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THE OSTROGOTHS IN LATE ANTIQUE SOUTHERN PANNONIA

ABSTRACT


This paper aims to analyze and interpret the literary and archaeological evidence relating to the rule of the Ostrogoths in late antique southern Pannonia, i.e. the late Roman provinces of Pannonia Savia and Pannonia Secunda (known in the Ostrogothic times as Pannonia Sirmiensis). The study is centred around two distinctive chronological periods into which, according to narrative sources, the Ostrogothic presence and rule in southern Pannonia can be divided: first, from the collapse of the Hun dominance in the Middle Danube region to the departure of the Ostrogothic groups from Pannonia (454–473), and second, from the establishment of the Ostrogothic rule in Italy to their withdrawal from the region between the Sava, the Drava and the Danube at the onset of the Byzantine-Ostrogothic war (493–535). The second period was introduced by a brief Ostrogothic stay in southern Pannonia on their way from the Lower Danube area to Italy (488–489), as well as extended by a temporary reappearance of the Ostrogoths in Pannonia Savia when they mustered troops from among local barbarian groups (537). One of the main purposes of the study is to bring the historical record into a meaningful and methodologically sound correlation with archaeological evidence bearing in mind the limitations with regard to precise dating of the material and its attribution to specific groups of peoples.
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SOME INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The lost world of the late antique and the early medieval southern Pannonia holds many research puzzles, which is due to the sparsity and fragmentary nature of narrative sources as well as to the deficiency and interpretative unreliability of archaeological evidence. This is not to say that researchers should be discouraged from forming hypotheses and conclusions, and offering coherent narratives — as coherent as possible — of past events. However, one always has to bear in mind the limitations of archaeological evidence and the interpretative uncertainty surrounding it. The study of the early medieval period is particularly challenging due to the paucity of sources and the interpretative difficulties associated with the archaeological record. Nevertheless, efforts should be made to bridge the gap between textual and material evidence, taking into account the limitations and challenges posed by each source type.
mind that any such attempt is merely a historiographic construct, more or less convincing or plausible, and not a petrified truth of historical processes. The history of the Ostrogoths in southern Pannonia is one of such research puzzles. This paper aims to shed light on the Ostrogothic rule in the former late Roman provinces of Pannonia Savia and Pannonia Secunda by analyzing and interpreting the available literary and archaeological evidence. The literary evidence is given here a scrutiny that befits its fragmentary nature, but it will not be examined with regard to the intellectual and ideological modus operandi of the authors of narrative sources used here, despite the fact that such an analysis is undoubtedly worthwhile and indeed essential when trying to provide a more refined contextualization and a deeper insight into what type of information the authors chose to present and to what purpose, that is to say, how they imagined and constructed the past. This does not mean that narrative sources will be taken at face value, since historical texts in the pre-modern times are a product of an educated and politically/ideologically interested élite aspiring to fulfil specific agendas and therefore prone to bias and selection, adjustment and/or distortion of facts, but the investigation will be limited to the analysis of usable historical data and their validity for the interpretation of archaeological evidence.

It is precisely the question of interpretation of archaeological evidence of paramount importance for better understanding of the Ostrogothic period in the history of late antique southern Pannonia. At this point it is necessary to emphasize that the methodological paradigm applied here operates within the modernized culture-history methodology. This methodology has recently been subjected to severe criticism and even discarded as obsolete or outdated. To be sure, quite justifiably when relating to the paradigm embedded in the notion that the ethnicity can be recognized and identified solely on the basis of the typology of archaeological artifacts or, in other words, that the archaeological cultures reflect specific ethnic groups of the past. Equally dismissible is the practice within the culture-history approach according to which the archaeological finds are tested for their validity against the historical evidence and then the findings thus obtained are further confirmed by conclusions derived from the archaeological analysis. Still, having all this in mind, the culture-history methodology, improved with new theoretical approaches, maintains its validity and usefulness for an attempt to determine the ethnic identity in the archaeological material. The preference of an ethnic group for certain artifacts or the manner in which they were used by them — the emphasis is here on the emblematic style — may serve in defining the ethnic boundaries, which means that the material culture takes on an active role in the formation of a distinct ethnic identity. Of course,

\[2\text{ Jones 1999, 225, with Curt \text{ a 2007, 160–162.}}\]
\[3\text{ Cf. Jones 1999, 220.}\]
\[4\text{ Curt \text{ a 2007, 173–176; see also Pohl 2010, 9–23, where it is maintained that, despite the multilayeredness, flexibility and complexity of ethnic identities in the context of medieval studies, the archaeology may provide valuable insights, for instance, by researching the role that specific grave finds may have played as active factors in the construction and maintenance of ethnic identity. More}\]
it is essential to identify first the contexts in which certain artifacts were used as identity markers as well as be alert to the fact that the ethnic identity is a fluctuating category, which means that other groups could also accept the usage of the same artifacts but still preserve their distinct ethnic identity. The task that a historian or an archaeologist has before her or him when reconstructing the history of the post-Roman southern Pannonia is further made difficult by the circumstance that the artifacts discovered thus far have been primarily stray finds, more often than not without archaeological context. To this it may be added that there has been too few systematic and methodologically complete field research, that the dynamics of the publication of the research results has been rather low, and that much of the material was unearthed a century or so ago, which necessitates its thorough revision and reinterpretation. One further point is that the small number of finds does not warrant the far-reaching conclusions that have often been made. The stated limitations may be overcome to some degree only by a full synergy of all available sources, both narrative and archaeological. As a final point, it should be stressed that the resulting historiographic interpretation offered in this paper is but one possible reconstruction of the past.

THE OSTROGOTHS IN SOUTHERN PANNONIA
AFTER THE COLLAPSE OF THE HUN STATE

Leaving aside the complex question of constructing ethnic identity in late antiquity\(^5\) it may be argued that the Hun rule contributed to the strengthening of the group identity of the Hun-controlled Goths around the Amal clan. These Goths came to be known as the Ostrogoths, albeit there is no firm evidence that they ever used this name as an identity marker themselves\(^6\). The Hun-controlled

\(^5\) For the discussion in connection to the Goths, see Amory 2003, 13–42.

\(^6\) The name was used by Theoderic the Amal in his family and his mythical ancestry (Amory 2003, 37–38). The first instances when it appears are in the works of writers from the late 4th and the early 5th centuries. Thus Claudian (In Eutropium II v. 153–154) says that Ostrogothis colitur mixtisque Gruthungis Phryx ager, whereas the SHA, Divus Claudiius 6.2 enumerates the Grutungi Austrogoti Tervingi Visi. For various examples, see Wolfram 1990, 34–36 (there exists now the fifth edition of Wolfram’s capital work on the history of the Goths, published in 2009). The Greuthungi were the first Goths who entered Pannonia in the late 370’s and the early 380’s, and were part of the so-called tripartite group of peoples who seem to have become the federates in Pannonia. In modern historiography they are usually identified with the Ostrogoths (see, for example, Grčanin 2006b, 30ff; 2011, 55ff), albeit the continuity of that group with the later Ostrogoths is doubtful (Amory 2003, 29–30). Here the name of the Ostrogoths is used as a historiographic ethnonymic term to denote the Gothic groups that derived their identity from acknowledging the clan to which Theoderic the Amal belonged as their rulers.
Goths were a compact enough entity and they maintained their cohesion after the disintegration of the Hun state. The 6th-century writer Jordanes, our only literary source for the events following Attila’s death in late 453, says in his *Getica* that various Germanic peoples rose up under the leadership of the Gepidic king Ardaric against their former Hun masters. The peak of the conflict was reached in the battle at the unidentified Pannonian river called *Nedao* by Jordanes (perhaps this is an ablative form of the river’s name and the nominative may have been *Nedaus*). The battle was in all probability fought in 454. The Gepids and their allies were victorious, whereas the Ostrogoths were on the defeated side. This, however, did not curtail their chances to participate actively in dividing the area once controlled by the Huns. They carved out Pannonia for themselves.

---

7 Jordanes, *Getica* 259–263.

8 The researchers have differently identified the river *Nedao*. Diculescu 1923, 65–66 has seen in it a left-side tributary of the river Sava, which is variously followed by Várady 1969, 327 (Pannonia Secunda); Mænchen-Helfen 1973, 149 (southern Pannonia); Wolfram 1990, 259 (Pannonia Savia); Schwarcz 1992, 50; Pritsak 1995, 35; Lotter 2003, 103, Footnote No. 367 (the Lower Sava region). Pohl 1980, 259–260 discards the possibility that the *Nedao* was in southern Pannonia, and locates it in the area west of the river Tisza. Wirth 1999, 113 opts for the area to the east of the Middle Danube, and Horedt 1980, 119 proposes the northern part of the Carpathian Basin. On a map in Šašel 1979, 129 (see also Šašel 1992, 750) the river is located in Pannonia Valeria, albeit in the text Šašel glosses over the problem, same as Thompson 1948, 153; Thompson, Heather 1996, 148; Altheim 1951, 153; 1962, 337; Bury 1958, 296, Footnote No. 4; Bona 1982, 183. Andrić 2002, 133, Footnote No. 23 deems Wolfram’s opinion unlikely but remains indecisive. The earlier research has identified the river *Nedao* with either Nitra, Leitha, or a stream Nádér (for the survey of these opinions, see Diculescu 1923, 64; Lotter 2003, 103, Footnote No. 367). Given the fact that the centre of the Hun state was located in the region between the rivers Tisza, Körös and Timiş (Bona 1991, 200, 206) the river *Nedao* is likely to be somewhere in northeastern Pannonia, or possibly in the region between the Danube and the Tisza. It is worth noting that the Anonymous of Ravenna (Cosmographia 4.19) mentions an otherwise unknown and unidentifiable place in Pannonia called Netabio (the nominative may have been Netabium or Netabius), which might have taken its name from the river *Nedao* (Diculescu 1923, 66; Mænchen-Helfen 1973, 148).


