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The cultural heritage of ancient Rome is ubiquitous throughout the Mediterranean world and has had a lasting global influence. This omnipresence of Rome’s legacy is not only a result of its hegemonic power in the Mediterranean world for 1000 years, but its cultural contributions that extended well past its borders. The focus of this paper is how ancient Roman cultural heritage influences the narrative history and identity of former frontier areas differently. Since Scotland and Romania are at opposite extremes of the vastness of the Roman Empire they have been chosen as the focus for this paper. These two locations were occupied by Rome at different times and have unique historical narratives. Through a comparative study of the similarities and differences of Roman heritage, a better understanding can be achieved on how Roman heritage affects the contemporary identity of these countries.
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INTRODUCTION

The cultural heritage of ancient Rome is ubiquitous throughout the Mediterranean world and has had a lasting global influence. This omnipresence of Rome’s legacy is not only a result of its hegemonic power in the Mediterranean world for 1000 years, but its cultural contributions that extended well past its borders. Ancient Rome also helped establish heritage by influencing government, philosophy, military, education, and national identities all over the contemporary world. The cultural influence of Rome, however, has had a mixed legacy. In a positive light, Rome is celebrated for its progressive ingenuity in governing, engineering, and art, but on the other hand, many have seen Rome as an oppressive tyrant that imperialistically exploited their neighbors. The popular interpretation of ancient Rome in the present varies in context, but in many cases, this heritage is seen as an integral part of the foundational success of Western Culture. In various media and educational programs, Rome is often presented as a homogenous European power that subjugated and assimilated many other well-known civilizations such as the Carthaginians, Greeks, and Egyptians. The material heritage of ancient Rome, that can be found in archaeological sites and museums around the world, also popularized the idea that Rome was dominant and influential on a global scale.

The various interpretations of ancient Roman culture have not been thoroughly studied in many areas not popularly associated with major historical sites, people, or events. This can be especially true of some of Rome’s frontier border areas, where the might of Rome was felt less, and local populations had greater autonomy. The focus of this paper is how ancient Roman cultural heritage influences the narrative history and identity of former frontier areas differently. Two such places at the extremities of the Roman Empire provide an excellent opportunity to look at the unique historical narratives and contemporary interpretations of Roman heritage: Scotland and Romania. This study will focus on these
two locations with the objective of gaining perspective on how ancient Roman cultural heritage is viewed by contemporary populations. As measured by how people from the regions interact with and promote Roman heritage and how archaeological sites are preserved. The focus for evidence in Great Britain will center around the region surrounding the Antonine Wall in Scotland, which is well-renowned and recognized as a UNESCO world heritage site. In Romania, the focus will be on the northwestern part of the country, Transylvania, which has yielded evidence of significant Roman occupation.

Even though there are common elements in the interpretation and celebration of ancient Roman cultural heritage, there is also a significant variation of what exactly comprises Roman culture since so many other cultures lived symbiotically within its borders. While it may be widely known that Rome merged its culture with others, such as with religion and art, much of this cultural diffusion has not been investigated thoroughly in certain areas on the fringes of its Empire. In addition, perspectives on how Roman cultural heritage is celebrated by contemporary border populations have not occasioned much research.

In terms of the presentation of Roman cultural heritage today, sometimes prominent examples of Classical Roman work are presented as a sort of badge of cultural sophistication for nations that possessed it. However, it’s rare to see Roman heritage interpreted in a way that shows they were influenced by other cultures. Most museum displays and school curriculums depict the Romans as conquerors who usually the ones influencing others, not the other way around. It’s common for many countries to make cultural ties to popular Roman heritage, which will often be showcased in national museums. Research has shown, however, that Roman culture did not replace the cultures they sought to conquer. In many cases, Roman customs merged with native cultures or were even overshadowed in some cases. For example, the Roman legions and government
officials that were stationed in a conquered territory often intermarried with local populations, which resulted in cultural mixing that influenced the Romans just as much as it influenced the local populations. The Roman cultural heritage left behind in Scotland and Romania attests to this cultural mixing, many examples of which include religious iconography, metalwork, and other artifacts. The physical barriers and forts constructed by Rome during its long history at first glance show a much different narrative. Some of these barriers are especially famous such as Hadrian's Wall and the Antonine Wall in Great Britain, as well as the German *limes* in central Europe; collectively known as the “Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site.”

A wall can have as much symbolic significance as it can be practical, and the walls have popularly been regarded as a boundary between the “civilized” Romans and the “barbaric” cultures beyond. While these walls were indeed manned by soldiers and lined with forts, they were not merely obstacles to keep out invading armies. These were more often considered checkpoints by Emperors that built them, such as Hadrian, who had it in mind to regulate and keep track of people crossing the border for peaceful purposes. While England and Southern Britain generally have a wealth of ancient Roman heritage to study and identify with, Scotland and the northern part of the island have a different perspective.

The Antonine Wall marks the northernmost frontier of Rome and it was commissioned to be built by the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius around 142 CE near the Forth River. This region was an area very hostile to the Empire, even during the roughly 70-year period the wall was manned by the Roman
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military. The wall was eventually abandoned around 208 CE after a brief attempt to reinforce it by the emperor Septimius Severus failed. Rome would never politically administer that portion of Britain again, but there is still evidence of interaction and influence between the Romans and local populations. While the Antonine Wall has been studied extensively this paper will try to look at how Roman culture influenced this region around the Forth River and if local populations today celebrate Romans more as ancestors or their occupiers.

These border areas were much more porous regarding non-Roman citizens being able to enter the Empire for various reasons, such as trade or seeing family. Additionally, some of these border areas, like Romania, have not had a tremendous amount of scholarship published about the impact of Roman culture on native populations and vice versa.\(^2\) While some Roman heritage, like the “Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site,” get a tremendous amount of recognition, many other locations that Rome bordered are just starting to yield important information that may impact the way people look to these sites to identify their heritage. In particular, the Danube River region in Transylvania that bordered the Dacian people and the fringes of the Roman Empire. Rome conquered Dacia during two wars between 101-102 and 105-106 C.E., which were part of the conquests of one of its most celebrated emperors, Trajan. Rome occupied Dacia for almost two centuries until a strategic retreat by the emperor Aurelian, which took place from 270-275 C.E. This region was of high value for Romans for military and economic reasons. Dacia became a buffer zone between Rome and the Germanic tribes beyond, and it also contained lucrative gold mines that the Empire desperately needed in order to fund its

legions and maintain the Empire. In this almost two-hundred-year period, there is not much known about how Rome interacted with the Dacian populations. There is also not a lot of scholarship published on how strong a cultural presence Rome had in the region and how local populations view Rome’s impact on their heritage.

There is research and archaeological fieldwork currently taking place in this region of Transylvania. This is apparent at many Roman heritage sites that are protected and maintained by the Romanian Government, such as Sarmizegetusa Ulpia Traiana and Apulum. Many of these heritage sites also have museums adjacent to them or are partnered with larger museums in Transylvania such as the Dacian and Roman Civilization Museum in Deva. In addition, Archaeological Techniques and Center Research, also known as ArchaeoTek, is a research program that has been working in the region since 2001. While operating a field school with educational opportunities for budding archaeologists, ArchaeoTek has focused on gaining a clearer perspective on the Roman presence in the region and its context into the local history. There have been some minor local publications in Romania on past excavations by ArchaeoTek and they have also collaborated with the Museum of Dacian and Roman Civilization. The museum contains a modest collection of artifacts found locally along the Mureș River and the town of Rapoltu Mare, where ArchaeoTek has focused most of its excavations dealing with Roman heritage since 2015. In the summer of 2019, ArchaeoTek continued excavations close to Rapoltu Mare in order to gain a better understanding of how much influence the Romans had on the Dacians. This excavation focused on the extent of Roman urbanization on Dacian society and how many
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ethnic groups from other parts of the Roman Empire had an impact on the creolization of culture in the region.\textsuperscript{7}

The scale of Rome's influence can be intimidating to anyone who is seeking to understand just how much Rome imposed itself on "conquered" populations and how much influence was reciprocated back to them. The focus of this paper is how ancient Roman cultural heritage influences the narrative history and identity of former frontier areas differently. Since Scotland and Romania are at opposite extremes of the vastness of the Roman Empire they have been chosen as the focus for this paper. These two locations were occupied by Rome at different times and have unique historical narratives. Through a comparative study of the similarities and differences of Roman heritage, a better understanding can be achieved on how Roman heritage affects the contemporary identity of these countries.

\textbf{ROME IN THE FRONTIER}

Rome is undoubtedly associated with its militarism and imperialism, which is the main reason its influence spread as much as it did across the ancient world. It's difficult to determine, however, why Rome chose to conquer so much land and what their ultimate plans were in sending their legions so far away from Italy. Some contemporary historians, like the Greek Polybius of the third century B.C.E., stated that Rome did have it in mind to conquer vast territory especially the Eastern Mediterranean in the third century. Despite this statement, Polybius’ narratives on the Roman Republic’s rise do not actually indicate a plan on conquest, nor do any other written sources.\textsuperscript{8} This being said, it's clear that the Roman aristocracy measured itself in military achievements and that individual rise to


\textsuperscript{8} Potter, David, \textit{Ancient Rome A New History}, New York: Thames and Hudson, 2018, 74.
power in Rome for its aristocrats largely depended on their military records. This
competition between elites likely helped give rise to Rome's frequent involvement in
warfare, even early on in its history. Early historical narratives of Rome state that after
Scipio Africanus' victory over the Carthaginians, that Scipio said the consequence of his
victory was conquering “the whole,” as in the whole world. As historian David Potter
writes, however, it's very difficult to prove Scipio said this and occasionally historians like
Polybius had made up quotes for people in his narrative in other cases. The term “the
whole,” was a Greek one that described the massive territory Alexander the Great
conquered after his death. The first Roman written work that mentions the intention of
actual domination comes in Virgil’s The Aeneid. In this source, Jupiter promises an “empire
without territorial boundaries,” to the descendants of Aeneas, who the Romans believed
they were. This passage from The Aeneid does not prove that the Romans actually wanted to
conquer the known world, even one of the dictators in the first century B.C.E., Sulla declared
it was treason for a Roman general to take their army outside of the borders of the province
in which it was stationed. The Roman idea of provinces, however, gives perspective on how
Romans saw the rest of the world. A province was a concept that Romans borrowed from
the Macedonian Greeks, who in turn borrowed it from the Persians. The system of
organizing land into provinces was especially helpful in Rome collecting taxes, which their
government sorely depended on from all its provinces. This system would give rise to the
idea of Empire that emerged later in the first century B.C.E. and helped Rome determine its
territorial organization. Rome viewed the world in three different ways, first as places it
directly controlled, places controlled by allies, and then everywhere else.

