

- ŠIMIĆ-KANAET 2003: Z. Šimić-Kanaet, Keramika/Keramik. In: M. Sanader, Tilurium I. Istraživanja - Forschungen 1997. - 2001., Zagreb, 2003, 109-188.
- ŠIMIĆ-KANAET 2010: Z. Šimić-Kanaet, Tilurium II. Keramika 1997. - 2006., Zagreb, 2010
- TOMIČIĆ 1990: Ž. Tomičić, Materijalni tragovi ranobizantskog vojnog graditeljstva u Velebitskom podgorju, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, 3. s., XXIII, 1990, 139-162.
- TOMIČIĆ - DIZDAR 2005: Ž. Tomičić - M. Dizdar, Gräber der La-Tène-Kultur von Veliko polje in Zvonimirovo - Ergebnisse der Forschungen 1993-1995, Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu 22, 2005, 9-125.
- TONC 2010: A. Tonc, Terenski pregled područja Tribanj-Krušćica-Gradina Sv. Trojica/ Field Survey of the Tribanj-Krušćica-Gradina St. Trojica Area, Annales Instituti Archaeologici VI, 2010, 118-121.
- TONC 2011: A. Tonc, Rezultati probnih istraživanja na gradini Sv. Trojice kod Starigrada-Paklenice 2010. / Results of trial excavations of the Gradina Sveta Trojica near Starigrad-Paklenica 2010, Annales Instituti Archaeologici VII, 2011, 85-87.
- ULBERT 1959: G. Ulbert, Die römischen Donau-Kastelle Aislingen und Burghöfe, Limesforschungen, Band 1, Berlin, 1959.
- ULBERT 1969: G. Ulbert, Gladii aus Pompeji, Germania 47, 1969, 97-128.
- UNZ - DESCHLER-ERB 1997: Ch. Unz - E. Deschler-Erb, Katalog der Militaria aus Vindonissa, Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft pro Vindonissa, Band XIV, Brugg, 1997.
- VIČIČ 1993: B. Vičič, Zgodnjerimsko naselje pod Grajskim gričem v Ljubljani. Gornji trg 15/ Frühromische Siedlung unter dem Schloßberg in Ljubljana. Gornji trg 15. Arheološki Vestnik 44, 1993, 153-201.
- VIČIČ 1994: B. Vičič, Zgodnjerimsko naselje pod Grajskim gričem v Ljubljani. Gornji trg 30, Stari trg 17 in 32/ Die frühromische Siedlung unterhalb des Schloßbergs in Ljubljana. Gornji trg 30, Stari trg 17 und 32. Arheološki Vestnik 45, 1994, 25-80.
- VIČIČ 1997: B. Vičič, Rimske najdbe izpod Miklavškega hriba pri Celju/ Römische Funde am Fuße des Miklavški hrib bei Celje. Arheološki Vestnik 48, 1997, 41-51.
- ZANINOVIĆ 2001: M. Zaninović, Jadranski Kelti/ Celts on the Adriatic sea, Opuscula Archaeologica 25, 2001, 57-63.

Branka Migotti

CAN SOLDIERS ON 3RD-CENTURY STELAE IN PANONNIA BE RECOGNIZED ONLY BY THE SAGUM?

Branka Migotti

Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti

Odsjek za arheologiju

Ante Kovačića 5

HR-10000 Zagreb

CROATIA

branka.migotti@zg.t-com.hr

INTRODUCTION

The funerary iconography of the 3rd-century Roman soldier is well known in its essentials. Its two components, the sagum fastened by a brooch on the right shoulder and a belted long-sleeved tunic are indispensable. The brooch is round or T-shaped or cross-bowed and a prominent belt buckle is sometimes square (the so-called frame-buckle), but is mostly round, nicknaming the whole group of stones with such depictions as *ring-buckle gravestones*. The remainder: weapons (a dagger, a sword, one or more shafted weapons), armour (a shield and very rarely a helmet), a scroll and the like, are optional. Trousers are also presumed, but are not readily visible in relief depictions.¹ However, the picture of the 3rd-century soldier in Noricum does not match such image. There, the sagum and tunic are indispensable, but the belt is lacking in the majority of cases. The aim of this paper is to establish the picture of the Pannonian soldier, compare it to its Norican counterpart and try to explain the possible differences.

¹ OLDENSTEIN 1976, 226-234; COULSTON 1987, 143, 149; UBL 2002, 275; BISHOP - COULSTON 2006, 11; COULSTON 2007; SUMNER 2009, 41-52; JAMES 2010, 44-45.

DISCUSSION

The starting point of this discussion is based on works of some Austrian scholars of the last several decades: Hannsjörg Ubl, Lothar Eckhart, Erich Hudeczek, Erwin Pochmarski and Ortoľ Harl.² When discussing the 3rd-century soldier's dress as depicted on funerary stones in Noricum, with Pannonia mostly implied by extension, they never mention a belt, as indeed it is hardly ever depicted. Along the same line, there is a tendency in some of the commentators both to determine the occupation and to date a person depicted in sagum just by the sagum. In other words, every male person shown as wearing sagum on his tombstone should be a third-century soldier, even if other insignia of his occupation are lacking. This, of course, is a simplified picture, which has its various facets. On the face of it, some scholars allowed for civilians to be dressed in sagum as well. E. Hudeczek and E. Pochmarski presumed that the sagum should be viewed differently depending on whether it was worn in a

² ECKHART 1976; UBL 1979; POCHMARSKI 1991; POCHMARSKI 1996; UBL 2002; HARL 2003.



