

SUMMARY: 1ST TO 3RD CENTURY FUNERARY MONUMENTS IN THE NORTHERN FRONTIER PROVINCES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Albeit not extensively, as early as the pre-Roman, late La Tène period, the following three different types of funerary monuments of earth and wood were constructed in the research area: barrows, temple-like structures and enclosures, frequently in combination. During the Hallstatt- and early La Tène period, barrows were widespread. Towards the end of the pre-Roman La Tène period they had almost ceased to exist commonly and in most regions. Individual barrows for indigenous aristocrats were built only in the South-East of Britannia, between the North-East of Gaul and the Lower Rhine and in the North of the Treveri-region, and even there only sporadically. The case was even more extreme in the later Danube provinces. In the 4th and 3rd century B. C. monumental barrows with stone tomb chambers and architectonic entrance façades were created in the sphere of influence of the Macedonian and Thracian kingdoms. According to current research, the custom to construct these funerary monuments came to halt in the late La Tène period. Wagon graves were associated with aristocratic burials and can be traced back to the late La Tène period throughout the above named regions and beyond them as far as Romania and Hungary. However, it remains unclear whether they were marked with barrows above the ground. Throughout the late La Tène period the entire area of study was predominated by earth graves. It has been possible to evidence wooden funerary monuments by means of features with postholes in cemeteries or at barrows, but only for the South-East of Britannia and the Middle Rhine (Eastern Gaul). Usually the majority of them have been found next to, rather than on top of, the graves. Therefore the wooden structures seem to have served in the context of a mortuary cult, either for temporary exposure of the deceased or as a site of memorial rites as the funerary temples. The absence of these structures in southern and the Danube regions can possibly be attributed to the current state of research. Nevertheless, the coincidence of the appearance of wood constructions with the distribution of the third pre-Roman type of funerary monuments, the enclosures of cremation burials with rectangular ditches or gullies, is striking: During the late Iron Age ditched enclosures spread to the East as far as to present-day Southern Poland, but according to current state of research scarcely south of the Danube. The interpretation of these enclosures as permanent or temporary markings of the grave site remains subject to contention, as does the interpretation of similar complexes of the Roman Iron Age. Here only precise analyses of features and their publication can bring more light into the matter. Where the funerary monuments of earth and/or wood occur in the Roman Iron Age, too, their continuity can by no means be presumed automatically. On the contrary, after the early La Tène period these funerary monuments were first erected *en masse* in the Roman Iron Age. This phenomenon is most compelling for barrows. Certain, narrowly defined northern peripheral provinces of Rome saw them reappear suddenly and in great numbers, in parts even massively, i. e. especially the South-East of Britannia, the Champagne, the Tungri-region, the Lower Rhine (particularly the Batavi-region), from the North and East of the Treveri-region up to the Middle Rhine, the border regions between Raetia and Noricum, between Noricum and Pannonia as well as further parts of Pannonia, Dacia and the border regions between Moesia and Thracia. Other regions of the northern frontier provinces and (older) inland provinces, however, lack barrows of the Roman Principate. Therefore, neither Central, Western and Southern Gaul, nor Hispania or Dalmatia ever witnessed a revival of the previously common (early) La Tène barrow custom. At the time of the Roman Principate, barrows were a phenomenon of the northern frontier cultures.

Though between South-East Britannia and the Middle Rhine (**map 1**), the possible continuity of barrows is debated, a closer examination of the chronology reveals that the oldest known barrows were erected as late as the mid and second half of the 1st century B. C. Secondary burials in prehistoric barrows began around the same period – an inexpensive alternative. Thus, the barrows of the Roman Principate appeared at the time of Caesar's Gallic Wars at the earliest or soon after. Initially, i. e. until the Augustan period, only aristocratic burials were honoured with barrows, as the famous examples of Goebblange-Nospelt, Feulen, Clemency and Lamadeleine in Luxembourg, Vieux-les-Asfeld near Reims and Badenheim near Bad-Kreuznach illustrate. These examples are richly furnished wooden grave chambers that were once certainly, or at least probably, covered with barrows. All evidence indicates that it was the immediate presence of the Roman power that inspired the revival of these traditional types of funerary monuments, although for the time being only for (aristocratic) parts of the native population. Grave-goods further reflect on the contact with the new Roman rulers. Barrows from South-East Britannia are the only ones to be known from before the time of the Roman conquest in 43 A. D. and even their grave goods demonstrate (political) contacts with the Roman Empire, such as the Augustus-medal from the Lexden barrow.

Nonetheless, the majority of barrows of the named areas were constructed upon the establishment of the provinces, i. e. after 27 B. C. in the case of Gallia Belgica before the administrative separation of the two Germanic military zones in the Rhine valley, and after 43 A. D. in the case of Britannia. According to the current state of research, a continuity of barrows or other pre-Roman types of funerary monuments into the period of the Roman Principate cannot be proven for the later Danube provinces. The cases of Raetia and Noricum even indicate a relation with the respective foundation of province (20/30 and 40/50 A. D.). In Central, Western and Southern Pannonia, Dacia and Moesia the oldest barrows to be dated originated upon a considerable time lapse after the establishment of provinces, a time lapse of one generation in Dacia (since 106/107 A. D.), two or three in Moesia (since 9 A. D.) and around four in Central and Western Pannonia (since 9 A. D.). The geographic distribution of barrows along the frontier to the province of Thracia demonstrates that the examples in Moesia originated in Thracia. This is also the case for the barrows in Dobruška, whereas the Greek poleis on the coast of the Black Sea in Lower Moesia looked back on an own, Hellenistic tradition. But even there, no archaeological records bridge the hiatus until the beginning of the 2nd century A. D. In Thracia itself, the early Hellenistic barrow custom for aristocratic burials only picked up again after the second third of the 1st century A. D. Once again, a relation with the transformation of the Thracian kingdom, ally with Rome, to the Roman province of Thracia (46 A. D.) can plausibly be assumed. The Eastern Barrow of Karanovo near Nova Zagora is one of the earliest examples. From the second half of the 1st century A. D. large barrows became a mass phenomenon in Thracia. Over two hundred examples known of alone from the present-day Bulgarian part of ancient Thracia are associated with the Hellenistic elite custom of wagon burials under barrows.