By the time of Julius Caesar in the first century B.C.E. the idea of Empire was on the
mind of the aristocratic patricians who for hundreds of years had vied to make a name for
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9 Ibid, 75.
10 Ibid, 81.
11 Ibid.
themselves in military exploits. Julius Caesar’s is renowned for setting the stage for Imperial Rome and conquering Gaul prior to the Civil Wars he fought against the Roman Senate. In his conquest for Gaul, Caesar also set his ambition on invading Great Britain, twice, first in 55 and again 54 B.C.E., making him the first Roman to do so. Caesar’s intention of attacking Britain in addition to Gaul was to flex Roman dominance in the region but also to increase his own prestige for his political motives. His invasion in Britain was cut short due to setbacks, one being that he had to reinforce the heavy losses of some of his cohorts in Belgium and the other being the tenacity of British tribes his soldiers faced on the southern shores of the island.\textsuperscript{12} The next time Rome would set its sights on Britain would during the reign of Caligula, but through his uncle and successor, Claudius in 43 C.E. Rome invaded Britain a second time using their traditional rationale for instigating war, which was to come to the aid of another group being attacked. In this case to help the prince of the Antrebates who needed Roman military assistance against other British tribes.\textsuperscript{13} The truth of the motivated invasion was that Claudius, at age 47, was looked down upon by his family because he never served in the military due to his limp and stutter. Claudius wanted to conquer Britain to give him some military prestige. Four legions at around 20,000 strong plus auxiliary units took most of Southern Britain that year. Claudius even arrived himself to witness the defeat of the largest British tribe the Romans were facing, the Catuvellauni, in their capital. After the Roman victory, Claudius instructed the first governor of the province of Britannia, Aulus Plautius “to conquer the rest” of Britain. This proved to be more difficult than anticipated.\textsuperscript{14}

Control of the Britannia province during the first 25 years of occupation would prove challenging for the Romans and they would not have a more solid control over the territories that make up modern England and Wales until Vespasian became emperor in 69

\textsuperscript{12} Potter, 156.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid, 31.
C.E. Vespasian charged three military governors with not only bringing order to Roman territory in Britain but taking over the whole island. At the time the two more well-known governors were Petillius Cerialis and Sextus Julius Frontinus, known for defeating the Brigantes and Welsh tribes. The governor that would become the most famous historically, would be Gnaeus Julius Agricola, whose task was to conquer modern-day Scotland.\textsuperscript{15}

Agricola had first served in Britain during the Boudican revolt from 60-61 C.E. and as a legionary legate from 70-73. These first two forays into Britain gave Agricola the firsthand experience he needed to be familiar with northern Britain and Caledonia, which is what Roman's called modern-day Scotland.\textsuperscript{16} We are also fortunate to know as much as we do about Agricola and the first campaign into Scotland since Agricola’s son-in-law happened to be the well-known Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus. Tacitus followed Agricola on his campaigns into Caledonia and provided essential information on his exploits.\textsuperscript{17} When Agricola arrived in Britain in 77, he first suppressed a revolt in Wales against the Ordovices before starting his first campaign season into Scotland in the summer of 78 and would continue until the year 83. In the six-years of campaigning Agricola tried to suppress many different tribes but he also built a series of alliances and forts up to the Forth-Clyde isthmus; he even started planning an invasion of Ireland.\textsuperscript{18}

The final two campaigning seasons for Agricola were in the north of the Forth-Clyde, which the Roman believed to be the area of the Caledonians. The culmination for Agricola’s campaign to control Scotland came during the battle of Mons Graupius. No one knows exactly where this battle took place, but it was the crowning military achievement for Agricola defeating the Caledonians. There is no record the Caledonians surrendering even after they lost the pitched battles that the Agricola forced. Caledonians fared much better

\textsuperscript{15} Breeze, Ibid, 33.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid, 33.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, 16.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, 35.
when practicing guerilla war tactics, but they were outmaneuvered and lacked the sophisticated military equipment the Romans had.\textsuperscript{19} Agricola left Britain as governor after this battle, but he also left his mark on Britain by orchestrating reconnaissance missions of Northern Britain and even sailing a fleet around the Orkney Islands, confirming that Britain was an island.\textsuperscript{20} In spite of Agricola’s military success and the establishment of forts along the Forth-Clyde, the Romans still did not maintain administrative control of the ethnic groups of Scotland. Ironically for the purposes of this paper, any follow up to Agricola’s victories was abandoned due to heavy losses Rome faced in Dacia under the emperor Domitian.\textsuperscript{21}

The next time an earnest effort was put into place from the Romans would be during the reign of Antoninus Pius and into the reign of Marcus Aurelius, from 139 to 161. The most notable portion of this campaign to control Southern Scotland was the creation of the Antonine Wall. The wall began to be built almost immediately after the death of the emperor Hadrian and would be located along the Forth-Clyde Isthmus, near where Agricola had participated in previous campaigns.\textsuperscript{22} The Wall was designed to be mostly made of turf but some parts of it were also made of clay and stone. Due to the difficulty of getting around the Forth-Clyde isthmus, a Military Way was constructed along the wall for troop movement and the original plan was for six forts to be built along the wall to house auxiliary troops. Eventually, modifications would increase the number of forts along existing fortlets for added security.\textsuperscript{23} One function of the Antonine Wall was to protect the frontier from local attacks, however, having neighbors potentially hostile on both sides of that wall made the military purpose of the wall less effective than its primary purpose, controlling the

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid, 50-51.
\textsuperscript{20} Breeze 16.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid, 92.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid, 64.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid, 66-67.
movement of people. The Antonine Wall functioned for nearly two decades but no one
knows exactly why the Romans withdrew from it. Archaeological and numismatic evidence
put the date of Roman withdrawal between 158 and 164. The reason for the withdrawal
was likely due to unrest from local tribes and the need for Roman reinforcements along
troop depletions on the Danube around that time.

The last major push to control Scotland came during the reign of Septimius Severus
from 193-211. Severus embarked on this campaign himself with his two sons that would be
his successors: Geta and Caracalla. Cassius Dio wrote that Severus’ goal was to see the
whole island conquered. Severus liked fighting and wanted his sons to gain experience
while also getting out of the toxic politics of Rome. His campaign was cut short, however,
when he contracted an illness and died in Eboracum, York, in 211. Caracalla continued the
campaign for a short time after his father’s death but then returned to Rome to consolidate
power. Shortly after Caracalla’s departure, any Roman administrative control retreated to
the south of Hadrian’s Wall. There would never be another significant military campaign in
Scotland.

During the occupation soldiers and camp followers alike interacted with local
communities and managed to survive in a sometimes hostile but livable environment. Even
though Roman artifacts are not found in great numbers, they occur in Roman and native
sites, showing that there were interactions and likely trade between Romans and local
ethnic groups. It also appears that Roman goods occur at high-status native sites in the first
century C.E. but spread further in the second century C.E., suggesting that Roman goods
reached a wider range of social classes as time went on. Even the non-material impact on
Scotland would have been significant when considering the decades Romans spent
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24 Ibid, 69.
26 Ibid, 102.
27 Ibid, 88.
interacting with local populations. For example, there is evidence of new methods of taxation, land ownership, architecture, education, religion and many other examples of Roman culture exerting influence on local people during the Roman occupation.29

Occupation and mutual cultural influence would go differently for the Romans in Dacia. Dacia was a region that lies in most of present-day Romania, just north of the Danube River bordering the Roman province of Moesia. Dacia was a heavily forested mountainous area, encompassing most of the range of the Carpathian Mountains. For most of Roman history, the Danube provided a critical barrier in preventing Germanic groups and other “barbarians” from invading the Roman Empire. The Dacians, however, were anything but uncivilized. Even though they relied on a primarily rural economy there was a high degree of commercialization and industrialization. Most of the upper-class Dacians were well educated and were fluent in Latin and Greek. In addition, Dacia was rich with natural resources such as gold, silver, iron, and salt, all of which attracted Rome’s interests.30

As the Dacians developed they sent raiding parties across the Danube River in Moesia, presenting a challenge to Rome. The first major raid was during the reign of Augustus and the second occurred in 69 C.E. during the tumultuous year of civil war between four emperors. The most ambitious move by the Dacians came in the year 85 when Decebalus became king. Decebalus launched a surprise raid into Moesia that same year driving back two legions so he could loot as many towns as possible before taking thousands of prisoners and even killing the province’s governor. As a result, a counter-offensive was orchestrated by emperor Domitian that began in 86. Domitian traveled with several legions to Moesia to help oversee the effort, but the first foray into Dacia ended in disaster as several legions were destroyed by a surprise attack in a mountain pass.31

Domitian then retreated to Rome to coordinate yet another offensive in 88 CE. At first, the

29 Ibid, 89.
campaign went well for the Romans, but it quickly got out of hand in 89 when other legions in the Upper Rhine revolted, and the Sarmatians invaded Moesia at the same time Roman armies were trying to mount an offensive into Dacia. Circumstances got even worse for the Romans when the German Quadi and Marcomanni tribes, that Domitian thought would assist him against Dacia, refused to help him and even attacked the province Pannonia. Domitian was forced into the embarrassing position of having to agree to peace terms favorable to the Dacians that paid them a large sum of gold annually so they would not invade Moesia. These embarrassing terms did not help Domitian’s reputation in Rome and many Romans called for a more favorable resolution to the situation in Dacia.⁴²

In 101 Rome would once again invade Dacia but this time under one its most capable military emperors, Trajan. Trajan was renowned for his military prowess prior to his invasion of Dacia and he was one of many Romans who were embarrassed by the terms set between Domitian and the Dacian king Decebalus.⁴³ Much of both Dacian Wars, which occurred between 101-102 and the second Dacian War between 105-106, are depicted on Trajan’s Column in Rome. Even though much of our knowledge comes from the Roman biased depictions on that column, it still provides an excellent outline of the massive effort Trajan made in conquering Dacia. Trajan mustered over 100,000 troops in order to conquer Dacia and he took every precaution to make sure he did not underestimate his opponent or let his military plans leak to Decebalus.⁴⁴ After two years of fighting Trajan laid siege to the Dacian capital of Sarmizegetusa, forcing Decebalus to surrender and come to new terms. The terms included that Dacia gives up territory to the Romans in the west known as Banat as well as a buffer zone along the Danube in Wallachia. Decebalus also handed over Roman advisors that were given to him as part of the terms from Domitian as well as any Roman
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⁴² Dando-Collins, 377-378.
⁴³ Ibid, 379.
⁴⁴ Ibid, 380.
deserters. Decebalus also had to recognize Rome’s allies as their own and, not surprisingly, would not be receiving any more tribute payments from Rome.

