

Cite as:

Killgrove, K. 2014. Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, C. Smith, ed., Springer., pp. 876-882. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2.

## **Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire**

In: *The Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*

Kristina Killgrove

University of West Florida

Department of Anthropology

### Introduction

Much of a person's life history is written on his or her bones. Skeletal remains of past populations are palimpsests of information about the behaviors people engaged in during their lives. The bioarchaeological study of burials from around the Roman Empire is a relatively new undertaking but has proven to be an essential line of evidence for understanding the demographic makeup, health status, and dietary regimes of the heterogeneous peoples that comprised the imperial population. Owing to a growing database of skeletal remains, bioarchaeologists are leading the way in answering questions about migration and urban life in the Roman Empire. Through an integration of bioarchaeological studies with traditional analyses of material culture and texts, the diversity of the Romans in all areas of the Empire is becoming apparent.

### Definition

Bioarchaeology is the study of skeletal remains from archaeological sites. The term osteoarchaeology is also used, primarily in Europe, and through the years both terms have been broadly defined as including skeletal material from both humans and animals. Owing to the influence of New Archaeology, however, since the 1970s, bioarchaeology has conventionally dealt with the physical remains of humans from burials found in the archaeological record. In the U.S., bioarchaeology is considered a subspecialty of biological anthropology, whereas in Europe the field is more closely allied with archaeology and anatomy.

An individual skeleton is the unit of analysis in bioarchaeology, but inferences about past behavior can only be reconstructed through a survey of the population and its sociocultural context. As such, bioarchaeology is an interdisciplinary field, incorporating techniques and theoretical approaches drawn largely from biology, anatomy, demography, anthropology, and archaeology. When used as a way to study the people of the Roman Empire, bioarchaeology also draws from classical philology, historiography, epigraphy, architecture, and artifact studies in order to situate the skeletal population under consideration within a cultural milieu.

### Historical Background

In one sense, the roots of classical bioarchaeology can be found in ancient authors. In the mid 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, Herodotus, reporting on the aftermath of a Persian War battle (*Histories* 3.12.2-3), noticed that the skulls of the Persians were brittle whereas those of the Ethiopians were quite strong, and he attributed this difference to sun exposure by the Africans. While Herodotus was not correct in this correlation, his observation foreshadowed discussions in biological anthropology of the effects of the environment on the human skeleton.

The osteological study of burials has been a part of Roman archaeology since at least the 19<sup>th</sup> century. At this time, cursory analysis of skeletons with the objective of culling demographic histories was always subsumed by publication of grave goods in large site reports,

Cite as:

Killgrove, K. 2014. Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, C. Smith, ed., Springer., pp. 876-882. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2.

sending biological material to languish in appendices. The sex of a skeleton was assigned based on associated artifacts as often as estimated by biological markers.

In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, biological anthropology in the U.S. and Europe developed similarly, as researchers attempted to look at skeletons, especially the skull, for evidence of diffusionary traits. Coupled with such pseudo-scientific tools as Retzius' cephalic index, biological anthropology in Italy, for example, became heavily invested in discovering the 'true race' of the Italians and explaining the Mezzogiorno, and American anthropology in finding a biological basis to support the practices of slavery, racism, and forced removal of Natives. Skeletal measurements, when twisted to fit preconceived notions of racial superiority, represented both a reliance on early empiricism and the rise of nationalist movements in Europe and America. This legacy of cranial indices and –cephalic suffixes, unfortunately, is still seen today in some Mediterranean bioarchaeological publications, but the field has evolved immensely just in the last decade.

Bioarchaeology arose as an independent field of research in the 1970s under the guidance of Jane Buikstra and other proponents of the science-focused New Archaeology. Researchers began to study skeletal collections housed around the world in order to answer research questions beyond chronology and typology of burials. In the 1980s, with the advent of post-processual archaeology, bioarchaeologists started asking how diet, behavior, and disease differed along the lines of status and gender. By the 1990s, bioarchaeology was coming into its own. Data recording practices and techniques were standardized in the U.S., but many European researchers still use a variety of data standards. At the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, several international laboratories and research centers that deal with classical bioarchaeology had been established, such as the Wiener Laboratory at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, the Servizio di Antropologia of the Soprintendenza Speciale per i Beni Archeologici di Roma, the Centre National de la Recherche Scientific in France, and English Heritage in the U.K.

