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ABSTRACT

This thesis proceeds from the contention that the relationship between text and archaeology, which comprises protohistoric study, is poorly understood. The archaeology of Later Iron Age religious ritual is employed as a forum for examination of this relationship.

Whilst text is often privileged in protohistoric study, the Later Iron Age textual data themselves have not been adequately examined. The first aim of this thesis is therefore to evaluate comments on the rites and beliefs of peoples described as Keltoi or Galli in Classical texts of Later Iron Age date. This evaluation forms the basis for exploitation of the potential of the texts and for analysis of existing archaeological approaches to this material.

The second part of this work examines three site categories from the current Later Iron Age ritual corpus. These are: water sources, wells and shafts, and rectilinear enclosures. The archaeological criteria on which cult identities are advanced in each case are examined, as is the nature and extent of the use of textual data in informing the ritual identities afforded these loci.

It is concluded that ritual identities are not assigned primarily on the basis of Later Iron Age material evidence, but are heavily predicated on text-led presuppositions of the nature of ‘Celtic’ religion, and on retrospective appeals employing the post-Conquest archaeological record.

The validity of ritual identities assigned on such bases are questioned, and it is argued that reliance on these processes has meant that the underlying dynamic of Later Iron Age religion has been little addressed. It is suggested that the contextual integration of textual and archaeological data, and greater chronological control over both data sets, are prerequisites for methodological progress in the study of Later Iron Age religious ritual.
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INTRODUCTORY NOTES

1. LIA literary sources: texts and translations used.

Translations of the well-known sources are widely available. The Loeb Classical Library parallel texts series has been used where possible. The remaining fragments were kindly translated by Dr. G Lewis of the Department of Ancient History, University of Edinburgh.

VATICAN PARADOXOGRAPHER
Translated by G. Lewis.

ARTEMIDORUS
Geography
-cited by Strabo, Geography
Loeb (1949), The Geography of Strabo, trans. Jones, H.L.

POSITONUS
Histories
-cited by Strabo, Geography.
Loeb (1949), The Geography of Strabo, trans. Jones, H.L.
-cited by Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai.
Loeb (1929), Athenaeus. the Deipnosophists, trans. Gulick, C.B.

POLYHISTOR
Translated by G. Lewis

ANDRONICUS OF RHODES
Translated by G. Lewis

VARRO
unnamed text
-cited by St. Augustine, City of God.
Loeb (1963), trans. Green, W.M.

CICERO
Pro Fonteio
Loeb (1953), Cicero the Speeches, trans. Watts, N.H.
De Re Publica
Loeb (1943), trans. Keyes, C.W.
De Divinatione
Loeb (1946), Cicero. De Senectute, de Amicitia, de Divinatione, trans. Falconer, W.A.

CAESAR
De Bello Gallico

HIRTUS
De Bello Gallico
Continuator of Caesar de Bello Gallico (Book 8)
CORNELIUS NEPOS
Loeb (1947), Nepos. On the great generals of foreign nations, trans Rolfe, J.C.

DIODORUS SICULUS
Bibliotheca
Loeb (1946), Diodorus of Sicily, trans. Oldfather, C.H.

PARTHENIUS
Narrationes A matoria
Loeb (1916), The love romances of Parthenius, trans. Gaselee, S.

SALLUST
un-named text
-cited by Servius, Commentary on Virgil’s Georgics
Translated by G. Lewis.
un-named text
-cited by Nonnius Marcellus, Glosses on Virgil.
Translated by G. Lewis.

TIMAGENES
-cited by Ammianus Marcellinus
Loeb (1950), Ammianus Marcellinus, trans. Rolfe, J.C.
-cited by Strabo, Geography
Loeb (1949), the Geography of Strabo, trans. Jones, H.L.

VITRUVIUS POLLO
De Architectura
Loeb (1945), Vitruvius on architecture, trans. Granger, F.

HORACE
Carmina
Loeb (1952), Horace, the odes and epodes, trans. Bennet, C.E.

LIVY
History

STRABO
Geography
Loeb (1949), the Geography of Strabo, trans. Jones, H.L.

POMPEIUS TROGUS

DIONYSUS HALICARNASSUS
Antiquitates Romanae

NICOLAUS DAMASCENUS
- cited by Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai*.
Loeb (1929), *Athenaeus, the Deipnosophists*, trans. Gulick, C.B.
- cited by Stobaeus, *Anthology*

2. Conventions for Greek vocabulary.

The following frequently-employed Greek nouns have been 'anglicised' as follows:

- άτίον (explanatory myth) aition (pl. aitia)
- ιερόν (temple) hieron (pl. hiera)
- ουάτεις (Greek rendering of ouateis Latin vates, diviners)
- μάντεις (diviners) manteis
- παράδοξα (marvels) paradoxa
- τέμενος (temple precinct) temenos (pl. temenea)

The title of Diodorus' Βιβλιοθηκή is given as Bibliothèque throughout.

3. Abbreviations.

The following abbreviations occur throughout:

CIL *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, 1861-1943.
FgrHist Jacoby, F. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 1923
Pauly-Wissowa *Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschafe.*
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1.1. **Introduction.**

This thesis examines aspects of the archaeology of protohistory, and sets out to develop specific methodologies to address the specific features of protohistoric periods.

The protohistoric period studied here is the Later Iron Age (LIA) of Gaul, with some reference to LIA Britain (Chapter 5). The date parameters employed are those of Duval (1971) for Gaul, comprising La Tène III (120-0 BC) and Gallo-Roman Précoce (30 BC-21 AD). With reference to Britain, the period studied spans the end of the C2nd BC to the Roman Conquest, commencing 43 AD, (the 'Late Pre-Roman Iron Age' of Millett 1990a:10).

Non-indigenous textual data are available for the LIA (1.2.1). The present study investigates our responses to this fact, and explores how text and archaeology function together in the LIA. The forum selected for these issues is the archaeology of religious ritual. This field is chosen because in so far as theoretical approaches to protohistory have been formulated, these have tended to stress the importance of documentation in studying religion (1.5.1); and because, in practice, the interpretation of the assumed archaeological cognates of religion in LIA Gaul and Britain has been heavily dependent on text (1.5.1-2).

The issues are explored through a re-assessment of contemporary LIA textual evidence (Chapters 2-3), and a series of case studies examining three site categories from the LIA ritual corpus (Chapters 4-6).

Despite growing awareness of the potential offered by the 'relationship' between text and archaeology (Champion 1985:12) there have as yet been few attempts to define methodologies to exploit this. Two studies may be noted in this context (Crumley 1974, Wait 1985). Both proceed from the position that text and archaeology are autonomous data bases. Crumley (1974), sought to
generate archaeologically testable hypotheses from points of discord and accord arising from a comparison of Iron Age literary and archaeological data. But her archaeological database was, inevitably, permeated by text-led biases, assumptions and explanations. Wait (1985) elaborated a systemic model of religion (drawn from Wallace 1966) in which both textual and archaeological data were integrated (1985:13-14). Again, Wait (1985) offered little analysis of the extent to which text had facilitated the initial interpretation of his material database.

That there is a general perception that LIA archaeology is able to function independently of text is clear from the frequent assertion that IA archaeology is text-aided. The phrase implies both that that there is a clear demarcation between textual data and archaeological interpretation, and that archaeology is the privileged database. The present chapter suggests that the nature of protohistory is such that its archaeology can never be text free (1.2). The subsequent chapters work toward a methodology wherein this fact may be exploited.

1.2. The LIA as protohistory.

1.2.1. The emergence of text on LIA Gaul.

The 'relationship' between text and archaeology is not an Iron Age issue, but a Later Iron Age one. Prior to the late C2nd BC there are too few textual data to enable us to speak of a protohistoric Iron Age. Keltoi entered the Graeco-Roman arena and literature before the LIA (Tierney 1960, Rankin 1989), following Celtic expansion into Northern Italy from C4th-2nd BC (Peyre 1979, Pauli 1980) and Asia Minor in the C3rd BC (Mitchell 1974, Rankin 1989). Greek colonial ventures in the western Mediterranean, under way by the C6th BC (Benoit 1965, Clavel-Lévêque 1977, Wells 1980), generated limited data on the littoral zones of Gaul. But it was only from c. 125-120 BC, with full-scale Roman intervention beyond
the Alps, culminating in annexation of the **Provincia** (Badian 1966, Barruol 1969), that significant quantities of data emerged on non-Mediterranean Gaul and Britain. Most Classical data on the **Provincia** also post-date 125 BC.

Whilst the use of the Greek alphabet for bureaucratic purposes (Caesar 1.29, 6.14, Champion 1985: 10) points to 'conditional literacy' (Goody 1977) in parts of Gaul by the LIA, indigenous languages were not committed to writing (cf. Caesar 1.26, 6.14). All pre-Conquest LIA data, and the vast majority of post-Conquest texts, were generated by Greek or Roman writers. The LIA is thus proto- rather than pre-historic because contemporary written information exists, but proto-rather than fully historic less because the textual data are quantitatively limited than because they are not generated indigenously.

1.2.2. **The LIA as prehistory?**

Though some workers have recently called for greater consideration of Classical texts (e.g. Champion 1985), there have also been recent demands for a 'prehistoric' approach to the IA.

The latter case has been argued by Hill (1989), who suggested we have imposed meaning on the IA uncritically, creating the period in our own, familiar, image. The concept of the past as a linear continuity, Hill argued, destroys our sense of the "other" in the IA, and so denies us access to what the period was really like. Hill did not draw specific attention to the availability of contemporaneous text in the LIA, mainly criticising the use of 'later' text (1989:19) in writing a familiar IA. But his critique (cf. also Merriman 1987, Champion 1987) that the privileging of text has contributed to the familiarisation of the IA, is important here.

Hill (1989) suggested that two processes obstruct the presentation of different perspectives on the IA.
First, the 'Celticism' of the IA ensures a familiar past (1989:18). Hill draws on Merriman (1987) and Champion (1987) in arguing that the 'Celts' are the product of modern ideologies, especially C19th nationalist and romanticist concepts of ethnicity. 'Celtic society' is constructed from a diversity of literary sources (1989:18. I take Hill to include contemporaneous text here), but later European history is privileged as a source of analogy. This, Hill (1989:18-19) argued, is the result of a concept of linear continuity; the Celts as a backward projection from the recent past.

The insight that modernist ethnogenetic fantasies have allowed us to consider a wide variety of textual data as equally valid in discussing the IA is an important one. But Hill’s critique of 'Celtic-ness' as dependent on a 'constant essence' (1989:18) contradicts his notion of linear continuity. As Fitzpatrick (forthcoming) suggests, the 'Celts' are fashioned on ideas of timelessness rather than by linear projection. This timelessness is the major factor in obstructing our writing of a different IA (1.3.1).

Hill’s thesis that familiarity with the past denies us access to it, is difficult to reconcile with his advocacy of a hermeneutic archaeology (1989:17). A frequent criticism of hermeneutics is that it offers a complacent view of history. The hermeneutic approach to understanding is predicated on a respect for authority and tradition. Gadamer (1975), for example, spoke of history not as a place of struggle and discontinuity but as a "continuing chain", and described the fusion of past and present horizons, through which the event of understanding comes about, as "coming home" (1975:267-74). In its emphasis on cultural tradition as the locus of understanding, hermeneutics may thus be argued to promote a familiar past (Eagleton 1983:72-3). For a critique of the relativism engendered by hermeneutic epistemology (principally in Hodder 1986) see Shanks and

Hermeneutics is of course a text-analogue approach to understanding. Indeed, Gadamer (1975), drawing on Dilthey and Heidegger, was one of the most influential voices to argue that this was an appropriate model for the understanding of social action. Contextual archaeologists, in particular Hodder (1986, 1989), have advocated a text-analogue model for understanding material culture, and the contextualist approach is particularly attractive for protohistoric periods such as the LIA. This is because contextualism provides a theoretical basis for integrating varied data without privileging one data group over another (Hodder 1986:118-146 and section 1.2.2.2 here).

It is thus ironic that Hill (1989) did not draw attention to the text-analogue basis of hermeneutic methodology in suggesting that text debilitates IA archaeological self-reflection. The post-structuralists’ refusal to treat the recovery of intended meaning as part of an interpreter’s task, has been perceived to be especially damaging to the text-analogue model, precisely because much of the critique (particularly by Barthes and Derrida) centres on written discourse (for which, see e.g. Hodder 1989). But at the same time, the new relativism stressed by post-structuralism places even greater emphasis on our own part in our dialogue with the past, and it is fallacious to assume that our dialogue with a text-free prehistory is any freer of this relativism than is our understanding of protohistory.

Hill’s second argument is that our understanding of the IA is limited by an historical approach to the period (by which he meant the attempt to write archaeology as history and the privileging of text). Champion (1985:10 and 1987) has offered a similar critique. That written accounts are almost inevitably privileged over archaeological evidence is made clear in case studies in
this thesis. But this is a problem of methodology, it is not an inevitability.

Others, who like Hill, have advocated a hermeneutic archaeology, by contrast stress that archaeology should regain its traditional links with history. Again, contextual archaeologists have done much to emphasise the benefits of such an approach. One such neo-historicist is Hodder (1986:77-102) whose approach to ‘re-enactment’ of the past is drawn from a reading of Collingwood (1939; 1946). Recent work on ideology in prehistory also advocates a historical, particularist approach to the evidence (see papers in Miller and Tilley 1984). Finally, the world-systems perspective (Wallerstein 1974) (1.4.1), whilst essentially an overview interpretation of history, is attractive to anthropologists and archaeologists because it allows a framework for the intimate reassociation of history and social theory (Marcus 1986:167).

Hill (1989:19) rightly called for a more contextual approach to contemporary literary and archaeological data in IA studies. Yet he appears to sympathise with the processualist view that archaeology best retains its integrity where it is concerned entirely with material data. It is possible to question Hill’s implication that the doing of IA archaeology is largely a matter of emulating standards set by prehistorians. Recent thinking suggests that there are benefits to be gained from transposing methods and assumptions of historical archaeology into prehistory (see e.g. Rahtz 1981). An example is the work of the Annales historians, in particular that of Braudel on the division of historical time (1980), which has generated much archaeological interest.

Equally, as the view that these interdisciplinary approaches are simply a dilettante exercise erodes, archaeological studies incorporating
historical linguistics, ethnography and historical records, point to the benefits of integrated approaches. Ethnohistorical approaches are of particular interest here (see e.g. Hodder 1982, 1986a, Marcus 1983). Finally several recent studies point to the value of later direct historical material in assigning meaning to symbols in pre-literate societies (e.g. Hall 1979, Hammell 1983, Levy 1981 and Leone 1984). The consensus of such studies is that where it is possible to demonstrate a historical relationship between archaeological data and ethnohistory (Trigger 1989:353) or where it is possible to make direct historical analogies (Hodder 1986:144), textual data can be very valuable, particularly in studying the symbolic meaning of material remains. Non-indigenous contemporaneous text, clearly, offers similar potentials, subject to the factors outlined in Chapter 2

1.2.2.1. Protohistory and contextual archaeology.

Neo-historicism, and an emphasis on the benefits of 'inter-disciplinary' approaches to the past are, as noted above, both characteristics of contextual archaeology. The present writer suggests that the most fruitful methodological basis for the study of protohistory is provided by contextual archaeology. In contextual archaeology, the use of contemporary written texts, as of ethnohistory (Hodder 1986:103-117) or later historical documentation is seen less as an 'inter-disciplinary' approach to the past than as the networking of interrelated data in an effort to explore all relevant contexts. For the present enquiry, which suggests that methodological advances in LIA ritual archaeology necessitate a recognition that LIA text and archaeology are inextricably related, the contextual position is therefore particularly relevant. Second, whilst stressing the need to explore all contexts, the theoretical basis of the contextual approach is that no single data group is overstressed: literary texts simply
provide another context of enquiry, and as the methodological problems of the employment of data from written and non-written contexts are regarded as essentially similar (Hodder 1986:141), the privileging of text is avoided. Contextual archaeology thus offers a methodological basis for the integration of text and archaeology in studying protohistoric periods.

1.2.2.2. Ancient and modern ethnographies.

There has always, of course, been debate as to whether archaeology is a closer sister to history or anthropology. Hill (1989:19) suggests the "marked absence of the use of ethnographic parallels in Iron Age archaeology" illustrates the fact that our view of the period is Eurocentric and closed to the "other" (see also Rowlands 1986, 1987). But whilst favouring modern 'specific ethnographies' (1989:7) as a source of analogy, Hill fails to note the availability of contemporaneous ethnographic data in the LIA.

By privileging later ethnographic analogy as a source of reference for the IA, archaeologists like Hill (1989:19, 22) discriminate against Classical ethnography as a source of reference for the LIA. But there are a number of parallels to be drawn between Classical and modern ethnography.

The modern ethnographer, like the ancient, is very often an outsider. As a result, the questions we ask in evaluating a modern ethnography are not, or should not be, different from those we would ask of a Classical text. To what extent is the writer relying on earlier texts; how old is any earlier information she uses; what is the writer interested in; what does she ignore because of her interests; is she a good observer-and how can that be measured; is she an outsider or an insider; what of the interplay between her own socio-cultural background, and that of the people she describes?

Secondly, the historical contexts of production are
in both cases similar. Modern anthropology was largely formed in the context of the colonial/imperialist encounter of the C19th-20th (see e.g. papers in Asad 1973). LIA data is likewise contexted in conquest and imperialist domination. Two points arise here. First, although modern ethnography recognises the power asymmetries in such encounters (Asad 1986, Geertz 1988:133-5, Fabian 1983:17,149) this is rarely argued to have vitiated the data thus produced. Secondly, the same power asymmetries are of course evident in LIA writing (2.11). Comparison of modern and ancient ethnographies thus offer fertile ground for exploring the dynamics of LIA data production (1.4.2.2).

The detailed, long-term observation of small communities which characterises modern ethnographic enquiry is rarely a feature of ancient ethnographic study, and modern anthropologists would of course see their texts as very different from those of the ancient ethnographers. Nevertheless there are a number of similarities between the generation of the two, and their use as sources for the archaeologist.

Both ancient and modern ethnography are textual sources. Most archaeologists rely on anthropological texts written by others, and in drawing on either data set the archaeologist is employing written information at second hand. As often noted (e.g. Wait 1985:193) Classical writing is riddled with "outsider" bias. These biases are considered in Chapter 2. But equally, no-one would argue that the modern ethnographer is a tabula rasa who records the lives of others in a value-free way. By making subjective assessments about our own abilities to write culture, we privilege modern over ancient ethnography. It is possible to illustrate this by noting Rowlands' (1986) reply to Gosden's (1985) criticism of the application of the anthropologically generated prestige goods model to EIA Europe. Rowlands remarked it
was inevitable that we construct prehistories in the light of modernist discourses, but suggested that these are to be preferred because we might now "be a bit better at recognising the common sense, taken for granted nature of the ideology [we] project into the past". (1986:746)

Even if this is accepted, the point remains that in order to understand the past we must consider not only our own ideology but the ideologies of the past with which we are concerned.

It is worth recalling here the hermeneutic insight that it is precisely the encounter between an observer's own beliefs and practices and those of the people she is studying which makes up whatever understanding we can have of another reality. This applies as much to text as to social action, and as much to past as to present text. Greek and Roman commentators on LIA Gaul were no more free of their own position in their historical tradition than we are of ours. And that is precisely why what they write is of interest.

1.2.2.3. The Later Iron Age as protohistory: summary.

The privileging of modern ethnographies over IA text ignores the fact that the latter, unlike its modern counterpart, has immediate spatial and temporal relevance to the IA itself. As Hodder emphasised (1986:144) archaeologists, in employing ethnographic analogy, should have greater confidence in direct historical analogies where the spatial context is constant and the temporal gap is slight, than in cross-cultural analogy (see Levy 1981 for the same point). LIA writing achieves (where insular Medieval literature does not: 1.3.3) this temporal and spatial immediacy, but is at the same time cross-culturally generated. Herein lies the uniqueness, and the potential, of protohistory.

The following points may be offered in summary:
1. We have never made a clear enough distinction, or faced the conceptual implications of the distinction, between text about IA peoples and text of IA date about IA peoples. Caesar’s Gallic War is an artefact of IA date, produced in Gaul. That the text is produced by an outsider does not negate its value. Indeed, one value of the text is that it documents and encodes the encounter between the outsider’s own society and that which he describes.

2. Contemporaneous text, like any other LIA artefact is simply one of many available discourses (Hodder 1986:141). That we make the mistake of privileging the written word over other available discourses is a point illustrated in later case studies in this thesis, but it is neither possible nor desirable to do LIA archaeology without recourse to textual sources.

3. The LIA has its own hermeneutic, a cycle of understanding in which text is an intrinsic element, and from which it cannot be abstracted. Our attempts to understand the past involve dialogue with that cycle.

4. The suggestion that in order to write a valid IA the archaeologist must emulate prehistorians’ standards
   a. precludes the devising of period-specific methodologies
   b. fails to appreciate that the nature of protohistory is such that we cannot approach archaeological data in a text free way.

There is no such thing as a text-free protohistory. This thesis aims to generate positive responses to this fact.

1.3. Prioritising contemporaneous text.

A necessary first step towards an archaeology of
protohistory is to assess the nature of the available textual evidence. Chapters 2-3, and Appendices 1-3, of the present study are concerned with this issue.

1.3.1. Towards an LIA textual corpus.

The fact that the specifically ethnographic element of the Classical literature has nowhere been systematically studied (Champion 1985:13) is an indication of attitudes to the data. Few works collate Classical writings on the Keltoi. Duval (1971) gives a comprehensive list of references for Gaul, but with neither text nor translation, and does not evaluate the data. For Britain, Ireland (1986) provides a selection of texts and inscriptions, translated, but again not evaluated.

Assessment of Classical writing on Gallic religion is greatly aided by Zwicker (1934), who collates (again without translation or evaluation) almost all references to Celtic religion from C6th BC to C4th AD. The absence of similar collations for other topics is to be lamented.

Lacking an evaluated corpus, we speak of a literary record without having established its constituents. Consistent themes are often not noted, because the data are scattered (e.g. voluntary death 3.9.3). Lacunae (3.13) are not identified because the extant corpus is not properly defined. The first aim of the present work was thus to collate and evaluate all references to LIA religion. A clearly defined corpus was necessary both in order to exploit the full potential of the textual data as evidence for LIA religion, and as a basis for subsequent analysis of archaeological use of the texts.

In collating the data, the writer has drawn mainly on Zwicker (1934) and Duval (1971). The translated texts are collated in App.1. and evaluated in App.2.

1.3.2. 'Timeless Celticity'.
Fitzpatrick’s comment (forthcoming) that the timelessness created by scholarly mal-practice obstructs the writing of a different IA was noted above (1.2.2).

The LIA archaeological approach to text is essentially an anecdotal one, dipping into a corpus spanning a millennium (when vernacular Medieval literature is included 1.3.3), and pulling out data perceived to be of equal relevance, whatever the temporal and geographic specifics of the individual texts. This practice, predicated on the naive ethogenetic concepts noted by Hill (1989) and Merriman (1987), creates a temporally and spatially static, homogenised IA.

Such practices are widely criticised (e.g. Nash 1976a, Reece 1979:230, Hill 1989:18), but continue to inform new work, including studies of Celtic religion (cf. Fitzpatrick’s review (forthcoming) of Brunaux (1988), Green (1986), Wait (1985) and G. Webster (1986a)).

Protohistoric study can only proceed by prioritising its own texts over others. The most relevant literary sources for the study of LIA Gaul are those written specifically about Gaul during that period. Thus, Caesar’s *Gallic War* is more relevant for the archaeology of pre-Conquest Northern Gaul than is Pliny’s *Natural History*, written 100 years later, or Polybius’ late C2nd BC comments on the North Italian Celts. This is an astonishingly simple point, and one to which much lip-service is paid. It is however little heeded.

'Timeless' Celticity ensures not only that some archaeological interpretation is undermined by careless textual generalisation (see 5.5), but that the enormous potential of Classical text as an indicator of short and long-term change is not realised. Little emphasis has been placed on the chronological value of literary data. Nash (1976a), who did stress the potential of the
literature in this respect, used it only to demonstrate Caesar’s veracity. Wait (1985), who reviewed texts from 150 BC-100 AD noted (1985:192) that as society at that time was in a state of flux (1.4) differing observations occur in the literary record "because the social facts were changing". That Wait should not expect differing reports to appear over 250 years, and that he should not see the temporal sequencing of the data as a primary necessity, indicates current attitudes to the Classical literary record.

In order to maximise the record’s potential as an indicator of change, relevant earlier and later texts are noted in considering the LIA data in Chapter 3. However, the primary database for the present study is LIA text: only by prioritising these data is it possible to determine the specifics of the LIA record for Gaul.

1.3.3. The inappropriateness of insular Medieval texts.

It is a contention of this thesis that the Medieval vernacular literature of Ireland and Wales is of minimal relevance to the study of the LIA. To quote Fitzpatrick (1989:28) the "probability of changes within the LIA societies documented by the Classical sources... flaws attempts to fuse the Irish and Classical texts in an interpretation of a timeless and unchanging 'traditional' Celtic society", and as the above discussion indicates, the use of such texts is generally predicated on a fallacious notion of timeless Celticity.

Recently, the Irish data have been claimed not as Celtic but as 'European'. Gosden (1985) employed the Medieval literature of Ireland to challenge the application of the anthropologically-generated prestige goods model to EIA Europe. In the course of the correspondence generated by his article (MAN 1986:745-8, 1987:558-61), Gosden stated explicitly that he drew on the Irish data "precisely because I considered this to be more relevant
than analogies drawn from ethnologies concerning other parts of the world". (MAN 1986:747).

Beyond defining the Irish data as European, Gosden (1985) offered no critique of the applicability of Medieval Irish data to EIA Europe. Nor did he explain his failure to draw on Medieval texts from other areas of Europe. Given this, it may be argued that his employment of the Irish data as a model for EIA European social structure rested on the twin presumptions of shared ethnicity and data archaicism (on which see below).

Central to Gosden’s (1985) paper, however, is the issue of the value of the Medieval texts vis-à-vis modern anthropological data in generating models of IA society. In this context, Hodder’s point (1986:144), noted above (1.2.2.3), that cross-cultural analogies are less useful to the archaeologist than direct historical analogies, may be re-iterated. Once the ethnogenetic concepts which colour perceptions of the Medieval data are questioned, these late texts may be recognised simply as cross-cultural analogues at considerable temporal, and also spatial, distance from LIA Gaul and Britain.

As the case studies below indicate, (especially Chapter 5) the Medieval data continue to be given an important role in the archaeology of IA religion. The methodological problems of data application may thus be re-iterated here. Discussion is restricted to the Irish texts. On Welsh data see Wait (1985:213-4).

Codification of Irish narrative began in the C7th AD, with the majority of texts dating to C8th-12th AD. No extant manuscripts predate the late C11th AD Leabor Na Huidre (O’Cathasaig 1984:293) but, as the codification of a long oral tradition, the literature is agreed to be heavily indebted to the pagan tradition of pre-Christian Ireland (Dillon 1947, Jackson 1964, O Rahilly 1967, Gantz 1976, Olmsted 1979, O’Cathasaig 1984).
In Celtic studies, lively debate continues as to the nature and extent of archaism in the Medieval literature. Iron Age archaeologists have not tended to emphasise these problems. Despite recent exceptions (e.g. Mallory 1987) there remains a tendency to view the vēnacular literature as a pre-literate Celtic tradition, free of the cultural alienation which affects the Classical sources. But to quote O’Cathasaigh (1984:294), "The oral tradition was indeed for a long time pre-Christian, pre-literate and uninfluenced by the Graeco-Roman world, but we have no direct access to this tradition".

Working from written to oral data, the debated issues are, briefly:

1. The nature and extent of influences during codification. There are two considerations here:
   a. Changes resulting from the context of production. Codification occurred mainly in sacred milieu (monastic scriptoria or secular scriptoria under the aegis of the church). This resulted in the accretion of Christianisms (cf. Carney (1955) on the transformation of the Voyage tales into Christian peregrinatio) and of elements from Classical literary traditions.

   The sacred milieu is an important consideration when assessing the survival of pagan features in the literature. Tenets contrary to Christian doctrine are likely to have been suppressed. An example here is metempsychosis (3.6.1). Further examples are provided by Wait (1985:213), who discusses the anarchic nature of the written mythology (the lack of systems/concepts), reflecting monastic redaction.

   b. The extent of changes wrought by the act of writing. This has been a long-standing debate in Irish studies. Carney (1955) argues that oral data were greatly changed by the act of textual composition (contra Murphy 1955).
2. The integrity of oral 'survivals' prior to codification. Issues centre on the role of composition-reshaping, redaction, contraction, accretion - in oral transmission.

3. Dating archaisms. Jackson (1964:50-2) suggested that the Ulster Cycle embodies oral traditions dating from the C2nd BC - c. 300 AD. Though O’Rahilly (1967) favoured the latter part of this time span, Champion (1985:11) argued against Jackson’s (1964) terminus post quem (the introduction of La Tène culture in Ireland), suggesting the correct date could be much earlier. Whilst there are arguments to suggest the body of narrative which makes up the Ulster Cycle was formulated before the C5th AD (Jackson 1964), more precise dating is very uncertain.

As the above suggests, oral narrative was subject to alteration, loss and accretion prior to and during codification. Even leaving aside the issue of date, there is no system of controls by which to extract archaisms from the resultant literature. Recent work on early Irish society and status, for example as elucidated from Fingail Ronain (Charles-Edwards 1978), suggests the potential of such studies, but few such analyses have been undertaken, especially for the mythological Cycles.

Jackson’s (1964) contention that the Ulster Cycle offers a window on the IA has been questioned from an archaeological perspective by Mallory (1981), who suggested that technical descriptors for swords in the Ulster Cycle relate these weapons to the early Christian period. Most importantly, the 'heroic' nature of Ulster Cycle society - Jackson’s (1964) principal argument for the archaism of the narrative- may reflect conscious imitation of Homer by the early Christian redactors (Champion 1985:11, O’Cathasaig 1984).

Although Champion (1985:11) argued it is unnecessary
to restrict the pattern of society in the Ulster Cycle to the La Tène period, the shared La Tène culture horizon is at the same time one of few grounds on which to relate the two data sets. It is thus to be stressed that the La Tène material horizon in Ireland is extremely limited, being largely restricted to the north and north-east, and manifested almost entirely in the form of locally manufactured metalwork (Raftery 1989, Harbison 1989).

The archaeological approach to textual archaism is fraught with circular logic. Inspired by Jackson (1967) and latterly Meid (1987), there is a tendency to point to 'shared' features in the insular and LIA data and to infer that these ratify, and may be used to expand, each other. The principal aspect of IA religion thus treated is the triad of specialists Druids/bards/vates, 'mirrored' by the insular trio Druids/bards/filid (e.g. Le Roux & Guyonvarc’h 1978, MacCana 1983). The circular logic is obvious; on the basis of the Classical literature the archaeologist predetermines the 'archaic' in the insular, and then finds significance in the similarities between the two.

A further approach to the literature is to presuppose that archaism underlies the entirety. In this case, all data are assumed to reflect LIA behaviour and, even where Classical comparables are lacking, are privileged in interpreting LIA archaeological data. The work of Ross (e.g. 1967, 1986) on religion is an obvious example. Features of the Irish literature lacking Classical referents include several site categories (4.2.1, 5.5.2), sacral kingship, and the liminal time scale (3.13).

In summary, whilst possibly preserving some IA traditions, the insular record is not LIA text. The data are applied to LIA Gaul and Britain on the basis of naive ethnogenetic concepts. To employ these texts in explaining LIA Gaul is to privilege spatially and
temporally disparate data, over whose own temporal specifics we have no dating controls. As a result, archaeological interpretations privileging such data are liable to be flawed.

1.4. The historical context of data generation.

In assessing the LIA textual data, there is a critical need to pay greater attention to the historical context of data production.

Despite the parallels between ancient and modern ethnographic data noted above, it is of course the case that LIA text was not produced by trained anthropologists. But all writing on the 'other' (Ricoeur 1984) is determined and constrained by the contexts of interaction, and by internal constraints operating on the producing society. The latter are considered in Chapter 2. The former, the modes of contact by which data entered the literature, are examined here.

1.4.1. Modes of contact.

Modes of contact between the Graeco-Roman world and pre-Conquest Gaul, summarised by Fitzpatrick (1989:31) are: trade and exchange; diplomacy (including gifts and subsidies); and warfare and the exercise of power. In Gaul the latter culminated in the conquest of the Provincia from 125-120 BC and of non-Mediterranean Gaul from 58-51 BC. There is an enormous body of literature on pre-Conquest Roman contacts with Gaul, and the present brief overview -drawing heavily on Fitzpatrick (1989)- aims simply to summarise how contacts are argued:
1. to shape data generation and content.
2. to contribute to social change in Gaul prior to annexation.

1.4.1.1. The language barrier.

Description of an alien other is an act of
translation, both culturally and linguistically (Asad 1986, Hartog 1988, and 2.11). On the linguistic level, the event of engagement is frequently mediated by a third party. Failure to command the language of those studied influences both modern culture translation (Fabian 1983:32) and ancient.

The Romans, and particularly the Greeks, saw little need to learn barbarian languages (Baldson 1979). As a result of centuries of colonialism, Greek was spoken on the Mediterranean coast of Gaul before the LIA. This, and the rapid dissemination of Latin during the core period, eased communication difficulties here. Latin, Greek and Celtic were all spoken in Massilia by Varro’s day (Isodore of Seville Orig. 15.1,63).

There is some evidence for the limited use of Greek in non-Mediterranean Gaul prior to the Gallic War (Champion 1985:10; Fitzpatrick 1989:37). Latin education, and hence language, spread upwards from the south during the LIA (Baldson 1979). The Augustodunum school was founded by 21 AD, and Latin was spoken among Celts on the Rhine by the early Empire.

During the Gallic war, contacts with non-Mediterranean Gaul were mediated by indigenous interpreters. Caesar relied on interpreters, including the Helvetan C. Valerius Troucillus (Caesar 1.19,3; 1.47,4-6; 1.53,5-8). Further references to the use of interpreters are Caesar 5.27,1; 5.28,1; 5.36,1.

Language difficulties must have influenced data generation and quality. A good translation seeks to reproduce the structure of an alien discourse; but most Classical writers made no such pretensions. Inequalities are inherent in all translation (Asad 1986), and the most obvious asymmetry in Classical language relations with Gaul is the conquering society’s assumption that Latin and Greek were the natural languages of discourse.

1.4.1.2. Trade and exchange.
Fitzpatrick’s contention (1989:43) that trade is seen as the most important form of pre-Conquest contact because of its archaeological visibility, should be recalled here. Recent approaches to contact in pre-Conquest Gaul have centred on trade and exchange.

Prior to the LIA, Mediterranean Gaul was exposed to several centuries of Greek influence (Badian 1966, Wells 1980). The Hellenistic encounter with southern Gaul lies outside the scope of the present study, but the resultant Gallo-Greek synthesis shaped subsequent responses to the Roman hegemony, with which we are here concerned. Access to Greek and Etruscan goods via Massilia is argued to have influenced developments in west central Europe in C6th-C5th BC (Härke 1979, Wells 1980). In what was later the Provincia, continuous Greek presence, coupled with an amalgam of Celtic and Ligurian influences gave rise to localised socio-political developments which were not paralleled elsewhere in Gaul (For example, a discussion of Greek influence on ‘Celto-Ligurian’ religion is provided by Benoit 1955).

Southern and central Gaul were almost certainly receiving Roman imports before the second half of the C2nd BC (Fitzpatrick 1987:33, Fulford 1985:94). The annexation of Spain from c. 206 BC gave Rome control over the Mediterranean coast west of the Rhone, and Massilia became a Roman ally in 154 BC. With the annexation of the Provincia (from 125 BC) southern Gaul entered into continuous contact with the Roman world, and trade beyond the frontier increased (for general summaries Fitzpatrick 1989, Fulford 1985; on wine, Tchernia 1983, 1986 and on Campanian ware Morel 1981, 1985).

Residence of Graeco-Roman craftsmen and merchants in foreign commercial centres was a common practice (cf. Caesar 1.39, 4.2-3, and Tacitus Annales 2.62 on Romans in Germany). Caesar, writing in the mid C1st BC, mentions mercatores in non-Mediterranean Gaul. It is sometimes uncertain whether these were Roman or Gallic (BG 1.1,39,
2.15, 3.1, 6.37; also Diodorus 5.22), and merchant colonies could have been established in the wake of Caesar's army. But the texts suggest some Italian merchants were trading beyond the Provincia frontiers. Caesar's Gallic War contains three references to Gaulish attacks on persons present in Gaul negotiandi causa ('for the sake of trade'; 1.3; 7.42; 7.55). At 7.3 Caesar states explicitly that these traders were Roman citizens (see also Büchsenschütz and Roijstam 1986:35). Fitzpatrick (1989:3) suggests Caesar is referring to oppida-based citizens operating in Gaul under Roman protection.

Two models have recently been employed to articulate the dynamics of Roman exchange with barbarian Europe. The first is the prestige goods model (Frankenstein and Rowlands 1978; Wells 1980 for EIA; Haselgrove 1982 for LIA, and latterly Wells 1985 and Nash 1985, incorporating the notion of 'warrior societies'). The second is the world system model of exchange and exploitation (Wallerstein 1974, Rowlands et al 1987), most frequently applied to Gaul in its 'core-periphery' manifestation (Ekholm and Friedman 1980; Nash 1987 for central Gaul; Haselgrove 1987 for Belgic Gaul; Cunliffe 1988).

The relationship between late Republican Rome and its periphery was one of naked exploitation (Millett 1990a:7), making the world system model an attractive one for the period. But as Millett (1990a, 1990b) stresses, Rome's relationship with the barbarian cannot easily be bracketed in one model. Recent work has tended to emphasise a more complex picture, with substantial regional variations in the level and nature of exchange, and has questioned the extent of direct exchange with Italy (Haselgrove 1987, Fitzpatrick 1989 and 1.4.2 below).

1.4.1.3. Alliances.

Diplomatic alliances may be as important as trade in shaping early contacts, if archaeologically more difficult to define (Fitzpatrick 1989:34).
A diplomatic mission to the ‘western’ Keltoi is recorded as early as 218 BC (Livy 21.20). Following the first Transalpine War, Rome retained links in non-mediterranean Gaul by concluding a formal alliance with the Aedui, 123-122 BC. Similar links may also have been forged with the Arverni and Ruteni in 121 BC (Fitzpatrick 1989:34). Caesar notes several pre-Conquest client kings of Rome, e.g., Ariovistus, and Catamantaloedis of the Sequani (1.3). During the war Caesar forged similar alliances, in particular with the Remi and Aedui (Cunliffe 1988:117-20).

1.4.1.4. Military conflict.

Fitzpatrick notes (1989:31), following Vencl (1984), that archaeologists in general are prone to neglect the importance and significance of warfare. The LIA record for Gaul is contexted in conquest and domination, and the importance of this cannot be overstressed. Roman territorial expansion in Gaul was achieved in two military campaigns, the first Transalpine War (125-120 BC) culminating in the annexation of southern Gaul, and the Gallic War 58-51 BC. It is clear that many data on Gallic religion were generated as a result of these military campaigns (3.14), and it is a direct result of the Gallic War that Caesar produced de Bello Gallico, the most valuable LIA Classical commentary on non-Mediterranean Gaul.

Other military links should be noted. Fitzpatrick (1989:35) points out that hostages were sometimes ‘educated’, by Rome, though this was more widespread in the Hellenistic east. From the C3rd BC, Celtic mercenaries were employed by enemies of Rome (see Rankin 1987:111-2 on the Gaesatae). Celts fought for the Carthaginians in the First Punic War (e.g. Diodorus 23.21), and Aquitanians in the Sertorian wars in Spain (Caesar, Civil War 3.23). By the late LIA, Gauls from the Provincia fought in Roman armies: Caesar raised
forces in southern Gaul (BG 1.7,15; 3.20; 7.65), and during the Civil War Brutus and Cassius used Celts from the west (Appian B.Civ. 2.70-1).

Finally, though Celtic raids on Roman territory had effectively ceased by the C2nd BC, the wars of the C4th-2nd BC had great influence in shaping attitudes towards and portrayal of the Gauls during the LIA (2.9.2).

1.4.1.5. Modes of contact: summary.

It is difficult to make general statements on the ways in which the modes of contact outlined above would have influenced data generation in LIA Gaul. But some points may be suggested.

1. The decrease in emphasis on trade as the basic form of pre-Conquest contact is important in assessing data generation in Gaul. With reference to religion, the long-held assumption that data were mainly provided by entrepreneurial mercatores has been used to explain such specific features of the literature as, for example, the primacy accorded to Mercury in Caesar’s Gallic pantheon (6,17: see Pascal 1964, de Vries 1975). But trade is only one of many ways in which data were generated. In Gaul, warfare may have been particularly important in generating data on religious rites (see 3.14).

2. Most of the modes of contact noted above were restricted to the Gallic elite. Status goods, whether imported through diplomatic gift exchange or trade, were channelled through native elites (e.g. Fitzpatrick 1989, Millett 1990b:38). The conduct of warfare in Gaul was dominated by the elite (Caesar 6.15; Nash 1985, Fitzpatrick 1989:28). Literary data on Gaul thus tend to be heavily biased towards the elite (cf. Caesar’s dismissal of the plebes, 6.13).

3. Finally, it is important to emphasise that information on Gaul need not always have occurred as a by-product of the contacts above. Data may also have been actively solicited. In the aftermath of Conquest, and
indeed in advance of this, geographical and limited ethnographic data were a practical requirement for Rome. Momigliano (1975:65-6, 121-2, 140), for example, suggested that at the time of the annexation of the Provincia, Greeks, as the traditional ethnographers (2.6.1), were employed to collect such material at the Roman behest. Similarly, Rawson (1985:63) suggested that Polybius, who travelled in Celtic areas shortly before the LIA, made use of Roman ships. Whether Greek services were actively solicited for Gaul remains uncertain. Such practices occurred elsewhere - Augustus was to send Dionysus of Charax to make commentarii on the East (Pliny Natural History 6.141: see Rawson:1985:64) - but Posidonius, at least, appears to have travelled independently. His voyages occurred early in his career, prior to his links with important Romans. Whatever the case, Greek interest in Gaul was more pronounced under the Roman hegemony: the principal LIA stimulant for data generation was the Roman annexation of the Provincia.

1.4.2. Pre-Conquest Romanization.

Wait's comment (1985:192) that the LIA in Gaul was a period of rapid change is of course accurate. The principal post-Conquest stimulus for change was continuous contact with Rome, and as noted above, access to Mediterranean goods is also argued to have stimulated change prior to the Conquest. This leads us to consider how far religious ritual and ideology were actively influenced by Mediterranean contact prior to annexation.

This is not to attempt to isolate what King (1990:223) calls a 'purely' Celtic religion. Such an attempt is vitiated by two considerations. First, religion is not static, and internally motivated change must be anticipated. Secondly, at no point in the IA was Gaul free of access to Mediterranean contact (See e.g. Wells 1980:16-21 on Greek and Etruscan products in EIA
eastern France). But in order to maximise the data, it is valuable to examine models articulating this contact.

Many sources argue that in non-Mediterranean Gaul the main thrust of Romanization, defined by Slofstra (1983:71) as the process of change through the interaction of pre-and protohistoric societies with the Roman Empire, occurred under Augustus (Slofstra 1983, Drinkwater 1983, Millet 1990a:31). It was only with the resolution of the Civil War that attention turned seriously to the newly conquered north, marked by the Augustan re-organisation of the Gallic Provinces (27 BC). Romanization is thus principally seen as a post-Conquest issue.


Work on early contacts has centred on access to materials from the Roman world, and it is widely argued that access to such goods had important social consequences for the receiving societies, with restrictive access to imports leading to status differentiation and increasing hierarchisation (e.g. Crumley 1974, Nash 1976b, 1978a, Fitzpatrick 1989). The development of coinage, complex political organisation and nucleated settlements (Fulford 1985:104) are all argued to result from this. Crumley (1974) and Nash (1976b, 1978) argued that trade had a major social impact, stimulating early state formation in central Gaul. Nash’s (1976b, 1978a) conclusions are now questioned (Ralston 1984, Fulford 1985, Fitzpatrick 1989), and it is unlikely that the quantity of imports to the Centre was disproportionate to that received
elsewhere in Gaul (Fitzpatrick 1989:33).

