


DISSERTATIONES ARCHAEOLOGICAE

ex Instituto Archaeologico

Universitatis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae



DissArch

Ser. 3. No. 11. | 2023

Dissertationes Archaeologicae
ex Instituto Archaeologico
Universitatis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae

Ser. 3. No. 11.

Editor-in-chief
Dávid BARTUS

Editorial board

László BARTOSIEWICZ (Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden)
Ondřej CHOJKA (University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice, Czech Republic)
Zoltán CZAJLIK (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary)
Miroslava DAŇOVÁ (University of Trnava, Trnava, Slovakia)
Mario GAVRANOVIĆ (Austrian Archaeological Institute AAS, Vienna, Austria)
Hajnalka HEROLD (University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom)
Tomáš KÖNIG (Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia)
Tina MILAVEC (University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia)
Gábor V. SZABÓ (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary)
Tivadar VIDA (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary)

Technical editor
Gábor VÁCZI

Proofreading
Katalin SEBŐK,
Emilia GRANDI, Zsuzsanna REED, Robin P. SYMONDS

Cover picture
Bence SIMON

Aviable online at <http://ojs.elte.hu/dissarch>
Contact: dissarch@btk.elte.hu
Support: vaczi.gabor@btk.elte.hu

ISSN 2064-4574 (online)

Publisher
László BORHY

© ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Institute of Archaeological Sciences
© Authors
Budapest 2024



PKP
PUBLIC
KNOWLEDGE
PROJECT



DOAJ

ERIH PLUS
EUROPEAN REFERENCE INDEX FOR THE
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES



CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Attila PÉNTEK – Norbert FARAGÓ	5
Obsidian-tipped spears from the Admiralty Islands in the Oceania Collection of the Museum of Ethnography in Budapest	
Máté MERVEL	33
New archaeobotanical finds from the Baradla Cave	
László GUCSI	47
Black or white, possibility or necessity? Virtual restoration of encrusted pottery for the better interpretation of their design	
JÓZSEF PUSKÁS – Sándor-József SZTÁNCSUJ – Lóránt DARVAS – Dan BUZEA – Judith KOSZA-BERECZKI	77
Chronology of the Bronze Age in southeast Transylvania	
János Gábor TARBAY	179
A looted ‘hoard’ from ‘Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County’	
Szilvia JOHÁCZI – Bence PÁRKÁNYI	203
Same but different: A new possible scheme on late archaic black-figure vases	
Károly TANKÓ – András KOVÁCS	215
Celtic plough and land use based on agricultural tool finds from the <i>oppidum</i> of Velem-Szent Vid	
Csilla SÁRÓ	233
A brooch with a name stamp from Győr-Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek (Pannonia, Hungary)	
Kata DÉVAI	255
Roman head-shaped glass vessels from Hungary	
Nikolaus G. O. BOROFFKA – Leonid M. SVERCHKOV	265
Kakhramontepa in Southern Uzbekistan: A 4th–6th-century AD monument in context	
Pavel SOKOLOV – Bence GULYÁS	283
Recently discovered early medieval grave from Serbin	

Bence GULYÁS – Eszter PÁSZTOR – Kristóf FEHÉR – Csilla LIBOR – Tamás SZENICZEY – László Előd ARADI – Réka FÜLÖP – Kyra LYUBLJANOVICS	293
<hr/>	
Tiszakürt-Zsilke-tanya: An interdisciplinary analysis of an Early Avar Period cemetery	
Gergely SZENTHE – Norbert FARAGÓ – Erwin GÁLL	443
<hr/>	
Chronological problems of the 7th–10th-century AD Carpathian Basin in light of radiocarbon data	
Bence GÓRA	493
<hr/>	
Household pottery of an urban noble house and craftsmen in Visegrád: Late medieval pottery finds from 5 Rév Street	

FIELD REPORTS

Gábor V. SZABÓ – Péter MOGYORÓS – Péter BÍRÓ – András KOVÁCS – Károly TANKÓ – Farkas Márton TÓTH – Dániel URBÁN – Marcell BARCSI	603
<hr/>	
Investigations of an Early Iron Age Siege 2: Preliminary report on the archaeological research carried out at Dédestapolcsány-Verebce-bérc and Dédestapolcsány-Várerdő between September 2022 and the end of 2023	
Dávid BARTUS – Melinda SZABÓ – Lajos JUHÁSZ – Ákos MÜLLER – Rita Helga OLASZ – Bence SIMON – László BORHY – Emese SZÁMADÓ	625
<hr/>	
Short report on the excavations of the Legionary Bath of Brigetio in 2023	
Bence SIMON – László BORHY – Dávid BARTUS – Rita Helga OLASZ – Melinda SZABÓ – Ákos MÜLLER – Mátyás PENG – Zoltán CZAJLIK – Dániel HÜMPFNER – Zsombor KLEMBALA	641
<hr/>	
The fort of <i>Ad Mures</i> (Ács, Komárom-Esztergom County, Hungary): New investigations on the northern section of the <i>ripa Pannonica</i>	
Bence SIMON – Szilvia JOHÁCZI – Ákos MÜLLER – László RUPNIK	655
<hr/>	
Excavation of a Roman settlement in the northwestern hinterland of Aquincum (Óbuda, Hungary) at Pilisszentiván	

THESIS REVIEW ARTICLES

Eszter MELIS	667
<hr/>	
Northwest Transdanubia from the end of the Early Bronze Age until the Koszider Period: Reworked and extended PhD thesis abstract	
Bence GULYÁS	701
<hr/>	
Cultural connections between the Eastern European steppe region and the Carpathian Basin in the 5th–7th centuries AD: The origin of the Early Avar Period population of the Trans-Tisza region	

A brooch with a name stamp from Győr-Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek (Pannonia, Hungary)

Csilla SÁRÓ 

HUN-REN – ELTE Research Group for Interdisciplinary Archaeology, Budapest, Hungary;
Institute of Archaeological Sciences, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
sarocsilla@gmail.com

Received 24 January 2024 | Accepted 7 February 2024 | Published 26 March 2024

Abstract: Name stamps occasionally appear on early Roman Period bow brooches, such as Aucissa brooches, Nertomarus brooches, brooches with side knobs (*Scharnierflügelfibeln*), and rosette brooches (*Kragenfibeln*, *Distelfibeln*, *Flache Distelfibeln*). Aucissa brooches are known from the territory of the whole Roman Empire and were produced in multiple workshops, while the other types were typical of the western parts, having been manufactured primarily in the western provinces. According to current research, the 55 bow brooches from Győr-Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek belong to different western types. The only stamped brooch is a fragmentary Nertomarus brooch with an abbreviated NERTOMARVS stamp (NORV). This brooch could reach Pannonia from the place of production in different ways. One option is that the brooch travelled with its owner, a military person, or someone who accompanied the troops.

Keywords: Nertomarus brooch, name stamp, Pannonia, 1st century AD, military

Introduction

Győr/Arrabona is a significant site on the Danube *limes* in north Pannonia. In the past decades, not only the auxiliary fort and the civil settlement at Győr but also a native settlement at Győr-Ménfőcsanak were excavated.

The current research focuses on the brooches from the excavation of the site located at Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek.¹ Metal objects were carefully collected by metal detectorists during the three-year-long excavation, whose conscious and thorough work saved many Roman Period artefacts. The Roman Period brooch record of the site is numerous (901 pieces) and highly varied.² This paper focuses on early Roman Period bow brooches and, most of all, a fragmentary piece with a name stamp.

It starts with a brief presentation of the archaeological site and the excavations, followed by an overview of early Roman Period bow brooches and their classification into types and variants. The main part focuses on the Nertomarus type, including its general presentation, distribution in Pannonia and the neighbouring areas, and a detailed description and classification of the brooch from Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek. The last part presents an attempt to follow the path of the brooch from the production area to Pannonia.

1 Site ID in the National Register of Archaeological Sites of Hungary: 34305.

2 My work on a detailed typology of the Roman Period brooches of the site is still in progress. Károly Tankó (senior research fellow, HUN-REN – ELTE Research Group for Interdisciplinary Archaeology) will evaluate the prehistoric brooches obtained by the excavation.

Excavations at Győr-Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek

Győr/Arrabona is situated in north-western Hungary on the northern *limes* and belongs to Pannonia Superior. The auxiliary fort was built on Káptalandomb, while the civil settlement (*vicus*) lies around it. The inhabitants of the two settlement parts had a close connection, not just because the family members of soldiers posted in the fort lived in the *vicus* but also because of the supply system between the fort and the neighbouring parts.³ Archaeological excavations have been carried out in both parts of Arrabona.⁴

Ménfőcsanak today is a southern district of the town of Győr.⁵ Its area was excavated in many places.⁶ Roman Period features and finds were excavated at Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek connected to archaeological projects called Bevásárlóközpont [Shopping mall],⁷ Burkus-földek,⁸ Eperföldek,⁹ M1 motorway,¹⁰ and the eastern side of Road 83 (Figs 1–2).¹¹

The earliest investigated part of the native settlement was unearthed during the construction of M1 motorway in 1990–1991, and a few years later, excavations also carried out at another part of the Széles-földek.¹² These continued between 2009 and 2011 under Gábor Ilon, who managed to investigate 277,165 m² in total in the three-year-long campaign.¹³ Altogether, 11,506 archaeological features came to light, representing diverse historical periods from the Neolithic Age to the Early Middle Ages.¹⁴ As a result of a well-designed metal detector survey programme carried out as part of the fieldwork, more than 7,000 metal objects were found. Many of the 4,192 recovered Roman




Fig. 1. The location of Győr-Ménfőcsanak and Site No. 34305 (after TANKÓ 2020, 1. kép)

3 BÍRÓ 2020, 73.

4 SZŐNYI – TOMKA 2006a; SZŐNYI – TOMKA 2006b. Information on the auxiliary fort and the *vicus* was recently summarised and evaluated by Sz. Bíró (BÍRÓ 2020).

5 The natural environment of the site was described by K. Tankó (TANKÓ 2020, 11–15).

6 BÍRÓ 2017, 50, Abb. 22–23. K. Tankó focuses on the La Tène period but also presents other details of the field research (TANKÓ 2020, 18–25).

7 SZŐNYI 1997, 97–108; SZŐNYI 1999, 86; M. EGRY et al. 2001; TOMKA 2001; SZŐNYI 2003a, 145; M. EGRY et al. 2006, 36; SZŐNYI 2007a; SZŐNYI 2007b; NAGY 2008.

8 M. EGRY 2005; M. EGRY et al. 2006, 38.

9 M. EGRY 2007, 27–28, 35–36, 38; VARGA 2007; BÍRÓ 2017, 152, 341–342.

10 SZŐNYI 1995; T. SZŐNYI 1996; SZŐNYI 1997, 97; M. EGRY 2003; SZŐNYI 2003a, 141–145, Abb. 2, Abb. 10; SZŐNYI 2005, 401–405; M. EGRY et al. 2006, 34–38; BÍRÓ 2007, 18, 23–24, 1. táblázat; ILON 2010; ILON 2011; BÍRÓ 2012; ILON 2012; MERKL – ILON 2012; BÍRÓ 2013; BÍRÓ 2014; BÍRÓ 2017, 341–342; ILON 2017; ILON 2018.

11 M. EGRY 2001; M. EGRY 2002.

12 M. EGRY et al. 2006, 34, 36; TANKÓ 2020, 21.

13 ILON 2010; ILON 2011; ILON 2017, 185, 1. ábra; ILON 2018; TANKÓ 2020, 25.

14 ILON 2017, 185–187; TANKÓ 2020, 25.

Period metal objects are brooches.¹⁵ In 2022–2023, I had an opportunity to investigate more than 900 Roman Period bow and plate brooches representing diverse variants from the Augustan–Tiberian Age to the beginning of the 5th century AD.