10 The assumption that the Ostrogoths joined the Huns is not generally accepted. While some researchers have not specified on whose side the Ostrogoths fought (Diculescu 1923, 60–67; Bona 1982, 183; 1991, 207; Andrić 2002, 133), or have left the question open (Lippold 1987, 207; Heather 1994, 246), others believe that the Ostrogoths did not participate in the battle (Alföldi 1926, 97–100; Enblin 1927–1928, 151; Schmidt 1927, 459; 1934, 268–269; Thompson 1948, 152–153; Thompson, Heather 1996, 167–168; Mirković 1968, 119; Mænchen-Helfen 1973; 143–144; Burns 1984, 52). A number of researchers envision the Ostrogoths joining the Germanic coalition against the Huns (Altheim 1951, 152–153; 1962, 337; Bury 1958, 296–298; Stein 1959, 336; Giustechi Conti 1994, 141; Wirth 1999, 112–113). However, the opinion that the Ostrogoths remained loyal to the Huns has recently more or less prevailed (Várady 1969, 324–328, for the survey of opinions, see 353–367; Pohl 1980, 252–263, for the survey of opinions, see 258–259; Demandt 2007, 189, with some reservations; Wolfram 2005, 259–260; Schwarcz 1992, 50, for the survey of opinions, see Footnote 3; Lotter 2003, 103, but with a reservation in relation to Valamir’s Ostrogoths: 104, Fotenoote 370).
themselves, since, as Jordanes puts it, they did not want to invade, with danger
to themselves (discrimine suo), the territories that others had occupied.\footnote{11} Jordanes
also adds that the Ostrogoths asked and received Pannonia from the Roman
authorities, which is further corroborated by the same writer later on in his text
when he refers to a treaty that Emperor Marcian (450–457) concluded with the
Ostrogoths\footnote{12}. Since Jordanes implies that Pannonia stretched from Sirmium to
Vindobona (Vindomina in his rendering), it seems that the area dominated by
the Ostrogoths extended across Pannonia Prima and Pannonia Secunda, and
that parts of Pannonia Savia and Pannonia Valeria were under their control as
well\footnote{13}. According to Jordanes, they were led by three brothers from the Amal
clan, Valamir, Thiudimir and Vidimir, of whom Valamir was the oldest and the
supreme king (Jordanes only grants Valamir the title rex while he was alive)\footnote{14}.
There is no reason to doubt that the Romans were eager to make arrangements
with the new power wielders along the Middle Danube, among whom were the
Ostrogoths. Making the federate treaties was an usual means of how the Romans
tried to solve their relations with various barbarian groups and stabilize their
frontier, and Jordanes alludes that many groups which had used the collapse
of the Huns to establish themselves in the region sought the recognition of the
Roman Empire.\footnote{15} As with the other groups, the Ostrogoths were allowed to retain
the land they had already occupied and were granted gifts (dona) to uphold the
peace\footnote{16}. Since there are practically no finds of Marcian’s coins in Pannonia, let
alone any evidence of an increased influx, it seems that the yearly amounts that
the Ostrogoths received were rather low, or it may not even have been money,
but some other commodity\footnote{17}. Be that as it may, the Ostrogoths thus legalized
their position in the former Roman provinces of Pannonia, and the Empire could
contend that it regained the formal suzerainty over the territory that had previ-
ously been lost to the Huns.

Three research problems stand out with regard to the Ostrogothic settle-
ment in Pannonia. The first one is related to Marcian’s authority as an Eastern
Roman emperor to cede Pannonia, which was once part of the Western Empire,
to the Ostrogoths as a provision of the federate treaty. Some researchers have

\footnote{11} Jordanes, Getica 264.
\footnote{12} Jordanes, Getica 270.
\footnote{13} Pohl 1980, 263; Wolfram 1990, 262; Lotter 2003, 103, 104–105.
\footnote{14} Jordanes, Getica 268 (sub rege Valamir), 270 (rex Valamir), 274 (Valameris regis Gothorum),
276 (rex eorum Valamir), 279 (regis sui Valameris).
\footnote{15} Jordanes, Getica 263.
\footnote{16} On the treaty, see Várady 1969, 331–332; Pohl 1980, 263; Schwarcz 1992, 51; Andrić
2002, 133–134; Lotter 2003, 104. Jin Kim 2013, 114 claims that the treaty was an agreement not
to invade Roman territory in return for a small monetary compensation and did not sanction the
Ostrogoths’ settling the Roman territory, whereas the “more definite foedus” was concluded in 461.
\footnote{17} However, presumably not metal or weapons, since Marcian banned iron export and weapons
sales to the barbarians (Moisil 2002, 81). From southern Pannonia, one bronze coin issued by Marcian
was discovered in Novi Banovci-Burgenae (Mirk 1996, 193, Footnote No. 235), and another piece
was found in Sisak-Siscia (Šipuš 1985, 8). For finds of Marcian’s coins in the Carpathian Basin, see
believed that Marcian could do so because, at that time, there was no lawful emperor in the West after the untimely death of Valentinian III in March 455\(^\text{18}\). Others have concluded that the Ostrogoths turned to Constantinople and not to Ravenna because the Eastern Empire could afford to pay them a subsidy, and the Western Empire allegedly could not\(^\text{19}\). Some have even assumed that the Ostrogoths concluded first a treaty with the Western Emperor Avitus (455–457) and that Marcian only renewed the treaty\(^\text{20}\). One researcher has inferred that Marcian’s authority derived from the fact that the West ceded the area of Sirmium to the East in 437, but that does not explain how Marcian could have sanctioned the settlement of the Ostrogoths in other parts of Pannonia\(^\text{21}\).

A satisfactory solution might be reached if one accepted that in 437 the Western Empire transferred a major part of the diocese of Illyricum or Pannonia, i.e. the Pannonian provinces, and presumably even Dalmatia, to the authority of the Eastern Empire\(^\text{22}\). Thus the East would have been entitled thereafter to decide, without limitations, on the fortunes of all of Pannonia which had lost its appeal for the West once the Pannonian provinces had come under the direct control of the Huns\(^\text{23}\). With regard to this issue one has to touch upon the question of the alleged intervention by Emperor Avitus in Pannonia in the late 455. The assumption is based on Sidonius Apollinaris’ lines from the Panegyricus dictus Avito Augusto, where it is said that Avitus restored the long lost Pannonias by a mere passage/march (iter)\(^\text{24}\). Researchers agree in general that this intervention would have resulted in a partial or even the complete restoration of Pannonia to the authority of the Western Empire\(^\text{25}\). However, it seems that no such military expedition ever happened, i.e. the source merely recounts Avitus’ journey from Gaul to Italy in July to September 455, during which the new emperor passed through the Norican provinces which belonged to the diocese of Pannonia\(^\text{26}\). The emperor’s very stay on the edge of territories which, until recently, were subject to the Hun rule would have been a good enough reason for the panegyrist, who was also the emperor’s son-in-law, to talk about the renewal of the Roman authority in the area.

---

\(^{18}\) Enßlin 1928, 154; Stein 1959, 353; Várady 1969, 331. Várady speculates that Marcian’s treaty was then confirmed by the Western Emperor Avitus.

\(^{19}\) Alföldi 1926, 100–101.

\(^{20}\) Schmidt 1927, 459–460; 1934, 269. This assumption is not corroborated by the sources.

\(^{21}\) Várady 1969, 331-332.

\(^{22}\) For a survey of the opinions and the discussion, see Gračanin 2006b, 54–58; cf. also MacGeorge 2002, 34–39.

\(^{23}\) Gračanin 2006b, 54.

\(^{24}\) Carmina 7.588-589.

\(^{25}\) Seeck 1920, 328; Alföldi 1926, 100; Schmidt 1934, 262, 269; Stein 1959, 369; Várady 1969, 331 (Pannonia Secunda); Maench-Helfen 1973, 144–147 (Pannonia Prima and another Pannonian province); Bóna 1991, 114–115 (a part of Pannonia); Schwarcz 1992, 51–52 (Pannonia Savia); Lotter 2003, 20, 106 (parts of Pannonia); Egger 1962, 117; Mócsy 1962, 582; Wofram 1990, 261 and Wirth 1999, 47, 119 speak of Avitus’ demonstration of force which, however, had no effect.

\(^{26}\) See Mathisen 1981, 237–240. Andrić 2002, 134 has also rightly expressed doubts about Avitus’ supposed expedition into Pannonia; see also Gračanin 2006b, 57.
The second research problem is related to the dating of the federate treaty, which varies between 455 and 456\(^27\). If one accepts that the battle at the river Nedao was fought sometime in 454, it is reasonable to assume that the treaty was concluded the following year, making for the time needed for the various groups to establish themselves in the Carpathian Basin, after which the Romans, just closely watching for the time being, could engage in the power plays with them. Valamir's Ostrogoths presumably moved into Pannonia shortly after the battle of Nedao since they were on the defeated side, and may have felt the vicinity of the victorious Gepids, who took possession of the central parts of the Hun state, as dangerous. The Gepids soon concluded a treaty with the Empire, and the Ostrogoths, too, needed the imperial sanction, especially since they entered the territory upon which the Romans laid their claims. Moreover, Marcian was certainly keen on striking deals with powerful barbarian groups which had exploited the collapse of the Hunnic state in order to secure the Danube frontier, i.e. the prefecture of Illyricum and the diocese of Thrace\(^28\).

The third research problem is related to the location of the Ostrogothic federates. According to Jordanes, the Ostrogoths settled in three distinct groups: the supreme king Valamir established himself between the rivers Scarniunga and Aqua nigra, Thiudimir around the lake Pelso (the Balaton), and Vidimir between the previous two\(^29\). The sequence in which the Ostrogothic rulers are mentioned in the source obviously corresponds to their status and age, i.e. it goes from the oldest and highest in ranking to the youngest and lowest in ranking. In older historiography it had been thought that the description starts with the position of the northernmost group, i.e. that the Scarniunga and the Aqua nigra match the Leitha and the Rába respectively, the right-side tributaries of the Danube in modern Austria and Hungary, and this opinion has carved its way into the modern historiography, too\(^30\). This would mean that the Ostrogoths only settled Pannonia north of the Drava, and that southern Pannonia remained out of their immediate reach. However, such a possibility is contradicted by the explicit testimony of the written sources. Jordanes records in one of his passages in the *Getica*...
that the Huns had attacked Valamir unbeknown to his brothers, which would be impossible if his group had been settled in the westernmost area, whereas the Huns had most probably come from the lower Danube region\textsuperscript{31}. Eugippius talks of the Rugians’ fear of the Ostrogoths whom he mentions as living in Pannonia (i.e. Pannonia Secunda and Valeria), and not close to Noricum which bordered Pannonia Prima\textsuperscript{32}. Based on these accounts and other arguments, a hypothesis had been set forth that the Scarniunga and the Aqua nigra are to be looked for in southern Pannonia, that is, the geographical sequence of the Ostrogothic groups had been reversed: hence, Valamir’s Ostrogoths would really be settled in southeastern rather than northwestern Pannonia\textsuperscript{33}. Moreover, it has been suggested that the Aqua nigra is the modern Karašica, a river in Slavonia, that flows parallel to the Drava, into which it empties, and the Scarniunga is a watercourse in the Lower Sava basin\textsuperscript{34}. Consequently, an objection has been raised as to why Jordanes would use the names of otherwise unknown rivers to mark the area under Valamir’s rule, and not the Drava and Sava rivers which are well-known\textsuperscript{35}. Some researchers have assumed that the Ostrogoths had expanded throughout Pannonia too\textsuperscript{36}. This has incited the opinion that the name Scarniunga actually refers to the Alps, i.e. Alpine passes (Carni iuga = Alpium iuga), which would mean that the area under Valamir’s control extended throughout the Sava region from Carniola to Syrmia\textsuperscript{37}.