If one takes a closer look at those regions in which barrows especially proliferated during the Roman Principate, one concludes that they were onset not only with the foundation of the Roman province, but in particular in the border area of two or three provinces (**map 1**). This is the case for the barrows in the Champagne and the Tungri-region (Gallia Belgica and the military zones of Lower Germany/Germania Inferior), the Treveri-region (Gallia Belgica and the military zones of Upper Germania/Germania Superior), the border region of Raetia and Noricum in the area between Munich and Iuvavum/Salzburg, the border region between Noricum and Pannonia around Flavia Solva and between Ovilava/Wels and Vindobona/Vienna and the border between Moesia and Northern Thracia. Each of the concerned regions was a previous territorial unit divided by Roman provincial borders. The barrows appear primarily in rural areas. They kept a distance to the direct sphere of influence of Roman power centres, such as legionary bases and *coloniae* – with the exception of the *colonia Flavia Scupi*/Skopje that was traditionally influenced by Thracian-Macedonian

culture. On the other hand, barrows can be encountered in the surroundings of some settlements that were declared *municipia* in the 1st or early 2nd century, such as Noviomagus/Nijmegen, Iuvavum/Salzburg, Ovilava/Wels, Aelium Cetium/St. Pölten, Virunum/Zollfeld and particularly Flavia Solva/Wagna. Nevertheless, even here the approximation to Mediterranean milieu was limited: Thus, barrow fields on the western arterial road of Flavia Solva maintained a considerable distance to the Mediterranean influenced western streets of tombs, of which the stone grave monuments were located much closer to the settlement. A similar topographic pattern is observable in Noviomagus/Nijmegen and Camulodunum/Colchester.

At the same time, the explanation of the appearance of barrows as a kind of cultural resistance to the Mediterranean power seems to fall short of plausibility. In this context it has proven useful to compare the spread of *tumuli* of urban Roman, or Central Italian type, with that of barrows. As a result significant differences are revealed between the Rhine provinces and Britannia on the one hand, and the Danube provinces on the other. The distribution areas of barrows and *tumuli* overlap in the South-East of Britannia, Gallia Belgica and parts of both Germanic provinces. A technical sophistication of barrows to *tumuli* with circular walls adapted from the Mediterranean, originated in the above-named areas as early as the 1st half of the 1st century A.D. (Nickenich; fig. 31). The examples of Early Principate *tumuli* or other types of circular stone funerary monuments can possibly have exacerbated the rapid adaptation of Mediterranean equivalents of indigenous barrows, such as the cenotaph for the Imperial prince Drusus the Elder from Mainz (fig. 26), the circular edifice for an Imperial slave of Tiberius' *familia* near *oppidum Ubiorum*/Cologne (fig. 25) or the *tumuli* from Haltern (figs 22-23), the circular walls of which were made of wood, but imitated Central Italian examples of stone. Surely it is more than chance that in the Treveri- and Tungri-regions – in the hinterland of the funerary monuments so modern for the day – barrows and *tumuli* mixed earliest and most intensively. The coincidence of models will rather have incited to imitation, as on the one hand, these regions were located within the area of perception of the named monumental memorials of agents of Roman power. On the other hand the still new, above-mentioned barrows of Iron Age type of an indigenous, Rome-friendly elite were visible (at least in the area of present-day Luxembourg). The monuments of the new rulers in combination with the re-adopted models of princely funerary monuments of ancestors reaffirmed each other in their external shape and circular plan and could therefore unfold a particular attraction to the native population. However, this development did not take place parallel everywhere. Rome recruited auxiliary units preferably riders from the East-Gaulish Tungri and Treveri tribes and the Germanic Batavi. This role within the Empire facilitated the integration of the Tungri and Treveri into Mediterranean culture, as is expressed in the forms of elite funerary monuments. The Germanic Batavi, however, always having enjoyed an exclusive role in the service to Rome as highly demanded special units for the Roman army, seem to have felt their pride in their own origins boosted and therefore maintained their traditional funerary architecture – barrows and ditched enclosures – as late as the 3rd century. Evidently, the insufficient availability of building stones in the Lower Rhine valley further played its part towards the conservative perpetuation of native funerary monuments and settlement types (byre-dwellings) in wood-and-earth-technique. At least the revival of barrows presents a certain parallel to processes in Thracia, equally a favoured recruitment area for Roman auxiliary units.

The situation is different in the Danube provinces. Where barrows appear *en masse*, only few *tumuli* are encountered, for example in Raetia. While barrows of the early Roman Principate are uncovered primarily in the East of the province, where they were probably built by a population immigrated from the Alps (the so-called »Heimstetten group«), *tumuli* are discovered almost exclusively in the West of the province, although they generally date to the 2nd to 3rd century. Actually, very few *tumuli* are known from the Danube provinces. The rare exceptions (e. g. Virunum, Baláca, Inota, Aquincum and Sarmizegetusa) are located outside or on the periphery of the distribution areas of barrows. The local concentration of *tumuli* in Carnuntum (Pannonia Superior) and Alburnus Major (Dacia) can be attributed to immigrants, i. e. legionaries and their