At the other extreme, Fulford (1985) adopts a minimalist position to the impact of trade. He argued that four centuries of Roman trade with the Limes cannot be shown to have been an important stimulant for social change there. Thus, he suggested, it is necessary to reconsider the impact of external trade on societies that were assimilated into the Empire.

The difficulty of dating early LIA imports makes it difficult to evaluate both the dynamics of pre-Conquest trade and its impact on receiving societies (Fulford 1985:97). Fulford (1985:91) also notes that evaluation is hampered by the difficulty of differentiating between the fruits of diplomacy and war, and distinguishing traded goods from material residues arriving via non-market systems of exchange.

Despite these problems, there is growing recognition that trade between Italy and Gaul was mediated by a complicated network of separate transactions. As Fitzpatrick notes (1985:9), following Crawford (1985), goods imported to the Provincia, particularly amphorae, may relate to the supply of Romans in Gaul rather than to trade with the indigenous population (cf. also Middleton (1985) who argues that imports essentially supplied the Roman army).

Equally, in the period between the annexation of Provincia and conquest of non-Mediterranean Gaul, trade with the latter may have been mediated from the Provincia rather than from Italy. As Haselgrove emphasised (1987:110-113; 1990) much pre-Conquest contact between northern Gaul and the Roman world was probably indirect, mediated by the more developed polities of central Gaul. Throughout non-Mediterranean Gaul, imported goods could also have been channelled through existing clientage networks (Fitzpatrick 1989:43).

In summary, as Fitzpatrick emphasises, whilst the
scale of pre-Conquest trade in Italian goods in Gaul, particularly in wine (Tchernia 1983, 1986) was substantial, this was not exclusively a direct trade with Italy (1989:42). This emphasises the danger of too readily explaining change in the LIA as a result of 'pre-Roman Romanization' (Haselgrove 1984). It is not always clear whether imports to Gaul are due to Romanization or other-long term processes, and internal processes are not to be discounted as stimuli for change in the LIA.

1.4.2.1. Religion in core-periphery analyses.

The relationship between power and ideology, and the legitimisation of inequalities as manifested in exchange is central to core-periphery perspectives (Rowlands 1987:vi; 8-9). In this context, Haselgrove (1987:115-6), discussing Belgic Gaul, noted ritual features suggesting ideological manipulation consistent with an identification of sectional interests in the legitimation of the post-Conquest 'new order'. These are, continued investment in sanctuaries and the differentiation in mortuary rites which developed in northeast Gaul.

King (1990:220-241) examined the emergence of Romano-Celtic temples, cult images and dedicatory inscriptions in relation to the core-periphery model. Rowlands' criticism (1987:4) of the functionalist assumption that a periphery can simply be 'read off' by the role it plays to reproduce a centre can be levied against King, for whom the Romano-Gallic core-periphery relationship appears to function as a one-way trade in materials and concepts. As described by King (1990), the core-periphery dynamic is reduced to diffusionism.

By restricting his enquiry to the 'organisational' aspects of religion, King adopted a functionalist position, advocating a definition of religion in purely material terms (1990:221), and presupposing that material changes were not related to changing ideology ('the Romanization of Celtic religion could have acted as a
means of protecting the underlying religious beliefs' (1990:237). Though arguing that the adoption of Roman material forms was used to 'promote' the transition from Celtic to Romano-Celtic (1990:237) he does not appear to consider that such processes could have been facilitated by the assimilation of Celtic and Roman religious ideology (e.g. Haselgrove 1987:215).

Two of the 'ceremonial' forms examined by King, cult images and dedicatory inscriptions, are rightly argued to develop as a result of Classical influence prior to the Conquest of northern Gaul (1990:229-31). In both cases, however, this influence is largely confined to southern Gaul and is initially the result of a Gallo-Greek synthesis, rather than the take-up of Roman material forms. This point is not stressed by King (1990).

Equally, King ignored the infrequency of dedicatory inscription (whether Latin or Greek) prior to the late Clst BC. Even beyond the Provincia the Greek alphabet was employed for bureaucratic purposes by the time of the Gallic War (Caesar 1.29). But Greek inscriptions are rare outside the Provincia (around 50 are known from temperate France). The majority of Gallo-Greek inscriptions occur in Provincia contexts, on funerary stelae or as graffiti on pottery, and date to the C2nd-early Clst BC (King 1990:231). Although Latin inscriptions became widespread in the Provincia in the late Clst BC, this is a century after the Roman annexation. These factors could suggest a conscious rejection of the use of writing in religious contexts. Fitzpatrick (1989:43), discussing trade, stressed that this was not received passively in Gaul. Conscious decisions must have been taken to admit trade, and in some cases it was resisted (Caesar 2.15, 4.2). It is difficult to understand why, having accepted that Hellenistic influence resulted in a Gallo-Greek synthesis in southern Gaul, King (1990) sees Romanization as a culture matrix imposed on Gaul.
As many writers emphasise, Romanization is a two-way process (e.g. Millett 1990a:1-8; 1990b:37). The nature of the society which emerged from the encounter owes as much to the native as to the Roman ingredient (Slofstra 1983; Millett 1990b:37). The same may be argued for pre-Conquest contacts, which were neither as sustained nor as direct.

1.4.2.2. The LIA, change and the encounter with Rome.

Two points may be offered in summary of the above:

a. It is undeniable that LIA literature was written in a period of rapid and widespread change; the very availability of the data points to this. But as Marcus (1986:163) noted, ethnographies have always been written in the context of historical change. To assume, with Wait (1985:192), that the factor of change limits the data, is to misinterpret where its value lies.

b. The essential stimulus for literary interest in Gaul was the Roman annexation of the Provincia. Hence, data are generated at exactly the point at which Gaul was first exposed to continuous Roman contact. One value of the data lies in encoding precisely that encounter. Certainly, the textual dialogue is one-sided (2.11), but as such it forms a written expression of the relations of inequality and domination which characterise the LIA.

1.5. Religion and archaeology.

1.5.1. Religion in hierarchies of inference.

A review of literature on the archaeology of religion finds one point of consensus: that it is difficult to do. Religion and ideology were traditionally placed at the top of hierarchical scales of ascending difficulty in reconstructing aspects of the past (Hawkes 1954, Clark 1957, Piggott 1959, Childe 1956,
see Trigger 1989:262-6; 392-4). A theoretical basis for such hierarchies was more recently proposed by Friedman and Rowlands (1979:203f), who argued that a hierarchy of negative constraints determines the limit of functional compatibility between levels of social formation. As each level is semi-autonomous in that not all of its properties can be derived from those of the preceding level, there is much scope, especially at the levels of social organisation and religious beliefs, for cultural traditions and external cultural influences to shape culture patterns.

Since Hawkes' 'ladder of inference' (1954), archaeologists have debated whether this hierarchy is inherent in the nature of archaeological data. Despite processualist arguments to the contrary (Binford 1972, Miller and Tilley 1984:3), processual archaeology continues to be concerned with the lower end of the hierarchical spectrum (Trigger 1989:392). Contextual archaeology also attempts to counter the model, by identifying constraints which apply specifically to the higher levels of the hierarchy (e.g. Hodder 1982a), but the present writer follows Trigger (1989:395) in noting that contextualist progress here, dependent on the recovery of cross-cultural regularities, has been limited.

Models employing hierarchical scales of inference in archaeological interpretation suggest that access to belief systems is dependent on text. Some very recent work continues to contend that only the 'operational' forms of religion are accessible without text (e.g. King 1990:221). This position was recently re-stated by Trigger (1989:342):

"There is no evidence of techniques that would allow detailed insight into culturally specific aspects of rituals, except those associated with the direct historical approach and the use of written documents."

Others have questioned such functional divisions,
stressing that the ideological and practical are inextricably linked, and that ideology is not autonomous comment on the social (Miller & Tilley 1984, Tilley 1984, Parker Pearson 1984, Hodder 1986:esp.153-5). Whilst, on the theoretical level, this proposition is accepted here, it remains the case that in IA archaeological practice, the ideational realm has until very recently (e.g. Haselgrove 1987, Hill 1989) been approached through text rather than archaeology. Equally, in most of archaeology the ideational realm is still studied in terms of the function of symbols and rituals. Even workers advocating idealist positions tend to differentiate between the archaeological accessibility of the content of belief systems and their ‘operation’ (e.g. Braithwaite 1984:94), and most archaeological work on LIA religion, despite the availability of text, continues to centre on ritual as practice rather than as belief. Certainly, this has been the emphasis in previous archaeological approaches to the three site categories examined in the present thesis (Chapters 4-6).

It is important to stress that the notion that ideology can only be accessed through documentary evidence has resulted in the privileging of text in all aspects of the archaeology of religion. It is my purpose to show that this is particularly true for the LIA, where text is employed less to elucidate belief systems than to suggest the ritual function of material data.

1.5.2. The archaeology of LIA religion.

Levy noted a decade ago (1981:172) that the role of religious ritual in society has greatly interested prehistorians, but that the subject lacked standard definitions, methods and theoretical approaches (see also Alexander 1979:215). For prehistory, this position has been considerably modified in the last decade. For protohistory, Levy’s comment remains unfortunately relevant. Although, as discussed below, individual
excavations have prompted new approaches, syntheses for the period tend to take one of two forms:
1. Accounts of cult loci in which the religious nature of the data is taken as given (e.g. Piggott 1975, Green 1986:17-26; G.Webster 1986a:23-51). Wait (1985) is one of few syntheses to reconsider identification criteria for cult loci.

This is partly a result of the availability of text. Hill’s (1989) position that Iron Age archaeology has simply illustrated the ‘Celtic story book’ of textual evidence is a somewhat extreme expression for the nevertheless clear tendency for IA archaeology to privilege text. This has been so from Wheeler & Richardson’s (1957) Caesar-oriented hillfort research trajectory through Gosden’s (1985) use of Medieval texts to elucidate Celtic social structure. Certainly, the present writer would agree with Hill (1989) that archaeology has rarely sought to challenge the literary picture of the Celts. Whilst it has been argued here that LIA archaeology is not text-free, it is also clear that the potential of the archaeological data has not been fully explored.

Some studies have been undertaken for specific artefact or site categories. Responding to criteria outlined by Ross and Peachem (1976), Wait (1985) formulated criteria (1985:52-4, 55f) for the recognition of ‘ritual’ shafts (see Chapter 5 of the present study). Criteria for the recognition of votive metalwork deposits are formulated by Tobrügge (1970-1), Fitzpatrick (1984) and Furger-Gunti (1982), and see also Levy (1981). A series of high-profile excavations in northern France has

The latter studies, in settlement contexts, have facilitated a growing recognition that the archaeology of Iron Age ritual has for long been hampered by a false dichotomy between an 'odd' ritual and a 'normal' domestic record (Hill 1989:21; King 1990:220): ritual has not been sought in domestic space. Workers in IA ritual archaeology are rediscovering the realm of the everyday (Hill 1989; Fitzpatrick, forthcoming).

At the same time, not all ritual is concerned with the everyday: public, institutional forms of religion are frequently characterised by their apartness from everyday life (Tilley 1984). As a result, these are more easily defined archaeologically. In this context, the difficulty of distinguishing non-religious from religious ritual in the archaeology of everyday has as yet been little discussed.

This issue arises for each of the case studies performed in the present thesis. Water sources (Chapter 4), wells and shafts (Chapter 5), and rectilinear enclosures (Chapter 6) may all fulfil everyday, utilitarian roles. In discussing these site groups, it is intended to demonstrate that methodological progress concerning the differentiation between LIA ritual and utilitarian loci, and between religious and non-religious rituals, has been lacking in part because the LIA database is itself so poor.
In the light of the above discussion, a summary of the aims of this thesis may be offered.

The present study proceeds from the contention that although protohistoric archaeology requires specific methodologies, the relationship between text and archaeological evidence, which comprises protohistoric archaeology, is poorly understood. This thesis examines how this relationship functions, and is perceived to function, in the archaeology of LIA ritual.

Whilst text is often privileged in protohistoric study, the contemporary textual data have not been adequately studied. The first aim of the present study is therefore to collate and evaluate LIA textual data on religious rites and beliefs in Gaul. The data are collated in App.1 and evaluated in App.2, following procedures set out in Chapter 2. The findings are summarised in Chapter 3, which offers a statement on the nature of LIA religion as suggested by textual sources. This forms a basis both for exploitation of the full potential of the textual evidence, and for subsequent analysis of the validity of archaeological use of these data.

The second half of the thesis examines three site categories from the current LIA ritual corpus. These are: water sources (Chapter 4), wells and shafts (Chapter 5) and rectilinear enclosures (Chapter 6). The validity of the ritual interpretation afforded these loci is assessed. The archaeological criteria in each case are examined, as is the nature and extent of the use of textual data. These case studies together afford an overview of common aspects of the archaeology of LIA religious ritual. The findings are summarised in Chapter 7.

The principal methodological thrust of this thesis
is towards greater rigour in addressing the available data. First, a more rigorous approach to the textual evidence is formulated. Second, case studies performed on aspects of the existing ritual corpus demonstrate that the identification of LIA ritual is characterised by a relaxation of archaeological rigour which in many cases vitiates the identification process. As such, it must be emphasised at the outset that the methodological progress achieved here is in one sense retrograde. Three case studies are performed, and in each case it is suggested that the site category should be removed from the LIA ritual corpus.

Whilst this proposed withdrawal of site categories represents a progressive advance, in terms of future practice, it does mean that no methodologies for the positive recognition of LIA ritual are advanced here. Rather, a major contention of this thesis is that the IA data base is so poor for many of the current ‘ritual’ categories that methodological progress has been actively precluded. The identification of LIA ritual is predicated less on LIA archaeological data than on recourse to retrospective and text-led procedures discussed in Chapters 4-6. In recognising and questioning these procedures, this thesis represents a methodological advance.

At the same time, the present thesis advocates a more rigorous alternative to reliance on retrospection and text: concentration on the recognition of structured patterns of deposition, and greater chronological control over both archaeological and textual data, in the contextual integration of the two. Work on the British settlement site pit series (1.5.2) has demonstrated the value of pattern/process analysis as a basis for identifying IA ritual activity, and it is suggested that, whilst employed in the present instance to remove site categories from the current LIA ritual corpus, the combined methodology advocated by this thesis offers the
potential to permit the recognition of ritual activity in the realm of the everyday.
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2.1. **Introduction.**

It has been argued above that LIA archaeologists must prioritise LIA data (1.3). At the same time, some LIA data are more valuable than others. Data given by visitors to Gaul, for example, have greater value than data repeated by plagiarists. In assessing the value of references, the circumstances of data production are thus a vital consideration. At the same time, like any writing on the other, all Classical literature on Gaul was determined institutionally: written within specific traditions and disciplines, and for specific audiences (Clifford 1986:6). The literary record (using the term for the sum of available works by authors writing within these contexts) can only be validly employed if the role and extent of these constraints in shaping individual texts is properly understood.

The present chapter examines both these areas of influence on textual data. On the basis of this assessment, a framework of questions is constructed by which individual texts may be evaluated (2.13). Through this process of evaluation and prioritisation, it is possible to determine how the record was shaped, and to assess the validity of its components as evidence for LIA religion.

The chapter opens with a consideration of accidental as opposed to cultural lacunae (2.2), then examines (2.3-5) methods by which to maximise the linguistic, temporal and geographic indices of texts, and turns to the contexts in which the literature was produced (2.6-11); contexts of institutional constraint, but also of power (see especially 2.11). The affects of plagiarism contemporary with the LIA are summarised (2.13). Finally, on the basis of the points raised in 2.2-12, a framework of questions by which texts may be approached and evaluated is set out in 2.13.
The city of Rome is central to any discussion of the contexts informing LIA literature. Nine of the twenty-one writers in App.1. are of Roman or Latin origin, and during the 50s BC thirteen of the sources considered lived in or visited Rome (Fig.2.1). Most of the remainder had important Roman contacts. In the course of the core period the Mithridatic Wars (87-63 BC) provided a turning point in Graeco-Roman intellectual relations, and a physical expression of the infiltration of Hellenistic thought into Rome, which had begun two centuries earlier. Greek intellectuals flooded into Rome, either as prisoners (like Parthenius and Polyhistor (App.2.4 and 12)) or voluntarily, seeking new patronage after the fall of Mithridates' court and of other intellectual centres in the Greek east. The mid LIA saw the flowering of Rome as an intellectual centre, and much of the following discussion centres on writing and literary constraints within Rome itself.

2.2. Loss of texts.

The cultural constraints which shaped the content of the record also dictated its lacunae. Systematic exclusion is a feature of all ethnographic writing (Clifford 1986:6-7), and as Crumley (1974:vi) remarked, what was left unsaid in the Classical literature is nearly as important to our understanding of Roman attitudes towards the Celts as what was commented on. But the record is also shaped by accidental loss. These processes must be understood before the cultural factors shaping the extant record - as the sum of both its presences and absences - can be assessed.

Processes underlying the loss of Classical literature are well documented (Bardon 1952-6, Duval 1971) and it is proposed only to consider this subject with reference to the transmission of accounts of pagan religion.
Fig. 2.1. Greek and Roman writers present in Rome during the LIA.
2.2.1. Losses after the collapse of the Empire.

The Church was central to the framework in which the handing down of Classical literature took place after the collapse of the Empire, but the triumph of Christianity took place at the expense of pagan values and literature (Reynolds 1983:xiv). As Ireland (1986:1) emphasised, works which survived the virtual collapse of learning which attended the fall of the Empire were then: "subjected to a further and protracted period of attention in which survival became dependent upon the ability of their contents to inspire continued interest in the monks who laboured in the scriptoria of mediaeval monasteries" How far pagan religion - Celtic as well as Roman - would have been considered a suitable topic is debatable. A similar point has been made regarding monastic redaction of the vernacular traditions of Ireland and Wales (1.3.3).

2.2.2. Losses in antiquity.

An enormous amount of literature was lost in antiquity, as Reynolds (1983:xiv) noted, through natural selection and changes in literary tastes (2.9.), through fire and warfare (e.g. the destruction of the Alexandria library in 47 BC) and through the limited efficiency of the Classical book trade (Starr 1987). A number of works pertinent to the present enquiry are known to be lost (Duval 1971:49-59). The most lamented is Posidonius' History, fragments of which, repeated by later writers, suggest this to have been an important account of the Provincia. Posidonius (c. 135 BC- after 59 BC) was one of few writers who made first-hand observations in Gaul. Also lost is Quintus Cicero's (102-43 BC) epic on the Galli. Quintus had served under Caesar (with little distinction: B.G.5.37-52). A long fragment of Timagenes'
History of the Kings survives, re-written in Latin, in the writings of Ammianus Marcellinus (C4th AD) and suggests this Clst BC writer considered some aspects of Gallic ritual. The Pythagorean Symbols of Alexander Polyhistor (end C2nd-35 BC) may have discussed the druids, though probably more superficially than some commentators have argued (Chawick 1966, and App.2.4).

Finally, there are a number of potentially interesting lost texts by indigenous writers. Most well-known LIA Gallic literati were professional orators from the Provincia. More likely to have considered Gallic ritual is Publius Terentius Varro Atacinus, a Gaul from the Aude region whose Bellum Sequanum documented Caesar’s conflict with Ariovistus (61-60 BC). The Vocontian Trogus Pompey, whose Historarium Philipicarum, a history of non-Roman peoples, was adapted in the C3rd AD by Julian, discussed Gaul (App.2.21). On core period Cisalpine literary talent (principally poets of the Catullan circle) see Rankin (1987:153-165).

2.2.3. How representative is the record?

Further relevant works must have passed from all knowledge. The extent to which loss of text implies loss of new information is however debatable. Though it is impossible to establish the nature of the record in its entirety, two factors suggest that the extant data are fairly representative of the record as it stood. These are the existence of a data ‘borrowing pool’, and the various processes which undermined the impetus for first-hand data collection in core period Gaul.

The relative inaccessibility of non-Mediterranean Gaul until the mid Clst BC, and the preference for encyclopaedic works and compendia, based on synthesis of earlier texts (2.9), weakened the impetus to collect information at first-hand. This fuelled the tendency to turn to the extant literary record for second-hand data. As a result, much core period information, initially
generated by very few writers (2.12) was recycled throughout the LIA.

The major extant sources on Gaul, including Posidonius and Caesar, were clearly accessible to many LIA writers. Undoubtedly a number of texts were less accessible (e.g. Strabo’s *Geography* was lost for over a century after it was written) but other data, including old texts, (Starr 1987:216) seem to have circulated quite freely. At least four core period writers had access (though not necessarily directly) to Posidonius’ *History* (App.2.3).

Book provision may be noted in this context. Before the Clst AD book circulation largely took place through private transaction. This restricted distribution to certain elite circles, but dissemination was fairly efficient within these networks (Starr 1987). There were also important public libraries in Rome, as well as in centres of learning like Alexandria (2.12). Roman examples included the former library of Aristotle and Theophasstus, and the collection of Atticus. Lucullus’ library at Tusculum was open to all, and leading intellectuals like Cicero and Varro had personal libraries. As Dictator, Caesar hired Varro to create a public library on the Greek model, though as Starr (1987) stresses, this was not built until the 30s BC.

The accessibility of textual data, with the fact that first-hand information was generated infrequently, leads us question how much more data on Gallic religion, and most especially of a type wholly different to the extant record, would have been available.

This does not negate the importance of known non-extant texts: the Posidonian fragments, for example, hint at much valuable detail on Gallic ritual which none of the plagiarising sources has reproduced in detail. Nor, as stressed above, is it to be suggested that the corpus was ever a complete record of ritual activity in Gaul: cultural constraints, not simply accidental loss, shaped
the record’s absences. On lacunae see 3.13.

2.3. Manuscript and linguistic problems.

2.3.1. Manuscript variability.

Crumley (1974:3) noted some causes of manuscript variability:
"Classical texts may pose difficulties arising from different versions of the same passage, missing or fragmentary portions of text, errors in interpretation of translation, misquotation or even misleading abbreviation of earlier texts."

Where few manuscripts survive in the original, and where extensive copying was practised, differing versions of a manuscript may occur. Variants here- mainly due to copyist error- may often be resolved by comparing the extant versions. More problematically, differing versions of an original can occur as a result of borrowing. The corruption of plagiarised data (2.12) is a major problem, and the resolution of discrepancies amongst texts drawing on the same source is by no means as simple to achieve as both Crumley (1974:3) and Wait (1985:194) have maintained, especially where a source is non-extant.

2.3.2. Fragmentation and the loss of context.

Many core period references are fragments of lost originals, preserved as second hand plagiarisms. The temporal and geographical context of such fragments is often impossible to establish (see e.g. Sallust in Nonius Marcellus 8). Equally, the original authorial emphases of plagiarised data are missing. Kidd (forthcoming) has lamented, in this sense, the loss of context in the Posidonian fragments (App.2.3). Verbatim quotation of sources is very rare (Athenaeus purports to quote Posidonius verbatim; App.2.3), and where fragments are non-extant, a borrower’s faithfulness to his source
cannot be determined accurately. A writer’s general approach to his sources can be assessed from his use of extant works (see e.g. Diodorus, App.2.11), but this cannot presage the accuracy of individual passages.

In many genres, frequent acknowledgement of sources was considered inelegant (Rawson 1985:51). Source attestation was an exception rather than a rule, and sources often cannot be determined. Temporal complexities thus arising are enormous (2.12). Many data which appear to be an author’s own are likely to have been plagiarised. Diodorus, for example, rarely names his sources, although Bibliothekel is entirely culled from earlier works (App.2.11).

2.3.3. Linguistic context.

The complex linguistic context in which LIA literature was generated also led to textual corruptions. Data circulated in both Latin and Greek, and not all writers were bilingual. By the late C2nd BC Greek was the first language in Roman education, and most prominent Romans spoke fluent Greek; but for a long period the Greek elite saw no need to learn Latin (Balsdon 1979:125). Several core period writers had an imperfect grasp of Latin (Diodorus, e.g. learned Latin to write the Bibliothekel) and textual errors occurred as data crossed the linguistic divide (see e.g, euhages; Timagenes in Ammianus 15.9,4. App.2.14).

Gallic languages were foreign to almost all core period authors (1.4.1.1). Lack of familiarity with the language led to confusion over Gallic words, and to mistranslation. Native vocabulary caused most difficulty for writers borrowing out of Greek into Latin or vice-versa, as the writer rendered into his own language a foreign-language adaptation of an already-foreign word. Unfortunately, words thus confused are often of great interest, denoting features of Gallic religion most inexplicable to the Classical observer and hence
difficult to render via comparative interpretatio. In this context, interpretatio (2.11.1) is itself a conceptual 'translation' and is equally open to error.

2.4. Temporal considerations.

The historical context in which LIA texts were produced was considered at 1.4: here we are concerned with maximising the temporal indices of the texts themselves. LIA writing on Gaul rarely takes explicit account of the historical contexts of its production, and whilst a few texts contain explicit information on changes in practices, this is rare. The motivation, where this does occur, is often political, and the veracity of the data problematic (3.9.2 on human sacrifice). Other approaches are required to maximise the temporal potentials of texts.

The core period parameters of 120 BC - 21 AD embrace the period from the annexation of Provincia through the Augustan administrative reforms. The date of composition of a text is thus important: Posidonius visited Gaul in c. 100 BC, and some of his historical data concern Middle La Tène Iron Age peoples (App.2.3). Strabo's Geography was completed some 120 years later, and incorporated Augustan data. As a complication, some texts were compiled over long periods (Strabo, e.g. uses Posidonian as well as Augustan data (App.2.18), and the prevalence of plagiarism means there is often a significant time lapse between the date at which information was generated and at which it was reproduced.

For temporal, as well as spatial, considerations it is necessary to distinguish data on the Provincia from those on non-Mediterranean Gaul. The Provincia was annexed in c. 118 BC, following five centuries of Greek influence. Non-Mediterranean Gaul was not annexed for a further seventy years. As evidence for insular practices, a text on the Provincia from 14 AD is clearly of less value than one on non-mediterranean Gaul from c.
50 BC. Equally, the differential rate of Romanisation in these areas (1.4) means the data are not simply interchangeable as indices to the development of Gallo-Roman religion. A major limitation, in both contexts, is the lack of data on non-Mediterranean Gaul (Wait 1985:192). Both before and after the Gallic War, the record is greatly biased towards the Provincia. Greek influence on religion here has been well documented (e.g. Benoit 1955) and the data, particularly for Massilia and its hinterland, should be seen as regionally specific.

2.5. Geographical considerations.

Crumley (1974:4) suggested that for Classical authors:

"Reliability can be ascertained by using geography as a constant, comparing Classical descriptions of a region with what is known now."

The prevalence of plagiarism negates this premise: Strabo, whom Crumley describes as "reliable and observant" did not visit most of the countries he describes (contra Crumley 1974:6 there is no evidence to suggest he visited Gaul). Testimonies most likely to be reliable are those of writers who visited Gaul. A severe limitation of the literature is that few did. Of the twenty-one writers considered, only three (Artemidorus, Posidonius and Caesar) certainly visited Gaul. For plagiarising authors, reliability largely depends on their faithfulness to the sources used (2.13).

A feature of the literature (as of modern use of it) is the tendency for plagiarists to ignore the geographic specifics of borrowed text. This is most clearly manifested as the generalisation of data specific to the Provincia. Posidonian data, for example, based on observations made in and around Massilia, were presented as pan-Gallic by writers like Diodorus who borrow from this source (App.2.11). Given the highly localised nature of developments in the Provincia, such
generalisations may well be erroneous. In many cases, it is impossible to demonstrate that data are misleadingly generalised, though we may suspect it. Many references offer no spatial context at all (data being simply given of ‘the Celts’). It is likely that some of this information was originally geographically specific. Inconsistent use of the terms Keltoi, Galatai and Galli (Duval 1974), sometimes even within individual texts, also creates confusion here.

The generalisation of geographically specific data is one of a variety of factors which enforced the minimalisation of observed differences and contributed to the standardisation of the record for Gaul.

For much of the core period, accurate data on the geography of non-Mediterranean Gaul, in particular, was limited. Even when data were available, plagiarising writers often reproduced out-dated information, ignoring more recent findings. Strabo, writing under Augustus, believed that the Pyrenees ran from north to south, parallel with the Rhine, and made several mistakes regarding Gallic rivers (App.2.18). Diodorus (5.23, 32) retained the early belief that Celtic lands extended as far as Scythia, and depicted as Celtic tribes which his contemporaries stated to be Germanic (cf. Tierney 1960:200). Outmoded geographical concepts influenced, in particular, discussion of Gallic origins and of Celtic migrations. Such views principally affect the geographical setting of data, and can often be resolved.

A number of core period references do not apply to Gaul, but are important both as a valuable source when examining regional variations in practices, and for consideration of the nature and rate of Classical influence on peoples exposed to this on a variety of levels. References to Celtic areas outside Gaul have thus been included, but attention is drawn to their limited value.
2.6. Greeks and Romans: different approaches?

Balsdon notes (1979:30):
"For the broad mass of contemporary Greeks the
majority of Romans had at all times in their history
felt unbridled contempt. Yet at the same time,
confronted by the spectre of Greek genius, the
Romans had a profound inferiority complex; if
they despised the Greeks, the Greeks, they
knew, despised them as much."

Despite this well documented differentiation, and the
fact that by the core period the Greeks were subjects of
Rome, a noticeable feature of much archaeological
handling of texts on Gaul has been the assumption that a
single, Graeco-Roman viewpoint on the barbaroi existed,
negating the need to distinguish between Greek and Roman
sources. This over-simplification ignores the fact that
almost all ethnographic data of LIA and earlier date were
generated by Greeks. Twelve of the writers considered
here, including two of the three known first-hand
observers of LIA Gaul-Posidonius and Athenaeus- were
Greek. It is necessary to address both the underlying
causes of this Greek-led data collection process, and the
concomitant conclusion that Greek attitudes to the
barbaroi were not identical with those of Rome.

2.6.1. Interest in ethnography.

Following annexation of the Provincia, Rome was well
placed to acquire ethnographic data for herself. The
fact that data were largely generated, and perpetuated,
by Greeks (1.4.1.5) is thus significant. One explanation
is that ethnography was simply of less interest to the
Romans. As Rawson (1985:257) noted, there appear to have
been no special studies, in Latin, of any barbarian
peoples. She suggested (1985:64) that by 1st BC the
Romans had little serious interest in the barbaroi. This
is not to deny that most Greek accounts were written with
a Latin as well as Greek readership in mind, or the
possibility (1.4.1.5) that Greek explorations of Gaul were sponsored by Roman interests. Rather, Rawson’s point stresses Roman contentment to rely on Greek ethnographic enquiry: a tendency fuelled by disinterest in ethnography for its own sake, the causes for which lay in Romans’ pride in their own shedding of the barbarian mantle and a preoccupation with measuring their culture against that of the Greeks alone (Rawson 1985:62-4).

The strong tradition of Greek ethnography must also have contributed to this process. Ethnography, like geography, had long been the province of the Greeks. The umbrella of the ‘ethnographic formula’ under which many core period writers laboured to some degree (2.10) had originated with Herodotus in the C5th BC and continued to flourish. It is perhaps unsurprising that Roman writers so readily relied on Greek ethnography: as Strabo (3.1,19) remarks on the Roman portrayal of alien societies:

"the Roman writers are imitators of the Greeks and they do not carry their imitations too far, for what they relate they translate from the Greeks".

But at the same time, this disinterest in first-hand data collection, as Rawson (1985) implies, says much regarding Roman attitudes to non Graeco-Roman culture.

Momigliano’s (1975:65-6, 121-2) suggestion that Greeks, as the traditional ethnographers, were employed to collect geographical and ethnographical material at the Roman behest has been considered elsewhere (1.4.1.5). Certainly, the annexation of the Provincia was instrumental in creating new interest in Gaul among the Greeks, and when Momigliano states that "Posidonius wrote because of the Roman progress in Spain and Gaul" (1975:68) he is correct in the sense that Posidonius’ interest was stimulated by Roman actions in Gaul. More contentious is Momigliano’s suggestion that the impetus for Posidonius’ travels was a wish "to preserve the physiognomy of a world in danger of disappearing"
(1975:69). Momigliano implies that Posidonius ignored indications of changes brought about by Roman occupation, and gave an erroneously archaic picture of Gaul. There is no justification for this view. Momigliano cites the quasi-legendary tale of Luvernius in support of it (App.2.3), but Posidonius was, after all, writing an History, and the surviving fragments disprove the assertion that he was unwilling to record change (App.2.3).

2.6.2. Attitudes to the barbaroi.

We may have expected that the Greek portrayal of other peoples, like themselves subject to Rome, would be both anti-Roman and present alien peoples sympathetically. With reference to the former, however, there is little to suggest that any of the Greeks noted here produced anti-Roman literature (see Balsdon 1979:182ff). In part this may reflect the dependent status of many Greek writers.

The dependency of Greek writers on the Roman aristocracy is a characteristic of the relationship between Greek intellectuals and Rome (see papers in Gold 1982). From the C2nd BC it was customary for distinguished Romans, eager to utilise the intellectual services provided by Greeks, to take Greek intellectuals into their homes as personal friends, but at the same time as dependents, and during the core period the Mithraic Wars saw a new surge of Greeks offering their services as educators to the Roman elite (2.1). Dependent status was a factor in the clientela systems of Greeks and Romans (Gold 1982, Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984), and artistic patronage sometimes led to partisan writing on behalf of patrones. Caesar and Pompey were among the foremost mid C1st BC Roman literary patrons, and Caesar, especially, cultivated minor figures like Hirtius (App.2.9) and Varro Atticanus as publicists. For Williams (1982:10-13), the mid core period sees a new era
of political literary patronage, ushered in by Caesar.

But for Greek writers, dependency involved more than literary patronage. The situation is best expressed by Wiseman's remark (1982:34) that for Greek poets in the late Republic "the question of social definition is comparatively straightforward since dependent status was inherent in their very Greekness". This is unlikely to promote publically expressed anti-Roman sentiment. Timagenes, for example, an Alexandrian brought to Rome as a slave in 55 BC (App.2.14), was not a lover of all things Roman (asked why he cried on seeing a burning house in Rome, Timagenes' answer was, because a bigger one would be built in its place). Yet his position was a delicate dependant one unlikely to have been jeopardised on his part by blatantly anti-Roman writing.

For the majority of Greek writers, ideological identification with the success of Rome negated the prospect of anti-Roman feeling. Momigliano (1975) stressed that the large-scale infiltration of Hellenistic thought and custom into the Roman world in the C3rd and 2nd BC provided a common basis of understanding for Greek and Roman intellectuals. Equally, by the C1st BC the interests of the Greek upper classes were intimately tied to the survival of the Empire. The literary outcome is implicitly pro-Roman writing with a particular slant regarding conquered peoples.

Momigliano (1975:22-49) has emphasised that Greek writers like Polybius and Posidonius, who implicitly accepted Roman rule, nevertheless criticise some aspects of the treatment of conquered peoples. Polybius, for example, criticises Roman behaviour after the defeat of Carthage and Corinth, and Posidonius the evil of chattel-slavery, the conduct of Rome during the Sicilian slave revolt, and the extortion of Provincial governors (see Momigliano 1975). These criticisms, not of the actuality of Roman rule but of the conduct of it, contain a common thread of concern with the abuse of power by Rome. This
particular stress, which is not simply a plea for a lenient handling of the Provinces but a direct expression of Greek upper class concern that the Empire on which its survival depended should not be destabilised by its own actions (Momigliano 1975), is a notable feature of Greek, as compared to Roman writing, of the period, but is unlikely to colour accounts of ritual practice.

2.6.3. Emphases in religious thought.

Despite the common basis of understanding stressed by Momigliano (1975) and others, certain Greek concepts were liable to promote differential reporting on alien religions. The most obvious is that Greek authorities employ Greek interpretatio. Many workers assume that Greek and Roman divine names are interchangeable (cf. the frequent assertion that Polybius (2.32,6) refers to a Celtic Minerva; in fact he mentions Athena). This modern interpretatio denies the complexities of Graeco-Roman divine equations, and the possibility that the choice of a Greek interpretatio may have been a deliberate statement on divine function.

A second factor is the strong Greek interest in the absence of anthropomorphism in primitive deity worship (Rankin 1987:51). Debate as to the appropriateness of anthropomorphism in Greek and Roman religion was principally conducted before the LIA. Interest in barbarian antipathy to anthropomorphism nevertheless continued, in some contexts in relation to primitivist theses (2.8.1). It is interesting to note that almost all references to Gallic divine imagery occur in Latin texts (3.11), and that a denial of anthropomorphism among the Celts is offered by the Greek Diodorus (22.9,4).

2.7. Philosophy.

Contemporary philosophical systems, and widely-diffused Greek theories on the origins and development of the human race, influenced attitudes towards alien
societies and religions. In considering these with reference to Gaul, we shall begin with the former. Some general comments may be offered first.

Ferguson (1985:211) remarked that ancient religions were in general accommodating of each other. The intermarriage of Roman and Greek belief systems and pantheons which took place before the core period (see e.g. Ferguson 1982), and the extraordinary mobility of theologies and cult associations which characterise Graeco-Roman religion, were predicated on concepts of religious tolerance which are clearly important in considering Graeco-Roman attitudes towards alien cults.

Freedom of religious opinion had been a basic feature of Greek thought in the three centuries after Plato. Rome, too, had an inherited dislike of religious exclusiveness (Ogilvie 1969, Rankin 1987:288), and operated in an ideology according to which a state protected its own gods. This in turn presupposed a society which recognised foreign gods, and in the Roman world "every man was free to define the nature of the gods as he wished" (Henig 1986:159). This was principally expressed through the equation of deities (2.11.1), and it is as well to stress here that, in a context of domination such as prevailed for post-Conquest Gaul, the syncretistic process was as much a reinforcement of Roman power claims as an expression of individual freedom of religious choice (see 2.11.1).

The principal overt constraints on religious tolerance were Roman antiquarianism, insisting that traditional rites were to be preserved (Henig 1984:37, 1986:159) and the proviso that state interests should not be compromised.

During the early Principate, the cult of the deified Emperor spread to the West and gradually superseded the official state religion, the cult of the Capitoline Triad. The Imperial cult was introduced in the West by Augustus as a method of Provincial control (Webster
1986a:137), acceptance of the cult being regarded by Rome as acceptance of the will of the State. The cult was first formalised in Gaul, with the establishment of the Altar and Temple to Rome and the Divine Caesar at the confluence of the Rhône and Sâone near Lyon (Walker and Desbat 1981, Webster 1986a) in 12 BC: LIA writers refering to this event are Livy (Periocha 139) and Strabo (4.3,2). Subsequently, the cult was rigorously imposed on the Provinces (including Britain, Tacitus, Annales 14). Under the early Empire, measures were directed against cults perceived to defy the State by refusing to recognise the Imperial cult. Such persecution was hence largely politically motivated, rather than inspired by a sense of barbarian impietas. Judaism is one example, and state proscription of the druids of Gaul and Britain has sometimes been seen in this context, or as otherwise politically motivated.

2.7.1. Stoicism.

Stoic thought is sometimes said to be a tangible influence on accounts of Gaul (see e.g. Tierney 1960:223). From C2nd BC Stoic philosophy became increasingly popular in Rome, largely due to Panaetius, the Greek head of the Stoa who arrived in Rome in 143 BC with Scipio Africanus and began the "humanisation" (Armstrong 1957:141) of Stoic philosophy which, fortuitously, made it attractive to the Roman elite. The system already held a number of attractions: the belief that the world was ruled by Providence was obviously appealing to the ruling class of a ruling people, and Panaetius made Stoic ethics less austere by laying greater emphasis on the relative value of external goods and pleasures (Armstrong 1957:143). Concerning religion, Panaetius was one of the first Stoics to drop the theory of world conflagration, and doubted the validity of divination (on these, see below). Posidonius, Panaetius' pupil, continued to modify the system, incorporating
elements of Platonic doctrine such as the theory of tripartite psychology, and laid greater emphasis on the organic unity of the world. He was more concerned with the "whole" than with the description of separate elements of it and to this end was very interested in causation. This led him on the one hand to an interest in phenomena - an interest of which the more orthodox Strabo disapproved (see Sandbach 1975:131) - and on the other to the view that events were caused by human psychology (Sandbach 1975:132). The latter had a tangible effect on his ethnographic work, in that he attempted to rationalise the behaviour of peoples as the product of national characteristics (Kidd forthcoming). It is this causational factor which is missing in the work of those who borrow from Posidonius. Some hint of its effects may be seen by comparing his account of the aurum Tolosanum with that of Timagenes, both preserved by Strabo (4.1.13). As Kidd (forthcoming) suggests, Timagenes account is both credulous and superstitious, but the Posidonian account is the work of a rationalist, replacing the legend of disaster through sacrilege with an explanation on social historical grounds.

This aetiological stress cannot be called a feature of 'Stoic' writing; it is a feature of Posidonius' brand of stoicism. Those writers who argue that 'Stoicism' has influenced accounts of Gallic religion are in fact mainly concerned with Posidonius' writings, and it is as well to note that the stresses in his work are highly individual.

The principal area in which Stoic interests have been argued to transform data into a "Stoic fiction" (Tierney 1960:223) is in the portrayal of Gallic philosophy, particularly with reference to the druids and cosmological tenets regarding life after death. Strabo's reference to Gallic belief in world conflagration (4.4.4.) is also often heralded as a blatant 'stoicism'. This was however a concept which the Middle Stoa had rejected.
2.7.2. **Other systems.**

The Stoa drew many of its tenets from Cynicism. Never a School proper, and so exhibiting great variety, Cynicism’s two main tenets were self-sufficiency, independent of material goods, and the belief that the norm in life lay in conformity to nature (Lovejoy and Boas 1935:119-20). These twin beliefs were of course the backbone of Cynic primitivism. By the Clst BC Cynicism was manifested mainly as an extreme wing of Stoicism (Armstrong 1957). Epicureanism also enjoyed a period of great success in Rome in the Clst BC. Epicureans recognised pleasure as the greatest good and highest aim of man, but were concerned with pleasure as a negative concept; freedom from pain and difficulty, and stability in life. Epicurus advocated that his followers should take no part in public life, but many Clst BC Romans ignored this tenet, and it was by no means impossible for the patrons and writers of literature to embrace Epicureanism: thus Cicero (Tusc. Disp. 5.) is a major source on Epicureanism.

Shortly before the LIA (130 BC) the Academy, rejecting Scepticism, had adopted a more positivist stance, concentrating on the systematisation of Plato’s thought. The Clst BC-2nd AD saw a revival of Platonism (Armstrong 1957:146-56), influenced by Aristotelian theory, which itself saw a new lease of life at the Peripatetic School (Andronicus’ editing of Aristotle occurs in this context: App.2.5).

The late Republic and early Empire is characterised by frequent modification of systems of thought, with individual Schools embracing aspects of other philosophies. Many writers of the period were true eclectics in that their philosophy was a combination of the aspects which attracted them from all the schools. Cicero, for example (App.2.7), professed himself a Cynic but was equally influenced by other Schools, and is generally regarded as an eclectic.
2.7.3. The philosophical critique of religion.

In the core period, as before it, the philosophical critique of religion was mainly confined to Graeco-Roman cults. But by the early Empire criticism of foreign cults—especially in Rome—was common (Attridge 1978: see Suetonius *Nero* 56; Juvenal *Satire* 6.511-2; 14.96-106; Pliny 2.5.21), and it is necessary to consider how the critique of religion by the individual schools may have influenced accounts of barbarian religion.

Of the systems considered, Stoicism (with the neo-Pythagoreans) embraced the most positivist theology, advocating an enlightened philosophical approach to religion, and embracing pantheistic monotheism. Radical cynicism, embraced by several systems, obviously took a more negative approach, and tended to be very critical of divination. In the late Republic, this topic continued to arouse interest and controversy, and by the Augustan era a considerable body of data existed on augural lore, including works by A. Caecina, Ap. Claudius, Varro (App.2.6) and Cicero (App.2.7), whose *De Divinatione*, written to disprove the possibility of divination, considered augury among the barbaroi, including the Gauls and Galatians.

A common thread in the work of writers adhering to all the systems above is a criticism of 'superstition', focusing on the impropriety of mythology, the absurdities of images, and on the aesthetic and moral repulsiveness of sacrifice. These themes are all potentially influential in attitudes towards barbarian religion. On sacrifice in Gaul see 3.9 and on images 3.11. Superstition and credulity are commonly attributed to the Gauls (e.g. Caesar 6.16,1).