During the time between the two wars, Trajan’s personal architect Apollodorus of Damascus began constructing a massive bridge across the Danube from Moesia to the new territories acquired by Trajan. Written sources have described this bridge as a marvel of engineering and the largest bridge ever constructed in the world at that time. It would also be essential for troop movements in the area and communication between provinces.\(^{35}\) The time between the two wars was also crucial for Trajan who needed to raise two new legions in order to replenish the number of troops lost during the first campaigns into Dacia. Trajan was convinced that Decebalus had to be removed and Dacia must be acquired by Rome in order not to be a threat to future Roman interests. Not surprisingly, Decebalus was not happy with the new peace terms, especially having Roman troops in the former Dacian territory. In order to force Trajan into a new agreement, Decebalus kidnapped Trajan’s legate in Dacia, Longinus, but he drank poison so Trajan would not have to make a new deal. The tension caused by this and mutual troop movements between both sides would lead to the second Dacian War starting shortly thereafter in 105.\(^{36}\)

The Second Dacian War began with Decebalus gathering a new fighting force and attacking the territories he had conceded in the previous war. Trajan quickly launched a counteroffensive with the troops that he had mustered in Moesia and first set on reacquiring Dacian territory he had previously won. Following the successful reacquisition, Trajan moved his armies further into Dacia and wintered his army there.\(^{37}\) When fighting resumed in the spring of 106 Trajan moved his armies to siege Sarmizegetusa, this time with the intention of sacking the city, capturing Decebalus, and dismissing any offer of surrender. Trajan’s armies eventually took the city but Decebalus escaped with some of his

\(^{35}\) Ibid, 396.
\(^{36}\) Dando-Collins, 396-397.
\(^{37}\) Ibid, 400.
closest followers. Before pursuing Decebalus, Trajan made it a priority for his troops to uncover Decebalus’ vast treasure that was hidden beneath a river that had to be diverted. This treasure along with the lucrative gold and silver production facilities and mines that Rome was acquiring funded major building projects in Rome for the next few years. Decebalus tried to regroup with a small force in the mountains near his former capital but ultimately failing to muster enough support, he took his own life before he could be captured. Dacia thus became a province of the Roman Empire. At least one legion would be left stationed there along with many auxiliary units to protect the new infrastructure for the precious metals on which the Empire now depended.  

Nevertheless, the success of Trajan and the wealth acquired from Dacia were not enough to sustain stability for Rome into the third century, in which a series of crises almost brought down the Empire. Restoration of Roman control over its lands would occur toward the end of the third century under Emperor Aurelian. Rome was overstretched in terms of its military capability in effectively controlling its vast territory. In 270, when Aurelian assumed the position of emperor, his priority was just making sure he could protect Italy from opportunistic raiding parties. In that same year, he decided to withdraw military personnel and political administrators from Dacia across the barrier of the Danube into Moesia. To soften this blow to Roman pride, part of Moesia was renamed Dacia so it would not seem that Rome was losing territory. This calculated military action allowed Aurelian to preserve other lands and re-establish Roman control in other parts of the Empire by letting the Danube act as the natural buffer it had been for the Romans in the centuries before the Dacian occupation. Regardless of the political wisdom behind Aurelian’s retreat, it must have been a blow to the Roman families who had lived in Dacia for over 170 years. Roman
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38 Dando-Collins, 404-405.  
39 Potter, 286.
culture would not leave Dacia, however, and the unique union between the two cultures helped make the present-day identity of many Romanians.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The scope of material written on ancient Rome’s legacy is vast, even in Rome’s former frontier areas. The narrative of ancient Rome’s legacy, however, is telling in the perspective on it in contemporary times. The narrative of ancient Rome in both Scotland and Romania are revealing in that they present different ethnic perspectives on Roman heritage. Roman heritage plays a role in the national perspective for both countries as well as how they see themselves globally. For example, one observation suggests that minority groups in Romania have a different view on Roman heritage than majority populations. Scotland, on the other hand, seems to have a more generally accepted narrative of Rome playing a temporary role in the development of the Scottish people.

A recent study by Richard Hingley addresses how border studies is an emerging field that could have tremendous contemporary value in Europe. Hingley bases this theory on the current politics of the European Union (EU), the United Kingdom, and other European countries that are struggling to balance autonomy and unification. The EU has outwardly promoted these frontier sites as an example of a shared heritage that crosses Europe’s internal international borders. These frontier sites are also domestically celebrated by their native countries that take an active role in publicly engaging with the sites. Ethnic variations, however, in former frontier nations also play a role in the perspective of Rome’s legacy in each nation’s identity. One example of Roman heritage being celebrated was a special in England in 2009, in which lights were placed along

---

41 Ibid, 80.
Hadrian's Wall to display it as a bridge uniting Great Britain. England generally celebrates much of its Roman heritage, sites like Hadrian's Wall and the Roman Amphitheater in London becoming major tourist attractions. Roman sites also serve as venues for festivals where locals dress up and re-enact Roman customs. Hingley mentions this appreciation of Roman culture as ironic because of its ties to the rest of Europe and the EU with which the UK is currently trying to break. The EU sees an opportunity with frontier Roman sites to promote a shared heritage that goes in line with the two central concepts it values most, cultural integration and dissolution of borders. The United Nations also draws heavily on the porous nature of Rome's frontier areas as places of integration between Rome and the outside world as much as military checkpoints. The EU particularly emphasizes this point and draws on the international nature of the Roman Limes fortifications that run through several Central European countries. The Roman Limes along with Hadrian's Wall and the Antonine Waa are collectively a UN world heritage site. While the history and archaeology presented from these frontier sites show the clear cultural mixing of Rome and its neighbors, the degree to which Rome mixed with local populations is not agreed. Particularly in Romania, the degree to which Rome “mixed” with local populations can be a disputed topic when considering the ethnic identity of people that live near these sites today.

Nationalist identity in Romania has been a contentious issue since the country was founded in 1859 with the merging of two of the three territories that encompass present-day Romania, Wallachia, and Moldavia. Following World War I, Romania would also annex its third present-day territory of Transylvania. Transylvania alone is a region that had been
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42 Ibid, 85.
43 Ibid, 79.
44 Ibid, 82.
46 Hingley, 83.
subjugated and invaded by many different groups, including the Magyars, Serbians, Ottomans, and eventually the Austro-Hungarian Empire. As a result, the ethnic origins of Romania, especially in Transylvania are diverse. While most citizens in Romania identify as Romanian, some identify also or solely with other ethnic groups of Eastern European origin. Some of these groups include Magyar (Hungarian), Serb, Croat, and Romani (sometimes referred to as Gypsy). Some authors also highlight the differing views on nationalism in Romania and how that can be interpreted through different statistics. Lucian Boia, a Romanian author also uses religion and language to help highlight the ethnic diversity and divide between Western and Eastern loyalties. For example, Boia discusses how Transylvanians felt a strong connection to Roman heritage by converting to become Greek Catholics, also known as Uniates in the 1700s, calling their region of Transylvania “Little Rome.”

The Transylvanian connection to Western Europe is relevant to how Roman heritage is viewed because, depending on ethnic background, Romanians have vastly different perspectives on whom they descend from, as addressed in an article by Duncan Light and Daniela Dumbraveanu. This article discusses the fluidity of interpretation of heritage regarding national identity. Light and Dumbraveanu show history is an essential part of what constructs national identity. Both authors highlight how nationalism, especially in Romania’s case uses landscapes and legends associated with those places to promote national identity. In the case of Romania, Light and Dumbraveanu survey an ethnically diverse group on the importance of Trajan’s bridge built by Apollodorus. The purpose of the bridge was to ferry Roman legions over the Danube River to invade Dacia. The bridge was destroyed a century later during Emperor Aurelian’s retreat to prevent Germanic
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48 Ibid, 25.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid, 24.
armies from following retreating Roman legions. During its existence, the bridge was written about as an engineering marvel and one of the many impressive feats Apollodorus completed for Trajan. Unfortunately, all that remained of the bridge after its destruction was a pillar and a small gatehouse on the southern bank.

This did not stop the 20th-century authoritarian government of Romania from using the bridge as a national treasure to rally around. The bridge was ingrained in the minds of many Romanians from the 1960s through the 1980s as it was featured in Romanian textbooks in schools. This was an important time for Romania’s communist government because party members like Nicolae Ceaușescu were trying to move away from the U.S.S.R. to establish more autonomy. Even today the bridge is still regarded as an important piece of Romanian heritage, unfortunately, the building of a dam along the Danube River in 1984 flooded the area, inundating the area where the bridge was located. The water level rose to a point where the last remaining physical features of the bridge are underwater.

Despite the heavy-handedness of Romania’s government, Light and Dumbravenau’s survey showed that not all Romanian ethnic groups view the bridge the same way. The Romanians who do see the bridge as significant to their cultural heritage point to it as proof of their ethnic connection to western Europe and a rejection of their physical presence and association with eastern Europe. In more than one source I have seen Romanians refer to their country as a Roman island in a Slavic sea.

However, Light and Dumbravenau’s survey also showed that in Transylvania, where there is the most significant and plentiful heritage of Rome, not all Romanians feel that way, especially the Hungarian minority, even Romanian citizens who identify as both ethnically

---

52 Ibid, 33-34.
53 Ibid, 34.
54 Ibid, 34.
55 Light and Dunbravenau, 38.
Romanian and Hungarian. While Light and Dumbravenau’s survey focuses on Trajan’s bridge, it’s clear that those they surveyed of Magyar descent either thought the bridge was getting too much attention or should not be associated with Romanian identity at all. Current Magyar perspectives are partially due to the struggle in Transylvania to establish the roots of Romanians. To ethnic Hungarians, they believe that their people’s migration in the Middle Ages and the centuries of occupation that followed gives them the ethnic claim on Transylvania. Magyar perspective is in stark contrast to Romanians who claim a more homogenous ethnic background. These Romanians, who favored the celebration of Trajan’s Bridge, see the descendants of Romans and Dacians intermixing and staying on in Transylvania, even when the Roman armies retreated and invading tribes took over. Much like the celebration of Hadrian’s Wall in England, the monument is seen as a link between the native land and the rest of Europe.