Fig. 1. Map of southern Pannonia with the find-sites of soldier funerary stones (Author: Tino Leleković).

military or civilian settlement. In other words, a man in sagum would probably be interpreted as a civilian in a prevalently civilian town of Flavia Solva, while he would be identified as a soldier in the military towns of Virunum and Lauriacum.³ Significantly, some of the *sagumati* in Lauriacum and none in Virunum also carry weapons, while a belted tunic is absent in both towns.⁴ As for Lauriacum, H. Ubl changed his opinion over the years. In the 1970s he was inclined to consider every man in sagum as a soldier, while in 2002 he presented a different picture of the soldier, while also allowing for *sagumati* civilians. As for the soldier, the author now described him so as to fit the common knowledge,

that is, featuring an indispensable belted tunic with a prominent round or rectangular buckle. To support this picture, Ubl adduced finds of belt buckles in Noricum. Yet, when describing so equipped soldier, he also mentioned depictions in funerary art, and at that point it is not clear whether the Roman soldier in general was meant, or the Norican soldier alone.⁵ Recently, the same author made a very significant point by comparing a “duplicated” image of a soldier on the front of a sarcophagus from Budaörs near Budapest, depicted once as a *vexillarius* and once as an *aquilifer*. In the same paper H. Ubl announced his intention to address extensively the subject of the covered military belt

³ POCHMARSKI 1991, 101; POCHMARSKI 1996, 131-132; L. ECKHART (1976, 17, 47) also considers only soldiers as the sagum wearers in Lauriacum, while G. PICCOTTINI (1972), discussing funerary portraits in Virunum, did not tackle this issue at all.

⁴ POCHMARSKI 1996; HARL 2003, 340.

⁵ UBL 1979, 37, no. 22; UBL 2002, 285.



Fig. 2. Stele of a centurion from Cibalae (detail), Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (UEL 3593).

(*verdeckte Militärgürtel*).⁶ To my knowledge, such paper has not yet appeared. For the time being, it therefore remains to bear in mind that soldiers in Noricum are only exceptionally, if ever, depicted as wearing a belted tunic on their funerary stones. Presumably, this fact was used as a background for O. Harl's paper, printed in 2003: *Die Donauarmee als Träger der norisch-pannonischen Kunst - der Fall Norikum*. This paper, on the other hand, is the starting point for the present discussion, given its claim that the 3rd century soldier can be identified exclusively by the sagum. Such claim does not lack evidential support, but is also not free of weak points. Firstly, the number of preserved epitaphs on funerary stones is small, and secondly, not all of them mention the military.⁷ It should be noted that in spite of the expression *Norico-Pannonian* in the title of Harl's paper, the material evidence used all (except for Carnuntum) stems from Noricum; Pannonia has been apparently implied by extension. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to check whether indeed each *sagumatus* on a 3rd-century funerary stone in Pannonia can be proclaimed a soldier just by the sagum. The whole of the province is considered, but the stress is on the southern Pannonia, that is, the area between the rivers Drava and Sava (Fig. 1).

First, it should be cleared whether any such assumption for Noricum can be applied straightforwardly to Pannonia, on purely theoretical grounds. The answer should be *yes*, given a high degree of uniformity of the

⁶ UBL 2006, 15, n. 77.



Fig. 3. Stele of a veteran from Mursa (detail), Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (UEL 4305).

Roman military dress and equipment.⁸ Furthermore, a special connection between Noricum and Pannonia has been presumed, based on the fact that these were two neighbourhood provinces, possibly sharing a common military command.⁹ The latter was even taken by Harl as an argument against the widely held opinion of a predominantly civilian Noricum in contrast to strongly militarized Pannonia.¹⁰ On the other hand, some regional variations in military dress and equipment as there were, should not be of any concern in this context, given that these were not functional or conceptual, but pertained to formal, structural or decorative details.¹¹ In other words, such variation could not possibly affect wearing or otherwise of the military belt. Therefore, the real question is why soldiers in Noricum chose to be depicted without the belt.

Before adducing the evidence for the 3rd century, a summary introduction to the circumstances in the 2nd-century will be brought. *The 2nd century* in the present context means the period terminating with the beginning of the Severan rule. However, when commentators refer to the 3rd century, they sometimes fail to ex-

⁷ UEL 301, 483, 858, 1379, 1539, 1624, 1625, 3118, 3610, 3616.

⁸ COULSTON 1998, 177; GSCHWIND 2007, 615; ROTHE 2009, 3; JAMES 2010, 252-254. In spite of that, commentators caution against perceiving Roman military as anything near the modern uniformed armies.

⁹ HARL 2003, 338; WEBER 1994, 43.

¹⁰ HARL 2003, 337-340.

¹¹ GSCHWIND 2007, 622-625; ROTHE 2009, 3; JAMES, 2010, XIII, 51, 241.



Fig. 4. Stele of a slave family from the territory of Andautonia, detail, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Author: Igor Krajcar).

licitly state whether this period includes the rule of Septimius Severus, that is, the end of the 2nd century, or whether it starts with Caracalla (211-217). Such ambiguity results from the fact that it is not established beyond doubt which one of the two rulers was responsible for the reform of the military dress and equipment.¹² On balance, when speaking about the Severans in the context of the military dress and equipment, the stress should be on the 3rd century. Also, it should be noted that the main subject matter in all papers underlying the present discussion is on the military, while the civilians are mostly covered in passing, quite as to complement the state of knowledge on the soldier's clothes. This is only understandable, as the evidence of civilians in sagum is even more ambiguous and more difficult to examine than the evidence for soldiers.¹³ The majority of commentators named the former *civilians*, without defining the term, but some of them still made some effort in this direction. For instance, H. Ubl indicated civilians who on occasions appropriated military dress for the sake of fashion and not as an official matter, while O. Harl defined non-soldiers as *real civilians* (*echten Zivilisten*).¹⁴ Even so, the issue of the civilians dressed in sagum remains a moot point.