2.8. Primitivism.

Throughout the Classical period, primitivism, the recurrent notion of a life of simplicity and value
influenced the depiction of earlier societies and contemporary alien societies. Following Piggott (1968), who offered a somewhat different perspective on the notion, primitivism has been seen as an important biasing factor in accounts of Gallic religion, particularly of the Druids.

The major study of Classical primitivism is Lovejoy and Boas (1935), who distinguish between two forms of primitivism; chronological and cultural. Chronological primitivism is a "philosophy of history as to the time at which the most excellent condition of human life, or best state of the world in general, may be supposed to occur" (Lovejoy and Boas 1935:1). Cultural primitivism on the other hand stems from the discontent of the civilised with civilisation, and is a belief that the simple life is more desirable than the current civilised state. Sometimes the two forms function together, when the exemplars of the simple life are perceived as having existed at the beginning of time, but frequently cultural primitivism, by perceiving such exemplars to exist in the present, among the barbaroi, stands apart from chronological primitivism.

Lovejoy and Boas (1935:9-11) go on to distinguish two types of cultural primitivism, hard and soft. The soft outlook arises from a reaction to the restrictive moral codes of one's own society: the allure of a society which does not impose such restrictions, and which, in addition, has a minimum of mental and physical toil. These conditions are perceived to exist in barbarian societies, which are extolled on that basis. Hard primitivism on the other hand arises from the view that the manifestly harder life of some uncivilised peoples is in fact a better life than that of the civilised observer. It is assumed that the life of poverty of barbarian peoples arises because they have fewer desires. Consequently, hard primitivism appealed to "practicers of the ethics of renunciation, of austerity, of self-
discipline." (Lovejoy and Boas 1935:11).

Hard and soft primitivism are profoundly different outlooks on barbarian life; one emphasising the virtues of the ease of such a life, and the other extolling the virtues of the simplicity and austerity of it. In the portrayal of barbarian societies they lay emphasis on very different aspects of those societies; but the idealisation is always essentially favourable. It is unusual for one alien people to be an exemplar for both hard and soft primitivist thinkers. The Scythians are constantly portrayed in hard primitivist terms, whereas the imaginary Hyperboreans are always portrayed as soft primitives.

In 1966 Chadwick argued for two separate literary traditions about the druids of Gaul, the first "Posidonian" (Posidonius and later writers felt to be drawing on him), the second "Alexandrian" (1st AD and later writers felt to be drawing on texts contemporary or earlier than Posidonius, but in a separate tradition: App.2.4). Chadwick divided these writers into traditions on the grounds of emphasis: the former group, reserved about the druids, concentrating on their part in sacrifices, the later, extolling the druids, concentrating on their teaching (1966:59, 90). Piggott (1968:102-3) went a stage further and viewed the "Posidonian" group as hard primitivist" and the "Alexandrians as soft. In the present writer's view Piggott was in error.

Piggott assumed that a soft primitivist stance is one of approval, while a hard primitivist stance is one of disapproval. This is also followed by Crumley (1974:3-4, 82-6), who refers to hard primitivists as those who "gave the Celts no quarter, but held a grudging admiration for a number of their virtues" (1974:3), and Wait (1985:193), who refers to the "stance of unflattering disapproval" of hard primitivists. It is now widely held that the hostile tone of the so-called
Posidonian School (principally Strabo, Diodorus and Caesar) is explicable as a hard primitivist trait (Wait 1985:193, Crumley 1974:4), but these views show a misunderstanding of hard primitivist motivation. To the hard primitivist, as for the soft the barbarian is an exemplar, for the hard primitivist "because he wanted less and therefore knew how to be content with little" (Lovejoy and Boas 1935:10).

Hard primitivism is not to be equated with criticism. This is not to suggest that hard primitivist descriptions of barbarian life are wholly eulogistic-they often express disapproval for aspects of barbarian life- but simply to stress that hostile accounts of the Gauls cannot be said to be hard primitivist simply because of their critical tone. Hostility may arise for a variety of reasons. Eulogy of the Celts was in any case unlikely to occur during a period of conquest, and the history of conflict between the Celts and the Classical world was equally unlikely to promote flattering idealisations of the former.

Piggott (1968) has not considered that the prospect of primitivist idealization influencing accounts of Gaul after 125 BC must have decreased as direct contact between Rome and Gaul steadily increased. Lovejoy and Boas (1935:8) state:

"the cultural primitivist’s model of human excellence is sought in the mode of life of existing primitive or so-called savage peoples. These contemporary embodiments of the ideal have usually been found among races not intimately known to, and existing at some considerable distance from, the people to whom the preacher of primitivism commends them."

One may ask how far these criteria apply to LIA Gaul, which during core period became part of the Roman Empire. Lovejoy and Boas (1935:315-44) demonstrate that the hard Primitivist romanticisation of the Scythians, for example, decreased as first-hand knowledge of the
Scythians increased. In LIA Gaul, as later in Germany (see Lovejoy and Boas on Tacitus Germania 4) greater familiarity may be argued to reduce the role of primitivism in biasing the literary record.

Hard primitivism did however play an important part in Stoic thought. The Cynics and Stoics were the chief promoters of hard primitivism because they found in certain barbaroi the exemplification of the type of virtue they preached and the evidence that the practice of these virtues was the life secundum naturam (Lovejoy and Boas 1935). Posidonius, who wrote an influential account of Gaul, was also the foremost Stoic philosopher of his generation. Should we thus expect the existence of a hard primitivist Posidonian tradition, as Piggott would argue?

In answer to this question it must be emphasised that there was no Stoic primitivist orthodoxy. It is clear that in Posidonius' work, on which Piggott's "hard" primitivist tradition depends, the spirit of cultural primitivism was considerably relaxed. Assuming that the "idealizing" tendencies in the (presumed: see App. 2.3) Posidonian treatment of the druids as philosophers were not a hard primitivist feature, Piggott (1968:100-1) attempted to attribute this to a soft primitivist streak in Posidonius' thinking. Thus the writer whom Piggott considers the original exponent of the hard primitivist tradition of writing on Gaul is at the same time held to be responsible for that aspect of writing on the druids which in Piggott's (1968) view is directly attributable to soft primitivist thinking.

In fact it is difficult to see why interest in the druids as philosophers should be equated with "soft" primitivism. If it is to be fitted into primitivist schemes at all, it would be more likely to appeal to chronological primitivist thought.

In the present writer's view, little core period data on Gallic religion can be shown to have acquired bias
simply from primitivist influences. Many of the *topoi* which recur as *Wandermotive* (2.8.2) in accounts of barbarian peoples of course have roots in primitivist thinking, but when such themes occur for LIA Gaul, dismissing these as primitivist fictions is often too simplistic an approach. For example, barbarian courage was an established primitivist *topos* (see e.g. Aristotle *Politics* 1324 b) and the theme occurs frequently in accounts of Gaul. However, it is likely that its recurrence owes more to first hand experience, following centuries of warfare with Celtic peoples, than to primitivist idealisation.

Some widespread *topoi* concerning barbarian religion may be noted in this context. It was widely held that primitive peoples worshipped the moon, stars and natural forces as opposed to anthropomorphs (Rankin 1987:50); the *topos* occurs, for example in Caesar’s account of the *Germani* (B.G. 6.21), but does not surface in the extant core-period record for the better-known Gauls. The related *topos* that barbarians worshipped without such artificialities as temples and images (Rankin 1987:50) interestingly only emerges in the post LIA record for Gaul (3.13.1). During the LIA references to formal cult *foci* (in so far as implied via *interpretatio*), and to images, occur fairly frequently.


As a generalising thesis, primitivism is one of many factors which contributed to the standardisation of the literary record. Concepts were thought to hold good for many barbarian peoples, and were widely applied, whether or not they are relevant to specific peoples. Generalising theories on the *barbaroi* are one factor (paucity of data is another) which ensured that statements were frequently transferred from one people to another. This process of *Ethnographische Wandermotive* has been argued by Norden (1920) to be a prevalent
feature of the Greek ethnographic tradition, and one which, through the constant transference of information, is much responsible for the increasing stylisation of ethnographic literature over time.

Whilst the transference of data from one people to another is often recognisable, the development of 'motifs' specific to the Gauls (and transferred temporally rather than spatially) is more difficult to recognise.

The question as to what constitutes a "motif" in ethnographic literature on Gaul is a difficult one. Tierney (1960:203) has argued that Gallic *clientela* is a literary motif which Caesar takes from the work of Posidonius. It is difficult to see what Tierney understands as motif here: Tierney suggests that Caesar's account of *clientela* is based on an original (postulated) account by Posidonius; this had been impressive in Caesar's eyes and he had repeated and elaborated it. Tierney appears to argue that information of a similar type occurring in a number of sources is a "motif" for which a single source was originally responsible: in other words, he defines a motif as frequently recurring material from a common source; but in an era of plagiarism, frequent occurrence is not in itself a definition of a literary motif. Nash argued (1976a:116-8) that to designate information as a "motif" it is necessary to show that it is repeated for reasons of literary convention: this is not demonstrable in the case of Gallic *clientela*.

The erroneous employment of the idea of motif can lead to the devaluing of material. Tierney (1960) suggested that Caesar borrowed the *clientela* theme from an earlier writer; he fails to consider that as a first-hand observer of Gaul, Caesar could have observed the workings of *clientela* for himself and as Nash (1976a:117) has argued, was not borrowing this information at all. Tierney (1960:203) is relying on the concept of motif to
facilitate an argument that Caesar borrowed most of the data in *The Gallic War*. (Similarly, with reference to *Wandermotif*, the view that the extant LIA accounts of the Druids as philosophers are based on a lost Posidonian account predicated on the ‘Golden Age’ motif (App.2.3) has meant that Caesar’s account of the druids (App.2.8) has consistently been devalued, though Caesar is one of the best-placed sources on LIA Gaul.

Recognising motif is not a simple process, but there are a number of ways in which it is possible to see this bias factor at work. Nash (1976a:116) remarked of Tierney (1960) that in considering ethnographic accounts he failed to distinguish between the subject matter of ethnography and the accounts themselves. It is by adopting the principle advocated by Nash (1976a), and recognising that some accounts were written in circumstances which make them more valuable than others, that something may be done to establish whether information of the motif type was relevant to Gaul, and also to estimate the chronological parameters of that relevance.

Two points remain. First, the frequent transference of data from the *Provincia* to non-mediterranean Gaul is a form of *Wandermotif*; secondly, the information next most likely to attach itself to Gaul concerns other Celtic peoples. Indeed, many writers did not perceive differences between the various Celtic groups to exist. (In this same way, the *terror Gallicus* affects texts on Gaul although the Celts who inspired it had not been Gallic: 2.9.2). Classical writing on Celtic peoples presupposed, and hence created, group characteristics rather than regional traits, and often failed to recognise the latter. These factors again contribute to a stylised portrayal of Gallic peoples in text.

2.9. *Literary tastes under the late Republic and Early*
Empire.

The subject matter of a text, and the general literary interests of a writer were of course basic influences on his choice of data. These factors were in turn influenced by literary tastes, and were important controls both on the types of data collected by first hand observers, and perhaps more so on the information which plagiarising writers would choose to extract from the available texts. The extent to which the character and content of the record is shaped by literary preferences in the period is thus considerable.

Rawson's comment (1985:250) that under the late Republic ethnography and geography enjoyed something of a Golden Age through the works of Polybius, Artemidorus and Posidonius requires qualification. First, after Posidonius' era there appears to have been little impetus for serious ethnographic study of Gaul. Secondly, and more significantly for our purposes, ethnography did not exist as a genre in its own right.

One manifestation of the intellectual curiosity which characterises the Late Republic (Ogilvie 1980) was a trend towards encyclopaedic works, encouraging the production of syntheses on a variety of subjects. This genre, largely taken over by professional scholars, is typified by the intellectual "tours de force" of Varro (App.2.6) and the spate of encyclopaedic works like Diodorus' Bibliotheca. A new genre of the period, biography (Momigliano 1971), may also be seen in this context (Nepos, App.2.10).

The Late Republic also saw a growing interest in recent history, as opposed to the quasi-mythological, annalistic histories of Rome which characterised the C2nd BC. This new emphasis was stimulated by recent political and military events, and by the writings of Polybius (c. 200-118 BC). The genre attracted serious scholars, who made increasing use of archival records. Five of the texts considered here are historical, and the new genre
of the commentarius, ostensibly a straightforward reportage of contemporary events to be used as source material by historians (App. 2.8), and first employed by Caesar and Hirtius, can also be seen in this context.

2.9.1. Writing histories.

The popularity of historiography has numerous repercussions for writing on Celtic peoples. One result is that many data of LIA date potentially concern earlier Celts. Livy’s Ab Urbe Condita, Diodorus’ Bibliotheca, and numerous other texts contain historical data of this type, not directly relevant to the core period date parameters. As the prevalence of plagiarism means that the same may also be said of other core period texts (which purport to be contemporary but borrow from earlier literature), and because it is to be expected that writers like Livy apply contemporary values to their sources (see App.2.17), historical texts remain of some value. Their principal limitation is that most concern Celts who had entered the Classical arena somewhat earlier than the Gauls; the Cisalpine Celts, the Celtiberians and the Galatian tribes of Asia Minor.

Accounts of these peoples appeared mainly as a by-product of the narration of the rise of Rome. Shortly before the core period, Polybius had documented Rome’s dealings with the Cisalpine Celts. Livy also wrote on the wars against the Cisalpine Celts, including the sack of Rome in 390 BC (nine of Livy’s eleven references to Celtic religion occur in these contexts: App.2.17) and Diodorus also covered the dies ater and Celtic incursions into Greece (App.2.11). Finally, Posidonius’ ethnography forms part of an historical narrative of the first Transalpine War (125-121 BC). Some of the Posidonian fragments (App.2.3) are historical in context.

2.9.2. The terror Gallicus: past prejudice and present text.
A long history of troubled interaction with Celtic peoples fostered fear and prejudice among both Greeks and Romans, the distillation of which is apparent in texts appearing throughout the core period, and even beyond (see e.g. Drinkwater (1983:42, 48) on Tacitus’ account of the Vindex revolt).

The Celts who had settled in the Po Valley from the C4th BC (Barfield 1971, Peyre 1979, Pauli 1980), and had invaded Anatolia as a by-product of incursions into Greece in C3rd BC (Mitchell 1986, Rankin 1987:188-207) were almost certainly not principally from Gaul (see e.g. Powell 1980, Pauli 1981, Peyre 1979). Genuine confusion—some of it etymological (Duval 1971)—as to the origins of Celtic peoples, coupled with Wandermotif (2.8.2), meant that such equations were widely made (on the Gallic origins of the tribes who invaded Italy see Livy 5.34.1, and, contra, Polybius 2.15). In this way, and as a result of the ageless racist tendency to equate all those of presumed shared ethnic origin, the Gallic keltoi were widely seen as perpetrators of these events.

Whilst it was precisely for this reason that the Gauls fared better than most barbaroi in exciting Roman literary interest (Rawson 1985:259), the portrayal of contemporary Gauls was at the same time affected. That centuries of conflict had inspired real fears cannot be doubted. Such emotive blackspots as the dies ater of 390 BC (the Celtic sack of Rome) and the threat to Delphi in 278 BC (Walbank 1957, Hornblower 1981, Rankin 1987), coupled with first hand experience of Celtic ferocity in battle during the Cisalpine wars, lent the Celts an aura which, whilst sometimes invoked as a propagandist tool by the C1st BC (witness Cicero’s deliberate re-raking of the terror Gallicus in Pro Fonteio: App.2.7), was writ large in the popular imagination.

Appeals to the terror Gallicus are often easy to identify in the Classical literature, and their effects on individual texts well understood (see e.g. Cicero Pro
A more insidious effect of the terror Gallicus lies in its contribution to the tendency for writers to rely heavily on outdated material. LIA Celts were constantly described by reference to the past.

2.9.3. The absence of ethnographies.

Despite the keen interest in history, little was written on the recent history of foreign peoples. Ethnography, as noted, did not exist as a subject in its own right. The early Hellenistic period had seen a renewal of the Herodotean logos (see below) and hence a revival of the relationship between history, geography, and ethnography (Murray 1972). Such was the context of ethnographic writing throughout the core period, tending either to be combined with geography (where the popularity of the periplus form meant that writers covered too large an area to avoid superficiality—see Artemidorus and Strabo. App.2.2, 18), or being treated as an adjunct of history (Rawson 1985:250-266): Posidonius’ ethnography, from Book 23 of his History, is a case in point.

As a result, one of the most serious limitations of the LIA literary record lies less in the fact that no extant ethnography of Gaul survives, but that no work devoted entirely to this topic appears to have been written. None of the major extant core-period sources (Strabo Geography 4.4,2-6, Diodorus Bibliotheca 5. 26-32, and Caesar Gallic War 6.11-28) were primarily interested in ethnography: Strabo was a geographer, Diodorus a compiler of a variety of types of information, and Caesar was recording the course of war against Gaul.

2.10. The ethnographic formula.

As Ireland (1986:5) stated:

"All the literary genres of antiquity share this much in common, that their aim was as much the production of literature as the provision of information. As a
result they were susceptible to a wide range of embellishments for the sake of their literary function."

Ireland was discussing format rather than writing techniques, and the same is our concern here (on techniques see 2.10-11 and 3.4). Convention demanded that certain genres, like history and geography, should incorporate ethnographic data. The strength of these conventions (and of the readership expectations they engendered) in colouring the content of texts, should not be underemphasised. Even Caesar, who had possibly developed the 'commentary' because he disliked, or had no time for, some aspects of full-blown historiography (Rawson 1985:228), adds the 'expected' historiographic elements to his narrative. His ethnographic digressions have often been seen in this context (Tierney 1960:213). Paradoxa (2.10.1), similarly, were a requirement of many genres, including history and geography.

Formulisation of this type was far reaching. It is often argued that writers of ethnography, throughout the Classical period, adhered to a formula which constrained the types of data entering the record (though in considering this charge, a more basic limitation of the core period literary record is that ethnography was hardly being written at all).

Despite the lack of ethnographic works in this period, it is necessary to consider Greek ethnographic traditions in some detail. Firstly, one LIA work did incorporate a first-hand ethnographic study: Posidonius' account of Gaul in book 23 of his History. Wait's (1985:193) remark that "the ethnographic passages were required by the geographic tradition in which he (Posidonius) worked" shows a lack of understanding of the motivation which prompted Posidonius' study of ethnography (see App.2.3), but when Posidonius wrote the History a five hundred year old tradition of ethnographic study existed with which he must have been reasonably
acquainted (e.g. his work seems to have been influenced by Timaeus and Agatharchides; Tierney 1960:192). To evaluate the Posidonian fragments alone, it is necessary to consider the extent to which he worked within this framework. The fact that all the major sources of ethnographic data on Gaul borrowed from Posidonius also makes this desirable.

Greek ethnographic writing is earliest and most clearly exemplified by Herodotus (490/80-425 BC). Tierney (1960:190), following Trudinger (1918), has summarised the "ideal" Herodotean ethnography, which served as a model for later writers. The ethnography has three main elements:

1. THE COUNTRY
   Boundaries, measurements and shape   Rivers
   Nature of the land                   Climate
   Animals
2. THE PEOPLE
   Population                           Way of life
   Antiquity and Ancient history        Customs
3. WONDERS OF THE COUNTRY

For present purposes, the most important category is "customs", which may be broken down (following Herodotus' Scythian logos: Histories 4) into these elements:
   Gods, Sacrifice, War, Divination, Oaths, Burials,
   Foreign Customs.
As Tierney (1960:190) argued, the model, like any other, can predetermine subjects of enquiry:
"the routine ethnographical schemata seem to have acted like blinkers on the less able ethnographers and by presenting them with a set of stock questions to have inhibited the ability to ask any others or to see their subject clearly."
Tierney (1960) clearly included Caesar among the less
able, and the format of Caesar's Gallic 'ethnography' is noticably close to that of Herodotus' account of Scythia (Histories 4). Rawson (1985:266) pointed out that the Classical ethnographic framework does not allow for investigation into subjects with which a modern ethnographer would be concerned; "kinship systems, inheritance rules, economic organisation and so on", and with reference to religion, rigid use of the list of headings above is unlikely to generate information on cult loci, non-sacrificial ritual or religious specialists. It is thus possible that the record for Gaul is biased by preferential inclusion of those aspects which fit the proposed ethnographic model, and exclusion of those which do not.

In considering this, it may be said that the LIA record is limited less by adherence to a preconceived model than by paucity of information. Secondly, the interests of individual observers counter some of the lacunae inherent in the ethnographic formula: two of the best documented areas of the LIA record are religious specialists (3.7) and cult loci (3.10). In considering how far writers are led by the formula, Posidonius is a good example.

Tierney's reconstruction of Posidonius' Gallic ethnography proceeds by organising often unattested fragments into the order of the Herodotean model (e.g.: "we can undoubtedly assume that Posidonius in his Celtic ethnography did not depart from [the] tradition...of treating the land before the people" 1960:220). He argues that fragments are Posidonian partly on the basis that, as none of the sources for the Posidonian fragments were themselves ethnographers, anything which fits into the ethnographic model was borrowed from the best-known ethnographer of Gaul: Posidonius. Yet at the same time, Tierney (1960) argues that Posidonius was not one of the lesser ethnographers, "blinkeried" by the constraints of the ethnographic formula.
The extent of the influence of the formulaic model on writing on Gaul is difficult to determine, but may therefore be less than Tierney (1960) would suggest.

2.10.1. Paradoxa.

Perhaps the most indispensable feature of all writing on alien cultures were Paradoxa, or marvels. This desire for marvels is reflected by the model ethnography - Paradoxa (or ὑμάτα) are a feature of the model given above - and was conditioned by many factors. The most simple of these was the universal interest in practices wholly alien to the observer. A second factor was the credulity and superstition of individual writers. Roman writers, whilst less interested in ethnography, retained a lively interest in foreign paradoxa (Rawson 1985:257): this tenor is evident in works for a Roman readership.

Rawson (1985:266) has stressed how far the desire for paradoxa bedevilled serious enquiry. Some Classical writers recognised this: Strabo (himself not immune to the attractions of paradoxa) was to say that we ought to forget how to marvel. Paradoxa are prone to the chronological difficulties outlined above for motifs, and their value is equally difficult to determine. Unfortunately, paradoxa entered the record at the expense of other data.

2.11. Defining the 'other'.

Like much ethnographic writing, Classical ethnography largely explained the alien 'other' by reference to itself. The basic allegories employed in translating differences in this way are contrastive (inversion of self), and comparative (syncretism with self). The principal figures employed within each category in LIA writing on Gaul are considered in detail elsewhere (3.4). Some general considerations are offered here.

First, the 'rhetoric of otherness' (Hartog 1988), in
its many dimensions, is always unequal. At the simplest level, the various figures employed to express ‘otherness’ are all made from Greek and Roman view points. On the one hand this means the veracity with which figures like interpretatio are employed cannot be judged because the alien element is masked by the figure itself (see below). More fundamentally, the ‘other’ is implicitly disadvantaged. Herodotus (Histories 3,38), writing specifically on attitudes to religion, had perceived long before the core period that otherness, measured against Graeco-Roman culture, would always be found wanting:

"For if anyone, no matter who, were given the opportunity of choosing from amongst all the nations of the world the set of beliefs which he thought best, he would inevitably, after careful consideration of their relative merits, choose those of his own country"

To define ‘the other’ by reference to the self is to rewrite, and reaffirm the self (Hartog 1988:212ff); the ‘other’ is implicitly disadvantaged in the process, because it does not conform with the self. And in the case of Latin writers, especially, Rome’s view of herself as the "capital of the world" (Balsdon 1979:1), and of her people as chosen for the greatness of Empire, ensured that comparison was often an explicitly condemnatory process.

As Asad (1986:164) stressed, there are asymmetrical tendencies in the languages of dominant and dominated societies. Inequality is embedded in the ethnographies of a conqueror. The most obvious expressions of this are the use of literary figures in sanctioning claims to, and control over, barbarian lands. Fundamentally, literary figures like interpretatio are expressions of cultural imperialism: the imposition of self on other peoples and other belief systems (see below).

2.11.1. Contrasts: Gallic barbarity and the just war.
Accounts of the dies ater and the 3rd BC threat to Delphi, of which there are several LIA examples (Livy 5.41.8; 5.46.2. on the former; Diodorus 22.9.4. on the latter), are particularly clear examples of the way contrastive techniques could be employed to denigrate the 'other' and at the same time to advance Graeco-Roman moral and cultural superiority. Livy's account of the dies ater and Diodorus' of Delphi are engineered to provide fictional moments of direct confrontation between Graeco-Roman and Celtic culture (see especially Livy 5.46.2. and Diodorus 22.9.4). The writers stress how far the Celts deviate from the Greek and Roman 'norms', and are thus barbaroi. In the act of contrast, Classical 'norms' and the moral superiority of Classical values are reaffirmed, with the result that the moments at which the Classical world was at its most disadvantaged in its dealings with the Celts are presented as ideological victories.

2.11.2. Comparisons: Interpretatio.

At the heart of Graeco-Roman writing on alien religion lies interpretatio. Henig (1986) gives the following definition:

"In the Roman Empire, with its many religions and social traditions [the] quest for metaphysical knowledge normally included the identification of foreign 'unknown' gods with those of Italy and Greece. Such a process is best described by the phrase, derived from Tacitus (Germania 43), interpretatio Romana, which it is probably best to take literally as the Roman interpretation of alien deities, and of the rites associated with them."

Comparisons of Gallic and Graeco-Roman religion lacking interpretatio are very rare (Cicero De Divinatione, 2.36,76 referring to the Galatians, is one example).

Interpretatio is a 'modes of thought' (rather than simply linguistic) translation from one language into
another (Asad 1986) and as such informs accounts of deities and the beliefs and loci associated with them (3.5, 3.10).

**Interpretatio Romana** or **Graeca** is a system of equivalences, in which, by definition, the "native" element remains unstated. But as Hartog (1988:247) emphasises, the system has no explicit rules: "the narrator never vouchsafes any explanation concerning the system of equivalences: the translation is presented as if it went without saying and were well known. He does not justify it, lend it his own backing or even explain it". The 'other' is thus masked by interpretatio, making passages which employ the figure particularly difficult to evaluate. On occasions, it is difficult to know if the figure is being used at all. In some cases (as in Caesar 6.17) this is obvious, but in others it is less clear: see e.g. the Galatian Zeus, Strabo 12.5,2).

Rawson's comment (1985:266) that much Classical commentary on religion was vitiated by naive syncretism, highlights some of the problems inherent in interpretatio. But the act of syncretism is not itself wholly naive. **Interpretatio** is essentially naming, and naming involves mastery (Hartog 1988:242). Giving names implies a measure of power. In early ethnographies, an indigenous divine name was sometimes given alongside an imposed Greek one. This sometimes involved translation from Greek to foreign (as in Herodotus on the Egyptians (Histories 2.144: "Horos is the Apollo, Osiris the Dionysus of the Greeks"), but more often Herodotus gives Greek names (Histories 4.59: "the Scythians worship Hestia... and Zeus": though even here some attempt is made to retain the sense of the 'otherness' of the deity: "in the Scythian language, Hestia is Tabiti"). But in later accounts of Gaul, written in a context of domination, native deities are entirely subsumed in interpretatio (see Caesar 6.17): new identities have been imposed.
At its limit, *interpretatio* is a matter of cultural imposition; superimposing a grid onto the divine space of others (Hartog 1988:242). This works on many levels. Its use, by an individual writer implicitly invokes his own authority, and sanctions the beliefs he shares with his readers. *Interpretatio* also functions at state level. Many workers have seen deity equation as a means by which unity could be fostered, and as such as a process, at the very least, encouraged by the state (de Vries:1975, Hatt 1970, Henig 1984:37, Rankin 1987:259).

Asad’s (1986) critique of the biases caused by the inequality of languages in ethnographic writing also applies to the ‘modes of thought’ translation which comprises *interpretatio*. Green (1986:36-7) and Ferguson (1982:214) speak of a reciprocal ‘*Interpretatio Celtica*’ but this is mainly argued to be expressed figuratively rather than through the textual and epigraphic media favoured by Graeco-Roman *interpretatio* (Green 1986:36 ff), and cannot be directly compared with the latter. Indeed, as Cepas (1986) shows with reference to Northern Britain, epigraphic *interpretatio*, at least, was largely the province of the Romanised elite, used more frequently by those of high military rank than by lower military ranks or civilians (i.e., those more likely to be of local origin). This suggests *interpretatio* served purposes other than a simple desire, by both Romans and Celts, to play safe with the heavens by invoking two deities.

The very existence of *interpretatio* is often seen as pointing to a benign policy of religious integration (on Graeco-Roman religious tolerance see 2.7.3): but it is also cultural imperialism. For this reason, as much as for the more prosaic problems of interpretation discussed for individual passages, *interpretatio* references are problematic.

In the course of this chapter it will have become obvious that many of the problems affecting the LIA literary record are related to the prevalence of plagiarism, in several guises. Unverified borrowed information is normally of less value than first-hand data, and as second-hand information is open to corruption in a number of ways.

The practice of borrowing from earlier - and contemporary - texts is not confined to the LIA. But in this period a combination of factors caused the borrowing of earlier text to be far more common a feature of the record than the generation of new data. These factors are:

1. Lack of access to new information. Despite continuous Roman presence in southern Gaul from 125 BC, few opportunities were taken to collect new data at first hand. Even beyond the Provincia, there were possibilities for data generation prior to the Conquest (1.4), but no extant first-hand account pre-dates the Gallic War.

2. The popular literary forms of the period (2.9) positively encouraged the synthesis of available data. There was no necessity for writers to provide new information on Gaul.

3. The existence of an information pool. Fifteen of the twenty-one writers considered in this study visited or lived in Rome, and in the mid core period (50-40 BC) eleven authors spent time in the city (Fig.2.1). Whilst not all personally acquainted, these figures were linked in a complex network of friendship, clientela and scholarly relationships, centred on the persons and patronage of Caesar, Cicero, Varro, Pompey, Atticus, and later Augustus (Fig.2.2).

Some figures were isolated from this network; principally Greeks, like Artemidorus and Andronicus, who lived and worked outside Rome. Posidonius, who spent little time in Rome, and is one of few major LIA literary
Fig. 2.2. Relationships between LIA Classical writers on Celtic religion.
figures who cannot be shown to have had a direct link to Caesar (Fig. 2.1), nevertheless enjoyed friendship ties to numerous highly-placed Romans, including Cicero and Pompey.

Relationships of this type facilitated awareness of, and access to, circulating texts (On literary provision within Rome see 2.2.2.). Three of the four principal core period accounts of Gallic religion (excluding Strabo: see App. 2.18) were widely available.

As a result of these factors, a good proportion of LIA literary data on Gallic religion was relatively easily accessible and easily plagiarised. Earlier textual information is perpetuated throughout the period: this is true of some pre-core period data, but also of texts written in the early phases of the LIA (e.g. Posidonius’ History and Artemidorus’ Geography). Frequent borrowing from such texts led to artificially extended chronologies for particular practices (on decapitation, e.g. see 3.12.1.2).

Literary convention actively prohibited the citing of sources, and it is often difficult to established whether work is plagiarised (Caesar is central to debate in this context: App. 2.8). If a writer did not visit Gaul he must be assumed to rely on literary and/or oral testimony, but if his sources remain anonymous it is impossible to determine the age of the borrowed material, and the status as evidence of the original source. In some cases, textual comparisons allow us to determine an unattested debt (Diodorus, for example, can be shown to have used Posidonius although he never cites him App. 2.11): but this is rare. The failure to cite sources is a very widespread, and particularly corrosive influence on the assessment of the temporal veracity of literary data.

Even where sources are acknowledged, problems remain: a writer may cite several sources and may not specify
which is used for particular passages (see e.g. Posidonius in Strabo; App.2.3). Finally, even in the context of a single passage, a writer may draw on several sources, amalgamating information (often of different dates) from all of them.

2.13. **Summary: evaluating Classical references.**

On the basis of the above discussion, it is possible to devise a framework of questions by which to evaluate individual references. The texts assembled in App.1. are reconsidered using this framework. The discussions are contained in App.2., and form the basis for the statement on the nature of the LIA literary record in Chapter 3.

2.13.1. **A framework of questions.**

**DATA COLLECTION**

(1.4) For first-hand sources:
What are the circumstances by which the text came into the record?
What was the capacity of the recorder?

**THE WRITER**

(passim)
What was the nationality of the writer?
Where was he writing?
Is he known to have visited Gaul?
What is known of his circumstances?
- Was he patronised, and if so by whom?
- Was the text written for a particular person or purpose?
- Was he likely to have anti-Roman sentiments?
What were his political sympathies and connections: did they influence the text?

(2.7) What was his philosophical outlook?

(2.9) What was the subject matter of the text and the literary interests of the writer?
TEXTUAL
(2.3.1) Are there differing versions of the passage?
   - If so, what is the nature of the discrepancies?

(2.3.2) Is the passage a fragment only?
   - Is the fragment extant or non-extant?
   - If non-extant, how well may it be contextualized?

(2.3.3) In which language was the text written?
   Was the text borrowed from Greek into Latin or vice-versa?
   - If so, are there translational difficulties?
   Are there any particularly problematic words in the text?
   - If so: are they Greek, Latin or Gallic?
   (For interpretatio references, see below)

TEMPORAL
(2.4) What is the date of composition of the text?
(2.4.1) What is the date to which the passage refers?
(2.4.1) Does the text give temporal data?
   - Does it refer to a practice as being of the past or the present?
   - Does it refer to a practice as in decline?
   If so, is a reason given for the decline or end of the practice?

(2.9.1) If data are historical:
   What are the historical sources of the
text, if known?
Do similar references also appear during
the historical period with which the text
is concerned?

(2.9.2) Does the passage draw on the terror
Gallicus?

GEOGRAPHICAL

(2.5) Did the writer visit Gaul: if so, what
areas?
Does the text apply to Gaul?
- Provincia, non-Mediterranean or both?
Is there a more specific location?
Is the geography accurate?

ETHNOGRAPHIC FORMULA / STANDARDISATION

Motif Is there a first-hand account of the
(2.8.2) theme in question, and if so from what
date?
What is the number of references to the
theme?
Over what time-span do they occur?

Wandermotif Is the information also given of other
(2.8.2) peoples outside Gaul?
Is the information first given for the
Provincia, and then for non-Mediterranean
Gaul?

Paradoxa Is information given in terms of the
(2.10.1) marvellous?
Does the writer himself express credulity?

CONTRAST

(2.11) Is an explicit contrast drawn between
Classical and native practices/beliefs?
(2.11.1) Does the text refer to the barbarity of that which it describes?

COMPARISON
(2.11) Is an explicit comparison drawn between Classical and native practices/beliefs?
(2.11.2) Is Interpretatio a definite or possible feature of the text? If so:
- is the terminology Latin or Greek?
- does it apply to a deity, structural type, or a concept?

PLAGIARISM
(passim) If data are by first-hand sources:
- Are the data explicitly said to be autoptic?
- If the text is borrowed:
  - Is the source acknowledged within the text?
  - Does another work clearly derived from the same source cite the name of the source?
  - Does the writer cite a source or sources elsewhere in the same work?
- Is the source untraceable?

- If the source is known:
  - What is the date of the source?
  - What are the dates of the first and last recorded instances of the information (These are often to be found outside the date parameters 125 BC-14 AD)?
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3.1. Introduction.

The nature and thematic content of the LIA literary record for ritual and religion is discussed in this chapter. The individual references on which this analysis is based are listed in App.1, and discussed in detail in App.2. The present chapter is intended as a summary of the detailed discussions, but also as an overview of the characteristics of the textual evidence as a whole. As such, it falls into two main sections: 3.2-4 consider general characteristics and 3.5-12 the principal textual themes. Finally, section 3.13 considers lacunae in the record.

The eight major themes identified in 3.5-12 are grouped under three headings by which it is helpful to consider religion: beliefs, organisation, and practices. Cult loci can be associated with both the latter sets of evidence (G.Webster 1986a:23), but as information on organisational loci is rare in the LIA (3.10), loci are considered here under practices. With the exception of human sacrifice (3.9.2), listed under sacrificial rites (3.9) for thematic continuity, the ordering of the major themes is a broad reflection of their potential value to archaeologists, in terms of their recognizability in the archaeological record. This elementary ranking is not intended to imply that textual data of limited archaeological potential are of lesser value. On the contrary, in the archaeology of protohistory these data are important precisely because archaeological possibilities are limited. Rather, as this study aims to identify areas in which text and archaeology can most profitably be juxtaposed, it was thought helpful to indicate areas with most potential in this regard.

The LIA data are summarised for each theme. References marked (*) concern areas outside Gaul, or pre-core period Celts. In discussing the temporal parameters suggested for these themes by the texts, attention is paid to pre- and post-core period texts. To facilitate
this, all Classical references to the major themes are summarised in App.3.

3.2. Breakdown of record content. (Fig.3.1)

The LIA corpus of references to Celtic ritual and religion comprises a total of eighty two references by twenty one writers (Fig.3.1.). The data base is more restricted than the latter figure suggests. Six writers are responsible for 66% of the extant output: Posidonius (7 references) Caesar (12), Cicero (5), Diodorus (11), Livy (11) and Strabo (8). Of these only Posidonius and Caesar are known to have visited Gaul. Diodorus and Strabo, who together provide 23% of the total (19 references), write entirely at second hand, and nine of the eleven notices in Livy are not to LIA Gaul.

Twenty texts (24%) refer to areas outside Gaul, the majority (8) concerning Galatian Asia Minor. Other areas are Celtiberia (5), Cisalpine/Alpine Gaul (2) and Britain (2). A further ten passages are not geographically specific. The remaining 52 references are to Gaul.

Nineteen references explicitly concern pre-core period Celts. With the seven aitia, and two further pseudo-historical passages (Livy 5.34,1; Parthenius Narrationes 8) references to historical or mythological subjects comprise 34% of the total (28 passages). Thirteen of these passages concern Gaul.

A total of fifty four references purport to refer to LIA Celts, but thirteen of these (including those which are geographically unspecific) do not concern Gaul. In total, thirty nine references (47%) give the appearance from their context, to discuss contemporary LIA Gaul. Only seventeen of these passages (21%) were generated by the principal first hand observers Artemidorus, Posidonius and Caesar. As a result, the record is characterised by heavy reliance on plagiarised data, frequently drawn from other writers within the LIA borrowing pool (2.12).
Fig.3.1. LIA Classical references to Celtic religion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>GAUL</th>
<th>ITALY</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>UNSPEC</th>
<th>CONTEMP</th>
<th>HIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parthenius</td>
<td>Nar. Am. B</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nar. Am. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallust</td>
<td>Virgil, Georg. 4</td>
<td>xS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non. Marc.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timagenes</td>
<td>Amm. Marc. 15, 9.4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strabo 4.1,13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
<td>De. Arch. 8.3, 17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Carmina 4.14, 9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>5.34,1-7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.39,1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.41,8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.46,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.26,2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.38,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.24,11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.44,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.25,1</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.47,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periocha 139</td>
<td>xN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>3.4,16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1,3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3,2</td>
<td>xN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4,4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4,5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5,4</td>
<td>xB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5,1</td>
<td>xG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5,2</td>
<td>xG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas</td>
<td>Athen. 6 249 B</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stobaeus 3.7, 39</td>
<td>xN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stobaeus 4.2, 25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denys</td>
<td>1.38,2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.40,3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.1,4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trogus</td>
<td>Justin 32.3, 9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justin 43.5, 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.3.1. (Cont.) LIA Classical references to Celtic religion.
Data for Gaul are heavily biased in favour of the Provincia. Only nineteen citations refer with certainty to non-Mediterranean Gaul. Caesar provides the majority of these (11 references). The major sources on the Provincia are Posidonius (6 references), Diodorus (5 references; given as for all Gaul) and Strabo (3 references in addition to 2 drawing on Posidonius). The only certain sources on inland non-Mediterranean Gaul are Caesar and Hirtius.

3.3. Plagiarism and the question of debt.

There is only one reference to autoptic data generation in the entire record (Posidonius in Strabo 4.4.5), and author presence in Gaul is no guarantee that references are autoptic. Even writers able to gather new data were to some degree content to use earlier text, and the extent of such debts is difficult to define (witness the controversy over Caesar’s originality, 3.3.2).

First hand data are very limited (2.12). Only one source is indigenous (Trogus Pompey) and of the remainder only Artemidorus, Posidonius, Caesar and Hirtius certainly visited Gaul. Posidonius, the main LIA source on the Provincia, cannot be shown to have travelled beyond the Massilote hinterland (Nash 1976a:119-20). Artemidorus’ travels were also restricted to coastal areas (Duval 1971:289). Only Caesar and Hirtius had first-hand knowledge of inland non-Mediterranean Gaul.

The principal first hand LIA sources are Posidonius and Caesar, writing c. 50 years apart and on different areas of Gaul. Posidonius visited the Provincia c. 100-90 BC. He was one of several early 1st BC Greeks whose interest in the West was stimulated by the Roman annexation of the Provincia (1.4.1.5), and his Gallic ethnography (History 23) formed an aetiological backdrop to an History of the first Transalpine War, written within a generation of the events. Posidonius’ History
is not extant, and debate centres on how much unattested data should be assigned to him (3.3.1).

Caesar spent the major part of eight consecutive years in non-Mediterranean Gaul. The Gallic War documents the course of the war which resulted in the annexation of that area, and was written during (Wiseman & Wiseman 1980:9), or in the immediate aftermath of (Handford 1951:24), these events. Many reasons have been advanced as to why Caesar included a Gallic excursus in The Gallic War: to fulfil the requirements of the historiographic format he was, loosely, following (Rawson 1985:259); to deflect interest from the Gallic campaign during a difficult phase of the war (Rambaud 1966, Stevens 1951/2); juxtaposing excursus on Gallic and German customs in order to portray the Rhine as an ethnic barrier beyond which the army need not advance (Todd 1975:11-12, Schutz 1983:249, 343-7, Powell 1980:164). Whatever his reasons, few now believe he wrote from a genuine interest in the Gauls (Rawson 1985:259 is an exception here). Ironically, for a figure who spent longer in Gaul than any other non-indigenous LIA commentator, debate centres on the originality of Caesar’s data and the extent of his debt to earlier sources, principally Posidonius.

Posidonius and Caesar were heavily used by later writers, though in Caesar’s case, his principal debtors (such as Lucan and Mela) post-date the LIA. Late LIA sources like Strabo and Nicolas do draw on The Gallic War, but it is a reflection of LIA borrowing patterns that those writing after Caesar drew more heavily on Posidonius than on Caesar’s more recent account. Whilst textual interdependency characterises the LIA record, the issue of debt has traditionally focused on Posidonius.

3.3.1. Core period debt to Posidonius reconsidered.

It is not to be doubted that Posidonius influenced several core period writers. Strabo (e.g. 4.1,13) and
Cicero (De Finibus Bonorum et Maiorum 1.2) both cite him. Diodorus almost certainly drew on Posidonius (Tierney 1960:203-7, App.2.11), as has also been suggested for Timagenes (App.2.14). It is virtually certain that Caesar had read History 23, though his debt to it is debated (3.3.2).

Two decades ago, the classicists Strasburger (1975:129) and Kidd (1972:xviii) indicated that the tendency to see Posidonius’ influence in almost every subsequent author was passing. It is now accepted that there is considerable uncertainty as to what can be taken as evidence that data are Posidian. (Kidd, forthcoming)

Following Tierney’s influential attempt (Tierney 1960) to reconstruct Posidonius’ ethnography of Gaul from acknowledged and unattested data in Athenaeus, Strabo, Diodorus and Caesar, a considerable proportion of the extant literary record has been ascribed to Posidonius (recently, e.g. Green 1986:14, G.Webster 1986a:19). In Tierney’s view (1960:118), almost all ethnographic material in accounts of Gaul stems ultimately from Posidonius History 23. Whilst, as noted above, the monolithic view of a single, common source on which Tierney’s ‘Posidonian’ attribution is predicated has long been considered as a most unlikely scenario by classicists like Kidd (1972, and forthcoming), Tierney’s work has continued to be highly influential in the use of Classical literary material by some archaeologists commenting on the LIA (e.g. Crumley 1974:5ff). It is an indication of the extent to which panposidonianism continues to pervade discussion of the LIA literature, for example, that the main area in which Posidonius is argued to have influenced, and corrupted, the literary portrayal of Gallic religion is one for which he is not an attested source: the depiction of the druids as philosophers and teachers (Tierney 1960:214-5). On this see App.2.3.