Early Roman Period bow brooches from the western provinces

Of the studied 901 Roman Period brooches, 869 were suitable for typological evaluation. They originate from different territories, produced in workshops of the Norico-Pannonian area, the Danubean provinces, the Rhineland, territories farther west, and the Barbaricum. Types characteristic of the Norico-Pannonian circle and the Danubean provinces were also crafted locally and arrived from other sites.¹⁶ Bronze workshops operated in Győr/Arrabona¹⁷ and Ménfőcsanak, as evidenced by the brooches recovered in 1990–1991¹⁸ and 2009–2011¹⁹ in Ménfőcsanak, which included semi-finished and faulty products.



Fig. 2. Names of localities used in the field documentation of the excavation at Győr-Ménfőcsanak (after TANKÓ 2020, 8. kép)

15 ILON 2017, 187, 192–193.

16 The latest summary on brooch production in the Danubean provinces was published by S. Cociş (COCIŞ 2019). Information on the brooch production of Brigetio was recently summarised by the author (SÁRÓ 2020a; SÁRÓ 2021).

17 SELLYE 1970; BEREZ 2008, 182; SEY 2013, 43, Kat. 17–19.

18 BÍRÓ 2013, 251–252, Abb. 2.3–5; SEY 2013, 61–62.

19 Unpublished.

Only 55 of the 816 bow brooches from the site have connections with the western provinces. Except for Aucissa brooches²⁰ and enamelled bow brooches,²¹ they were undoubtedly manufactured in the western part of the Empire. Only two types have a spring pin in a spring case, the *Nertomarus* and the Riha 4.8 (*Fibeln mit breitem Fuss*).²² Other types have a hinged pin. The type variants include Aucissa,²³ Riha 5.12 (*Scharnierfibeln mit längsverziertem Bügel*),²⁴ Riha 5.7 (*Scharnierflügelfibeln*),²⁵ Riha 5.6 (*Querprofilierete Scharnierfibeln*),²⁶ Riha 5.10 (*Scharnierfibeln mit ungeteiltem Bügel und Fuss-*

- 20 Initially, Aucissa brooches were probably only produced in a few workshops. Later, regional variants appeared, which were manufactured locally. The Berecz A242.3 subtype was supposedly produced in Siscia and its surrounding area. Classical Aucissa brooches with a DVRNACVS stamp (Eric Lacabe 20.5) were produced in limited areas. They were popular in Central Italy, Dalmatia, and Southeast Hispania. The so-called Bagendon type Aucissa brooches (Eric Lacabe 21 = Berecz A242.4) appeared mainly in the northern provinces, having been less common in Hispania and Italy. Other local variants include late Aucissa brooches (Grbić 1996/I–II, Cociş 14d) from Dacia and Moesia (ERIC LACABE 1995, 119–121, 127, 134–136, 141–148, Figs 10–11, Maps 17–18; GRBIĆ 1996; BERECZ 2008, 35, 41, 48–49, 53–55, 61–62; COCIŞ 2019, 40–41, 45, 47–48, 73–74, Pl. 100.8, Pl. 101.9, 11–12, Pl. 104.29a–b, Pl. 108.3–4; BERECZ 2023, 206, 212, 214, 219, 223, 225, 230–231).
- 21 Enamelled brooches were certainly manufactured in Britannia, Gallia, and Rhineland. Moreover, K. Berecz supposed they were also produced in Pannonia (BERECZ 2008, 181–184). However, semi-finished or faulty products have not yet been found in Pannonia. As only Berecz IA and IB enamelled bow brooches are presented in this paper, the possibility of Pannonian production is hypothesised solely in their cases. While Berecz IA and IB types were popular in the western provinces, K. Berecz supposed that the pieces under Cat. C149 (Győr-Moson-Sopron County, IA/1a4), Cat. C236 (Nagyigmánd-Thaly-pusztá, IA/4c), Cat. C239 (Neusiedl am See, IA/3c2), and Cat. C471 (unknown site Hungarian National Museum, IA/13a1+13a2) are local, Pannonian products (BERECZ 2008, 93, 95, 98–100, 106, 164–167, 182–183).
- 22 Type: Ettlínger 27 = Riha 4.8.3 = Feugère 18a3 = Mazur 4.8.3 = Philippe 18a3c = Boelicke 4.6 = Gaspar 17f (ETTLINGER 1973, 87–88; RIHA 1979, 108–109; FEUGÈRE 1985, 278–280, 285; RIHA 1994, 95–96; MAZUR 1998, 32; PHILIPPE 1999, 60, 63–67; BOELICKE 2002, 88; GASPAR 2007, 42; MAZUR 2010, 52).
- 23 Type 1: Riha 5.2.1 = Eric Lacabe 20.3 = Mazur 5.2.1 = Gaspar 24a = Berecz A242.2 (5 pieces); Type 2: Ettlínger 31 = Riha 5.3 = Feugère 22e = Eric Lacabe 22.a = Mazur 5.3 = Gaspar 25b = Berecz A242.5 and Type 3: one piece, a non-identifiable derivative (ETTLINGER 1973, 97–98; RIHA 1979, 114–118, 121; FEUGÈRE 1985, 312, 316–328; RIHA 1994, 101–105, 107–108; ERIC LACABE 1995, 111–118, 125–133, 136–141, 143–144, 148–150; MAZUR 1998, 33–35; BERECZ 2008, 51–53, 55; GASPAR 2007, 44; MAZUR 2010, 53–54; BERECZ 2023, 220–223, 225–226).
- 24 Type 1: Ettlínger 31 = Riha 5.12.1 = Feugère 23a = Mazur 5.12.2 = Philippe 23a = Ortisi 15a = Gaspar 28a; Type 2: Ettlínger 31 = Riha 5.12.2 = Feugère 23a = Mazur 5.12.2 = Philippe 23a = Ortisi 15a = Gaspar 28b (3 pieces); Type 3: Ettlínger 31 = Riha 5.12.2 = Feugère 23a = Mazur 5.12.2 = Philippe 23a = Ortisi 15a = Gaspar 28c; Type 4: Ettlínger 31 = Riha 5.12.1/2 = Feugère 23a = Mazur 5.12.2 = Philippe 23a = Ortisi 15a = Gaspar 28a/b and 5: one piece, a non-identifiable derivative (ETTLINGER 1973, 97–98; RIHA 1979, 137–142; FEUGÈRE 1985, 331–335; RIHA 1994, 122–127; MAZUR 1998, 42–44; PHILIPPE 1999, 103–109; ORTISI 2002, 30–31; GASPAR 2007, 45; MAZUR 2010, 58–60).
- 25 Type 1: Riha 5.7.2. = Feugère 23d1 = Philippe 23d1 = Gaspar 29b; Type 2: Riha 5.7.3. = Feugère 23d1 = Mazur 5.7.3 = Philippe 23d1 = Gaspar 29b (2 pieces); Type 3: Riha 5.7.4. = Feugère 23d1 = Mazur 5.7.4 = Philippe 23d1 = Gaspar 29c (2 pieces); Type 4: Riha 5.7.5 = Feugère 23d1 = Mazur 5.7.5 = Philippe 23d1a = Gaspar 29d; Type 5: Riha 5.7.6. = Feugère 23d1 = Mazur 5.7.6 = Philippe 23d1 = Gaspar 29e (5 pieces); Type 6: Riha 5.7.7 = Mazur 5.7.7 = Gaspar 29i; Type 7: Riha 5.7.10. = Feugère 23d3 = Mazur 5.7.10 = Philippe 23d3 = Gaspar 29j; Type 8: Riha 5.7.11. = Philippe 23d5 = Gaspar 29g; and two non-identifiable pieces (RIHA 1979, 126–132; FEUGÈRE 1985, 331–335; RIHA 1994, 112–117; MAZUR 1998, 38–40; PHILIPPE 1999, 103, 120–132; GASPAR 2007, 45; MAZUR 2010, 55–57).
- 26 Type 1: Ettlínger 32 = Rieckhoff 7C1 = Riha 5.6. = Feugère 23b = Mazur 5.6 = Boelicke 5.4 = Gaspar 30b; Type 2: Ettlínger 32 = Rieckhoff 7C1 = Riha 5.6. = Feugère 23b = Mazur 5.6 = Boelicke 5.4 = Gaspar 30 (ETTLINGER 1973, 99; RIECKHOFF 1975, 51–57; RIHA 1979, 123–125; FEUGÈRE 1985, 331–335; RIHA 1994, 110–112; MAZUR 1998, 37; BOELICKE 2002, 105–106; GASPAR 2007, 45; MAZUR 2010, 55).


knopfrudiment),²⁷ Riha 5.14 (*Scharnierfibeln mit seitlichen Bügelknöpfen [und Varianten]*),²⁸ Riha 5.15 (*Nielloverzierte Scharnierfibeln und Varianten*),²⁹ Riha 5.16 (*Scharnierfibeln mit kleinen runden Einlagen*),³⁰ Riha 7.16 (*Gleichseitige Scheibfibeln*)³¹),³² brooch with one axis of symmetry,³³ brooch with two axes of symmetry,³⁴ fantail brooch,³⁵ enamelled bow brooches with one axis of symmetry,³⁶ enamelled bow brooches with two axes of symmetry,³⁷ and non-identifiable pieces (Tab. 1). The next part focuses on the Nertomarus type.

General presentation of the Nertomarus type

The name of the type refers to the name most commonly stamped onto brooches, *Nertomarus* (Fig. 3). Main characteristics of the brooches of this type are the case housing the spring pin, the slightly tapered bow with longitudinal ribs, and the triangular catchplate with one to three perforations. Its most specific attributes are the pseudo-filigree decoration of two scroll motifs, one to three groups of three circles, and the name stamp on the spring case.³⁸

E. Riha created a well-designed classification of the type with two main categories, the first including brooches with pseudo-filigree decoration (Riha 4.3.1), while the second those featuring the typical characteristics of the type but lacking pseudo-filigree ornaments (Riha 4.3.2). Further sub-variants were defined based on the position of the pseudo-filigree motifs. The three-circle motif may appear between and beside (Form A) or only between (Form B) the scroll motifs.³⁹