Within the last decade, bioarchaeology has entered the 21<sup>st</sup> century by increasingly employing chemical techniques such as isotope and DNA analyses to answer questions about population interaction, dietary differences, and the origin and spread of disease. There has also been a trend towards osteobiography, or creating detailed, individualized life histories from skeletal remains, often accompanied by a forensics-based facial reconstruction. Classical bioarchaeology today is balancing scientific and humanistic approaches in order to understand life in antiquity.

### Key Issues and Debates

Although classical archaeology was founded on an historical tradition in which material remains were mainly used to illustrate the vast body of Latin literature, today's Roman bioarchaeologists ask their own questions about what life was like in ancient times, in part to provide a history to those segments of society that did not merit inclusion in elite writing. Key areas of Roman bioarchaeology research in the past decade have focused on questions about diet, migration, and disease in the Empire. The majority of this research has been done on skeletal assemblages from Rome and from Britain and has been published in the traditional venue of peer-reviewed anthropology journals. There is a growing movement towards synthetic treatment of bioarchaeological data from the classical world, however, that is reaching an audience made up of both anthropologists and classicists.

Cite as:

Killgrove, K. 2014. Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, C. Smith, ed., Springer., pp. 876-882. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2.

The Imperial Roman diet, particularly for the lower classes, has been reconstructed primarily through the agricultural writings of authors such as Cato, Varro, and Columella. People in all parts of the Empire subsisted on cereals, fruits, and vegetables generally in the form of bread, olive oil, and wine. There is little evidence, however, of the diversity that existed in the Roman diet, and there has been disagreement about the role of seafood and the consumption of millet. Bioarchaeologists have weighed in with chemical analyses of skeletal tissue in an effort to demonstrate that different imperial populations used different alimentary resources.

Carbon and nitrogen isotope analyses from bone collagen yield a general picture of a person's diet in the years leading up to death. Because carbon enters the food chain through photosynthesis, a human's carbon isotope ratio is largely affected by the kind of plants he or she ate. Additionally, there are two major photosynthetic pathways, which means that carbon isotopes can distinguish a diet reliant on temperate grasses such as wheat and barley from a diet reliant on tropical grasses such as millet and sorghum. Nitrogen in the human diet is obtained primarily through consumption of other organisms, so understanding nitrogen isotopes means understanding an organism's position in the food chain. The values of nitrogen isotopes therefore range from very low, indicating a diet composed of legumes, to very high, indicating a diet composed primarily of aquatic resources.

Isotope research on skeletons from Imperial Italy has shown great differences in diet. In the shadow of the city walls of Rome, people were eating more millet and less seafood than were people from Portus Romae (Prowse 2001; Killgrove 2010). Skeletons from the early Christian necropolis of San Callixtus in the Roman suburbs further revealed an ascetic diet for this religious group, with consumption of freshwater fish from the Tiber River (Rutgers et al. 2009). Correlation between frequency of external auricular exostosis, an ear pathology related to cold water immersion, and nitrogen isotope values for people from Portus and Velia, a site on the Tyrrhenian coast, further demonstrates that the population of Imperial Italy was indeed consuming both freshwater and saltwater resources (Crowe et al. 2010). Differences in diet at Portus have also been found to reflect age, with children eating more terrestrial food and older adults consuming more olive oil and wine (Prowse et al. 2005), and there is evidence that foreigners at Rome changed their diet after immigrating and consumed less millet (Killgrove 2010). Diet also varied within populations and through time in Roman Britain (Müldner & Richards 2007); nevertheless, isotope studies on several skeletal series have revealed that Romano-British people ate a largely terrestrial diet composed of plants, meat from herbivores, and a small amount of marine or freshwater fish. Chemical analyses of skeletal remains are therefore providing bioarchaeologists with information about the diets of individuals and of populations, giving new insight particularly into the diet of lower-class Imperial residents.

The phenomenon of migration and its implication for the demographic structure of the Empire has previously been investigated through census records and inscriptions on tombstones. As the center of Imperial power, Rome itself had a great number of free immigrants and slaves who hailed from elsewhere. Identifying immigrants and slaves in the archaeological record has been challenging, however, because most were not noted as such in inscriptions or through artifact assemblages in graves. A major contribution of bioarchaeology in recent years has been the application of chemical techniques to identify population diasporas within the Empire.