One of the more controversial interpretations of the dichotomy of Roman and Dacian legacy in Romania is protochronism. Protochronism is a literary theory concept started by a Romanian named Edgar Papu in 1974, which attempts to establish Dacian culture as the reference point for national identity and for much of European culture. Papu doesn’t specifically claim that Romanian Dacian culture had influenced culture in the West, but he implies that certain cultural works that are well-known in other parts of Europe were “anticipated” first in Romania. For example, one of Papu’s earliest theories was that Romanian literalists in the 15th century anticipated baroque literature and that Romanian romantic writers anticipated the concept of existentialism. One of Papu’s motivations in creating protochronism was combating the concept that Romanian literature
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was behind Western European literature. What Pau didn’t know was that this theory would be embraced by many others after him and would be applied to more than just literary concepts but the identity and perception of how some Romanians saw themselves.\textsuperscript{62}

One of the more outlandish proposals protochronism supports is the Dacians played a role in some for all major parts of ancient history and even the ascendancy of major cultures thousands of miles from present-day Romania.\textsuperscript{63} Examples of this would include the first writing being created in Dacia with the Tărtăria tablets, which Neolithic tablets that scientists have found difficult to date but protochronists believe to be over 7,000 years old. This stretch of Dacian influence even includes the foundation of Ancient Rome, which some protochronists credit to migrating Dacians who traveled to Rome and essentially established its Empire.\textsuperscript{64} While the self-aggrandizing motives of all protochronists claims are transparent in trying to elevate its status internationally, the claim of being the true founders of the Roman Empire provides protochronists with the narrative that makes Dacians seem like the winners even if they lost to the Romans, because to the protochronists the Romans are Dacians.

While the view of protochronism is a minority view in Romania, the multiple views of Roman heritage mentioned in other sources parallel the diversity of Romania's population. By looking at how heritage is viewed in different locations in Romania provides perspective on how valued the relics of Rome remain presently.

In Scotland, the Antonine Wall was not the only significant Roman fortification and settlement. Other Roman settlements mainly occur in southern Scotland after the first major attempt to incorporate Scotland fully into the Roman Empire failed in the late first
The second-century invasions spurred the creation of the Antonine Wall and the Romans would consolidate control around the Forth-Clyde and Tyne-Solway isthmuses and establish fortifications and civilian settlements. Some authors suggest that Roman civilian settlements, known as Vici, would have existed outside a military camp and their impact was minimal compared with the soldiers that lived in the area. Other authors like D. W. Harding has said the cultural impact and overall “Romanization,” of Scotland was minimal in spite of their occupation. Harding goes on to say how Romanization had much more lasting effects in other frontier areas than Scotland by citing that even place-names for Roman settlements did not survive after the military withdrew. In contrast to minimal Romanization in Scotland, even Harding acknowledges that the cultural impact of Rome is hard to measure for archaeologists. Especially since the Roman military and civilians in Scotland would have been from many parts of the Roman Empire and brought their own customs. Creating a unique cultural amalgam in each site. Harding also mentions that Rome did have a significant impact on high-status metalwork in all of Britain, including southern Scotland. While most of this high-value metalwork would have been produced further south in modern-day England, this still would have also had an impact on production in Scotland. Some of this metalwork was initially traded further north but archaeologists have found that over time metalworkers in northern Scotland also began to mimic Roman styles as well. Some examples of this metalwork include horse trappings like bridals, strap junctions, and terrets. Other examples of a more artistic variety would be bronze mounts used as embellishments on wooden caskets. This metalwork would have stylized depictions of natural elements like animals and plants used for decoration.
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Brooches also provided an excellent example of the fusion between Celtic and Roman styles. Even with these physical examples, Rome’s influence is not only measured by material goods or what is left of the physical locations they occupied. Rome would have impacted the economy and political establishment in the region with the wealth of goods and diversity of people that came with them.

A recent study by several authors in the journal *Enclosing Space: Opening New Ground Iron Age Studies from Scotland to Mainland Europe*, shows how much the economic and political impact of Rome on the ethnic groups in southern Scotland. In this article, the authors analyze several locations around the Forth River, which include the former Roman military sites of Fairy Knowe, Ochtertyre, Craigarnhal, and several other small sites all of which are in proximity to the city of Stirling. Traditionally, these military forts have been noted for the conflicts that arose between Romans and the Scottish population, but the evidence also shows that Rome had a tremendous effect on trade in this area. It is hard to judge the circumstance of Roman artifacts found at certain sites around Stirling because of the possibility that items of Roman origin could have been spoils of war passed down as heirlooms in local populations. Radiocarbon dating has provided archaeologists with the necessary data to suggest that many artifacts were acquired at times when Romans were settled in the area, probably because of trading. The clear remains of a Roman road also show the extent of trade in the area and help provide context for how Roman goods moved into even contested areas of Britain. One of the main points made in this article is that even though the Roman military was in Scotland to exert authority, the resources they brought with them for trade likely, and ironically, enriched local leadership, even helping to
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create a tiered system among those who would have better access to trade routes. The author hypothesizes that prior to Roman expansion, native populations were in conflict over resources, but when Rome came in with its roads and civilian entourage including traders, it provided an opportunity for local leaders to gain resources and technology previously unavailable. The evidence for this assertion is from artifact hordes found with Roman implements and more advanced styles of Scottish roundhouse settlements. While the departure of Roman armies initially created disorder, which is shown by the destruction of settlements, the authors believe the trade network and hierarchy systems that were established with Roman influence and goods helped create a foundation for the feudal orders of the Middle Ages. Thus, the Romans seem to have had a lasting impact on the ethnic identity of the Scottish people, even if only to speed up the arrival of an economic and political system that had already been established in the Iron Age. These conclusions are relevant to understanding modern perceptions of Roman heritage because they show that new evidence on Rome’s involvement can alter narratives.

The comparison of literary evidence highlights the importance of ethnicity in the question of how integral Rome’s heritage is in its former frontier areas. Ancient Rome was influential enough that almost every nation on earth can say their ancestors were impacted by Rome, but it’s not the same as claiming to be ethnically descended from them. As Hingley stated, the question of identity in Europe is a particularly sensitive topic currently for both governments and their citizens. It’s clear that Roman heritage can be used as a political tool, as demonstrated by the EU or authoritarians like Ceaușescu, who use ancient Rome’s legacy to unite a diverse citizenry that may not have much in common culturally. More studies like Light and Dumbravenau should take place in order to gain insight into other forms of Roman heritage. For example, it would be interesting to see a survey that takes samples of
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multiple ethnic groups in the United Kingdom on the importance of sites like Hadrian’s Wall and the Antonine Wall. Based on these sources I would not be surprised if there was a similar disparity in appreciation between the English and Scots as there is between Romanians and Hungarians on Trajan’s Bridge. There seems to be more association with Roman heritage in England than Scotland, this could partially be attributed to Rome having a longer and more dominating presence there. By going deeper into the role of museums, celebrations, educational curricula, and other cultural institutions it would also shed light on the perspectives of Roman heritage in these locations.

**METHODODOLOGY**

There is, fortunately, a wealth of Roman cultural heritage in both Scotland and Romania, much of which is still be discovered and studied, that can help give perspective on how Rome is viewed in local cultures. How does the presence of ancient Roman cultural heritage affect the narrative history and identity of these two frontiers differently? To answer this question, I will look at several different sources that highlight how both Scotland and Romania interact with their Roman heritage and how they want it to be perceived by foreigners and locals. While all my sources will be in English, some of the sources from Romania will be translated from Romanian or written by Romanian authors in English. There are three types of data that will be used in order to better understand how Roman heritage is viewed in these frontier areas. First, what is the focus of most scholarship about Roman frontier sites in Scotland and Romania, which Roman sites are considered important, and why have certain after sites have not received the same attention. Second, which sites connected with Roman heritage are protected, how are they protected and why. The data here will look at who protects Roman heritage, what is the goal of that protection, and how is it decided that something is worthy of protection. Lastly, how do people interact
with Roman heritage? The data for this last question will focus on which heritage is celebrated or ignored and why. Below, I will list the methodology on which sources I will use for the three data sets I have proposed.

The Roman presence in each frontier location can be used to examine Rome’s role in the development of ethnic identity in respective regions it occupied. Current articles for some frontier sites that are still being studied can show a contemporary perspective on Rome’s role in those areas. In Scotland, for example, this perspective would include archaeological sites like the Antonine Wall and the Roman timber fort in Ardoch. In Romania’s case the Roman forts in Sarmizegetusa Ulpia Traiana, Alba Iulia, Sibiu, and Turda have all had publications written about them and some cases even have their own museums built adjacent to their locations. What most of these sites have in common is that they are large, they have been known by locals for some time, and that the historical record provides insight into their significance. Since these locations are still being studied it would be useful to collect data on how narratives have changed over time for these locations. An analysis of this data will clarify Rome’s level of assimilation into the frontier culture. Current scholarship about recent excavations will also provide necessary data on contemporary objectives in Rome's role in the region. For example, this paper will focus on the purpose of excavations in Rapoltu Mare, Romania, where the archaeology firm ArchaeoTek is currently working with the Romanian government in analyzing the extent of Rome’s presence and involvement in local Dacian culture. From Scotland’s perspective, recent archaeological studies on brochs, which are dry stone roundhouses, will show how Iron Age peoples of Scotland interacted with Roman traders. As already mentioned, Roman sites in Scotland like Fairy Knowe are still yielding important evidence on the perspective of Scots at the time of Roman occupation. Studies of these sites and their contents will reveal the level of dependency and assimilation of Roman material culture in these frontier areas.
ROMAN HERITAGE IN SCOTLAND

In Scotland, the most significant national presence in managing cultural heritage comes from Historic Environment Scotland (HES). This organization is a non-departmental public body, governed by a board of trustees that were appointed by Scottish Ministers. HES has charitable status and is responsible for over 300 properties that are considered nationally important. In addition to organizing locations, it also manages millions of other historical materials, such as drawings, photographs, negatives, and manuscripts. Since HES is a public body they are able to invest £14 million per year to national and local organizations or to provide training and renovations to heritage sites that deem direct support. It's important for any country to have a government-sponsored organization to manage heritage, especially to collaborate with local communities. The challenge, however, even for a well-funded group like HES, is managing a relatively small country that is so dense with cultural heritage. For example, there are many sites with “Known” status, which means they are being considered for funding and protection but are not receiving either. This paper looks at how and why HES prioritizes Roman sites that receive protection and funding. Historic Environment Scotland provides a hands-off approach to cultural heritage sites when local establishments manage sites effectively, but not every site receives the same attention, funding, and protection. Many locations of potential heritage value do not receive any attention. For example, Historic Environments Scotland’s national record website called CANMORE lists over 476 locations in relation to the Antonine Wall that

garner varying degrees of attention.\textsuperscript{81} The Scottish government also promotes heritage festivals such as World Heritage Day. In 2017, Roman heritage was highlighted in one of the events of the day that featured a race between Scots dressed as Picts and others dressed as Roman legionnaires at the Antonine Wall.\textsuperscript{82} The event was obviously meant to promote the prestige of the Antonine Wall and given the national attention, the event clearly shows that Roman occupation plays a large role in the narrative of Scottish identity.