- 27 Type 1: Rieckhoff 7C3 = Riha 5.10 = Mazur 5.10 = Gaspar 32a; Type 2: Rieckhoff 7C3 = Riha 5.10 = Mazur 5.10 = Gaspar 32c (RIECKHOFF 1975, 51–57; RIHA 1979, 135–137; RIHA 1979, 119–122; MAZUR 199 41–42; GASPAS 2007, 45–46; MAZUR 2010, 58).
- 28 Type: Riha 5.14.3. = Feugère 23c2 = Mazur 5.14.3 = Philippe 23c2a = Gaspar 35b (RIHA 1979, 146–148; FEUGÈRE 1985, 331–335; RIHA 1994, 132–133; MAZUR 1998, 46–47; PHILIPPE 1999, 103, 111–117; GASPAS 2007, 46; MAZUR 2010, 61–62).
- 29 Type 1: Ettliger 35 = Rieckhoff 7C4 = Riha 5.15 = Feugère 23c1 = Mazur 5.15 = Philippe 23c1b = Boelicke 5.10; Type 2: Ettliger 35 = Rieckhoff 7C4 = Riha 5.15 = Feugère 23c2 = Mazur 5.15 = Philippe 23c2d = Boelicke 5.10 (ETTLINGER 1973, 103–104; RIECKHOFF 1975, 51–57; RIHA 1979, 148–152; FEUGÈRE 1985, 331–335; RIHA 1994, 133–136; MAZUR 1998, 47–48; PHILIPPE 1999, 103, 111–118; BOELICKE 2002, 112–113; MAZUR 2010, 62).
- 30 Type: Ettliger 35 = Riha 5.16.1 = Feugère 23c3 = Mazur 5.16.1 = Philippe 23c3 = Ortisi 15e3 = Gaspar 36 (ETTLINGER 1973, 103–104; RIHA 1979, 153–154; FEUGÈRE 1985, 331–335; RIHA 1994, 137–138; MAZUR 1998, 48; PHILIPPE 1999, 103, 111–112, 114–116, 118–120; ORTISI 2002, 30, 32; GASPAS 2007, 48).
- 31 Although E. Riha discussed this type among plate brooches, it is better classified as a bow brooch instead. K. Berecz classified the enamelled brooches with a square bow and two axes of symmetry among bow brooches (IB) (BERECZ 2008, 108–110, 112, 115–116).
- 32 Type: Riha 7.16 = Feugère 26 = Gaspar 50a (RIHA 1979, 191–194; FEUGÈRE 1985, 357–368; RIHA 1994, 163–166; GASPAS 2007, 49).
- 33 Type: unique. The enamelled Berecz IA/12a1 brooch is similar (BERECZ 2008, 104).
- 34 Type: Riha 7.16 = Feugère 26 = Gaspar 50a (RIHA 1979, 191–194; FEUGÈRE 1985, 357–368; RIHA 1994, 163–166; GASPAS 2007, 49).
- 35 Type: Mackreth CD H 7b1/7b2/7b3/7b4 (MACKRETH 2011, 89–91).
- 36 Types. 1: Exner I.19 = Böhme 17d = Riha 5.17.2 = Erice Lacabe 27.2 = Philippe 26b3; 2: Riha 5.17.5 = Feugère 26b1 = Berecz 2008/IA/12a3; 3: Riha 5.17.5 = Feugère 26b2 = Cociş 18d = variant of the Berecz 2008/IA/13a1; 4: one piece, a non-identifiable derivative (EXNER 1939, 48–49, 52, 78; BÖHME 1972, 15–16; RIHA 1979, 154–157, 159–161; FEUGÈRE 1985, 357–364; RIHA 1994, 138–141; ERICE LACABE 1995, 168–172; PHILIPPE 1999, 144–149; COCIŞ 2004, 86–88; BERECZ 2008, 105–106).
- 37 Type: Riha 7.16 = Feugère 26c1 = Rey-Vodoz 7.16 = Philippe 26c1a = Berecz 2008/IB/4a2 (RIHA 1979, 191–194; FEUGÈRE 1985, 357–366; RIHA 1994, 163–166; REY-VODOZ 1986, 167; PHILIPPE 1999, 144, 149–150; BERECZ 2008, 114).
- 38 ETTLINGER 1973, 76; LERAT 1979, 37; RIHA 1979, 97; FEUGÈRE 1985, 262; RIHA 1994; MAZUR 1998, 28; LEIFELD 2007, 165; MAZUR 2010, 50; BACKHAUS 2016, II, 277.
- 39 RIHA 1979, 97; RIHA 1994; MAZUR 1998, 28; MAZUR 2010, 49–50.

Tab. 1. Proportions of early Roman Period bow brooch types from the western provinces in the record of Győr-Ménfőcsanak (by Cs. Sáró)

Brooch type	Pieces	Percentage
Nertomarus	1	1.81
Riha 4.8	1	1.81
Aucissa	7	12.72
Riha 5.12	7	12.72
Riha 5.7	16	29.09
Riha 5.6	2	3.63
Riha 5.10	2	3.63
Riha 5.14	1	1.81
Riha 5.15	2	3.63
Riha 5.16	1	1.81
Riha 7.16	1	1.81
One axis of symmetry	1	1.81
Two axes of symmetry	1	1.81
Fantail brooch	1	1.81
Enamelled, one axis of symmetry	4	7.27
Enamelled, two axes of symmetry	1	1.81
Non-identifiable pieces	6	10.9
Sum	55	100




Fig. 3. Nertomarus brooches with the variations of the NERTOMARVS stamp (without scale).
1–3 – Windisch, Mainz, Vertault (BEHRENS 1950, Abb. 2), 4 – Marloux (ARMAND-CALLIAT 1944, Fig. 3.f)

The name stamp is an important component of these brooches. The stamp may appear under the pseudo-fligree motifs, and it is probably the abbreviation or the full name of the craftsman or his workshop. Most names have Celtic connections. G. Behrens and E. Ettliger collected such name stamps, but their list can be completed with more names.⁴⁰ Also, numerous stamped brooches were included in the Artefacts database,⁴¹ not only the variations of *Nertomarus*⁴² but also others, including ATEXTOS, B[I]IVA, B[...]OVIS or B[...]DVA, CDVA (?), H[.]A[.]O[.], LITAICCUS or LITAICCOS or ITAICCOS or ITAICCOS, [...]NI (LITVGENI ?), SABINVS, SAA[.]OS, SIIROS or SIICCOS or CACCOS (?), TIIRTV, and [...]SSIVSF(ecit).⁴³ A handful of brooches with illegible stamps are also known.⁴⁴

Besides Nertomarus brooches, some other early Roman Period bow brooch types were also stamped. For example, more than fifty different name stamps appear on Aucissa brooches, including variations of Celtic, Illyrian, and Latin names.⁴⁵ In contrast, *Kragenfibeln* and *Scharnierflügelfibeln* were usually

40 BEHRENS 1950, 3; ETTLINGER 1973, 76–77.

41 Artefacts FIB-41227–41229, 41231–41235, FIB-41842.

42 NERTOMR: Mainz (Germany), Windisch (Switzerland); NERTOMAR: Alise-Sainte-Reine (France), Kembs (France), Vertault (France); NERTOMF: Windisch (Switzerland); NERTO: Marloux, next to Mel-lecey (France) (ARMAND-CALLIAT 1944, 28, Fig. 3.f; BEHRENS 1950, 3, Nrs 1–4, Abb. 2.2–3; ETTLINGER 1973, 76, Nrs 1–2; Artefacts FIB-41232).

43 ATEXTOS: Gisingen (Germany); B[I]IVA: Michelbach (Germany); B[...]OVIS or B[...]DVA: Martberg (Germany); CDVA (?): Ptuj (Slovenia); H[.]A[.]O[.]: Insula Nr. 51, Augst (Switzerland); LITAICCUS or LITAICCOS: Alise-Sainte-Reine (France), Avenches (Switzerland), Engen (Germany), Musée d'Art et d'Histoire Saint-Germain/Auxerre (France); LITAICCOS/IITAICCOS or ITAICCOS: Mâcon (France), Reims (France); [...]NI (LITVGENI ?): Grave 15 of Schankweiler (Germany); SABINVS or [S]ABINV[S]: Bern-Enge (Switzerland), Lorraine (France), Peyre-en-Aubrac (France); SAA[.]OS: Bad Kreuznach (Germany); SIIROS or SIICCOS: Dalheim (Luxembourg), Bern-Engelhalbinsel (Switzerland); CACCOS: two pieces from Grave 82, Tr. 23 of Messancy (Belgium); [...]CCOS (SIICCOS or CACCOS ?): Bern-Engelhalbinsel (Switzerland); TIIRTV: Bingen (Germany); [...]SSIVSF(ecit): Windisch (Switzerland) (BEHRENS 1950, 3, Abb. 3.1; ETTLINGER 1973, 76–77; LERAT 1979, 37, Pl. 14.121; RIHA 1979, 97, Nr. 455, Abb. 19a, Taf. 18; LUDWIG 1988, 77, 236, Taf. 13.1; LEIFELD 2007, 165, Footnote 899; MAZUR 2010, 49, Nr. 483, Fig. 15; NICKEL 2011, 64, 220, Abb. 18.2, Taf. 65.1–2; Artefacts FIB-41227–41229, 41231–41235, FIB-41842).

44 ETTLINGER 1973, 77; RIHA 1979, 98, Nr. 464, Abb. 19a, Taf. 18.

45 The list of G. Rasbach (RASBACH 2014, 155–161) can be completed with a handful of stamps (BERECZ 2008, 53, 262, 269–270, 274, 280, Footnote 303, Kat. A78, Kat. A125–126, Kat. A155, Kat. B2; HARALAMBIEVA 2013, 102, 105–106; BERECZ 2023, 223, 254–256, Footnote 177, Kat. 86, 134–135, 164, 'Barbaricum' Nr. 2).

not stamped. G. Behrens published a *Kragenfibel* with DRVCIEDOF name stamp⁴⁶ and a *Scharnierflügelfibel* with CARIL name stamp.⁴⁷ Name stamps are more common on *Distelfibeln* and *Flache Distelfibeln*. Legible stamps on *Distelfibeln* are AA or ΛΛ,⁴⁸ ACA,⁴⁹ BIBI,⁵⁰ C. ERECTVS,⁵¹ CONDV,⁵² CON,⁵³ FLAVOS/FLAOSF,⁵⁴ OXTAILLOS,⁵⁵ RCVN (?),⁵⁶ ROVIL,⁵⁷ and VLATI.⁵⁸ In contrast, only a handful of stamps appear on *Flache Distelfibeln* (ANGVIL,⁵⁹ DARIB⁶⁰). Aucissa brooches are known from the whole territory of the Roman Empire,⁶¹ while the others were widespread only in the western parts.⁶²

Nertomarus brooches are known from Britannia to Pannonia but were especially popular in north-eastern Gaul and the territory of today's western Switzerland,⁶³ where their scatter outlines a probable production centre.⁶⁴ Not just Feugère 14b⁶⁵ but Nertomarus brooches⁶⁶ were undoubtedly produced in Autun. Their production is also evidenced in the *oppidum* of Bibracte.⁶⁷

Brooches from burials help complex investigations focused on attire. Based on a handful of graves from France and Germany, researchers suggest that Nertomarus brooches were mainly worn by men⁶⁸ and associated with the army.⁶⁹

46 BEHRENS 1950, 5, Abb. 5; Artefacts FIB-4455.

47 BEHRENS 1950, 8, Abb. 13.1.

48 Luthern (Switzerland) (BEHRENS 1950, 5; Artefacts FIB-4075).

49 Grave 1514 of Wederath-Belginum (Germany) (CORDIE-HACKENBERG – HAFFNER 1991, 53, Taf. 395, Grab 1514/b; GELDMACHER 2004, 69).

50 Bingen-am-Rhein (Germany), Grave 2 of Rouen (France), two brooches (BEHRENS 1950, 5, Abb. 7; Artefacts FIB-4075).

51 Lyon (France) (Artefacts FIB-4060).

52 Augst (Switzerland) (RIHA 1979, 103, Nr. 534, Abb. 19b; Artefacts FIB-4075).

53 Bad Kreuznach (Germany), Bertrich (Germany), Bingen-am-Rhein (Germany), Engers (Germany), Junglinster (Luxemburg), Graves 205, 246, 1183, 1324, 2117 of Wederath-Belginum (Germany), unknown site, Rheinisches Landesmuseum, Trier (Germany) (BEHRENS 1950, 5, Nr. 2–7, Abb. 8; NOLL 1952, 395–396; HAFFNER 1971, 48, 55, Taf. 46.16, Taf. 60.6; HAFFNER 1978, 58, Taf. 299.7; CORDIE-HACKENBERG – HAFFNER 1991, 14, Taf. 354, Grab 1324/f; CORDIE-HACKENBERG – HAFFNER 1997, 59–60, Taf. 578, Grab 2117/c; GELDMACHER 2004, 69; Artefacts FIB-4075).

54 Gabsheim (Germany) (BEHRENS 1950, 5, Abb. 9; NOLL 1952, 396; Artefacts FIB-4076).

55 Niort (France) (Artefacts FIB-4076).

56 Gabsheim (Germany) (BEHRENS 1950, 5; NOLL 1952, 396; Artefacts FIB-4075).

57 Unknown site, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz and Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien (BEHRENS 1950, 5, Abb. 10.1; NOLL 1952, 396; Artefacts FIB-4076).