¹² Some authors specifically or implicitly postulate Caracalla (POCHMARSKI 1990, 531; POCHMARSKI 1996, 129; SUMNER 2009, 41-42), while others seem to be referring to the Severan period in general (ECKHART 1976, 17; von SCHNURBEIN 1977, 88; UBL 2002, 275; BISHOP - COULSTON 2006, 149).

¹³ Symptomatically, O. HARL (2003, 341) posits the research on the civilians dressed in sagum as one of the *desiderata* of his paper, but later he mentioned this issue only twice, and in passing (342, n. 21; 346, n. 55).

¹⁴ COULSTON 1987, 149; POCHMARSKI 1991, 101; POCHMARSKI 1996, 131; UBL 2002, 175; HARL 2003, 342.



Fig. 5. Stele of a civilian (?) from Mursa, detail, Museum of Slavonija Osijek (Author: Tino Leleković).

In Noricum, the sagum in the 2nd century seems to have been used equally rarely among the military and the civilians.¹⁵ As for the military in general, it has been suggested that only the auxiliary cavalry wore the sagum, while the infantry used the paenula.¹⁶ O. Harl names several reasons for the lack of military stones in 2nd- and 3rd-century Noricum and in Carnuntum: a high rate of wearing and the destruction of funerary stones, the loss of epitaphs, the lack of enthusiasm on the part of soldiers and/or their families to advertise the deceased's occupation in funerary context.¹⁷ Given that the legion was stationed in Carnuntum in the period 114-260 A. D., at least some of the funerary stones should date from the 2nd century, and they do not belong to cavalry auxiliaries. The archaeological evidence from northern Croatia is quite meagre for this period, as only four (limestone) stelae featuring a combination of both the picture and inscription are available.¹⁸ The first one belonged to Marcus Herennius Valens (Fig.

¹⁵ POCHMARSKI 1991, 101; POCHMARSKI 1996, 131. Although the sagum is not used extensively by the military in the 2nd century, it is still not right to proclaim the sagum as one of the dating criteria for the 3rd century military, as seems to be the case in POCHMARSKI 2006, 104, *passim* and 2007, 94. See also note 25.

¹⁶ ECKHART 1976, 17; COULSTON 1987, 141-142; POCHMARSKI 1991, 101; SUMNER 2009, 73-79.

¹⁷ HARL 2003, 337-338, 346. However, the evidence for the neglect of the military image on funerary stones is, at least, as inconclusive as that which supports a great pride the soldier takes in his occupation, active or former. Cf. HOPE, 2001, 37-38; SUMNER 2009, 10.

¹⁸ All the stones but three stemming from Croatia and mentioned in this paper are kept in the the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. Of the three exceptions, one is walled *in situ* (fig. 9), while two (figs 4 and 13) are kept in the Museum of Slavonija Osijek.



Fig. 6. Stele of a legionary from the territory of Aquae Balissae, detail, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Author: Tino Leleković).

2), a legionary centurion from Cibalae (Vinkovci), dated 110-130¹⁹, the second to Titus Aurelius Avitus (Fig. 3), a legionary veteran from Mursa (Osijek), dated 140-160²⁰, the third to a slave family of Valens (Fig. 4) from the territory of Andautonia (Šćitarjevo near Zagreb), dated 150-160²¹, and the fourth to one Publius Aelius Valenus and his wife from Mursa (Fig. 5), dated 160-180.²² Valenus was most probably a civilian, as otherwise his military occupation would probably have been indicated in the epitaph and put immediately after his name.²³ Three of the four men (M. Herennius Valens, the slave Valens and P. Aelius Valenus) are dressed in the same manner: they wear a sagum fastened by a round brooch, and a tunic with no belt shown; one of the brooches is of a rosette type (Fig. 1), and the remaining two are plate (Figs: 3 and 4).²⁴ Unlike them, T. Aurelius Avitus is dressed in toga. Marcus Herennius Valens and Titus Aurelius Avitus belonged to the military, as stated in the epitaphs of both, and additionally marked by a centurion's stick in the portrait of the former. Of the remaining two one was a slave (Valens), while the other (P. Aelius Valenus) was a Roman citizen and most probably a civilian. Although the sample

¹⁹ CAMBI 1989.

²⁰ CAMBI 1989.

²¹ MIGOTTI 2008.

²² DAUTOVA-RUŠEVLJAN 1983, 24, no. 137; MIGOTTI 2013, s. 25, pp. 308, 316, Fig. 5.

²³ The preserved part of the epitaph goes: *D(is) M(anibus) / P(ublio) Ael(io) Valeno / et Ritutiae Ma / rcel<I>inae uxo(ri) ?*.

²⁴ Although the Bitutiae is very typical of the 3rd-century military dress, it was worn from the 1st to the 4th century in both military and civilian circles. Cf. POCHMARSKI 1990, 530-531; MIGOTTI 2002, 43.



Fig. 7. Fragmented stele of two legionaries from Lobar, territory of Siscia or Andautonia, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Author: Igor Krajcar).

is insignificant, provisory conclusions for the 2nd century can still be attempted: 1. The sagum was worn by both the military and civilians; 2. The military veterans could have chosen to dress toga; 3. A civilian in sagum was possibly not a rarity; 4. The soldiers in sagum are not necessary cavalry auxiliaries, although in this case it should also be allowed for a centurion to figure as a cavalryman, since centurions indeed possessed a horse and rode when on the march.²⁵

As far as the 3rd century is concerned, the circumstances for Noricum have been sketched above. With some exceptions, by and large, a man dressed in sagum, with no belt shown, is in the literature represented as most likely a soldier. Arguably, a typical military belt with a huge circle or rectangular buckle, otherwise indispensable in the description of the 3rd-century Roman soldier, appears only very sporadically in Norican funerary art. I know of only two examples, both inconclusive. On a stele from Celeia (Celje) the buckle is presumed, but is not visible due to wear of the relief, while on an aedicule relief stone from the territory of Spittal an der Drau the buckle apparently was not at all rendered, at least not in relief.²⁶ On a further two stones soldiers are rendered as full standing figures wearing sagum, but

²⁵ LE BOHEC 1994, 131.