The Antonine Wall’s international fame makes it the most significant relic of Rome’s presence in the country, but it’s not necessarily a symbol of Roman dominance if its history is considered. Rome’s occupation of Great Britain has shown that Rome had relatively firm control of the Southern half Britain from the time of Emperor Claudius in the first century CE to the early fifth century when Roman administrators and the military abandoned the Roman province of Britannia. Rome did, however, dedicate tremendous military and civilian resources attempting to take the entire island of Great Britain several times.\textsuperscript{83} In those military excursions, Rome’s presence was felt, not just through military confrontation but through the establishments of military outposts and civilian settlements that surrounded them. One of the most notable of these fortifications in Scotland, as already mentioned, is the Antonine Wall. This fortification ran about 37 miles from modern Bo’ness near the Forth River all the way to Old Kilpatrick on the Clyde River. It’s considered to be one of the most complex
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frontier fortifications ever constructed by the Roman Army at that time.\textsuperscript{84} It was ordered built by the emperor, Antoninus Pius in 140 C.E. as a military barrier but also a symbol of Rome's power. Built by the Roman general, Quintus Lollius Urbicus with the initial objective of defending the frontier from Caledonian raiding parties, the Antonine Wall's foundation was a bank of turf over 9 feet high and 12 feet wide, which was topped with a wooden palisade. Hundreds of soldiers would have been housed along the wall in approximately 19 forts. On the north side, a deep ditch was put in place for defense and on the other side a road to increase the mobility of soldiers. Caledonian raiders continued despite the wall's presence and it was abandoned by Rome's military around 165 C.E.\textsuperscript{85}

As a UNESCO protected the site, the Antonine Wall is one of the most well-known and historically important Roman relics to survive in Scotland. Under criteria ii of UNESCO’s protection rules, the Antonine Wall was designed to be not simply a barrier between Romans and “barbarian” ethnic groups of Northern Britain but more of a porous venue where these cultures intermixed.\textsuperscript{86} UNESCO then broadly mentions how Rome brought people from all over the Empire to Scotland along with goods from those places, which had a profound effect on the development of the people in that region, even after Rome left.\textsuperscript{87} As with all UNESCO sites, the management of the Antonine Wall falls on local Scottish councils through which the wall runs and the HES and can be especially complicated when looking at large sites like the Antonine Wall. For example, some portions of the Antonine Wall, are completely unprotected and sit on private land despite its world heritage status.\textsuperscript{88} Other locations along the wall are impractical for excavation or preservation due to geography or proximity to existing structures. Large sites can also be complicated in terms of
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management from the local perspective. For the most part, the Antonine Wall has been managed effectively by the cooperation of local governments and it remains free for anyone to explore and read about with placards in key locations.

Today people interact with the Wall in several ways, from simply hiking on its former foundation to participating in various education programs. According to the Antonine Wall official website, visitors can tour several different portions of the wall available to the public. The website lists and provides summaries for over 40 specific locations on the Wall that are either well preserved or carry a special historical significance that encourages visitors to visit. There is even a smartphone application for the Wall to allow visitors to access pertinent information while visiting the site. The organization and attention given to the Antonine Wall obviously demonstrate its importance as a tourist site, but the educational programs promoted by councils provide deeper insight into how the Wall is viewed as local heritage. Educational programs from nursery school to the university level are promoted by the local government to encourage the youth of Scotland to understand how this heritage is a part of their lives. When navigating the official website there are links to downloadable resources and a list of official education standards that assist teachers in using the Antonine Wall in their lessons. Given the level of detail and attention the government pays to this site, it’s clear that Roman cultural heritage is a big part of what the Scottish believe to be a significant part of their past.

Other Roman sites, even large and prestigious ones like the Roman Timber Fort in Ardoch, do not appear to receive the same amount of active management and attention as the Antonine Wall. The Roman timber fort in Ardoch is a good example of how even major sites in Scotland vary with the amount of publicity they receive. The timber fort is located
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about 25 miles north of the Antonine Wall and well into an area of Scotland over which Romans had very little political influence. This fort is listed on Canmore and HES, but they do not have the same kind of internet presence on these sites that encourage visitation comparable to that of the Antonine Wall. The timber fort is significant because it is the best-preserved Roman timber fort in Scotland, and one of the best in the Roman Empire. The fort’s condition makes it especially valuable for continuing to yield archaeological evidence on Rome’s function in the region. It consists of a well-preserved earthwork, annex, a signal station, and five overlapping marching camps. So far, the fort has shown there were three phases of occupation for the Romans there, ranging from the late first century to the early third century C.E. In terms of Scottish identity, this fort became a significant national monument since the first published site plan by Sir Robert Sibbald in 1695, and marks the beginning of antiquarian interest in Scotland. HES does an excellent job of pointing out the significance of the site and its protective status, but given that the site comprises a rectangular site of two hectares, it’s difficult to manage and some portions of the sites are privately owned and managed like the Antonine Wall.

There are other archaeological sites in Scotland that are not seen as Roman but show the extent to which the Romans interacted with local populations. The distribution of Roman finds goes well beyond the Antonine Wall and is very extensive. More Roman objects are found in Scotland the further south one goes, but Roman objects can be found as far as the Inner Hebrides and the Western Isles where rare artifacts were found, such as Spanish amphorae. An excellent example of a site that was a nexus of trade with Rome is Traprain Law. This site was originally a Bronze Age burial site that became a fort to the local
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Votadini people in the Iron Age and during the Roman occupation. The site is located on a laccolith, the result of the geological process of magma swelling below the earth’s surface forcing rocks upward to create a very large hill in an otherwise flat plain. The geological prominence of the site is one of the reasons Traprain Law had seen continuous use by local populations for hundreds of years. This site was the capital for the Votadini people, but many other tribes considered Traprain Law to be an important meeting place. In the Roman period, the main use of Traprain Law would have been for settlement and trade. There is evidence of various types of Roman goods, especially pottery.\(^98\)

The main features left on Traprain Law that can be noticed are the series of Iron Age ramparts that show evidence of being built and rebuilt as one walks up the 221-meter hike to the top. Despite being one of the largest prehistoric forts in Scotland, Traprain Law did not receive much academic attention until excavations began there between 1914-1923.\(^99\)

Shortly after the first excavations, a significant portion of the laccolith became a quarry in 1931, which destroyed much archaeological evidence. This led to a meeting of parliament that gave the rest of the site a protective status in 1966.\(^100\) Historically the site is significant because Traprain law is the best, and possibly only, example of a capital location or meeting place for different ethnic groups in the area before and during the Roman occupation.\(^101\) Traprain Law, like Fairy Knowe and other lowland brochs, helped control the import of prestigious goods from the Romanized south of Britain.\(^102\) These Roman goods helped sustain the political and social status of Scottish ethnic groups. Traprain Law, particularly, was where more high-quality Roman goods would be traded. Even during the Antonine Period, where more mundane everyday objects were traded in other places in Scotland,
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Traprain Law remained a location for prestigious items throughout the Roman period.\textsuperscript{103} Some of the best evidence of these prestigious objects were found in a hoard of Roman silver at Traprain Law in 1919 and is currently displayed at the National Museum of Scotland. This hoard of silver, dated by coins minted in the fifth century, contains over 250 pieces and is the largest hacked-silver hoard found outside the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{104} Archaeologists suspect that the fragments from the hoard were originally pieces of fine silverware used by the upper classes that lived in the region. It’s likely these items were acquired through trade or bribes from the Romans who wanted to maintain stability in the region right outside its borders.\textsuperscript{105} In some cases the silver was kept as the Romans would have had it, displaying mythological or Christian motifs. Other examples from the hoard show how local people melted down the sliver for their own purposes, as with some silver torques found in the hoard.\textsuperscript{106} This hoard along with other artifacts provides an excellent example of the unique combination of cultural characteristics that grew in Rome’s frontier areas. The National Museum of Scotland uses the silver horde and many other examples of Roman heritage to create a narrative of this diffusion that helped shape the contemporary mindset on Roman heritage in the nation.

One of the main permanent exhibits in the National Museum of Scotland is the Scottish History and Archaeology galleries, which display a chronological history of Scotland from the earth’s creation to the present. This exhibit presents a significant amount of data and archaeological evidence on Rome’s presence in Scotland and provides a
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narrative for the duration and influence of Rome’s occupation. Roman heritage is only one portion of the exhibit but it’s intermingled with the heritage of Scots that are contemporaneous in the period of Rome’s occupation. I’ve had the privilege of visiting this exhibition twice, once in 2013 and again in 2017, and both times I’ve come away with a strong impression that Rome’s occupation of southern Scotland influenced them as much as they influenced the Scottish ethnic groups with whom they interacted. Unless otherwise indicated, all the information about Roman heritage from the National Museum Scotland mentioned comes from the descriptions on the museum displays. The artifacts having to do with Roman heritage provide examples of Rome’s military occupation but most objects on display refer to Rome’s religious practices and how they intermingled with various Scottish ethnic groups.

There are various display cases in the exhibit that show a variety of materials used by the Roman military. The exhibit makes a point to mention how the imperialistic goals of the Romans were alien to the Scots, and that the immensity of the Roman Empire would have been hard to contemplate. There is also a clear amount of evidence on display that shows the military nature of Rome, including weapons, tools, and garments used by all Rome’s infantry, cavalry, and auxiliary troops. The exhibit makes a point to show that the auxiliary Roman troops, just like in other places in Rome’s Empire, were locally recruited in some cases and many Scots fought alongside the Romans. The physical evidence displayed shows fittings for horses that were of a local style. In addition to the gear and materials, the exhibit points out the dramatic effect Roman roads made on local populations. The exhibit shows that the Roman roads were gravel highways with milestones that showed the distances between certain places in southern Scotland. However, these roads were not maintained by local leadership after the Romans left and the roads became overgrown. This

did not mean they were not used though, and local populations continued to follow the lines and impressions of the roads that survived after the Romans left.