Isotopes of strontium and oxygen are most commonly used to distinguish immigrants from locals in a skeletal assemblage. Strontium is incorporated into the human body during

Cite as:

Killgrove, K. 2014. Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, C. Smith, ed., Springer., pp. 876-882. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2.

growth via groundwater, and the strontium isotope ratio derived from a human's dental enamel reflects the geology of the area in which the person grew up. Lower strontium values generally indicate younger geology, such as volcanic areas, while higher values are indicative of older rock. Oxygen isotopes incorporated during tissue development are related to the overall climate of the area; lower values suggest a person grew up in a colder, wetter climate, and higher values suggest life in a warmer, drier climate. Some strontium and oxygen isotope studies have been done in the Roman Empire, but until significantly more data are available, interpretations are necessarily conservative in nature.

In the Roman suburbs, a strontium and oxygen study of dental enamel from the first molar, which forms between birth and three years of age, showed that roughly one-third of the people tested arrived at Rome from elsewhere (Killgrove 2010). Interestingly, these immigrants to Rome did not have significantly more diseases than the locals, but the two groups ate different diets as children. Similarly, an oxygen isotope analysis of the first and third molars from individuals buried at Portus Romae suggested one-third of the population moved there during childhood (Prowse et al. 2007). It is not currently possible to pinpoint an immigrant's homeland, but general trends in the data from Rome and Portus suggest that people were arriving in these cities from nearby areas such as the Apennines but also from areas with strikingly different geology and climate. Further, research on migration in the Roman suburbs suggests that the practice was not confined to young men, as there is ample evidence of immigrant women and children in the bioarchaeological record.

Migration did not occur just to Rome and to other large urban centers (Eckardt ed. 2010). In southern Italy, a combination of oxygen isotope analysis and ancient DNA analysis revealed an adult female with east Asian ancestry, whose burial form and grave goods otherwise did not indicate she originated elsewhere. In the Romano-British burial ground of Spitalfields, a woman who was buried in a decorated lead coffin was shown through Pb isotope analysis to have originated in Rome. Several strontium and/or oxygen isotope studies have been conducted on Romano-British skeletal series in the past decade. By and large they reveal a great deal of mobility in the area. At the sites of York, Gloucester, and Lankhills, for example, only about half of the people studied could be considered locals, while about fifteen to twenty percent were from elsewhere in England, and twenty to thirty-five percent were long-distance migrants. And in Bavaria during the later Empire, a skeletal series affiliated with a Roman fort at Neuburg revealed through strontium isotope analysis that approximately thirty percent of the population came from elsewhere; women and children immigrated to the site in addition to men (Schweissing and Grupe 2003).

Isotope analyses of skeletal tissue are yielding new information on patterns of migration within the Roman Empire as well as on the demographic makeup of both urban and rural settlements. Physical mobility within the Empire was quite high, and immigration was not by any means unidirectional. The reasons for population mobility, however, are still uncertain. Diasporas of people likely occurred with slavery and to a lesser extent with military service, but migration may also have been an option for families and for free individuals looking for work or for a spouse. The growing database of strontium and oxygen isotope data is revealing the great distances that people migrated in antiquity, and new applications of DNA analysis point the way forward for bioarchaeologists interested in contributing to the conversation about mobility and migration in the Empire. In the future, the challenge will be to integrate the scientific data drawn

Cite as:

Killgrove, K. 2014. Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, C. Smith, ed., Springer., pp. 876-882. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2.

from chemical analyses of skeletons with the historical evidence from inscriptions and censuses to glean new information about the demographic fluctuations of imperial populations.

Only within the last ten or fifteen years have reports of trauma and disease in the archaeological record evolved from case studies of pathological conditions to large-scale research into the prevalence of specific diseases in imperial populations. The recent debate on health in the Roman Empire starts with a look at systemic factors that may have increased people's stress, including urbanization, malnutrition, hygiene and sanitation, as well as the comorbidity of various infectious diseases and parasites. The health of an individual and of a population is multifaceted, and researchers have employed skeletal remains from both Rome and Britain, in addition to primary and secondary source material, to argue that the Empire was not a particularly salubrious place to live.