58 Lyon (France), Prasville (France) (BEHRENS 1950, 5; Artefacts FIB-4075).

59 Windisch (Switzerland) (BEHRENS 1950, 5, Abb. 6; Artefacts FIB-4090).

60 La Canourgue (France) (FEUGÈRE 1985, 293, 295, No. 1389, Pl. 106; Artefacts FIB-4090).

61 BEREZ 2008, 37–43, 63–72; BEREZ 2023, 207–214, 231–239.

62 *Kragenfibeln*: Gallia (FEUGÈRE 1985, 268–269; METZLER 1995, 205, 208–209; PHILIPPE 1999, 38–41; GASPARD 2007, 41). *Scharnierflügelfibeln*: Britannia, Gallia, Switzerland, Rhineland (RIHA 1979, 127; RIHA 1994, 112; MAZUR 1998, 38; PHILIPPE 1999, 126; GASPARD 2007, 45; MAZUR 2010, 57). *Distelfibeln* and *Flache Distelfibeln*: Britannia, Gallia, Rhineland (RIHA 1979, 101–107; FEUGÈRE 1985, 289–291, 293–297; RIHA 1994, 90, 93; METZLER 1995, 214; GASPARD 2007, 42).

63 ETTLINGER 1973, Karte 14; RIHA 1979, 97; FEUGÈRE 1985, 265; RIHA 1994, 86; MAZUR 1998, 29; BOELICKE 2002, 84; MAZUR 2010, 50; Artefacts FIB-4054, FIB-41227–41229, FIB-41231–41235, FIB-41842.

64 FEUGÈRE 1985, 265; MAZUR 2010, 50; DESCHLER-ERB 2013, Abb. 9.

65 CHARDRON-PICAULT et al. 2008, 43, No. 42, Fig. 32.

66 CHARDRON-PICAULT et al. 2008, 44, 47–48, No. 44.4, 47.1.

67 GUILLAUMET 1993, 38, No. 167, Pl. 30.

68 MAZUR 2010, 50.

69 BÖHME-SCHÖNBERGER 2000, 514–516; LEIFELD 2007, 167; DESCHLER-ERB 2013, 136.

Scholars agree on the type used mainly in the first half of the 1st century AD.⁷⁰ Overall, Nertomarus brooches appeared at the end of the Augustan Age, were popular in the Claudian–Neroan Age, and quickly disappeared after that.⁷¹

Nertomarus brooches in Pannonia and the neighbouring provinces

Although I. Kovrig and E. Patek published Nertomarus brooches from Pannonia in their monographs, early researchers did not know the exact type and mixed them with different brooches. Kovrig's Group IV includes two types, Nertomarus and Langton-Down.⁷² E. Patek categorised this type and other brooches with a possible Gallic origin in her Type E1,⁷³ and she merged the Nertomarus brooches, the Feugère 18b bow brooches with a lion-shaped element, and the Langton-Down type in her Group E1/1.⁷⁴ Only a handful of Nertomarus brooches were known from Dalj and Sisak/Siscia in Croatia and unknown Pannonian sites (Kovrig T. III.26 = Patek T. XII.4).⁷⁵

The type seems to be rare in the province. According to recently published catalogues, no Nertomarus brooches have been found in Carnuntum.⁷⁶ S. Schmid did not publish any Nertomarus brooch from Vindobona,⁷⁷ nor did M. Merczi from north-eastern Pannonia.⁷⁸ Based on my research, this type was also unknown in Aquincum, Brigetio,⁷⁹ and the area of today's Tolna County (Hungary).⁸⁰ Moreover, no pieces were published from the 1990–1991 excavations of Győr-Ménfőcsanak.⁸¹

Based on the earliest presence of Romans in the province, one might expect to find Nertomarus brooches on archaeological sites in the Drava and Sava areas or by the Amber Road, for example (I. Kovrig and E. Patek mentioned Nertomarus brooches from Dalj and Siscia).⁸² Another Nertomarus brooch with uncertain origin from Poetovio, bearing a CDVA (?) stamp, can also be mentioned.⁸³ Unfortunately, specimens of the type are not known from other significant sites.⁸⁴ However, their

70 RIHA 1979, 97; RIHA 1994, 86; MAZUR 1998, 29; PHILIPPE 1999, 52; BOELICKE 2002, 84; LEIFELD 2007, 165–167.

71 MAZUR 2010, 50; DESCHLER-ERB 2013, 136–137.

72 KOVRIG 1937, 13, T. 3.26–27.

73 PATEK 1942, 42–45.

74 PATEK 1942, 42, T. 12.1–6.

75 KOVRIG 1937, 40, 86, T. III.26 = T. 39.8a–b, T. 20.3 = KOŠČEVIĆ 1980, 47, Kat. 84, T. 7.48; PATEK 1942, 201–202, T. 12.4, Nos 2–7. For the difficulties of identification, see DIZDAR–TONC 2013, 64.

76 HUMER 2006; BEUTLER et al. 2017.

77 SCHMID 2010.

78 MERCZI 2012; MERCZI 2016a; MERCZI 2016b; MERCZI 2017; MERCZI 2019; MERCZI 2021; MERCZI 2023.

79 My current research project (supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences) focuses on Roman Period brooches from Brigetio. According to the current status of research, no Nertomarus brooch was found during the early and modern-day excavations in Brigetio. A comprehensive presentation of Roman Period brooches from Aquincum has not been published yet. I studied the brooches in the collection of BHM–Aquincum Museum for my PhD dissertation, and found no Nertomarus brooch there.

80 SÁRÓ 2014a; SÁRÓ 2014b.

81 BÍRÓ 2013.

82 Dalj: PATEK 1942, 201. Siscia (the number of pieces is uncertain): KOVRIG 1937, 40, 86, T. 3.26 = T. 39.8a–b, T. 20.3 = PATEK 1942, 201–202, T. 12.4, Nr. 2–3,5 = KOŠČEVIĆ 1980, 47, Kat. 84, T. 7.48; DIZDAR – TONC 2013, 64–65, Map 2.

83 G. Behrens did not mention the exact findspot of the brooch (BEHRENS 1950, 3), but the *Artefacts database* originated it from a cemetery in Poetovio (*Artefacts FIB-41229*).

84 Zs. Mráv studied Early Roman Period *militaria* from Pannonia. He collected finds from military sites along the Amber Road between Poetovio and Carnuntum and the Savaria–Brigetio and Scarbantia–

lack may only reflect the current status of research, and now-unpublished brooches might add further details to the distribution of the type.

Nertomarus brooches are also rare in the neighbouring provinces. Only a handful can be mentioned from Noricum: I. Kovrig and E. Patek published Riha 4.3.1.A (?) brooches from Maribor.⁸⁵ That type is also underrepresented in Raetia. A Riha 4.3.1A brooch is known from the *vicus* at Kempten (Germany),⁸⁶ and another from the cemetery of the settlement (Grave 141, a cremation burial of an individual of unknown sex).⁸⁷ E. Deschler-Erb also presented a Riha 4.3.2 brooch from Augsburg-Oberhausen.⁸⁸ However, the similar Gallian type (Langton Down) is more common in the eastern Danube area.⁸⁹ It was in fashion almost simultaneously, from the early Augustan to the end of the Claudian Age.⁹⁰

The Nertomarus brooch from Győr-Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek

The only Nertomarus brooch in the record of the site is a small and incomplete stray find (Fig. 4). The copper-base alloy brooch is two-part; its spring pin is covered with a spring case. The bottom of the spring case is open, and its surface is decorated with pseudo-filigree motifs (three circles between two scrolls) and a NORV stamp⁹¹ in the middle between them. The wings of the spring case are also adorned

Vindobona roads. This area was strategically important in the 1st century AD. Numerous *militaria* came from military stations, auxiliary forts, and weapon graves, but also from 1st century AD towns established along the Amber Road (Savaria, Scarbantia) (MRÁV 2013). Aucissa brooches were used primarily by soldiers. K. Berecz investigated this type and collected 52 A242.1–5 subtype brooches from the area (Arrabona, Brigetio, Bruckneudorf, Carnuntum, Mursella, Poetovio, Salla, Savaria, Schützen am Gebirge, Velem-Szentvid) (BERECZ 2023, 221, Tab. 5). Conclusively, one might also expect the presence of other 1st century AD foreign brooch types in the area.

85 KOVRIG 1937, 40, T. 3.26 = T. 39.8a–b; PATEK 1942, 201, T. 12.1, Nr. 1, T. 12.4, Nr. 1.

86 SCHLEIERMACHER 1993, 27, Nr. 151, Taf. 14.

87 MACKENSEN 1978, 239–240, Taf. 56.5,7.

88 DESCHLER-ERB 2013, 136–137, 146, Abb. 4, Abb. 6.

89 Raetia: Augsburg-Oberhausen (Germany), three brooches (DESCHLER-ERB 2013, 137, Abb. 4, Abb. 6), Graves 28, 54, 56, 116 of Kempten (Germany) (MACKENSEN 1978, 209, 215–216, 231, Taf. 8.6, Taf. 15.3–4, Taf. 16.4, Taf. 42.1; BUORA 2004, 71, Nos 3–5), Kempten (Germany) (ETTLINGER 1973, 78; SCHLEIERMACHER 1993, 25–26, Nos 141–142, Taf. 13; BUORA 2004, 71, No. 2, Nos 6–7). Noricum: Bela Cerkev (Slovenia) (GUGL 1995, 8; BUORA 2004, 71, No. 10), Kalsdorf bei Graz (Austria) (HEYMANS 1997, 347, Kat. 14, Taf. 2), Magdalensberg (Austria) (SEDLMAYER 2009, 20, 240, Abb. 2, Abb. 88, Taf. 5.146–148), Wagna/Leibnitz (Austria) (GUGL 1995, 8; KROPF – NOWAK 2000, 43, 117, Kat. 252, Taf. 47; BUORA 2004, 71, No. 9), Zollfeld (Austria) (GUGL 1995, 8, 76, Kat. 4, Taf. 1). Pannonia: Dalj (Croatia) (KOVRIK 1937, 40), Erdut (Croatia) (KOVRIK 1937, 40), Novi Banovci (Serbia) (KOVRIK 1937, 40; PATEK 1942, 201, T. 12.3; PETKOVIĆ 2010, 51, Nr. 76), Purbach am Neusiedler See (Austria) (SEDLMAYER 2009, 20, Footnote 65), Schützen am Gebirge (Austria) (SEDLMAYER 2009, 20, Footnote 65), Sisak (Croatia) (KOŠČEVIĆ 1980, 47, Kat. 85, T. 7.49), Sava River at Sisak (Croatia) (KOVRIK 1937, 40, T. 3.27, T. 24.1; PATEK 1942, 202, T. 12.9), Surčin (Serbia) (PETKOVIĆ 2010, 51, No. 77, Sl. 10), Zemun (Serbia), two brooches (PETKOVIĆ 2010, 51, No. 78–79, Sl. 11), unknown site, Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna (Austria) (KOVRIK 1937, 40), Dalmatia: Graves 49 and 58 of Jezerine cemetery (Croatia) (ETTLINGER 1973, 78; BUORA 2004, 71, No. 12; BUSULADŽIĆ 2010, 150, Kat. 94–95; DIZDAR – TONC 2013, 65, Map 2), Salona (Croatia) (IVČEVIĆ 2002, 234, 247, Kat. br. 3, T. 1; BUORA 2004, 69–70, Fig. 1; IVČEVIĆ 2005, 78, Kat. 4, Sl. 4; DIZDAR – TONC 2013, 65, Map 2). Moesia: Lom (Bulgaria) (GENČEVA 2004, 124, T. 29.2), Židovar (Serbia) (PETKOVIĆ 2010, 51, No. 80), unknown site, probably the Mlava valley, Zavičajni Muzej u Jagodini (Serbia) (PETKOVIĆ 2010, 51, No. 81, T. 4.7, Sl. 12). However, it should be mentioned that I. Kovrig's and E. Patek's identifications of the published findings without pictures are uncertain, albeit M. Buora accepted their interpretation (BUORA 2004, 70, Nrs 11, 14–15).