There seems to be no reason to doubt that Valamir’s group was settled in southeastern Pannonia. The whole of Pannonia Savia could not have been in the possession of the Ostrogoths, neither the interior of Pannonia (Valeria)\textsuperscript{38}. Next to the bulk of Pannonia Secunda (without, however, the areas south of the Sava), the Ostrogoths appear to have held directly the northeastern part of Pannonia Savia, the southeastern part of Pannonia Prima and the southern part of

\textsuperscript{31} Jordanes, Getica 268.
\textsuperscript{32} Eugippius, Vita s. Severini 5.1.
\textsuperscript{33} Alföldi 1926, 101–104. This is accepted by Stein 1959, 353 and Egger 1962, 117. Meinechen-Helfen 1973, 156–157 has also believed that Alföldi was, in essence, right.
\textsuperscript{34} Alföldi 1926, 103–104; Schmidt 1934, 270. Cf. also Wolfram 1990, 262 and Schwarcz 1992, 53 (Aqua nigra Crna voda = Karašica, Scarniunga = Jarčina, a stream in eastern Syrmia); Lottner 2003, 106 (Aqua nigra = Karašica, Scarniunga = the Lonja-Čazma-Kamešnica-Glogovnica river system).
\textsuperscript{35} Schmidt 1927, 460, with Enblin 1928, 156 (Valamir’s group was settled in the north, 1928, 158).
\textsuperscript{36} Schmidt 1927, 460; Enblin 1928, 157; Mirković 1968, 122.
\textsuperscript{37} Mirković 1968, 124–125; 1971, 49; 2008, 100. According to this researcher, the Aqua nigra is a right-side tributary of the Sava (1968, 124). This equating Scarniunga = Carni iuga = Alpium iuga assumes that the word fluvios (acc. plur.) at the end of Jordanes’ sentence (Getica 268) must be rejected.
\textsuperscript{38} Jordanes (Getica 273) distinguishes between Savia (Suavia) and Pannonia where the Ostrogoths lived. Cf. Andrić 2002, 139; Lottner 2003, 105, Footnote 375. Jordanes (Getica 272) also mentions the Ostrogothic expedition against the Sadag(ar)es qui interiorem Pannoniam possidebant. Várady 1969, 335; Śašel 1979, 130 (see also Śašel 1992, 751), and Schwarcz 1992, 59 locate the Sadag(ar)es in Valeria, north, i.e. northeast of the lake Balaton; Schmidt 1927, 460 and Lottner 1976, 202 believe that they lived west of the Balaton; Andrić 2002, 136-137 thinks that they inhabited the part of Pannonia next to Noricum. The Sadag(ar)es seem to have dwelled in Valeria, on the right bank of the Danube (cf. also Wolfram 1990, 260).
Valeria\textsuperscript{39}. However, their influence must have extended over a larger area, and in the later wars and campaigns as described by Jordanes they are very likely to have expanded the area under their immediate control\textsuperscript{40}. As regards to the rivers that defined the outer edges of the area controlled by Valamir, the objection as to their insignificance may be removed if one accepts that Jordanes’ geographical references were only a summary from a much more extensive account, i.e. the now lost history of the Goths by Cassiodorus, where this was described with more details\textsuperscript{41}.

Probably the same year in which they concluded the federate treaty with Marcian, i.e. in 455, the Ostrogoths were suddenly attacked by the Huns who seem to have arrived from the lower Danube region\textsuperscript{42}. The battle which by Jordanes’ account ended in the Huns’ defeat was probably fought in the eastern part of Valamir’s domain, i.e. in eastern Slavonia or Syrmia. Soon thereafter, the Ostrogoths turned against the eastern Illyrian provinces being unsatisfied with how they were treated by the new Eastern Roman government (Marcian had been succeeded by Leo I in the early 457)\textsuperscript{43}. According to the prevalent scholarly

\textsuperscript{39} Wolfram 1990, 262; Andrić 2002, 135; Lotter 2003, 106. Šašel 1979, 131 (see also Šašel 1992, 752) has Vidimir in Syrmia, Thuidimer in the vicinity of the Balaton, and Vidimir in Slavonia. Tomičić 2000, 269 believes that the Ostrogoths were settled in Syrmia, Slavonia and Baranya and are supposed to have extended into the area between the Karašica and the Scarniungu in 456 and later into Panonnia Savia as well.

\textsuperscript{40} Pohl 1980, 263 believes that the Ostrogoths controlled the Middle Danube area from Vindobona to Singidunum, and Wolfram 1990, 261 claims that they were probably in charge of the entire area from the Morava valley to the river Enns in Noricum Mediterraneum, with the provinces between Sirmium and Vindobona directly granted to them. Mirković 1968, 122, too, thinks that Sirmium and Vindobona were borders of the area held by the Ostrogoths. It seems, however, that the Ostrogoths gradually spread their influence, and that their expansion was a result of independent actions.

\textsuperscript{41} Cf. Andrić 2002, 136; Gračanin 2005, 463.

\textsuperscript{42} For the date of the Hun attack, see Maench-Helfen 1973, 158; Schwarcz 1992, 53. Schmidt 1934, 272; Várády 1969, 333; Bôna 1987, 119; Wolfram 1990, 262 and Lotter 2003, 105 opt for 456. Heather 1994, 246 dates the attack to 453/4, and Enßlin 1947, 12 and Bôna 1991, 208 to the winter of 456/7. Jin Kim 2013, 114, 117–118 believes that Jordanes distorted the facts and that there was only one attack against the Ostrogoths by the Huns, the one in the mid-460’s. The testimony for the treaty is provided by Jordanes, Getica 268. Cf. Pohl 1980, 264; Wolfram 1990, 262; Schwarcz 1992, 53. It is worth noting that Jordanes claims that Valamir was attacked “unbeknown to his brothers” (ignarisque aliis fratribus), which only corresponds to the view that the Gothic groups were settled separately over a larger area without immediate connections between them. The Huns seem to have arrived from the area between the Pruth, the Dniester, the Danube and the Black Sea (cf. Schwarcz 1992, 54), since Jordanes (Getica 266) says that Attila’s son Ėrrnać settled in the farthest section of Scythia Minor, the Roman province in the south easternmost part of the diocese of Thrace, whereas his relatives Ementzur and Últzindur settled in Dacia Ripensis. Mirković 1968, 123 and Burns 1984, 53 claim that the Huns who attacked the Goths came from Dacia Ripensis, but Jordanes clearly states that the attack was conducted by Attila’s sons Dengizich-Dintzic and Ėrrnać who are seen to operate together on another occasion (Priscus, fr. 46 Blockley; cf. Bôna 1991, 208).

\textsuperscript{43} As reasons for this invasion, Jordanes (Getica 270) cites the delayed delivery of the usual gifts and the status Theoderic Strabo, the leader of the Thracian Goths, enjoyed at the court (here, however, Jordanes seems to have anticipated Strabo’s pre-eminent position; cf. Heather 1994, 248). Priscus, fr. 37, 5–6 Blockley says that Valamir explained to the Eastern Roman envoys that he was driven to war by a lack of necessities.
opinion, the Goths invaded the prefecture of Illyricum in 45944. In 458, the relations between the Ostrogoths and the Eastern Romans were still peaceful given that the Western Roman emperor Majorian (457–461) was recruiting troops in the Middle Danube area among the Pannonians and various barbarian peoples, among which the Ostrogoths are also mentioned45. Around the same time, in 458, the relics of the martyred Saint Anastasia were translated from Sirmium to Constantinople, which could not have happened without the Ostrogoths’ consent since they controlled the town and, on the strength of the same argument, if there had been an open breach in good relations between them and the Eastern Romans46. The starting point of the attack seems to have been Sirmium, and the Ostrogoths appear to have penetrated deep into the Roman territory47. The war, which did not seem to have entailed much or even continuous fighting, ended in the renewal of the federate treaty and the payment of an annual subsidy of 300 pounds of gold48. The date of the new treaty is not known, but the year 461 seems likely49.

44 The date of the war is based on the entry in the Auctarium Epitomae Vaticanae ad Prosper Tiro (cf. Auctarium Epitomae a. 459): Valamer Durracium intravit. Jordanes (Getica 270) is imprecise, saying that the Ostrogoths sent an embassy to Emperor Marcian concerning the delayed annual gifts post tempus non multum following the Hun attack against Valamir and adding that they attacked Illyricum ilico. The Auctarium entry refers in part to later times (the conquest of Dyrrachium in 479; cf. Heather 1994, 247, Footnote No. 18), and, by Valamir, may have even meant Theoderic the Amal since other sources call him Valamir’s son (see infra note 67), which would indicate that the episode is completely misplaced chronologically, thus the year 459 is the most logical solution since it seems that, in 458, there still was peace. Schmidt 1934, 272; Wolfram 1990, 263; Schwarcz 1992, 57 and Giustechi Conti 1994, 141 accept the conquest of Dyrrachium in 459 (Giustechi Conti even says that the Ostrogoths simultaneously attacked the area between the Sava and the Drava, which does not make much sense). Cf. also Jin Kim 2013, 114.

45 Sidonius Apollinaris, Panegyricus dictus Maioriano Augusto (= Carmina, 5.477). Majorian was preparing to move against the Vandals and he must have received a permission for the recruitment from the eastern Roman court given as he also enjoyed partial recognition of his imperial status in the West by Constantinople (cf. Gračanin 2006b, 58). Lotter 2003, 107 claims that the relations between the two parts of the Empire were tense then, which does not seem justified.


47 Jordanes (Getica 271) says that the Ostrogoths laid waste to pene totum Illyricum. Mirković 1971, 49 assumes that Valamir resided in Sirmium (omitted in Mirković 2008), which does not seem far-fetched even if there is no evidence for it. Sirmium was once a frequented imperial residence, and one has only to remember that the Gepidic kings resided there.

48 Jordanes, Getica 271; Priscus, fr. 37 Blockley. Cf. Schmidt 1934, 272–273; Várády 1969, 337–338; Pohl 1980, 265; Wolfram 1990, 263; Schwarcz 1992, 57; Heather 1994, 247. Lotter 2003, 108 claims that Emperor Leo I was induced to stop the subsidy to the Ostrogoths due to the good relations of Majorian with the Danubian barbarians, which cannot be corroborated. For finds of Leo I’s coins in Pannonia, see Budaj, Prohászka 2011.

49 Pohl 1980, 265 and Schwarcz 1992, 57 seem to date the end of hostilities and the treaty to 459, Andrić 2002, 136 has 459 and Wolfram 1990, 263 459/60. On the other hand, Lippold 1987, 207 is more inclined to 460/1, while Mænchen-Helfen 1973, 164 and Jin Kim 2013, 114 opt for 461. Blockley 1983, 394 says that the fighting continued from 459 to 461, and Bona 1987, 119 dates the fighting to 459/60. Burns 1984, 56 thinks that the hostilities only began in 461. The later date of the peace and the treaty seems more likely since Theoderic the Amal was simultaneously sent to Constantinople as a hostage, where he spent the next ten years (Jordanes, Getica, 271, 281), and it is usually thought that he returned to Pannonia in 470 (Schwarcz 1992, 60; Giustechi
After they had thus secured their back, the Ostrogoths turned their attention to consolidating and extending their authority to the northwest and the northeast. By their aggressive moves they seem to have provoked the Huns' response, sometime in the mid-460's (by 466 at the latest), when Attila’s son Dengizich-Dintzic attacked Bassianae on the south easternmost edge of Pannonia Secunda and ravaged the town’s environs. The Ostrogoths discontinued their campaign against the Sadag(ár)es and counter-attacked and defeated the Huns expelling them for good. After this victory, in 467, the Ostrogoths extended their influence into the Norican provinces and caused trouble for the Rugians and the local inhabitants. The Ostrogothic actions may have provoked the Suevi settled north of the middle Danube and, apparently in 467, their king Hunimund ventured on a long inroad that led them through western Pannonia into Dalmatia. Since at that time the influential military commander Marcellinus of Dalmatia was absent from the province, the Suevi may have been trying to make use of his absence and, simultaneously, testing perhaps the real strength of the Ostrogoths since they must have known that they would have to traverse the area controlled by the Ostrogoths. It is, however, equally possible that the Suevi were induced to attack Dalmatia by the powerful magister militum Ricimer who deemed Marcellinus as his main rival and it is known that Ricimer was, through his father, of Suevic descent and, through, his mother, of Visigothic royal lineage. To add to these speculations, Marcellinus may have recruited his troops among the Ostrogoths if they are the Scythians mentioned by Priscus of Panium who were bribed by Ricimer to abandon Marcellinus in Sicily in 461, and Ricimer may have intervened against the Ostrogoths when they attacked Noricum in 467. Thus the Suevi may have also been employed by Ricimer to keep the Ostrogoths in check. Be that as it may, Jordanes narrates that the Suevi, on their way to Dalmatia, encountered some cattle owned by the Ostrogoths that roamed the

Conti 1994, 141; Gračanin 2006a, 102; 2011, 85) or 471 (Burns 1984, 56; Heather 1994, 246, Footnote 15), even though Wolfram 1990, 267 and Lotter 2003, 115–116 move the date to 469/70 and 469 respectively.