²⁶ Celje: UEL 3598; Spittal an der Drau: UEL 3632.



Fig. 8. Soldier stele from northern Croatia, detail, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Author: Igor Krajcar).

the belt is not depicted, although the tunic is in both cases clearly belted.²⁷ Now, the finds of belt buckles in funerary contexts in Lauriacum (Enns) and possibly elsewhere, testify that the evidence of small finds is at variance with funerary depictions. Ultimately, the archaeological evidence suggests that the military in Noricum did not care to present themselves belted as soldiers. On the other hand, several relief depictions and statues in the round from various Norican sites testify that a favoured scheme within the 3rd-century funerary iconography of soldiers was one featuring a metallic body armour and lacking a plated belt. Such iconography was however reserved for officers, and was, furthermore, rarely used in family portraits.²⁸ Neither of the above funerary portrait schemes is typical of the soldiers in Pannonia. Another difference between Noricum and Pannonia in the depiction of clothes on funerary stones concerns the toga, which is extremely rare on 3rd-century reliefs in the whole of Pannonia. On the other hand, it occurs more frequently in Norican funerary art, but mostly not later than the Severan period. The toga is there occasionally found in tandem with the sagum on one and the same stone, probably indicating the difference between the civilians and soldiers.²⁹ A discussion on the use of toga is otherwise much hampered by the fact that the majority of the stones featuring men dressed in toga lack

²⁷ UEL 2341 (Klein Sankt Paul); UEL 523 (Enns / Lauriacum)

²⁸ UEL 582, 1264, 1266, 2488, 4684, 4687. See GESZTHELY - HARL 2001, 147-150.

²⁹ The evidence is, however, inconclusive. For instance, on one stone (UEL 1623, Stallhofen) a veteran is depicted in toga and a soldier in sagum, while on another (UEL 1424, Pfannberg) a civilian is dressed in toga and a soldier in sagum.



Fig. 9. Fragmented soldier stele from the territory of Siscia, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Author: Igor Krajcar).

inscriptions.³⁰ On balance, both the military and civilians wore the sagum on their funerary portraits in Noricum, but the belt is hardly ever shown in either of the two groups, while the difference (status? occupation?) between the civilians dressed in toga and those wearing the sagum remains unclear. Last but not least, veterans dressed in toga also need to be considered.³¹

Before considering the 3rd-century stones from northern Croatia, the evidence for the rest of Pannonia will be sketched in broad lines, sourced exclusively from the available literature and the UEL. The sample is not exhaustive, but is still representative. In northern Pannonia soldiers customarily wear sagum, while the belted tunic is not obligatory; many soldiers' portraits feature a belt with a prominent round buckle, but equally many lack it.³² Also, some civilians are depicted as dressed in sagum but without the belt shown.³³ On a curious example from Aquincum (Budapest), one man is shown wearing the sagum and another is

³⁰ PICCOTTINI 1972, nos 106 ff.; ECKHART 1976, 44-45, nos 46, 47; POCHMARSKI 1991, 101; POCHMARSKI 1996, 130-131; HARL 2003, 341-342.

³¹ O. HARL (2003, 339, 342) seems to advocate the idea that the tunic when worn alone, as well as the toga, indicates civilians, in contrast with *sagumati* soldiers; even though, in his list one *togatus* veteran is evidenced (p. 350, UEL 1623).

³² Soldiers with the buckle: UEL 2769, 2846, 2896, 3062, 3095 etc; without the buckle: UEL 2850, 2937, 2974, 2976, 10559, etc.

³³ For example UEL 2851, 3178. On a family stele from Aquincum (UEL 3036) two men wear the sagum and one the toga, but the epitaph is missing and none of the men feature any military insignia.



Fig. 10. Fragmented Stele of two *sagumati* from Sveti Petar na Mrežnici, territory of Andautonia or Siscia (after HOFFILLER - SARIA 1938).

dressed in toga.³⁴ Regrettably, the epitaph is not preserved, so the social relevance of the different clothes remains unknown. Equally uncertain is the meaning of the belt buckle on a stele from Brigetio (Szöny), with two men dressed in sagum and only one of them featuring a military belt.³⁵ To conclude: The presumption of all *sagumati* as representing soldiers cannot be safely applied to northern Pannonia. The evidence for the later 2nd- and the 3rd-centuries soldier stones from southern-Pannonian towns of Poetovio (Ptuj) and Sirmium (Sremska Mitrovica) is rather inconclusive; very few pieces with discernible diagnostic features are available from the UEL, due mostly to wear. All there is from Poetovio is two civilians and two soldiers in sagum. Both civilians lack the military belt³⁶, while of the soldiers one has it, while the other does not.³⁷ If any conclusion is allowed on such meagre evidence, it should be postulated that the circumstances in Poetovio are similar to those of northern Pannonia. The diagnostic stones from Sirmium are even fewer: on one stele the belt is hidden by the sagum, while on another it is not depicted at all.³⁸ Yet another stele featuring two men dressed in sagum is, however, problematic in terms of the nature of the deceased's occupation. They are both recorded in the epitaph as key-keepers in the governor's office (*clavicularius ex officio praesidis*), that

³⁴ UEL 3036.

³⁵ UEL 3840.

³⁶ UEL 3756, 3758.

³⁷ UEL 3781 (showing the belt); UEL 4250 (lacking the belt).

³⁸ UEL 4336 (belt hidden); UEL 4337 (belt not depicted).