There are a variety of other materials in the exhibition that feature Roman heritage, notably mixed in with artifacts that are local. Much of the material that has to do with Rome is of a religious nature, which includes altars, votive offerings, contracts, and burial practices.

The exhibition shows that most Scots cremated their dead between 800 B.C.E. to 500 C.E., although high-status individuals performed inhumation with simple grave goods deposited. The Romans used cremation as well, just as they have in other parts of their empire, putting their ashes in small pots. Some symbolism in Roman burials is consistent with other parts of the Empire, such as pinecones being depicted on pottery that symbolizes immortality. The museum also has a striking example of a stone grave monument for a Roman officer, which shows a life-size lion attacking a bearded man with two snakes below him. This sculpture could symbolize Roman dominance over local populations since it is common on the burial locations of Roman officers, the snakes below the scene of carnage were supposed to represent immortality. The museum also shows that Scottish auxiliary troops typically stuck to their local burial practices, even though they similarly cremated their dead.

Altars were created all over Scotland for the various Roman gods worshiped, including Jupiter, Neptune, Ceres, Mars, and various others. Altars were often locations of sacrifice, placement of votive offerings, and they provided
public locations for worship where someone could engage in a contract with a specific god in order to gain their help for a special task. For example, these tasks could be a soldier looking for good fortune in a battle or a woman wishing for a positive outcome in pregnancy. The display shows how Romans would sacrifice animals, offer votive figurines, or gems with the depictions of gods. On display, the altars, which usually have a basin at the top to receive sacrificial wine, have the writing of the person who sponsored them and the god’s name to which they are dedicated. Interestingly, the exhibit shows how not all gods worshipped were traditionally Roman. There is evidence of worship of Sol, a sun god, and Priapus, a fertility god, who were both popular gods throughout the Empire. There is even evidence of Roman gods merging with other gods from conquered territories, as with Jupiter Dolichenus, who was part of an exotic cult that combined Jupiter with a Syrian deity. Importantly, there is also evidence that local deities of Scottish ethnic groups were worshiped by Roman soldiers. The archaeology in the exhibit shows statuary for Brigantia, the chief goddess of local tribes in northern England and southern Scotland depicted as a Roman goddess as well as two other unidentified local deities. While it’s very possible that Scottish auxiliary troops were the ones worshipping the local gods it’s also possible that Roman soldiers accepted these gods as well since it was common to assimilate other gods into the pantheon. The Roman stylized imagery of Brigantia also provides evidence that the Romans and Scots were influencing one another.

The museum also has numerous educational programs and celebrations for Roman heritage. In fact, there is a whole section of the Scottish History and Archaeology Gallery that is catered toward children with interactive displays and even stations where children get
to dress up in period-accurate clothing for Romans. On the National Museum of Scotland’s website, there are also numerous free resources for children, parents, and teachers to discover more about the Romans and the part they play in Scottish heritage.108 The interactive website has interactive games for children, which include map games of the Roman Empire and building a Roman fort. There is a downloadable packet for teachers to use either on a class visit to the museum or something that could be used in the classroom that highlights certain exhibits and artifacts with the Roman heritage that are on display in the main gallery.109 Interestingly, the narrative for all these online resources makes little mention of the Romans mixing with local culture, with the exception of the mention of the Brigantia statue in the teacher resource packet. Collectively, the impression one gets from visiting the National Museum is that the Romans were a separate people from the Scottish ethnic groups with whom they closely interacted, while they did influence each other it would appear that the narrative does not necessarily consider Roman heritage as Scottish.

In addition to the National Museum, there are other online resources for children and teachers to learn more about the Roman presence in Scotland. How Rome is taught in the classroom is important in understanding how the Scots view the posterity of their Roman heritage. On examination of their social studies standard for education, the Scottish National government does not specify that the heritage of specific ethnic groups, like the Romans, has to be taught in the classroom, which is contrary to social studies standards in most U.S. states.110 However, the standards highlight the need for preservation and understanding of any Scottish heritage that contributes to the identity of its people. Specifically for Roman heritage, however, the HES website posts a page dedicated to

providing teachers with various tools for social studies classrooms that are in line with the national standards of teaching with the Scottish government. The main resource is a page with several free downloadable PDFs that highlight four different themes on the Roman presence in Scotland. The first is on the life of a legionary soldier, the second on a Syrian archer, the third on the off duty life of a soldier, and lastly on the cuisine of Romans in Scotland. There is even a PDF dedicated for the teacher to use to help organize all four themes into effective lessons for students that clearly state each lesson’s objective. The resources also include a “Go Roman” game, which involves students trying to experience living like Romans in a video game and lessons highlighting the Antonine Wall. The packet also connects the lessons to at least three standards in the national social studies curriculum that help students develop an awareness of Scotland’s history and the importance of preserving it. Since the HES is sponsored by the national government of Scotland it’s clear that Roman heritage is important to the national narrative, even if the Romans themselves are not mentioned among the ancestors of modern-day Scots.

ROMAN HERITAGE IN ROMANIA

From the Romanian perspective, there is a clear indication that Roman heritage is valued highly from the name of the country alone. The national government takes the main role in monitoring ancient Roman culture with the Ministry of Culture and National Identity. The department’s website shows that the Romanian government has a hands-on approach

to administering the country’s heritage sites.¹¹⁴ This ministry does this on two levels, first, from a legislative and institutional level, and second, from a management level. The Romanian government and formal institutions, like museums, regulate any fieldwork concerning archaeology and prioritizing a Romanian art and cultural presence at an international level, potentially meaning many things, including loaning works to other museums and institutions or cooperating with UNESCO.¹¹⁵ From the management perspective, the Ministry manages all assets, budgets, and funds for all subordinate institutions that manage heritage in the country, which would include independent enterprises in archaeology like ArchaeoTek.¹¹⁶ Romania’s national government has much more oversight responsibility for cultural heritage sites than Romania’s local municipalities. There are various ways locals and visitors interact with Roman heritage in these former frontier areas, which are primarily located in Transylvania. How people interact with Roman heritage is largely dictated by the people and organizations that manage and protect the sites. The data from the sources below will show how and why certain sites still receive public support and what gives some of these sites more attention than others by locals and foreigners alike. Several archaeological sites and museums carry special importance in understanding how ancient Rome plays a role in Romanian national identity. Below major examples of Roman Cultural heritage will be analyzed in the collections of the National Museum in Bucharest, as well as other examples like Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa, the former Roman capital of the Dacian province. Smaller sites and even cultural festivals also play an important role in understanding the presence of Roman heritage in Romania, in
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archaeological sites like the villa at Rapoltu Mare, the Dacian and Roman Civilization Museum in Deva, and the Roman and Dacian heritage festival is known as Dac Fest.\textsuperscript{117}

The Romanian National History Museum has a significant collection of Roman artifacts and replicas. The museum is in the country’s capital Bucharest and is funded and regulated by the Ministry of Culture and National Identity. The museum’s website lists only three permanent displays or exhibitions, all of which either feature Roman heritage or include it significantly.\textsuperscript{118} The website advertises its main collections in line with the goals proposed by the ministry in promoting Romania’s heritage on an international level, as exemplified in the \textit{Historical Treasure} exhibition, a permanent exhibition featuring over 3000 pieces with special histories or made of precious metals.\textsuperscript{119} There are 40 showcases in the exhibition that use religious objects and other cultural treasures to show a timeline of the Romanian people's history. Roman heritage is featured in this exhibition by showcasing golden objects discovered in Roman Dacia and Scythia Minor. Another main permanent exhibition is the Lapidarium that features 165 lithics from Romania, the majority of which are from the time of Roman occupation. The lithics from the Roman period feature architecture, religion, and everyday life in the reliefs and pictures displayed on the artwork.

The last of the three permanent exhibitions is an exact copy of Trajan’s column. The column is prominently placed in the center hall of the museum. The bas-reliefs of the column are well known and depict a very Roman perspective of the two Dacian wars that took place in subjugating the province of Dacia for over a century. The prominent location of this copy is very telling of the national perspective of Romania on Roman heritage. While Dacian culture is considered more native to Romania than Roman, the government has

showcased a copy of a piece that has a completely biased and imperial message of Rome’s dominance.

In odd contrast to Trajan’s column, in 2012 a statue was placed just outside the museum of the Emperor Trajan nude and holding a wolf meant to symbolize Dacia. This statue has received a mixed reception from visitors and locals alike who are not clear on the intention of the artist, a Romanian named Vasile Gorduz, who died four years before the statue was unveiled. Unfortunately, Gorduz never clarified the meaning of the statue from his perspective before he died but it is believed to act as a representation of Roman and Dacian culture coming together to form a modern Romania. This controversial statue of Trajan and other recent artwork like a stone portrait of Decebalus, the Dacian king who challenged Trajan, emphasizes a strong connection with Dacian heritage that may challenge other narratives portraying Rome in a more positive light. The 40 meters tall stone portrait of Decebalus took 12 sculptors 10 years to make and was completed in 2004. It is the tallest rock sculpture in Europe and was the idea of the businessman and historian Iosif Constantin Dragan.

The relief is located on the banks of the Romanian side of the Danube across from the Tabula Traiana, memorial on the Serbian side of the river that the Romans erected in their conquest of Dacia. Clearly, the placement of this relief is meaningful in expressing how many Romanians value their Dacian heritage,
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especially in opposition to the Roman conquest. There is an interesting dichotomy to the relationship between Dacian and Romanian heritage that is apparent in other locations in Romania and that contrasts Scotland’s perspective on how Roman heritage fits their national identity.

The most significant Roman Heritage site in Romania in terms of scale and presence is Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa. This was the Roman capital set up by the emperor Trajan immediately after the second Dacian war in 106, which is dated from an inscription at the site.\textsuperscript{122} The name of the site is meant to mimic and replace the Dacian capital of almost the same name Sarmizegetusa Regia, which is about 47 miles northeast. The location of the Ulpia Traiana was carefully chosen to protect a strategic pass toward the Transylvanian Plateau in the southwest portion of the province of Dacia and the inter-Carpathian part of Transylvania.\textsuperscript{123} The strategic importance of the site obviously meant that there was a permanent military presence there but the type of units and number of troops is debated. A legionary detachment could have been stationed there or at the very least a unit of auxiliary troops.\textsuperscript{124} This site, however, was much more than a military outpost. Ulpia Traiana served as a Roman political, economic, and cultural center for the entire province of Dacia. I was fortunate enough to visit this site in the summer of 2019 and was able to explore the grounds firsthand. In the north of the site, there is an amphitheater, in the east, there was a kind of religious section with several temples, including one to Asclepeion the God of medicine, and in the western portion of the town is a necropolis. One of the largest portions of the site that is well preserved and excavated is the governor’s residence toward the north end near one of the main gates adjacent to the surrounding wall that was meant to protect the town. There is also evidence of manufacturing ceramics at the site, which has brick kilns.
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and evidence of pottery in the southeast portion of the site. One of the last main features of the site is the thoroughly excavated forum, which lies in the center of the town.