Even Nash, whose (1976a) critique of Tierney’s
methods goes some way towards re-instating Caesar as a reliable independent observer, accepts Tierney’s contention that most data on Gallic religion originate with Posidonius.

Numerous unattested LIA passages are argued by Tierney (1960), Chadwick (1966), and others as Posidonian in origin. The principal references to religion, ascribed to Posidonius, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>CAESAR</th>
<th>DIODORUS</th>
<th>STRABO</th>
<th>TIMAGENES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votives</td>
<td>6.17,3-4</td>
<td>5.27,4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>6.13-14</td>
<td>5.28,6</td>
<td>4.4,4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>5.31,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifices</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>5.32,6</td>
<td>4.4,5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gods</td>
<td>6.17,1-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.18,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is general agreement that these passages draw on Posidonius. An exception is Nash’s argument (1976a:121ff) for the originality of B.G.6.13-14, but she accepts that the account of Bards, Druids and Vates in the remaining major sources was "given by Posidonius" (1976a:123).

Taken with the attested passages, data variously argued as Posidonian thus comprise the bulk of LIA commentary on religious matters. Caution must nevertheless be urged. As is argued in detail under the relevant passages in App.2, the inference of Posidonian attribution in each case is extremely weak. Here, it is only necessary to reiterate the point that where two passages may be thought to draw on an unnamed shared source, this source cannot be assumed to be Posidonius (see also Nash 1976a: esp.114).

Even if one follows Tierney’s arguments for accepting Posidonius as the fullest LIA commentator on Gaul, he was certainly not the only one. The inhabitants of temperate Europe had been of interest to the
Mediterranean world for some time before Posidonius wrote about them. In Posidonius' own day, the Cimbric migrations were not discussed by Posidonius' alone; the Roman historian Rutilius Rufus, a friend of Posidonius, certainly wrote an account of them. The long history of Greek colonisation of the Mediterranean coast of France, followed by Roman annexation of the Provincia in c. 118 BC must have generated some early textual information on this area, on which Posidonius may himself have drawn (see e.g. Strabo 4.4,6). For Strabo and other late LIA writers, texts of the post-Posidonian generation will also have been available: Timagenes wrote on Gaul (Strabo 4.1,13), and Caesar's account circulated in the mid-core period. Strabo certainly drew on both these sources (Caesar at e.g. 4.1,1; Timagenes at 4.1,13). As Kidd (1972) stressed, it would be naive to suggest that Posidonius was the only source on the habits of Gaul available to the later C1st BC writers who preserve all such unattributed information of seemingly precocious date.

The only material which can confidently be ascribed to Posidonius is that for which he is an attested source. Following the methodology of Edelstein and Kidd (1972), only those passages for which Posidonius is a cited source have been accepted as Posidonian in the present work. There are seven attested fragments on Gallic religion: Strabo 4.1,3, 4.4,5, 4.4,6, and Athenaeus 4.152 D, 4.152 D-F, 4.154 A-C, 6.246 C-D. In addition, one unattested passage (Diodorus 5.29,4) is so similar to Strabo 4.4,5 that it is reasonable to accept it as Posidonian in origin (see App.2.11.5). These data refer mainly, though not exclusively (Strabo 4.4,6, Athenaeus 4.152 D-F), to the Provincia and relate to the early LIA, or earlier (e.g. Athenaeus 152 D-F). They include the only references to decapitation as a contemporary LIA rite (Strabo 4.4,5; Diodorus 5.29,4) and the single account of lakes as cult foci (Strabo 4.1,13), all made
with specific reference to the Provincia.

In the present study the non-attested fragments noted above are not regarded as fixed by the geographical and temporal specifics which apply to Posidonian data. This is because these fragments are not here accepted as Posidonian. In practice, those writers who accept these unattributed passages as Posidonian generally fail to observe the specificity of their geographical contexts, and such geographically specific data as Strabo provided (4.1,13) are widely treated as 'Pan-Gallic'.

3.3.2. Caesar’s originality.

It has long been argued that Caesar employs earlier texts in his account of Gallic customs, but the extent of his debt is debated. At one extreme, Jacoby (FGrH) and Zwicker (1934:14-19) give none of the Caesarian data as Posidonian. Tierney (1960:211-2) summarises other earlier views, and, at the other extreme, his own:

"The usual view of scholars on the passage [B.G. 6.11-28] has been that the Germanic section of [the] ethnography (B.G. 6.21-28) is largely, if not entirely, the original work of Caesar and that the same is true of the Gallic section, true, that is, of chapters 11, 12, and most of 13, and again of 17-20 inclusive. This view would leave chapters 14-16 and a few points of 13, 17 and elsewhere as derived from previous ethnographical literature or more specifically from Posidonius. It is possible however to establish with certainty or with great probability that the opposite is the case, and that the bulk of Caesar’s information comes from earlier sources, although of course his own experience in Gaul will have provided some confirmatory information".

Tierney (1960) thus sees Caesar’s commentary as drawn almost entirely from literary sources, principally Posidonius. His view has greatly influenced modern commentators, and has been little challenged, except by
Nash (1976a), who argued that as Caesar was in a position to observe Gallic customs at first hand, it was difficult to envisage that he would draw more heavily on Posidonius, or any other source, than on his own observations (1976a:115). Kidd (forthcoming) reiterates this point.

The main area in which Caesar’s originality is debated is his commentary on the druids (6.13-14; App.2.8.4). His account on Gallic deities (6.17, 16.18.1) also illustrates the weakness of the argument that Caesar is drawing on a source who must be Posidonius. Tierney (1960:216) and Brunaux (1988:66) maintain that Caesar’s data on the Gallic gods (6.17, 6.18,1) are drawn from Posidonius. Tierney argued (1960:216) that the sacrifice to Mars in B.G. 6.17,3-4 corresponds to what Posidonius said elsewhere of the Lusitani (Strabo 3.3,7). But the reference to Mars in each case is an interpretatio, and as Posidonius is, again, not expressly cited for Strabo (3.3.7), Caesar’s information cannot reasonably be construed as Posidonian. Brunaux’s contention (1988:66) that the data are not only Posidonian, but may be attributed to a 2nd or even 3rd BC source employed by Posidonius, is equally unfounded.

As Caesar is the only supposedly Posidonian source to comment on Gallic deities, there is no evidence that Posidonius even considered the topic. Given this, and Caesar’s first-hand knowledge of Gaul, it is perverse to assume the data are not his own. Most workers, including Sjoesddevt (1949), Pascal (1964), de Vries (1975), MacCana (1983) and Wait (1985) treat the data as Caesarean.

In summary, in the present work all Caesarean data which are not closely paralleled in Diodorus and Strabo are assumed to be original to his account; this information is not of course necessarily autoptic. The original data include most LIA text on divinities (6.17, 6.18,1) and druidic teaching and organisation (6.13-14). The information, assumed to date to c. 50 BC and to apply
to non-Mediterranean Gaul. All other Caesarean data are assumed original. They comprise two references to socio-religious clientela relationships (3.22,1ff on the solduri, 7.40,7 on Litaviccus), a reference to the plea of religio (5.6,3), an account of elite funerals (6.19,4) the sole LIA reference to Gallic sacerdotes (7.33,4), and a note on food taboos in Britain (5.12,6).

3.4. Explaining the 'other'.

The principal figures and allegories employed in denoting 'the other' in writing on Gaul are discussed in this section, and are set out in Fig.3.2. It is necessary to recall that the 'rhetoric of otherness' (Hartog 1988) is always unequal (2.11).

Classical ethnographic writing mainly defined the alien other by reference to the (Graeco-Roman) self, using a variety of contrastive and comparative figures (2.11). In writing on the Gauls, the main figure of contrast employed is inversion by reference to Gallic barbarity. The principal comparative technique is interpretatio. See Fig. 3.2.

3.4.1. Contrast: Gallic barbarity and human sacrifice.

Some Celtic practices were so novel to the Graeco-Roman observer that this alone may account for their presence in the literature: decapitation (3.12.1) and voluntary death (3.9.3) are examples. Nevertheless, contrastive figures are mainly employed in the following areas:

a. accounts of disadvantaged moments in historical dealings with Celtic peoples (noted in 2.11.1).

b. accounts of human sacrifice.

The main practice explicitly contrasted with Graeco-Roman behaviour is human sacrifice. While few writers refer explicitly to the rite as opposed to their own beliefs
(Strabo 4.4,5 is one example), this contrast is implicit in the moral outrage expressed in most texts (e.g. Cicero Pro Fonteio 13,30; Diodorus 5.32, and also *30.1,13, on the Galatian uprising of 168-166 BC).

In considering the frequent occurrence of references to human sacrifice, it is necessary to recall that whilst inversion was in part simply a useful device for showing 'otherness', it also worked to sanction the imperialist claim to Gaul (2.11.1). Romans, like most conquerors, preferred to advance the notion that their wars were just (Balsdon 1979), hence Caesar's efforts to portray military aggression as the defence of Roman interests in B.G. (Rambaud 1966). Another approach, noticeable in works rationalising Rome's rise, was to demonstrate the unsuitability of the conquered to rule themselves. The unfitness of the Gauls for self-determination is a subtext of many references to human sacrifice. A good example of this attitude is Cicero's Pro Fonteio (13.30). Cicero's defence of Fonteius proceeds from the position that, as practicers of human sacrifice, his accusers, the Allobroges, lack pietas, and cannot be considered trustworthy under oath. The moral outrage expressed at the rite at the same time enforces Graeco-Roman moral superiority and their own fitness to rule.

Human sacrifice was not as far removed from Graeco-Roman culture as writers tend to imply in their condemnation of the rites among the barbaroi (Rankin 1989:286-7). It was not until 97 BC that human sacrifice was forbidden in Rome, and the elder Pliny remembered the interment alive of a Greek and Gallic couple in Rome (Baldson 1979). As late as 213 AD Caracalla, having debauched a Vestal Virgin, was responsible for her burial alive at the Colline Gate (Baldson 1979). That such rites could apparently be overlooked in condemning barbarian sacrifice is for many writers explicable only as Roman hypocrisy, or remains an inexplicable paradox (Brunaux 1988:129). However, a number of processes ensured that
the potentially thorny topic of human sacrifice, rather than rites clearly distinct from Roman practice, tended to be most frequently contrasted with Graeco-Roman behaviour, and was actually overstressed in the record for Gaul.

Contra Wait (1985:194), Gallic human sacrifice had no real oddity value for Classical commentators. Rather, frequent reference to the rite in the LIA is partly to be explained by the fact that Rome had so recently abolished similar practices that reference to it among the barbarians offered the potential for self-congratulation and reassured the Romans as to their own, newly-acquired higher measure of civilization.

Equally, the concept of the expansion of Rome as a civilising influence was one sold to Graeco-Romans as well as to barbarians. As Baldson (1979) stressed, from the LIA Romans were brought up to believe that human sacrifice had been shunned deliberately or else abolished at an early period. Thus, for many writers, human sacrifice, if not an oddity, was genuinely shocking. This too ensured frequent reference to the practice among the barbaroi.

Finally, Mediterranean peoples were able to draw clear conceptual distinctions between certain of their own practices, and those of the Gauls. For Brunaux (1988:129) it is paradoxical that texts condemn the sacrifice of criminals, when the execution of criminals was legal in Greece, and when the Romans themselves employed execution in the course of a warrior rite. High-ranking enemies were publicly strangled during triumphs: this was the fate of Vercingetorix, during Caesar’s Gallic War triumph (Rankin 1987:129). That Gallic sacrifice of prisoners of war is criticised in Classical texts (3.9.2) is less a matter of hypocrisy than of the nature of contacts with the Gauls, and of the authors’ ability to draw distinctions between rites within the two cultures.
All the above factors ensured that human sacrifice was frequently mentioned in LIA texts, and there is every reason to suspect that the practice is over-represented in the literary record.

3.4.1.2. **Contrast: paradoxa.**

Paradoxa or (2.10.1) also translate the difference between what is here and what is far away (Hartog 1988:232) and can be seen as a form of description by contrast (Fig.3.2). Few practices are explicitly referred to as marvels (obvious examples are those recounted by the Vatican Paradoxographer Nr 25, 45, 46, and Athenaeus in Strabo 4.4,6; introduced as (legend) by Strabo) but the desire for marvels lies at the heart of much data borrowing. Writers selected items from extant works on this basis, and the plagiarising commentaries of, for example, Diodorus and Strabo are essentially a series of the most incredible details from sources available to them, strung together without adequate contexting.

3.4.2. **Comparison: aitia.**

Aitia, spurious mythologies fitting the Celts into Classical mythology, occur on several occasions in LIA literature. The figure embraces motivations similar to interpretatio (2.11.2), and is the conceptual opposite of paradoxa. As such, it may be seen as a relative of description by comparison. Almost all examples concern the hero Herakles. The LIA references are: Diodorus 4.19,1, 5.24.1; Parthenius 30; Denys 1.40,3, 14.1,4; also *Livy* 5.34 passim.

Aitia are among the earliest writings on Gaul. Greek mythology associated Herakles with western Europe long before Roman interest in the Provincia, and even before Massilia became a Phocaean colony. The labour of Geryon's cattle sent Herakles to the far west of Europe, returning overland through Spain to the Rhone, and across
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Fig. 3.2. Describing and defining the 'other': interpretatio and related figures.
the Alps. Subsequent claims for Herakles as 'father' of the Celts accreted to these earliest tales. Nicander of Colophon (in Antonio Liberalis 4.6) makes the earliest specifically territorial claim for Herakles, and during the later LIA, aitia emerge in which Herakles is presented as the forefather of the Gallic race.

In part, such tales function etymologically (similarly, Timaeus had long before argued that the Gauls were descended from Galataea, or a giant named Keltos (FHG 1.22: Rankin 1987:81), and in part they are a logical development from the earlier myths. The tales add little to the study of LIA ritual, but are interesting because the desire to assimilate Gaul into Classical myth is a clear expression of the reductionism which pervades Graeco-Roman attitudes to Gallic religion. In other contexts this reductionism is, often naively, equated with religious tolerance (2.11.2). Here, in the imposition of an external mythical schema, reductionism expresses itself clearly as cultural imperialism. It is thus ironic to note that the one core-period writer to mention the Gauls' own belief in their origins (as autochthonous descendants of Dis Pater) is Caesar (6.18.1).

After the core period, aitia continue to be popular, and occur frequently (App.3.4.2)

3.4.2.1. Comparison: Interpretatio.

The principal comparative figure in Classical writing on the other is interpretatio (for discussion of which see 2.11.2). In accounts of LIA Gaul interpretatio underpins most references to deities (3.5.1) and may also be argued to inform accounts of cult loci (e.g. the use of hieron for pre-conquest sacred sites, see 3.10) and a specific eschatological tenet (the ascription of 'Pythagorean' beliefs to Gaul 3.6.2). These themes are discussed individually, beginning with deity interpretatio, below. Here it is only intended to
emphasise the extent to which the figure is used, and to recall that the potential of texts thus affected is, for reasons noted elsewhere (2.11.2) largely vitiated by the inequalities embedded in the figure itself. The use of interpretatio is set out in Fig.3.2.

3.5. Deities.

There are eight LIA references to deities in Celtic contexts. These comprise Artemidorus (in Strabo 4.4,6); Caesar (6.17), (6.18,1); Strabo (4.1,3); *Strabo (3.4,16), *(12.2,5) and *Livy (21.38,9-Alps), (26.44,6).

Of these, only Caesar (6.17, 6.18,1) and Strabo (4.1.3) refer to Gaul, and Strabo may be refering to a Classical deity. The identification of deity is one theme for which the LIA record is not biased towards the Provincia, and in fact no LIA data on this topic certainly relate to the Provincia. Strabo (4.1,3) refers to the Celtiberian frontier. Caesar’s comments are probably based on his own observations (3.3.2) and whilst, as de Vries (1975:27) points out, Caesar’s could have drawn on his knowledge of the Provincia, it is as likely that he based his account on observations made in non-Mediterranean Gaul.

3.5.1. Interpretatio and deity.

Livy (21.38,9), on Poeninus, is the only LIA writer to give the Celtic name of a deity, and as a result his is the only LIA account which can be linked directly to contemporary archaeological and epigraphic evidence. Poeninus, frequently name-paired with Jupiter, is the principal deity attested epigraphically at a temple constructed on the summit of the Great St. Bernard Pass soon after 15 BC (Pascal 1964).

The majority of LIA references use Classical divine names. The interpretatio status of some is disputed (e.g. Strabo 4.1,3) but it is almost universally agreed that the major Gallic commentary, Caesar’s, is an interpretatio
account in which Celtic names are entirely subsumed (App.2.8.8 and below).

The ideological and political asymmetry of the processes informing textual deity syncretisms at this period (2.11.2) vitiates the potential value of LIA texts as evidence for the nature and organisation of pre-conquest Gallic deities. Less through recognition of this, than because Celtic names are ignored in LIA textual interpretatio, discussion of Gallic deities has centred on post-conquest epigraphic interpretatio in which name-pairing is employed. The extant epigraphic material may be argued to be affected by the same asymmetries which influence the earlier, textual interpretatio (2.11.2). Such considerations lie outside the scope of the present study, but as conclusions based on the epigraphic record have influenced assessments of the LIA literature, some brief comments are considered appropriate here.

3.5.2. Deity function and organisation.

Wait (1985:197) sums up the consensus view on the way the Gauls organised their gods. The picture, he says 'is one of many gods, each of multiple functions, but usually very localised in occurrence'. de Vries (1975), privileging the insular record, posulates a universal pantheon for Gaul, but most workers are agreed that there is no evidence for a common Gallic pantheon (see e.g. Vendryes (1948), Sjoestedt (1949), Powell (1980), Wait (1985) Green (1986)). For most writers, there is no divine order in Gaul, only chaos (Sjoestedt 1949:92). The main dissenting voices are de Vries (1975) noted above, Lambrechts (1942, arguing for an overruling monotheism), and Brunaux (1988:144) who appears to argue for the co-existence of diverse panthea in the Celtic world.

According to a now out-dated count cited by Sjoestedt (1949) and Piggott (1975) a total of 374 Celtic
divine names or epithets is preserved in epigraphic contexts. 305 of these occur only once. For many workers, the multitude of localised deities suggested by these figures is a primary example of the pluralism of belief and practice which is widely perceived to characterise religion in LIA Gaul.

Yet for the pre-conquest period, in the absence of epigraphy, the only major written statement is Caesar, who portrays a quintet of deities, with exclusive individual functions, as gods of all Gaul. This account differs markedly from the picture of the Celtic gods drawn from the epigraphic sources. A plausible way to reconcile the apparent divergence is to interpret Caesar’s interpretatio equivalences as "typological indexes" (MacCana 1983:23) i.e., to see them as descriptors, subsuming many native deities whose functions are similar to those of the Classical god with whom they are equated. In this way, Caesar too may be postulated to point to a multiplicity of deities.

However, Caesar’s stress on the individuality of divine function is largely ignored in reconciling his account with the epigraphy. On the basis of the latter, it is generally argued that Gallic deities were more or less polyvalent. Sjoesedt (1949) Powell (1980), Vendryes (1948) MacCana (1983), all argue for polyvalency. Whilst pluralism may be read into Caesar’s account, polyvalency may not. Function lies at the heart of interpretatio (Wait 1985:196): gods are generally equated because they are perceived to have similar roles, and it is clear that Caesar equates deities by role (Wait 1985:196), suggesting at least that deities had primary functions. This calls the concept of divine anarchy into question. If deities are not polyvalent, they must be conceptually related to deities who fulfil other roles.

Whilst it is possible to dismiss Caesar’s account as simply the imposition of one belief system on another, with functional comparanda being advanced in a somewhat
haphazard way, he deserves attention as our only first hand text. It is arguable that Caesar may provide indications that in scholars' reliance on the epigraphic data, we have too readily accepted that there was no organisation imposed, at any level, on LIA deities.

The epigraphic evidence for polyvalency is not itself clear cut. First, the large number of deities cannot of itself alone support this: the sum of the major and minor Roman deities and numina is itself rather larger than that of the known Gallic gods (Rankin 1987:289). That the gods of the inscriptions are localised rather than universal is supported implicitly by the mass of single occurrences of names (implicitly because a single epigraphic occurrence need not limit a god to a particular locale), and explicitly by the fact that multiple occurrences of a name or epithet tend to cluster geographically. Thus Cicolluis is attested seven times in Gaul, but always in the Côte D'Or (Vendryes 1948:268). Borvo is similarly restricted to Nièvre, and mainly to Bourbon-Lancy (4.4.2). But other names are more widespread (e.g. Belenus is mentioned in Gaul, Northern Italy and Norica (Vendryes 1948:269 and 4.4.2), and references to Epona are likewise widespread (Vendryes 1948:269). Localisation, again, is not itself evidence of polyvalency.

It seems clear that different deities fulfilled the same roles. For example, twenty five Celtic deities are name-paired with Mercury (de Vries 1975:286-7), and this is generally thought to indicate that each had functions similar to those of Mercury. But the plurality of avatars for Roman deities is not itself evidence for the multifunctionality of the avatars.

Conversely, the epigraphic record shows that a Celtic deity could have several Roman avatars (examples are Smertius, twinned with both Mars and Dis Pater, Poeninus, twinned with Jupiter and Silvanus (on these Vendryes 1948:270) and, in Britain, Cocodius, twinned
mainly with Mars (RIB 602, 993, 1017, 2024) but also with Silvanus (RIB 1578). This would appear to be a good argument for polyvalency, but such multiple pairings may indicate the overlapping functions of the Roman, not the Celtic, gods in these equations. Equally, misinterpretation of the functions of native gods may have led to different equations. A textual example of this is the Lucan commentaries, where Esus and Teutates are linked in turn to both Mars and Mercury (App.3.5).

In summary, while the evident multiplicity of gods with similar functions negates the idea of a universal pantheon, it does not preclude the possibility that Gallic gods had specific, or at least primary, functions. It thus becomes impossible to negate the idea of order entirely: if a deity is not polyvalent, he cannot provide for all the requirements of those who invoke him, and some form of organised pantheon (heptarchical or hierarchical) must be supposed. In the absence of evidence for a single pantheon, it is thus possible to suggest a series of more localised panthea.

The proposal of a variety of panthea, rather than simply indicative of diversity, helps to account for what would otherwise be anomalies in the post-conquest epigraphic and archaeological records. As noted, some epigraphically attested divine names enjoy a wide distribution. The iconographic record also suggests that certain divinities of the Gallo-Roman period were, whilst regionalised, of more than purely local significance. Such divinities include a three-headed figure found mainly among the Remi in the Marne and in Côte D’Or (Sjoesdedt 1949:16) and the god with a mallet, particularly concentrated in NE Gaul and on the Rhone (Green 1989:75).

These enigmatic regional deities are differentiated from the more localised deities of the epigraphic record in that they are primarily invoked by image rather than inscription. Rather than leaving these gods to one side,
as de Vries (1975:32) tried to do, they may be fitted easily into a model of multiple panthea. Such panthea might contain not only highly localised gods but deities who functioned in some way for *civitates* - or even bigger groupings - as a whole, and whose distribution would thus be more widespread. Indeed, Sjoæstedt (1949:16) pointed some time ago to evidence that the tricephalic god was a tribally-specific god of the Remi and their *clientes*. More recently, Graham Webster (1986a:52) suggested that deities acknowledged over wider areas may have been tribal divinities.

In summary, it is possible to argue not for one pantheon in LIA Gaul, but for the co-existence of an unknown number of panthea. How many, and organised at what scale, remains speculative. Whether such panthea should be viewed as LIA "customised" versions of a single, earlier Pan-Celtic model, as both Brunaux (1988) and Webster (1986b:esp.52) would appear to argue, also remains open to debate. This topic has been considered in detail because it points to Gallic ability to conceive and maintain structured panthea, and hence to have attained a measure of cosmological standardisation, albeit on a non-national level. The same quasi-uniformity may be argued from references to druidic cosmological tenets (Caesar 6.18,1) and from the organisation of the druids (3.7.1.4).


MacCana (1983:122) remarked that nothing about the Celts is more certain than that they believed in life after death: with reference to LIA and later Classical data - which have very little to offer regarding a Gallic 'otherworld' - it is more accurate to say that there is a strong textual tradition of belief in the immortality of the human soul. This theme, with the allied tradition that the Gauls do not fear death, is recurrent both during and after the core period. Other documented
expressions of Gallic contempt for death (e.g. voluntary death 3.9.3) may also be cited here. There is thus a considerable body of LIA data centred on this theme: see Fig.3.3.

Belief in an immortal soul is noted by: Polyhistor (in Clement of Alexandria Stromata 1.15,70); possibly implied in reference to Pythagoras, see App.2.4)); Timagenes (in Ammianus Marcellinus 15.9,6); Caesar (6.14.5.); Diodorus (5.28,6); and Strabo (4.4.4). And the following sources note the absence of fear of death: Diodorus (5.29); Horace (Carmina 4.14.49); and Andronicus of Rhodes (3.7, quoting Aristotle).

3.6.1. The immortal soul.

Several LIA writers explain the aforementioned eschatological beliefs by reference to the Pythagorean tenet of metempsychosis. Chadwick (1966:101) suggested the Gauls had adopted Greek beliefs, but as Wait argued (1985:205) the Pythagorean theme is an interpretatio, making Gallic beliefs more readily explicable to the Classical reader.

This interpretatio is employed by Timagenes (15,9.6) and Diodorus (5.28,6) and is probably implicit in Polyhistor’s reference to Pythagoras as a pupil of the Galatae (Clement of Alexandria, Stromata 1.15,70). Caesar (6.14.5.) also appears to refer to metempsychosis, here without recourse to the explanatory interpretatio.

Wait (1985:205) draws a clear distinction in the literature between belief in the immortal soul commencing an afterlife in an ‘otherworld’, and belief in the transmigration of souls in this world, as implied by the ‘Pythagorean’ interpretatio. The two groups of references are thematically related in implying belief in life after death, and while variant beliefs are quite possible, the textual distinction may reflect differing Classical readings, rather than separate Gallic tenets.
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Diodorus 5.29
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Fig.3.3. Classical references to Celtic religion: the immortal soul.
Whether or not metempsychosis was a Gallic tenet (3.6.2) it is likely that the perceived similarity between Gallic and Pythagorean beliefs is one reason for the textual popularity of the theme. A second possible reason is that the concept of immortality could be advanced to explain Gallic bravery in battle.

Gallic fearlessness, already entrenched in Roman folklore by LIA (2.9.2), required explanation. The rationale that this stemmed directly from the teaching that souls were immortal, advanced by Caesar (6.14), could be seen in this context. Tierney (1960:223) goes so far as to see the 'Pythagorean' theme as an aetiology superimposed (on his reading, by Posidonius) on the fact of Celtic fearlessness. The causation suggested by Caesar and others may be simplistic, but it is difficult to follow Tierney in dismissing the well-documented Gallic belief in the immortal soul as an aetiological fiction.

3.6.2. Interpretatio and the immortal soul.

While there is very strong textual evidence that the LIA Gauls believed in the immortality of the human soul, the question of their belief in metempsychosis remains problematic. Whilst other textual data (Caesar 6.19,4; Diodorus 5.28,6 and, after the LIA, Mela De Chorographia 3.2.), and the very limited archaeological evidence for mortuary rituals, point to belief in an otherworld in which the trappings of the present world were required (Wait 1985:205-6), this is not incompatible with a belief in metempsychosis, which may have been envisaged as a necessary stage or stages in the soul’s passage to the next world. Equally, the belief could be a variant held by some and not others. Nevertheless, the belief in metempsychosis implied by the Pythagorean interpretatio, and by Caesar (6.14.5), is almost universally regarded as a Classical fiction. Tierney’s view is noted above. Ross (1967), Le Roux and Guyonvarc’h (1978), MacCana
(1983:122) and Green (1987:121) all argue, on the basis of insular Irish traditions, that Classical writers have misinterpreted a belief in metamorphosis as one in metempsychosis. Le Roux and Guyonvarch (1978:) argue that such a misinterpretation could be easily made, but it is difficult to see how; furthermore the fact that a belief is not attested in the insular record—particularly one such as serial reincarnation, which runs contrary to Christian teaching—is not itself evidence that the tenet did not exist in the LIA. Belief in metamorphosis, incidentally, is nowhere attested in the Classical literature for Gaul.

The possibility of formalised eschatological tenets, particularly of metempsychosis, points to a degree of eschatological complexity, and hence to some systematisation of religious thought, which some appear unwilling to envisage for LIA Gaul. Tierney (1960:223) offers an obvious example of the latter type of thinking. For the same reasons, Chadwick (1966:101) suggests the Gauls adopted 'Pythagorean' beliefs from the Greeks, via the colonies in Southern Gaul. Whilst the lack of a pan-Gallic pantheon (3.5.2) certainly points to a diversity of belief systems, on which arguments such as Tierney's are predicated, the lack of evidence for a single cohesive belief system does not deny LIA Gauls the ability to devise and systematise complex eschatologies.

Caesar, Strabo and Timagenes suggest the eschatological matter noted above was taught by the druids (see also Caesar 6.18,1 on another druidic cosmological tenet). Caesar's account of druidic education provides some support for the systematisation of religious thought. In these conditions, complex eschatologies could well have flourished.

3.7. Religious specialists.

Religious specialism is one of the best represented literary themes. Unfortunately, the topic has limited
potential for corroboration with material culture studies. Despite the fantasies of Ross (1986) and Ross and Robins (1989) there is little hope of identifying lone druids. Varied material data for practices and beliefs can be employed in estimating the degree of religious organisation in Gaul (for example, the nature of evidence for deities (3.5.2) points to some degree of supra-civitas organisation). Texts offer some indices here (3.7.1.4).


There are eleven LIA references: Caesar (6.13-14), (6.16), (6.18,1), (7.33,4); Cicero (De Divinatione 1.49,90); Diodorus (5.31,2-5); Timagenes (in Ammianus (15.9,4-8), (15.9,8); Strabo (4.4,4), (4.4,5) *Livy (23.24,11). Nine concern Gaul. The tenth (Livy 23.24,11) considers the Boii, then in North Italy.

Although Caesar gives much unique information which it seems sensible to regard as original (App.2.8), the major statements on religious specialists (Caesar 6.13-14), Diodorus (5.31,2-5), Timagenes in Ammianus (15.9,4-8) and Strabo (4.4,4) are not entirely independent of each other. The relationships amongst these texts are more complex than the scenario of independent use of a shared source argued by Tierney (1960: see App.2.8.4), and necessitate that, with the exception of some Caesarean data, the passages cannot be treated as independent testimonies. Thus the fact that three of the major sources refer to the same specialist groups is less a measure of the accuracy of the data than of their plagiarised origin. The specialists noted in Timagenes/Ammianus, Strabo and Diodorus are:
Taking into account translation errors (on o auteis/ euhages see App.2.14.) it is generally agreed that the same three groups are described here. Diodorus’ manteis is given for a group similar in function to the ouateis; manteis is possibly a gloss on the former (Tierney 1960:210-11). Much has been written on the import of these texts. Earlier comments are reviewed in App.2. Here, it is only necessary to repeat that the attested functions fall broadly into three groups:

**SPECIALIST FUNCTION**

- **Bards**
  - lyric poetry

- **Vates**
  - divination, sacrifice

- **Druids**
  - philosophy and education, overseeing sacrifice, divination, judgement and arbitration

There is a functional overlap between druids and diviners, in that both druids and vates/ manteis are linked to sacrifice. This is especially so in Strabo, where the noun vates (diviners) is glossed ψεφονοιοι. Chawick (1966:18) takes this as equivalent to ‘diviners’ (the Loeb editor also gives ‘diviners’) but the term refers to overseers of religious rites, and as such frequently to sacrificers. Equally, in Diodorus’ unclear text, divination employing human victims (5.31,3-4) appears to be attributed to the manteis, though the presence of druids is said to be required at all sacrifices.

Ihm (in Pauly-Wissowa) concluded that there was not enough evidence to distinguish clearly the functions of the druids and vates. His position has been accepted
Some workers attribute the overlap in functions to confused handling of plagiarised data, but it is possible that specialist functions were not rigidly demarcated.

With the exception of Caesar's reference to **sacerdotes** (7.33,4), and Posidonius' to the **Samnitai** (Strabo 4.4,4), bards, druids and vates are the only specialist groups noted in the LIA. **Gutuater**, which may denote a class of religious specialist, occurs in **Hirtius** (B.G.8.38), but possibly as a personal name. Otherwise the term appears later, in epigraphic references from Autun (CIL XIII 11225-6) and Puy-en-Valais (Haute-Loire) (CIL XIII 1577). Bards, first noted in an historical reference by Posidonius (Athenaeus 6.246 C-D) and otherwise confined to texts of LIA date or context, are at best quasi-religious (Wait 1985:200). The principal specialist groups in the LIA texts are thus druids and diviners.

Caesar, the principal source, refers only to druids. Tierney (1960:215) argued that Caesar over-simplifies, subsuming all specialist groups under one title. But as the non-Caesarean texts almost certainly relate largely to the **Provincia**, and Caesar's account to non-Mediterranean Gaul, the texts may reflect regional differences in religious organisation. Equally, as Nash (1976a:123) noted, Caesar's account may be different to those of Diodorus and Strabo because it reflects change over time. (Strabo and Diodorus preserve information which almost certainly pre-dates Caesar: App.2.8.4). The apparent confusion in Diodorus' and Strabo's accounts could in any case reflect a functional overlap, and Caesar may indicate that the subdivision of religious roles in non-Mediterranean Gaul was further eroded before the Conquest, with the various responsibilities devolving onto one 'class' of specialist. Thus Diodorus (5.31,3-4) and Strabo (4.4,4) who mention the druids in connection with divination via human sacrifice, do not explicitly call them diviners. Caesar, who explicitly links the
druids to sacrifice, also speaks of them as interpreting ritual questions (6.13,4), which may well imply divination. Cicero, who knew Divitiacus, says the druids were diviners (De Divinatione 1,41.90).

3.7.1. The role of the druids in the LIA.

Throughout the Classical record, druids are the most frequently noted religious specialists (though there is much to show that by C3rd AD the title had lost its original significance: see App.3.7.1). As Sherwin-White (1967:10) suggested, the fact that Graeco-Roman society had nothing which approximated to the druids may explain why this group drew so much interest. It may also explain why the term druid escaped interpretatio.

Wait (1985:200-3) lists the following roles assigned to religious specialists in the literature up to 150 AD: teaching, civil justice, medicine, calendrics, divination, sacrifice and care of temples. Caesar’s account suggests that by the mid core period the responsibility for teaching, civil justice, calendrics (implied in Caesar 6.18,1) and sacrifice had devolved entirely on the druids. The care of cult foci is noted only twice in the LIA. Posidonius (Strabo 4.4,6) refers to an hieron of the Loire Samnitai, and Livy (23.24,11) gives an historical account of the North Italian Boii which is arguably heavily influenced by the Classical model of temple care. Medicine is not noted as a role of religious specialists until after the LIA. Thus, with the exception of temple care, all functions noted during the core period are assigned to the druids.

Some workers have argued that Caesar, in assigning the druids such sweeping responsibilities, overemphasised their power as part of his propaganda effort. This argument rests on the apparent contradiction between druidic powers and status as noted by Caesar and their absence from the narrative of B.G. (De Witt 1938:322, Tierney 1960:214). But precisely because they play, or
are assigned, no major role in the Gallic War - and are actually said to stand aloof from war (6.14,1) - it is difficult to understand why it should have served Caesar to invent powers for the druids in other spheres.

De Witt (1938:325) argued that by the 50s BC the druids were exercising 'the shadow not the substance of a former power', casting a shadow over Caesar's veracity which has had considerable influence on later work. But since De Witt was able to credit Caesar's account enough to accept that the druids were still teaching, judging, and supervising religious rites in the mid C1st BC - the three principal roles assigned to them throughout the literature- it is difficult to understand why he advances the idea of a reduction in druidic power by the mid first century BC.

As De Witt's argument (1938:325) implies, the functions assigned to the druids by Caesar are foreshadowed in Strabo and Diodorus, who are presumed to draw on earlier data. Strabo refers to druids as judges (4.4,4), Diodorus (5.31,5) and Strabo (4.4,4) to arbitration in war, and both mention druidic supervision of divination and sacrifice. Even the idea of druids as teachers, the main original element in Caesar, is anticipated in the tradition of druidic philosophy, which certainly predates the Gallic War (3.7.1.3).

Tierney (1960:223), it is true, argued that Strabo and Diodorus' accounts are themselves falsely conceived, vitiated by the Stoicising fictions of Posidonius. Rather than accept the contention that LIA accounts of druidic power are over-exaggerated first by the Golden Age fantasies of one major source (Posidonius, who cannot be shown to have discussed the druids at all), and later by the unexplained political motives of another (Caesar), it is certainly possible to assume that the texts reflect the functions of the druids in the LIA more straightforwardly than previous scholars were prepared to accept.
3.7.1.1. **Supervision of rites.**

Druidic functions fall into three main groups, supervision of sacrifice, judgement, and teaching.

In Gallic, as in Roman, religion (Henig 1984:128ff), blood sacrifice was a principal means by which to approach the gods. Caesar remarks (6.13,5) that banishment from attending sacrifice was the most painful sanction levied against individuals in Gaul. Authority to ban attendance from, and to oversee, sacrifice (if not to perform it: Chadwick 1966:21, Rankin 1987:272) lay with the druids. Supervision of sacrifice is attributed to this group by Strabo (4.4,5), Caesar (6.16,1), who specifies human sacrifice, and by Diodorus (5.31,5).

Rankin’s comment (1987:279) that the druids were a special class of intermediary with a distinctly intellectual side to their functions, sums up well the druids as represented in the LIA texts. It is possible to go further in arguing that their authority was predicated on intellectual status. Diodorus (5.31,5) says the druids were required during sacrifices because it was believed that thank-offerings should be rendered by men experienced in the nature of the divine. Study of the divine is a clear theme in accounts of the druids. Diodorus (5.31,2) calls them *θεολόγοι* (those who study the gods), and Caesar (6.14) notes they study the nature of the gods. A similar idea is probably implicit in the use of *θεατητα* to describe the druids. Finally, druidic study of cosmology is implicit in accounts of a doctrine of the immortal soul (linked to the druids by Strabo (4.4,4) and Timagenes (Ammianus 15.9), though not elsewhere), and explicit in Caesar (6.18,1).

3.7.1.2. **Justice and arbitration.**

As Brunaux (1988:6) noted, the druids of Caesar’s era were set above the civil condition not only by their study of the gods but in that they paid no taxes and were exempt from war. Set above secular concerns, they were
deemed able to judge them. All sources suggest the druids acted as intermediaries between men in secular disputes. Strabo (4.4.4,4) and Diodorus (5.31.5) refer to the druids as, in former times, arbiters in war. This role appears to be obsolete by Caesar’s day. Again, their power is based on a religious authority predicated on learning: Strabo says the druids were considered the most just of men. Caesar (6.13.40), here possibly followed by Strabo (4.4.4) develops the theme of arbitration in public and private disputes.

For Tierney (1960:214-5) the theme of civil power through arbitration and administration of justice was a literary motif, because ‘it is the most typical assertion in Randvolkeridealiserung’. But it is too simplistic to dismiss the theme thus. Religion was embedded in Celtic society, and Wait (1985:202) rightly saw this aspect of druidic power (the sacro-judicial trial) as a perfect example of the integration of secular and religious subsystems.

Two further passages may provide pointers to secular authority. At 7.33,4 Caesar mentions sacerdotes not druids, but the passage suggests the importance of sanctification in secular matters. Finally, if Divitiacus was a druid as Cicero (De Divinatione 1.14,90) maintains, he at least wielded considerable secular power. On his role in the Gallic War see B.G.1.16-20, 31-2, 41; 2.5, 10, 14; 6.12).

3.7.1.3. Teaching.

Diogenes Laertius (Vitae 1.1.) establishes that the druids entered the record before the core period. According to Diogenes, druids and the otherwise unattested Σενυγός were mentioned in the Μαγικός and by Sotion. Diogenes attributes the Μαγικός to Aristotle (384-332 BC), but Duval (1971:214) and Rankin (1987:271) attribute the treatise to a peripatetic follower of Aristotle, writing possibly c. 200 BC (Duval 1971:215),
though Rankin (1987:271) points to C3rd BC. Sotion also flourished c. 200 BC.

Diogenes indicates that druids entered the record by the early C2nd BC. He also suggests that it was the concept of druids as philosophoi which first emerged at that time. This was to be a tenacious theme, current throughout the LIA, and resurfacing later in the Alexandrian School’s debate on the origins of philosophy. Chadwick (1966) also noted that the theme emerged early, but her thesis that the Pythagorean notebooks had contained the idea is an erroneous attempt to account for the emergence of a Pythagorean interpretatio, in the C1st BC (3.6.2).

It is mainly to Caesar (6.13.4; 6.13.11; 6.14,1-4; 6.14,6) that we owe the portrait of druids as educators, but it is possible to see the Caesarean theme as simply a detailed variation on the theme of druids as ἀλεξάνδρειος.

The gloss ἀλεξάνδρειος (Strabo 4.4.4; Diodorus 5.31,2) may point to an educational role, as Chadwick (1966:44) notes. Teaching and philosophy were conceptually related in Classical thought, a link summed up by Seneca’s comment (Epistulae Morales 89.13) that the philosopher is humani generis paedagogus. Similarly, the Stoic-influenced treatise On the education of children sees education as leading towards the study of philosophy, which teaches moral values and reverence for the gods (Bonner 1977:110). Philosophy and education were also related in practice, as philosophers were employed as higher level tutors. Cicero, for example, was tutored in geometry and dialectics by the Stoic philosopher Diodotus (Brutus 90.309). For a Classical reader, ἀλεξάνδρειος may clearly have implied an educational role. Seen in these terms, Caesar is simply expanding on an established theme, not introducing a new druidic function in The Gallic War.

Caesar gives a detailed account of the druids as teachers, mentioning druidic schools (disciplina) to
which young men were sent for training. What was taught is not specified; Caesar simply notes that teaching was conducted entirely orally, through the medium of verse. The rationale (6.14,4) that writing was avoided because the druids wished to restrict access to their knowledge is consistent with the argument that druidic power was predicated on knowledge.

3.7.1.4. Organisation.

For the archaeologist, the most useful features of Caesar’s account concern druidic organisation (3.7), because of the potential for identifying this in the archaeological record. Caesar (6.13.) speaks of the druidic disciplina (order, way of life), and points, as Wait noted (1985:263), to a level of supra-civitas organisation: the druids had an elected leader and met annually in the territory of the Carnutes (regarded as the centre of Gaul) to settle disputes. Wait (1985:201) following Wallace (1966:86-8) pointed out that the development of the organisation of a religious elite, concomitant with the political elaboration argued for various parts of Gaul in the LIA (e.g. Nash 1976b, 1978, Collis 1980, 1984, Ralston 1988), would be a logical occurrence. Given the function of the druids as interpreters of the gods, as cosmologists and as educators, the textual implication is of the possibility of standardisation of belief at a more than local level.

That there was a single homogenous Gallic LIA belief system is of course refuted by the regional character of archaeological evidence for ritual activity, but also by the LIA texts. These point to a supra-civitas organisation of religious specialists, but on a limited basis. Caesar’s use of disciplina points to contexts in which religious belief and practice could be standardised, but at the same time suggest diversity:— Druids are said to be scattered, only meeting together once a year. This, with the use of
oral teaching methods, could have facilitated diversity of teaching on religious matters.

The suggestion of limited supra-tribal organisation of religious specialists points, as Wait noted (1985:263), to the existence of 'ecclesiastical' cult institutions in addition to local ('communal') ones. It is in this area that the theme of religious specialism acquires archaeological potential. One archaeological cognate in this context is the iconographic record for deity organisation (3.5.2), which has been argued to be informed by exactly this model of organised diversity.

On textual evidence for the rapid decline of the druids following the Conquest see App.3.7.1.


The texts suggest prediction of the future was an important aspect of Gallic religious life. (On specialists associated with this see 3.7). Six LIA references concern divination in Gaul. Cicero also offers three anecdotes on Galatian augury. The texts are: Artemidorus (Strabo 4.4,6); Cicero (De Divinatiane 1.41,90); Caesar (6.13,4 - ?uncertain, see App.2.8.4); Hirtius B.G. 8.43,4; Diodorus (5.31,2-5); Strabo (4.4,4), (4.4,5); *Cicero (De Divinatione 1.15,25; 2.36,76; 2.37,39); and *Livy (5.34,7 - migrations myth).