relatives, or to non-local skilled workers at the mines at Alburnus Major (Dacia). It would however be a mistake to conclude that the reluctance towards adopting *tumuli* was due to a greater cultural reservation of natives towards Rome. Especially the border region between Noricum and Pannonia, but also for example the barrow group in the surroundings of Iuvavum/Salzburg, saw the establishment of a different form of stone monumentalisation in the 2nd century, i. e. the construction of stone grave tombs, not seldomly accessible via corridors (*dromoi*) behind representative façades. Evidently, they imitate Thracian-Macedonian examples. At the same time, stone tombs constitute the change of paradigm: this barrow was conceptually no longer an individual grave (secondary burials aside), but rather a family or multigenerational funerary monument. This is a difference to western *tumuli*, which fundamentally remained individual graves. In addition, many barrows in the Danube provinces had *stelae* with inscriptions and reliefs erected in front of them. The comparison with the Rhine provinces shows that the monumentalisation took place approximately three generations later, while its chronology proceeded parallel with the generally late occurrence of stone funerary monuments in the Danube provinces. Therefore, the development of barrows does not deviate fundamentally from the processual tendencies of other types of funerary monuments. As in the Rhine provinces, the monumentalisation always affected but a part of the barrows in the Danube provinces (*tumuli* in the former, tombs with *dromoi* in the latter provinces).

For the entire area of the research we can conclude that the revival of older types of funerary monuments in earth-and-wood-technique should not be understood as cultural resistance to Rome, but rather as an acceptance of the »play« on grave construction as a socio-political method of communication which was fashionable among the Italian elite of the late Republic and early Principate. Particularly the Augustan period and the 1st century A. D. appreciated the imitation of Mediterranean stone construction technology with locally available resources, earth and wood, as not all parts of the population had financial or logistical access to it otherwise. At least in the Treveri-region and South-East Britannia (Lexden), large barrows of the Augustan period had grave inventories, the composition of which indicates a Rome-friendly rather than a Rome-hostile aristocracy. Nonetheless, it remains out of doubt that the choice of pre-Roman native types of funerary monuments can also be a statement of confidence vis-à-vis the culture of the new rulers in the sense of re-establishing a social and cultural identity within the changed context of a Roman province. This behaviour is reflected in the fact that barrows were maintained in almost all of the mentioned regions until the 3rd century, though in more or less rapidly declining numbers. However, the adoption of grave monuments as a medium alone is a step of assimilation, towards integration to Mediterranean culture. Being part of a Roman province certainly meant new opportunities for some natives: indigenous people and families of non-aristocratic origins were now in the position to demand types of funerary monuments previously exclusive to the elites because they enjoyed chances of advancement within a new context, e. g. auxiliary veterans. This further explains the boom of barrows, in particular, and also of ditched enclosures from the early Roman Principate onwards. The maintenance of old burial customs reveals that there was an ongoing commitment to native cultural traditions notwithstanding the exterior shape of funerary monuments. For example, in Gaulish influenced regions of the north-western research area, urned cremation burials with pyre debris or cremation burials in stone cists are interpreted as indication for the indigenous population. Ash pits containing the remainders of the pyre would accompany burials of higher status. In the case of the Danube provinces, *busta* prevail in tile (masonry) tombs, which can be traced back mainly to Macedonian and Thracian, and also to Upper-Italian influence.

The erection of funerary temples can be associated with the conservation of autochthonous practices of burial and memorial rites going back to the Iron Age. Their case is primarily one of monuments for cult-practices – funerary meals or the exposure of the deceased – and if at all secondarily one of funerary monuments in the strict sense of the term. The fact that they were located next to the actual funerary monuments is

most telling. In South-East Britannia and North-East Gaul the discussion of several post structures discovered next to barrows is necessary (see p. 11-23. 446-453). They and younger constructions resembling temples were frequently located within a mutual enclosure. Some of these funerary monuments were enclosed so generously with ditches and/or palisades or fences, that there was space for gardens or assembly points. Relevant evidence of the early Roman Principate is known from Britannia, from the East of Gallia Belgica (Treveri-region) to the Middle Rhine, and also from the South of the later province Germania Superior (Aventicum). Contrary to barrows and enclosures however, these are types of funerary monuments that are found in solitary and in small numbers and constitute individual sanctuaries associated with distinguished burials of local aristocrats. Whereas wooden buildings within an own enclosure were evidenced next to the barrows of Feulen and Büchel (fig. 293 or 295) and can be interpreted as mentioned above, stone temples with ambulatory of Gallo-Roman type were found next to the barrow »Folly Lane« near Verulamium/St. Albans (fig. 9) and close to the *mausolea* »En Chaplix« near Aventicum/Avenches (fig. 294). In these cases the adoption of Mediterranean style is limited to the use of stone architecture. More recent examples of the 2nd/3rd century for the association of the actual grave monument and (alleged) funerary temple have been found in Britannia, e.g. »Wood Lane End« near Verulamium (fig. 276). Such later examples are rare, however, in the area of Gallo-Germanic culture, e.g. Newel near Trier (fig. 296). Much indicates that these complexes were the sites of a kind of hero cult from pre-Roman times, having arrived to Gaul originally from the area of Greek culture (via Massilia/Marseille or with Celtic mercenaries serving the Macedonians?). The positively bipolar distribution pattern of temple-like funerary monuments in the northern frontier provinces, with a second cluster between Greece and the linguistically and culturally Greek influenced province Moesia Inferior, could therefore be more than a merely coincidental reflection of the state of research – notwithstanding the methodological difficulties due to the conditions of conservation in the area of research (see below). In both main regions of distribution temple-like funerary monuments are found near (native) settlements in the hinterland, but not, however, in the *limes* zones.