Fig. 11. Civilian stele from Siscia, detail, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Author: Tino Leleković).

is, as civil officials. The stone is additionally inconclusive on account of its presumed date (the 2nd half of the 3rd century), which contradicts the administrative organisation of Pannonia at that time; namely, the seat of the *praeses* was not yet in Sirmium, but in Aquincum.³⁹ On balance, given the military importance of Sirmium in the 3rd century, the scanty evidence as given above should be accidental, and therefore inaccurate and hardly relevant for conclusions.

The archaeological evidence in northern Croatia is similar to that for the rest of Pannonia, in that soldiers are shown both with and without the military belt. Again, the sample is meagre but not without the potential for discussion. The evidence comprises seven stelae and one each ash-chest and sarcophagus. On a sandstone stele from Brusnik (the territory of Aquae Balissae / Daruvar) dated 213-222/235 on account of the mention of the *legio III Flavia Antoniniana*, the upper bodies of a legionary soldier and his wife are depicted. The legionary is wearing the sagum and a long-sleeved belted tunic with a huge round buckle, and is equipped with a baldric, a sword and a shield (Fig. 6).⁴⁰ A similar picture appears on a limestone stele from Lopor (the territory of Andautonia or Poetovio), dated 220-250 and belonging to a centurion of the *legio X Gemina* and his brother, a praetorian. Both are depicted as frontal standing figures, flanking the figure of their mother (Fig. 7). Although the soldiers from Lopor were portrayed in a different posture than the one from Brusnik, all three are dressed and equipped in basically the same way, except that the former lack

³⁹ UEL 4335; FITZ 1994, 984-985.

⁴⁰ HOFFILLER - SARIA 1938, no. 590; UEL 3812.



Fig. 12. Soldier stele from northern Croatia, detail, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Author: Igor Krajcar).

shields and their belt buckles are rectangular instead of round.⁴¹ On a Severan-period marble stele of unknown provenance, although certainly from northern Croatia (Fig. 8), whose epitaph has not been preserved, the busts of three persons are depicted: two men flanking a woman. Both men are wearing the sagum, while the belts are lacking.⁴² The man on the right side is most probably holding a sword in his left hand, while the depiction of the one on the left is not clear. The latter also seems to be holding a sword, but in his right hand, which does not occur frequently in funerary depictions.⁴³ Moreover, the gesture of his right hand is paralleled in numerous examples featuring men who hold a scroll in their left hand and point to it with the right.⁴⁴ On a limestone stele from the Siscian territory (Fig. 9), dated to the mid 3rd century, the half figures of two men are shown flanking a woman. The men are dressed in sagum and a belted tunic, fastened with the round buckle. Both have a scroll in their left hand, but the one on the right-hand has a sword, tucked under his left arm.⁴⁵ Besides, a shield shown behind the horse rider in the lower register, with a lance leaning on it, possibly hints at the military occupation of the stele's owners, even though the relief represents a hunt scene.

⁴¹ HOFFILLER - SARIA 1938, no. 455; Migotti 2010; UEL 3110.

⁴² MIGOTTI 2013, S 42, pp. 309, 318, Fig. 7.

⁴³ Cf. UEL 3113 (Solva); 685 (Savaria); 2397 (Intercisa); 480 (Lauriacum). It should be noted that in the literature a sword is sometimes mistaken for a scroll and vice versa, as is the case with no. 2397. Cf. M. NAGY 2007, 40, no. 26: the object described in UEL as a sword, M. Nagy considers a scroll.

⁴⁴ HAINZMANN 1991.

⁴⁵ HOFFILLER - SARIA 1938, no. 579; MIGOTTI, forthcoming, no. S 31. It appears that the sword is of the type with a bird's head. In some examples such swords are clearly depicted (UEL 4004, 496, 1207), while in many others, with reliefs poorly preserved, can only be presumed.

Admittedly, the hunting and fighting weapons are mutually interchangeable, and commentators commonly see the shield as a hunting equipment. Even so, the hunter in hunt scenes on Norican and Pannonian funerary stones is very rarely shown with the shield; customarily, he only brandishes a spear.⁴⁶ Apart from that, in the funerary context hunting is associative of battle, and not only in terms of iconography but also of symbolism; therefore, it is frequently depicted on soldiers' funerary stones.⁴⁷ As a whole, the reliefs on this stele reveal a mixed symbolism: military, administrative (a bunch of scrolls or *stili* and a codex at the left side in the upper register) and elite, be it civilian or military (hunt). The stele from Sveti Petar na Mrežnici (the territory of Andautonia or Siscia), dated the mid 3rd century, is now built in the church façade there (Fig. 10). It features the busts of two men flanking a woman, the former two wearing the sagum, with no belts shown. Regrettably, the inscription is missing.⁴⁸ The last two stelae, both marble and both dated to the mid or 2nd half of the 3rd century, each feature two men wearing the sagum, with no belt depicted. The first one stems from Siscia and holds a depiction of four upper bodies and one bust of a family of five (Fig. 11). It transpires from the epitaph that one of the two men, *Cenius* (the cognomen is not preserved) was a *vir egregius*, that is a man of equestrian status, while the preserved part of the inscription suggests that the other man (*Flavius Tiberianicus*) was also probably a civilian: no mention of a military occupation is attached to his name.⁴⁹ The second one is of unknown provenance (Fig. 12), although certainly from northern Croatia.⁵⁰ It shows the busts or upper bodies of a family of three: a man, a woman and a child, with both male persons dressed in sagum and lacking the belt. The man, one *Aurelius* (the whole of the epitaph is not accessible), was a legionary tribune, and therefore also an *eques*. Significantly, two knights are on their funerary stones depicted in the same way, but their epitaphs reveal a different attitude towards their social standing. The soldier (*Aurelius*) namely had his military post recorded, with the social

⁴⁶ Cf. S. PALÁGYI. In: ERTEL - PALÁGYI - REDŐ 1999, 138; MARTON 2002, 134; BUSCH 2003, 685-686; PILIPOVIĆ 2006; JILEK - BREEZE 2007, 201; L. NAGY 2007, 151-153; JAMES 2010, 49. One of the rare examples of the shield depicted on a civilian funerary relief, stems from Csákvár (M. NAGY 2007, 55-56, no. 47). Otherwise, the hunt scene is more widespread in funerary art of Noricum and western Pannonia, than in eastern Pannonia. See DAUTOVA-RUŠEVLJAN 1997, 103; UEL 1146, 1456, 4211, 3858, 4400, 4702.