90 BUORA 2004, 70; GASPARD 2007, 43; MAZUR 2010, 50; DESCHLER-ERB 2013, 137.

91 The stamp seemed illegible, only the 'N' being discernible by the naked eye. Therefore, I investigated the stamp with an STM 4c stereomicroscope and read all four letters.

with three-circle motifs on the top (Fig. 5). The bent and slightly tapered bow is decorated with a longitudinal rib on each side and a group of three similar ones in the middle. The rest of the bow, including the catchplate is missing. Fragment length 1.2 cm, total width 3.1 cm, bow profile 1×0.5 cm. In the collection of the Hungarian National Museum National Institute of Archaeology, Inv. No. 1.34305.1.505.

Based on its main characteristics, the brooch from Győr-Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek certainly belongs to the Ettliger 22 = Riha 4.3.1A = Feugère 14b2 = Boelicke 4.2.1 derivative type.

The name stamp is the most exciting part of the brooch. *Nertomarus* was written in different versions; brooches with NERTOMR, NERTOMAR, NERTO, and NERTOMF are known from France, Germany, and Switzerland.⁹² Although another brooch with a NORV stamp has not been published yet, the brooch from Győr-Ménfőcsanak also belongs to this group. The abbreviation can undoubtedly be interpreted as N(ert)O(ma)RV(s).




Fig. 4. The Nertomarus brooch from Győr-Ménfőcsanak (drawing by Cs. Sáró)

Contacts between distant areas: travelling brooches

Seeing how unique this brooch was in Pannonia raises the question of how this object arrived at the site. What story does this piece of clothing accessory have? Who owned it? Who brought it so far from its place of production?

Theoretically, the object could arrive at its place of finding in several ways. Firstly, it may be a local imitation of a foreign type from a workshop in the Danubean provinces; secondly, its transfer could be part of a commercial transaction with people in the western provinces; thirdly, it could be the personal property of someone who came from the western provinces; and fourthly, it could have been brought there by a person who passed through the western part of the Empire and came to Pannonia. While all these explanations hypothesise a direct connection between the production centre and the place of finding, there could have been intermediary stages involving in-between people on the route.

Two scholar's thoughts on the subject are worth mentioning. S. Petković studied Langton Down brooches from Serbia (Type 7) and explained their presence in the area in two ways: either as evidence of intensive import from the western provinces or of the existence of Gallic brooch-making workshop(s) in the region.⁹³ M. Buora studied Langton Down brooches from the area of the Adriatic Sea and concluded that they could be connected to persons of Gallic origin in this area (he interpreted the presence of other Gallic brooch types the same way⁹⁴).

Based on the suggested chronological position of Nertomarus brooches (first half of the 1st century AD), I reject the idea of local production and imitation. A look at Pannonia and the popular types in the 1st century AD leaves no doubt about the predominance of Norico-Pannonian-made brooches in the period in question. Local people used their regional brooch types, and fashion only changed

92 Alise-Sainte-Reine (France); Kembs (France); Marloux, next to Mellecey (France); Vertault (France); Mainz (Germany); Windisch (Switzerland), two brooches (ARMAND-CALLIAT 1944, 28, Fig. 3.f; BEHRENS 1950, 3, No. 1–4, Abb. 2.2–3; ETLINGER 1973, 76, Nos 1–2; Artefacts FIB-41232).

93 PETKOVIĆ 2010, 51.

94 BUORA 2004, 71.

mildly and gradually. Thus, our Nertomarus brooch was probably manufactured somewhere in its main distribution area.

A commercial connection is another less likely option. Commerce works well if the product has a value in the market, and western brooch types were probably only slightly interesting for the local Pannonian inhabitants in this period. Research by T. Ivleva connects to the topic well. She studied British-made brooch finds from the Continent and concluded that “[...] British-made brooches were rather regionally specific and therefore could not have always acted as trader items since there might have been no market for them outside the province of their manufacture.”⁹⁵

As several authors discuss, brooches were used to fasten and decorate clothing, but they also transmitted subconscious messages about the origin, gender, status, etc., of the wearer.⁹⁶ They were “personal items used to secure clothing, and this purpose was the main reason why brooches ‘travelled’.”⁹⁷ M. Dizdar and A. Tonc concluded similarly regarding the brooch finds of the North Adriatic Region: “People migrating is a possible explanation of find of rare brooches of Gallic origin [...]”⁹⁸ Thus, the Nertomarus brooch from Győr-Ménfőcsanak was, in all probability, the personal possession of someone and came from the main production area of the type. As mentioned, several authors define this type as military brooches; therefore, whether a soldier was a hypothetical owner must also be examined. Győr/Arrabona had a crucial military function in the Roman Period. The auxiliary fort was built at a strategically important spot where the Savaria–Arrabona military road joined the *limes* road. The earliest known earth-and-timber fort was constructed under Claudius, and its foundations were dug into layers dated by Tiberian *terra sigillata*.⁹⁹



Fig. 5. The name stamp and the pseudo-filigree motifs on the spring case (photos by L. György, National Institute of Archaeology, Hungarian National Museum)

95 IVLEVA 2016a, 372. However, she mentions elsewhere that some British-made brooches possibly reached the Continent as trade items. Later, she wrote that “The majority of the brooches be they produced in the late first or mid-second century arrived in the provinces [i.e. northern Gallia Belgica, Germania Inferior, Germania Superior] on the clothes of or as part of personal possessions of people who spent some time in Britain.” (IVLEVA 2011, 54).

96 IVLEVA 2011, 51; ROTHE 2012, 213–215; IVLEVA 2016a, 370–378; IVLEVA 2016b, 121–122; SÁRÓ 2020b, I, 131, 202.

97 IVLEVA 2011, 51.

98 DIZDAR – TONC 2013, 68.

99 T. SZŐNYI 1988, 29; SZŐNYI 2003b; MRÁV 2013, 75–76; BÍRÓ 2020, 73. T. Szőnyi listed not just *terra sigillatae* from the production centre of Arezzo but also other imported pottery (T. SZŐNYI 1988, 24–29). A Berecz A242.2 subtype brooch should also be mentioned here. It was found in Pit 5 at the Apór Vilmos püspök Square (previously Martinovics Square) and dated between 25/30 BC and AD 50/55

During the centuries, several military troops were stationed at the fort. The first garrison might have been the *ala Pannoniorum*. During the Augustan Age, the *ala* was garrisoned in Dalmatia, and under Tiberius, it was moved to the fortress at Strebersdorf (Pannonia). After that, it stayed at Arrabona between AD 25/30 and 69.¹⁰⁰ Epigraphic evidence scarcely offers information on the origins of the soldiers. During its first deployment in Dalmatia and Pannonia, the *ala Pannoniorum* comprised Hispanian and Pannonian recruits. Soldiers from Illyrian tribes, for example, the *Breuci* and the *Colapiani*, were supposedly recruited under Tiberius. Further names refer to Celtic lineage.¹⁰¹

The *ala Pannoniorum* was replaced by a Syrian unit, the *ala I Augusta Ituraeorum sagittaria*, stationed there between AD 70 and 92. This unit was created most likely under Nero.¹⁰² Originally, it comprised soldiers from among the *Ituraeans* (Syria). Later, while stationed in Arrabona, it included, besides Syrians, Celts from Pannonia and probably *Batavi*.¹⁰³

After the *ala I Augusta Ituraeorum sagittaria* had left Arrabona, another cavalry unit, the *ala I Hispanorum Arvacorum*, was garrisoned there until AD 106.¹⁰⁴ According to the tribe's name, this unit was created in Hispania.¹⁰⁵

The next military unit stationed in the auxiliary fort was the *ala I Ulpia contariorum milliaria civium Romanorum*. The 1,000 strong cavalry unit stayed with short intermissions until the 3rd century AD.¹⁰⁶ Several authors discussed the origin of this unit, and most agreed that the *ala* was established by Trajan.¹⁰⁷ According to some opinions, the unit moved from Germania to Pannonia.¹⁰⁸ However, J. E. H. Spaul doubted that, believing the military unit was created under the Flavians, was upgraded to a milliary a few years later, and never served in Germania.¹⁰⁹

Finally, geographical and chronological connections should be summarised. The survey of the history of the troops stationed in Arrabona has revealed that no military unit originating from or serving in Gaul or Germania was ever garrisoned there, i.e., no such unit can link directly the area of production and the place of finding of the brooch. The production and usage period of Nertomarus brooches lasted from the end of the Augustan to the end of the Neroan Age, and the *ala Pannoniorum* was the only military unit that served at Arrabona during that time, i.e., the first half of the 1st century AD. As research has revealed, not only Illyrians and Celts but also Hispanians served in this unit, and Hispanian soldiers were recruited right at the start when the cavalry unit was formed. Their presence may reflect the need for reliable and loyal soldiers familiar with the ways of the Roman army—as the newly subjugated peoples in the Danube area were probably not wholly competent and/or trustworthy, experienced soldiers and officers must have been moved from remote areas regardless of their origin or ethnic background to serve as the backbone of the

(BERECZ 2008, 68, Kat. A53, 1. tábla 4; BERECZ 2023, 235, 253, No. 60, Abb. 9.4). Based on *terra sigillatae* with square stamps, scholars suppose the existence of a Late Augustan – Early Tiberian Age military camp. The Aucissa brooch confirms this possibility (GABLER 2006, 94; BERECZ 2008, 68; BERECZ 2023, 235).

100 T. SZŐNYI 1988, 21, 29; GABLER et al. 1990, 75; SPAUL 1994, 169–171; LŐRINCZ 2001, 22, 49, 57, 59, 102; MRÁV 2013, 68, 76; FERJANČIĆ 2015, 38–39; BÍRÓ 2020, 73.

101 FERJANČIĆ 2015, 39–42; MEYER 2012, 109–115; MATIJEVIĆ 2019, 85–90.

102 GABLER et al. 1990, 75; SPAUL 1994, 155, 259; LŐRINCZ 2001, 21–22, 49, 61–62, 65, 68, 102; ȚENȚEA 2012, 31; MRÁV 2013, 76; BÍRÓ 2020, 73–74.

103 ȚENȚEA 2012, 31, 34, 107–108, AIV.1–4.

104 GABLER et al. 1990, 75; LŐRINCZ 2001, 20, 49, 78, 86, 102; BÍRÓ 2020, 74.

105 SPAUL 1994, 32, 257.

106 GABLER et al. 1990, 74–75; LŐRINCZ 2001, 18–19, 49, 78, 85, 92, 94, 96, 103, 111; BÍRÓ 2020, 78.

107 SPAUL 1994, 98–99; LŐRINCZ 2001, 18.

108 GABLER et al. 1990, 74; BÍRÓ 2013, 250.

109 SPAUL 1994, 99.

new military unit.¹¹⁰ On the other hand, the exact composition of this unit is unknown, and other foreigners could also serve in the *ala Pannoniorum*. As for the story of the Nertomarus brooch, it was likely brought to Pannonia by someone who originated from or travelled through the main distribution area of the type.

At this point, it is worth citing T. Ivleva's thoughts about travelling brooches. She studied British-made brooches found outside the province of production¹¹¹ and suggested that "[...] since they were British products, brooches were symbols associated with a British past."¹¹² Although this connection seems easy to understand, it is complex indeed. She also stated, "This British-ness does not necessarily imply ethnic associations; rather different British pasts as a soldier, a trader or a traveller are emphasised."¹¹³ Finds of brooches from the western provinces in Pannonia shall be seen in a similar light. However, not all 1st century AD foreign brooches came to Pannonia with a military person; as emphasised, civilians always accompanied the Roman military units. If a unit was posted elsewhere, the civilians moved with it; the English term 'camp-follower' describes the phenomenon rather well.¹¹⁴

It must be remembered that the Nertomarus brooch in focus did not finish its journey in the auxiliary fort or the *vicus* but ended up in a civilian settlement of local inhabitants. Unfortunately, its find context does not allow speculation about its final destiny. Brooches from burials, depositions, sanctuaries, waste pits, roadsides or fields, beneath floors of buildings, and ditches in forts allow one to build various theories about the connection between the last owner and the item.¹¹⁵ Brooches may have had very diverse life trajectories; they could present value for an individual and/or one's family throughout their use life, but they could also be thrown away as rubbish. Further research might reveal more about the stories of foreign brooches in Pannonia.