Temple-like funerary monuments with an accessible interior room and a simultaneous function as a tomb, are referred to here as temple-tombs. From the second half of the 1st century A.D. these graves came to be the dominant types of funerary monuments of the upper and middle class in Rome and Central Italy. The temple-tomb of the *gens Flavia* in Rome contributed to the popularity of this monument type as one of its examples. The fashion reached Southern Gaul in the 2nd century at the latest and spread from there to Central Gaul, to the South of Upper Germania and to Western Raetia with few examples. In contrast to Italy, where temple-tombs and *mausolea* lined streets of tombs in large numbers (e.g. in Ostia), they remained prominent individual monuments in Gaul, generally associated with the owners of large rural estates. The same is true for most of the Britannic temple-tombs. In the South-East of the island they appear more frequently than anywhere else in the northern frontier provinces. Apparently the veneration of the dead in temples was continued to be reserved for distinguished personalities in the area of Gaulish culture. The so-called »Testament du Lingon«, i.e. the last will of an aristocrat of the Lingones preserved as a medieval copy of a Roman epitaph, describes a funerary temple (the altar containing the cremated bones was to be erected in front of the building) within a funerary garden. The source confirms that the Iron Age-rooted notion of the hero cult was still practised in at least certain elite circles. The novelty however was constituted in the architectonic combination of a grave site and a memorial place within a temple-tomb and, frequently, the choice of Mediterranean architecture. At the same time, Romano-Celtic temples continue to appear.

The development of *tumuli* and temples in Italy and the northern frontier provinces took an opposed direction. In the Italy of Augustus and in the early Roman Principate the *tumulus* was the type of funerary monument of the state elite. References suffice to the funerary monument of Augustus and the Julio-Claudian dynasty in Rome itself (*tumulus Iuliorum*; fig. 1), to the *tumulus* of Lucius Munacius Plancus near

Gaëta (fig. 4) and to the »Casal Rotondo« and the so-called monuments of the Hortarii family at the Via Appia. Their circular plan also influenced the architecture of state central- and victory monuments in the provinces, e. g. the *monumentum Alpium* near La Turbie, the cenotaphs for Drusus near Mainz, the monument which Germanicus had erected in honour of the fallen of the *clades Variana*, an insufficiently studied large monument on the Upper Rhine near Augusta Raurica and the *monumentum Traiani* near Adamklissi. In some parts of the north-western provinces the *tumulus* became a popular type of funerary monument. The popularisation of originally aristocratic stone architecture took place for the Noric-Pannonian barrows, too, though later and differently: Vaulted tombs with *dromoi* influenced by Macedonian-Thracian royal tombs became »modern« in some parts of the Danube provinces in the 2nd century. In the case of temples, a contrary trend may be observed. Whereas they were a considerably popular type in Italy, they underwent a change of paradigm towards a funerary monument of the aristocracy, or at least with an association to the upper class, in Gaul. However, one must consider that the conditions of conservation of Roman funerary monuments in the northern provinces often inhibit a reliable (particularly a functional!) identification of a temple. The same must be concluded above all for the many square to rectangular stone footings, which can indisputably be interpreted as funerary monuments, but which cannot unequivocally be reconstructed either as a roofed temple- or house-shaped funerary monument on the one hand, or open enclosure on the other hand because of their unsatisfactory state of conservation. Particularly in Raetia and Noricum, and also in the area of the Upper German *limes* numerous of such funerary monuments are known ultimately eluding a typological classification. Noricum presents the most complicated situation, as these building records count among the oldest ever funerary monuments in the province. One example is the grave inscription of C. Iulius Vepo Donatus from Celeia/Celje (CIL III 5232) who was vested with civil rights by Emperor Augustus himself.

On the Rhine and in Eastern Gaul, where single funerary temples are evidenced for the beginning of the Roman Principate, these and more recent temple-tombs are missing later on, not counting sporadic uncertain findings. Thus, a temple-tomb can possibly have towered above the *columbarium* of urban Roman type from Cologne-Weiden (fig. 289). However, this grave complex is an exception in various respects and should rather be associated with a family immigrated from Rome or Italy. In contrast to Britannia and Southern and Central Gaul, temple-like funerary monuments seem to be out of fashion as early as the 1st century in Eastern Gaul and on the Rhine, as rare and questionable examples prove. It is possible, that the defeat of the Revolt of the Batavi contributes to explaining this development. The old, local aristocracy – in so far they had not already gone into exile – could have preferred to come to dispense of traditional, conservative status presentation in the shape of buildings for a hero cult. A noticeable decline of barrows in these regions – but not of *tumuli* – could further fit into this interpretation. Other types of monuments were to fill this void, especially pillars and *stelae* (see below). Only in the late 3rd century the type of the temple-tomb achieved prevalence over tombs and was left the only remaining type of funerary monument in Late Antiquity.

Funerary meals can hardly have forfeited their religious dimension. The (regular) ceremonial meal of the bereaved honouring the deceased was a central intercultural memorial rite common to pre-Roman late La Tène Gaul and the Greek-Roman culture. However, within the research area, there can have been differences concerning the locality of funerary meals. At any rate, in the Mediterranean world the place for funerary meals and libations usually was the grave itself, for which purpose the temple-tombs and *mausolea* provided appropriate conditions. Although only few funerary monuments with the facilities for the family sacrificial meal can be identified in Eastern Gaul and on the Rhine (temples), its religious relevance was illustrated in a different way: in relief depictions. The motif of the funerary meal was introduced to the Rhine upon the end of the Revolt of the Batavi by Thracian auxiliary soldiers. It is their sepulchral *stelae* which first showed the subject in these regions before natives too adopted it on their *stelae* and other types of monuments

(e.g. tower-tombs). The distribution pattern of funerary temples/temple-tombs on the one hand and the motif of the funerary meal on the other complement one another.