⁴⁷ PILIPOVIĆ 2006, 343-344.

⁴⁸ HOFFILLER - SARIA 1938, no. 498; MIGOTTI 2013, S 32, pp. 309, 317, Fig. 6.

⁴⁹ GREGL - MIGOTTI 2000; UEL 8817. It is a known fact that the knights, although passing through military posts, ultimately cherished a civilian funerary iconography. See HARL 2003, 339.

⁵⁰ See footnote 48.



Fig. 13. Ash-chest of a veteran from Siscia, detail, Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (Author: Tino Leleković).

standing implied but not pointed out, while the civilian (*Cenius*) gave only his social rank. An ash-chest from Siscia, dated to the mid 3rd century, belonged to a veteran, a former consular beneficiary (*beneficiarius consularis*), shown as a full standing figure together with his wife, and wearing a sagum and a belted tunic with a prominent round buckle (Fig. 13).⁵¹ It should be remembered that although the staff post of the *beneficiarius consularis* was not of a strictly military profile, this man was still an army veteran.⁵² The last stone, a sarcophagus featuring frontal standing figures of a cavalry praetorian and his mother in lateral niches by the inscription field, stems from Ilok (*Cuccium?*) (Fig. 14). The soldier is dressed in sagum and a tunic featuring a belt and a prominent round buckle; he carries a spear in his right hand and a sword in the left.⁵³

⁵¹ MIGOTTI 2005; UEL 3801.

⁵² Active *beneficarii* are usually depicted as carrying weapons. See FEUGÈRE 1995, 116, fig. 9; BISHOP - COULSTON 2006, 150-152, passim.

⁵³ DAUTOVA-RUŠEVLJAN 1983, 26, no. 169. Recently H. GÖRICKE-LUKIĆ (2008, 46) found out that this piece does not stem from Mursa, as previously believed.



Fig. 14. Sarcophagus of a praetorian from Ilok, territory of Sirmium, detail, Museum of Slavonija Osijek (Author: Tino Leleković).

Only one of the above stones should be discarded (Fig. 9), for its lack of diagnostic elements of the social statue or occupation of the *sagumati*. From the remainder it appears that 3rd-century soldiers in the part of southern Pannonia comprising the municipal territories of Andautonia, Siscia, Aquae Balissae, Cibalae and Mursa, had themselves preferably depicted on their funerary stones as wearing the sagum and a belted tunic, while weapons, armour and the scroll are optional. By extension, all men depicted as dressed in sagum and a belted tunic, although lacking other insignia, should be considered as probably soldiers.⁵⁴ On the other hand, those depicted without the belt can be either soldiers or civilians. On balance, the answer to the question whether soldiers on 3rd-century stelae in Panonnia can be identified only by the sagum should be negative.

⁵⁴ As customarily assumed. See OLDENSTEIN 1976, 226-234; COULSTON 1987, 149; UBL 2002, 275; BISHOP - COULSTON 2006, 11; JAMES 2010, 44-45.

Let us now briefly consider the issue of the civilians. Four men on three stelae (Figs. 8, 11 and 12) do not feature the military belt. Even so, two of them were soldiers (Figs. 8 and 12) and the remaining two (Fig. 11) were civilians, as evidenced by the epitaph. While the occupation and status of one of them (Tiberianicus) remains unknown from the inscription, the other (Cenius) was a *vir egregious*, that is, a knight whose occupation remains unknown, but was probably close to a state or town administration. Here we come once again to the topic of the *echten zivilisten* (true civilians) mentioned by O. Harl and the unspecified civilians referred to by other authors.⁵⁵ While, presumably, Harl had in mind people like artisans or the like, other authors remained evasive. Based on the example of Cenius' stela (Fig. 11), it seems that in the 3rd century the civilians dressed in sagum are those of at least a mid-elite class, known as a broad category of *honestiores*, performing some administrative duties, be it municipal or imperial. Some of them might have started their careers in the army, like Cenius, a *vir egregius* from Siscia, to proceed by taking up civilian posts. Arguably, in the 3rd century a funerary stone monument was available mostly to the classes of such civilians and the military. In other words, in the 3rd century a slave would hardly have put up a stone stela for his family, and would even less likely have had him depicted as dressed in sagum, as was the case in the 2nd century.

CONCLUSIONS

On the present evidence, soldiers on 3rd-century stelae in Pannonia cannot be recognized just by the sagum. As for the Croatian part of the province, the 3rd-century soldier appears to be safely identified by only wearing the sagum and the military belt, even if no weapons or armour are present. This, however, does not exclude a picture of a soldier without the belt shown. Therefore, a man wearing the military belt should be a soldier, while one without it can be either a soldier or a civilian. By and large, this is true for the whole of Pannonia. While the evidence for Pannonia as a whole could be circumstantial, that from northern Croatia points to some iconographic regularity. The so-called ring-buckle stelae were all made from local stones, while the two examples featuring soldiers without the belt were both fashioned from Norican marbles and were imported. Therefore, it seems that soldier funerary iconographies of Pannonia had less to do with military

rules or attitudes and more with artistic conventions of various workshops and the importation of stones. On the other hand, the preference for the lack of the belt is typical of Noricum, featuring therefore a common standardized funerary iconography of the military on the provincial level. Therefore, although an answer to the basic question of this discussion has been attempted, the reasons for discrepant iconographies in Noricum and Pannonia should be further examined.⁵⁶

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere thanks go to Ivan Radman Livaja and Zsolt Mráv for providing me with many useful information on the subject matter discussed in this paper.