50 Jordanes, Getica 272.


52 Schmidt 1934, 120; Pohl 1980, 266; Lotter 1989, 37; Schwarcz 1992, 59.

53 On the settlement of the Suevi, see Várády 1969, 339; Pohl 1980, 263, 275. Lotter 1968, 279–284 believes that these Suevi are the ones settled in Pannonia Prima since the late 4th century. Jordanes (Getica 273) provides the only testimony for the Suevic inroad into Dalmatia.


55 On the rivalry between Ricimer and Marcellinus, see MacGeorge 2002, 59–60.

56 For Marcellinus’ failure in Sicily, see Priscus, fr. 38.1 Blockley. That these Scythians were the Ostrogoths has been maintained by Blockley 1983, 395, Footnote 147 and Demandt 2007, 208, Footnote 25. For Ricimer’s move against the Ostrogoths in Noricum, see Sidonius Apollinaris, Panegyricus dictus Anthemio Augusto bis consuli (= Carmina 2.377), with MacGeorge 2002, 201.

57 Jin Kim 2013, 117–118, who offers quite a different reconstruction of events as expounded by Jordanes, believes that the Sciri joined the Huns against the Ostrogoths.
fields freely. However, on their return, they were attacked and defeated by Thiudimir who apparently even captured Hunimund and forced him to a treaty.

According to Jordanes, the treaty was not to last and Hunimund is next found conspiring against the Ostrogoths with the Sciri who were settled in the region between the Danube and the Tisza. Probably in 468, the Sciri crossed the Danube and attacked the Ostrogothic Pannonia whether it be Valamir’s area or somewhat to the north. Valamir moved against the invaders presumably in the capacity of the supreme king and, although he was killed in the ensuing battle, the Ostrogoths are said by Jordanes to have won the upper hand and decimated their enemies. Such a complete Ostrogothic victory is not very likely since Priscus records that both sides sought assistance from Emperor Leo I and he chose to support the Sciri ordering the *magister militum* of Illyricum to send them appropriate help, which probably boiled down to bringing the reinforcements to the frontier fortifications in Moesia Prima.

Valamir was succeeded as the supreme king by his brother Thiudimir. In the meantime, the Suevi formed, together with the Sciri, Sarmatians, Gepids, Rugians, and possibly even the Heruli, a large anti-Gothic coalition. The battle fought at the unidentified river *Bolia* in Pannonia presumably in 469 is said by Jordanes to have been a bloody success for the Ostrogoths. It was followed by

---

58 Based on the Suevi passing through Pannonia to get to Dalmatia and their capture of the cattle owned by the Ostrogoths, Mirković 1968, 123 claims that the Ostrogoths held Pannonia Savia too. Since, on the way back, they were attacked by Thiudimir, it is reasonable to conclude that it was his Ostrogoths’ cattle that the Suevi took. As Thiudimir’s group was settled around the Balaton, this makes it much more likely for the Suevi to have seized the cattle in Pannonia Prima and not in Pannonia Savia. Andrić 2002, 139, too, believes that this information cannot be used as evidence for a (major) Ostrogothic presence in Pannonia Savia.


60 Cf. Alfoldi 1926, 103; Bóna 1971, 277; Pohl 1980, 263, 273; Kiss 1983, 95–96; Schwarz 1992, 60. Jordanes (*Getica* 275) says that the Sciri *tunc super Danubium consedebant*, by which he is likely to mean the stretch of the Danube between the mouth of the Drava and the Tisza (thus Várady 1969, 339). Schmidt 1934, 98 has them settled in the area between the river Váh (Waag) and the Lesser Carpathians, and Šašel 1979, 130 (see also Šašel 1992, 751), in the area between the Váh and the Ipel’ (Ipoly, Eipel), along the Danube. Csallány 1961, 311 sees them in the area northwest of the Upper Tisza, i.e. northeast of the bend of the Danube. Blockley 1983, 395–397 believes that the Sciri who attacked the Ostrogoths were the same who, with the Roman permission, settled Moesia Secunda and Scythia Minor.


62 Priscus, fr. 45 Blockley. Cf. Heather 1994, 248; Lotter 2003, 110; Schmidt 1934, 275; Pohl 1980, 266; Wolfram 1990, 265; Schwarz 1992, 60 bring this information in connection with the battle at the river *Bolia*.

63 Jordanes, *Getica* 277. The name of Alaric whom Jordanes mentions along with Hunimund as king of the Suevi seems to point rather to the Heruli. Cf. Schmidt 1934, 275; Pohl 1980, 266; Wolfram 1990, 265; Schwarz 1992, 60; Lotter 2003, 111.

Thiudimir’s punitive expedition against the Suevic king Hunimund who had to flee to the Alamanni on the Upper Danube, while the majority of the Suevi must have remained in their territory but were forced to acknowledge the Ostrogothic dominance\textsuperscript{65}. The Ostrogothic victory may have persuaded Emperor Leo I to send Thiudimir’s son Theoderic back to his father from Constantinople in 470 (or 471). The young Ostrogoth had been raised in the Greco-Roman environment of the Eastern Roman capital and exposed to its cultural and ideological influences and thus, perhaps, was thought to be inclined to ensure that his father would remain on friendly terms with the Empire\textsuperscript{66}. Theoderic seems to have taken over his uncle Valamir’s domain in Pannonia Secunda, which could explain why the Eastern Roman sources often call him erroneously Valamir’s son\textsuperscript{67}. Jordanes has Theoderic engaged, soon after his return, in a conflict with the Sarmatians who had previously captured Singidunum in Moesia Prima but were now defeated and expelled from the town which was next seized by the Ostrogoths\textsuperscript{68}. Theoderic presumably mounted his expedition from Sirmium, and his action was perhaps sanctioned by the Eastern Roman court, but he did not restore Singidunum to the imperial control, since the possession of the town offered the Ostrogoths a foothold on the Eastern Roman territory and an easier access to Moesia Prima. This might indicate that the Ostrogoths were by this time already planning to leave Pannonia. If we are to believe Jordanes, they were increasingly dissatisfied with their Pannonian prospects since the spoils taken from the neighbouring peoples diminished and, understandably, the opportunities to acquire more by war were becoming less and less, and they began to suffer from a lack of necessities, which made the quitting of Pannonia and seeking fortune elsewhere an attractive solution\textsuperscript{69}. To be sure, the fact that they had to struggle constantly with other groups for dominance in the Middle Danube area must have had something to do with their decision, too. They were clearly aware of how well the leaders of the Thracian Goths were doing for themselves on the Eastern Roman soil, and general circumstances in both parts of the Empire seemed favourable for such


\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Cf. Enßlin} 1947, 35; Lotter 2003, 115. In Gračanin 2011, 85 it is proposed also that the emperor’s move may have been a manoeuvre to secure the support of the Ostrogoths as a counterbalance against the Thracian Goths who were allied with Flavius Ardaburium Aspar the all-powerful \textit{magister militum} at the Eastern Roman court and a thorn in Leo’s side. This seems far-fetched, although the Ostrogoths were perhaps perceived by Leo as a potential reserve of troops should the necessity arise. On the relations between the Thracian Goths and Aspar, see Heather 1994, 253-263.


\textsuperscript{69} Jordanes, \textit{Getica} 283. \textit{Cf. also Priscus fr. 37, 5–6 Blockley for an earlier instance of “lack of necessities” that is said to have influenced the action of the Ostrogoths (see supra, Footnote 43).
an enterprise: the Eastern Empire was paralyzed by the ongoing rebellion of the Thracian Goths following Aspar’s elimination in 471, and the Western Empire was in turmoil in the spring and summer of 472 due to the open conflict between Emperor Anthemius and Ricimer who himself died shortly after he had eliminated his rival\cite{70}. In 473, as testified by Jordanes who dates the Ostrogothic move to the reign of the Western emperor Glycerius, the Ostrogoths finally departed from Pannonia\cite{71}. One group was led by Vidimir into Italy, in all likelihood, along the Roman road in the Drava area, and the other group was headed by Thiudimir, together with his son Theoderic, and moved probably along the Roman road in the Sava area that led to Singidunum, the place where they must have crossed the river, threatening both the (recently vanquished) Sarmatians and the unspecified (but presumably Eastern Roman) soldiers, as the Ostrogoths entered the prefecture of Illyricum\cite{72}. This was the end of the first period of the Ostrogothic rule in the former late Roman Pannonia.

**THEODERIC’S OSTROGOTHS IN SOUTHERN PANNONIA**

The Pannonian Goths spent full fifteen years in the Balkan provinces of the Eastern Empire, sometimes at war, sometimes at peace with the court at Constantinople\cite{73}. In the end, Theoderic who propelled himself into position as the principal and, finally, the only leader of the Goths in the Eastern Empire after the death of his father Thiudimir (474), Theoderic Strabo (481) and Strabo’s son Recitach (483), and the then Emperor Zeno (474-491) reached, by 488, an