Before the LIA, Nicander of Colophon (Tertulian De Anima 57) refers to a divination rite - oracular incubation - which is not subsequently noted. The LIA passages indicate two forms of divination:

a. the observation of natural events.
b. divination involving sacrifice.

Roman religion distinguished two between types of omens, solicited (impertrativa) and unsolicited (oblativa). Though some passages are unspecific (e.g. Diodorus 5.31,3), similar distinctions are observable in
references to Gaul. Artemidorus (Strabo 4.4.6) refers to a solicited omen, Hirtius (B.G. 8.43,4.) and Livy (5.34,7; though here the context is pseudo-historical) to unsolicited ones. The texts also suggest that, as in Roman religion, augury by the observation of bird flight and behaviour (auspicia), was a means of obtaining omens (Artemidorus in Strabo 4.4.6; Diodorus 5.31.3. Cicero 1.41,90 is not a specific reference to the use of birds; App.2.7.4). The similarities to Graeco-Roman rites suggested by the texts (especially Artemidorus in Strabo 4.4.6) cause some concern that the relevant passages are over-influenced by Classical concepts; augury, however, is common to many civilisations (Ogilvie 1967). Haruspicy, the other prominent form of Roman divination under the Republic, (Ferguson 1970:154-5) is not explicitly noted for Gaul. This latter point might support the inference that references to Gallic augury are not the result of the translation of Roman practice.

As Wait noted (1985:207) divination is closely associated in the literature with sacrifice. This is suggested as much by the glosses offered for the functions of religious specialists (3.7) as by accounts of rites, of which there are few. Divination involving the sacrifice of animals is only explicitly noted by Diodorus (5.31.3), but is perhaps implied in other references to divination and diviners. The use of human victims is noted only by Diodorus (5.31.3-5) and Strabo (4.4.5), following a shared source. These latter references are limited to the Provincia.

Diodorus (5.31.3-5) and Strabo (4.4.5) note the practice of divining the future from the death throes of a human victim stabbed near the diaphragm. A recent discovery on South Uist has been hailed as archaeological confirmation of these accounts. Here, the skeletal remains of a boy in early puberty were buried c. 200 BC in four pits, possibly following excarnation, with the remains of sheep and cattle. The child died following
two blows to the lower back, inflicted by a sharp metal blade and apparently aimed at the same spot (The Independent, March 14th 1989). Diodorus’ description is offered as an explanation for the Uist discovery, and a ‘ritual’ interpretation of the child’s death is advanced.

The proposal that the child was sacrificed and, particularly, that the sacrifice was a prediction rite, is text-led. Without text, the link between this find and divination would not have been advanced. But the parallels do merit consideration. Discrepancies in date and locale are obvious, though while Diodorus’ wrote some 150 years after the date suggested for the Uist find, his principal sources belong to the early Clst BC. Diodorus also refers to the rite as long-established (although this could simply be a nod at his uncited source: App.2.11.6).

Other forms of divination, such as the type noted by Artemidorus (Strabo 4.4,6), would not be recognisable archaeologically.

3.9. Sacrifice and votive offerings.

Rites of sacrifice are one of the most frequent themes in the LIA literature. Four types of sacrifice are noted: human, animal, self-sacrifice through voluntary death, and votive offerings (inanimate objects, ‘sacrificed’ by their removal from circulation, and sometimes additionally by their partial or complete destruction). Human sacrifice is the most commonly noted (Fig.3.4).

3.9.1. Animal sacrifice.

Animal sacrifice is infrequently mentioned. The victim is not always specified in references to sacrifice, but it is unlikely that a human victim is implied in such cases. On this basis, the following are or may be references to animal sacrifice:

Parthenius (Narrationes 30); Caesar (B.G. 6.13.1 - ?uncertain, see App.2.8.4), (6.17.3-4 - animalia capta
HUMAN SACRIFICE

CRIMINALS

Caesar 6.16.
- Execution of criminals pleasing to the gods

Strabo 4.4,4
- Big yield from judged cases
(Decadence) means big yield for the land

7.LISTRAL
(cf. pharmakos rites
Fig.3.5)

Cicero Fonteio 13.30
Diodorus 5.37,6
Livy 50,47,11
(Galatians)

Caesar 6.13,4 possibly
Caesar 6.16.

Strabo 4.4,6
Dionysius 1.38,2

Diodorus 5.32,6.
- Criminals and other first fruits

UNSPECIFIED VICTIM: POSSIBLE ANIMAL SACRIFICE

Caesar 6.17,3
Parthenius Nar. Am. 8
Strabo 3.4,16 (Celtiberians)
Artemidorus in Strabo 4.4,6 (Island near Britain)

VOTIVE OFFERINGS

BATTLE SPOILS

Caesar 6.17
Diodorus 5.27
Livy 5.39

TREASURES

Posidonius Strabo 4.1,13
Diodorus 5.27,4
Livy 25,24 (N. Italian Boii)

Fig.3.4. Classical references to Celtic religion: sacrifice.
immolant probably refers to animal sacrifice); Diodorus (5.32,6); Strabo (4.4.5); *Artemidorus (in Strabo 4.4.6 – the Demeter/Core interpretatio may imply animal sacrifice); and *Strabo (3.4.16).

Animal sacrifice is mentioned much less frequently than human sacrifice. While this is probably to be explained by the fact that such practices were generally unremarkable to Classical observers, the scarcity of data is nevertheless noteworthy.

All references to animal sacrifice date to the core period and later. Caesar is the only first-hand observer to note animal sacrifice, and there are arguments that he is drawing on an earlier text here: App.2.8.4). Diodorus (5.32,6) and Strabo (4.4,5) are possibly borrowing from Posidonius’ first-hand account, but this is uncertain, and there is a likelihood that Strabo (4.4,5) is reliant on Caesar. It is in any case noticeable that in these three accounts, the sacrifice of animals occurs as part of the offering up of battle spoil to the gods. The mythological tale from Parthenius (Narrationes 30) is the only probable reference to the sacrifice of animals by individuals, rather than communal practices.

There are few data on animals used or rites employed, with the exception of the burning of living things taken in warfare. Here, given the context, the animals are likely to be domestic, but Strabo (4.4,5) refers to the inclusion of wild animals as well as cattle in the Κολωνίας sacrifice. With reference to Artemidorus (or Strabo’s) comment on rites similar to those of Demeter and Core, on an island near Britain (Strabo 4.4,6), Brunaux (1988:89) drew attention to the most famous of the Demeter and Core festivals, the Thesmophoria. During this festival, pig remains, having decomposed in pits, were mixed with grain and scattered on the fields. As Brunaux (1988:89) remarked, Celtic counterparts for rites linking pits and decayed animal
remains are demonstrated at Gournay-sur-Aronde (Oise; Brunaux et al 1985) and elsewhere, and it is tempting to parallel text and archaeology here. Unfortunately, the features of the native rite which prompted the textual comparison are uncertain. Strabo or his source specifically mention rites of Samothrace, which may suggest he had in mind the Cabeiri Mysteries of Samothrace rather than the Thesmophoria (the Cabeiri were deities linked to Demeter and Core: Ferguson 1970:123).

No data are recorded on the subsequent deposition of sacrificed animal remains in any of the LIA texts. For this reason, and in contrast to the theme of human mortuary rites (3.12), textual data offer little potential in conjunction with the archaeological.

3.9.2. Human sacrifice.

Numerous LIA sources mention human sacrifice: Posidonius (Strabo 4.4,6 - woman’s death forming part of rite: App.2.3.3); Caesar (6.16,1-5); Cicero (Pro Fonteio 13.31); Cicero De Res Publica 3.9,15); Varro (in St. Augustine City of God 7.19); Diodorus (5.31,4 - probably), (5.32); Strabo (4.4,5); *Diodorus (31.13); and *Livy (38.47,2).

Many accounts do not specify the status of the victim, but two specific groups may be noted:

a. captives (specifically those taken in battle)
b. criminals

Other groups may have been included (Caesar 6.16,5. mentions ‘innocents’), but the sacrifice of outsiders is the most economical approach to a perceived need for human victims. Criminals, similarly, as deviants from the social order, could have been considered the most expendable of a community’s members. Wait (1985:119) noted that one of the few more recently studied peoples to have employed human sacrifice, the Maori, also
preferred to sacrifice enemy warriors.

The sacrifice of captives, noted before the core period by Sopater (possibly referring to the Galatai of Asia Minor), is mentioned in the LIA by Cicero, (Pro Fonteio 12.30) and Diodorus (5.32,6). *Diodorus (31.13) and *Livy (38.47,11) also give historical references to Galatian sacrifices. *Tacitus (Annales 14,30) later mentions the sacrifice of captives in LIA Britain.

The sacrifice of criminals is mentioned only in the LIA (Caesar 6.16, Diodorus 5.32,3. Strabo’s reference (4.4,4) to the yield from cases tried by the druids may also imply sacrifice of wrongdoers). These texts may not be wholly independent of each other. Even if taken as such, the theme is confined to the LIA.

The occurrence of pre- and post-core period accounts of the use of captives may suggest this variant on the practice was longer-lived. However, the sacrifice of prisoners of war was an emotive issue which certain writers (e.g. Cicero Pro Fonteio 12.30) were keen to employ, as it broke Graeco-Roman codes of conduct in war and offered a double emphasis on Gallic barbarity.

There is no explicit mention of the sacrifice of women (though this is not precluded in any of the accounts). Children are only noted with reference to the Galatians (Livy 38.47,2). Varro’s comment (St. Augustine City of God 7.19) suggests that child sacrifice was not commonly associated with the Gauls.

The probability that human sacrifice is over-represented in the texts, relative to its actual rate of occurrence, has already been considered (3.4.1). In this context, Green (1986:28) took Caesar (6.16) to suggest that it was through human sacrifice alone that the Gauls controlled the power of the gods, but Caesar is clear that such rites were only employed in emergencies such as great sickness (otherwise unattested) and the perils of battle. The 'life for a life' rationale offered by Caesar may be his own, but could well be valid, and
itself suggests that human sacrifice was only employed in life-threatening circumstances. Diodorus' comment (5.32,6) that criminals were imprisoned for five years prior to sacrifice could also suggest the infrequency of the practice. As Brunaux (1988:30) remarked, as prisoners of war were the principal source of supply of slaves, it is most unlikely that all were sacrificed. Finally, Diodorus (5.31,3) says it was only in considering major issues that human victims were used in divination rites. These factors, with the ideological considerations above (3.4.1) suggest that the picture of daily bloodbaths which it suited Cicero (Pro Fonteio 13.31) and others to paint, is considerably exaggerated.

3.9.2.1. Human sacrifice and archaeology.

Despite the quantity of textual data, sacrifice is an area where text and archaeology are difficult to use in conjunction. Archaeological evidence for human sacrifice is scarce and equivocal. To demonstrate the votive character of human bone deposits is not to preclude the possibility of fortuitous death, and Brunaux (1988:133) pointed out that even where human remains occur in unequivocal cult contexts, as at Gournay-sur Aronde (Oise; Brunaux et al 1980, 1985) and other Picardy sites like as Ribemont-sur-Ancre (Cadoux 1984), the demonstration of violent death and post-mortem mutilation of human remains is not evidence for human sacrifice (see also Brunaux 1986:323-4). Therefore, as Brunaux concluded, our knowledge of human sacrifice in IA Gaul rests almost wholly on the texts (Brunaux 1988:136).

Even leaving aside the problems of distortion, sensationalism and over-emphasis noted elsewhere, the available LIA references are of limited value for the archaeologist. Three methods of killing are mentioned. Diodorus (5.32) and Strabo (4.4,5), probably drawing on a shared source, mention impaling (later noted as employed in Britain during the Boudiccan revolt (Dio Cassius,
Epitome 62,7). Strabo (4.4,4) notes shooting with arrows, and Diodorus (5.32.6), Caesar (6.16,4) and Strabo (4.4,5) all refer to death by burning. Subsequent deposition rites linked to these pyre sacrifices would be likely to prove difficult to determine archaeologically. Nothing is said of the post-mortem deposition of sacrificial remains, on which archaeological approaches to human sacrifice must necessarily concentrate. Minority and outcast sectors of a population are often accorded non-normative burial rites (Wait 1985:119), and given the status of most documented victims of Gallic human sacrifice - criminals and captives - it is likely that the disposal rites subsequently afforded were non-normative. Wait 1985:119 notes that this was also the case with Maori sacrifices. As, in many areas, the normative LIA rite is unknown, this again creates problems of archaeological definition.

As Brunaux noted (1988:133), one possible victim of human sacrifice is the Lindow bog body (Lindow Moss, Manchester). Dating has proved problematic, but the body is generally agreed to date to c. Clst AD. Initial radiocarbon dates on the body varied from Clst AD (Gowlett et al 1986) to C5th AD (Otlet et al 1986). Dates from a more recent analysis of the stomach contents cluster to Clst AD (Ross and Robins 1989:17). This example provides an excellent case study for developing a critique of the archaeological recognition of human sacrifice.

Before his body was dropped face down in the bog which ensured its preservation, the Lindow man had been subject to a triple death, via axe blows, garrotte and a cut throat (Stead, Burke and Brothwell 1986). Clearly, the employment of three modes of execution in rapid succession, each of which would alone have proved fatal, suggests that this death was not a simple act of violence. Ross (1986:162-4) proposed that the folklore motif of the three-fold death offers textual support for
the possibility that the Lindow man was ritually killed. But while the motif is common in medieval insular texts, there is little earlier evidence for it. Ross (1986:162-4, Ross and Robins 1989:45ff) contended that the Clst AD source Lucan (1.444-6) records the triple motif. Lucan describes sacrificial rites associated with several Celtic deities of southern Gaul: Teutates’ victims are drowned, those of Esus hanged or stabbed, and Taranis was propitiated by fire. Though Esus, Teutates and Taranis continue to be described as an important triad (Rankin 1987:290) it is far from clear that they represent a triad in anything other than Lucan’s text. There is little epigraphic support for the contention that they were widely recognised (Green 1986:14) and Lucan himself restricts their worship geographically. The passage can at best be said to refer to three sacrificial rites.

Ross’ second major criterion for ritual death was the traces of mistletoe pollen in the stomach contents (1986:167-8) of the Lindow corpse. Mistletoe was associated with the Gallic druids by Pliny, writing in the Clst AD (16.249). Ross argued that Pliny’s account ‘points strongly to the ritual sacrifice of Lindow man’ (1986:168), but as Pliny suggests that mistletoe was prized for its healing properties, its presence need not be explained by reference to sacrificial rites. The very small pollen traces could in any case have been ingested inadvertently (Scaife 1986:132). Ross’ other criterion, the presence of charred bread in the stomach (1986:164-7), is predicated entirely on mediaeval and later accounts of sacrificial rites in which a sacrificial scapegoat was elected by selecting pieces from bannocks or cakes.

It may be concluded that these proposed textual parallels for aspects of the Lindow deposit are uncritically advanced by Ross. The best criterion on which to propose human sacrifice here remains the unnecessary repetition in the modes of execution employed.
A number of the parallel series of (non-Celtic) inhumations from waterlogged peat deposits in IA Denmark had cut throats or had been strangled, including those from Tollund, Grauballe and Borre Fen (Glob 1969). As Whimster noted (1981:180), such modes of execution would leave little or no detectable trace in terms of the purely skeletal material normally available.

Other suggested examples of human sacrifice may briefly be noted. de Navarro (1972:17-18) argued for human sacrifice at La Tène. Wait (1985:117 and 119) attributed complete inhumations under ramparts in Southern Britain to human sacrifice. Wait interpreted human bone from pits on the same sites as mortuary deposits, and there is nothing from examination of the skeletal evidence to support his contention that foundation deposits represent human sacrifice rather than the votive deposition of the fortuitously dead.

3.9.2.2. Human sacrifice through time.

The concept of barbarity, as evinced through human sacrifice, was often employed to justify Roman domination (2.11.1; 3.4.1). This should lead us to expect post-Conquest references to Roman success in terminating the practice. The first extant writer to comment on this is Strabo (4.4,4), in a comment clearly not drawn from Posidonius (App.2.18.4). After the LIA Mela (3.2) indicates that human sacrifice had been replaced by a symbolic act. Pliny (30.4) also refers (by implication) to the cessation of human sacrifice (App.3.9.1). Some optimism in these claims of success may be expected, but it is likely that the practice decreased in the C1st AD. De Witt (1938) argued that proscription of the druids in C1st AD was linked to their continued use of human sacrifice (a link apparently made by Pliny 30.4). The suggestion is supported by Henig (1984:27), but of the writers who refer to the cessation of the practice, only Pliny mentions the druids. The druids are however linked
to human sacrifice by several LIA writers (Caesar 6.16,2-3, Strabo 4.4,5, Diodorus 5.31,4), and it is clear that Classical commentators associated the druids with human sacrifice.

References to human sacrifice occur as late as C3rd AD (App.3.9.1). While as Henig (1984:27) noted (for Britain) there is a little evidence that such rites continued in rural areas, the late texts are not based on direct observation, but are anecdotes harking back to an earlier era and the claims of the terror Gallicus.

3.9.3. Self sacrifice (voluntary death).

Accounts of voluntary death, occurring in a variety of socio-religious contexts, recur throughout the Classical literature. The stimulus for most accounts was probably that voluntary death afforded the ultimate illustration of the commonplace that death held no fear for the Celts (3.6). The LIA references are: Posidonius (in Strabo 4.4,6), Posidonius (in Athenaeus 4.154 A-C); Caesar (3.22) and conceivably implied in (6.19,4), though this is far from certain; and *Sallust (in Servius’ commentary on Virgil Georgics 4). (Fig.3.5).

The majority of LIA accounts concern reciprocal social contracts between individuals, but some texts, especially Posidonius in Strabo (4.4,6), may be advanced as cognates for otherwise much later references to rites employing a ἡμιroring or emissary victim.

The LIA texts include comments by two visitors to Gaul. Posidonius (in Athenaeus 4.154 A-C) is the earlier, noting a practice of former times, which almost certainly predates the LIA. Caesar (3.22) is the second, referring to core period Aquitania.

It is often difficult to draw a distinct line between the secular and non-secular in LIA Gaul. References to suicide are a case in point. For Mauss (1925:324-9), followed by Brunaux (1988:82), the custom of committing suicide in exchange for wealth and
Fig. 3.5. Classical references to Celtic religion: potlatch, suicide, counter-prestation.
prestige, described by Posidonius (Athenaeus 4.154A-C) was an extreme form of potlatch, in which the counter-gift was one’s own life. Mauss argued (1925:326-7) for life as a ‘supreme gift’ on functional rather than ideological grounds; through his death the donor escapes the obligations of a later counter-prestation. Brunaux (1988:82) offered a similarly functional view of voluntary death, remarking that the to and fro of gifts may sometimes have resulted in deadlock, and that death would have offered a means to avoid debt, and client status.

However, two early 1st AD writers suggest that Gallic belief in immortality was such that debt obligation extended into the afterlife (Mela 3.2, and Valerius Maximus 2.6,10; the latter refering to ‘former times’). Although these are post core period references, they suggest that voluntary death was more than an economic expedient (Fig 3.5). Equally, contra Brunaux (1988:82) Posidonius suggests that voluntary death was actively solicited. This despite the fact, as Meid (1988:73) remarked, that the bargain struck is manifestly unequal. Other unequal bargains in which a contractee forfeits his life are attested in Caesar’s account of the Aquitanian Soldurii (B.G.3,22), and by Sallust (Servius’ commentary on Virgil Georgics 4), referring to the Celtiberians.

Whilst potlatch encourages unfavourable bargains, the notion of willingly staking one’s life in such an exchange is probably only explicable against a background of religious beliefs (Meid 1987:73). For Meid, as for Chadwick (1966:54), this background is the well-documented Celtic contempt for death, arising from a belief in immortality. But suicide may have had an ideological status which afforded it especial prestige.

Human sacrifice (as Varro remarked of the Gauls and others, according to St. Augustine, City of God 7.19) was considered by many peoples to be the ultimate divine
offering. That voluntary death was often seen as especially propitious is suggested by the widespread existence of the rite of emissary victim, which as Brunaux (1988:132) noted may have existed at some point in the Provincia. This is suggested by a late notice in Servius (fl. c. 400 AD: Gloss on Aeneid 3.57), following a fragment by Petronius. Servius says that if an epidemic broke out at Massilia, one of the poor of the town offered himself to save the city. Having been fed for a year at the town’s expense, he was crowned with leaves and wearing consecrated clothes, was led through the town. At the same time, he was heaped with imprecations so that the ills of the city fell on his head. He was then thrown into the sea.

There is a close parallel for this account, probably drawn from the same source, by Lactantius Placidus, the C5th/6th AD commentator on Statius (writing c. 95 AD). Both are late and untrustworthy and, contra Brunaux (1988:132), may document Greek-inspired lustral rites particular to Massilia, rather than Gallic customs. However, during the LIA, Posidonius described an hieron roofing rite in which a woman is torn to death (Strabo 4.4,6). Though, as Ross (1986:165) noted, her death may be seen in terms of the importance of the correct performance of rites, she is possibly to be seen as a διπρωκός: Posidonius suggests her death was engineered, indicating a death was a requirement of the rite.

Finally, the concept that purification of the land could be achieved through human sacrifice, implicit in the Marseilles references, has possible LIA cognates (though death is not voluntary in these texts). These are Vatican Paradoxographer (Keller 25), Diodorus (5.32) on criminals as first fruits, and Strabo (4.4.4) on the yield from cases tried by the druids.

Of the LIA sources, only Posidonius mentions the manner of death in some detail. Posidonius says the
victim lay on his back, stretched out on his shield, and his head was cut off. Decapitation is attested in other contexts, primarily the ritual beheading of the enemy dead (3.12.1). The Paradoxographer (Keller 25) also states that the Keltoi decapitated women who advised them wrongly in matters of war. As the skeletal remains in each case would be similar, it would be difficult to distinguish archaeologically between these rites. On the occurrence of isolated skulls and corpses lacking skulls see 3.12.1.

Archaeological approaches to this theme necessarily concentrate on subsequent deposition rites, and the texts say little on this. These may well have differed according to the context of death, but the texts do not enable us to predict how. The nature of lustral 

rites is such that the status accorded to the individual in life (as voluntary victim) is not reflected in the treatment accorded the corpse. The ills of the community are heaped on the individual, and his body is cast out from the community to purify it. Deposition thus takes place outside the community boundary.

3.9.4. Votive offerings.

Wait remarked (1985:207) that textual evidence for votive offerings is brief. The data are however consistent and instructive. The LIA references fall into two principal groups:

a. Dedication of war booty.

b. Dedication of treasures, principally precious metals.

The two groups are not exclusive. *Livy’s comment (23.24,11), on the adornment with gold of a skull taken by the North Italian Boii, falls in both groups, though into neither comfortably. The passage should probably be considered in the context of decapitation (3.12.1). More simply, precious items could have been taken as booty
(for example, removed from corpses).

There are a number of indications that the data point to two quite distinct types of votive deposition. Whilst group (b) is consistently associated with structures (at least in as far as interpretatio suggests this) group (a) is not. This aspect is discussed under cult loci (3.10.). Here we are concerned with the votives themselves.

Several texts, dating mainly to the core period, imply the votive status of war booty in LIA Gaul. Caesar 6.17,3-4 is the principal example. The following, although not referring specifically to booty as votives, should probably be seen in the same context:

Diodorus 5.29.?: *Livy (5.39,1 - Allia 390 BC); (23.24,11 - Cisalpine Boii (216 BC).

The Roman army must have had considerable experience of Gallic treatment of war booty, and it is easy to see how the topic entered the record. Nevertheless, Caesar offers the only account by a first-hand source, and is the only writer to state explicitly that booty was thus dedicated. Diodorus (5.29,4-5), very probably borrowing from Posidonius’ autoptic account (App.2.11.5) implies dedication, as does Livy, but the latter is not referring to Gaul. Whether Livy’s reference to Allia (5.39,1) is evidence for the antiquity and widespread employment of such practices remains debatable (App.2.17.2).

The logic of sacrifice, in many societies, dictates that votive dedication is often a two-stage process. First, the promise of a sacrifice in requital of favours received (in Roman practice, the nuncipatio), and second, the fulfilment of the promise if the god does his part (the Roman solutio). Caesar 6.17,3-4 suggests Gallic booty sacrifices were conducted on a similar basis.

The ritual process described by Caesar (6.17,3-4) began with a collective promisory dedication made in advance of battle. Everything the Gauls hoped to take in the fighting was dedicated to the god, presumably to
ensure the outcome. Caesar is the only LIA writer to mention promissory dedication, but Florus (Epitome (1.20,5) writing in the C2nd AD but with reference to the C2nd BC wars, mentions similar dedications made in advance of battle. The latter passage is ironic (App.2.8.8) but points to a Roman conception that a form of nuncipatio was a Gallic habit in advance of conflict.

In the aftermath of battle, considerable effort was made to ensure that everything was rendered up to the god and the contract with the deity not broken. Individual enrichment from war booty was, according to Caesar, proscribed. As the object of a promissory dedication, the spoils belonged to the god. As Brunaux noted (1988:108) the concept of booty as a supplement to soldiers’ income is thus absent from the record for Gaul. This is a stark contrast to Roman attitudes, and may explain Classical interest in the practice.

Caesar (and Livy 5.39,1 on Allia) says spoils were piled up in heaps. The nature of the depositional loci is uncertain. As the booty - sacred prior to deposition - may be argued to render any locus sacred, no formal structure need be implied by Caesar’s use of locus consecratus (on this see 3.10.1). Caesar stresses a conceptual inviolability.

The spoil thus dedicated, following Caesar, (6.17.3) comprised all inanimate booty. This could have included treasures such as personal ornamentation, but presumably mainly implies weaponry. Despite the usefulness of this material (if only as a source of scrap metal), it was considered taboo. Equally, spoil heaps were less likely to be plundered by Caesar’s forces than the precious metals considered below. The texts thus point to the existence of weaponry caches, and predict good survival opportunities for these. On archaeological responses to, and suggested excavated cognates for, the practice noted by Caesar, Diodorus and Livy, see 3.10.
A second set of notices concerns the dedication of precious metals. Celtic love of gold was legendary by the LIA, but it is only during this period that references emerge on the deposition of gold and other precious materials in sacred loci. It is possibly only as a result of interest in the scandal of the aurum Tolosanum that the topic entered the record at all. The references are:

Posidonius (in Strabo 4.1,13); Diodorus 5.27.4; and
*Livy (23.23,11- Cisalpine Boii (216 BC).

Posidonius gives the only account by a visitor to Gaul, and although there is much to suggest that his rationale of the aurum Tolosanum is based on observations in Southern Gaul (App.2.3.1), there is no evidence that Posidonius visited Tolosa. Diodorus' account is borrowed, possibly from Posidonius (App.2.11.3). Whatever the case, both texts refer only to southern Gaul, and Posidonius only to Tolosa.

Depositional loci appear to have differed between the two groups of votives. Uniquely, Posidonius (Strabo 4.1,13) mentions lakes, but as discussed at 3.9.4, the remaining Classical terminology employed for loci in which treasures were deposited is distinct from that employed in references to spoil heaps.

It is possible that some votive treasures were themselves battle spoil, but Posidonius, refering to Tolosa, mentions the local availability of metals, and the aetiological stress of Posidonius' account is that the Tolosa treasures accumulated through thrift, rather than through plunder (App.2.3.1). Treasure dedication may have been differently motivated to the booty offerings noted by Caesar (6.17,3-4), but in both cases, sources stress the taboo status of votives. Religious scruple rendered treasures, like booty, inviolable.

The two votive groups proposed above offer good survival possibilities, though precious metals would be less likely to survive in situ given the intrinsic value...
of the material. Strabo's remark that the Romans drained the lakes at Tolosa suggests Roman eagerness to plunder Gallic treasures. Whilst for the Gauls, the conceptual inviolability of dedicated material rendered it safe from plunder, the Romans had no such scruples (Suetonius Augustus 5.9,3 i). The plunder of the aurum Tolosanum was no doubt only the most famous of many such incidents.

Recovery possibilities for lake depositions of the type noted by Posidonius (Strabo 4.1,13) are limited, although the problem of access is balanced by the good preservation afforded by the locale. The occurrence of metal in watery contexts is well documented for the La Tène period (Tobrügge 1971, Fitzpatrick 1984, Wait 1985). Posidonius' account of Tolosa is widely cited as a textual cognate for this practice, but Posidonius in fact only mentions the depositon of gold and silver - rarely attested archaeologically - and in a very restricted geographical context. The absence of similar references could reflect the fact that in France, unlike Britain, the practice of depositing metals in water seems to have declined after the end of the C2nd BC. (Wait 1985:49).

3.10. Cult loci.

The modern myth of Celtic atectonicism (Lewis 1966:4) is increasingly challenged by recent excavation in France, particularly in Picardy (see below), but continues to inform much work on sacred space in Gaul (see e.g. Green 1986:17; G.Webster 1986a:107ff).

The concept is also discredited by the contemporary texts, though little attention has been drawn to the number of LIA literary references to the delimitation of sacred space.

This is one of the best-attested textual themes. There are fourteen LIA references:

Posidonius (in Strabo 4.1,13), Posidonius (in Athenaeus 4.37); Caesar (6.13), (6.17); Strabo (4.1,3), (4.4,6); * Cicero (Pro Fonteio 13,30); *Livy (5.39,1), (21.38,9)
(23.24,11), (Periocha 139); and Strabo (4.3,2), (12.5,1 - Galatia), (12.5,2 - Galatia)

Nine examples refer to Gaul, but of these Strabo 4.3,2 and Livy Periocha 139 consider the federal sanctuary at Lyons and are of little value in the present context. Of the non-Gallic references, Livy 5.39,1 concerns spoil heaps at Allia, Livy 21.38,9 the sacritum of Poeninus on the Great St. Bernard pass, and 23.24,11 the North Italian Boii. The remainder concern the Galatians. (See Fig.3.6)

3.10.1. Interpretatio and cult loci.

With the sole exception of Strabo’s reference to the Galatian Drunemeton (12.5,2), all passages employ Classical vocabulary in describing and defining Celtic cult foci, and may thus be said to employ interpretatio. As Buchsenschutz and Ralston (1986) have argued for Caesar’s use of vicus et aedificia in Gaul, Classical terms were often applied to Gallic settlements as formulaic generalisations. Some references to cult loci may be similarly influenced; given the context, Cicero’s aera ac templum (13.30) can hardly be a careful attempt to render Gallic foci explicable to the reader. Descriptive details rarely accompany interpretatio, and it is uncertain whether terminology in individual instances represents a conscious attempt to reflect the nature of Celtic cult foci, or simply the imposition of one frame of reference on another. The basic issue to be resolved is whether foci were tectonic, as much of the terminology implies at face value.

The common Greek descriptors for temple complexes on the Classical model are temenos and hieron. Temenos (a ‘cut’ or share of land apportioned to a god) defines a consecrated, enclosed area surrounding a god’s altar. Hieron is the sanctuary at the heart of the enclosure. Used on its own, hieron may designate a temple complex as a whole—temenos generally does not. The Latin
INTERPRETATIO IMPLYING
FORMAL STRUCTURES

Posidonius (Strabo 4.4,6) hieron (roofed)
Diodorus 5.27 hiera kai teemea
Strabo 4.1,3 hieron
Strabo 4.3,2 (federal sanctuary)
Strabo 4.4,5 hieron
Livy 21.28,9 sacrum
Livy 23.24,11 templum
Livy Periocha (federal sanctuary)

INTERPRETATIO IMPLYING ENCLOSURES

Posidonius (Strabo 4.1,13) sekos
Diodorus 5.27 temenos
Strabo 12.5,2 temenos

DESCRIPTIVE ACCOUNTS
(FORMAL STRUCTURES NOT NECESSARILY IMPLIED)

Posidonius Athenaeus REF dodevastadion tetragonon Arverni
Posidonius Strabo 4.1,15 limais (Tolosa)
Caesar 6.13 locus consecratus (druidic meeting place) Carnutes
Caesar 6.17 locus consecratus (loci of weapons heaps)
Livy 5.39 cumulus (piles of arms) Allia

OTHER

#Strabo 12.5,2 Drunemeton (Galatian)

Fig. 3.6. Classical references to Celtic religion: sacred space.
equivalents, *fana* and *templum*, have similar meanings.

In accounts on Gaul, where commentators on cult *foci* tend to be Greek, the Greek terms naturally occur more frequently. The LIA references are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>TERMINOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posidonius</td>
<td>Strabo 4.1,13</td>
<td>hieron (Tolosa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posidonius</td>
<td>Strabo 4.4,6</td>
<td>hieron (Loire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>Fonteio 13.30</td>
<td><em>arae ac templa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus</td>
<td>5.27,4</td>
<td>temenea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>4.1,3</td>
<td>hieron (Gallic/Iberian border)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>4.3,2</td>
<td>hieron (Lyon-Classical model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>4.4,4</td>
<td>hieron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note also a later reference to the Gallic War period:

*Plutarch (Vitae Caesar 26.4)* says Caesar’s dagger was hung up in an Arvernian *hieron*.

The term *fanum* is not used of Gaul by any of the LIA sources, and Cicero alone mentions *templum*. A later historical reference to the Gallic war (*Suetonius Life of Caesar 54*) does, however, refer to *fana templà que plundered by Caesar.*

Posidonius (in Strabo 4.4,6) is the only unambiguous reference to a roofed structure, but it is likely that certain other *interpretatio* references (particularly those of Posidonius and Diodorus for the *Provincia*) do refer to formal structures (see App.2.3.1; 2.11.3). With the exception of Posidonius (in Strabo 4.4,6) and Strabo himself (4.4,4) all references employing this terminology are to the *Provincia*; it is probable, given the long Greek influence here, that some sites thus described were constructed on the Classical model (Strabo 4.1,3). Equally, 'Celto-Ligurian' stone-built *foci*, with which Greek travellers to Massilia would have been familiar,
display clear Greek influence (Benoit 1955, 1957). Classical terms could have been felt appropriate in describing such architectures. Finally, the one hieron noted outside the Provincia (Posidonius in Strabo 4.4.6) is described as a roofed structure.

Whilst the case for formal structure can thus be argued, a considerable range of possibilities remains for all uses of standard Graeco-Roman descriptors. Accounts not employing this terminology are potentially more useful, as a measure of thought is implied in the selection of vocabulary. References falling into this group are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>TERMINOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posidonius</td>
<td>Strabo 4.1,3</td>
<td>Λήμναι (Tolosa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posidonius</td>
<td>Athen. 4.152 D-F</td>
<td>Ἐνώσεις κοστοδόχου τετράχυλου (Arverni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>locus consecratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>6.17,3-4</td>
<td>locus consecratus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Posidonius' reference to οἰκός is an interesting choice of terminology. οἰκός, commonly translated 'enclosure', also designates a shrine or chapel. According to Ammonius (Diff. 94.V), however, οἰκός designates a locus dedicated to a hero (as opposed to ναός, a shrine sacred to a god). It is possible that this vocabulary reflects a rare attempt to specify the function and form of a Gallic cult locus. Greeks heroised the dead in addition to supernatural beings, and it is surprising that this use of οἰκός by a Greek commentator on Gaul is not noted by writers arguing that the 'Celto-Ligurian' sanctuaries of Provence served a cult of the heroised dead (see e.g. Benoit 1955; Duval 1976:21-2; Brunaux 1988:38).

Posidonius (Athenaeus 4.152 D-F) also notes an act
of enclosure among the Arverni; Luvernius' constuction of an enclosure twelve stades square in which to host a feast. This historical passage is argued by Berger (1963:26-8) to refer to a Viereckschanze (6.2.1). Even allowing for exaggeration, formal structure is unlikely here. Luvernius' enclosure is simply a delimited space.

Caesar's references to loci consecrati may possibly be read in the same way. In the case of the druidic meeting place (Caesar 6.13), a single formal structure is unlikely (App.2.8.4), and the text again points rather to a delimited area of sacred space.

Caesar (6.17,3-4) also uses locus consecratus for heaps of battle spoil dedicated to a divinity considered cognate with Mercury. Again, formal structure is probably not implied (see below).

Despite interpretational problems, the LIA record points to a variety of means by which sacred space was delimited, some of which almost certainly involved formal structures and the man-made delimitation of space. (Fig.3.6). Unfortunately, structural techniques are suggested only by Posidonius' reference to hieron roofing materials (Strabo 4.4,6), and methods of spatial delimitation are nowhere documented.

While accounts of votive treasures employ interpretatio suggesting formal structures, the same terms are not used for heaps of weapons. Posidonius (Strabo 4.1,13) mentions lakes as repositories for treasures, but also notes hieron and κηκας. Diodorus (5.27,4) mentions hiera kai temenea, and also temenea in this context, though as his account may draw on Posidonius, too great a significance may not be attached to it. References to pre-core period Northern Italy, by *Polybius (2.32,55), and, during the LIA, by *Livy (23.24,11) also link valuable items to loci defined by standard Graeco-Roman vocabulary. *Suetonius, finally, says Caesar plundered fana templae que (Vitae Caesar 54).
Spoil heaps, on the other hand, are nowhere mentioned in association with loci for which common Classical descriptors are used. In two cases, specific items of spoil are deposited in 'temples'. *Livy (23.24,11) says Posthumius' spoils were carried to a Boii templum in 216 BC) and Plutarch, post-dating the LIA, says that during the Gallic War Caesar's dagger was hung up in an Arverni templum: Vitae Caesar 26.4). But in both cases, these spoils may be seen as spolia optima, receiving differential treatment to the majority of booty.

Caesar (6.17,3-4) simply says that war booty was piled up in heaps in sacred spots. His use of locus consecratus, as Wait (1985:202) noted, is ambiguous, but need not imply formal structure. Livy (though with reference to Allia) suggests booty was piled up on the battle field (5.39) - the existence of a formal structure would appear to be ruled out here. Diodorus (5.32) says booty is taken off the field, but does not refer to its fate. These distinctions are considered below.

3.10.2. Cult loci and archaeology.

Unsurprisingly, references to cult loci are among the data most frequently cited by archaeologists of Gallic religion. Most recently, Brunaux (1986 and 1988:126) drew parallels between the deposits at Gournay-sur-Aronde (Oise) and references to weapons heaps in Caesar (6.17,3-4) and Livy (5.39). Brunaux was only able to draw these parallels by arguing that war booty was taken off the battle field to an existing sacred site. None of the texts are specific about this (and Livy contradicts the claim) but as Brunaux plausibly suggested (1988:127) heaping weapons on the battle field itself may only have occurred in foreign territory, or in situations where spoils could not be removed quickly to existing cult loci. Brunaux suggested that in other circumstances spoils would be taken to a civitas sanctuary.

Cadoux (1984:77) suggested the 'ossuary' at
Ribemont-sur-Ancre (Somme) may be explicable in the light of references to Gallic trophies by Caesar 6.17,3-4 and Diodorus 5.32. Although Caesar and Diodorus indicate that animate and inanimate spoils were subject to different rites, the association of human and animal bone with weapons, which occurs at northern French sites like Gournay, Ribemont and Moeuvres (Nord) (Brunaux 1986:324, Cadoux 1984:75), is not precluded by the texts.

As discussed above, the texts suggest a notional distinction between, on the one hand formal structures containing precious metals, and on the other booty heaps (presumably principally made up of armaments), with no formal structural associations. The latter are not textually attested for the *Provincia*.

The archaeological evidence for enclosed cult loci is considerably more complex than this notional division would allow (see e.g. the schema in Brunaux 1986:319). The principal known IA deposits of precious metals (argued as votive by Furger-Gunti 1984) are hoards lacking structural associations (e.g. Tayac, Gironde; (Colbert-de-Beaulieu 1973:269-70) Ertsfeld (Lkr. Uri; Wyss 1975), and St-Louis (Basel; Furger-Gunti 1982)). These deposits decline by the 1st BC, and precious metals in unequivocable cult associations are rare in the LIA. Brunaux (1988:92) suggested that the decline in hoards may relate to the development of coin deposition at formalised cult loci, but the latter is essentially a post-Conquest phenomenon (Gruel and Clement 1987, Haselgrove 1989).

Weapons deposits in unequivocal cult contexts are better-known. Taking the best attested series, the 'Belgic' sanctuaries, as an example, there is some possible reflection of the textual division. First, iron weapons rarely occur in association with precious metals, or even with personal ornamentation. At sites where deposits mainly comprise weapons and human and animal bone (such as Gournay, Ribemont and Moeuvres),
ornamentation is rare. Those of the Picardy sites producing large quantities of fibulae and bracelets yield few weapons (e.g. Estrees-St-Denis (Oise; Gallia 1985:475), Vendeuil-Caply (Oise; Piton and Dilly 1985:27,33) and Morvilliers (Somme; Gallia 1985:483). Mirebeau-sur-Beze (Côte D’Or) produced large quantities of both ornaments and weaponry fragments, but the weapons deposits are significantly later than the bronze fibulae (Brunaux et al 1985:108).

In this context, the distinction in deposits identifiable in the series of Picardy sites could itself largely be temporal: weapons deposits commence in the late 3rd BC, whereas the earliest deposits at the latter group of sites include coinage, and may post-date the Conquest (Morvilliers certainly does, Gallia 1985:484. On the dating of artefacts deposited in the pits at Vendeuil-Caply see Piton and Dilly 1985:33). Weapons deposits nevertheless occur in the LIA at Ribemont (Cadoux 1984:71) and St-Maur (Oise; Brunaux 1988:24). At Mirebeau (Côte, D’Or) the majority of the weapons were dated to the latter part of the LIA (Brunaux et al 1985:108).

Large weapons assemblages at unequivocal cult loci do however tend to be associated with enclosure ditches, not with formalised structures. This is true of Gournay, St-Maur and also Ribemont, where weapons are associated with the ossuary and deposited along the top of the ditch (Cadoux 1984). Structural formalisation occurs at a late stage in the history of these loci; the pit group at Gournay was formalised by the early 2nd BC, but there is no known formal structure at Ribemont or St-Maur until the Gallo-Roman era. The deposit at Moeuvres has no known structural associations (Cadoux 1984:75). This is true of another poorly-known series of metalwork finds. These are closed, compacted deposits, comprising mainly iron tools and horse-gear. Examples are the ‘Massefund’ at Tiefenau (de Bonstetten 1852) and a deposit from
Nalliers, Vendée (reinterpreted by Lejars 1989:11).

This broad association between weaponry and delimited spaces rather than formal structures is possibly reflected in the texts, which associate weapons heaps with *locae consecrati* (Caesar 6.17.3-4) or with the battlefield.

3.11. Iconography.

Like the modern myth of Celtic atectonicism, the long-held belief that pre-Roman deity worship was largely aniconic (Lewis 1966:4, Green 1989:1) has been increasingly challenged by archaeological evidence, and only appears to have arisen by ignoring the indices contained in the contemporary texts. Deity representations are mentioned by several LIA sources: Caesar (6.16 - not certainly deity images), (6.17); Strabo (4.2,3); and *Strabo* (12.5,2).

Diodorus’ account of Brennus at Delphi (278 BC; 22.9,4), is the only core period suggestion that Celts did not employ anthropomorphs (see App.2.11.10 on this problematic historical reference). A second pseudo-historical reference (Trogus in Justin 43.5,4), concerning the tribes around Massilia, can be read to imply that deities here were anthropomorphically conceived (Rankin 1987:40). This tale, however, has as little historical value as Diodorus’, and neither should be taken at face value.

Most references to Gallic deity images occur in Latin writers. On Greek theories of barbarian antipathy to anthropomorphs, which may have coloured Diodorus’ clearly fictionalised account, see App.2.11.10.

