Axiopolis and Tomis\(^{29}\). That is why one should seriously take into consideration an early local and quite elaborate production along the Danube in the area between Durostorum and Axiopolis and, why not, the inland, according to the pattern of the Pavlikeni and Butovo workshops.

We can conclude that all South Gaulish sigillata fragments with their glossy high-quality slip can be dated to the Flavian – Trajanic period, but also the other Pontic Sigillata found in Early Roman contexts inside or near the barrack of the cohort at Capidava. Such an early dating is in full accordance with the Roman military equipment and stamped bricks previously published\(^{30}\). Moreover, the Flavian production of Drag. 35 and 36 (components of table set A) found at Capidava and Dinogetia perfectly match the dating of the dominant Drag. 37 South Gaulish finds from Novae and Augustae and the newly published sigillata from Ratiaria and Conbustica. The first imported bowls of that kind dated back to the Flavians, yet most of were shipped under Domitian and during the early regnal years of Trajan\(^{31}\).

\(^{15}\) Hermet 1934, 3, pl. 3; Vernhet 1986, 98.

\(^{16}\) Danell 2018 (section 3.3 Pannas): https://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue50/5/1.html#33; see also Mees 1995, Taf. 17.

\(^{17}\) Mocanu 2021, 78-82 (nos 22-38); Honcu and Chiriac 2015, 256-257, pl. II.2a-c.

\(^{18}\) Drageendorff 1895, 130, Taf. II. For the only find in Dobrudja (Dinogetia), see Mocanu 2021, 77; Ştefan 1958, 62-63, fig. 1.

\(^{19}\) Vernhet 1986, 97, fig. 1.

\(^{20}\) Ivanov 2022, 61-62, 64, 193 (cat. nos 344-347).

\(^{21}\) Mocanu 2021, 113. Personal communication of Dan Elefterescu, who acknowledged the production at Durostorum of a a wide range of bowls, plates, cups, lamps and moulds with kaolinic fabric. Pottery with barbotine decoration (bowls, dishes and cups) from Durostorum was published by Mușețeanu 2003, 122-124, pl. 42; Băltăc 2018, 217, fig. 6.1-2, but with a different (darker) kind of fabric.

\(^{22}\) Dyckz 2016, 242.

\(^{23}\) Oprîș and Rațiu 2019, 265, 279, fig. 6.1 (LEGXICPF); Oprîș 1997 (COHVBIOR).

\(^{24}\) Dimitrova-Milčeva 2000, 14, 55-58, cat. nos 195, 197-200, 202, 204, 206, 208-210, 212-219, 221-237 (Novae and Augustae); Luka 2023, 52-54 (for Ratiaria and Conbustica). Krasimira latter proposed a Flavian production period for some South Gaulish Drag. 35-36 examples (100, cat. nos 62-64 and pl. 11), while some of the Drag. 37 bowls (101-102, cat. nos 74-75, 77, 79-81, pl. 14-15) could have been even earlier, i.e. Neronian-Claudian.
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1. Cup Type Drag. 35.
   b. RD: 141 mm.
   d. Decorated with vegetal motifs, small leaves and stems, by the barbotine technique.
   e. From the bowl remains only one fragment from the rim.
   f. La Graufesenque.
   g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

2. Bowl Type Drag. 36.
   b. RD: 224 mm.
   d. Decorated with vegetal motifs, small leaves and stems, by the barbotine technique.
   e. From the bowl remains only four fragments from the rim.
   f. La Graufesenque.
   g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

3. Bowl Type Drag. 36.
   b. RD: 222 mm; PH: 30 mm.
   d. Decorated with vegetal motifs, small leaves and stems, by the barbotine technique.
   e. From the bowl remains only three fragments from the rim.
   f. La Graufesenque.
   g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

4. Bowl Type Drag. 36.
   b. RD: 211 mm; PH: 32 mm.
   d. Decorated with vegetal motifs, leaves and stems, by the barbotine technique.
   e. From the bowl remains only three fragments from the rim.
   f. La Graufesenque.
   g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

The structure of the catalogue voice is as follows: a. Place and context of discovery; b. Dimensions; c. Technique and colour; d. Decoration; e. Short description; f. Production centre; g. Dating. Abbreviations used within the catalogue are: RD: rim diameter; BD: base diameter; MD: maximum diameter; PD: preserved diameter; H: height; PH: preserved height; L: length; W: width.
5. Cup Type Drag. 36.
   b. RD: 202 mm.
   d: Decorated with vegetal motifs, leaves and stems, by the barbotine technique.
   e: From the bowl remains only one fragment from the rim.
   f: La Graufesenque.
   g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

6. Bowl Type Drag. 36.
   b. RD: 172 mm.
   d: Decorated with vegetal motifs, leafs and stems, by the barbotine technique.
   e: From the bowl remains only one fragment from the rim.
   f: La Graufesenque.
   g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

7. Bowl Type Drag. 36 (?).
   b. PD: 153 mm; BD: 68 mm; PH: 34 mm.
   d: No decorum visible.
   e: From the bowl remains only one fragment from the body and base.
   f: La Graufesenque.
   g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

8. Bowl Type Drag. 36 (?).
   b. PD: 128 mm; PH: 33 mm; W: 38 mm.
   d: No decorum visible.
   e: From the bowl remains only one fragment from the body.
   f: La Graufesenque.
   g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

9. Bowl Type Drag. 35/36.
   b. L: 20 mm; W: 17 mm.
   d: Some decorum is still visible, part of a leaf stem.
   e: From the bowl remains only one small fragment from the rim, not large enough to render a diameter.
   f: La Graufesenque.
   g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