Ulpia Traiana was very important in trade for the entire region of Dacia during the periods of Roman occupation. Even though there is evidence of craft manufacturing in the town, the main source of income was agriculture in the surrounding area. This economic presence in the region had a tremendous impact on the entire province since Ulpia Traiana was along such a traveled region. During the Severin dynasty in the early third century, the town saw its greatest increase in wealth, which can be seen in the remains of the site with marble construction replacing wood, more overall artwork, and stone inscriptions. During the Aurelian retreat, when Roman administration and military personal left the city and province, Ulpia Traiana and the rest of Dacia were left to their own devices. Upper classes left with the Romans and the city went into decline economically as the population dwindled. Archaeological and historical evidence shows that any occupation of the Ulpia Traiana was sparse by the end of the fifth century. When Slavs arrived in the sixth century there were only ruins left of the city and Slavs erected a town adjacent to the site called Grădiste, which means "a place with ruins." Largely after this, the site was used as spolia by local inhabitants until the 15th century when antiquarian scholars showed interest in the site. Destruction of the site sadly increased in the late 19th century, even after the first archaeological research began there around the 1830s. Research has remained ongoing at the site with the museum in Deva playing a significant goal preserving its remains.

Today the former Roman provincial capital is protected and managed through the Romanian government in cooperation with the Romanian National Museum and Dacian and Roman Civilization Museum, as is evident as one enters the site from its current main
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entrance on the north end of the town. At this main entrance is a large parking lot, restaurant, concession stand, and gift shop. All the amenities are clearly there to benefit the many tourists that walk around the site. The entrance fee is only around $2.00 U.S. and once inside one is free to walk around non-restricted areas. On my visit, I saw two armed security guards protecting the site but no other staff to speak with tourists other than at the entrance. Overall the main portions of the very large site were well groomed with cut grass and many informational signs, the majority of which had descriptions in four languages: Romanian, English, French, and German. Even though there are brief descriptions in most general areas, there are not many signs available to describe specific portions of larger construction, such as the amphitheater. One of the currently excavated portions of the site that is the former court area adjacent to the forum, it had scaffolding and signs explaining what was happening there, but it was all in Romanian. Overall one gets the impression that the site is cared for and important to the local population. It is obviously a source of tourist revenue for locals at the very least and most Romanians I spoke to within the vicinity seemed proud and aware of their Roman heritage.

Adjacent to the archaeological site is a museum with some of the more valuable and delicate artifacts from Ulpia Traiana. As one enters the museum it is again clearly marked as a branch of the National Museum. The museum is small with two floors and no more than eight modest indoor galleries and an outdoor lapidarium, a common feature at most museums in Romania with Roman stone remains. Most of the artifacts in the museum are friezes, busts, or objects made of precious metal. One of the more impressive aspects of the museum is the number of authentic reproductions adjacent to actual artifacts. The reproductions served as a reference to the actual artifacts, which in many cases were so degraded that it was not obvious what the artifacts were or their purpose. For example, there were many reproductions of armor and clothing to show the different ranks of the
Roman military that would have been stationed at Ulpia Traiana. In some cases, objects were labeled in English but unlike the archaeological site, all descriptions in this museum were in Romanian. Overall the museum seems to cater primarily to Romanian visitors. Ulpia Traiana is difficult to find in most American travel guides and unless an American was studying Rome in that part of Europe I would be surprised if they had heard about it. Nevertheless, exploring Ulpia Traiana is valuable in gaining an understanding of what Roman heritage means on a local and national level.

A little under 100 miles northeast of Ulpia Traiana in the archaeological site of Apulum, another major Roman military site known as a castrum, which is legion’s camp. Apulum today sits in the middle of the modern city of Alba Iulia and is overlaid in many places by other important cultural remains from the Middle Ages and modern architecture. Established around the end of the second Dacian war in 106, Apulum was a camp that was arguably as important as Ulpia Traiana. Built next to the advantageous location of the Mureș River in Transylvania, it was on the route that connected Ulpia Traiana with other cities and towns in the interior portion of the Dacian province. Like Ulpia Traiana, the inscriptions and artifacts at Apulum show that it had a bustling economy with artisans, merchants, and veterans living among the eight legions that were stationed there.\textsuperscript{128} Archaeological excavations began there in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century and have continued up to the present with some of the latest excavations in 2007 sponsored by the National Museum in Alba Iulia and Lucian Blaga University in Sibiu.\textsuperscript{129}
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A report was written on the 2007 excavations highlighting some of the challenges facing the preservation of Apulum and further excavations. The report sites that many portions of Apulum have faced potential destruction from modern-day construction projects in Alba Iulia. The 2008 report highlights a law passed by Romania’s parliament in 1997 that spurred the National Museum and Lucian Blaga University to take action to preserve the remains of Apulum. The law stipulates that the value of the archaeological heritage must be accessible to the public in order to ensure they understand the value of it. As a result, the finds from the 2007 excavation have been put on special display in Alba Iulia and have provided a protective status to what has survived construction on the Apulum site. It is also apparent from Alba Iulia's official website that they value Roman heritage and consider it part of the long narrative of major historical events to affect the people who live there. There is even a replica of the Capitoline Wolf with Romulus and Remus in the center of the town.

Smaller sites also reveal important evidence on Rome’s presence in Dacia and the extent to which Roman culture flourished and mixed with local customs. As already mentioned, ArchaeoTek a small private field school has been working on a site that was discovered in 2015 on a small farm in the outskirts of a town in Transylvania called Rapoltu Mare.

The land was purchased by a local archaeologist, Dr. Andre Gonciar, who is one of the directors of ArchaeoTek that has partnered with the museum in Deva and is in cooperation with the Romanian government to excavate the site. Since excavations began in 2015, it has been revealed that this site contains a Roman-style villa that was likely owned by someone very wealthy. The archaeology shows that Roman artifacts are present from around the time of first Dacian War up until the Aurelian retreat, most of which has been dated from Roman coins found and other Roman artifacts. The wealth of the site is also exemplified with some of the archaeological evidence, such as jewelry and frescoes that are on the inside and outside of portions of the two structures that have been found. No mosaics were found, but many beautiful floor bricks known as tegulae. The goal of the ArchaeoTek excavation isn’t just to reveal who lived in this settlement and how potentially vast it was but how the Rome interacted with local cultures to create a diffusion of Roman and local customs.133 This excavation has also yielded archaeology going back to the Neolithic Era and has proven to be a site rich with information about settlement in this particular region in Transylvania going back thousands of years.

I was fortunate enough to attend the field school for the excavation this past summer for a three-week session in July and was able to see and experience finding proof of unique Roman

heritage in the area. I was also fortunate that Dr. Gonciar gave me permission to discuss some of the findings that pertain to my thesis and use my own photos of the site. Two of the most notable finds that will be mentioned in the completed site report for the 2019 season are a unique crossbow fibula and what is believed to be a bronze amulet. The fibula is a very rare example of crossbow design made in iron and one of the archaeologists from the museum of Deva, Dr. Marius Barbu said it was likely a unique style to the Romans living in Dacia. The bronze amulet, which was found just a few feet from me, is even more unique. After being cleaned and studied by Dr. Gonciar and Dr. Barbu, the current interpretation of the artifact is that it is a rare depiction of Venus, the Roman goddess of love and fertility. The amulet depicts the front of the figure on one side and the back on the other. Possibly, this is the only example of this type of Venus amulet showing her front and back. Dr. Gonciar and Dr. Barbu have a working theory of this amulet, which is that Venus is making a “hush” gesture with her hand, possibly meaning that the wearer of such an amulet wanted to keep secret an indiscretion. These were just two examples of the artifacts that show how the diffusion of Dacian and Roman cultures created their own unique heritage but even more examples from Rapoltu Mare and other sites in Transylvania could be found at the Deva museum, which is also referred to as the Dacian and Roman Civilization Museum.

The protection status for Rapoltu Mare is tenuous at best, any valuable artifacts that can be moved are properly recorded and stored in a secure area but even while I was there unauthorized people would try and access the site. Many local people have used bricks from the site as spolia, including a neighboring house that took bricks from the site for their
outdoor grilling area. There is an anxiety among the archaeologists that if goldware is found on the site looting could become an even more serious problem and would invite more direct government involvement in the excavation. As of now, the government allows ArchaeoTek to dig but their privileges could change depending on the interpreted value of what is found on the site. It also remains unknown what will be done with the site once excavations conclude. There is no foreseeable date for the conclusion of excavations since the site keeps yielding important information and another structure that may be part of the villa that has yet to be excavated. Plans have already been made for another excavation in 2020, but Dr. Gonciar is not sure what will happen to this site when excavations finally do cease. The main concern is that government money may not be available to protect this site and make it available to the public. In the meantime, the Dacian and Roman Civilization Museum is doing everything it can’t catalog the villa and will likely exhibit items from there once work on the site is officially published.