Nowhere in Classical literature are the Gauls described as *kòi eis kòi*, the word which usually implies the worship of gods unrecognisable to the Greeks, and hence probably without determined physical characteristics (Rankin 1987:260). This absence itself may suggest that Gallic deity representation could be anthropomorphic. The
texts are somewhat ambiguous, but may be read the same way. Caesar (6.17,1) says the Gauls have many images (simulacra) of 'Mercury'. The term designates images of deities or persons, and hence generally refers to anthropomorphic likenesses. Caesar does not qualify the vocabulary, which to a Classical readership would certainly suggest anthropomorphic imagery. Caesar also uses simulacra for figures filled with living men and burnt as sacrificial offering. In this case, though the figures are not necessarily representaions of deities, they are at least mimetic, having limbs (membra). Strabo's use of $\kappa\omega\lambda\varphi\sigma\varsigma$ for a figure of this type (4.4,5) also implies anthropomorphic representation. Lucan, writing after the core period with reference to the Civil War, uses simulacra (3.412-7) for crudely worked timbers representing deities in a sacred wood near Massilia (App.3.11). He says these are more fearful than the rustic statues of Rome, but that he should contrast them with any form of Classical divine imagery is itself instructive. Contra Green (1989:8), Lucan describes the Massiliote images as crudely worked, not unworked, and, again, the representation could have been broadly mimetic. Valarius Flaccus (died c. 92-3 AD) also refers to simulacra of Jove, (Argonautica 9.9) here glossed as columnae. As Chadwick notes (1966:36) these passages recall some of the CIst AD wooden figures from the Sources of the Seine. On wooden figures at sources see (4.4.1). Archaeological evidence for pre-Conquest anthropomorphic statuary, possibly representing deities, continues to emerge. Statuary, argued to represent deities or warriors, has long been documented for the Bouches-du-Rhône area (3.11). There are an increasing number of discoveries beyond the Provincia. Some examples are the tricephalic figure from Bais (Ille-et-Vilaine), possibly of LIA date (Meuret 1990:87-91), the dieu accroupi from Argentomagus (Indre, Gallia 1984:320),
and a female example from Avallon (Avallon Museum) and the torqued Euffigneix idol, Marne (Megaw 1970:no.226). Torqued figures also occur at Vedigant, (Creuse) and Levroux (Indre; Vuaillat et al 1989:36-37).

Unsurprisingly, most known figures are worked in durable media. In the LIA texts, the only media noted are twigs (Caesar 6.16) and straw and wood (Strabo 4.4,5 for the κοιλάττων sacrifice). While the media here may be conditioned by the nature of the rite (sacrifice by fire) the texts may hint that deity representations were mainly executed in media with poor survival chances. In the C1st AD, as noted, Lucan mentions the use of wood. As late as the C3rd, Maximus of Tyre (Dissertations 8) says the Celtic image of Zeus was an oak.


Mortuary rituals are clearly an area where text and archaeology may potentially be utilised together. Textual data on disposal rites subsequent to death are unfortunately limited, though for the most frequently referenced rite, post-mortem decapitation, some information is given on the treatment of human skulls.

3.12.1. Decapitation.

References to decapitation are as follows:
Vatican Paradoxographer (Keller 46 ); Posidonius (in Athenaeus 4.154 A-C); (in Strabo 4.4,5); Diodorus (5.29.4-5); *Diodorus (14.115,15); and *Livy (10.26); (23.24,11).

Note also: *Anon. Bellum Hispanensis (32.1): At Munda, where Caesar was using Gallic forces, the skulls of the enemy were mounted on stakes around the besieged town (46 BC) (noted in App.2.11.5).

With the exception of Polybius and Justin, all accounts of decapitation date to the core period. However, apart from the Paradoxographer (date uncertain)
and the Posidonian data borrowed by Strabo (4.4,5) and almost certainly by Diodorus 5.28,6), all accounts are historical. Posidonius offers the only account of the practice as a contemporary LIA rite, and this near the start of the period. Before examining the rite, it is necessary to consider the dating suggested by the texts.

LIA commentators (and the earlier Polybius) consistently set the practice in the past. Dates offered for the practice are 390 BC (Diodorus 14.115,15), 295 BC (Livy 10.26,2), 225 BC (*Polybius 2.28,10), 218 BC (*Polybius 3.67,22), 216 BC (*Livy 23.24,11). The Posidonian account cited by Athenaeus (4.154 A-C) is also historical, pre-dating the LIA. Thus only the Paradoxograph (who may well predate the LIA) and the Posidonian account preserved by Strabo and Diodorus, suggest decapitation was a contemporary LIA rite.

It is possible that Posidonius' account, which proved popular with later writers, influenced some core period depictions of historical events. Diodorus' account of the dies ater (14.115,15) may be coloured in this way (App.2.11.9). But it is difficult to accept that all 'historical' references were similarly generated. Polybius, who pre-dates Posidonius and writes independently of the Posidonian tradition, also refers to decapitation, and there is a good case to be made from the texts that decapitation was widely practised by the C3rd BC. As is unsurprising, the historical texts refer mainly to N Italy rather than to Gaul: but archaeological evidence from the Provincia suggests decapitation rites existed here by the C3rd BC (see below).

Posidonius' autoptic LIA account of the decapitation of enemies (Strabo 4.4,5) offers a unique temporal 'fix' of around c. 100-90 BC for decapitation rites in the Provincia. At the same time, this is the latest certain account of the practice (the Bellum Hispanensig reference is problematic (see App.2.11.5), and it is possible that post-mortem decapitation of enemies was decreasing by the
LIA. It may be significant that Caesar makes no explicit reference to such rites. Strabo’s assertion (4.4,4) that the Romans put an end to the practice may too readily take the credit for what was in fact an internally motivated change in practice. The comment is in any case over-optimistic. That decapitation continued to some degree is suggested by the depiction on Trajan’s column of Celts riding off from battle bearing heads (Ross 1967:66), leading Webster (1986a:40) to suggest this was allowed to continue providing the heads were those of enemies of Rome.

There are no textual references to post-mortem decapitation in non-Mediterranean Gaul. Wait (1985:200) noted that archaeological evidence for the association of skulls with religious sites is very sparse North of the Massif Central and suggests that veritable 'head cults' were limited to Celto-Ligurian areas. Caesar’s silence on decapitation may reflect this, or point to change over time. But as discussed below, LIA archaeological evidence for the practice of suspending skulls suggests that certain activities involving skulls were widespread.

In the majority of sources, decapitation is depicted as a post-mortem rite performed on the enemy dead in the aftermath of battle. Only the Paradoxygrapher (Nr 46 112,6) and Posidonius (in Athenaeus 4.154 A-C) refer to decapitation as a mode of execution, both with reference to community members. The practice noted by Posidonius, the only example in which decapitation is employed in a peacetime context, pre-dates the LIA.

Few accounts suggest decapitation had a ritual aspect. Motivation is only discussed by Strabo (4.4,5) and Diodorus (5.29,3), following Posidonius, where the practice is depicted as a means by which warriors display battle prowess. Livy (23.24,11) on the decapitation of a Roman consul, and the subsequent treatment of his head in a templum of the North Italian Boii, is one of only two writers to suggest a ritual aspect for decapitation.
other is Diodorus (5.29.4), who refers to severed heads as \( \lambda \varepsilon p\sigma \gamma i \nu \alpha \) (first-fruits). The passage almost certainly refers to the Provincia. It is possible that writers ignored any religious motivation for decapitation in stressing Gallic "savagery". But commentators' abhorrence must have been conditioned by their own beliefs: the corpse was considered taboo (Webster 1986a:40, and see the scene on Trajan's column in which the emperor averts his head when offered decapitated heads by Celtic auxiliaries; Webster 1986a:40 and pl.1).

Whilst Diodorus' use of \( \lambda \varepsilon p\sigma \gamma i \nu \alpha \) indicates the cult status of heads, Classical writers do not outline the beliefs on which this status was predicated. For many peoples, including the Romans and Greeks (Henig 1984:18) the head was regarded as the seat of human power and energy, and hence as the "essence of being" (G.Webster 1986a:39). Several writers suggest Gallic decapitation stemmed from a similar belief in the head as a totem of power (e.g. Ross 1967:64; Green 1986:216). The related, very primitive, concept that to kill a brave enemy was to transfer his qualities to the victor may also apply to Gaul (G.Webster 1986a:61; Brunaux 1988:78).

Brunaux (1988:88) noted that in Classical accounts of other peoples who practised decapitation (such as the Scyths, Tartars, Monguls) the rite is accompanied by a cult of the head of ancestors. He argues from this that the Gauls too had ancestral cults involving the veneration of the head. Aside from the fact that ancestor worship is nowhere mentioned in Classical literature on Celtic peoples, Classical texts are almost unanimous in depicting decapitation as a rite reserved for dead enemies. In most circumstances these are unlikely to have had kinship ties to the victors.

3.12.1.2. Decapitation and archaeology.

Decapitation was practised in a number of contexts in LIA Gaul. The texts alone suggest the decapitation of
enemies, the decapitation of women in certain circumstances, and decapitation as a mode of execution for voluntary victims. From the skeletal remains normally available, it would be difficult to distinguish archaeologically between the various rites.

Textual accounts of post-mortem decapitation are nevertheless argued to have many archaeological referents. The human head is, for example, a frequent image in Celtic art (e.g., Green 1989:211-14), though such images need not depict decapitated heads.

More directly, there is considerable archaeological evidence, mainly from the Provincia, for the use of human heads in unequivocably cult contexts. Principal examples are the well-documented shires of Roquepertuse, Entremont and Glanum (Benoit 1955:16-7, Benoit 1957:244-58). Human skulls were depicted on stone pillars from these sites, and skull-shaped niches were cut into pillars at Entremont (Benoit 1955: pl XXV; 1957:245) and Roquepertuse (Benoit 1955 pl XXVII), for the suspension of skulls. At Glanum (St-Rémy-en-Provence) hooks were carved inside similar niches (Benoit 1957:248). Finally, Ross (1967:66) noted a post-Conquest deposit of eight or nine skulls beneath an altar at Apt (Vaucluse).

Benoit dated the bulk of 'Celto-Ligurian' statuary from mid C3rd BC to the Roman annexation (1957:250). Subsequent sources favour the earlier end of this scale. Jacobsthal (1944:3) dates the Roquepertuse sanctuary to C4th BC, Megaw (1970:134) to ?C4th-2nd). A jamb stone with niches from St-Blaise (Alpes-Maritimes) was incorporated into Gallo-Greek structures in the C4th BC (Piggott 1968:56). Finally the Glanum lintel and pillars, like the Entremont examples, were re-used in the C2nd BC, attesting their antiquity. The infrequency of post-Conquest data accords well with the dating suggested by the textual evidence, although the context of the dieu accroupi from Argentomagus (see 3.11) would argue for a later date for at least some material of this type.
There is detailed textual commentary on the subsequent use of heads once decapitated. As a result, archaeological cognates can be advanced for such practices. The fixing of heads to horses, presumably suspended from the horse-gear, is noted by Posidonius (in Strabo 4.4.5) for the Provencia and by Livy (10.26) for the Senones at Clusium, 295 BC. Benoit (1957:245) cited a close iconographic parallel for the practice. A carved pillar from Entremont (Bouches-du-Rhône) depicts horsemen carrying lances, and a severed head suspended from the withers of one horse. The pillar is dated on stylistic grounds to the Celto-Ligurian phase at Entremont.

Brunaux (1988:78) suggested that decapitation may have been the privilege of horsemen; an inference drawn not from the texts, which alone cannot support it, but from iconographic associations between human heads and horses. These occur, for example, on a lintel from the sanctuary at Nages (Gard; Benoit 1955: pl XII). For Celto-Ligurian horse imagery see also Green (1989:146).

Several sources refer to the public display of heads. Posidonius (Strabo 4.4.5,) and Diodorus (5.29,3) note that heads are nailed to entrances. Cognates are suggested at Entremont where skulls, possibly post-dating the siege of 123 BC, bear puncture marks from nails (Benoit 19XX:246). Similar finds are infrequent, but widespread. They occur in non-mediterranean France at Gournay-sur Aronde (Oise) where skulls may have been hung from the entranceway (Brunaux et al 1985:159-60), and L’Imperial (Cahors) may have had skull decoration (Benoit 1955:22-3). A skull from Lux, Saône, also bore nail damage (Guillaumet 1983:32). At Puig Castellar, Spain skulls were pierced with nails (Filip 1962:157) and skulls had possibly been nailed to the gate at Bredon fort, Hôshire (Whimster 1981:187).

Wait, who argued that the use of skulls in religious contexts is limited to the Celto-Ligurian area (1985:199-200), suggested that the more widespread use of skulls on
ornamental gateways is to be seen in a secular context. While the Celto-Ligurian rites are clearly localised, it is difficult to follow the argument that the use of skulls elsewhere lacked religious referents.

The widespread occurrence of disassociated skulls may also point to rituals involving the human head, though such finds are not evidence for decapitation rites per se. Equally, outside the Provincia this is less an LIA phenomenon than a Gallo-Roman one. For the occurrence of skulls in wells and shafts in post-Conquest contexts see 5.4.1. Beyond the Celto-Ligurian sanctuaries of the Provincia (above), pre-Conquest examples of disassociated skulls are infrequent. Wait (1985:99), synthesising data on southern British settlement and hillfort sites, calculates that disassociated human skulls make up only 9% of LIA human bone deposition.

Articulated corpses lacking skulls are also rare. Cremation and skeletal disarticulation as a result of excarnation may contribute to this absence, as may ritual processes of the type suggested by the Ribemont 'ossuary': long-bones were deliberately selected here. (Cadoux 1984, Brunaux 1986).

Two articulated torsos from a skeletal group at Ribemont-sur-Ancre lacked skulls (Gallia 1985:185), as did the 200 skeletons from Moeuvres (Nord; Cadoux 1984:75). Early - Middle La Tène examples are documented in inhumation contexts, in Marnian cemeteries. At Les Bouverets (Marne) four skeletons in a multiple grave all lacked skulls. At Sogny-aux-Moulins (grave 13) two headless corpses were interred either side of an intact third (Whimster 1981:188). Whimster (1981:188) recorded further headless inhumations at the Marne cemeteries of les Jogasses, Mont-Gravet, Mont Troté (Ardennes), Poix and Grandes Loges. Most syntheses of skeletal remains concern Britain (Whimster 1981, Wait 1985). Whimster (1981:187) noted that in the Clst AD mass grave at Bredon
fort (Hampshire) up to 67 individuals were represented, but only 27 skulls. On the other hand, no under-representation of skulls was noted in mass graves at other forts (1981:187).

3.12.2. Funerary rites.

Funerary rites, unfortunately, received little attention in LIA commentaries. There are only two pertinent texts:

Caesar (6.19,4); Diodorus (5.28,6).

Both writers refer to cremation. In the 1st AD Mela mentions interment (3.2) and Lucan a form of excarnation (This comment from Lucan is noted by Brunaux 1988:87, who provides no reference: the passage has not been traced by the present writer). Excarnation is also noted in the 2nd AD by Pausanias (22.21,7).

In the absence of frequent inhumation evidence, unaccompanied cremation is assumed to have been the common burial rite in many areas of Gaul by the Gallic war. That two core period sources should refer to it need occasion no surprise. The value of both texts has nevertheless been questioned. Tierney (1960:206) finds Diodorus’ reference to letters cast on funeral pyres unbelievable, but this need not discredit the remainder of the account. Brunaux (1988:85) argues that cremation on the lavish scale described by Caesar (6.19,4) finds no counterpart in the LIA archaeological record, where inurned ashes, in simple earth graves, rarely with grave goods, comprise the main evidence for La Tène D mortuary rites. Brunaux thus argues that Caesar’s information belongs to an earlier period in which cremation was the exception rather than the rule.

Caesar is however largely concerned with the Gallic elite, and many of the practices which he suggests as normative may be restricted. This may be true of 6.19.4, which describes the cremation of those of sufficient status to retain servi et clientes. Some lavish LIA
cremations are known (e.g. Goeblingen-Nospelt, Luxembourg, Metzler 1984), and Caesar’s text could be contexted here.

It may also be argued that Brunaux (1988:85) fails to distinguish in his analysis between rites of cremation and post-cremation deposition. Caesar (6.19,4) and the mortuary data Brunaux cites are not directly compatible, as they relate to different stages in the cremation process. That lavish cremation will be followed by lavish burial of cremated remains, as Brunaux assumes, need not follow. Caesar (and also Diodorus 5.28,6) in fact suggest that the personal wealth of the deceased was destroyed during the cremation rite, not interred with him subsequently. This point has considerable implications for the archaeological identification of "high status" LIA burials.

Formal deposition rites may not have been employed for the enemy dead. Whilst it is clear from the texts that the heads of enemy warriors were accorded special rites, the corpses were possibly left where they fell: Livy implies this in a reference to Northern Italy, and during the LIA there are no references to the subsequent disposal of decapitated corpses.

After the LIA there are possible references to excarnation. The rite described by Lucan (see Brunaux 1988:87), unless followed by secondary deposition, would be archaeologically unrecognisable.

3.13. Absent themes.

Taking the LIA record as a whole, some lacunae are obvious. There are for example very few data concerning fertility deities (e.g. none of Caesar’s quintet is ascribed a fertility role) or fertility rites. The significance of identified lacunae is difficult to assess. Are lacunae accidental, reflecting simply the lack of available data, and the cultural biases of the commentators, or do they reflect rather the character of
Gallic religion?.

Most attempts to systematise the recognition and assessment of lacunae employ a model against which the Classical data can be measured. Wait (1985) employs a systemic general model; otherwise there is a general tendency to measure Classical data against the insular literary record (1.3.3). Lacunae proposed via the latter sources are, for example, sacral kingship (Wait 1985:227-8) and the liminal timescale, including Celtic festivals (Wait 228-9). The LIA record is silent on both topics.

Lacunae thus identified are of course seen as accidental (cf. Wait 1985:203 on the lack of references to burial officials in Gaul). Both approaches privilege external schema over the contemporary texts, and the possibility that the lacunae may reflect the character of LIA religion is ignored.

The best approach to the significance of lacunae is to determine absences by constant reference to the contexts of data production. In this way, the recognition that data collection was heavily biased towards the elite (1.4.1.5), indicates that the rites of the majority of the population will not be textually defined.

3.13.1. A 'natural religion'?

It is widely assumed that Celtic religion centred on 'natural' cult loci such as groves and springs (Henig 1984:17, Green 1986:17,19-22, esp 22). This view is not based on the LIA texts, which are largely silent on these topics. Instead, it is in part predicated, negatively, on the apparent paucity of archaeological evidence for tectonic loci and is in part a text-led expectation, arising by privileging the insular mediaeval texts.

To facilitate this notion, the silence of the LIA record (noted by Chadwick 1966:46) must be assumed to be accidental. Bearing in mind the contexts in which the data were produced, some arguments may be advanced which
support this view. The near absence of references to natural loci may in part be attributed to the fact that Gallic rites of this type were too familiar to Classical observers to excite interest. Worship centred on the natural world was deeply entrenched in Graeco-Roman religion (Ferguson (1970:65-69), and groves (see Virgil, Aeneid 8.352: 597, Ovid 3.1,1: 3.13,7), trees (Pliny 12,3; 15,77; 15,137) and springs were all considered sacred. It is also possible that some rites involving natural foci will have been rural practices, which in a record biased to the elite, are largely ignored.

These factors may be advanced to facilitate an argument that natural foci are accidentally absent from the record. On the other hand, although ‘natural’ foci were common to the Mediterranean observer, close similarities often excited comment by their very familiarity, as happens for Gallic augury (3.8). The absence of LIA commentary on this assumed ‘common ground’ between the two systems thus becomes significant.

Arguments for LIA use of sacred groves illustrate the problems involved in this context. Other ‘natural’ features conspicuous by their absence in the texts are considered elsewhere. These include water sources (Chapter 4) and subterranean cult loci (Chapter 5).

There are no LIA references to groves as cult loci. Despite this, and the archaeological intangibility of the category, groves are frequently advanced as Gallic cult sites (e.g. G.Webster 1986a:107, Green 1986:17).

Lucan, writing in the C1st AD with reference to the Civil War, is the only writer to suggest a (Massiliote) grove as an LIA Gallic cult focus (though there are later references to groves in early Roman Britain (Tacitus Annales 14.399ff; Dio Cassius Epitome 62). In the absence of direct LIA testimony, Gallic use of sacred groves is argued to be suggested by Roman place-names with the Celtic element nemeton. Examples from Gaul are Augustonemetum (Clermont-Ferrand), Nemetacum Atrebatum
(Arras) and Nemetodorum (Nanterre). Further examples from Spain and Britain, include Aquae Arnemetiae (Buxton) (Rivet and Smith 1979:254-5). Whether these sites were groves is far from certain. Rivet and Smith (1979:254) who gloss nemeton as 'sacred grove', point out it can have other meanings. Nemeton possibly denoted precincts, and the Irish nemed was glossed sacellum (sanctuary), suggestive of a small shrine or enclosure (Piggott 1978). In support of the argument that nemeton can denote structures, Powell (1980:171) mentioned an inscription from Vaison (Vaucluse) documenting the setting up of a nemeton in honour of Belesamma. MacCana (1983:14) rightly glosses nemeton as 'sacred place'. The word is not indubitable evidence of LIA cult groves.

Groves and related loci are not entirely absent from the Classical record, simply from the LIA data. During the Clst AD there is a spate of independent references to groves and woods, almost all associating these loci with druids. Whilst it is possible that such information is simply due to greater data availability, the late emergence of the theme is rarely seen as significant, though Wait 1985:204 notes the change in emphasis.

Other factors suggest that groves and secluded loci are veritable post-Conquest phenomena. Lucan and Mela stress the need for seclusion, and while this could be explained as a feature of the druidic teaching, Imperial proscription of the druids (App.3.7.1), and their loss of prestige under Rome (Wait 1985:204) may have necessitated the use of aecetonic or secluded locales.

Finally, it remains possible that the literary association of druids and woods or groves arose as a result of a spurious etymology (Chadwick 1966:38). Pliny - who writes much on this topic - suggests that druid derives from the Greek word for Oak. It is possible that the druid/groves association is entirely a literary construct of the Clst AD.

The clear change in textual emphasis between Clst BC
and 1st AD accounts of cult foci is ignored by workers arguing for groves as LIA cult loci. On the basis of the above, it may be suggested that the lack of contemporary data is not an accidental lacuna as such workers would argue, but an accurate reflection of LIA practice.


In summarising the characteristics of the LIA literary data, the circumstances of its production should be re-emphasised. The LIA 'record' is contexted in and characterised by Conquest and domination. That the record speaks the language of domination, either directly or via interpretatio and figures of contrast, has been discussed above (3.11). But the context of conflict is also evident in overall data content. Some early LIA data were no doubt generated through mercantile contacts (1.4.1.2), but much information prior to 50 BC was produced as a by-product of conflict. Many documented rites pertain to war. The sacrifice of captives (3.9.2), the post-mortem decapitation of enemies (3.12.1), the heaping up of battle spoils (3.9.4), and the offering of sacrifices to gods of war (3.9.4) may all have entered the record as the result of Roman conflicts with the Gauls. The theme of Gallic afterlife belief, widely held to explain fearlessness in battle (3.6), may also be contexted here.

In part, as Brunaux notes (1988:99), this emphasis is simply due to Graeco-Roman interest in alien battle customs. In the case of the Celts, this took on another, important, dimension. Centuries of Celtic threat, and the terror Gallicus (2.9.2) ensured that past wars and attitudes are much in evidence in describing LIA Gauls.

A corollary to the point that many documented rites are contexted in conflict, is that these rituals are often exceptional ones: this is clear for human sacrifice (3.9.2) and divination employing human victims (3.8). Normative rites are not textually defined. Equally,
most documented rituals are by their nature public acts. The LIA record offers very little on household rites or individual approaches to deity. Rural practices, which even a cursory look at other societies suggests would be considerably different to elite ones—go almost entirely unnoted. A similar limitation affects the Roman record (Henig 1984).

In summary, the principal lacunae in the LIA record concern the rites of everyday life. The absence of data on fertility rites, noted above, is in part contextual here. Propitiation and fecundity in social and biological reproduction are normally the central concerns of everyday religious life (Fitzpatrick, forthcoming). The archaeology of LIA ritual should proceed from the recognition that religion is embedded in daily life (1.5.2), and is increasingly concerned to identify the sacred in the profane. The silence of the texts on everyday rites is thus extremely unfortunate.
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4.1. Introduction.

As noted recently by both Brunaux (1988:41) and Green (1989:155), later Iron Age archaeological evidence for springs as cult foci in Gaul is virtually non-existent. Yet both writers contend, as have many other workers (e.g. Ross 1967:19-33, especially 20; Thévenot 1968:200-21) that water sources were of primary importance in the "natural religion" (Henig 1984:17) of the Celts.

Springs (here defined, following Ward (1975:198) as the concentrated discharge of groundwater resulting in a surface flow) have served as cult foci in numerous societies, and water sources have entered the Celtic ritual corpus in part simply because it has been difficult to conceive that Celtic peoples would not have endowed such phenomena with religious significance; accounts of Celtic source cults are frequently preceded by essays on the 'universal' principle of water source veneration (e.g. Thévenot 1967:203, G. Webster 1986:107).

But the primary (though of course related) processes by which water sources have entered the LIA corpus are those of retrospective inference (4.4-5). Water sources featured prominently in Graeco-Roman religious rites and rationalist medical regimes, frequently in a therapeutic context (4.4-5). There is an extensive body of archaeological evidence for water sources as cult foci in Gallo-Roman Gaul, and this has been suggested to attest not only to new rites introduced from the Graeco-Roman world but to earlier cults which served as jumping off points for the newly-introduced practices (see e.g. Brunaux 1988:41).

A re-examination of a geographically limited corpus of Gallo-Roman source sites has been undertaken to establish the extent and nature of archaeological evidence for LIA activity at such loci (4.3, and App.4), and the processes employed by scholars to supplement the LIA archaeological data in arguing for water sources as
pre-Conquest cult foci (4.4-5). The aim here is to examine whether the observation that the identification of insular activity never occurs independently of Gallo-Roman data is a testimony to the validity of the above thesis, or points instead to the need to re-assess the validity of the 'retrospective' methodology.

4.1.2. Parameters of the study.

The study area selected is Burgundy (comprising the modern départements of Côte d'Or, Nièvre, Saône-et-Loire and Yonne: Fig.4.1). Burgundy was chosen in part because geological factors make it rich in rivers and springs. The sources of two major French rivers, the Seine and Yonne, rise in Burgundy, as do those of the Cure, Serein, Arroux, Armançon and Dheune (Fig.4.1). Burgundy is divided into three areas geologically: the crystalline socle of the Morvan (central Burgundy, i.e. eastern Côte d'Or, southern Saône-et-Loire and western Nièvre), its Triassic and Jurassic sedimentary spur to the east (much of Côte D'Or) and to the north the alluvial network of the Saône valley and Bresse. Springs occur in all three areas, but certain terrains yield a higher proportion of mineralised sources (i.e. containing mineral salts in solution: see below).

Burgundy was also selected because a relatively recent synthesis of the Gallo-Roman data was available. Deyts' (1967) Sanctuaires et cultes des divinites des sources à l'époque Romaine en Bourgogne (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Dijon, recently synthesised in Deyts 1986:9-30) gives a less than exhaustive cover of the evidence available to 1967 but nevertheless offered a good starting point for the present study. Her catalogue has been supplemented from a number of sources for sites known prior to 1967, and updated to the present from the Revue Archéologique de l'Est et du Centre-Est and the Gallia circonscription notices for Burgundy.
Fig. 4.1. Burgundy: départements and principal rivers.
The catalogue is limited to archaeological data from springs: standing surface water sites such as lakes and bogs have not been considered. Springs take three basic forms: those which give rise to a surface flow (i.e. the heads of streams of rivers); those with no obvious surface flow (seepages) and those with intermittent flow (bourne). The resurgence points of rivers with subterranean passages are also included on the basis that these may have been regarded as springs. These varied forms, whilst all serving as foci for Gallo-Roman cult activity, may well have been conceptualised in different ways.

The same may be said with reference to qualities of the water itself. As noted, some areas of Burgundy produce ground water rich in mineral salts ('fontaines salées'), particularly sodium chloride and magnesium. These areas are the Morvan socle and the Triassic sector (rich in salted clays) of the eastern sedimentary spur. Springs rising elsewhere on the sedimentary spur and on the northern alluvial area generally carry near-negligible mineral charges. Western Burgundy (and the whole of the Bourbonnais and Auvergne) has a particularly high frequency of thermal sources, again with high mineral content. Mineralised sources are not therefore spread evenly over Burgundy; if water type influenced source activity at any period this may condition the locales selected.

Thermal sources and 'fontaines salées' often have some therapeutic value. In Burgundy, Gallo-Roman source activity occurs mainly in areas with a high number of mineralised sources (especially the Côte D'Or: Fig.4.2). However, the majority of sources listed here do not have genuine therapeutic capabilities (Deyts 1967). Sites which Deyts (1967) classified as Gallo-Roman 'healing sanctuaries' (on the basis of ex-votos: 4.5.2) are included in this group. The Seine Sources, for example, are not mineralised. This suggests that the distribution
of springs with perceived therapeutic properties was not geologically determined, since it is unrelated at least to the present chemical composition of the water itself. It should be realised, however, that sources which form heads of rivers may be non-mineralised at origin, but pick up considerable trace elements in their surface progress. This is true, for example, of the Cure, Serein, Arroux, Armançon, and Dheune, which are not significantly mineralised at source, but in their course collect numerous mineralised trace elements, with some therapeutic value. Source veneration in some cases could therefore relate to downstream water quality.

‘Medical’ ex-votos (4.5.2), so termed because they display graphically portions of the human body, are the principal material evidence for a healing aspect at source loci. Ex-votos of this type occur at only a quarter of the Burgundian sites catalogued: see 4.5.2.

4.2. Literary evidence.

This section examines literary evidence for LIA water source activity.

4.2.1. Literary evidence: Classical.

As water sources were common loci for Graeco-Roman ritual and for rational medicine, Classical observers may be expected to have commented on similar practices in Gaul. Pre-Conquest textual data on this topic are, however, notably sparse. Hirtius’ account of the diversion of a spring at Uxellodunum in 51 BC (B.G. 8.43,4), and the subsequent surrender of the oppidum, is the only LIA possibility. The text is ambiguous: Brunaux (1988:42) interpreted the spring as of cult significance, but a purely utilitarian function could as readily be implied (App.2.9). Lucan, writing after the Conquest with reference to the Civil War, notes springs in a woodland cult site (Pharsalia 3.399-425) near Massilia. This account of the Provincia is the one text to imply a link between sources and cult activity in LIA Gaul.
Possibly predating the LIA is a reference in the treatise *On Rivers* to a healing stone at the source of the Arar (Saône). The comment may be Calisthenes’ (writing c. 156 BC), but this is far from certain: the treatise draws on over 40 writers of diverse date, and was compiled c. C3rd AD (Duval 1970).

The therapeutic value of springs, especially thermal sources, was frequently noted in Graeco-Roman medical texts, from the collection attributed to Hippocrates (Fontanille 1985:15-24) through Soranus (writing under Hadrian) to Oribasius’ C4th AD *Collectiones Medicae*. Such accounts rarely make specific reference to Gaul, though Pliny (23/4-79 AD) referred to therapeutic springs among the Aquitanian Tarbelli and in the Pyrenees (*Natural History* 31.2), and an anonymous Panegyric to Constantine (spoken 310 AD by a Gallic rhetor (Duval 1971:531)) mentions a temple to Apollo, with a thermal source, at Autun (Saône et Loire).

With the possible exception of the treatise *On Rivers*, there are thus no pre-Conquest references to Gallic healing springs, and little textual evidence for any form of cult activity at water sources. There is, in fact, a paucity of textual evidence for any form of water-related cult *loci* (3.13). Standing water is mentioned in this context only once, in Posidionius’ account of the sacred lakes of *Tolosa* (Strabo 4.1.13).

4.2.2. Medieval literature.

The archaeological tendency to plug presumed accidental gaps in the Classical literary record by recourse to Celtic venacular texts is in this case confounded by a similar paucity of evidence in the vernacular texts. It is often difficult to distinguish whether *foci* in individual references are wells or springs, but clear references to springs occur infrequently (on wells see 5.5). There are some references to the heads of rivers: most noticeably, the
source of the Boyne and Shannon was considered to be the Otherworld Well of Segais (actually a spring), (O Rahilly 1957:322; *Metrical Dinnshenchas* iii 26; 286ff). However, as Dillon and Chadwick (1967:137) emphasised, accounts of local cults of springs are uncommon in the Medieval texts.

4.2.3. **Hagiography and other folklore.**

Other forms of textual and even oral data (local legends) have been employed in identifying source cults in Burgundy. Bulliot and Thiollier (1892), drawing on hagiographic and folklore accounts of the mission of St. Martin (d. 397 AD) to destroy pagan cult foci, attempted to identify Gallo-Roman sanctuaries by charting the Saint’s progress through Burgundy. The weaknesses of the methodology are self-evident (not least since the itinerary is established from data ranging from Gregory of Tours’ 6th AD account of the miracles of the Saint to local contemporary folklore). Water sources noted in Bulliot and Thiollier (1892) are only included in the present work when there is supporting archaeological evidence for their use in the Gallo-Roman era.

A general assumption by Bulliot and Thiollier (1892) was that they recorded late post-Conquest manifestations of much earlier cults. They remarked, for instance, that the use of statuary at sources was a Roman innovation, "mais sans rien innover dans les pratiques dont elles étaient l’objet" (1892:44). They do not support this double retrospective (i.e. link to St. Martin, *ergo* Gallo-Roman cult, *ergo* pre-Roman cult) by archaeological evidence. Similar assumptions, regarding both the date and nature of cult activity at water sources, pervade the literature. A recent example, for the Bourbonnais (Piboule and Piboule 1985:145-156), infers from folklore alone not only that certain water sources were in use in the Gallo-Roman era, but that these had healing aspects.
4.3. The Burgundian Site Corpus (Figs. 4.2-3, App. 4. Bracketed numbers given in bold script refer to catalogue entries in App. 4).

Gallo-Roman source veneration took a number of forms. Some sources, such as the Sources of the Seine (21) were the focus of major structural complexes. Others lacked structural associations, and in common with Romanised practice elsewhere, post-Conquest source veneration was often marked simply by a statue representing the deity or spirit of the spring (e.g. Allerey (1), Touillans (27)). Sometimes a small structure sheltering the figure (e.g. Beuray-Beugay (5)) was erected.

Most Burgundian loci have been subject to modern capture works. However, in an effort to understand topographical considerations influencing site choice, a limited programme of site visits was undertaken. 24 sites have produced some form of structural evidence; 21 of these were visited (see App. 4). Most of the 18 sites at which source veneration is represented only by chance finds of statuary were not assessed.

4.3.1. Limitations of the data.

The catalogue of sites in App. 4 lists Burgundian spring sites cited in the literature as offering evidence for Gallo-Roman activity (summarised in Fig. 4.2). The sample totals 42 sites (having discounted five sites not clearly source related). Of these, 27 are in Côte D’Or, six in Nièvre, six in Saône-et-Loire and three in Yonne (Fig. 4.3). The proportion of these for which pre-Conquest horizons have also been argued is very small: only four of the sample of 42 sites (9.5%). There are, however, a number of factors which should be taken into account in this regard.

Audin (1985:121), in a recent examination of Arvernian sources, noted the two most obvious limitations which affect such studies, the absence of systematic
Fig. 4.2. Burgundy: distribution of Gallo-Roman water source loci.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Excav. 'IA'</th>
<th>Associated Structures</th>
<th>Canopy etc</th>
<th>Caption/Statuary only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CÔTE D’OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Allerey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Crois-St-Charles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Alesia 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Arroux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Beurey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Biere/Chatel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cussy/Chatel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cussy/Colon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Diancey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Eschalot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Essarois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Essey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Etalante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Fresnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Bissey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Ladoix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lantilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Massingy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Montlray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Premieux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Seine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Ste-Sabine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Santenay 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Santenay 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 St-Romain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Terrefondre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Touillon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Trouhans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Vertault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEVRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Arleuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Entraines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Saulx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 St-Honoré 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 St-Honoré 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 St-Parize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Yonne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAÔNE-ET-LOIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Aze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Bas de Marais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Bourbon Lancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Brosse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Chaintre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Grisy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Sercy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YONNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Escolives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Fontaines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Montmartre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Treigny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.3. Burgundy: Gallo-Roman water source loci catalogued in App. 4.
excavation at most sites, and the poor quality of the documentation for those which had been excavated, often in the C19th.

In Burgundy, the majority of sites have not been systematically excavated. Of the sample of 42, some excavation has occurred at 16 (38%) although not always at the present position of the source itself (see below). In only 11 cases are the excavations of this century (26%), and only six of these (14%) are after 1960. The remainder of the sites are represented by chance discoveries of caption and statuary during, mainly, C19th efforts to cap or re-cap sources.

In Burgundy, as elsewhere in France, interest in water sources peaked between the C19th and the Second World War. The C19th saw the majority of excavations (though in the 1960s finds at the Sources of the Seine (21) prompted a new phase of site re-examination), and the period between the First and Second World Wars saw a considerable number of syntheses (e.g. Corot 1927, Vaillat 1932, Drioux 1934). Valuable later syntheses were provided by Grenier (1960) and Thévenot (1950, 1968).

Certain factors specific to the antiquarianism of the C19th may have a bearing on the record. Firstly, both in caption finds and in C19th excavations, an overriding interest in aesthetic antiquities (i.e. stone statuary) meant that things other than such artefacts, or other aesthetic or valuable finds, such as coins, tended not to be conserved or noted. Deyts (1983:165) cited a clear example of this process at Coren (Cantal), where two wooden figures, located during the C19th excavation of a source, were simply thrown back into the water.

Early excavation reports are characterised by vagueness as to the exact nature of materials found (e.g. references to 'ex-votos' or 'Gallic coins', with no further elaboration). Despite the prevalence of wall-chasing as the preferred field technique, structural
details are slight. Above all, the relationship between source and finds is often not explicitly stated (statuary is frequently said to be found 'near to' a source, for example). The problem is greatest at excavated sites where structures were examined, but the source itself was not (e.g. Croix-Saint-Charles (2), Essarois (11) and the Sources of the Yonne (43)), though the identification of contemporary canalisation networks often demonstrates that the sources fed the structures in question.

Captions have been explored at 47% of Burgundian sites with excavated structures: Massingy (18), Montlay (19), Sources of the Seine (21), Arleuf (30), Saulx (32), Grisy (42) and Fontaines Salées (45). In only one case (Fontaines Salées) has a wooden caption been dated. Dates assigned in the remaining cases are those of the associated assemblages. Whilst it is possible that caption may considerably pre-date associated material, this is rarely considered (exceptions are Grisy (42) and the square pool (Fig.4.7, H) at Fontaines Salées (45)). Similarly, if captions were re-utilised in the Gallo-Roman period it is possible that Iron Age evidence was obliterated by clearing out the caption prior to re-use; or that inadequate excavation technique may simply have failed to identify multi-period use.

4.3.2. Retrospection and LIA activity.

The possibility of post-LIA caption clearance may be considered a fundamental limitation to the present study. If pre-Conquest caption and related structures continued to be employed in the Gallo-Roman era, as retrospective inference implies, then Iron Age data may have been obliterated by the later use.

A feature of the retrospective approach is that it actually predicts the paucity of LIA archaeological evidence (LIA material being presumed to be obliterated by cults which supersede it, but which are at the same time the only evidence for it), and thus avoids the need
to explain its absence. Clearance of captions, favissae and structural obliteration are the archaeological inferences on which the absence of LIA data at Gallo-Roman source sites is generally explained away (see e.g. the Octogon temple at Croix-St-Charles (2) where a pre-Conquest sanctuary is inferred on the basis of a possible favissa and assumed obliteration of IA evidence during the Hadrianic construction phase: 4.3.3).

To surrender to this proposition is to miss the point that in the archaeology of LIA ritual, processes associated with post-Conquest continuity may limit the availability of archaeological data but should not acceptably serve as a total replacement for it. In terms of structural remains, the argument of obliteration is in any case suspect: the LIA temple corpus for Britain, for example, includes structures identified retrospectively on the basis that they are superposed by Romano-Celtic fana. Thus, of the 24 possible Celtic shrines catalogued by Wait (1985:385-393), 12 are overlain by Romano-Celtic temples. In only two cases (Bath and Woodeaton) is the former existence of pre-Conquest foci asserted in the face of total absence of pre-Conquest structural evidence, and the latter has LIA occupational debris. Even where pre-Conquest alignments are completely respected (as at Uley: Wait 1985:391), structural and other evidence for LIA horizons remain. Most of the proposed British temple sites have produced, in addition, some datable LIA material. In Burgundy, by contrast, LIA material at source sites with Gallo-Roman structural evidence is extremely sparse (4.3.4).

It is, notwithstanding, clear that the possibility of continued use or re-use of water source sites will have reduced the likelihood of recognising pre-Conquest structural horizons at sites excavated in the 19th. In the case of unexcavated springs represented only by Gallo-Roman caption and/or stray finds (45% of the sample), where re-employment of caption could have been
preceded by a ritual or utilitarian clearance of earlier debris, LIA data may also have been substantially reduced. But even given these problems, some portion of the excavated sample may be expected to produce evidence of LIA activity. In fact, four excavated sites (25% of the excavated sample) have been argued to have LIA horizons.

4.3.3. Sites with putative LIA horizons.

Four Burgundian sites have been argued by the excavators to have pre-Conquest origins. The evidence for IA activity is considered in this section. Further information is also contained in the relevant entries in App.4. Sites for which pre-Conquest origins are inferred from the stylistic consideration of wooden assemblages with post-Conquest deposition dates (Sources of the Seine (21) and St-Honoré (33)) are considered elsewhere (4.4.1)

Croix-Saint-Charles (Alesia) (App.4.2; Fig.4.4)

The ‘Moritasgus’ Sanctuary at the Eastern edge of the Mt-Auxois plateau (Côte d’Or) was excavated from 1909-11 by Espérandieu. The exploration was very rapid (Espérandieu examined an area 100 x 70m in three short seasons) and incomplete when the excavation was abandoned (Espérandieu 1912:312).

The excavation was prompted by the discovery in 1898 of ‘ancient’ captions at two sources c. 250m from the sanctuary complex: Espérandieu made no exploration of the sources themselves: it is clear that the water which fed the canalisation network around the Gallo-Roman complex originated here, but this need not date the original captions.

The very precise phasing suggested by Espérandieu (see App.4.2) is based almost entirely on the 243 Roman coins, from Augustus to Arcadius, found across the site, allied uneasily with documented historical events. This evidence is used to argue for destruction horizons. This
Fig. 4.4. Burgundian water source loci: 21008 Croix-St-Charles (Alesia), after Grenier (1960).
phasing is not based on stratigraphy: none of the existing buildings can be shown to pre-date Hadrian, and in only one area is there clear evidence for two phases of construction: this is the small structure (Fig. 4.4, E) to the southeast of the Octogon temple (A). The flagstone floor is made from re-used materials (notably inscribed stones, including one to [Morita [sgo] CIL XII 11242), below which are traces of an earlier structure (Espérandieu 1910:268). Coins below the floor date from Nero - Trajan, and above it from Hadrian - Valens. The Hadrianic date this suggests for the later structure is also argued by Espérandieu to apply to the Octogon temple, largely because both are constructed from similar materials. This is open to doubt, as the coins here all date to the C4th AD. The lateness of the numismatic assemblage is perhaps explicable, since many of the ex-votos recovered at the complex were not associated with a formal structure but were located at the base of the retaining wall (H) on a slope to the south of the Octogon. This association, unexplained by Espérandieu, could possibly result from a temple clearance in the C3rd AD, given that the coins located behind the wall (H) date to Diocletian and Constantine. The canalisation which fills the pool in the square structure (E) runs under the Octogon (A) and must predate it, though not necessarily by much.

Arguments for pre-Hadrianic use of the Octogon are focused on a small rectilinear deposit (C) a few metres from the southeast side of the Octogon. This contained 'Gallic' coins (not described), animal bones and ashes and a small bronze of Augustus, and was interpreted as a favissa from a pre-Octogon temple, obliterated by the later construction. The value of the favissa argument, here as elsewhere, is that it is possible to imply that materials were of considerable antiquity when deposited. If this deposit is a favissa, it was clearly not made before Augustus, on the basis of the associated
artefactual evidence, and need not relate to pre-Conquest activity. The canalisation which runs under the Octogon (A) and feeds the small square structure (E), noted above, also passes under the proposed favissa, making a pre-Conquest date most unlikely.

With the exception of the baths complex (F), the first stage of which is possibly Julio-Claudian (Le Gall 1963), the proposed favissa (C) is almost the only evidence for pre-Neronian activity at the Croix-St-Charles, with the exception of 43 'Gallic' coins found over the site as a whole. These are unspecified, but it is entirely on this basis that Grenier (1960:660) was able to argue for a pre-Conquest use of the site: this was not argued by Esperandieu, whose phasing starts at the Conquest.