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\cite{70}] For Heather 2014, 23, it was Theoderic who convinced his father of “an unmissable opportunity” the situation in the Eastern Empire offered.
  \item[\cite{71}] Jordanes, Getica 283. Based on Jordanes’ testimony it is usually taken that the Ostrogoths left Pannonia in 473 (cf. Pohl 1980, 267; Burns 1984, 56; Bóna 1987, 120; Wolfram 1990, 268; Schwarz 1992, 67; Heather 1994, 264; 1996, 154). However, Schmidt 1934, 277; Löwe 1961, 8 and Várady 1969, 340 date the departure to 471; Šašel 1979, 131 to 472 (see also Šašel 1992, 752), and Lotter 1989, 42-43, 2003, 116-118 to 471/2, while Andrić 2002, 140 has 472 or 473. Pritsak 1995, 35 mentions 476, whereas Mirković 2011, 93 has 477, both of which is obviously a mistake.
  \item[\cite{72}] Jordanes, Getica 284–285. The testimony on Thiudimir’s and Theoderic’s campaign in Illyricum is provided by Jordanes (Getica 285–288). Cf. Wolfram 1990, 269–270; Schwarz 1992, 67–68; Heather 1994, 264–266; Tejral (2012, 124) assumes that not all Goths set out on the journey but that some remained in Pannonia, since, as he puts it, Theoderic’s campaigns in the Balkans and Italy involved in particular warriors’ retinues of the younger generation. As a corroboration for the residual presence of the Goths in the late 5th century he lists fragments of the New Testament in the Gothic language and the writing on a lead tablet in grave No. 5 at Hács-Béndekpuszta, but these may actually belong to the time of the Ostrogoths’ stay in Pannonia. This said, it is easily conceivable that too elderly and sickly persons to journey were left behind, even though this must not be overstated since, from what Jordanes has to say, it is clear that the Ostrogoths had no reason to remain in Pannonia. Furthermore, even Tejral says that the evidence that he adduces may only testify to the Gothic cultural influence. On a final point Tejral has failed to mention that there were two Gothic groups leaving Pannonia.
\end{itemize}
agreement according to which the Goths were to leave Moesia Secunda where they were settled as federates, march on Italy and depose Odovacer. With this commission, Theoderic set off on a journey to Italy with his followers comprising of men, women and children74. The scholarly opinions differ on when precisely the Goths left for Italy, but they must have arrived in southern Pannonia by the late autumn of 488, moving along the Roman road in the Danube area, which led from Novae (Svištov) to Singidunum75. At that time, the major part of the former Roman province of Pannonia Secunda, including the Sirmium area and the town itself, was under the Gepidic sway76. Sirmium was undoubtedly a stop on Theoderic’s itinerary77. Since the sources do not mention any fighting in or around Sirmium it may be concluded that the Gepids retreated before the Ostrogoths, and these seem to have decided to spend the bitter winter cold in the Sirmium area, resting and recuperating after a long march. The Gepids, on the other hand, used the pause to strengthen their positions in the marshy river *Ulca* (modern Vuka) area, using the river as a sort of a defensive ditch, i.e. a moat78. The Gepidic decision to withdraw from Sirmium and to make their stand on a terrain more favourable for the defender must have been influenced by the Ostrogothic prevalence in numbers. The older historiography has, to some extent, questioned the identification of the *Ulca* with the Vuka basing on the assumption that the Ostrogoths marched towards Italy along the road in the Sava area and thus the *Ulca* must have been a tributary of the Sava79.

74 That Theoderic’s following included both warriors and non-combatants is clear from Ennodius, *Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico*, 72.28, with Marcellinus, a. 488.2 who says that Theoderic took with him *omnium suorum multitudo Gothorum*.

75 It is a fair assumption that the advance of the Gothic multitude was slow and lasted several months since it must have entailed various logistic difficulties (cf. Löwe 1961, 13; Burns 1984, 65). Additional indication that the Gothic move may have started in the summer of 488 is perhaps offered by Marcellinus’ *Chronicle* (a. 488.2), where it is dated by the consulate of Dynamius and Sidius, but also by Indiction XI, which lasted from 1st September 487 to 31st August 488. Wolfram 1990, 280 and Schwarecz 1992, 82 have dated the move to the late summer (after the harvest), and Gračanin 2006a, 104 to the early summer, i.e. June/July since it is taken that the move lasted “more months” (Footnote 124). Other scholars have dated the move to the autumn (cf. Diculescu 1923, 106; Schmidt 1934, 293; Bury 1958, 422; Dušanić 1967, 74; Pohl 1980, 29; Lippold 1987, 212; Giustechi Conti 1994, 144) or the autumn/winter (Heather 1994, 308; 1996, 218; cf. also Moorhead 1997, 19). Lotter 2003 is somewhat contradictory since he first mentions the spring (p. 113) and then the autumn (p. 127). The move is erroneously dated to 489 by Bona 1987, 120 and Tomićić 2000, 272, presumably through an oversight (Tomićić even says a few lines below in his text that the battle between the Ostrogoths and the Gepids was fought in 488).


77 Jordanes, *Getica* 292.

78 Ennodius, *Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico*, 7.28. There is also an opinion that the Ostrogoths tried to check the Ostrogothic movement at Fossae near the modern village of Šašinovci east of Sremska Mitrovica (Sevin 1955, 128; Dautova-Ruševljanska 1981a, 152), but this is not substantiated by the available sources.

79 Diculescu 1923, 109 (Sava), Schmidt 1910, 153 (Jelenica east of Sirmium); 1934, 294 (Sava); Schönfeld 1918, 822 (Jelenica); Enblin 1947, 68 (Jelenica). Stein 1949, 55 also believes that Theoderic continued to move along the Sava.
However, the identification of the *Ulca* with the Vuka has come to prevail in the modern historiography, and the Ostrogoths undoubtedly used the Roman road along the Drava for their further advance\(^{80}\). As the winter approached its end Theoderic decided to remove the Gepid threat, as the Gepids could have jeopardized his march by attacking the Ostrogoths from behind\(^{81}\). The need to resolve the situation was further intensified by the fact that the Ostrogothic supplies were running out\(^{82}\). Ennodius reports that Theoderic first sent envoys to the Gepids requesting free passage and new supplies, which was denied, and then he prepared for the battle that was fought in the floodplain of the *Ulca* through which the *Ulca* ran, between Mursa (Osijek) and Cibalae (Vinkovci), presumably in February 489\(^{83}\). After the initial difficulties, and if Ennodius is to be believed, thanks to Theoderic’s personal bravery, the Ostrogoths managed to break through the Gepid defense line and seize their food supplies. The Gepid king Traustila/Trapstila seems to have been killed in the fighting, and his son and successor Traseric concluded a peace with the Ostrogoths\(^{84}\). Soon afterwards, the Ostrogoths seem to have been compelled to repel an attack by the Sarmatians who were perhaps keen on exploiting the Ostrogothic exhaustion resulting from the recent clash and get hold of the food supplies that the Ostrogoths captured from the Gepids\(^{85}\). This attack must have happened in the eastern part of Pannonia Secunda, since it is reasonable to assume that Theoderic’s headquarters were in Sirmium and that it was where the bulk of his people was left before the confrontation with the Gepids, and the supplies would have been transported there after the battle to alleviate the food shortage that had struck the Ostrogoths.

---

\(^{80}\) For the identification of the *Ulca* with the Vuka, see, for example, Bóna 1976, 16; Pinterović 1978, 100; Pohl 1980, 291; Burns 1984, 65; Wolfram 1990, 280; Schwarcz 1992, 82; Tomić 2000, 272; Andrić 2002, 143; Lotter 2003, 118, although there were still some dissenting scholarly opinions (Mirković 1971, 50, Footnote 50, who believed that the battle between the Ostrogoths and the Gepids was fought near Sirmium, presumably relying on Stein 1949, 55 and Bury 1958, 422; however, she has recently changed her views; 2008, 101). Löwe 1961, 3–10 has decisively showed that the Ostrogoths marched towards Italy along the road in the Drava area.

\(^{81}\) Cf. Löwe 1961, 10, 12.

\(^{82}\) Ennodius, Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico, 7.28, 34 mentions the famis necessitas, famae and inedia. Cf. Löwe 1961, 14; Burns 1984, 65; Wolfram 1990, 280; Lotter 2003, 118.

\(^{83}\) Some scholars have tried to place the battlefield in the vicinity of the modern town of Vukovar in Croatia (cf. Wolfram 1990, 280; Heather 1996, 219). For the date of the battle, see Löwe 1961, 14; Moorhead 1997, 21. Ennodius, Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico, 7.28 indicates that the battle was fought when it was still cold, but the riverbank was already muddy. Many scholars date the battle to the late 488 (Schmidt 1934, 294; Bury 1958, 422; Burns 1984, 65; Wolfram 1990, 280; Tomić 2000, 272; Andrić 2002, 143) or the late 488/early 489 (Diculescu 1923, 108).

\(^{84}\) Diculescu 1923, 110; Stein 1949, 55; Mirković 1971, 50; 2008, 101; Moorhead 1997, 21.

\(^{85}\) Ennodius, Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico, 7.35. Cf. Schmidt 1934, 294, Fig. 7, Enblin 1947, 68; Löwe 1961, 15; Pohl 1980, 292; Wolfram 1990, 280; Heather 1996, 219; Lotter 2003, 127. Schwarcz 1992, 82 thinks that the Sarmatians supported the Gepids in the conflict with the Ostrogoths, but there is no evidence to corroborate this.
After restoring their strength and renewing the supplies, in the late spring of 489, Theoderic and his Ostrogoths again set out on the march towards Italy.\footnote{For the date, cf. Lőwe 1961, 14–15. Wolfgram 1990, 280 says that they stayed until the harvest in the upper Slavonia. Diculescu 1923, 110 thinks that the Ostrogoths moved at the onset of the summer, and Schmidt 1934, 294 opts for the spring. Bur 1958, 422 believes that the Ostrogoths spent the winter, the spring and the summer somewhere between Sirmium and the border with Italy.} In the Upper Drava area, they were apparently joined by the Rugians whose king Fredericus had escaped to Theoderic in Novae in 488 and struck an agreement with him against Odovacer\footnote{On Fredericus’ escape to Theoderic in Novae, see Eugippius, *Vita s. Severini* 44.4. On the Rugians’ joining the Ostrogoths in the Drava area, see Lőwe 1961, 10–12; Pohl 1980, 291. Schmidt 1934, 123 and Lotter 2003, 122 are more inclined to assume that the Rugians had already joined the Ostrogoths in Moesia Secunda, with Wolfram 1990, 279, who also claims that the majority of the Rugians may have joined the Ostrogoths in Pannonia (p. 280). The sources are not clear as to where the Rugians joined the Ostrogoths (cf., for example, Procopius, *Bellum Gothicum*, 2.14.24 who only says that the Rugians accompanied the Gothic army to Italy).} By August 489, Theoderic and his allies arrived in the northern Italian province of Venetia and pitched their camp at Pons Sontii (Mainizza), where they stayed awhile, resting before the breakthrough.\footnote{Jordanes, *Getica* 292–293. The first battle with Odovacer was fought on the Isonzo on 28 August 489.} After three years of indecisive fighting, Theoderic succeeded in eliminating Odovacer in March 493 by treachery and he must have spent the first years of his rule over Italy in strengthening his position and did not overstep his authority nor tried to expand the territory under his dominion beyond what Odovacer had previously held, which may be presumed to have been reason enough to strain the relations with the court at Constantinople since Odovacer had annexed Dalmatia in 480/1 and southern Noricum in 488 without any consent from the Eastern Roman government and Theoderic was only given the permission to take control of Italy.\footnote{For the final result of the struggle between Theoderic and Odovacer, see Schmidt 1934, 300; Enßlin 1947, 76; Stein 1949, 58; Bur 1958, 426; Wolfram 1990, 283; Heather 1996, 219; Moorhead 1997, 26. For Theoderic’s seizing of coastal Dalmatia and southern Noricum in the 490’s, cf. Šašel 1979, 134 (see also Šašel 1992, 755); Wozniak 1981, 365–366; Tomićić 2000, 272.} Following the recognition of Theoderic’s position by Emperor Anastasius I (491–518) in 497, which may have also included a *de facto* recognition of his hold over Dalmatia and southern Noricum, the Ostrogothic king soon felt secure enough to interfere actively in southern Pannonia, too.\footnote{Prostko-Prostyński 1994, 151–153 dates Theoderic’s recognition by Anastasius I to 498.} The line from Ennodius that *Sermiensium civitas olim limes Italiea fuit* may be taken as insightful for the official view of the Ravenna government and Theoderic’s attempt to justify his move in southern Pannonia which further infringed on the Empire’s territorial rights.\footnote{Ennodius, *Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico*, 12.60. The control of Sirmium was of paramount importance for the Ostrogoths, which is clear from Cassiodorus, *Variae* 8.10.4, where the entire campaign is called the *expeditio Sirmensis*.} Furthermore, Cassiodorus notes that Pannonia Sirmiensis is *quondam sedes Gothorum*, which implies that, by the conquest of the former Roman province of Pannonia Secunda, the Ostrogoths merely retook...
the territory that was once theirs\textsuperscript{92}. The annexation of Pannonia Savia must have been accomplished between 497 and 504 since the latter year was when the Ostrogoths attacked Sirmium. Theoderic seems not to have encountered any opposition in Pannonia Savia, even though, if the assumption is correct, the province had been settled by the Suevi, in a significant number, if the use of the form \textit{Suavia} for Savia in late antique sources carries any weight\textsuperscript{93}. At that time, Theoderic still maintained good relations with the Gepidic king Traseric, but, in 504, the Gothic commanders Pitzia and Herduic invaded Sirmium, expelled Traseric and annexed the former Roman province of Pannonia Secunda\textsuperscript{94}. The next year, Pitzia intervened in Moesia Prima and helped a brigand of the Gepidic royal blood, Mundo, who had previously established himself at Herta located at the mouth of the river Margus (Morava) into the Danube and now entered the Ostrogothic service, to face the Eastern Roman army led by the \textit{magister militum per Illyricum} and consul Sabinianus and made up mostly of the Bulgar mercenaries. Pitzia, his lieutenant Tuluin and Mundo jointly succeeded in defeating Sabinianus at Horreum Margi (Ćuprija), which not only secured the recent Ostrogothic acquisition of Pannonia Secunda, but also gave Theoderic a good position for bargaining with the Eastern Empire. Negotiations ensued: the first embassy arrived in Constantinople in the winter of 506/7, although the empire tried to exert pressure and a diplomatic struggle continued\textsuperscript{95}. Finally, in 510, an agreement was reached and a compromise struck, through which the Eastern Empire seems to have received the south easternmost part of Pannonia Secunda with the town of Bassianae as a defensive salient, whereas Theoderic retained the bulk of the province and presumably now secured the formal recognition of the territorial possessions which he had obtained previously\textsuperscript{96}.