Apart from the methodological difficulties concerning the reconstruction of the walled foundation of funerary monuments, especially in Noricum, the general lack of temple-type funerary monument in the Danube provinces Pannonia, Dacia and Moesia Superior is striking¹⁶¹¹. Similarly, this type of funerary monument is absent in Dalmatia. The gap is filled with a different monument form derived from the sacral area, the altar. Monolithic funerary altars and composite altar-shaped funerary monuments were common from the late 1st until the 3rd century in the mentioned provinces. Most of the time, the design of these monuments and their associated relief themes was oriented by examples from Upper Italy, which, in turn, had generally been adapted from the *regiones VIII et X*, especially Aquileia. Yet one important distinction to the Italian funerary altars lies in the fact that their function as ash altars cannot be evidenced in the Danube provinces. They merely seem to have functioned as grave markers, focusing primarily on the inscription – in the centre of the altar (body) – and secondarily on the portrait of the deceased. The associated cremation burials were usually arranged within walled enclosures, within or in front of which most of the altar shaped funerary monuments were probably positioned or in some cases pedestal type urn chambers. There are also examples in Dalmatia. In the Moesian provinces, altars seem to have been preferably erected without any architectonic context. Further provincial evolutions and metamorphoses particularly effected crowning attachments of altar-type monuments, especially pyramid-shaped fixtures and free-standing portrait medallions. Altar-type funerary monuments, or rather their construction parts are known in large numbers from the Danube provinces – due to their preservation as *spolia*. Their central parts, i. e. the vertical rectangular shafts for the epitaphs can only be distinguished with great difficulty from bases for detached statues of the deceased. Especially in Dacia, where a lot of slightly below life-size stone statues of the deceased are attested, this alternative form of honouring the dead can be assumed. The large number of shafts for epitaphs, specifically, their inscriptions, allow the conclusion that altar-type funerary monuments were preferred mainly by Roman citizens of the numerous *coloniae* and *municipia* in the Danube provinces, and also by soldiers or veterans and their families. Hence, altar type monuments were the favoured type of funerary monument for the urban middle stratum in the Danube provinces from Raetia to Moesia Inferior, and especially in Noricum, Pannonia, Dacia and Moesia. Altars were also regarded suitable identifications of family graves, i. e. not only of individual graves. The peregrine (rural) population tended to dispense with this rather urban monument type.

In Britannia and the Rhine provinces a contrary pattern is observable. Funerary altars were exceptional phenomena throughout all periods. This is also true for free-standing statues of the deceased, the bases of which can be confused with the shafts of the altars. Apparently these monument types were regarded as memorials for deserved members of public life – as in the Rome of Augustus' times. Individuals, rather than families, were honoured with funerary altars in these regions. Thus, in Aventicum for instance an equestrian tribune highly decorated by Emperor Claudius was rewarded with a funerary altar, or a base for his statue (CIL XIII 5094). Subsequently, the few funerary altars present from the Rhine provinces and Britannia are disproportionally frequently dedicated to equestrian commanders and, more generally, to individuals from outside the province. Two altars for the slave child of a family of a senatorial proconsul in Mainz (157/159 A. D.) did not find contemporary imitators (**fig. 216**). Funerary altars were probably not introduced to Germania Inferior until strangers did from the Danube and eastern provinces in the Severan period. Alone in the area of the *coloniae* in the South of Upper Germany, once again in the urban milieu, were they common among regular citizens as early as the 2nd century. In general the differences between Danube and Rhine

¹⁶¹¹ Stone tombs below barrows with dromoi as accessible funerary monuments for families or several generations can possibly have served the (practical) functions of temple-tombs in some areas.

provinces apply to larger altar-type funerary monuments, too. In Eastern Gaul and in the Rhine provinces individual altar-shaped funerary monuments of oblong format are testified, the models for which came from Rome, Central Italy and Southern Gaul. The oldest of them were erected on the Rhine and Moselle probably as early as the 1st century A. D. Altar-shaped funerary monuments of oblong format are rare in the Danube provinces because they were also rare in Upper Italy.

As monumental markers of individual and family graves, *stelae* were the alternative to funerary altars in the Danube provinces. Throughout the northern provinces *stelae* are the first and oldest stone funerary monuments. The bulk of *stelae* from the Danube provinces (especially from Pannonia) however still considerably exceed the number of *stelae* from the Rhine provinces. This result is explained not only by research history (frequent excavations of late Roman fortification walls with numerous *spoliae* in the Danube provinces), but seems to reflect ancient reality. Whereas the number of *stelae* on the Rhine strongly declines from the end of the 1st century onwards, their numbers were constant on the Middle and Lower Danube and even increased from the end of the 2nd century onwards. After the mid-3rd century they were still erected frequently. Precisely the case of *stelae* illustrates the shift of military focus in the North from the Rhine to the Danube under Domitian and Trajan particularly strikingly. There, *stelae* were chosen not only by soldiers, or veterans, and citizens of the numerous *municipia* and *coloniae*, but also by natives with peregrine status. The present study considers only large *stelae* over two metres height. On the Rhine, they were concentrated geographically on the Rhine *limes* zone and chronologically on the 1st century A. D. There are clusters around Mainz and Cologne. Soldiers, especially horsemen, were the main clients. In the early 1st century A. D. the so-called niche *stelae* with full body statues (**fig. 248**) were created in the area between Mainz and Cologne inspired by sepulchral *stelae* from Upper Italian legionaries. This type of monument was adopted by natives in Mainz already in Tiberian times. On the Middle Rhine and in the adjacent East Gaulish regions these examples were enhanced to monumental façade constructions (here referred to as monumental *stelae*) made from several architectural elements (**fig. 250**) around the mid-1st century A. D. Similarly, the rock monument from Schweinschied near Bad Kreuznach (**figs 258-259**) can be interpreted as a constructional exception for this monument group dating predominantly in the early Roman Principate. Direct Italian or Mediterranean examples are known for none of these monuments; indeed, all evidence suggests their classification as provincial creations. In the Danube provinces Noricum, Pannonia, Dacia and Moesia such monuments are without equivalence. Instead monolithic *stelae* of more than three metres height were often erected in these regions, which, in turn, do not occur in similar height ranges neither in the Rhine provinces nor in Britannia. Some are decorated with multiple relief zones. The largest example of this kind is on the present-day market square of Poetovio/Ptui (**fig. 272**). Typical for the Danube provinces are separate *stelae* attachments representing two cowering lions at both sides of a crowning motif (e.g. a symbolic urn, a bearded deity's head with *polos*, Medusa or a genius of death). However, the archetypes of such *stelae* attachments originate in Upper Italy. In Dacia, own regional variants were derived from Pannonian models.