There is widespread evidence for continuing post-Conquest circulation of LIA coins (Haselgrove 1987:204-8). Equally, as Gruel and Clement (1987) argued, monetary offerings in cult contexts in Gaul may be seen as an early Roman introduction, expressing the changing values of post-Conquest society. Given this, and the absence of other datable LIA material, particularly the fibulae, pottery and weaponry which characterise pre-Conquest offerings elsewhere in Gaul, the Croix-Saint-Charles coinage cannot be taken as evidence for pre-Conquest cult activity at the site. 'Gallic' coins were found in the rectangular deposit (C) noted above: deposition here must date at the earliest to Augustus.

It remains possible that there was pre-Conquest activity at the Croix-St-Charles, although there is no structural evidence for it; but two points should be borne in mind. First, as the Mt-Auxois plateau was occupied in the LIA, some coinage scatter over much of its surface might be expected; only the favissa coins need relate to cult usage, and this deposit is not of LIA date. Second, the coins, as far as can be judged from the reports, were the only possibly LIA material at the
Finally, here as at other sites, the occurrence of a deity with a Gallic name (here Moritasgus) has been used to suggest pre-Conquest activity. On this deity of this practice see 4.5.1.

Essarois (App.4.11; Fig.4.5)

Daviet, who re-excavated briefly at Essarois in the 1960s, argued for two LIA structures here, Essarois I and II (see App.4.11). There is no published plan of Daviet's excavation. It is thus difficult to position Daviet's structures in relation to those of the earlier excavator, Mignard.

Evidence for Essarois I, below Mignard's southern Cella (Fig.4.5), comprises simply the in situ base of one elm post (42cm diam), and portions of another, said to represent a pre-Augustan wooden temple (Gallia 1966:390; Daviet and Daviet 1966:938). No dating evidence is offered for this proposed structure. Because the later Essarois III was dated on ceramics to Augustus, the earlier structure was presumed to be pre-Conquest. This is obviously hypothetical. In addition, there is nothing to indicate the function of the proposed structure termed Essarois I.

Daviet and Daviet's arguments (1966:934ff) for the La Tène Finale origins of Essarois II, below the northernmost of the cellae excavated by Mignard, are complex, but again are not assemblage based. Daviet and Daviet (1966:935) recognised one coherent archaeological level which he argued was formed between 50 BC and 40 AD. This level produced 65 coins, six unidentifiable, one Caesarian denarius struck in 48 BC, six Augustan coins, ten Tiberian bronzes, and the remainder Gallic coins. Daviet and Daviet (1966:935-6) noted that the latter were all in circulation prior to the Conquest, and dated the layer to the immediate post-Conquest period, 50 BC-40 AD.

This dated layer rests on an homogenous alluvial
Fig. 4.5. Burgundian water source loci: 21250 Essarois, Mignard's excavation, after Grenier (1960).
substratum, which the excavators suggested (1966:937) will have taken 5-30 years to form. A section through the northern gallery wall demonstrated that this alluvial deposit had infiltrated the wall (Daviet and Daviet 1966:936-7), and hence post-dated the construction of the walls. The excavators argued from this observation that the construction phase could be anything up to thirty years earlier than the recognised archaeological horizon (dated 50 BC-40 AD), and hence dated from 80-55 BC.

Whilst the interpretation is conceivable – though no explanation is offered as to why the structure would be erected and immediately abandoned for up to 30 years (there is no La Tène material stratified below the alluvial layer) – the dating is very tenuous (as Daviet and Daviet admitted 1966:938), and bears the hallmarks of an attempt to push a structure which dates, at the earliest, to the Conquest, into the ‘free Celtic’ period.

The excavators’ argument for the pre-Conquest construction of Essarois II rests on their dating of the origins of the archaeological horizon to 50 BC. This date is open to re-interpretation. First, as Daviet and Daviet (1966:935) stress, the layer is homogenous; the excavators were only able to infer temporal sub-divisions by arguing that ‘indigenous’ ceramic forms, with the Gallic coinage, reflect earlier activity than the manifestly Gallo-Roman forms, and coinage, within the same stratum. Secondly all the Gallic coinage issues present in this context (Vindia, Calatedu (which Nash 1978 dates to 40-20BC), Q DOCI/QDOCI SAMF, Rhône valley horseman, and Aeduan anepigraphic) continued in circulation until the early 1st AD (as the excavators themselves note 1966:935).

The postulated mid C1st BC origin of the archaeological horizon at Essarois II is thus far from conclusively demonstrated. Daviet and Daviet’s (1966:937) suggested pre-Conquest dating of the construction of the walls, itself dependent on this
dating, is thus also insecure.

Daviet and Daviet (1966:938ff) attempted to secure what they admitted was a tenuous proposition by asserting that three iron arrow heads and a stimulus recovered from the northern gallery were seized from the Roman army at the siege of Alesia, and hence date to 52-51 BC. Unsurprisingly, there is little beyond wishful thinking to support this assertion; the items in question cannot be closely dated. It goes without saying that there is nothing to tie them to the siege of Alesia.

Grisy (App.4.42; Fig.4.6)

Pre-Conquest activity at the thermal source at Grisy is attested by the occurrence of Neolithic material in the lowest of the archaeologically productive levels surrounding the caption pits. Immediately above the subsoil were found worked flints, two polished stone axes and pottery sherds identified by Déchelette as Neolithic (noted by Thévenot 1968:200). The upper, sandy, layer around the caption contained Gallo-Roman debris. A wooden pipe in the top of the central caption pit (see Fig.4.6) was traced downslope to an area containing Roman tiles. The excavators (Desbordeau and Camusat) suggested that the caption itself was of Gallo-Roman date, but Louis (1943:69) argued that the caption system was of considerable antiquity and had simply been reutilised in the Gallo-Roman era. He had two bases for this argument: firstly, the Neolithic material suggested early activity at the source; secondly the caption pits were similar in form to the wooden caption pits from Fontaine's Salées, which date to c. 1000 BC. There is no demonstrable relation between the Neolithic finds and the caption (and it is clear that the horizontal planking used to seal the area between the caption pits overlay this material. For Louis (1943:69) the value of the finds was that they attested to pre-Roman activity at the site, and hence supported his thesis that the caption is pre-Roman.
Fig. 4.6. Burgundian water source loci: 71482 Grisy.
Schematic section of the caption pits,
after Louis (1943).
This is certainly possible: as Louis (1943:69-70) noted, all the Gallo-Roman finds are from upper levels, and there are parallels for the construction techniques of the caption pits of late Bronze Age date. The largest caption is made from four curved segments of oak joined together to form a circular casing; the technique was also used at Fontaines Salées.

However, there is no evidence for Iron Age activity at Grisy. Thévenot (1968:200) mentioned Gallic pottery, but this is noted nowhere else, and Thévenot otherwise made several errors in his account of this site. Vaillat (1932:98), like Louis (1943:69-70) was quite specific that all the finds were either Neolithic or Roman. In the absence of Iron Age finds, the argument for IA activity here rests on a supposition of continuity of use from the neolithic to the Roman period. This is obviously unsatisfactory: though Thévenot (1968:200-1) was happy to accept it, as was Vaillat (1932:98).

Finally, the only evidence for possible cult activity is Gallo-Roman in date: a "phallic" bronze cross, a small statue of a female, and bronze coins (Louis 1943:70).

**Fontaines Salées** (App.4.45; Figs. 4.7 and 4.8)

The salt sources at Fontaines Salées were certainly in use in the LBA. Wood from one of the caption pits to the NW of the complex (see App.4.45) produced a C14 date of 2970 +/- 200 bp. This is the only C14 date available for a Burgundian wooden caption. Whilst structural comparisons between the caption here and at sites like Grisy (42) with its four-piece wooden caption, are often drawn (e.g. Lacroix 1943), the technique probably had a very long duration.

Arguments for Iron Age activity are based not on these captions, but on the circular enclosure (BJ) surrounding a source (H) at the east of the site (Fig.4.7). This source, with its brick-lined basin, was
discovered in 1954, and was dated, on the basis of the fill, to the C4th AD. The extreme upper and lower levels of the pool were sterile alluvial deposits, but the intervening layers (Lacroix C1-3) contained coins dating from Nero to Arcadius, with the vast majority from the C4th AD (Febre in Lacroix 1956:265-7). The C4th AD dating was also extended to the oval enclosure (BQ), designated by a clay-filled trench, which in 1955 was found to surround the square basin (H) (Fig.4.8).

In 1959-61 (Lacroix 1963) this oval enclosure was in turn found to be enclosed by a wall forming a very regular circle (15.5m diam) (Fig.4.8). The western edge of the enclosure was stratified below the C2nd AD additions (BA) to the 'sanctuary' (BO) and the northern edge broken up at the point where it met the C2nd additions to the baths (BF), the stones having been reused in the latter. The enclosure was thus evidently pre-2nd AD.

This observation led to a re-valuation of the date of the square basin (H), which lay exactly at the centre of the circular enclosure. The circular enclosure (BJ), and by implication alone the structures inside it, were assigned a C2nd-1st BC date.

This chronology was apparently proposed on the reasoning that the structure (BJ) was certainly pre C2nd AD, and constructed differently to the known CIst AD elements, and therefore assumed to be earlier in origin than both. This is clearly unsatisfactory.

As Lacroix remarked in his attempt to phase the circular enclosure, (1963) finds on which to date the construction phases are sparse. Nevertheless, Louis (1956:317) referred to two coins found on the natural below the first compact floor level of the oval enclosure (BQ) which surrounds the square basin (H). These were a cast Aeduan bronze and a Roman as from Ampurias. Martin dated them to between 47 and 25 BC. Inexplicably, Lacroix (1963:102 n.1) dismissed these as having no
Fig. 4.8. Burgundian water source loci: 89364 Fontaines Salées. The 'Circular Shrine', after Lacroix (1963).
Fig. 4.7. Burgundian water source loci: 89364 Fontaines Salées. Schematic plan of the excavated area.
practical value for dating the enclosure. Clearly, these coins offer a somewhat more secure dating basis that Lacroix’s dubious reasoning noted above, and suggest the oval enclosure floor (BQ) post-dates the Conquest. Martin (1965:317) also referred to a bronze Nîmes issue (Crocodile) and coins of Nero, and from Vespasian to Commodus, in the level immediately above this. There is thus no evidence for a pre-Conquest date for the oval enclosure.

Whilst the caption of (H) could pre-date the oval enclosure (BQ), Lacroix’s (196:107) assertion that the original caption dates to the Iron Age is unsupported by stratified artefactual material or clear structural evidence. The earliest datable items in the fill of the pool - the only dating evidence for its use - are two Neronian coins (Lacroix 1956:266). Two Hadrianic issues were also noted, but the vast majority of the coins in the fill date from the C3rd.

4.3.4. Summary of the evidence.

Two issues must be considered here. (1) What evidence is there for LIA activity at Gallo-Roman source loci? (2) was any identifiable LIA activity cult related?

4.3.4.1. Evidence for LIA activity at Gallo-Roman source loci.

Absent in each of the examined cases are IA horizons dated on the basis of secure and uncontentious finds assemblages. At Grisy (42), the IA ‘horizon’ is argued purely from a supposition of historical continuum. Vaillat (1932:99) also employed this thesis at the Source de St-Sauveur (Forêt de Compiègne, Oise) which produced broken Neolithic flints and Gallo-Roman debris, but nothing of Iron Age date. One problem with such arguments (although at Grisy this does not apply) is the apparent Gallo-Roman propensity to re-employ Neolithic
artefacts in cult contexts. Pliny (Natural History 37.9) mentions the collection of *ceraunia* (polished stone axes, regarded as thunderbolts: Merrifield (1987:10)). Neolithic axes have been recorded at over 24 Gallo-Roman temples, principally in eastern Normandy and in Burgundy itself Merrifield (1987:10-11). Numerous flint objects, and even fossils, were discovered in Gallo-Roman levels at Fontaines Saléees (45), (Louis 1942:53).

Two sites have produced Gallic coinage; in the case of Essarois (11) dating to the Conquest decade at the earliest, and at the Croix-Saint-Charles (2) undated, but clearly not stratigraphically homogeneous. In neither case were coins associated with further IA material, and it is of course possible that they continued in circulation for some time after production; this is specifically argued at Essarois. Even at Fontaines Saléees, where the case for IA cult activity is argued stratigraphically, there is no published material evidence to support the suggested dating. Even supposing that these sites had received periodic ritual cleansing, the total absence of IA material would still require explanation before arguments for their IA origins could be accepted.

4.3.4.2. Evidence for the cult status of LIA activity at Gallo-Roman source loci.

Securely-stratified LIA artefacts at Burgundian water-source sites are therefore sparse. A similar pattern occurs elsewhere in France (see, for example, Audin’s (1985) summary of water source activity in the Arverian and Biturigan civitates of Central Gaul, and, more generally, Brunaux 1988:41). Outside Burgundy, some sites have produced LIA material. La Tène pottery occurs in several springs in Corrèze (Lintz 1971). One of the captions at the baths at Vichy, the *Puits Chomel*, produced LIA pottery (Audin 1985:121-2), and *St-Eualalie* (Oise) was said by Vaillat (1932:99), to have produced
Roman and La Tène material.

However, where LIA data are available, the central issue is not that of identifying pre-Conquest activity, but pre-Conquest cult activity. Water sources have an obvious utilitarian role, and it is often far from clear whether a pre-Conquest caption served anything other than a utilitarian purpose. Single, hollow trunks were a common means to direct the flow of water on soft sediments for utilitarian purposes (Audouze and Buchsenschutz 1989:182). Wooden captions were frequent and sometimes elaborate; the MBA fountains at St-Moritz have wooden Blockbau construction, the earliest known, and springs in the IA raised village at Feddersen Wierde (Lower Saxony) have plank-built captions.

Some of the Burgundian sites, for which the only evidence is the caption itself, could have been utilitarian in purpose. In arguing for ritual activity at Gallo-Roman sites for which pre-Conquest caption has been suggested (Fontaines Salées (45), Grisy (42)), it is necessary to demonstrate original function independently of the retrospective inference that earlier activity on a Gallo-Roman cult site must also have been of similar type. In neither case are the data sufficient to demonstrate LIA activity, regardless of the nature of that activity.

The issue of utilitarian use is especially problematic with mineral and thermal sources. Salt extraction by evaporation was practised at some sources well before the Conquest and long after. At Fontaines Saleés (45), the LBA/EIA wooden captions at the salt sources may have been for this purpose. Salt extraction continued here until the Cl4th AD, when the introduction of the gabelle (salt tax by royal decree) during the Hundred Years War made it unprofitable. Thermal sources were often used in the Gallo-Roman period for utilitarian baths complexes, and as Audin (1985:128) remarked it is often difficult to distinguish a thermal site with a
religious vocation from private baths related to a villa or the public baths of a vicus or conciliabulum. In LIA contexts, similar problems of differentiation must be assumed to arise. But at the same time, because LIA ritual identities are advanced principally by retrospective methods, discussion of these issues tends to be restricted to the Gallo-Roman data.

4.4. Retrospective arguments from Gallo-Roman data.

The absence of stratigraphic evidence for LIA activity, and the paucity of material of IA date, has meant that, in Burgundy as elsewhere, retrospective arguments based on post-Conquest assemblages are the principal means by which Iron Age cult activity is inferred at source sites. Two groups of material may be singled out as the basis for such arguments: wooden statuary and epigraphy on stone.

4.4.1. Wooden statuary.

Wooden figures, carved in oak or beech, are documented for four Burgundian sites: Essarois (11) (Bulliot and Thiollier 1892:93-4, Deyts 1983:190; E.3412); Montlay-en-Auxois (19) (Gallia 1985:257-9); Sources of the Seine (21) (Deyts 1983), and St-Honoré-les-Bains (34) (Deyts 1983:189). Similar sculptures are known from French source sites outside Burgundy, often as poorly documented finds of the C19th or earlier. Examples catalogued in a recent synthesis by Deyts (1983) are: St-Amand-les-Eaux (Nord), (Deyts 1983:165); Bouronne-les-Bains (Haute-Marne), (Deyts 1983:23); Chamalières (Puy-de-Dôme), (Vatin 1969:103-114, 1972:39-42, Deyts 1983:192-5); Coren (Cantal), (Deyts 1983:165); Geneva (Deyts 1983:178-9), Luxeuil (Haute-Saône) (Deyts 1985:185-6); Montbouy (Loiret), (Deyts 1983:191-2).

The restricted diameters of these figures, and carving techniques which pare the sap-wood growth-rings, have been suggested to prohibit dendrochronological
analysis. The single published example thus dated is a stray find from the old port at Geneva (Deyts 1983:178-9). This large figure (3.05m high) was discovered in 1898. Dendro-dating suggests a date of 100-50 BC (Moutier 1976, quoted in Deyts 1983:179). The wide date margin is given because a number of growth-rings were lost in carving the piece. Clearly there remains a margin of uncertainty as to true date of the Geneva figure. Radiocarbon dating using Accelerator Mass Spectometry, recently acheived for the British and Irish series by Coles (1990), has yet to be extended to the Continental examples.

At the Burgundian site of Montlay-en-Auxois (19) figures were found in wooden basins. Dendrochronological analysis of the vertical posts which delimit the basins gave absolute dates of 86-119 AD (Dupont 1990:154). The ceramics from this site date entirely to the 2nd AD, and as Dupont (1986:59) suggests, a similar date may almost certainly be advocated for the associated wooden ex-votos. As will now be considered, other figures for which dates have been offered are without exception of Augustan or later date.

In spite of the dating offered for wooden figures from the Sources of the Seine and other recently excavated sites (see below), there is a prevailing tendency to assign a pre-Conquest date to wooden statuary. Green (1989:152) continues to describe the Sources of the Seine figures as 'pre-Roman', and throughout her work, Deyts has attempted to lengthen the chronology for wooden figures. She argued (1987:23) for example that the wooden head from St-Honoré-les-Bains (34) attests to pre-Conquest activity here, but it appears (Deyts 1983:189) that the head was found within the Gallo-Roman thermal establishment and cannot be shown to pre-date it. The same may be said, as far as may be judged from the poor documentation, of the Essarois figures (11) (Bulliot and Thiollier 1892:93).
Poorly-contexted figures from outside Burgundy are also frequently argued as pre-Conquest. Deyts (1986:23) stated that figures discovered in 1977 during reconstruction of the modern thermal establishment at Bourbonne-les-Bains came from "couches profondes, sans doute antérieures aux fondations architecturales anciennes", but in the absence of systematic excavation this remains to be conclusively demonstrated. A large assemblage discovered in 1865 during caption works at the Source du Pré-Martin, Luxeuil (Haute-Saône), 150m north of the Gallo-Roman thermal complex, was interpreted by Lérat (1960:99-104) as a favissa possibly predating the Conquest, or as evidence for the persistence of a 'tradition celtique' shortly after the Conquest. The suggestion of a favissa allowed him to dismiss the one securely datable find from the same context as the sculptures, an Augustan coin, as dating not the sculptures themselves but their disposal. This argument—also originally employed for the Sources of the Seine figures—will be considered below.

In only three cases have wooden figures resulted from recent, systematic excavations; two examples, Montlay-en-Auxois (19), discussed above, and the Sources of the Seine (21), are Burgundian. The other (Chamalières) is from the Puy-de-Dôme.

At the Sources of the Seine (see App.4.21, Figs.4.9 and 4.10) over 300 wooden figures were discovered in 1963-6 in marshy ground at the northern end of the valley (Fig.4.9a), below what was probably the basal layer of the late C2nd AD trapezoidal esplanade (Fig.4.9.b, M1, M2, M6) first excavated by Corot in 1932, and originally interpreted as a ritual bathing pool (Deyts 1983:82-3). Two layers of wooden deposits, separated by an alluvial layer, were recognised by the excavators (Deyts 1983:35), the upper containing the majority of the larger, heavier pieces, with numerous animal bones and sigillata. The lower layer contained the smaller items, with animal
Fig. 4.9. Burgundian water source loci: Sources of the Seine. General plan of the excavated area, after Deyts (1983).
Fig. 4.10. Burgundian water source loci: Sources of the Seine. Baudot's excavation, after Deyts (1983).
bones and small fragments of local ceramics and terra sigillata. The sigillata, associated with both layers, forms a very homogenous group with a very limited date range (Tiberius-Claudius: Martin 1965:252) giving a terminus ante quem of around the start of the Flavian era. The dates of the only two associated coins, a Claudian as (41-46 AD) and one of Nero, reinforce this view.

The deposit was initially interpreted as either a favissa or a workshop (Martin 1965:251-2) but is now suggested to be the product of successive water-borne deposits, carried downstream by the Seine, during flooding, from an unidentified site - possibly the upper source in the Parc de la Ville - further upstream (Fig.4.9a) (Deyts 1983:62). Whilst the hypothesis of alluvial deposition is the obvious way to account for the idiosyncracies of the depositional stratigraphy, the very homogeneity of the associated material, which, for Deyts, actually reinforces this conclusion, must cast some doubt over the argument.

Thévenot (1968:217) favoured the favissa argument, saying that the "époque de l’entouissement ne fournit une date approche que pour les sculptures les plus récentes; les pièces les plus anciennes peuvent remonter à une époque sensiblement plus lontaine": again, the argument functions to lengthen the chronology of the material. Speculation as to the antiquity of the figures prior to their deposition is fruitless, but highlights the tangible desire of many workers to push the dating of wooden figures into the pre-Conquest era.

The Chamalières find is interesting both for the very similar dates suggested for the figures (Vatin 1969:103-114), and for the excavator’s explicit rejection of the possibility that the deposit was a favissa. At Chamalières, over five thousand figures were discovered in 1968 in the natural basin of the thermal Source des Roches. These occurred in an homogenous peaty layer up
to 0.5m deep: the excavators were unable to distinguish successive deposition stages. Associated coins and ceramics indicate a Clst AD date. The coinage was typical of early Gallo-Roman circulation (Nash 1978:131), with seven *asses* of the Augustan colony at Nîmes, and a Gaulish bronze of the Arverni. The ceramics, all local forms, dated to the first half of the Clst AD (Vatin 1969:107). Vatin’s assertion (1969:108) that the deposition was completed well before the death of Augustus is open to some doubt (coinage of Trajan and Nero were discovered in 1958 during works at the source; Vatin 1969:104), and a lead *tabella defixionis* with a Gallic text, discovered in 1971, was tentatively dated by Fleuriot (1980:145-160) to the Vindex revolt of 69 AD. The Augustan (or later) origin of this deposit cannot be doubted. It is also clear, stylistically, that much of the wooden sculpture was Classically inspired (Vatin 1969:110-113).

Despite the apparently homogenous nature of this deposit (Vatin 1969:105), the excavator rejected the possibility that the find represents a *favissa*. The apparently deliberate concentration of statuary around the two original exit points of the water is probably due to post-depositional gravitation of the figures towards the funnel-shaped emergence points. But as Vatin (1972:40) argued, the discovery of coins, pottery vessels and hazelnuts inside the funnels of the sources, suggest these were objects of veneration to which the figures are directly related.

At both the Sources of the Seine and Chamalières, associated pottery indicates a Clst AD date for wooden figure deposition; the same may be argued for Luxeuil, and also for Essarois (11). As Romeuf noted (1986:66) there is little evidence that such sculpture outlives the century; she regards the Montlay-en-Auxois figures (19: dated to the C2nd AD, as noted above), as a late example of a practice which she, nevertheless, suggests
originated before the Conquest.

As yet there is no wooden figure from Gaul associated with La Tène material. In spite of the Clst-2nd AD dates for the examples from the only sites systematically excavated, many writers continue to argue that the use of wooden statuary is a 'Celtic' practice. In the light of the dating offered by the three sites discussed above, the argument has shifted ground somewhat. The use of wooden statuary is now said to be a 'tradition celtique, sinon de l'époque celtique' (Deyts 1986:24), with the implication that such figures attest to pre-Conquest activity at source sites though they post-date that era. In the absence of securely dated pre-Conquest Gallic examples, this tradition is predicated entirely on a progressive assessment of the development of statuary in Gaul. Wood is seen as a less advanced medium than stone (see e.g. Megaw 1970:142 on wooden precursors of stone pillar figures). Simplistic or abstract representation is similarly regarded in comparison to Graeco-Roman techniques (Green 1989:220-1, is an obvious example). The crudely-executed Montlay figures (19), associated with C2nd AD ceramics, suggest such generalisations are themselves simplistic.

Classical textual references to wooden figures are instructive in this context. Although there are several references to divine imagery in the LIA (3.11), no LIA source refers specifically to wooden figures in Gaul. In the Clst AD, Lucan (36-65 AD makes an historical reference to the LIA (specifically, to the Civil War) in which he mentions crudely carved wooden images in a wood near Massilia (Pharsalia 3.399 ff). The figures described by Lucan are deity images, not ex-votos, but the passage does refer to wooden figures in an LIA context. Lucan was writing more than century after the Civil War, and may have projected concepts from his own era onto the past. A second Clst AD source, Valerius Flaccus (d. c. 92-3) refers to Celtic representations of Jove as
columnae (Argonautica 9.9); wooden figures may also be implied here. Whilst the texts suggest that Gallic wooden deity imagery was first recorded in the literature in the Clst AD, the LIA texts offer no support for the contention that wooden figures were produced prior to the Conquest.

As noted, it is certainly possible that wooden figures are among the earliest ex-votos to appear at Gallo-Roman source loci. At the Sources of the Seine, for example, only two stone figures and five bronze eye-plaques occur in association with the wooden objects. The abundant bronze and stone mobilier elsewhere on the site is however difficult to date, the majority of the bronze plaques occurring as what is clearly a secondary deposition in the C4th AD. At Chamalières, the only non-wooden ex-voto is a single eye-plaque in bronze. The absence of stone here may be due to the paucity of suitable stone in the Auvergne (Romeuf 1986:66), or wood may have been a preferred medium at certain springs, as Vatin (1972:41) postulates for Chamalières.

On the other hand, wooden figures continue to be found well into the C2nd AD; e.g. Montlay-en-Auxois (19). Other examples occur at Nîmes (Gard) where a figure of a child from a pit is dated to the C2nd AD, and at Rezé (Landes) where a wooden panther from a 'puits funéraire' is similarly dated (Gallia 1965:335).

But the occurrence of post-Conquest sculptures, even in a 'Celtic tradition', does not constitute evidence for pre-Conquest activities at such sites. The figures may simply point to early Gallic responses to Graeco-Roman cults, and cult objects, introduced in the aftermath of the Conquest. Many of the Chamalières figures, for example, are clearly early attempts to emulate Graeco-Roman artistic traditions.

Where deposits are interpreted as favissae (as at Luxueil, or in Thévenot’s (1968) interpretation of the Sources of the Seine), it is argued that as the attendant
assemblage gives a date for the deposition, rather than the figures themselves, these Augustan depositions could have pre-Conquest origins. But given the nature of favissae - for the disposal of sacred waste, ranging from the inedible remains of sacrificed animals, to dedicated items removed from cult loci, either because considered defiled (Henig 1984:114) or as the result of periodic clearance of sacred sites - it is almost impossible to accept that some material contemporary with the statuary would not have been deposited, even accidentally, at the same time. Yet it is necessary to accept such a scenario in order to assert that the statuary significantly pre-dates its deposition.

4.4.2. Epigraphy.

Celtic divine names, attested epigraphically after the Conquest, are frequently cited as evidence for pre-Conquest activity at sources. An obvious illustration of this approach is the thermal complex at Bath (Avon). Wait (1985:386), citing Bath as a Celtic shrine, gave the following catalogue entry:

"A probable Iron Age shrine site. No structural remains are known: these are presumed to have been destroyed by the extensive Romano-Celtic temple complex later built on the site. The attribution of an Iron Age shrine to this site rests on the fact that the later Roman temple was dedicated to Sulis Minerva, and since Sul was a Celtic deity the locus must have been sacred before the Roman Minerva arrived.[... ] No specifically pre-Roman finds are known." (emphasis mine)

The same argument is offered for Burgundian source sites which are equally lacking in pre-Conquest data. These, with their epigraphically attested Gallic divine names are: Croix-Saint-Charles (2) [Moritasgus], Essarois (11) [Vindonnum], Sources of the Seine (21) [Sequana], Ste-Sabine (22) [Berenus], Entrains (31) [Borvo], St-Honoré-
les-Bains (34) [Ritona], and Bourbonne-les-Bains (39) [Bormo/Borvo and Damona]. In the case of Entrains, where no Gallo-Roman source site has been located, the divine name is put to work prospectively rather than retrospectively (Thévenot 1950:602ff), but otherwise the Gallic divine name is another form of retrospective reasoning, as the emphasised comment from Wait (1985:386), above, makes clear.

An immediate weakness of this approach is that, in order to employ epigraphically-attested divine names to argue for sites as pre-Conquest cult foci, the Gallic deities thus attested must be assumed to be site-specific. Often this is not the case. Borvo/Bormo, ('bubbling water'), for example, is widely attested epigraphically at thermal sites. He occurs twice in Burgundy (Entrains, CIL XIII 2901, associated with Candidus; Bourbon-Lancy, CIL XIII 2805-7, twice with Damona), and also at Bourbonne-les-Bains (Haute-Marne) (Aug(usto) Borvoni, CIL XIII 5912, Apollini Borvoni, ibid.5911, and seven dedications to the divine couple Borvo and Damona ibid.5914--20). He is also known at Die (Drôme), Aix-les-Bains (Savoie) and Aix-en-Provence (Bouches-du-Rhône) and in the toponyms Bourbonne-les-Bains (Haute-Marne), Bourbon-Lancy (Saône-et-Loire) and Bourbon-l’Archambault (Allier). Whether before or after the Conquest, the cult cannot be shown to have originated in Burgundy, and could have been imported. Post-Conquest attestation of Borvo at Burgundian loci is therefore not itself evidence for pre-Conquest activity.

Belenus (noted at Ste-Sabine, if Thévenot’s argument (cited by Deyts 1967:246) that Berenus is a bad reading for Belenus is accepted) is the most frequently attested of all Celtic divine names. 31 examples of this name are recorded (Hatt 1985) occurring in South-eastern France, Northern Italy and Noricum (Klagenfurt: CIL III 4774). Tertillian (AD 160-240) referred to Belenus as the
principal god of the Norici (Apologeticus 24.7). Finally, Ritona is suggested as the divine name on a fragmentary inscription from St-Honoré-les-Bains (CIL XIII ?: Aug(ustis) et deae] .......iton[ae]), but only on analogy with attestations at Montaren (Gard; CIL XII 2927) and in Trier.

Three of the deities do appear to be localised within Burgundy. Related cult activity in these cases cannot be dismissed as imported. Vindonnus is the first (although it is possible that the toponym Vindobona is drawn from this divine name (MacCana 1983:109). Sequana is another: all but one of the dedications to Sequana were discovered at the Sources of the Seine (21), and the other at Salmaise, six km to the southwest. Finally Moritasgus is at present attested only at Alesia where he occurs twinned with Apollo. It is possible that Moritasgus ('masses of sea-water': Green 1986:162) is an adjectival epithet for a Classical deity (G.Webster 1986a:54), rather than a proper name.

Even where deities are highly localised, it is difficult to demonstrate that they are water-source specific. One of the three dedications to Apollo-Moritasgus, for example, was discovered on the western side of the Mt Auxois plateau, some distance from the source complex at the Croix-Saint-Charles (Deo Apollini Moritasga[e et] Damonae; Deyts 1967:245), and there is some debate in the literature as to whether Sequana was the goddess of the Seine or purely of its source (Thévenot 1968:208).

Green (1986) argued that where the majority of dedications to a deity have no interpretatio element, this points to the 'Celtic' nature of a cult. The comment is important, because, as the work of Cepas (1989) has shown, non interpretatio dedications to deities with native names (e.g. Coventina, RIB 1522-33) do tend to be made by the lower (and thus more often native) military
and civilian ranks. But as Henig noted (1984:43) epigraphy is by definition a practice of the ‘Romanized’.

Assessing the proportion of Celtic dedicants at Burgundian water-source loci is hampered by the failure of many dedicants to record their name and status. Of a total of 25 inscriptions, the dedicant can be established on 15, but status is only noted once (a slave, Hilariclus, who makes a dedication to Sequana: Deyts 1985:10). Two dedicants have Celtic names; Criciru, dedicating to Veriano, i.e. Berenus, at Ste-Sabine, CIL XIII 2837), and Hilariclus, noted above. Three have Celtic family names: Lucius Nertecomarus, dedicating to Sequana (Deyts 1985:10); Catianus son of Oxtau, to Moritasgus (CIL XII 11240); C. Iulius Eporedirix, to Bormo, (CIL XII 2805).

Thus, of the named dedicants, only a third are of certain Celtic ancestry. Whilst it should be remembered that non-Roman dedicants sometimes adopted entirely Roman names (Salway 1965), Burgundian source veneration cannot, on present epigraphic evidence, be considered primarily as a Celtic practice.

The fact that divine names occur alone (rather than simply in interpretatio pairings) is often suggested to point to their ‘Celtic’ nature. Sequana, for example, is never paired; Borvo is often alone, as is Belenus, and Vindonnus is alone once. But the ‘Celticity’ of a deity need not date him to before the Conquest. The issue of whether deities with Gallic names attested after the Conquest, were venerated before it, is highly complex and can only be considered briefly here, but the confident assumption that this is generally the case has for long informed accounts of Celtic deities. As the study of the dynamics of interpretatio has been systematised in the last decade, this orthodoxy has begun to be challenged (e.g. Henig 1984). The very act of writing divine names may point, as does the written interpretatio, to profound
changes in the Gallic concept of deity. But embedded in the orthodoxy are the twin assumptions that Gallic language was fossilised after the Conquest and that Gallo-Roman religion was a matter of ‘native’ accrual of Romanised concepts, and in no sense a reworking of Gallic beliefs and behaviours in response to external stimuli.

This is not to suggest that Sequana, for example, could not have existed before the Conquest; it is simply emphasised that her role may have changed considerably in the course of her passage into the Gallo-Roman pantheon. The issues are clouded enough to make it impossible to identify pre-Conquest source cults on the basis of divine names.

Finally, it is interesting in this context that textual data on the deities of Burgundian sources is invariably late. Herodian, who says Belenos becomes popular again in Aquila, assimilated with Apollo, was not writing until c. 200 AD (History 8.3.8). Ausonius, who died in 395 AD, mentions Belenus twice (Professors of Bordeaux 4.7, Latin Grammarians 10.12), both times linked to Apollo. He says the grandfather of a contemporary had been aedituus of Belenus. Elsewhere, Grannus (linked to sources at Aix-la-Chapelle and Aquae Granni) is noted by Dio Cassius, who records Caracalla’s visit to a shrine of Apollo-Grannus in 213 AD (History of Rome 77.15,5-6). Finally, in the C5th AD, Claudius Marius Victor (3.204) refers to a sanctuary of Apollo-Grannus at the frontier of the Lingones (Hatt 1985:209-10).

4.5. Retrospective arguments for LIA healing cults.

As Henig (1984) remarked of Romano-Celtic religion, sickness was a principal reason that sanctuaries were visited.

Deyts (1967, 1986) made much of the prevalence of ex-votos at non-mineral sources (4.5.3), but opinions differ as to whether in Graeco-Roman religion a distinction was drawn between waters which were genuinely therapeutic and
those which were not (Deyts 1967:123ff), or whether waters were considered, by virtue of associations with deity, or via notions of 'purity' as having curative powers. Ginouves (1962:351) argued that for the Greeks the 'thermal' cure, like any other water-based cure, was a matter of belief in the power of gods, a point recently stressed for Graeco-Roman cults in Gaul by Duminil: "les sources guérisent parce qu’elles détiennent d’une divinité le pouvoir magique de guérir" (1985:10).

That pre-Conquest source cults were also frequently healing-linked is generally inferred partly by reference to epigraphic, and occasionally textual, equations of Apollo and indigenous deities (4.5.1), partly from the nature of post-Conquest ex-votos (4.5.2-3) and by recourse to textual and oral folklore survivals.

4.5.1. Interpretatio: Gallic deities twinned with Apollo.

Apollo was commonly associated with healing in Graeco-Roman thought, and it is often suggested that deities who are twinned with him were in origin healing deities (Thévenot (1968) goes further in arguing that all Gallic deities were healing gods and that any Classical deity assimilated to them took on a healing aspect). The retrospective is that of interpretatio.

Three Burgundian deities are associated with Apollo; Moritasgas (Alesia, CIL XIII 11240-1, in association with Apollo), Vindonnus (Essarois, CIL XIII 5644; associated at the same site with the Fontes, ibid. 5645, and once alone, ibid. 5456). Two further deities, Borvo (Bourbon-Lancy) and Berenus (if Belenus) are frequently associated with Apollo, but not at their Burgundian locales (see Hatt 1985:219-10 for these). Apollo was a well-known Graeco-Roman healer, frequently associated with water sources, and that he is intended in his healer aspect at the Burgundian sites is clearly possible. All attestations are, however, of post-Conquest date.
4.5.2. Medical ex-votos.

Post-Conquest ex-votos are the principal basis on which Deyts (1967, 1986) subdivided the function of Gallo-Roman water source sites. The principal problem here is deciding what constitutes a medical ex-voto. Deyts’ definition, of any sculpture representing a part of the body, has obvious pitfalls, since there is a danger of mistaking statuary fragments for ex-votos. Some more discriminatory criteria are advanced by Deyts, although she does not adhere to them: representations of obvious signs of sickness (such as feet with sponges applied at Essarois (11) and the Sources of the Seine (21): such explicit examples are rare) and plaques representing internal organs are obviously medical ex-votos. Bronze plaques of eyes and breasts (widespread throughout the Graeco-Roman world) fall into the same category. There is in fact a great deal of evidence for eye diseases in Gallo-Roman Burgundy, and for the oculist trade, in the form of salve stamps (Salles 1985). In addition, a series of figures cross the fertility/sickness boundary: these are ‘enfants emaliolites’ (representing swaddled infants), figures of pregnant women, and of sexual organs. Limbs, torsos and heads can only be counted as medical ex-votos where they can be shown to be complete sculptures. This is often difficult. Deyts also assumed that all the complete human figures in wood count as medical ex-votos on the basis that they represent ‘pilgrims’. This is a supposition. The number of Burgundian sites with certain Gallo-Roman medical ex-votos is 11.

Deyts (1967 and 1986) has drawn attention to the paradox that medical ex-votos occur in greatest quantities at sources with no mineral quality, whereas at thermal sites they are much less frequent. Of the excavated Burgundian thermal complexes, Fontaines Salées (45) has a few possible phallic ex-votos, and St-Parize (35) none at all, although excavation here was very
partial. As many thermal complexes have not yet been excavated, it is difficult to assert that they lack ex-votos, though admittedly this is often the case.

The absence of ex-votos at thermal stations generally is certainly striking. The phenomenon also occurs in Britain. Only one medical ex-voto, a pair of ivory breasts, has been found at Bath (Cunliffe 1986:10). Wroxeter produced over 35 eye-plaques (mainly cut from wall-plaster), the largest number from a single site in Britain (G.Webster 1986a:125). Henig (1984:152) saw the paucity of such finds as a matter of chance.

4.5.3. Deyts’ arguments for LIA cults at thermal sources. Deyts suggested that Gallo-Roman source sites fall into two groups:

a. thermal mineral water: baths complex: few medical ex-votos
b. non mineral water: no baths complex: many medical ex-votos

The Croix-Saint-Charles (2) is an obvious exception to a rule which, she argues (1983:190ff, developed 1987), reflects a native response to the Roman takeover of water source sites. She suggests that the Roman adoption of Gallic thermal sources for medico-religious spa complexes meant that to some extent, thermal sources became desacralised in the native view, and Gallic healing cults crystallised instead on local deities like Vindoninus and Sequana.

Deyts’ thesis is based on the recognition that whilst wooden figures occur at thermal sites (e.g. St-Honoré (34), Luxeuil and Bourbonne-les-Bains, and other mineralised sources like Chamalières), the evidence for stone and bronze ex-votos at these sites is minimal. She argued therefore that there is no continuity between wooden ex-votos and bronze and stone examples, suggesting
a change in Gallic practice shortly after the Conquest, away from thermal sites.

This thesis is predicated on a notion of continuity for which archaeological evidence is lacking. Whilst it is clear that wooden statuary was in use at source sites within fifty years of the Conquest, this cannot be shown to predate the appearance of bronze and stone ex-votos. The Sources of the Seine and Chamalières both have limited quantities of bronze ex-votos in direct association with wooden figures. It is possible that wood was a preferred medium in the 1st AD at some sites, but the idea that this reflects specifically pre-Conquest 'Celtic' concepts, rather than early attempts to copy Romanised practices, is unfounded (4.4.1). It may also be re-iterated that the assumption that undated wooden figures from thermal sites predate the bath complexes themselves is in any case unfounded.

4.6. Conclusions.

The identification of LIA water source cults is built on inference. It is largely a matter of looking backwards from the Gallo-Roman era (or sometimes forwards, from LBA/EIA sites such as Duchcov (Megaw 1970:99 and Le Val (Côte d’ Azur: Gallia 1977:35) and arguing for the existence of practices for which contemporary archaeological evidence is singularly deficient.

As noted (4.3.4), there are limited data for LIA source activity outside Burgundy, but evidence for cult activity is extremely sparse. It is evident that water source cults have not become so entrenched in the LIA cult corpus as a 'universal' Celtic tradition on this extremely meagre basis, but rather by reference backwards from Gallo-Roman cults.

As noted earlier, the paucity of LIA archaeological data is pre-explained by the retrospective approach to the identification of LIA ritual foci: hence its
tenacity. But it may be asked whether this is an acceptable methodology by which to allow the present site category into the LIA ritual corpus.

The data reviewed in this chapter do suggest that cult activity at some water sources was established within a generation of the Conquest, or at least under Augustus. The majority of known wooden statuary deposits, for example, may be dated to Augustus (e.g. Chamalières, Luxueil and possibly the Sources of the Seine). Coinage often points to the same conclusion. Outside Burgundy, St-Marcel (Indre), Avord (Cher), Sagonne (Cher), Vichy (Allier), Châteauneuf-les-Bains (Puy-de-Dôme), Coren (Cantal) and Vic-sur-Cère (Cantal) (Audin 1985) have all produced early post-Conquest ceramics or more often coins, as have the Burgundian sites at Croix-Saint-Charles, the Sources of the Seine and Essarois.

Ultimately, there are two ways to consider this phenomenon: either through the retrospective approach that activity at these sites is close enough in date to the Conquest that it is reasonable to infer that such data as wooden statuary and deity names are post-Conquest survivals of an earlier tradition; or, having recognised that pre-Conquest material is absent from such sites, it is possible to consider instead the implications of this sudden, early surge of activity as an index to the speed with which new cult practices were introduced, and adopted. The present author favours the latter perspective.
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5.1. **Introduction.**

Wells and deep shafts are a particularly entrenched category in the LIA ritual corpus in Britain and elsewhere in Europe. In Britain, however, as this chapter will examine, archaeological evidence for wells and shafts as LIA cult foci is far less common, and more uncertain, than previous workers suggest (e.g. Alcock 1965:1-12, Ross 1968:255-85, Ross and Peachem 1976:230-237, Wait 1985:51-82 and App.II, Green 1986:155-7).

In contrast to the groundwater source sites discussed in Chapter 4, for which LIA archaeological evidence is generally acknowledged to be almost entirely lacking, and where the category has been included in the ritual corpus on the basis of a series of retrospective arguments based on Roman period cult activity, LIA evidence for ritual use of wells and shafts in Britain is generally argued to be more widely available. Wait (1985:56, 320-335), for example, catalogued 21 examples as being of Iron Age date. It may be expected, therefore, that wells and shafts have entered the record less through processes of retrospection and related methodologies than through independent archaeological evidence.

In practice, as this chapter aims to show, this is not the case. Instead there are a number of ‘external’ arguments (both archaeological (5.4) and textual (5.5)) which have influenced not only the dating of wells and shafts, but also their identification as cult loci. This chapter will consider: (1) the archaeological identification of ritual activity at these loci (5.2); (2) the paucity of Iron Age archaeological evidence for this phenomenon in Britain (5.3); (3) processes by which the argument for pre-Roman cult activity at wells and shafts is advanced (5.4); and (4) the conceptual underpinning of these processes (5.5-6).
5.1.1 Scope of study and problems of definition.

In limiting itself to mainland Britain, this study does not ignore the fact that outside Britain a limited number of shafts with securely dated LIA fills may have had a ritual function (5.4.4). Rather, Britain was selected in part in order to consider the value of ‘pan-Celtic’ arguments brought to bear on the ritual identification of sites in an area for which secure dating and functional evidence is absent. It would have been possible to examine these processes by an interregional study of French examples, but Britain was selected for the additional reason that a number of recent syntheses have made this the most accessible documented area for the study of wells and shafts. In France, the necessary corpus – assembled to coherent standards – remains to be achieved, although numbers of ritual and ‘puits funéraire’ shafts are distributed through the literature.