\textsuperscript{92} Cassiodorus, \textit{Variae} 3.23.2.

\textsuperscript{93} Jordanes, \textit{Romana} 218; Cassiodorus, \textit{Variae} 4.49. 5.14.1, 5.15 (however, both Th. Mommsen and L. J. Fridth who respectively edited the \textit{Variae} for the \textit{Monumenta Germaniae Historica} and the \textit{Corpus Christianorum Series Latina} emended the manuscript from \textit{Suavia} to \textit{Savia}). Jordanes (\textit{Getica} 30) knows of Suavia in the vicinity of Dalmatia and not far from Pannonia, and Procopius (\textit{Bellum Gothicum}) distinguishes between the Siscians and the Suevi who both live in the interior east of Liburnia, Histria and Venetia (1.15.25–26), and mentions the recruiting by the Gothic commanders of the unnamed barbarians (obviously not the Goths) in Suavia before advancing toward Salona (1.16.8–9). For the hypothesis, see Gračanin 2006a, 99–101, 2011, 223, with Hauptmann 1929, 329–333; Lotter 1968, 275–282; 2003, 102, 122–123; Kolnik 1987, 72; Castritius 1994, 139–140, 143–146 (\textit{Castritius} 1995, 75–76, 80–85).


\textsuperscript{95} The expedition of the imperial fleet against southern Italy in 508 seems to have been a part of this pressure (\textit{cf.} Marcellinus, a. 508 with Cassiodorus, \textit{Variae} 1.16.2, 2.38.2). See Wozniak 1981, 373, Footnote 73.

The Ostrogothic expansion into southern Pannonia served several goals. First and foremost, the region was of a significant strategic importance as a forward defense of Italy and Dalmatia; secondly, the Ostrogothic dominance over Italy would be put at risk if southern Pannonia with its road network were to be used by the enemy to acquire an easy access to Italy and, by the region’s annexation, this danger would be forestalled; thirdly, the control of southern Pannonia offered Theoderic the opportunity to watch more closely over the situation in the middle Danube area; and, finally, the need to restore the organized Roman administration in the southern Pannonian provinces as a clear proof of Theoderic’s support for various aspects of the Roman civilitas, by which he strove to legitimize further his rule in the eyes of the Roman aristocracy. Precisely the restored provincial organization and efforts at establishing and maintaining the ordered circumstances as well as securing the obedience to the law became a hallmark of the Ostrogothic rule in southern Pannonia. The southern Pannonian provincial organization underwent a significant change: Pannonia Savia was merged with Dalmatia into a single province with the seat in Salona and under the authority of the comes Dalmatiarum et St(u)aviae. It is impossible to determine with any certainty when this change occurred, but it may have already been in place shortly after 504/5 and definitely before 526/7 when the sources mention Osuin as comes of Dalmatia and Savia. The administrative union of Pannonia Savia and Dalmatia is additionally supported by the acts of two provincial ecclesiastical councils convened in Salona in 530 and 533 respectively, to which the bishops of Siscia, John and Constantine, were summoned. Pannonia Secunda, now known under the name of Pannonia Sirmiensis, was organized as a separate province with its own comes (called probably comes Pannoniae Sirmiensis), which was dictated by strategic needs since the region was a frontier area with the Eastern Empire. The joining of Pannonia Savia with Dalmatia seems to have influenced

---

2000, 63–67; Andreić 2002, 144–145; Lotter 2003, 26–27, 127–128. Christou 1991, 57–58 dates the peace treaty to 512 and claims that Theoderic relinquished the region west of Sirmium. The opinion that Theoderic handed over Bassianae to the Empire is based solely on Justinian’s constitution of 14 April 535, where a pars secundae Pannoniae, quae in Ba[c]<c>ensi est civitate is mentioned as a part of the metropolitan area of the newly established archdiocese of Justiniana Prima (Novellae 11). Another indication that the Eastern Romans were in possession of parts of Pannonia Secunda derives from a combination of source information: the settlement of the Heruli in the territories and towns of the Romans by order of Anastasius I in 512 (Marcellinus, a. 512, with Procopius, Bellum Gothicum 2.14.28, 15.1), and the mention of “the land of the Heruli which “is called Pannonia Secunda” (Menander Protector, fr. 5.4. 2–6 Blockley).

97 Cf. Wozniak 1981, 368.

98 Cassiodorus, Variae, 9.8.1. Cf. Wilkes 1969, 424; Wozniak 1981, 375; Wolfram 1985, 315; 1990, 320; Tomićić 2000, 272; Andreić 2002, 145. Wolfram believes that the change occurred before 504 (see also Sokol 1998, 1134), whereas Burns 1984, 174-175 claims that Pannonia Savia had its own comes until the revival of Gepidic power around Sirmium. Osuin had already been comes of Dalmatia between 507 and 511 (Variae, 1.40.1), and is mentioned on two other occasions as being in charge of Dalmatia (Variae, 3.26.1, 9.9.1). Cf. PLRE II, 815, s. v. Osuin; Amory 2003, 403.


100 For the province’s name, see Cassiodorus, Variae 3.23.2, 4.13.1.
the identification of the term Pannonia with Pannonia Sirmiensis\textsuperscript{101}. To bring stability to the region and thus strengthen the Ostrogothic rule, Theoderic sent officials to Savia and Sirmiensis, of which three are known by name, Fridibadus (507/11), Severinus (525/6), and Colosseus (ca. 510). For Fridibadus, there is evidence that he was put in charge of Siscia and Savia, which could mean that he was \textit{comes provinciae}, but he could have also been \textit{comes civitatis} (which is more likely if Savia was united with Dalmatia by 511)\textsuperscript{102}. He was presumably a military \textit{comes civitatis} since he held the authority over troops (\textit{capillati defensores}). Both Fridibadus and Severinus could have also been sent from Ravenna on a special task and without a permanent commission\textsuperscript{103}. In any case, Fridibadus was authorized to check violence and wrongdoings in the province, bring cattle-thieves and murderers to justice, prevent thefts, and save the peaceful provincials from criminal acts. Severinus, too, may have been a military \textit{comes civitatis} since he also held the authority over troops (\textit{defensores}), and his mission was to introduce righteousness in tax obligations, remedy abuses of \textit{possessores} against the provincials and punish the offenders with legal severity, investigate and rectify the wrong done to the \textit{possessores} by judges, curials and soldiers, force the \textit{antiqui barbari} (presumably the Suevi are meant) who had married Roman ladies and thus obtained estates to pay their due taxes, make sure that the \textit{iudex Romanus} does not overburden local communities with his expenses, resolve the cases of intimidation perpetrated against the provincials by officials (\textit{domestici}) of the \textit{comes Gothorum}, and appease the \textit{possessores} displeased with the height of their due taxes\textsuperscript{104}. Colosseus was \textit{comes Pannoniae Sirmiensis}, and, very much like Fridibadus, he was called upon to nurture the righteousness and defend the innocent against the corrupted practices which destroy the civilized way of life, prevent the conflicts between the barbarians and the Romans, and watch over the discipline of the Gothic soldiers and see to it that they were well provisioned so they would not engage in plunder\textsuperscript{105}.

Theoderic’s efforts at improving the defense capabilities of the southern Pannonian region, on the one hand, and at bringing about more peaceful conditions

\textsuperscript{101} Cf. A n d r i č 2002, 148. Cassiodorus (\textit{Variae} 3.24) calls the province administrated by Colosseus Pannonia, which can be interpreted as showing that Pannonia could not have been mistaken for Savia (the letter is dated to between 507 and 511 and thus may well provide indication that the administrative joining of Dalmatia and Savia occurred before 511). Moreover, Procopius (\textit{Bellum Gothicum} 1.15.26) distinguishes between the Siscians and the Pannonians who, according to him, live along with the Dacians east of the Noricans, extend to the Danube and hold the towns of Sirmium and Singidunum.

\textsuperscript{102} Cassiodorus, \textit{Variae} 4.49. Cf. PLRE II, 485, s. v. Fridibadus (\textit{comes provinciae}); Lotter 2003, 124 (\textit{comes provinciae}); S c h w a r c z 2000, 68 (\textit{comes civitatis Sisciae}); A m o r y 2003, 376 (a military \textit{comes civitatis} since he was in charge of the \textit{capillati}, acting under the authority of Osuin who held the senior military command).

\textsuperscript{103} Cf. W o l f r a m 1990, 320. However, it is less likely that neither Fridibadus nor Severinus held the \textit{comes} title as Wolfram claims.

\textsuperscript{104} Cassiodorus, \textit{Variae} 5.14, 15.