The funerary monument type of *mausoleum*, a two- to three-storey tower with an open top storey and a composition in shape of a temple, also illustrates the striking differences between Rhine and Danube provinces. Different to funerary temples and temple-tombs, however, this top storey was not accessible, but served as an architectural platform for the presentation of statues of deceased. In the Rhine military zone this originally Hellenistic type of monument was introduced by legionaries during the Tiberian-Claudian period. The best preserved example is the *mausoleum* of Pobliscus in Cologne (**fig. 69**). Typologically and chronologically they tie on late Roman Republican to Augustan archetypes, which were conveyed from Rome via Southern Gaul and from Upper Italy to the North. Battle scenes of horsemen on bases inspired by South Gaulish examples indicate that at least some of the clients of such monuments on the Rhine and in Eastern Gaul were auxiliary veterans of native origin. *Mausolea* of three storeys of up to 23m height

are known from stately villas in the surroundings of native civitas capitals in the East Gaulish hinterland of the Rhine military zone (Aventicum/Avenches, Andemantunum/Langres and Augusta Treverorum/Trier) (figs 77. 80-81). These borrowed from Roman and South Gaulish models. Comparably extraordinary examples of this type remain unknown on the Rhine. They are reckoned to have been erected in the period between 20 and 40 A. D. In this respect, it is intuitive to assume that these monuments were commissioned after the so-called Sacrovir Revolt of 21 A. D. by native elites loyal to Rome. The conscious choice of a Roman monument type very modern at the time (rather than a traditional barrow) clearly resembles a political declaration of loyalty, manifest and permanent for all coming generations of the family to see set in stone. South Gaulish elite examples gave orientation, having integrated successfully to the Roman state several generations previously. The impression that such large monuments could have replaced the above mentioned funerary temples in their distribution area could rest on more than mere coincidence. The type *mausoleum* was the expression of social climbers with political ambitions within the framework of Roman power both in the Rome of the late Republic and the Augustan period as well as in the Gaulish-Germanic provinces. This may well be the case not only for the native upper class, but also for Pöblius' example. He was a mere legionary, no officer. As a veteran, and possibly as one of the first citizen generation of the new CCAA, he will have enjoyed greater chances of social advancement on the Rhine than where he came from. The number of such exclusive grave monuments remains limited, as does the period in which they were erected in the 1st century A. D. The fact that *mausolea* have not yet been identified with certainty in Britannia may be explained by their loss of popularity by the time that economic and societal conditions were created for potential clients in a province which was only conquered in 43 A. D. Individual examples can be dated to the 2nd century only in the South of Upper Germany.

Similar sized *mausolea* from the Danube provinces have not yet been registered. During the 2nd century – though the initial dating remains controversial – inventive stone masons in the border area between Noricum and Pannonia departed from *stelae* with architectural frames, diffused to Carnuntum from Upper Italy via Aquileia and Emona to create a smaller type of *mausoleum* with an open top storey, the so-called Noric-Pannonian aedicula. This type seldom superseded 5-6 m height. Hence, the enlargement of a single piece monument to a building must be evaluated as a thus far unique innovation, in particular with respect to a prefabricated construction for mass production. Discoveries are correspondingly frequent. Clients were generally municipal officials and veteran families with Roman citizenship. This is also reflected in the sites where *aediculae* were mainly found, i. e. in towns with Roman legal status (*municipia* and *coloniae*) and military bases. A reduced version of the *aedicula* with a top storey constructed with three wall panels (the so-called *aedicula in antis*) was popular, chronologically mainly in the 3rd century, and geographically more frequently in Dacia. Similar monuments having derived from Greek models existed in Lower Moesia, although only few examples of them are as yet known (or published).

Whereas the *aedicula* type of *mausoleum* is present in the Danube provinces until the 3rd century, it was rapidly replaced by a new type of monument in Eastern Gaul and in the Rhine provinces. As early as the first half of the 1st century A. D. stone masons in the area of Mainz and on the Middle Rhine were experimenting with the Italian inspired monument forms *stela* and *mausoleum*. By combining the above mentioned niche *stelae* and the *mausoleum*, a new type of funerary monument was developed: the relief pillar with enclosed façade on all sides. The so-called gardener's funerary monument from Mainz (fig. 127) is considered one of the first prototypes. The latter and the niche monument from Nickenich (fig. 248) demonstrate that the initiative for this innovation came (at least among others) from the native population. The *mausolea* and the relief pillars are characterised by curved pyramidal roofs with scale decorations, which are rare in this form in the Danube provinces. Furthermore, an influence of the monumental Jupiter Columns with relief decoration of the 1st century cannot be excluded for the development of relief pillars. The latter were erected