Pathological data from several skeletal series in Rome have been published (Catalano, Scheid & Verger ed., 2008; Eckardt ed., 2010). Most suggest that there were significant health stressors for people living in the city and suburbs, as evidenced by high frequencies of enamel hypoplasia and cribra orbitalia and by a decrease in overall stature during the Empire. Hypoplasias are defects in the formation of dental enamel and can be caused by a number of health issues, including malnutrition, disease, and weaning; cribra orbitalia is generally considered to result from iron-deficiency anemia, which in turn can be caused by nutritional deficiencies or disease; and variation in adult stature, particularly a trend in shorter stature, results when an individual is stressed during childhood, as from disease or malnutrition. In general, skeletal series from Rome show higher frequencies of enamel hypoplasia and cribra orbitalia and shorter stature than do series from Britain, likely owing to the urban nature of Rome, which had high population density and unequal resource allocation. Through time, the British skeletal series also provide evidence for a decrease in stature as well as increased exposure to anthropogenic lead in the Roman period. One suggestion for the decline in health during the Roman Empire is the presence of endemic malaria in the Mediterranean. Malaria in antiquity has been the subject of debate for a number of years; however, the skeletal evidence is still inconclusive, particularly since not all Roman skeletal series show high frequencies of cribra orbitalia. Also problematic in the debate about disease in the Empire is the current lack of standardization in data collection practices, particularly for lesions that may indicate anemia and, by extension, malaria.

Morbidity and mortality in a population are complicated processes dependent on a variety of environmental and sociocultural factors. With few fully published skeletal series outside of Roman Britain, the disease ecology within the Empire as a whole is still largely unknown. Research that synthesizes the available historical and osteological information on population size, sanitation, nutrition, and disease is becoming more common in bioarchaeological research in general, opening up a worldwide discussion about health and disease in antiquity. Combined with the growing use of chemical techniques to identify pathogens, bioarchaeological research is beginning to produce novel information about health in the Roman Empire.

In the past decade, bioarchaeological research in the Roman Empire has surged from basically nothing to an active international research program tackling difficult questions about diet, disease, and demographics from a scientific standpoint. Bioarchaeologists in the Roman world have only recently begun to reflect on the accumulated data, however. Synthetic works that explicate current osteological knowledge about diet, health, and foreigners in the Empire

Cite as:

Killgrove, K. 2014. Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, C. Smith, ed., Springer., pp. 876-882. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2.

have not yet been created, meaning the historical and epigraphic records are still the primary sources for these topics. Yet bioarchaeological approaches have already clearly demonstrated that the Roman Empire was a strikingly diverse place. Heterogeneous groups of people from different homelands lived in cities, rural outposts, and forts on the *limes*. Their diets were composed primarily of cereals, meat, and plants, but the proportions of these resources and the types consumed differed dramatically. The people likely differed biologically in their risk of mortality and culturally in their attempts to mitigate disease and induce health. The last decade of research has demonstrated that literature is a great way of framing life in the Roman Empire but that bioarchaeology is necessary to complete the picture.

### International Perspectives

For most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, North American researchers led the field of bioarchaeology in the classical world. J. Lawrence Angel published scores of articles between the 1940s-70s, many on the palaeopathology of skeletal remains from the eastern Mediterranean, at sites such as Athens, Corinth, Pylos, Olynthus, and Troy. In the 1980s, Sarah Bisel tackled the remains from Nichoria and the Kerameikos and also delved into the skeletal remains from Herculaneum. Marshall Becker has been prolific in his research throughout the Italian peninsula and Sicily. By the 1990s, however, classical bioarchaeology was being undertaken by an international group of scholars focused on Greece, Italy, and Britain, including Sherry Fox, Luigi Capasso, Gino Fornaciari, Anna Maria Bietti Sestieri, Loretana Salvadei, Giorgio Manzi, Simona Minozzi, Estelle Lazer, Renata and Maciej Henneberg, and Simon Mays.