⁵⁶ Possibly, those commentators who made a case of a civilian character of Noricum as opposed to more strongly militarized Pannonia did not quite miss the point. Cf. HARL 2003, 337-338.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BISCHOP - COULSTON 2006: M. C. Bishop - J. C. N. Coulston, Roman Military Equipment from the Punic Wars to the Fall of Rome, Oxford, 2006.
- BUSCH 2003: A. W. Busch, Von der Provinz ins Zentrum - Bilder auf den Grabdenkmälern einer Elite-Einheit. In: P. Noelke - F. Naumann-Steckner - B. Schneider (eds), Akten des VII. internationalen Colloquiums über Probleme des provinziäl-römischen Kunstschaffens, Mainz am Rhein, 2003, 679-694.
- CAMBI 1989: N. Cambi, Bilješke uz dvije panonske nadgrobne stele, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, 3. ser., XXII, Zagreb, 1989, 59-76.
- COULSTON 1987: J. C. N. Coulston, Roman military equipment on third century tombstones. In: M. Dawson (ed.), Roman Military Equipment: The Accoutrements of War, British Archaeological Reports, Intern. Ser., 336, Oxford, 1987, 141-156.
- COULSTON 1998: J. C. N. Coulston, How to arm a Roman soldier. In: M. Austin - J. Harries - Ch. Smith (eds), Modus Operandi. Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Rickman, London, 1998, 167-190.
- COULSTON 2007: J. C. N. Coulston, Art, Culture and Service: The Depiction of Soldiers on Funerary Monuments of the 3rd Century AD. In: L. de Bois - E. Lo Cascio (eds), Impact of Empire, 6, Leiden - Boston, 2007, 529-561.
- DAUTOVA-RUŠEVLJAN 1983: V. Dautova-Ruševljan, Rimska kamena plastika u jugoslovenskom delu provincije Donje Panonije, Novi Sad, 1983.
- DAUTOVA-RUŠEVLJAN 1997: V. Dautova-Ruševljan, Prilog proučavanju scena lova na spomenicima provincije Panonije, Rad vojvođanskih muzeja, 39, Novi Sad 1997, 103-107.
- ECKHART 1976: L. Eckhart, Die Skulpturen der Stadtgebietes von Lauriacum, Corpus Signorum Imperii Romani, Österreich, Band III, Faszikel 2, Wien, 1976.
- ERTEL - PALÁGYI - REDŐ 1999: Ch. Ertel - S. Palágyi - F. Redő, Die Skulpturen des Stadtgebietes von Salla und Mogentiana sowie des Balaton-(Plattensee)Oberlandes in den Komitaten Zala und Veszprém, CSIR, Ungarn, Band VIII, Budapest.
- FEUGÈRE 1995: M. Feugère, L'équipement des officiers dans l'armée romaine. In: Y. Le Bohec (ed.), La hiérarchie (Rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire, Paris, 1995, 113-126.
- FITZ 1994: J. Fitz, Die Verwaltung Pannoniens in der Römerzeit, III, Budapest, 1994.
- GESZTHELY - HARL 2001: T. Geszthely - O. Harl, Vom Staatsmythos zum Privatbild: Aeneas auf der Grabädikula eines ritterlichen Offiziers in Solva / Steiermark. In: T. A. S. M. Panhuysen (ed.), Die Maastrichter Akten des 5. Internationalen Kolloquiums über das provinziäl-römische Kunstschaffen - im Rahmen des CSIR, Maastricht, 2001, 139-170.
- GÖRICKE-LUKIĆ 2008: Hermine Göricke-Lukić, Nekropole rimskodobne Murse, PhD thesis, Zagreb 2008.
- GREGL - MIGOTTI 2000: Z. Gregl - B. Migotti, Nadgrobna stela iz Siska (CIL III 3985), Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, 3. s., XXXII-XXXIII, Zagreb, (1999-2000) 2000, 119-164.
- GSCHWIND 2007: M. Gschwind, Roman military equipment from Dura-Europos, The Journal of Roman Archaeology, 20, Portsmouth 2007, 613-625.
- HAINZMANN 1991: M. Hainzmann, Schriftrolle und Schwurgestus. Neue Beobachtungen zu einem Bildmotiv. In: M. Heinzmann et al. (eds), Akten des I. internationalen Colloquiums über Probleme des Provinziäl-römischen Kunstschaffens, Teil II, Mitteilungen der Archaeologischen Gesellschaft Steiermark, 5, Wien, 1991, 120-146.
- HARL 2003: O. Harl, Die Donauarmee als Träger der norisch-pannonischen Kunst - der Fall Norikum. In: P. Noelke - F. Naumann-Steckner - B. Schneider (eds), Akten des VII. internationalen Colloquiums über Probleme des Provinziäl-römischen Kunstschaffens, Mainz am Rhein, 2003, 337-361.

⁵⁵ HARL 2003, 342.