for example in Lutetia Parisiorum/Paris (so-called *nautae*-pillars), in Noviomagus/Nijmegen, in Traiectum Mosae/Maastricht, Augusta Treverorum/Trier and in Divodurum Mediomatricorum/Metz. The fact that relief pillars and Jupiter Columns have a roughly identical area of distribution further supports this relation. Certainly also as a more economic alternative, relief pillars prevailed over the *mausolea* in the Flavian period, if not even earlier. Transitory types of the late 1st to mid-2nd century were the funerary monuments from Mersch in Luxembourg (fig. 89), the so-called tower-tomb 9 from Neumagen on the Moselle (fig. 88) and the recently excavated ruins of a two-storey funerary monument near Frankfurt-Zeilsheim. The latter is currently analysed by Marianne Tabaczek. Unfortunately, the lack of assignable inscriptions and complete architectural assemblages renders it impossible to fathom whether political incidents determined this development. Most of the construction elements of relief pillars were found as isolated spoliae in secondary architectural contexts, which further impedes the necessary precision for dating. The Revolt of the Batavi, which also affected parts of Gallia Belgica, could have accelerated the process by causing agitation within the native aristocracy and encouraged social climbers to break with established conventions (see above). In any case, relief pillars became a popular mass memorial throughout the 2nd century between the South of Britannia and the East of Noricum, especially however in the East of Gallia Belgica, in the Germanic provinces and in Western Raetia. The Treveri contributed most to the further development and distribution of this type. Treveran merchants implemented it in the Raetian capital Municipium Aelium Augustum/Augsburg. A veritable serial, reduced type of monument was created there, which spread within the North of Raetia during the second half of the 2nd century, especially in the *limes* zone and along the Danube. The appeal of the relief pillar is also demonstrated by the fact that it was established as the most relevant type of funerary monument even in Castra Regina/Regensburg, when the *legio III Italica* was stationed there from 170 A. D. onwards. Although this legion had been recruited only a few years earlier in Italy, the legionaries imported hardly any new types of monuments from the South (other than portrait friezes with half busts and busts on sepulchral *stelae*), but recurred to those types which were present in their new province of stationing, i. e. especially the repertoire of the stone masons in Augsburg¹⁶¹².

Pillars impressed by their height in combination with their respective location (e. g. on an elevation or next to a road) on the one hand by their images (reliefs) on the other hand and only then by their epitaphs. High, slender pillars could be recognised as land marks and address travellers on a (long distance) road with their relief images. There is no other type of monument which reflects the course of the most important Roman roads better than the relief pillars by their distribution (map 8). The height can vary between c. 1 m for miniatures and 20-30m for the category of the highest funerary monuments of the Imperium Romanum (e. g. Duppach in Gallia Belgica and the so-called »Igeler Säule«, figs 131-132). The combination of size and pictorial themes makes the relief pillars a most suitable universal monument type across very different groups of society. The motifs emphasise the economic success and the resulting social status of the client – from craftsman to wholesale merchant and large landowner. Merchants and craftsmen enjoyed high social reputation in the Gaulish cultural zone. The communicative representations of professions are very individual, for the demonstration of a more or less elevated style of life a range of scenic pictorial codes was used. Thanks to its flexible versatility relief pillars became the most popular and one of the most long living and first of all most multi-variant types of funerary monument in the North-West of the Roman Empire over almost 200 years. This could lead to the assumption that dimensions and pictorial motifs reflect the wide social gap in

¹⁶¹² However, it must be qualified that by the late 2nd century, large funerary monuments had already gone out of fashion. Most families buried their deceased in already existing monuments. A considerable number of the first generation vete-

rans (of *legio III Italica*) may have returned to Italy. Perhaps it was possible for pillars to become popular only later, i. e. when local/ regional recruitment had been introduced.

the Gallo-Roman society during the 2nd and middle of 3rd century. The largest and most prominent example is the »Igeler Säule« with an original height of 23 m (**fig. 132**) dating to the first half of the 3rd century. As a land mark it could be seen clearly both from long-distance roads from the West to Trier and from the not less important traffic route the Moselle. The relief scenes covering all four exterior walls, account the economic success and the resulting life style of the Secundini family as well as the integration in the Greek-Roman culture which is expressed by the represented mythological subjects – the latter presumably rather in the sense of the antique general education than in the sense of a religious confession. However, there were regional preferences, too. Monuments of this dimension are typical for the Treveri-region whereas small monuments prevail in the region of the southern neighbours the Mediomatrici and Leuci.

In the Danube provinces, relief pillars are exceptions. Especially in Noricum, Pannonia and Dacia combinations of the basic shape of an altar were preferred which could be enriched by portrait reliefs – less often by full-body presentations – and pyramidal attachments with relief decoration and thus became pillar-like monuments. Their height ranged between 2 m and 6 m. They appeared in great numbers in the urban centres and in the military zone along the Danube. The general uniformity of the Danubian monuments (or at least their lesser variety in comparison to the Gallic-Germanic provinces) was most suitable to reaffirm the social structure of a widely urban society preventing single individuals or families from being excessively elevated. Here, funerary monuments were a mean of social competition within a well-defined context. Generally, the epitaph was in the centre of the monument, relief decoration covered the sides and was usually restricted to mythological-religious subjects. Contrary to Eastern Gaul and the Rhine provinces both depictions of profession or other indications to the source of economic prosperity and their epigraphic notion were the exception (perhaps even taboo). The only profession worth presenting in word and image, seem to have been the soldier. More importantly, civil status and own merits for the society were emphasised, especially by mentioning the official offices and functions. In this way the funerary monuments of the Danube provinces rather corresponded to the original Republican ideal of commemorating deceased individuals or families which had served the *res publica*, than those of Eastern Gaul and the Rhine provinces.

These significant differences between the Rhine and Danube provinces can be explained by several reasons. Firstly, there is the chronological situation: since Augustus the emphasis of the diplomatic and military foreign policy of Rome was in the North and during the whole 1st century A.D. on the Rhine frontier. All together eight legions not only strongly presented Mediterranean culture but encouraged economic prosperity and the opportunity for social advancement of the native population. In Italy and Rome under Augustus and in the early Principate large and multi-variant funerary monuments of various types were used as a medium of social communication in the re-establishing society of the Principate. During the civil wars of the late Republic and in the period of Augustus, political elites were leading in the development by erecting large monuments often after Hellenistic models. In the early Principate flamboyant monuments garnered attention, erected especially by a new social group, the Imperial slaves and freedmen. At least a part of this variety of types and sizes will have served as models at the legionary bases on the Rhine. Also the Gallia Narbonensis influenced Eastern Gaul and the Rhine region as there were logistic, economic and cultural connections. In the Augustan period the foundation of legionary veteran colonies in Gallia Narbonensis caused both economic growth and social changes reflected by large funerary monuments, e.g. *mausolea*, funerary altars of oblong format, monuments with exedras as well as pyramids the models of which are to be found in Rome and its surroundings. The obvious delight in combining various elements in funerary architecture continued to reside in Eastern Gaul and on the Rhine. Apart from the above named types this is also testified by monuments with exedras and free-standing ash cists. Innovative and unique creations such as the stone bar of a pub from Thil-Châtel near Dijon (**fig. 395**), the rock monument from Schweinschied (**figs 258-259**) or the ash cist with internal relief decoration from Simpelveld (**fig. 347**) are rather typical for

the Rhine than for the Danube provinces. The joy of combining elements was also perpetuated in the reliefs of the funerary pillars.