The international picture of Imperial Roman bioarchaeology in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is still primarily focused on Italy, Greece, and Britain, which have produced a wealth of skeletal remains in the past few decades, but research is also being undertaken by bioarchaeologists in far-flung provinces of the Empire, including Egypt (Tosha Dupras), Bavaria (Gisela Grupe), Croatia (Mario Šlaus), and Tunisia (Anne Keenleyside). Although the population of bioarchaeological practitioners has diversified since the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, British researchers remain at the forefront of the field, particularly those at Durham University (Charlotte Roberts, Janet Montgomery, and Rebecca Gowland), the University of Reading (Hella Eckardt, Mary Lewis, and Gundula Müldner), the British Geological Survey (Janet Evans and Carolyn Chenery), the Museum of London (Rebecca Redfern), and English Heritage (Simon Mays). With large skeletal series such as the population from Poundbury Camp and cutting-edge technology, the bioarchaeology of Roman Britain is yielding in-depth reports on palaeopathology, demography, mobility, and diet. New techniques in chemical analysis are just beginning to be applied to Rome and Ostia Antica by Italian researchers affiliated with the Servizio di Antropologia in Rome (Paola Catalano, Walter Pantano, and Carla Calderini) and the Museo Nazionale Preistorico Etnografico (Luca Bondioli and Alessandra Sperduti), as well as by North American scholars (Tracy Prowse and Kristina Killgrove).

In this age of digital connections, however, information on classical bioarchaeology is being shared across linguistic divides not just at international conferences but also through social networking, newsgroups, blogs, and interdisciplinary journals. Although there is not yet an international database of Roman skeletons, a movement towards data sharing and open access is underway in American biological anthropology, which will pave the way for synthetic treatments of bioarchaeological information by its international creators.

Cite as:

Killgrove, K. 2014. Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, C. Smith, ed., Springer., pp. 876-882. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2.

### Future Directions

The past decade has seen bioarchaeological research expand from the core of the Roman world to the lesser-investigated provinces of the Empire. More work is needed, however, in places like Hispania, Gaul, Illyricum, Asia Minor, Syria, and Judaea. The city of Rome itself has produced thousands of skeletons in recent years, but most cemeteries remain unpublished, making synthetic treatments challenging at the moment. Future studies at both the center and periphery of the Empire will make it easier to understand the diversity of the heterogeneous peoples who comprised the imperial population.

As the publication of case studies of diet and demographic trends has picked up in the last few years, synthesis of this information is needed. Knowing the dietary proclivities of a handful of average Romans is useful, but bioarchaeologists would do well to produce a volume or series of volumes on isotopic evidence of dietary practices. In this way, bioarchaeological data can be integrated with texts and artwork to create the most in-depth understanding of the ancient diet to date. Similarly, demographic trends have been published from a few sites in Roman Britain and in the Roman suburbs, but the bioarchaeological data have not been commanded in the same way as census records and tombstone inscriptions have been by historical demographers. The time is right for producing synthetic works that incorporate bones, texts, and material culture in a new and exciting way.

Moving forward, Roman bioarchaeologists can address research questions about disease ecology, identity formation, and population interaction. Palaeopathological research has primarily been focused on identifying diseases in the skeletal record of the Roman Empire, but more could be done to understand the ecology of those diseases. In Rome, for example, wildly varying frequencies of skeletal markers of stress and infection suggest living in different areas of the city and suburbs put people at different risk for diseases such as malaria. Investigating the topography, climate, and water sources of Rome is just as important as doing macroscopic and chemical analyses of skeletons for understanding morbidity patterns, and a bioarchaeological approach that incorporates disease ecology will move the study of Roman health forward.

Isotope and DNA analyses have already yielded key information about migration within the Roman Empire, by isolating individuals who traveled to and from Italy during their lifetimes. These data, however, have seldom been used to draw conclusions about identity formation in the multiethnic Empire, which would be a key step forward for Roman bioarchaeology. Pushed even further, data from chemical analyses combined with material remains and demographic models may allow Roman bioarchaeologists to investigate the practice of slavery in a novel manner. With more isotope analyses and additional DNA studies, a bioarchaeological approach to understanding Roman slavery cannot be far off.

Thirty years ago, Colin Renfrew wrote that there was a place “for anyone who can command the data and the scholarship of the Great Tradition while employing the problem-orientation and the research methods of current anthropological archaeology” (Renfrew 1980: 297). Bioarchaeologists who work in the Roman Empire have taken up this challenge and are weaving together scientific and humanistic data on a daily basis. Roman archaeology has already benefitted immensely from a bioarchaeological approach that integrates textual, artistic, and other material evidence with biological remains to create a more holistic picture of all levels of life and culture in the Roman world. There is a lot more work to do in the bioarchaeology of the

Cite as:

Killgrove, K. 2014. Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, C. Smith, ed., Springer., pp. 876-882. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2.