Summary

Numerous metal objects, including brooches, were found during the three-year-long excavation at Győr-Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek. Currently, 901 have been identified as Roman Period brooches, and 869 of these are suitable for typological investigation. Many early Roman Period brooches represent types popular in the western provinces. A few of the 55 brooches of western origin could not be identified on type level, while the rest could be classified into sixteen types and 31 variants. One belongs to the Nertomarus type, which is highly underrepresented in Pannonia. It could be dated to the first half of the 1st century AD, the type having been in fashion from the end of the Augustan to the Claudian–Neroan Age. The fragmented brooch is decorated with a name stamp (NORV), the abbreviation

110 A. W. Meyer presented a tombstone from Gyalóka, Hungary, with several names (*Abilus, Turancus, Bovegius, Veminus, Pentius, and Doviderus*) that can be traced back to north-western Hispania (MEYER 2012, 109–111). I. Matijević also studied another stele from Salona. The soldier (*Cloutius*) came from Curunniacis in north-western Hispania and held the rank of *duplicarius* (MEYER 2012, 111–112; MATIJEVIĆ 2019, 88). Scholars stated that these stone monuments prove the recruiting of new soldiers in Hispania besides Illyricum. Moreover, the three cavalrymen mentioned on the tombstone from Gyalóka might have had a close relationship, the character of which cannot be defined (MEYER 2012, 110–114; MATIJEVIĆ 2019, 88–90, 93–94). T. Szőnyi also had a theory about the early activity of this *ala*. She supposed that after the unit had been created, it was posted to Hispania, and after new soldiers had been recruited from this area, the *ala* returned to Pannonia (T. SZŐNYI 1988, 29, 31).

111 IVLEVA 2016a; IVLEVA 2016b.

112 IVLEVA 2017, 82.

113 IVLEVA 2017, 83.

114 SOMMER 2015, 219–223. In connection with Arrabona, see: BÍRÓ 2020, 73.

115 T. Ivleva studied these various contexts and connections through several examples of British-made brooches (IVLEVA 2016a, 373–375).

of NERTOMARVS. This brooch could arrive in Pannonia in different ways. The possibility that it was a local imitation could be excluded, and it is also unlikely that the artefact was brought and sold there by traders. The brooch probably ‘travelled’ with a person who originated from or travelled through the main distribution area of the type. Some scholars linked Nertomarus brooches with men, more specifically, soldiers. As the earliest known auxiliary camp at Győr/Arrabona was built during the Claudian Age, the hypothesised owner could be a soldier or a person who accompanied the *ala Pannoniorum*, the first troop stationed there. Later, the brooch could be transferred to the civil settlement. Being a stray find, the find context does not hint at its final destiny. Early Roman Period bow brooches from the western provinces were foreign accessories and did not really belong to the attire of local inhabitants in Pannonia but probably ‘travelled’ there with foreigners. Is it possible to reconstruct and analyse their route and the complex network behind it? Can they be connected with military troops and used in analysing the intensity of various connections between distant territories? Future research must focus on seeking answers to these questions.

Acknowledgements

I express my gratitude to Gábor Ilon, leader of the archaeological excavations at Győr-Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek, who enabled the scientific investigation of the Roman Period brooches from the site. This paper was supported by two grants, the Archaeological Scholarship of the Hungarian National Museum National Institute of Archaeology and the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

References

- ARMAND-CALLIAT, L. 1944: Les fouilles de Marloux (Saône-el-Loire) en 1943. *Gallia* 2, 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.3406/galia.1944.1985>
- BACKHAUS, C. 2016: *Ceci n'est pas une chronologie. Die Konstruktion einer alternativen Fibelchronologie am Beispiel der Fibeln des Oppidum Bibracte (Burgund, Frankreich)*. PhD Dissertation, Universität Leipzig–Universität de Bourgogne, Leipzig–Bourgogne.
- BEHRENS, G. 1950: Römische Fibeln mit Inschrift. In: Behrens, G. – Werner, J. (eds): *Reinecke Festschrift zum 75. Geburtstag von Paul Reinecke am 25. September 1947*. Mainz, 1–12.
- BERECZ, K. 2008: *Aucissa és emailos fibulák Pannoniában és a szomszédos Barbaricumban* (Aucissa and Enamelled Brooches in Pannonia and the neighbouring Barbaricum). PhD Dissertation, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.
- BERECZ, K. 2023: Die Aucissafibeln in der römischen Provinz Pannonia. *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 74, 205–263. <https://doi.org/10.1556/072.2023.00017>
- BEUTLER, F. – FARKA, C. – GUGL, C. – HUMER, F. – KREMER, G. – POLLHAMMER, E. 2017: Katalog. In: Beutler, F. – Farka, C. – Gugl, C. – Humer, F. – Kremer, G. – Pollhammer, E. (eds): *Der Adler Roms – Carnuntum und die Armee der Caesaren. Ausstellung im Archäologischen Museum Carnuntinum, Bad Deutsch-Altenburg, März 2017 – November 2020*. Bad Vöslau.
- BÍRÓ, SZ. 2007: A Sokoró vidéke a római korban (The Sokoró Region in the Roman Age). In: Bíró, Sz. (ed.): *FIRKÁK I. Fiatal Római koros Kutatók Konferenciakötete I*. Győr, 17–34.
- BÍRÓ, SZ. 2012: Egy különleges pannoniai pecsételt edény a Győr-Ménfőcsanaki római kori vicusból (A peculiar stamped pot from the Roman vicus of Győr-Ménfőcsanak [County Győr-Moson-Sopron, Hungary, Pannonia]). *Arrabona* 50, 229–240.
- BÍRÓ, SZ. 2013: Fibeln aus einer dörflichen Siedlung in Pannonien. In: Grabherr, G. – Kainrath, B. – Schiert, T. (eds): *Brooches and other elements of dress as sources for reconstructing interregional movement and group boundaries from the Punic War to the decline of the Western Roman Empire. Proceedings of the International Conference from 27th-29th April 2011 in Innsbruck*. Innsbrucker Klassisch-Archäologische Universitätsschriften 8. Innsbruck, 248–256.

- BÍRÓ, Sz. 2014: Ein bemerkenswertes Gefäß mit Stempelverzierung aus dem Vicus von Győr-Ménfőcsanak (Kom. Győr-Moson-Sopron / H). In: Nickel, C. – Röder, M. – Scholz, M. (eds): *Honesta missione. Festschrift für Barbara Pferdehirt*. Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums 100. Mainz, 437–444.
- BÍRÓ, Sz. 2017: *Die zivilen Vici in Pannonien*. Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums 131. Mainz.
- BÍRÓ, Sz. 2020: Kronológiai és topográfiai megfigyelések Arrabona táborában és vicusában (Chronological and Topographical Data on the Roman Fort and Vicus of Arrabona). In: Nemes, G. – Czigány, D. – Nemesné Matus, Zs. (eds): *Tomka 80. Ünnepi tanulmányok Tomka Péter köszöntésére* [Studies in honour of Péter Tomka]. Győr, 73–86.
- BOELICKE, U. 2002: *Die Fibeln aus dem Areal der Colonia Ulpia Traiana*. Xantener Berichte 10. Xanten.
- BÖHME, A. 1972: Die Fibeln der Kastelle Saalburg und Zugmantel. *Saalburg Jahrbuch* 29, 5–112.
- BÖHME-SCHÖNBERGER, A. 2000: Römische Kaiserzeit im Provinzialrömischen Gebiet und Beziehung zur Germania magna. In: Beck, H. – Steuer, H. – Timpe, D. – Wenskus, R. (eds): *Fibel und Fibeltracht. Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*. Berlin–New York, 511–523.
- BUORA, M. 2004: Fibule del tipo Langton Down nell’arco Alpino Orientale e lungo la costa Adriatica. *Quaderni Friuliani di Archeologia* 14, 69–72.
- BUSULADŽIĆ, A. 2010: *Morfologija antičkih fibula iz zbirke Zemaljskog muzeja Bosnie i Hercegovine – The morphology of antique fibulae in the Collection of the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Sarajevo.
- CHARDRON-PICAULT, P. – BERNARD, M. – GRAPIN, C. – LARCELET, A. – TISSERAND, N. – VERNOU, C. – VIAL, E. 2008: Les ateliers de bronziers. In: Chardon-Picault, P. (ed.): *Hommes de feu, hommes du feu. L’artisanat en pays Eduen*. Autun.
- COCIȘ, S. 2004: *Fibulele din Dacia Romană. The brooches from Roman Dacia*. Cluj-Napoca.
- COCIȘ, S. 2019: *The Brooch Workshops from Dacia and other Danubian Provinces of the Roman Empire (1st c. BC – 3rd c. AD)*. Patrimonium Archaeologicum Transylvanicum 16. Cluj-Napoca.
- CORDIE-HACKENBERG, R. – HAFFNER, A. 1991: *Das keltisch-römische Gräberfeld von Wederath-Belginum. 4. Teil: Gräber 1261–1817., Ausgegraben 1978–1980*. Trierer Grabungen und Forschungen VI/4. Mainz am Rhein.
- CORDIE-HACKENBERG, R. – HAFFNER, A. 1997: *Das keltisch-römische Gräberfeld von Wederath-Belginum. 5. Teil: Gräber 1818–2472., Ausgegraben 1978, 1981–1985*. Trierer Grabungen und Forschungen VI/5. Mainz am Rhein.
- DESCHLER-ERB, E. 2013: Fibeln aus Augsburg-Oberhausen. In: Grabherr, G. – Kainrath, B. – Schiert, T. (eds): *Brooches and other elements of dress as sources for reconstructing interregional movement and group boundaries from the Punic War to the decline of the Western Roman Empire. Proceedings of the International Conference from 27th–29th April 2011 in Innsbruck*. Innsbrucker Klassisch-Archäologische Universitätsschriften 8. Innsbruck, 128–152.
- DIZDAR, M. – TONC, A. 2013: Finds of fibulae from 1st cent. BC in Croatia: Trade and exchange between Eastern Alps, Danube and North Adriatic Region before and during the Roman conquest. In: Grabherr, G. – Kainrath, B. – Schiert, T. (eds): *Brooches and other elements of dress as sources for reconstructing interregional movement and group boundaries from the Punic War to the decline of the Western Roman Empire. Proceedings of the International Conference from 27th–29th April 2011 in Innsbruck*. Innsbrucker Klassisch-Archäologische Universitätsschriften 8. Innsbruck, 49–75.
- M. EGRY, I. 2001: Beszámoló a Győr-Marcalváros-bevásárlóközpont területén végzett megelőző régészeti feltárásról (Report on the Preliminary Exploration Carried out in the Area of Győr-Marcalváros-Shopping Centre – Bericht über vorausgehende Freilegungen auf dem Terrain des Einkaufszentrums Győr-Marcalváros). *Arrabona* 39, 57–78.
- M. EGRY, I. 2002: Győr, Marcálváros, Szabadidőközpont, Pápai úti vásártér (Győr-Moson-Sopron megye). In: Marton, E. – Kisfaludi, J. (eds): *Régészeti Kutatások Magyarországon 1999 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 1999*. Budapest, 206.
- M. EGRY, I. 2003: Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Széles-földek, Pápai-dűlő (Győr-Moson-Sopron megye). In: Kisfaludi, J. (ed.): *Régészeti Kutatások Magyarországon 2001 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 2001*. Budapest, 169.