\textsuperscript{105} Cassiodorus, \textit{Variae} 3.23, 24, 4.13. It is usually thought that these barbarians were primarily the Gepids (cf. G r a č a n i n 2007, 21; 2011, 99).
in the frontier area, on the other, seem to be reflected in the settlement of a number of Alamanni who are believed to have joined the Suevi in Savia in the early 6th century, and in the resettlement of the majority of the Gepids (multitudo Gepidarum) who, between 523 and 526, were moved from Pannonia Sirmiensis to Provence in Gaul, where they were supposed to strengthen the frontier against the Burgundians. After Theoderic's death in 526, the Eastern Empire seems to have attempted to renew its influence in southeastern Pannonia, which is what may have lain behind the Gepidic attack on Pannonia Sirmiensis of 528, repelled by the future Ostrogothic king Vitiges and followed by a transient Ostrogothic penetration into Moesia Prima and the capture of the town Gratiana (Dobra near Golubac) east of Viminacium (Kostolac). The choice of words in Cassiodorus seems to imply that the Ravenna court was convinced of the Eastern Roman involvement in the Gepidic attack, which may explain why the Ostrogoths ravaged the Roman territory. Nevertheless, Vitiges readily withdrew when ordered so by the Ostrogothic queen and regent Amalasuntha (526–534). Later, Emperor Justinian I (527–565) made an official complaint about the incident in a letter to Amalasuntha, stressing that the Ostrogothic attack had been unprovoked. In 535, the Eastern Romans launched a war against the Ostrogoths. Their principal thrusts were directed against Italy (Belisarius) and Dalmatia (Mundo), but the Eastern Roman troops also captured Sirmium. The town did not remain long under the Eastern Roman control since it was seized by the Gepids in 536. Having been forced to defend Italy, Ostrogoths withdrew from southern Pannonia. However, in 537, a Gothic army led by Asinarius recruited soldiers among the barbarians (presumably the Suevi) in Savia for a planned attack against Salona.

106 For the Alamanni, see Cassiodorus, Variae 3.50.1–3; Ennodius, Panegyricus dictus clementissimo regi Theoderico, 15.72, with Lotter 1968, 278–279; 2003, 125–126; Wolfram 1990, 317; Castritius 1994, 144 (see also Castritius 1995, 82). Schmidt 1934, 348–349 claims that the Alamanni were garrisoned in Sirmium, whereas Enßlin 1947, 136 and Stein 1949, 147, Footnote 1, speak generally of Pannonia. For a partial resettlement of the Gepidi, see Cassiodorus, Variae 5.10.1–3, 5.11, with Diculescu 1923, 118; Schmidt 1934, 534; 1949, 250; Bóna 1976, 29; Wolfram 1990, 322; Andrić 2002, 144; Lotter 2003, 128. Tomičić 2000, 275 erroneously says that the Gepids were resettled to northern Gaul.

107 Procopius, Bellum Gothicum 1.3.15, 11.5 (erroneously says that Vitiges distinguished himself in a campaign led by Theoderic near Sirmium); Cassiodorus, Variae 11.1.10–11. Cf. Diculescu 1923, 120–121; Schmidt 1934, 534; Stein 1949, 307–308; Mirković 1971, 51; 2008, 102; Bóna 1976, 17; Pohl 1980, 299; Wozniak 1981, 377–379; Wolfram 1990, 322–323, 334; Andrić 2002, 150. Wolfram 1990, 323 claims that the Ostrogoths conquered the eastern part of Pannonia Sirmiensis which they had ceded to the Eastern Empire in 510, whereas Tomičić 2000, 275 believes that the Ostrogoths were forced to withdraw from Syrmia in 528 and that the Gepids used this as an opportunity to attack.


109 Procopius, Bellum Gothicum 1.3.17.

110 Procopius, Bellum Gothicum 3.33.8. Šašel 1979, 137 (see also Šašel 1992, 758) claims that Pannonia Sirmiensis and Savia were annexed immediately following the capture of Sirmium, which is unsubstantiated.
in Dalmatia\(^{111}\). This was the last time that the Ostrogoths were active in southern Pannonia after which their presence and rule in the region, which had lost its relevance for the defense of Italy, came to an end\(^{112}\).

**THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE OSTROGOTHS**  
**IN SOUTHERN PANNONIA**

As already stressed, a determination and interpretation of the archaeological evidence poses a great challenge for a sound historical reconstruction. Apart from the fact that the archaeological dossier is rather slim, the finds at hand have rarely been unearthed in the course of systematic and protective archaeological investigations, having been discovered chiefly by chance and, for the most part, in the early 20\(^{th}\) century\(^{113}\). The available material consists mostly of jewellery, dress accessories and military equipment. A special group of the archaeological evidence is the numismatic material. Of course, there are still problems of chronology and attribution to be taken into account, especially if one attempts to trace more precisely the Ostrogothic presence in the archaeological material which could easily have been utilised by other ethnic groups living under the Ostrogothic rule (or before or afterwards), or identify exactly material that may be brought into connection which may be attributed to either of the two periods of the Ostrogothic rule in southern Pannonia\(^{114}\). A gazetteer of artifacts associated with the Ostrogoths in southern Pannonia is presented in the Annex.

Of listed archaeological finds, those from Beli Manastir (2), Hrtkovci (4), Ilok (5a), Neštin (7), Novi Banovci (8a–b), Rakovac (10a), Sotin (13), Sremska Mitrovica (14a) and Zemun (16a–c) are usually attributed to the first period of the Ostrogothic rule in southern Pannonia and with Vidimir’s (Beli Manastir) and Valamir’s domains\(^{115}\). To these, the finds from Zmajevac (17) may be added,
even though they are generally thought to belong to the period of the Hun dominance\textsuperscript{116}. There are two finds from Sisak (12a–b) also attributed to the first period of the Ostrogothic rule in southern Pannonia\textsuperscript{117}. The finds of double-edged swords (spatha) pose a different problem since they are all stray finds discovered outside the archaeological context. If they come from destroyed graves they were not a possession of the Ostrogoths since, as far as we know, they traditionally did not inter weapons in their graves\textsuperscript{118}. Thus these swords must have been grave goods of another Germanic group and the obvious candidates are the Gepids. Another possibility is that the swords are actually remnants of armed conflicts, in which case they may have equally been a possession of the Ostrogoths. Along the lines of such reasoning it has been proposed that spatha finds from Ilok (5), Neštin (7b), Rakovac (10b), Sremska Mitrovica (14c) and Zemun (16d) may indicate where there was fighting between the Ostrogoths and the Gepids either during Theoderic’s march in Italy or later (in 504 or 528)\textsuperscript{119}. To be sure, this cannot be entirely excluded, but neither can it be proved with any degree of certainty and thus these finds are better not used as a basis for a historical interpretation.

The finds of combs present yet another problem since they are not easily attributed to any of the Germanic groups in southern Pannonia if there is no specific archaeological context. A good example is the Kupinovo find (6). The cast notched fibulae and brooches are yet another example of items that are characteristic for a broader, so-called, eastern Germanic cultural circle. A special problem for a correct interpretation is posed by the Baldenheim-type helmet from Batajnica (1). The helmet is usually thought to have belonged to a Gepid who obtained the object after the Ostrogoths withdrew from Sirmium in 535. This interpretation hangs on the assumption that the helmet was found in a single grave along with a pottery vessel featuring a stamp decorated pattern that is regularly interpreted as typically Gepid\textsuperscript{120}. However, the written record does not contain more detailed data on the exact site of the find and only the testimony of the individual who is supposed to have found the helmet and the vessel brings these items into connection and places them inside a single grave. Furthermore, the finds from Rakovčani (11) are believed to show the coexistence of the Ostrogothic and Roman populations\textsuperscript{121}. The coin finds are much more reliable indicators of the extent of their influence, and those struck by the Ostrogothic kings have been found at Bačin, Dalj, Donji Miholjac, Golubinci, Jakovo, Novi Banovci, Sisak, Sremska Mitrovica, Štrbinci, Vinkovci, Vukovar,

\textsuperscript{116} Cf. Gračanin 2011, 74, where the finds from Neštin (7), Novi Banovci (8a) and Zemun (16a) are also claimed to possibly have been used by the Huns or the Ostrogoths under the Hun rule (with Footnotes 33–34).

\textsuperscript{117} Cf. Gračanin 2011, 83 with Footnote 49, where only one of the two is mentioned as a possibility (12b). The find is brought into connection with an Ostrogothic reconnaissance expedition, which is unlikely.

\textsuperscript{118} Cf. Werner 1956b, 128, Bierbrauer 1994, 144, with Burns 1984, 113.

\textsuperscript{119} Gračanin 2011, 91, 94, 101.

\textsuperscript{120} Cf. for example, Rapap Papesa 2012a, 433.

\textsuperscript{121} Cf. Vinski 1971a, 1971b.
Fig. 1. Finds imported for the study of the Ostrogoths presence in Late Antique Southern Pannonia (for administrative data see Annex); drawn by H. Gračanin and I. Jordan.

- a – metal and non-metal finds
- b – coins finds
and Zemun (excluding specimens with no certain location of the find). On balance, the distribution of finds which are affiliated with either of the two periods of the Ostrogothic rule in southern Pannonia, may be taken as an indication that the Ostrogoths consistently followed the logic of controlling the important river crossings and roads, traffic hubs and junctions (cf. Fig. 1). In general, the finds from the eastern parts of the region (Pannonia Secunda, i.e. Sirmiensis) vastly outnumber the finds from the western parts (Pannonia Savia), which may be interpreted as suggesting that Pannonia Sirmiensis was of a much greater importance for the Ostrogoths than Pannonia Savia (which would explain why they decided to unite this province with Dalmatia).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Ostrogothic rule in southern Pannonia may be divided chronologically into two distinct periods. The first started with the appearance of Valamir’s Ostrogoths who apparently settled a large portion of the former Roman province of Pannonia Secunda, something subsequently sanctioned by Emperor Marcian in 455. The extant archaeological evidence that can be brought into connection with this period is rather slim notwithstanding the fact that it is dubious whether it can be utilised at all to determine the region settled by Valamir’s Ostrogoths. The narrative sources depict this whole period as fraught with incessant offensive or defensive wars waged by the Ostrogoths who, after having apparently exhausted all the immediately available resources of the region, left Pannonia in 473. The second period started with King Theoderic’s annexation of southern Pannonian provinces (by 504), and was marked by his repeated attempts at bringing order in the region, i.e. to reinstitute the provincial administration which actually had ceased to function ever since the beginning of the Hunnic rule over Pannonia. This renewal, however, is not visible in the archaeological material at the present state of knowledge, especially with regard to the stability of settlements. Even though there is much more archaeological evidence datable to the second period of the Ostrogothic rule in southern Pannonia, the question remains open to what extent it really indicates the presence of the Ostrogoths as opposed to the presence of other Germanic groups, since the bulk of the material belongs to the so-called Germanic cultural circle and can be variously interpreted with regard to ethnic identity. The second period of the Ostrogothic rule in southern Pannonia ended effectively with a war waged by the Eastern Empire against the Ostrogoths in 535. On balance, the Ostrogothic rule seems to have brought a brief respite and something of a revival to the region, at least, this is suggested by the literary sources and the coin finds. Only further archaeological investigations as well as a careful revision of published material and the publication and analysis of unpublished material can provide a basis for a more refined and reliable historical contextualization and interpretation.
ANNEX

List No. 1.
Metal and non-metal finds imported for the study of the Ostrogoths presence in Late Antique Southern Pannonia

1. Batajnica, Beograd, Serbia
   chance find (but, according to the written record, lifted from a grave) of a Baldenheim-type helmet, site unknown (environs of Batajnica), 6th century

2. Beli Manastir, Osiječko-baranjska županija, Croatia
   chance find of a silver sheet bow fibula, Ciglana site, second half of the 5th century

3. Dalj, Osiječko-baranjska županija, Croatia
   chance find of a buckle mount made of gilded silver, ornamented with seven almandine inlays, Ciglana site, early 6th century

4. Hrtkovci, opština Ruma, Sremski okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia
   finds from a rescue investigation, fibulae made of gilded silver, earrings made of silver wire, cast bracelets, biconic beads made of precious and plain materials, buckle, fragmented metal mirror, Vranja site, second half of the 5th century

5. Ilok, Vukovarsko-srijemska županija, Croatia
   a) chance find of a pair of solid silver sheet bow fibulae produced by hammering, elementary school Slaviša Vajner Čiča site, second half of the 5th century
   b) chance find of a spatha with a damascened blade and remains of a pommel, site unknown, late 5th/first half of the 6th century
   Vinski 1957a, 21, 34; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 77, No. 76:2; Bojić 1984, 214; Sekelj Ivančan 1995, 243, No. 810; Rapan Papeša 2012a, 430.
6. Kupinovo, opština Pećinci, Sremski okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia
   chance find of a single-row type bone comb, site unknown, 6th century
   Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 80, No. 79; Tomićić 2000, 275.