Roman Empire, but the amount of research that has already been produced demonstrates the promising future of this field.

### References

- Catalano, P., J. Scheid & S. Verger, ed. 2008. *Rome et Ses Morts: l'Archéologie Funéraire dans l'Occident Romain* (Les Dossiers d'Archéologie 330). Paris: Editions Faton.
- Crowe, F., A. Sperduti, T. O'Connell, O. Craig, K. Kirsanow, P. Germoni, R. Macchiarelli, P. Garnsey & L. Bondioli. 2010. Water-related occupations and diet in two Roman coastal communities (Italy, first to third century AD): correlation between stable carbon and nitrogen isotope values and auricular exostosis prevalence. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 142: 355-366.
- Eckardt, H., ed. 2010. *Roman Diasporas: Archaeological Approaches to Mobility and Diversity in the Roman Empire*. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology.
- Killgrove, K. 2010. Migration and mobility in Imperial Rome. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- MacKinnon, M. 2007. Osteological research in classical archaeology. *American Journal of Archaeology* 111: 473-504.
- Möldner, G. & M.P. Richards. 2007. Stable isotope evidence for 1500 years of human diet at the city of York, UK. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 133: 682-697.
- Prowse, T.L. 2001. Isotopic and dental evidence for diet from the necropolis of Isola Sacra (1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> centuries AD), Italy. Unpublished PhD dissertation, McMaster University.
- Prowse, T.L., H.P. Schwarcz, S.R. Saunders, R. Macchiarelli & L. Bondioli. 2005. Isotopic evidence for age-related variation in diet from Isola Sacra, Italy. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 128: 2-13.
- Prowse, T.L., H.P. Schwarcz, P. Garnsey, M. Knyf, R. Macchiarelli & L. Bondioli. 2007. Isotopic evidence for age-related immigration to imperial Rome. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 132: 510-519.
- Renfrew, C. 1980. The great tradition versus the great divide: archaeology as anthropology? *American Journal of Archaeology* 84: 286-298.
- Rutgers, L.V., M. van Strydonck, M. Boudin & C. van der Linde. 2009. Stable isotope data from the early Christian catacombs of ancient Rome: new insights into the dietary habits of Rome's early Christians. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 36: 1127-1134.
- Schweissing, M.M. & G. Grupe. 2003. Stable strontium isotopes in human teeth and bone: a key to migration events of the late Roman period in Bavaria. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 30: 1373-1383.

### Further Reading

- Agarwal, S.C. & B.A. Glencross, ed. 2011. *Social Bioarchaeology*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Buikstra, J.E. & L.A. Beck, ed. 2006. *Bioarchaeology: the Contextual Analysis of Human Remains*. New York: Academic Press.
- Catalano, P., B. Arrighetti, L. Benedettini, C. Caldarini, G. Colonnelli, M. Di Bernardini, S. Di Giantonio, D. Galani, L. Maffei, L. Nencioni, W. Pantano & S. Minozzi. 2001. Vivere e

Cite as:

Killgrove, K. 2014. Bioarchaeology in the Roman Empire. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, C. Smith, ed., Springer., pp. 876-882. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2.

morire a Roma tra il primo ed il terzo secolo. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 108: 355-363.

Filippi, F., ed. 2001. *Archeologia e Giubileo: gli Interventi a Roma e nel Lazio nel Piano per il Grande Giubileo del 2000*. Naples: Electa Napoli.

Katzenberg, M.A. & S.R. Saunders, ed. 2008. *Biological Anthropology of the Human Skeleton*. New York: Wiley-Liss.

Lazer, E. 2009. *Resurrecting Pompeii*. New York: Routledge.

Rife, J.L., M.M. Morison, A. Barbet, R.K. Dunn, D.H. Ubelaker & F. Monier. 2007. Life and death at a port in Roman Greece: the Kenchreai Cemetery Project, 2002-2006. *Hesperia* 76: 143-181.

Schepartz, L., S.C. Fox & C. Bourbou, ed. 2009. *New Directions in the Skeletal Biology of Greece*. *Hesperia* Supplement 43. Athens: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.