The Dacian and Roman Civilization Museum in Deva is in the northern portion of this Transylvanian city. This modestly sized museum is linked to the Hunedoara County History and Archaeology Society that was founded in 1880 and has been playing a role in a major archaeological project in Transylvania since that time. For example, it helps run the adjoining museum at Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegethusa in addition to helping excavate smaller projects around Transylvania like Rapoltu Mare. The location of the museum today is sandwiched between a large public park and the base of a very large hill that is topped by the famous Deva Citadel, another historically important monument. The museum is housed in the 19th-century architectural monument that was as a mansion residence known as the Magna Curia building or Bethlen Castle. The museum’s two-floors have an impressive collection of Romanian heritage that goes beyond Dacian and Roman, including medieval, military, and modern era items. There are also natural history galleries that take up at least
half the galleries on the first floor and focus on the physical science in Transylvania and the rest of Romania.\footnote{Museum of Dacian and Roman Civilization Official Website, \url{http://www.mcdr.ro/despre-noi-mcdr-deva}, (Accessed November 24, 2019).}

The ArchaeoTek field school students and I were given a guided tour of the Deva Museum by Dr. Barbu, who happens to be one of the head curators. He showed us the outdoor lapidarium, which contained many excellent examples of Roman stonework, some of which were in well-protected glass shelters. He also showed us artifacts from the site we were working on at Rapoltu Mare that will eventually go on display in the museum once a published report on the villa site appears, including various pottery, weapons, and jewelry cleaned and currently in storage at the museum. One of the more impressive aspects of the museum were interactive displays, of which there were several scattered around different galleries. The interactive displays consisted of a large television and Kinect X-box One sensor bar that is usually used for video games but the museum staff had devised software that allowed a museum visitor to virtually manipulate artifacts that had been 3-D scanned at high resolution. One user at a time could use this device to turn and zoom in on selected artifacts by simply making gestures with their hands. The interactive display not only allows museum visitors to look at an object from different angles but also examine fine details that normally would be missed with the naked eye. The museum also has a webpage
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allowing a visitor to manipulate these artifacts on their own from any internet-connected device. The most notable artifact that could be manipulated this way also happened to be one of the most relevant artifacts at the museum with its own gallery, which is a bronze hexagonal mold used for various precious metals found at the Dacian capital of Sarmizegetusa Regia.

When Dr. Barbu explained the significance of this bronze mold, citing the descriptions around the gallery, it was clear that this artifact offers evidence of the close link between Romans and Dacians. In 2013, this artifact was found in the twisted roots of a tree that was being removed from the former Dacian capital, which is now a national park and UNESCO world heritage site. Dr. Barbu explained that the roots had helped preserve the artifact and prevented its discovery during previous excavations or by park visitors. The wear on the item shows it was used multiple times. The engravings are negative so that sheets of precious metal such as copper, silver, and gold could be melted over the mold and used to create various ornamental applications of a variety of different animals and mythical creatures. Significantly, the engravings on the mold show decorative styles that are Roman and North Pontic, showing how Dacians mixed with neighboring cultures with their own. In his lecture to us on the mold, Dr. Barbu mentioned that this artifact, which he plans to publish, is very significant in understanding the dually important role that both Dacian and Roman culture play in Romanian identity.

In addition to museums and heritage sites, there is a local annual cultural festival just outside Simeria, Romania called “Dac Fest,” which always takes place in July and began in
2009. The ArchaeoTek field school encouraged all its students to attend this event between July 12-14, which I visited for two of the three days it ran. The festival took place at the foot of a rock outcrop called Măgura Uroiului, which has multiple archaeological sites that have to do with Dacians and Romans. This festival, which partially run by local historians and archaeologists, most of whom work at the Museum of Dacian and Roman Civilization, gives a contemporary perspective on Roman heritage in this region of Romania. Local communities and Romanians from all over the country partake in this event. There were even many international visitors and Ancient Rome enthusiasts who attended as well. The whole event is spread out in a large field at the base of Măgura, with food vendors and small gift stands set up near the main entrance. Taking most of the field to the center and west of the open area are recreations of a Dacian camp on the north end and Roman camp on the south. Between them is an open field where various reenactments are preformed from Vestal Virgin dances to gladiator fights and mock battles meant to depict events between the Romans and the Dacians. Those specific historical battles acted out are not announced to the public so that no one knows what the outcome will be until the performance is finished. Of the several performances, I saw both the Dacian side and the Roman side had opportunities to win, showing no bias to one culture or the other.

What set this festival apart from similar festivals I have seen in the United States, such as Renaissance Fairs, is the level of dedication by everyone portraying a Dacian or Roman. Even non-performers were well versed in the Dacian and Roman history and were eager to talk to visitors in multiple languages about their role in the festival and who they were meant to portray. Many participants had specific jobs that recreated the camp life of the Dacians and Romans,
which included blacksmiths, weavers, coin minters, artisans, cooks and many more. Not only would someone make authentic replicas of objects used during the occupation of the Romans, but they would explain the process and even sell them in some cases. Visitors can also participate in some of the activities such as coin minting, which I participated in when I noticed a group of re-enactors dressed as Roman legionaries showing other visitors. Many of the reenactors doubled as vendors, many of which are archaeologists or historians themselves who use the festival as an opportunity to show off their skills in experimental archaeology. For example, Dr. Barbu practices experimental archaeology with blacksmith techniques contemporary to the time of Roman occupation. Dr. Barbu also participates in the mock battles as a Dacian soldier and he makes all his armor and weapons that are based on real artifacts found in Dacia. He even made a 3-D model of the Dacian bronze mold, which he then used to create embellishments to his armor and shield.

Even though this festival has only been going for ten years it’s clear that it plays a large role in the local culture given the attendance of hundreds of people that showed up for all three days. In neighboring Simeria there were posters put up all over the city and locals encouraged us to go to the festival weeks in advance. Dac Fest is clearly an important cultural event where Romanians in Transylvania have an opportunity to connect to their Dacian and Roman roots.

**ANALYSIS**

The Roman heritage in Scotland and Romania mentioned in this paper has shown that both former Roman provinces have their own unique responses to the Empire’s impact. While they both show reverence to it in the history of their nation, there is a clear difference between both countries in how Rome is perceived in terms of ethnicity. The unique perspectives on ancient Rome can be understood if the narrative of each country’s history
and national identity is analyzed. While both countries consider ancient Rome to be a major player in the development of each location, there are variations to Rome’s role in ancestry. Another challenge to understanding where Roman heritage fits in the national narrative is that it’s very difficult to interpret who exactly a “Roman” was, especially when referencing Rome’s military. In many cases, Roman soldiers were not from the Italian peninsula or Roman citizens, but recruits who came from far-flung parts of its Empire and scattered to different locations. In both Scotland and Romania, many of these soldiers settled and stayed in these provinces, even after Rome abandoned political control. There are clear examples of assimilation of Roman cultural characteristics, along with other places the Romans conquered, merging with local customs, as can be seen in artifacts like the Brigantia statue in the Scottish National Museum and the bronze mold in Romania. Our modern interpretation of national identity, a relatively new concept that gained popularity in Europe in the 19th century, was not necessarily how people identified themselves in the heterogenous frontiers of the Roman Empire. Therefore, it’s important to look at the context of nationalistic development in both Scotland and Romania in order to gain perspective on how Rome’s heritage is viewed.

In Scotland, it was very difficult to find any sources or verbiage in museums that referred to Romans as anything but an occupying power. Given the strong presence of the military artifacts and structures including the most impressive Roman remains, including the Antonine Wall and Ardoch timber fort, it’s not surprising that Rome’s dominant presence in the historical narrative is imperialistic in nature. On closer inspection, however, artifacts show that Roman heritage influenced the peoples of Scotland politically, economically, and socially. As mentioned, it’s clear that some ethnic groups in Scotland joined up with the Roman military auxiliary units and even shared religious practices with them. Influence goes further when considering the access to a wider trade network that
Romans provided, which had been previously unknown to northern Britain. This economic influence helped establish power structures in Scotland that led to the rise of feudalism after Rome abandoned Britain. These trade networks allowed local lords to establish enough wealth to create fiefdoms for themselves among local inhabitants, which directly influenced the political outcomes in the Middle Ages. Despite this influence, it’s also important to remember that Rome was only in Scotland for a little over a century and was never able to establish the political dominance it had in southern Britain. Thus, Scotland never having been completely “conquered” plays an enormous role in the perspective Scots have on Roman heritage. This is not to say that there isn’t present evidence of Scots greeting Roman heritage warmly. The amount of local dedication and effort to preserving Roman heritage, through sponsoring interaction through education, tourism, and public events, show that Scots value Rome’s role in its history and development. Taken all together, the brief but influential presence of Rome in Scotland shows a national appreciation but not necessarily a national identification with Roman heritage.

Romania, on the other hand, presents a much more direct connection to Roman heritage playing a role in national identity. While the name of the nation and the national language, present some of the closest and most obvious links between Romania and Rome, the cultural heritage examined here presents even closer bonds between the two. Even though most Roman heritage is found in its former province of Dacia in the region of Transylvania, its presence is felt all over the country. The short presence of Rome’s direct control of Dacia for just over a century also has not tempered its importance in national identity, especially with those who consider themselves ethnically Romanian. As mentioned, Romania has faced nationalistic upheaval in the past century that has dramatically changed the role of Romans and Dacians in its historical narrative. From the annexation of Transylvania in the First World War to the rise of communism and the autocracy of Nicolae
Ceaușescu, the view of Roman heritage has significantly shifted over the course of the last hundred years. Roman and Dacian heritage have been used as political tools to manipulate populations by autocratic governments in order to create a national identity. Depending on who was in power to control the narrative, either Rome or Dacia could be the dominant culture in Romanian heritage. Political propaganda aside, both Rome and Dacia play an important role in how ethnic Romanians see themselves. Some Romanians, like protochronists take very unique perspectives on Roman heritage by trying to combine with Dacian legacy but others in Romania don’t see Rome as part of their identity at all. While the country does have a large Hungarian and Romani population, both of which do not strongly identify with Roman heritage, many people do show a sense of national pride in Roman sites and museums. In addition, the national government still has a tremendous amount of oversite on how and when Roman heritage is presented. Romania's acceptance in the EU has also bolstered the government’s involvement in preserving and promoting Roman heritage as another cultural link between Romania and Western Europe. Even though the national government has the strongest presence in Roman heritage, local institutional involvement has made it relevant to locals and foreigners alike. Local museums like the Museum of Dacian and Roman Civilization have made Roman archaeology accessible for field schools, tourists, and local people to appreciate and interact. In addition, cultural festivals like Dac Fest literally bring Roman heritage to life. Dac Fest unites Romanian communities and international visitors to participate in customs that are uniquely Romanian as they address the diffusion between Dacian and Roman cultures during the Empire's occupation.

In summary, it's hard to really define what Roman heritage is because of its ubiquity and multicultural nature. There are recognizable elements and prestige that come from being associated with a culture that lasted so long and united so many different people. As
this paper has mentioned, however, there is still more to learn from Rome’s time in frontier areas and the level of mutual influence Rome had with local populations. Rome’s imperialistic presence in so many locations will continue to be debated as a benefit or hindrance to the places they occupied, but its importance in the development of countless cultures is undeniable. Perspective on Roman heritage, like all heritage, will change as time goes on and how that change affects identity depends on the people who live in the former frontier areas and how they choose to interact with that heritage.
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