7. Neštin, opština Bačka Palanka, Južnobački okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia
   a) chance find of a gold buckle for footwear with stone inlays in the Pontic
      polychrome style, site unknown, 5th century
      Vinski 1957a, 31; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 81, No. 81:1;
   b) chance find of a spatha made of cast iron, site unknown, late 5th/first half
      of the 6th century
      Prbaković 1955, 36; Vinski 1957a, 21, 34; Csallány 1961, 241; Dimitrijević,
      Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 81, No. 81:2; Majnarić-Pandžić 1994, 90

8. Novi Banovci, opština Stara Pazova, Sremski okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia
   a) chance find of one complete mirror and four pieces of two other mirrors
      made of silver alloy, two cast cicada fibulae made of silver, one cast bronze
      cicada fibula, five cast bronze cicada fittings, Purger site, 5th century
      Werner 1956a, 21–22; Vinski 1957a, 29; Csallány 1961, 240; Dimitrijević,
      Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 81–82, No. 82:1–5; Németh 1987, 224, 11a–I;
   b) chance find of bow fibula made of a silver sheet, cast bow fibula made of
      low silver (two pieces), foot of a cast bronze bow fibula, foot of a cast notched
      bow fibula made of silver, fragment of a cast notched bow fibula made of gilded silver, cast bronze bow fibula, mostly of the Pontic-Danubian type,
      Purger site, second half/late 5th century
      Vinski 1957a, 28; Csallány 1961, 240; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski
      11j–k.
   c) two cast bronze bow fibulae, one a so-called Thuringian type, cast notched
      bow fibula made of silver, cast notched bronze bow fibula with gilding, foot of
      a cast notched bronze bow fibula, fragment of a cast notched bow fibula
      made of silver with a zoomorphic terminal, Purger site, early 6th century
      Vinski 1957a, 29; 1973, 179; Csallány 1961, 239, 240; Dimitrijević,
      11l–n.

9. Nuštar, Vukovarsko-srijemska županija, Croatia
   chance find of a cast bronze bow fibula, site unknown (environs of Nuštar),
   5th–6th century
   Rapan Papeša 2012b, 8, No. 1.

10. Rakovac, opština Beočin, Južnobački okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia
    a) chance find of a silver fibula of the Pontic-Danubian type, two bronze
       buckles, site unknown, probably the second half of the 5th century
       Vinski 1957a, 21, 31; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 89–90,
b) chance find of spatha with a damascened blade, site unknown, 5th/6th century (?)

Pribaković 1955; Vinski 1957a, 34; Csallány 1961, 242; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 89–90, No. 84:3.

11. Rakovčani, Republika Srpska, Bosnia and Herzegovina
finds from a regular excavation, items belonging to jewellery and dress accessories, such as a solid iron bracelet with silver gilding and a massive faceted brooch, all stemming from graves in a necropolis, Bošnjića Voće site, late 5th/first decades of the 6th century


12. Sisak and its environs, Sisačko-moslavačka županija, Croatia
a) chance find of a bronze cicada fitting, site unknown, 5th century

Vinski 1957b, 138, No. 2; Simon i 1989, 109, 120, No. 13.

b) chance find of a fragmented hammered silver sheet bow fibula, site unknown, second half of the 5th century

Vinski 1957b, 143, Fig. 48, 157; 1978, 35; Simon i 1989, 110, 121, No. 19; Burkowski 1999, 87; Rapan Papeša 2012a, 428

c) chance find of a silver pin with a head in the form of a cicada, bronze ornamental cicada fitting, silver cicada fibula, one bronze and one silver bow fibulae, silver spoon of the Desana type, a bronze bar with an ornament in the form of a bird, sites unknown, first half of the 6th century


13. Sotin, Vukovarsko-srijemska županija, Croatia
chance find of a small cast silver bow fibula, Vrućak site, second half of the fifth century

Uglešić 1994, 146, No. 1, 147; Tomićić 2000, 270; Ilkić 2007, 279, 282, No. 4; Rapan Papeša 2012a, 429.

14. Sremska Mitrovica, Sremski okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia
a) chance find of a pair of notched silver fibulae with gilding, an amber bead and a biconic bead, Puškinova Ulica site, late 5th century


b) chance find of a cast bronze ring (“Zelengora” site), two cast bronze buckles (Krajiška Ulica site), five cast bronze buckles (sites unknown), a cast bronze buckle (Sonda 24 site), 5th/6th century

Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 91–92, No. 88: site Zelengora:1,
site Krajiška ulica:1–2, site unknown:1–2, site Sonda 24:1; Németh 1987, 231, No. 22a.

c) chance find of two iron spathae, site unknown, second half of the 5th and first half of the 6th century
Vinški 1955a, 36–38; 1957, 34; Pribaković 1955, 36; Csallány 1961, 241; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinški 1962, 92, No. 88: site unknown:1

15. Sremski Karlovci, Južnobački okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia
chance find of a gilded fibula made of bronze silver alloy, Rovine (Strasser’s vineyard) site, late 5th century
Kovačević 1960, 32; Csallány 1961, 240; Vinški 1957, 27; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinški 1962, 91, No. 87/2.

a) chance find of a fragmented cast bronze bow fibula, Kapela site, 5th century
b) chance find of a pair of notched silver fibulae with gilding, a silver brooch, two beads made of golden sheet, Gradski Park site, second half of the 5th century

c) chance find of a polyeder gold earring, six beads made of golden sheet, a silver buckle, site unknown, second third of the 5th century
Prohászka 2007, 180, 182–183, 186–188
d) chance find of a spatha made of cast iron, site unknown, late 5th/first half of the 6th century
Pribaković 1955, 36; Vinški 1957, 21, 34; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinški 1962, 104, No. 93: site unknown:1

17. Zmajevac, Osječko-baranjska županija, Croatia
chance find of a pair of gold fittings in the Pontic polychrome style belonging to a scabbard, Várhegy site, 5th century

List No. 2.
Numismatic finds imported for the study of the Ostrogoths presence in Late Antique Southern Pannonia

1. Baćin, Sisačko-moslavačka županija, Croatia
solidus of Theoderic, in the name of Justin I (518/526), site unknown
2. Dalj, Osječko-baranjska županija, Croatia

1/4 siliqua of Theoderic, in the name of Anastasius I (493/518), site unknown

Stefan 1925, 4–5; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 85, No. 82:32; Demo 1981, 455, 462; 1994, 61–62, 173, 181, 193; Mirnik, Šemrov 1998, 205, No. 818 (in Stefan 1925; Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski 1962; Mirnik, Šemrov 1998 Novi Banovci is indicated incorrectly as the site of the find)

fragmented 1/4 siliqua of Theoderic, site unknown

Demo 1981, 455, 377, No. 24; Rapan Papeša 2012a, 430

3. Donji Miholjac, Osječko-baranjska županija, Croatia

1/4 siliqua of Athalaric, in the name of Justinian I (527/534)

Kiss 1984, 19, Note 8; Demo 1994, 36, 94, 173, 181, 196

4. Golubinci, opština Stara Pazova, Sremski okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia

1/4 siliqua of Theoderic, in the name of Justin I (518/527), Selište site

Demo 1994, 169, 182

5. Jakovo, Beograd, Serbia

solidus of Theoderic (bronze with gold gilding), in the name of Anastasius I (493/518), Kormadin site

Dimitrijević, Kovačević, Vinski 1962, 79, No. 77, grave No. 5

6. Novi Banovci, opština Stara Pazova, Sremski okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia

1/4 siliqua of Theoderic, in the name of Anastasius I (493/518) and 1/4 siliqua of Athalaric, in the name of Justinian I (527/534), Purger site


7. Sisak, Sisačko-moslavačka županija, Croatia

1/2 siliqua, three 1/4 siliquae and a tremissis of Theoderic, in the name of Anastasius I (497/518), and five 10-nummi of Theoderic, in the name of Justin I (518/526), sites unknown

Alföldi 1924, 35; Stefan 1925, 2–4; Metcalf 1960, 437; Demo 1981, 455, 462, 477, Nos. 18, 20–22, 478, Nos. 33, 36–37, 479, Nos. 40–41; 1994, 184 (one 10-nummus erroneously attributed as struck in the name of Anastasius I); Mirnik, Šemrov 1998, 203, No. 804, 204, Nos. 810, 814–815, 205, Nos. 817, 823, 825, 826, 206, No. 829; Tomić 2000, 271; Rapan Papeša 2012a, 430.

8. Sremska Mitrovica and its environs, Sremski okrug, Vojvodina, Serbia

six 1/4 siliquae of Theoderic, one in the name of Zeno (490/491), three in the name of Anastasius I (493/518) and two in the name of Justin I (518/526), and 1/4 siliqua of Athalaric, in the name of Justinian I (527/534), No. 21 site (one 1/4 siliqua of Theoderic in the name of Anastasius), the other coins from unknown sites
The Ostrogoths in Late Antique Southern Pannonia

9. Štrbinci, Osječko-baranjska županija, Croatia
   1/2 siliqua of Theoderic, in the name of Justin I (518/526), Budrovci site

10. Vinkovci, Vukovarska-srijemska županija, Croatia
    1/2 siliqua (bronze with silver gilding), in the name of Justin I (518/526), and a coin with no data, site unknown
    Dimitrijević 1979, 190; Demo 1994, 173, 186.

11. Vukovar and its environs, Vukovarska-srijemska županija, Croatia
    three 1/2 siliquae of Theoderic, in the name of Anastasius I (483/518), and 1/2 siliqua of Athalaric, in the name of Justinian I (527/534), sites unknown

12. Zemun and its environs, Beograd, Serbia
    1/4 siliqua of Athalaric, in the name of Justinian I (527/534)

13. Unknown sites
    a) tremissis of Theoderic, in the name of Anastasius I (493/518)
       possibly from the Sisačko-moslavačka županija
       Mirk, Šemrov 1998, 204, No. 812; Rapan Papeša 2012a, 430 (Glina indicated erroneously as the site of the find)
    b) two 1/4 siliquae of Theoderic, in the name of Anastasius I (493/518) from Slavonia
       Bojić 2009, 21; Rapan Papeša 2012a, 430.
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