- M. EGRY, I. 2005: Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Burkus-földek (Győr-Moson-Sopron megye). In: Kisfaludi, J. (ed.): *Régészeti Kutatások Magyarországon 2004 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 2004*. Budapest, 222–223.
- M. EGRY, I. 2007: Előzetes beszámoló a Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Eperföldeken végzett megelőző feltárásról (2005–2006) (Preliminary report on the investment-led excavation at Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Eperföldek (2005–2006)). In: Kisfaludi, J. (ed.): *Régészeti Kutatások Magyarországon 2006 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 2006*. Budapest, 27–52.
- M. EGRY, I. – SZÖNYI, E. – TOMKA, P. 2001: Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Bevásárlóközpont (Győr-Moson-Sopron megye) (Győr – Ménfőcsanak, Bevásárlóközpont [Győr-Moson-Sopron County]). In: Mesterházy, K. (ed.): *Az 1997. év régészeti kutatásai – Archaeological reports from the year 1997*. Régészeti Füzetek I.51, Budapest, 30.
- M. EGRY, I. – SZÖNYI, E. – TOMKA, P. – VADAY, A. 2006: Ménfőcsanak. Településrészletek (Ménfőcsanak. Siedlungsdetails). In: Bíró, Sz. (ed.): *Rómaiak nyomában...Az elmúlt 15 év római koros ásatásai Győr-Moson-Sopron megyében. Kiállításvezető – Auf der Spur der Römer... Archäologische Forschungen zur Römerzeit in den letzten 15 Jahre im Komitat Győr-Moson-Sopron. Ausstellungsführer*. A Győr-Moson-Sopron Megyei Múzeumok Kiállításvezetője 1. Győr, 33–40.
- ERICE LACABE, R. 1995: *Las fibulas del nordeste de la Península Ibérica: siglos I A. E. al IV D. E.* Zaragoza.
- ETTLINGER, E. 1973: *Die römischen Fibeln in der Schweiz*. Bern.
- EXNER, K. 1939: Die provinzialrömischen Emailfibeln der Rheinlande. *Berichte der Römisch-Germanische Kommission* 29, 31–121.
- FERJANČIĆ, S. 2015: The ala Pannoniorum in the army of Illyricum. *Istraživanja Journal of Historical Researches* 26, 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.19090/i.2015.26.37-45>
- FEUGÈRE, M. 1985: *Les fibules en Gaule Méridionale de la conquête à la fin du Ve s. ap. J.-C.* Revue Archéologique de Narbonnaise Supplément 12. Paris. <https://doi.org/10.3406/ran.1985.1668>
- GABLER, D. 2006: Das Donautal in augusteischer Zeit. Zur Frage der frühen Militärstationen. *Carnuntum Jahrbuch*, 81–101.
- GABLER, D. – LŐRINCZ, B. – MÓCSY, A. 1990: Hadsereg. In: Mócsy, A. – Fitz, J. (eds): *Pannonia régészeti kézikönyve*. Budapest, 71–113, 313–330.
- GASPAR, N. 2007: *Die keltischen und gallo-römischen Fibeln vom Titelberg. Les fibules gauloises et gallo-romaines du Titelberg*. Dossiers d'Archeologie du Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art 11. Luxembourg.
- GELDMACHER, N. 2004: *Die römischen Gräber des Gräberfeldes von Wederath-Belginum, Kr. Bernkastel-Wittich. Typologische und Chronologische Studien*. Kiel.
- GENČEVA, E. 2004: *Les fibules romaines de Bulgarie de la fin du Ier s. av. J.-C. à la fin du VIe s. ap. J.-C.* Veliko Tarnovo.
- GRBIĆ, D. 1996: Fibulae as products of local workshops at Diana. In: Petriković, P. (ed.): *Roman Limes on the Middle and Lower Danube*. Belgrade, 87–91.
- GUGL, C. 1995: *Die römischen Fibeln aus Virunum*. Klagenfurt.
- GUILLAUMET, J.-P. 1993: *Les fibules de Bibracte. Techniques et typologie*. Dijon.
- HAFFNER, A. 1971: *Das keltisch-römische Gräberfeld von Wederath-Belginum. 1. Teil: Gräber 1–428, Ausgegraben 1954/55*. Trierer Grabungen und Forschungen VI/1. Mainz.
- HAFFNER, A. 1978: *Das keltisch-römische Gräberfeld von Wederath-Belginum. 3. Teil: Gräber 885–1260, Ausgegraben 1958–1960, 1971 u. 1974*. Trierer Grabungen und Forschungen VI/3. Mainz.
- HARALAMBEVA, A. 2013: Aucissafibeln mit Inschriften aus den Provinzen Moesia inferior und Thracia. In: Grabherr, G. – Kainrath, B. – Schiert, T. (eds): *Brooches and other elements of dress as sources for reconstructing interregional movement and group boundaries from the Punic War to the decline of the Western Roman Empire. Proceedings of the International Conference from 27th–29th April 2011 in Innsbruck*. Innsbrucker Klassisch-Archäologische Universitätschriften 8. Innsbruck, 102–108.
- HEYMANS, H. 1997: Die Fibeln aus dem römerzeitlichen Vicus von Kalsdorf bei Graz. *Fundberichte aus Österreich* 36, 325–374.

- HUMER, F. (ed.) 2006: *Legionsadler und druidenstab. Vom Legionslager zur Donaumetropole. Katalogband*. Bad Deutsch-Altenburg.
- ILON, G. 2010: Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Széles-földek (KÖH 34305). In: Kisfaludi, J. (ed.): *Régészeti Kutatások Magyarországon 2009 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 2009*. Budapest, 214–215.
- ILON, G. 2011: Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Széles-földek (KÖH 34305). In: Kisfaludi, J. (ed.): *Régészeti Kutatások Magyarországon 2010 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 2010*. Budapest, 237–238.
- ILON, G. 2012: Győr-Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek (Győr-Moson-Sopron megye, bevásárlóközpont építése). In: Kvassay, J. (ed.): *Évkönyv és jelentés a Kulturális Örökségvédelmi Szakszolgálat 2009. évi feltárásairól – Field Service and Cultural Heritage 2009 Yearbook and Review of Archaeological Investigations*. Budapest, 104–105.
- ILON, G. 2017: A néhai Kulturális Örökségvédelmi Szakszolgálat fémkeresős protokolljának eredményei egy ménfőcsanaki lelőhelyrészleten. Előzetes anyagközlés (Results of the metal detector survey protocol of the former Field Service for Cultural Heritage at Ménfőcsanak. Preliminary report). In: Benkő, E. – Bondár, M. – Kolláth, Á. (eds): *Magyarország régészeti topográfiája. Múlt, jelen, jövő. Archaeological topography of Hungary. Past, present and Future*. Budapest, 185–206.
- ILON, G. 2018: Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Széles-földek (KÖH 34305). In: Kisfaludi, J. (ed.): *Régészeti Kutatások Magyarországon 2011 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 2011*. Budapest, 60–62.
- IVČEVIĆ, S. 2002: Fibule. In: Marin, E. (ed.): *Longae Saloniae I–II*. Split, 229–275, 124–147.
- IVČEVIĆ, S. 2005: Nekoliko ranocarskih fibula iz Salone (Several Early Roman Imperial Fibulae from Salona). *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku* 98, 73–82.
- IVLEVA, T. 2011: Brooches tell tales: British-made brooches in Germania Inferior and Superior as indicators of the presence of British emigrants. In: Hujiben, K. – van den Liefvoort, S. J. A. G. – van der Weyden, T. J. S. M. (eds): *SOJA Bundel 2010. Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Proceedings of Symposium Onderzoek Jonge Archeologe (Research symposium for young archaeologists) held on 19th March*. Nijmegen, 51–56.
- IVLEVA, T. 2016a: A totality of a thing with objects: multifaceted British-made brooches abroad. In: Hofmann, K. P. – Meier, T. – Mölders, D. – Schreiber, S. (eds): *Massendinghaltung in der Archäologie. Der material turn und die Ur- und Frühgeschichte*. Leiden, 365–386.
- IVLEVA, T. 2016b: The role of brooches in Roman military dress of the late 1st–3rd centuries AD in the Roman West. In: Pauli Jensen, X. – Grane, T. (eds): *Imitation and inspiration. Proceedings of the 18th International Roman Military Equipment Conference. Copenhagen, Denmark, 9th–14th June 2013*. *Journal of Roman Military Equipment Studies* 17. 121–129.
- IVLEVA, T. 2017: 'Active brooches': theorising brooches of the Roman north-west (first to third centuries AD). In: Martin, T. F. – Weetch, R. (eds): *Dress and society: Contributions from archaeology*. Oxford, 69–94.
- KOŠČEVIĆ, R. 1980: *Antičke fibule s područja Siska*. Zagreb.
- KOVRIG, I. 1937: *A császárkori fibulák fő formái Pannoniában. Die Haupttypen der kaiserzeitlichen Fibeln in Pannonien*. *Dissertationes Pannonicae* 2.4. Budapest.
- KROPF, W. – NOWAK, H. 2000: *Fibeln von Flavia Solva aus Privatbesitz*. Römisches Österreich 21–22. Wien.
- LEIFELD, H. 2007: *Endlatène und älterkaiserzeitliche Fibeln aus Gräbern des Trierer Landes. Eine antiquarisch-chronologische Studie*. *Universitätsforschungen zu prähistorischen Archäologie* 146. Bonn.
- LERAT, L. 1979: *Les fibules d'Alésia dans les musées d'Alise-Sainte-Reine*. *Bibliothèque pro Alésia* 7. Dijon.
- LÓRINCZ, B. 2001: *Die römischen Hilfstruppen in Pannonien während der Prinzipatszeit. Teil I: Die Inschriften*. *Wiener Archäologische Studien* 3. Wien.
- LUDWIG, R. 1988: Das frühromische Brandgräberfeld von Schankweiler, Kreis Bitburg-Prüm. *Trierer Zeitschrift* 51, 51–422.
- MACKENSEN, M. 1978: *Das römische Gräberfeld auf der Keckwiese in Kempten. I. Gräber und Grabanlagen des 1. und 4. Jahrhunderts*. Bayerisch Landesamt für Denkmalpflege. Abteilung für Vor- und Frühgeschichte. *Materialhefte zur Bayerischen Vorgeschichte* 34 – *Cambodunumforschungen* 5, Kallmünz.
- MACKRETH, D. 2011: *Brooches in Late Iron Age and Roman Britain*. Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvh1dv2x>
- MATIJEVIĆ, I. 2019: Ala Parthorum i ala Pannoniorum na natpisima iz Salone. The ala Parthorum and the ala Pannoniorum in inscriptions from Salona. *Journal of Dalmatian archaeology and history* 112, 71–97.
- MAZUR, A. 1998: Les fibules romaines d'Avenches I. *Bulletin de l'association Pro Aventico* 40, 5–104.