10. Bowl Type Hermet 23/ Drag. 37 (?).
    b. RD: 128 mm; MD: 128 mm; PH: 69 mm; Beak W: 20 mm.
    d: Decorated with stamped vegetal motifs, wine leaves, bordered in its upper part by an ova register.
e: From the bowl remains only two fragments from the rim and body, also the pouring beak is preserved entirely.
f: La Graufesenque.
g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

11. Bowl Type Drag. 37.
b. RD: 162 mm; PH: 41 mm.
d. Relief decoration inside a panel with stamped vegetal motifs (?), under a continuous line.
e: From the bowl remains only one fragment from the rim and body.
f: La Graufesenque.
g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

12. Bowl Type Drag. 37 (?).
b. RD: 215 mm; PH: 19 mm; W: 37 mm.
d. No decoration is visible.
e: From the bowl remains only one fragment from the rim and body.
f: La Graufesenque.
g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

13. Bowl Type Drag. 30 (?)
b. BD: 78 mm; PH: 23 mm.
d. Relief decoration with a kind of "palisade" pattern (Vernhet 1986, 100), under the central panel.
e: From the bowl remains only the entire rim of the base, and a small part from the lower body.
f: La Graufesenque.
g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

14. Bowl Type (?).
b. BD: 84 mm; PH: 28 mm.
d. No decoration is visible.
e: From the bowl remains only part of the base, and a small part from the lower body.
f: La Graufesenque.
g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

15. Bowl Type (?).
b. BD: 69 mm; PH: 16 mm.
d. No decoration is visible.
e: From the bowl remains only a small part of the base, not large enough to determine the diameter.
f: La Graufesenque.
g: 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.
16. Bowl Type (?).
   b. PH: 55 mm; W: 54 mm.
   d. No decoration is visible.
   e. From the bowl remains only one fragment from the lower body.
   f. La Graufesenque.
   g. 1st - early 2nd c. AD, Flavian - Trajanic period.

17. Pontic Sigillata Bowl - Krateroid vessel type Ivanov 2.
   b. RD: 248 mm; BD: 97 mm; MD: 252 mm; H: 142 mm.
   c. Moulded and barbotine. Fabric: Munsell 7.5YR 8/1. Slip: Munsell 7.5YR
   d. Decorated using the barbotine technique with vegetal motifs, ivy leaves and stems.
   e. The vessel is restored, only small parts from the body and one handle are missing.
   f. Pontic workshop, probably Tomis.
   g. 1st - 2nd c. AD.
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Pl. I. 1. Lower Danube Provinces (after Tentea, Matei-Popescu and Călina 2021, 82, pl. I); 2. Capidava Roman Fort, Baths and Cemetery (after the authors).
Disposition and description of the archaeological contexts

| Context no. 1 | Modern vegetation level, grey-brown in colour, sandy textured; accidental finds of archaeological material. |
| Context no. 2 | Occupational level: medium-grey sediment, dusty texture, granular structure. Finds: large quantities of pottery, animal bones and adobe fragments. Complexes: Late-Byzantine sunken dwellings with battered clay floors and hearths. 9th – 11th c. AD |
| Context no. 3 | Occupational level: yellow-brown sediment, homogenous, dusty texture, low compaction degree. This is an incendiary level, proved by evidence of heavy burning. Finds: large quantities of Early byzantine pottery, bricks and tiles, burnt beams and adobe bricks. Complexes: walls from the last constructive phase of the building, with additional partition inner walls. The floors are made from battered clay. Second half of the 6th c. AD |
| Context no. 4 | Occupational level: yellow-brown sediment, homogenous, dusty texture, low compaction degree. This is an incendiary level, proved by evidence of heavy burning. Finds: Early byzantine pottery, ceramic construction material, burnt beams and adobe bricks. Complexes: last constructive phase of the building, with additional partition inner walls. The floors are made from battered clay. Second half of the 5th c. AD - first half of the 6th c. AD |
| Context no. 5 | Occupational level: yellow-brown sediment, homogenous, dusty texture, low compaction degree. This is an incendiary level, proved by evidence of heavy burning. Finds: small quantities of Late Roman pottery, ceramic construction material, some coins, which date the context. Complexes: walls from the first constructive phase of the building. The floors are made from battered clay and in some places of bricks planted in mortar. 4th c. AD, possibly end of 3rd c. AD |
| Context no. 6 | Occupational level: yellow soil, sometimes deep red and black from heavy burning. Consists from foundations of walls, made by stone and earth masonry, with battered clay floors and outdoor street pavements. Finds: large quantities of Early Roman pottery, especially amphorae, military equipment and coins. Complexes: stone buildings, narrow paved streets, a fountain and a large dumping area. Second half of the 1st - first half of the 2nd c. AD |

Pl. II. 1. The stratigraphy from the Late Roman Principia from Capidava (after the authors).
Pl. III. 1. Orthophotoplan of the Late Roman principia from Capidava taken in 2017 (photo D. Costea).
2. Plan of the Late Roman principia excavations, with emphasis on the Early Roman discoveries, with light red (drawing by Al. Rațiu).
Pl. IV. South Gaulish terra sigillata from Capidava (drawings by Raluca Dobrogeanu).
Pl. V. South Gaulish terra sigillata from Capidava (drawings by Raluca Dobrogeanu).
Pl. VI. South Gaulish terra sigillata from Capidava (drawings by Raluca Dobrogeanu).
Pl. VII. Pontic sigillata from Capidava (drawing by Raluca Dobrogeanu).
Pl. VIII. Photographs of some of the vessels presented in this paper (photos by Al. Rațiu).