In contrast, only a reduced spectrum of types can be encountered in the Danube provinces, i. e. *stelae*, barrows and small *tumuli* in the Carnuntum region. It is difficult to reconstruct the original appearance of the stone monuments during the early Principate mainly in the South of Noricum. The development takes up in a remarkable way only in Flavian times, e. g. with the establishment of Flavia Solva as a *municipium*, but primarily due to the shift of the political-military focus from the Rhine to the Danube as a result of Domitian's and Trajan's Dacian Wars.

A further reason for the different forms of self-representation by means of funerary monuments in the Rhine and Danube provinces can be found in the varying density of Roman urban culture. Whereas towns of Roman urban status were rare in Eastern Gaul and the Germanic provinces and native tribal organisation generally persisted (*civitates*), the politics of the Emperors from Hadrian to Caracalla encouraged the legal and social Romanisation of the Danube provinces by creating and raising numerous *coloniae* and *municipia*. The Imperial sponsoring of the Danube provinces and especially of their urban structures reached a peak under Septimius Severus and Caracalla who essentially relied on the loyalty of the Danubian army. The ambitious civil society found the archetypes of their funerary monuments in the Upper Italian towns, first of all in Aquileia. At the beginning of the 2nd century large extravagant monuments had gone out of use there. In the funerary enclosures monuments of small and middle size were considered sufficient and might reflect a broad established middle class. The preference for mythological relief motifs originally came from Greece via the Adria. In the Danube provinces the Upper Italian models were rather copied than modified. An amalgamation with native elements did not take place. Innovations are missing, an exception being the so-called Noric-Pannonian *aedicula*. Earlier than in Eastern Gaul and on the Rhine, Italian funerary fashions of the 2nd century were adopted, e. g. altars and relief sarcophagi.

A comparison between the Rhine and Danube provinces certainly demonstrates large tendencies which are not necessarily valid for each single monument in the research area. At the end of the day, they are private monuments dependent on individual taste and requirements the background of which might not be understood in the single case. Generally, the occurrence especially of funerary monuments has been proven as an indication for socio-political change. By them, the association with and distinction from a social group is manifested. Access to the Mediterranean archetypes was provided by the important traffic and trade routes to Italy – via the sea route and the Rhône valley in the West, via Aquileia on the Amber Road to the Danube in the East. The character of Romanisation is not only evidenced by the adoption of advanced craftsmanship (construction in stone), but also by the choice of foreign shapes and elements which were taken and modified for the representation of native subjects and expression of cultural (regional) identities. While archetypes were further developed in the cultural zone influenced by Eastern Gaul, in the Danube provinces one maintained (Upper) Italian forms and standards as well as one was open towards funerary trends from Italy.

	Eastern Gaul and Rhine provinces	Danube provinces
chronology	From 1 st half of 1 st century A. D. large variety of types in different sizes. On the Rhine initial spark by legionaries, in the <i>hinterland</i> by native elites.	In 1 st century small spectrum of types (<i>stela</i> , <i>tumulus</i> , enclosure, barrow); with beginning of 2 nd century increase due to Dacian wars. New types result from conferment of municipal law.
origin of archetypes	Mainly Rome and respectively via Gallia Narbonensis. Early and further development of Hellenistic archetypes, e. g. as relief pillars or stelae. Slow adoption of new trends in 2 nd century (altars, sarcophagi).	Upper Italy, mainly Aquileia; models are widely copied. In Moesia and Dacia archetypes also from Thracia, Dalmatia and Macedonia (tile masonry tombs, barrows). Innovations in the case of the so-called Noric-Pannonian <i>aedicula</i> . In 2 nd century receptiveness for urban Roman trends (altars, sarcophagi).
evidence for native elites	Several cases of fusion between Mediterranean and native types (<i>tumuli</i> , temples). Funerary monuments of stone are prevalent not later than 2 nd over all regions.	Only singles cases of fusion between Mediterranean and native types (so-called Noric-Pannonian female costume) or retarded fusion (<i>tumuli</i> with <i>dromoi</i> not before 2 nd century). Clear town-country-divide when adopting funerary monuments of stone.
sizes of stone monuments	Great variety of height, 1-30 m. The same type of monument is chosen by different social groups in varying sizes, individual variation. Largest monuments associated with villas in Gaul (large landowners?). Size of monument could reflect traditional social order.	Small spectrum of sizes, only 2-6 m height, rarely more. Few individual variations. Many average monuments for municipal citizens. Greater uniformity than in Eastern Gaul/Rhine provinces. Monuments rather reflect an Romano-Italic social order.
representation	Variety of different types of monuments from 1 st century A. D. Shapes and images more relevant than inscriptions. Most important are profession and economical success. Representations of the whole person instead of portraits.	Inscriptions and portraits are most important medium. Emphasis on civil society and merits for the <i>res publica</i> by holding offices; high status of soldiers and veterans.
commissioners	Veterans, native upper class, »upper middle class«: craftsmen and merchants. Roman citizenship is often not recognisable.	Veterans, (active) soldiers, municipal functionaries, Roman citizens, rarely <i>peregrini</i> , sometimes freedmen.

Tab. 38 Funerary monuments in the Rhine and Danube provinces. Summary on most important tendencies.

Translation: *Manuela Struck*