- MAZUR, A. 2010: Les fibules romaines d'Avenches II. *Bulletin de l'association Pro Aventico* 52, 27–108.
- MERCZI, M. 2012: A Budaörs-Kamaraerdei-dűlőben feltárt római vicus fibulái (Die Fibeln des römischen Vicus in Budaörs-Kamaraerdei-dűlő). In: Ottományi, K. (ed.): *Római vicus Budaörsön. Régészeti tanulmányok*. Budapest, 455–528.
- MERCZI, M. 2016a: A Budaörs-Kamaraerdei-dűlőben feltárt római temető fibulái (Fibeln des römischen Gräberfeldes von Budaörs-Kamaraerdei Flur. Bewertung des Fundmaterials der Siedlung und des Gräberfeldes). In: Ottományi, K. (ed.): *A budaörsi római vicus temetője. Régészeti tanulmányok*. Budapest, 432–489.
- MERCZI, M. 2016b: Kora római rugótokos és csuklós ívfibulák a Balassa Bálint Múzeum gyűjteményéből. Adatok Északkelet-Pannonia kora római településhálózatához (Hülsenspiral- und Hülsenscharnierfibeln von dem Sammelgebiet des Balassa Bálint Museums). In: Csécs, T. – Takács, M. (eds): *Beatus homo qui invenit sapientiam. Ünnepi kötet Tomka Péter 75. születésnapjára*. Győr, 447–462.
- MERCZI, M. 2017: Római kori fibulák Perbálról és Zsámbékról (Roman fibulae from Perbál and Zsámbék). *Studia Comitatus* 35, 71–119.
- MERCZI, M. 2019: A Páty-Malom-dűlőben feltárt temető római kori fibulái (Roman brooches from the graveyard excavated in Malom-dűlő, Páty). *Studia Comitatus* 37, 32–71.
- MERCZI, M. 2021: Újabb római kori fibulák Aquincum térségéből (Further Roman Fibulae from the Aquincum Area). *Studia Comitatus* 39, 18–45.
- MERCZI, M. 2023: Római kori fibulák a diagonális út menti településekről, Dorogról és Kesztlőrcről (Römerzeitliche Fibeln aus den Siedlungen der Diagonalstrasse, aus Dorog und Kesztlőrc). In: Merczi, M. (ed.): „*Testas, turres, tegulas titulosque litterate tractavit*” Ünnepi kötet H. Kelemen Márta 80. születésnapjára. Budapest, 87–123.
- MERKL, O. – ILON, G. 2012: Rovarmaradványok egy római kori kútból Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földekről (Insect remains found in a Roman Age well located in the lands of Ménfőcsanak-Széles-földek). *Archeometriai Műhely* 2012/1, 53–56.
- METZLER, J. 1995: *Das treverische Oppidum auf dem Titelberg (G.-H. Luxembourg). Zur Kontinuität zwischen der spätkeltschen und der frühromischen Zeit in Nord-Gallien*. Dossiers d'Archéologie du Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art 3. Luxembourg.
- MEYER, A. W. 2012: *The Creation, Composition, Service and Settlement of Roman Auxiliary Units Raised on the Iberian Peninsula*. PhD Dissertation, Duke University, Durham. <https://doi.org/10.30861/9781407311210>
- MRÁV, Zs. 2013: The Roman Army along the Amber Road between Poetovio and Carnuntum in the 1st century A.D. – Archaeological Evidence. A preliminary research report. *Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungariae*, 49–100. <https://doi.org/10.54640/CAH.2013.49>
- NAGY, A. 2008: Győr-Ménfőcsanak, bevásárlóközpont (Győr-Moson-Sopron megye). In: Kisfaludi, J. (ed.): *Régészeti kutatások Magyarországon 2007 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 2007*. Budapest, 220–221.
- NICKEL, C. 2011: Die Fibeln vom Martberg. Altfunde, Privatsammlungen, Feldfunde, Grabungen. In: Haffner, A. – von Kaenel, H.-M. – Wegner, H.-H. (eds): *Martberg. Heiligtum und Oppidum der Treverer II*. Berichte zur Archäologie an Mittelrhein und Mosel 18. Koblenz.
- NOLL, R. 1952: Römerzeitliche Fibelinschriften. *Germania* 30, 395–399. <https://doi.org/10.11588/ger.1952.44634>
- ORTISI, S. 2002: *Die früh- und mittelkaiserzeitlichen Fibeln*. Römische Kleinfunde aus Burghöfe 2. Rahden, 9–58.
- PATEK, E. 1942: *A pannoniai fibulatípusok elterjedése és eredete – Verbreitung und Herkunft der römischen Fibeltypen in Pannonien*. Dissertationes Pannonicae 2.19. Budapest.
- PETKOVIĆ, S. 2010: *Rimske fibule u Srbiji od I do V veka N. E. Römische Fibeln in Serbien von 1. bis 5. Jh. nach Chr.* Archäologisches Institut Monographie 50. Beograd.
- PHILIPPE, J. 1999: *Les fibules de Seine-et-Marne du 1er siècle av. J.-C. au 5e siècle ap. J.-C.* Mémoire archéologiques de Seine-et-Marne 1. Nemours.
- RASBACH, G. 2014: Aucissafibeln und Reliefknöpfe zwischen Gallien und Dalmatien – Funde aus einer Mainzer Privatsammlung. In: Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum (ed.): *HONESTA MISSIONE. Festschrift für Barbara Pferdehirt*. Sonderdruck aus Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums 100. Mainz, 143–168.

- REY-VODOZ, V. 1986: Les fibules gallo-romaines de Martigny VS. *Jahrbuch der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Ur- und Frühgeschichte* 69, 149–198.
- RIECKHOFF, S. 1975: Münzen und Fibeln aus dem Vicus des Kastells Hüfingen (Schwarzwald-Baar-Kreis). *Saalburg Jahrbuch* 32, 5–104.
- RIHA, E. 1979: *Die römischen Fibeln aus Augst und Kaiseraugst*. Forschungen in Augst 3. Augst.
- RIHA, E. 1994: *Die römischen Fibeln aus Augst und Kaiseraugst. Die Neufunde seit 1975*. Forschungen in Augst 18. Augst.
- ROTHE, U. 2012: Clothing in the Middle Danube provinces. The garments, their origins, and their distribution. *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts* 81, 137–231.
- SÁRÓ, Cs. 2014a: Kora császárkori fibulák a Wosinsky Mór Megyei Múzeum gyűjteményéből (Fibeln von der Frühkaiserzeit aus der Sammlung des Komitatsmuseums Mór Wosinsky). *A Wosinsky Mór Múzeum Évkönyve* 36, 159–221.
- SÁRÓ, Cs. 2014b: Roman brooches from Paks-Gyapa-Rosti-pusztá. *Dissertationes Archaeologicae* 3.2, 299–319. <https://doi.org/10.17204/dissarch.2014.299>
- SÁRÓ, Cs. 2020a: The Fibula Production of Brigetio: Clay Moulds. *Dissertationes Archaeologicae* 3.8, 117–139. <https://doi.org/10.17204/dissarch.2020.117>
- SÁRÓ, Cs. 2020b: *Hagyományörzés és romanizáció az eraviscus viselet tükrében* (Tradition and romanization by the dress of the Eraviscus tribe). PhD Dissertation, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. <https://doi.org/10.15476/ELTE.2020.209>
- SÁRÓ, Cs. 2021: The Fibula Production of Brigetio: Model, Semi-finished Products and Failed Castings. *Dissertationes Archaeologicae* 3.9, 155–175. <https://doi.org/10.17204/dissarch.2021.155>
- SCHLEIERMACHER, M. 1993: *Die römischen Fibeln von Kempten-Cambodunum*. Bayerisch Landesamt für Denkmalpflege. Abteilung Bodendenkmalpflege 63, Cambodunumforschungen 5. Kallmünz, 11–52.
- SCHMID, S. 2010: *Die römischen Fibeln aus Wien*. Monografien der Stadtarchäologie Wien 6. Wien.
- SEDLMAYER, H. 2009: *Die Fibeln vom Magdalensberg*. Archäologische Forschungen zu den Grabungen auf dem Magdalensberg 16. Klagenfurt am Wörthersee.
- SELLYE, I. 1970: Adatok az arrabonai fémművességhez (Data to the metallurgy of Arrabona). *Arrabona* 12, 69–82.
- SEY, N. 2013: *A pannoniai római kori bronzművesség műhelykérdései* (Issues of the Bronze Working Workshops in the Roman Age in Pannonia). PhD Dissertation, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.
- SOMMER, C. S. 2015: Civilian Settlements. In: Le Bohec, Y. (ed.): *The Encyclopedia of the Roman Army I*. Chichester, 219–235. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118318140.wbra0346>
- SPAUL, J. E. H. 1994: *Ala². The auxiliary cavalry units of the pre-Diocletianic imperial Roman army*. Andover.
- SZÓNYI, E. 1995: Die einheimische Keramik von der frühkaiserzeitlichen Siedlung Győr-Ménfőcsanak. In: Tejral, J. – Pieta, K. – Rajtár, J. (eds): *Kelten, Germanen, Römer im Mitteldonauebiet vom Ausklang der Latène – Zivilisation bis zum 2. Jahrhundert*. Brno–Nitra, 217–223.
- SZÓNYI, E. 1997: Adatok a Brigetio–Savaria út nyomvonalához (Data on the Route between Brigetio and Savaria). *Arrabona* 35, 97–108.
- SZÓNYI, E. 1999: Római kori útatatok Győr megyében (Added Data to Ancient Roman Roads in Győr County). *Arrabona* 37, 83–98.
- SZÓNYI, E. 2003a: Römische Brunnen in der Kleinen Tiefebene. *Antaeus* 26, 141–158.
- SZÓNYI, E. 2003b: Fortifications along the Ripa Pannonica. Arrabona castellum. In: Visy, Zs. (ed.): *The Roman army in Pannonia. An archaeological guide of the Ripa Pannonica*. Pécs, 68–69.
- SZÓNYI, E. 2005: Landwirtschaftliche Siedlungen hinter dem Limes. *Balácai Közlemények* 9, 401–412.
- SZÓNYI, E. 2007a: Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Bevásárlóközpont (Győr-Moson-Sopron megye). In: Kisfaludi, J. (ed.): *Régészeti kutatások Magyarországon 2006 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 2006*. Budapest, 207.
- SZÓNYI, E. 2007b: Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Mérföldkő út (Győr-Moson-Sopron megye). In: Kisfaludi, J. (ed.): *Régészeti kutatások Magyarországon 2006 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 2006*. Budapest, 207–208.

- SZŐNYI, E. – TOMKA, P. 2006a: Arrabona vicusa. Győr-Széchenyi tér (Vicus von Arrabona. Győr-Széchenyi Platz). In: BÍRÓ, Sz. (ed.): *Rómaiak nyomában...Az elmúlt 15 év római koros ásatásai Győr-Moson-Sopron megyében. Kiállításvezető – Auf der Spur der Römer... Archäologische Forschungen zur Römerzeit in den letzten 15 Jahre im Komitat Győr-Moson-Sopron. Ausstellungsführer. A Győr-Moson-Sopron Megyei Múzeumok Kiállításvezetője 1. Győr, 12–16.*
- SZŐNYI, E. – TOMKA, P. 2006b: Arrabona vicusa. Belvárosi feltárások (Vicus von Arrabona. Ausgrabungen in der Innenstadt). In: BÍRÓ, Sz. (ed.): *Rómaiak nyomában...Az elmúlt 15 év római koros ásatásai Győr-Moson-Sopron megyében. Kiállításvezető – Auf der Spur der Römer... Archäologische Forschungen zur Römerzeit in den letzten 15 Jahre im Komitat Győr-Moson-Sopron. Ausstellungsführer. A Győr-Moson-Sopron Megyei Múzeumok Kiállításvezetője 1. Győr, 17–22.*
- T. SZŐNYI, E. 1988: Régészeti adatok Arrabona legkorábbi megszálló csapatához (Archäologische Daten zur frühesten Besatzungstruppe von Arrabona). *Arrabona* 24–25, 21–33.
- T. SZŐNYI, E. 1996: Römerzeitliche Altansässigensiedlung von Ménfőcsanak (Umgebung von Győr). *Archeološki vestnik* 47, 249–256.
- TANKÓ, K. 2020: *Kelta falu Győr határában. A ménfőcsanaki késő vaskori település* (A Celtic village in North-West Hungary). Budapest.
- ȚENȚEA, O. 2012: *Ex Oriente ad Danubium. The Syrian units on the Danube frontier of the Roman Empire. The Centre for Roman Military Studies 6.* București.
- TOMKA, P. 2001: Győr, Ménfőcsanak – Bevasárlóközpont (Győr-Moson-Sopron megye). In: Marton, E. – Kisfaludi, J. (eds): *Régészeti kutatások Magyarországon 1998 – Archaeological Investigations in Hungary 1998.* Budapest, 148.
- VARGA, K. 2007: Előzetes beszámoló a Ménfőcsanak-Eperföldek lelőhelyen feltárt késő római temetőről (Preliminary report on the Roman cemetery recovered at the site of Győr-Ménfőcsanak, Eperföldek). In: BÍRÓ, Sz. (ed.): *FIRKÁK I. Fiatal Római koros Kutatók Konferenciakötete I.* Győr, 35–49.