- HOFFILLER - SARIA 1938: V. Hoffiller - B. Saria, *Antike Inschriften aus Jugoslavien. Heft 1: Noricum und Pannonia Superior*, Zagreb, 1938.
- HOPE 2001: V. M. Hope, *Constructing Identity: The Roman Funerary Monuments of Aquileia, Mainz and Nimes*, British Archaeological Reports, Int. Ser., 960, Oxford, 2001.
- JAMES 2010: S. James, *Excavations at Dura-Europos 1928-1937. Final Report VII: The Arms and Armour and other Military Equipment*, London, 2010.
- JILEK - BREEZE 2007: S. Jilek - D. Breeze, *The detritus of life: the contribution of small finds to understanding smaller military installations*. In: R. Hingley - S.H. Willis (eds) *Roman Finds: Context and Theory*, Oxford, 2007, 199-213.
- LE BOHEC 1994: J. Le Bohec, *The Imperial Roman Army*, Batsford - London, 1994.
- MÁRTON 2002: A. Márton, *Roman burial with a weapon from the Bécsi Road cemetery (Aquincum-Budapest)*, *Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungariae*, Budapest, 2002, 117-152.
- MIGOTTI 2002: B. Migotti, *Two Gold-sandwich Glasses from Štrbinci (Đakovo, Northern Croatia)*, Zagreb, 2002.
- MIGOTTI 2005: B. Migotti, *The Ash-chest of Marcus Aurelius Glabrio from Siscia Reconsidered*. In: M. Sanader - M. Šegvić - I. Mirnik (eds), *Illyrica Antiqua. Ob honorem Duje Rendić-Miočević*, Zagreb 2005, 367-384.
- MIGOTTI 2008: B. Migotti, *Nadgrobni spomenik robovske obitelji iz Donjih Čeha kod Zagreba*, *Archaeologia Adriatica*, 2/2, Zadar, 393-415.
- MIGOTTI 2010: B. Migotti, *Vojnička nadgrobna stela severskog razdoblja iz Lobora*, *Archaeologia Adriatica*, 4, Zadar, 453-465.
- MIGOTTI 2013: B. Migotti, *The Stelae of Northern Croatia*. In: N. Cambi - G. Koch (eds), *Funerary Sculpture of the Western Illyricum and Neighbouring Regions of the Roman Empire*, Split, 2013, 303-341.
- NAGY 2007: L. Nagy, *Beiträge zur Frage der gesellschaftlichen Stellung der in den römerzeitlichen Hügelgräbern Bestatteten in Transdanubien*, *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, LVIII, Budapest 2007, 145-163.
- NAGY 2007: M. Nagy, *Lapidarium*, Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, Budapest, 2007.
- OLDENSTEIN 1976: J. Oldenstein, *Zur Ausrüstung römischer Auxiliareinheiten. Studien zu Beschlägen und Zierat an der Ausrüstung der römischen Auxiliareinheiten des obergermanisch-raetischen Limesgebietes aus dem zweiten und dritten Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission, 57, Mainz am Rhein 1976, 49-284.
- PICCOTTINI 1972: G. Piccottini, *Die Rundmedaillons und Nischenportraits des Stadtgebietes von Virunum*, *Corpus Signorum Imperii Romani*, Österreich, Band II, Faszikel 2, Wien, 1972.
- PILIPOVIĆ 2006: S. Pilipović, *La scena di caccia: motivo di decorazione*, *Starinar*, LVI, Beograd 2006, 337-352.
- POCHMARSKI 1990: E. Pochmarski, *Römischen Bildhauerkunst des 3. und 4. Jh. n. Chr. am norischen Limes*. In: Herman. Veters - Manfred Kandler (eds), *Akten des 14. Intern. Limeskongr. in Carnuntum, Der römische Limes in Österreich*, 36 (1, 2), Wien, 1990, 525-538.
- POCHMARSKI 1991: E. Pochmarski, *Zur Datierung von Solvenser Porträts*. In: M. Heinzmann et al. (eds), *Akten des I. internationalen Colloquiums über Probleme des Provinzialrömischen Kunstschaffens, Teil II, Mitteilungen der Archaeologischen Gesellschaft Steiermark*, 5, Wien, 1991, 99-109.
- POCHMARSKI 1996: E. Pochmarski, *Severische Reliefs aus dem Stadtterritorium von Virunum*. In: G. Bauchhenß (ed.), *Akten des 3. internationalen Kolloquiums über Probleme des provinzialrömischen Kunstschaffens Köln - Bonn*, 1996, 127-139.
- POCHMARSKI 2006: E. Pochmarski, *Zur Frage der Typologie und der Chronologie der römischen Porträtstelen in Noricum, Römisches Österreich*, 29, Wien, 2006, 89-114.
- POCHMARSKI 2007: E. Pochmarski, *Werkstätten von Porträtreliefs aus Flavia Solva, Römisches Österreich*, 30, Wien, 2007, 91-105.
- ROTHER 2009: U. Rothe, *Dress and Identity in the Rhine-Moselle Region of the Roman Empire*, *British Archaeological Reports, Intern. Ser.*, 2038, Oxford, 2009.
- SCHNURBEIN, von 1977: S. von Schnurbein, *Römisches Gräberfeld von Regensburg, Materialhefte zur bayerischen Vorgeschichte, Reihe A - Fundinventäre und Ausgrabungsbefunde*, 31, München, 1977.
- SUMNER 2009: G. Sumner, *Roman Military Dress*, Stroud, 2009.
- UBL 1979: H. Ubl, *Die Skulpturen des Stadtgebietes von Aelium Cetium, Corpus Signorum Imperii Romani, Österreich, Band I, Faszikel 6*, Wien, 1979.
- UBL 2002: H. Ubl, *Ein «Ringschnallencingulum» aus Lauriacum*. In: Maurizio Buora (ed.), *Miles Romanus dal Po al Danubio nel Tardoantico*, Pordenone, 2002, 275-285.
- UBL 2006: H. Ubl, *Defunctus in expeditione Germanica, Lauriacum morte sua. Ein neues Kapitel zur Geschichte Lauriacums und der Adler der Legio II Adiutrix, Römisches Österreich*, 29, Wien, 2006.
- UEL: - <http://www.ubi-erat-lupa.org>
- WEBER 1994: E. Weber, *Rapporti amministrativi fra Pannonia e Norico*. In: G. Hajnóczy (ed.), *La Pannonia e l'Impero Romano*, Roma 1994, 43-49.