In cataloguing examples argued elsewhere as Iron Age cult foci (App.5.1), the present study utilises the syntheses of Ross (1968) and Wait (1985) – especially the latter, whose Iron Age site catalogue has been examined in detail (5.3.2). The writer has also drawn on Green (1976), in addition to a variety of sources which post-date Wait (1985).

Wells and shafts were frequently utilised for cult activities in Roman Britain, and retrospective processes have, inevitably, been employed in the identification of pre-Conquest examples (5.4.2). For this reason, it has also been necessary to consider Romano-British examples: these are listed in App.5.2, but are not catalogued in detail as this would have entailed little more than a repetition of the syntheses noted above. A number of the sites are discussed in more detail in the text (bold numbers in brackets being the Appendix catalogue number for the site); elsewhere the reader is referred to the references noted in App.5.2. This list is largely drawn
from the aforementioned syntheses, and is not exhaustive.

In attempting to limit discussion to shafts and wells, this and earlier studies have faced major problems of differentiation. As Wait (1985:54) noted, there is arguably a continuum of features from Iron Age storage pits through shafts of a variety of depths to the very deep wells found on the chalk uplands of the south, and any attempted distinction may therefore be arbitrary. However, as Wait (1985) demonstrated, the fill of pits under c. 2.5m in depth differs from that of deeper examples, and these may thus be considered as distinct. Wait’s (1985:54) use of a 2.5m minimum depth as the definition of a shaft has been adopted here, although it must be accepted that as this is to some extent arbitrary and will not have applied in all cases, some sites which merit discussion may have been ignored here.

Equally problematic is the difficulty of distinguishing wells from shafts: this tends to cancel out the somewhat rough and ready dating criterion offered by the fact that "as far as can be seen the pattern of NW European deep-well sinking was brought about by Roman innovation or influence" (Ashbee 1989:136, with reference to Clark 1944:8). Ashbee’s comment oversimplifies: there is evidence that shafts and cisterns were used for water storage in Britain well before the Conquest (e.g. Hogg 1975, and Bradley 1975:50-51 on cisterns on the Breiddin and the late Neolithic shafts apparently dug in an area of fluctuating water-table at Maidenhead).

Ross (1968:256) defined any shaft over 120 ft. (36.5m) deep as a well, but this is an arbitrary criterion. Numerous deep shafts could have originally served as wells (defined, following Bromehead (1942) as a 'means of obtaining water from the earth vertically beneath the spot at which it is required, where it is not obviously present at the surface') but changing watertables can make this difficult to establish. The
recently re-opened debate over the Bronze Age Wilsford shaft (Ashbee et al 1989) is a case in point; similarly, Pitt-Rivers (1887) argued from the remains of a bucket in the fill of a 188 ft. (57m) dry shaft in the Romano-British settlement at Cranborne Chase that this had originally been a well, the water table having since lowered. Steining or lining may indicate a well, but as steining was not required in certain geological formations (e.g. chalk (Clark 1944:7)) the most common lithology for wells/shafts in Apps.5.1-2), its absence cannot be considered as evidence that the example was not a well. The proximity of easily available surface water, sometimes employed as a factor in arguing that certain shafts had not been sunk as wells, is a rationalist criterion, ignoring the fact that wells could be sunk for non-utilitarian reasons, and is thus of limited value.

In addition, a shaft may originally have been dug as a well, but re-utilised for different purposes when the well dried or was fouled (see 5.2. for this and the possibility that certain shafts were cut to obtain chalk). Finally, certain shafts could have been dug not to reach, but to contain water (i.e. as cisterns).

Both Ross (1968:256) and Wait (1985:54-5) argued that the distinction between wells and dry shafts is irrelevant; as Wait (1985:55) noted, wells may have served as places for ritual activity both during and after their active use as water supplies (though many of the deposits noted in Apps.5.1-2 would have fouled a functioning well: see 5.2). Given the problems of definition noted above, the assumption that wells and shafts had a "single significance" (Ross 1968:256) is understandable, but may be a false convenience.

Human skeletal remains occur in under 20 % of British well and shaft fills. In the case of complete skeletons, as in the example of Newstead Railway Pit 1 (containing an upright human skeleton: Ross (1968:270))
primary burial may be signified. Complete skeletons are, however, rare. The majority of human bone deposits comprise skulls or long bones (Wait 1985) and while these could signify formal secondary burial, it is generally impossible to determine whether this is the case. In addition, cremated bone is noted in some early reports, but is often unidentifiable (e.g. Bekesbourne (3) has calcined bones of unidentified origin). In France especially, there has been a tendency to assume that ritual shafts producing 'urns' contained human cremations (hence the terminology 'puits funéraire' for these loci), although there is often little evidence to support this. For these reasons, following Wait (1985), the presence of human bone is not accepted in the present study as evidence per se for either mortuary ritual or human sacrifice. Wait (1985) indicated that the fills of shafts containing human bone are not otherwise distinguishable from examples lacking this feature, which would also tend to support the contention that human bone should not be a criterion accorded particular weight in the identification of 'ritual' wells and shafts.

5.2. Identification of ritual activity: problematic.

The possibility of utilitarian origins (see below) means that formal characteristics (depth, diameter, shape) of wells and shafts do not afford valid criteria on which to base ritual identification. Consideration of the geology and geomorphology of individual loci is also meaningless, again because some subterranean features could originally have been cut for utilitarian purposes. As a result, the principal basis for the archaeological identification of ritual wells and shafts has been the nature and characteristics of their fills.

Recent British work on the fills of disused storage pits in Iron Age settlement contexts (Grant 1984:533-548, Wait 1985:122-153, Maltby 1985, Hill 1989) raises two points of particular importance to the present study:
1. A false contrast between an 'odd' ritual and a 'normal' domestic record (Hill 1989:21) may hamper the archaeological identification of ritual. Ritual is not confined to 'cult' sites, but can occur in contexts which we have assumed are domestic, and so secular (Hill 1989).

2. Features cut for utilitarian purposes (in this case, grain storage) may subsequently be utilised for activities with a ritual aspect. Both are important in discussing wells and shafts, which are also subterranean features with a possible utilitarian application.

Many of the loci discussed here could have had utilitarian origins. Wells have clear utilitarian possibilities, and many of the features in Apps.5.1-2 could originally have been dug for flint and chalk extraction. Pliny (Natural History 17.8.4) noted that in Britain, chalk for liming fields was obtained from deep pits. In the Roman period, at least, the function of some shafts changed over time. A C2nd AD dry shaft at Chelmsford (35), containing five horse skulls, was recut in a former well. Coventina's Well (Carrawburgh, 33) was dug as an utilitarian cistern (possibly before the Conquest), and only later became a focus for cult activity. Many examples cut as utilitarian wells may have been re-utilised for ritual deposition only after the water supply had dried up or fouled. At Queens Street, London (55), a human jaw bone was deposited in a silted former public well.

As King remarked (1990:220), the disabling split between ritual and secular, domestic and non-domestic, which hampered the identification of pit fills as ritual features (Hill 1989:21) also affects the archaeology of wells and shafts.

By imposing an either/or differentiation on ritual and secular activities (see point (1) above), the
possibility of ritual activity within 'secular' contexts is overlooked. As King (1990:220) noted, intermediate possibilities exist for wells and shafts.

First, essentially utilitarian wells could have been afforded rites of commencement or termination. This situation was recently encountered at Neatham (65). Here, the excavators (Millett and Graham 1988) suggested that two differentiable kinds of ritual deposit could be identified relating to otherwise utilitarian Roman period wells. When a well was dug to beneath the water-table a complete pot or pots were deposited, and when the water fouled, further deposits were made before the wells were filled with rubbish or used as cess-pits.

In these cases, where ritual activity is confined to isolated and brief rites, identifying ritual activity is dependent on the quality of excavation data. In many cases, as noted by the writer subsequently, such data are very poor. Equally, such wells are not cult foci - they are utilitarian loci whose use period is marked by isolated ritual episodes. The ability to distinguish between such intermittent ritual usages of wells and shafts is likewise hampered by data quality.

In this context, a number of considerations suggest that the identification of ritual activity at wells will be more problematic than in the case of dry shafts. Firstly, where material was deposited in active wells, deliberate placement (5.2.3) would often not be archaeologically discernible. Secondly, given that many of the types of deposit noted in Apps.5.1-2 would have fouled an active well, it is to be expected that rites may have occurred before or after, but conceptually related to, utilitarian use, as suggested for Neatham. As Merrifield (1987:47) noted, animal skeletons at the bases of Roman period wells are frequently covered by building debris, filling the well, and possibly attesting to a termination phase at the sites the wells served.

Equally, rites at wells may have occurred following
a change in conception of the locus, as at Coventina's Well. As noted, the ritual aspects of the former would be difficult to identify (cf. Neatham).

Given the above, intermittent ritual deposition during the use period of otherwise utilitarian loci is more likely to occur for shafts, but is also possible at utilitarian wells; offerings which would not foul the water could have been made in times of drought, or to ensure the water supply. Ritual activity of this type, unlikely to present patterns of structured deposition, may be very difficult to identify. It is unlikely to be marked by structured deposition, and isolated finds within an otherwise unremarkable fill may be dismissed as accidental.

Many shafts, and wells with secondary fills, may have served as favissae, that is, for the disposal of sanctified debris such as the remains of sacrificed animals. In such cases, where a fill may have little or nothing to distinguish it from domestic rubbish, and where diagnostic features such as deliberate placement and layering (5.2.3) are absent, the ritual status of a fill may often be archaeologically unrecognisable. In these cases ritual status may be assigned on other grounds (e.g. proximity to other non-functional structures: shafts within fana enclosures may be favissae, as may also be the case for the shaft at the centre of the Aylesford cremation cemetery (2)).

5.2.1. Fill analyses.

As noted above, ritual function is assigned to wells and shafts almost entirely on the basis of their fills.

Fill analysis of wells and shafts, less advanced than for storage pits (e.g. Grant 1984), is often highly subjective and lacking in systematisation. Wait, commenting on the identification of ritual shafts by Ross
(1968) rightly criticised the intuitive basis of her selection process. He noted that some of the examples she included could simply be rubbish pits (1985:51-2). (Manning 1972:243-6 equally expressed strong reservations about Ross' assessment of some of the Newstead pits). In his own work, Wait attempted to decrease this intuitive element by a statistical analysis of well/shaft fills, which will be considered below (5.3.3). Ritual identification did not however proceed on the basis of this analysis; statistics were performed on a group of sites pre-determined to be of ritual function (Wait 1985:54 referred to his gazetteer as a list of sites 'for which there is prima facie evidence of ritual activity'). Although Wait (1985:54) attempted to firm up this identification process by revising the list of artefact categories which Ross (1968:281-3) had taken as evidence for ritual fills, a number of the sites in his own catalogue would nevertheless appear to have been selected with scant regard to this.

5.2.2. Wait's (1985) identification of ritual characteristics.

Wait (1985:52-3) outlined 27 fill categories which he considered serve as ritual indicators, but argued that none of these alone was sufficient to categorise a fill as ritual. He suggested (although he did not develop this) that identification must proceed on the basis of category combinations. However, the potential of the individual categories was not explored by Wait.

Wait's use of artefact categories (which form the basis of his statistical analysis) considers only the presence/absence of materials in various categories. This is partly necessitated by the poor quality of much of his data, but ignores the equally important factor of quantity (and relative proportions) of each category, which can be established in many individual cases. Whilst it is likely that the presence of animal bones or
pottery sherds does not point to a ritual fill, a deposit entirely composed of the former (as for example at Aylesford (2)), or with a very high quantity of the latter (for example the ceramic-filled shafts of the Toulouse area; Fouet 1958, Gallia 1978:405-6, 1980:484-7) implies an element of selectivity which is not easily explicable in terms of rubbish disposal or such factors as accidental loss. The Cadbury Castle shaft (4), for example, has portions of 24 bracelets in its fill.

5.2.3. Acceptable archaeological criteria for the identification of ritual fills.

The weakness of simple presence/absence analysis of fills is that it fails to consider the structure of deposition. The demonstration of patterns of structured deposition has formed the basis of many recent attempts to identify ritual activity (1.5.2), and it may be argued that this, rather than the nature of deposited material, is a key criterion on which the identification of ritual well and shaft fills must proceed. As Wait himself noted (1985:54,79), the layering of a fill is the single most convincing category for ritual identity, in that it involves the deliberate organisation and placement of artefacts within the well or shaft. There are some spectacular Romano-British examples of this (e.g. Jordan Hill (51, Somerset; Ross 1968:266-7) and Ashill (22, Norfolk; Ross 1968:258). Layering is clearly an acceptable criterion for identifying ritual activity, where it can be shown (as in the examples above) that layers are not simply the product of sequential infilling, but are rather the result of deliberate deposition.

Similarly, a number of shafts contain items which can be shown to have been deliberately positioned or grouped. For example, a niche in one wall of a C2nd AD well at Kelvedon (Essex) held a figurine (52), and the base of the Bekesbourne shaft (3) contained a pegged
stone with a circle of horse teeth placed on it, and urns arranged symmetrically above it. Vessels at Ashill (22) were arranged symmetrically, and at Northfleet (11) animal bones were placed in apparently deliberate discrete groupings on the floor of the shaft. Complete vessels, as at Wolfamcote (18), and broken ones, where breakage can be shown to have occurred subsequent to deposition, also point to deliberate placement. Again, while the presence of tree trunks need not point to ritual activity, the placement of upright stakes or logs in the base of shafts, as at Ipsden (10), may do in so far as they would impede other functions.

There is an obvious danger in relying too heavily on deliberate placement alone. In some cases, ritual activity at shafts/wells could have simply involved throwing materials into the shaft, as is argued, for example at some of the Gallo-Roman shafts at Chartres (Gallia 1978:267). It may also be contended that deposits of favissa type would be unlikely to display structured deposition. But it remains the case that deliberate placement, and in some cases, selectivity, are basic categories of activity on which to formulate the possible identification of ritual in wells and shafts. These serve as good criteria to identify ritual fills. That further elaboration of this approach has not been a task undertaken during the present study of Iron Age ritual foci reflects the fact, as will now be considered, that the overwhelming majority of wells and shafts which exhibit such characteristics are of post-Conquest, rather than Iron Age, date.

5.3. The 'Iron Age' sites.

In this section, those wells and shafts normally attributed to the Iron Age will be examined.

5.3.1. Limitations of the data.

The analysis of the date and function of the
wells/shafts catalogued in App.5.1 is conditioned by a number of limitations inherent in the data set.

A high proportion of these shafts were investigated in the C19th-early C20th: of the 21 putative Iron Age shafts sites, nine (43%) were excavated after 1900, but in only one case (Warbank Keston) after 1950. Many were chance finds located during chalk extraction or railway cutting, and were damaged prior to examination (see e.g. Ashstead (1)). Documentation is often poor, in part because such sites were generally excavated quickly, and in an archaeological vacuum: information on site context is frequently extremely vague. More recent excavations in urban locations (e.g. London (Wilmott 1982; Rowsome 1983), Southwark (Yule 1982), Neatham (Millett and Graham 1988), and in France at the Luxembourg Gardens (Paris; Gallia 1965:301-3), Chartres (Gallia 1978:287-8; 1980:319), Saintes (Gallia 1975:117-58) and Toulouse (Gallia 1974:474; 1976:478-9, 484; 1980:480, 484-7) have provided far more comprehensive data, but the most recently excavated British examples all have only post-Conquest fills (the earliest example, at Cannon Street, London, is a well containing Neronian pottery: Rowsome (1983:277)). It is not insignificant that well-documented shafts excavated after 1950, for which secure dating is offered, are without exception argued to have been infilled after the Conquest.

Data on most of the putative Iron Age sites is often too poor to establish adequately such features as dimensions (limiting the value of morphological analyses of the type undertaken by Wait (1985:76)) and sequential infilling (as suggested for the Romano-British shaft recently excavated at Keston, where ten phases of animal deposit were distinguished, dating from C1st-2nd AD (Merrifield 1987:42)).

Finally, the waterlogged, or damp, condition of a number of wells/shafts has afforded excellent if fortuitous preservation of materials, including organic
deposits. It is probable that organic deposits were a feature of most ritual fills and their occurrence could have contributed to their identification as such if preserved, but the accident of survival means that those shafts which do preserve organic materials cannot be compared meaningfully with dry shafts. This serves further to restrict the utility of the data-base.

5.3.2. The 'Iron Age' sites examined.

The 21 wells and shafts classified as Iron Age by Wait (1985) are catalogued and re-examined in App.5.1. (see also Fig.5.1). There are inconsistencies in the dating proffered by Wait: Frittenden (7) is catalogued as a Roman shaft but appears in the analyses as an Iron Age example; Stone (14), Warbank Keston (16a) and Winterbourne Kingston (17a) are all catalogued by Wait as 'probably Roman' but again appear in the analyses as Iron Age examples. All four sites are therefore included in the present re-examination. Caburn, for the reasons noted in App.5.1 is omitted from the present study, which therefore considers 19 shafts.

Shafts not considered by Wait (1985) include an example at Belle Tout (Sussex). Bradley (1974:156) noted a possible Iron Age shaft brought to light during a cliff fall, within the area of the Beaker settlement here. No finds were recovered. An Iron Age date was proposed for the Belle Tout shaft because pottery from this area of the site did not pre-date the Iron Age. A subsequent attempt to recover samples from the fill (Drewett 1982:96) produced one sherd of Middle Bronze Age pottery, and in the absence of secure dating the shaft is not accepted as Iron Age here.

As App.5.1 indicates, the majority of the examples discussed by Wait cannot be shown to have Iron Age fills (or even fill phases). Only 3 examples, (Ashstead (1), Calke Wood (5) and Purberry Shot (12), have securely dated pre-Conquest materials in their fills. A further
Fig. 5.1. Distribution of putative British IA ritual wells and shafts, after Wait (1985).
shaft, Aylesford (2) has an undated fill, but the site context may suggest a late Clst BC date. Pottery in the fill of the Crayford (6) shaft was argued, on stylistic grounds, to be pre-Conquest.

Before examining these sites, it is necessary to reiterate that it is often difficult to date well and shaft fills accurately, and for this reason, some sites of Iron Age date may not be recognised as such. On the other hand, the practice (especially noticeable in Wait 1985) of advancing pre-Conquest dates for poorly documented sites which cannot be accurately dated is unacceptable and is predicated on expectations arising from non-archaeological considerations (5.4-5). A number of the examples considered by Wait (1985) are undatable (Ipsden (10) and Wolfamcote (18)). Others are mentioned in Cl9th or earlier notices, in which pottery from the fill (often the only, or principal, means to date shaft fills) is not discussed in detail, and is simply stated to be 'Romano-British'. Examples here are Bekesbourne (3), Greenhithe (8), Rotherfield Peppard (13) and Winterbourne Kingston (17a). With reference to the latter group, Wait (1985) may be right to question the value of Cl9th pottery classifications, but the sites are too poorly documented to allow for certainty in their dating, and cannot be presupposed to have Iron Age fills. Green (1976) catalogued all four examples as Roman. The remaining eleven suggested Iron Age wells and shafts are, notwithstanding Wait (1985), of post-Conquest date (see Appendix 5.1).

Turning to those examples containing pre-Conquest material, two of the three such shafts are dated, by this material, to before the LIA. The only finds noted for the deep shaft at Calke Wood (5) are Beaker pottery sherds (as is also the case for the less well known shaft from the Cottage Field on the edge of Calke Wood). Wainwright (1975:24) considered Calke Wood an EBA shaft,
and the site should be seen in the context of the other Bronze Age examples noted below (5.4.3). It is in any case most uncertain whether the fill should be considered as ritual (see App.5.1)

The only datable material from the Ashstead (1a) shaft comprises pottery fragments of All Cannings Cross type, conventionally datable to the LBA/EIA transition. If accepted as a ritual shaft (the apparent layering of the fill may be a feature of the sequential deposition of otherwise unremarkable domestic debris), the site could be regarded as either a late manifestation of Bronze Age practices, for which there is some further evidence (5.4.3) or as evidence for early EIA use of shafts as ritual foci. Further evidence for EIA ritual shafts is almost entirely absent, however. The third well with pre-Conquest material, Purberry Shot (12), produced one EIA loomweight, but this is a problematic site: the finds have a wide date range (the EIA loomweight, a brooch of 'pre-Roman date' and Clst-mid C2nd AD pottery sherds) but this material is not sequentially stratified. The excavator's suggestion (Lowther 1946-7:15) that the fill is simply debris from the surrounding LIA/Roman settlement, used to fill a utilitarian well before a road was sited over it in the mid C2nd AD, may account for this. Purberry Shot is not certainly, therefore, a ritual fill, and if, as Lowther argues, the well was infilled in one episode, this process cannot in any case have occurred before the mid C2nd AD.

The Aylesford (2) shaft contains no datable material, but is located in a late Clst BC cremation cemetery. The suggestion of a Clst BC date for this shaft is not unreasonable (though it remains a supposition), and both the cemetery location and the nature of the fill could suggest ritual usage (5.2).

Finally, the Crayford (6) shaft was said by Haverfield (1932:151) to contain pots of probable pre-Roman date. The pottery in this shaft occurred in one
compact deposit: at the top of the stratum, fine wares (sigillata, Upchurch and local wares) and at the base, coarser fabrics. It is evident from Haverfield’s note on the site that the suggestion of a pre-Roman date for the vessels at the base of the deposit is proffered because the fabrics are coarser; the apparent stratification of the vessels neatly confirming a presupposition that coarse vessels attested to lesser technical competence and were thus ‘early’. However, there is nothing in Haverfield’s account to demonstrate that the pottery stratum was not an homogenous deposit; the pottery (as a whole) is said to be intermixed with iron fragments, animal bones and other material in what appears to be an homogenous layer. The suggested pre-Conquest date for a portion of the fill is thus unlikely.

5.3.3. **Previous attempts to differentiate an Iron Age group.**

Despite the paucity of archaeological evidence for Iron Age use of wells and shafts for cult purposes, and in spite of the recognition that the majority of fills had unquestionably been made after the Conquest, Wait (1985), Ross (1968) and others have advanced a variety of arguments to suggest that these data are nevertheless indicative of Iron Age, and later, Celtic cult activity.

Wait (1985:55-81) carried out Chi-square analysis on some 102 shafts and wells of suggested Iron Age and Roman period date, correlating the presence/absence of a pre-defined series of artefact categories with four (pre-determined) well/shaft groups, in order to test the hypothesis that the group distinctions were significant. Wait concluded that the fills in each of the four groups had less than 1% probability of occurring by chance. This would appear to support Wait’s assertion that an Iron Age group is archaeologically identifiable, but a number of problems undermine his analysis.

Chi-square analysis can only be applied to pre-
selected groups, but there are fundamental difficulties with the way Wait divided up his sites as the basis for his analysis. He divided wells and shafts into four groups: Roman military, Roman civilian, Iron Age sites in Kent/Surrey and Iron Age sites elsewhere in Britain. The distinction between the Roman sites creates no problem, but Wait's 'Iron Age' groups pose real difficulties. Firstly, as has already been considered, the majority of his 'Iron Age' sites either date to the Roman period or cannot be securely dated (5.3.2). Wait's own catalogue indicates that a number of the 'Iron Age' sites are of post-Conquest date, yet these are treated as Iron Age for the purposes of statistical analysis. This inconsistency negates in no small measure his approach. Secondly, he defines his two Iron Age groups simply by drawing an arbitrary geographical boundary between the extreme SE and the rest of Britain: but the Surrey/Kent concentration (Fig.5.1) may be explicable in ways which have nothing to do with regional ritual preferences (e.g. distributional bias related to the density of railway lines). It is in any case illogical that, having argued for regional trends in one area, Wait should then ignore the possibility elsewhere by grouping all other British sites together.

Other criticisms relate to data quality. For many sites, the data are inadequate even for the rudimentary, nominal presence/absence analysis which Wait had felt constrained to employ because the data are so poor: documentation quality is inconsistent (even within individual sites, as Ross and Peachem noted (1976) with reference to Curle's (1911) report on the Newstead pits), and it is often impossible to determine what was present or absent in a given case. In cases like the Danebury pits, (Grant 1984) where systematic and consistent data are available, statistical analyses are practicable, but the quality of the wells/shafts database does not support them.
In summary, given the problems of Wait's (1985) analysis, not least the inconsistent dating of his data sets, the Chi-square results cannot be considered as meaningful. Even if Wait's findings are accepted, the differences between his groups could be explicable in terms of regional or other (e.g. military/civilian) variations in the post-Conquest record and cannot be considered a basis for dating: Wait also recorded a statistical distinction between his two purportedly contemporaneous Iron Age groups ($X^2 = 41.78$).

By analysing the 'principal elements' of ritual shafts, Wait (1985:78-81) also suggested a series of observable differences between shaft fills in his four groups, which need to be considered here. These principal elements are defined somewhat dubiously - comprising both the artefact categories which occur in most shafts in a group, and those which occur in a minority, "but whose presence is significant in distinguishing one group from another" (1985:78). The procedure is, again, based on the nominal presence/absence of artefact categories. Wait concluded that Roman shafts are distinguished from 'Iron Age' examples by the presence of tools, votives, deer and pig bones, oysters and coins (1985:79). On the other hand, seven further categories occur across all four of his well/shaft groups, and the differences Wait noted may be due to external factors (the availability of oysters for example) or perhaps to post-Conquest regional variation. It may also be noted that of Wait's 21 putative Iron Age shafts, one has pig bones and two deer; three contain tools, and one oysters. Secondly, as only 17 of Wait's 84 Roman wells and shafts have Roman votives and only 14 have coins, their presence is actually not the post-Conquest norm, and their absence thus hardly classifies a site as Iron Age. Wait also suggests that the presence of ash deposits and human bones distinguish Iron Age
sites, but 17% of Wait’s Roman sites (Table 3.6 and note on page 64) produced human bone, compared to 15% of the putative ‘Iron Age’ sites (Wait gives 23% (Table 3.6 and note on page 64) but there is no record of human bone at either Northfleet (11) or Cadbury Castle (4).

A second factor argued to suggest the existence of Iron Age ritual wells/shafts is geographical distribution. Given, as Ross (1968:279) noted, that the distribution of wells and shafts "co-incides so strikingly with the distribution of Romano-Celtic temples and that of villas" it might have been expected that distribution analyses would have pointed rather to the essentially post-Conquest nature of the phenomena. On the contrary, Ross (1968) argued that the concentration of shafts and wells in southern Britain, noted by both herself and Wait (1985:Figs.3.1,3.2) indicated that this was predominantly a custom of ‘Belgic’ Celts, who introduced the practice from the continent, explaining the outliers to her ‘Belgic’ group, notably at military installations in the North, as the work either of wandering Belgae or of Belgic auxiliaries in the Roman army (though she was later to argue (Ross and Feachem 1976) that the Newstead pits were filled after the Conquest by Celts who were not Belgae: 5.6.1). As Wait noted (1985:61), whilst there is a concentration of sites in the south-east, the distribution is clearly not the ‘Belgic’ distribution suggested by Ross (there are also numerous sites in the southwest, and further north), and it is possible that the southerly concentration simply reflects a general data bias in favour of SE England; also, many sites were discovered as a result of railway workings, and the concentration of rail lines emanating from London may in part explain the distributional imbalance (Wait 1985:61). The ‘Belgic’ argument may therefore be dismissed.
5.4. Retrospection and extrapolation

There is a considerable amount of archaeological evidence for wells and shafts as cult foci in earlier periods and in localities outside Iron Age Britain. This section examines the ways these observations have informed analyses of LIA and Roman period British wells and shafts.

5.4.1. ‘Celtic tradition’: retrospection I.

As the above discussion indicates (5.3), archaeological evidence for LIA use of wells and shafts as ritual foci in Britain is very poor. It is clear that the widely-held assumption that Iron Age Celts employed wells and shafts for this purpose is not founded on an independent archaeological database. Instead, poor data are supported, as often, by retrospective arguments, that features of the Roman period sites attest to the post-Conquest continuation of ‘Celtic traditions’, on which basis the existence of pre-Conquest practices can be inferred. Some features of Roman period wells have been argued to indicate such ‘Celtic traditions’.

The human corpse was considered taboo in the Graeco-Roman world (Henig 1984). Given this, and the Roman proscription against human sacrifice, the not infrequent occurrence of human bone in wells and shafts could be seen as an argument for ‘Celtic’ usage. Similarly, human remains occur in several Roman urban wells, despite post-Conquest proscriptions against burial within town walls. Wait (1985:80) noted that human bones occur frequently on Roman period sites, and saw this as a Celtic survival. Similarly, it would appear to be the presence of human bone in some of the Newstead shafts which prompted Henig (1984:89) to accept Ross and Peachem’s argument (1978) that the shafts were filled by the native population after the Roman withdrawal, rather than by the occupying army.

Human bone occurs, albeit in limited quantities, on
four of the six military installations documented by Wait (above). While this could conceivably be attributed to the activities of Celtic auxiliaries, as Ross (1968: 279) at one stage suggested, this is surely special pleading, not least because if such apparently 'non-Roman' rites were introduced by auxiliaries, these units need not have been Celtic in origin. The ethnic make up of the Frontier military units in Clst-2nd AD includes troops drawn from a variety of regions (Salway 1965:17-18, Mann 1983:23-25, 89-90). It is also possible that human remains occurred in shafts and wells for reasons which had nothing to do with sacrifice or formal rites of burial (e.g. surreptitious disposal: Manning 1972). This may account for some of the human remains in urban contexts (above).

Ross (1962; 1968) has drawn particular attention to the occurrence of human skulls in wells as an indication that Roman period wells were being filled by the native population. Similarly, Marsh and West (1981:86-102) have argued that a concentration of skulls in post-Conquest contexts in the Walbrook Valley (London) is explicable in terms of the continuation of pre-Conquest insular rites. As Ross (1962) rightly noted, decapitation was frequently practised in Celto-Ligurian contexts (though as a post-mortem battle rite). Ross also drew attention to insular texts in which heads and wells are linked in magical contexts: the Metrical Dinnshenchas relates that the hill of Sliab Gam was so named because the youth Gam was decapitated beside a well on the hill. His head was thrown into a well, giving the water magical properties (Ross 1962:37). In a further tale from the same source, the well of Tipra Brothlaige was so named because the sons of Morna killed three sons of the Finn ua Baiscne household and threw their heads in a well. There are a number of references of this type (5.5.1), but decapitation was a frequent motif, and the majority of
accounts are not contexted at wells. The Medieval literature does not therefore suggest an explicit relationship between decapitation rites and wells.

Skulls are in fact fairly uncommon in Roman period wells, occurring in only six of the 81 shafts documented by Wait. Other examples are, however, known: skulls were found in London at both Queens Street and Cannon Street (56), and at Odell (Bedfordshire (68)), where a skull minus the lower jaw was found behind the well lining and must have been placed there when the well was constructed (Merrifield 1987:46)), but the incorporation of crania cannot be said to be a common feature of post-Conquest ritual wells and shafts. Secondly, it is not the case that Celts were the only peoples to view the human head symbolically. The Romans and Greeks, like the Celts, saw the head as the seat of power and energy (Henig 1984:18; Onians 1951:101). For example, the legend of the head of Olus appearing on the site of the Capitol and talking (Onians 1951:95) may be cited. In the late Empire, corpses were often decapitated to prevent ghosts haunting the living (Henig 1984:203). The idea that skulls are evidence per se for native as opposed to imported rites is simplistic.

Other, more nebulous, 'Celticisms' are often suggested to have influenced shaft-fills; for example the presence of bones of hare and cock. Ross (1968:275) noted, in cataloguing the Bekesbourne shaft (3), that Caesar (5.12,6) said hare and fowl were sacred to the British, and Dio (Epitome Book 52,7) notes the sacrifice of a hare to Andraste. Bekesbourne is, however, the only shaft for which bones of these creatures have been recorded (though a hare is depicted on an embossed metal sheet from the recently excavated shaft at Winterbourne Kingston (17b)); and Ross ignores the fact that the cock was also sacred to Mercury. Dog bones, occurring often in shafts, have also been argued to demonstrate their
'native' aspect (intimations that dogs were sacred to the Celts are outlined by Green 1986:175-6). It is however pertinent to note that dogs also had sacred significance in the Graeco-Roman world; the theme of the divine hunt was as common in Classical mythology as in Celtic, and the dog was sacred to Artemis/Diana.

The benefit of such arguments, for workers like Ross, is that they allow sites of manifestly Roman period date to be seen as 'Celtic'. But the pitfalls of the approach are obvious. It is dependent on the precept that certain features of the Romano-British record may be isolated as 'purely' Celtic, and as the few examples given above will have made clear, this is in practice almost impossible to achieve. It is exactly this notion which underpins the majority of studies of Celtic religion, the database employed for many aspects being largely Romano-British and Gallo-Roman (see most recently the work of Green (1986, 1989) and the criticism by Henig (1984:14)) and it is thus unsurprising that the approach continues to be employed for wells and shafts.

The principal weakness of this retrospective process is that even if a feature of shaft- and well-fills can be isolated as 'Celtic', the resultant conclusion that post-Conquest shafts and wells have a 'native' aspect is not an indication that wells and shafts were employed as cult foci in the pre-Conquest era: these loci may simply have been adopted after the Conquest, and the associated rites adapted to accommodate insular preferences (5.6.2).

5.4.2. Roman period: retrospection II.

In Britain, as in France, the majority of wells/shafts with possible ritual fills are of post-Conquest date. Of the British sites catalogued in Appendices 5.1-2, 19 sites have shafts with putatively Iron Age fills, compared with 66 sites yielding shafts with post-Conquest fills. As considered above, many of
the 'Iron Age' examples put forward in Wait (1985) are in fact of post-Conquest date (5.3). The recognition of the prevalence of post-Conquest sites (Green 1986:145) has not, however, led to a re-appraisal of the assumed 'Celticity' of this phenomenon, but instead, as is also the case with Burgundian water source sites (Chapter 4) has generated a suspect methodology of retrospection, based on the post-Conquest evidence, by which LIA cult activity is 'identified'. In both cases one line of argument is that the sheer quantity of post-Conquest evidence may be advanced to suggest that pre-Conquest activity served as a model on which were grafted Graeco-Roman practices. In contrast to water source sites, for which it is argued that Roman period use has obliterated Iron Age evidence, independent archaeological evidence for the Iron Age use of wells and shafts as cult foci is widely perceived to exist (e.g. Ross 1968:255-85, Ross and Peachem 1976:230-237, Wait 1985:51-82, Green 1986:155-7).

5.4.3. Neolithic and Bronze Age British sites: extrapolation I.

In assigning wells and shafts to the LIA ritual corpus, retrospective inference (5.4.1-2) is complemented by two further processes of extrapolation. The first is an appeal to the pre-Iron Age record.

As is often the case in the archaeology of Celtic religion, an almost inevitable prolegomenon to accounts of ritual wells and shafts is a brief statement on the antiquity of the rites in question (e.g. Ross 1967:25-7), Green 1986:145, Wait 1985:51). Neolithic pits/shafts such as Cannon Hill (Bradley et al. 1978), Maumbury Rings (Bradley 1975), and Eaton Heath (Wainwright 1973), or BA examples such as Swanwick (Piggott 1963), Wilsford (Ashbee 1963, Ashbee et al. 1989), Berlin-Lichterfelde (Von Müller 1964) and Vledder (Netherlands, Piggott 1963) are frequently cited in this context, the underlying
implication being that such sites, taken with well-attested post-Conquest examples (5.4.2, App.5.2), point to a 'cult continuum' of which the British LIA must have formed a part. Certain features are temporally and geographically widespread. The placement of upright stakes or wooden elements in the base of shafts, for example, is noted at BA shafts (Swanwick and Vledder, above), and even earlier (Newgrange: Sweetman 1985). It also occurs in Iron Age contexts (e.g. Holzhausen, Bavaria, Schwarz 1962) and Tomerdingen, Bavaria (Zürn 1971), and is a feature of post-Conquest fills such as La Bernard (Vendée; Baudry and Ballereau 1873). But this is hardly evidence of a continuum of practice. The function of many pre-Roman period wells and shafts is in any case itself debatable (see in particular Ashbee et al 1989).

5.4.4. LIA sites in Europe: extrapolation II.

A somewhat similar line of reasoning (of, in this case spatial association) pervades the assumption that the existence of LIA 'ritual' shafts elsewhere in Europe necessitates their existence in LIA Britain. Such examples as the Holzhausen shafts in Bavaria (Schwarz 1962) are cited not as parallels for British sites but as substitute data for them (e.g. Green 1986:20). Concepts of 'pan-Celticism' are then used to imply that such shafts must also have existed in Britain. The 'pan-Celtic' thesis, dependent on concepts of cultural homogeneity (1.3.1) is not a satisfactory basis on which to identify cult activity (1.3.3). Even on the sparse evidence available, regional trends emerge. Shafts located inside or under the banks of Vierecksschanzen (6.3.5, 6.5.1), for example, are on present knowledge, confined to southern Germany. They occur at Holzhausen (Bavaria; Schwarz 1962, 1975), Tomerdingen (Bavaria; Zurn 1971), Schonfeld, Kreuzpullach (Schwarz 1962), and Fellbach Schmiden (Baden-Württemberg; Plank 1985). A pit (max. depth 1.75m) was also noted against (and pre-
dating) the south bank of the enclosure at Gerichstetten (Deglatigny 1925). At Holzhausen, three shafts (up to 120ft (36.5m) depth) were dug in the Iron Age, one (dating to phase I) under the phase III earth bank, the others inside the bank (Schwarz 1962). At Tommerdingen a 5m deep shaft was cut below the southern part of the bank of an enclosure 70 x 70m. Three La Tène bowls (at 2.4m) date the fill (Zürn 1971). Wells and shafts with LIA fills also occur in France, but mainly in the Provincia. Numerous shafts have been discovered in the Toulouse area; several date to the late Clst BC (e.g. at La Planho: Gallia 1972:475, 1978:409-10), but none securely pre-dates the Roman annexation of the Provincia. The earliest example is a 3.6m deep ceramic-filled shaft from Vieille Toulouse, dated to 50-30 BC (Fouet 1958). The city of Nîmes (Gard) has also produced a number of shafts (Bessac et al 1984:187-222). Three are dated to the Clst BC, and the construction of one shaft (at Lattes, Combas) is dated to the end of the C2nd BC (Bessac et al 1984:216), although there is no clear evidence for ritual activity here.

Beyond the Provincia, as within its boundaries, the majority of shafts do not pre-date the Augustan era. A well sunk around the time of the Conquest in Bavay (Nord) was subsequently filled with three successive inhumations, not later than the early Clst AD (Henault 1930:5-9). At Argentomagus (Indre), four 'puits' in the vicinity of an artificial 'spring' are deep enough (4.25-4.75 m) to be classed as shafts, and date to the Clst AD (Allain et al 1988:105-114). The 112 shafts and pits in the Place de la République, Chartres (Eure-et-Loire) are all dated to Clst-2nd AD (Gallia 1978:287-8; 1980:319). Studies of the French 'puits funéraire' are generally very localised, but the Gallia Circonscription reports allow a partial overview to be assembled. The Gallia indexes for 1972-82, for example, list 27 sites with shafts having probable ritual fills. Of these, only six
(all from the Provincia) date to before Clst AD, and none pre-dates the second half of the Clst BC.

Finally, the 'sacrifice' scene on the Gundestrup cauldron (C2nd-1st BC) was argued by Kimmig (1965) to depict a victim about to be thrust head-first into a shaft in an enclosure. Warriors carrying an uprooted tree in the same scene are said to recall the occurrence of wood in shafts like La Bernard (Vendée) and Holzhausen (Bavaria), noted above. This interpretation is only one of many, and the 'Celticity' of the cauldron, found in a bog in northern Jutland, and probably made in eastern Europe, is in any case debated (Collis 1984:11-12).

5.5. Textual data.

Whilst the arguments noted above have considerable weaknesses, they continue to be accepted because an expectation that British Celts worshipped at wells and shafts dictates that there must be evidence for it. The final part of this chapter considers why this arises.

This expectation is, the present writer would argue, informed by text; not Classical text, in which as will now be seen, there is little evidence, but insular Medieval literature.

5.5.1. Contemporary Classical texts on Iron Age shafts.

There is only one Classical reference to the use of shafts in Iron Age Britain, and this is ambiguous: Diodorus (5.21), writing in the LIA but drawing on Pytheas, mentions 'underground buildings', sometimes claimed to be a reference to corn storage (Ashbee 1989). The context is certainly agricultural. Two post-Conquest references may also be noted: Pliny's claim (Natural History 17.8.4), already mentioned, that in Britain chalk for cultivation was obtained from deep pits, and an ambiguous reference by Tacitus (Germania 16. 4) to underground cavities for the concealment of commodities, and other uses.
Tacitus and Diodorus, as Ashbee (1989:136) noted, are both discussing agriculture, as is Pliny. Ashbee's suggestion that these Classical writers are using ancient data which may originally have implied the religious significance of shafts is entirely unsupported by any contemporary evidence.

In summary, there are no Classical references to British Iron Age or indeed later rites involving wells or shafts; such references are similarly lacking for all other Celtic areas. Shafts served as ritual foci in the Graeco-Roman world (5.5.3), so information on 'similar' rites in Britain would have been likely to enter the record, had it been available. On the other hand, little detailed information on Britain was generated before the Conquest in 43 AD, and the absence of data on this topic may simply reflect the poverty of the record: it may be noted in this context that the use of pits for ritual purposes, well documented archaeologically in Britain (e.g. Wait 1985, Hill 1989), is not noted in the contemporary Classical literature.

There is however a considerable body of data which indicates that wells and shafts informed Graeco-Roman religious life. This is often overlooked by those arguing that Roman period shafts and wells represent the survival of Iron Age Celtic traditions.

5.5.2. Classical accounts of Graeco-Roman rites involving shafts.

As Merrifield noted (1987:44), the idea of a deep shaft as a means of communicating with the powers of the underworld is ancient and widespread. In the Graeco-Roman world shafts (Latin mundus, Greek ἱερός) were employed as a means of direct communication with the spirits of the earth or the dead. On three days of the year in Italian cities or on the Palatine, the cover of the mundus was removed and the gate of the underworld was thus opened. This was the home of the manes, hostile
spirits known euphemistically as the 'kindly ones', who when the cover stones were removed were supposed to emerge (Ashbee et al 1989:134).

Shafts were also commonly employed as favissae. Anything which had been consecrated to gods, even the bones of sacrificial animals, became sacer and required appropriate disposal. Deep shafts or pits were employed for the proper disposal of sacrificial remains, vessels in which offerings and libations had been made, and votives which had been broken or were occupying needed space. Shafts located in temple enclosures may well have been favissae, as may many others with no known structural associations.

There are many Classical accounts of the use of pits as cult foci. Homer (Odyssey 11.25-50, 97-9) notes that the Latin mundus is a by which contact could be made with the underworld, to whose denizens libations could be poured. Odysseus recounts how he went to the kingdom of Persephone to get advice from the dead Tiresias and was to vow an offering for his safe return by digging a and pouring a libation of sheep's blood to all the dead. Pausanias (2.12,1) describes how at Titane in Sicyonia a priest performed secret rites in four pits to soothe the fury of the winds. Philostratus (Life of Apollonius 6.2.18) noted how the chthonic gods welcomed ceremonies performed in the hollow earth (Harrison 1908:47,68,125).

The use of shafts for cult activities is not, therefore, a practice which can be isolated as a 'Celtic' phenomenon. That this is so often overlooked by Celticists is unfortunate. That the observation that shafts were also a feature of Graeco-Roman rituals should also be ignored, despite the obvious post-Conquest dating of the majority of ritual wells and shafts, is surprising. The explanation for our failure to address these issues lies, the present writer will argue, in our reliance on insular textual data.
5.5.3. Insular Medieval texts.

The insular Medieval record, particularly for Ireland, provides many accounts of wells in mythological or magical contexts (see Cross V134, D925-7, F162.1.21, F162.8). In addition to the inherent difficulties which limit the value of such material (1.3.3), analysis of these data is hampered by confusion as to whether particular examples are wells or springs. The most famous well in Irish legend, the Segais, from which comes all wisdom, is actually a spring: the Metrical Dinnshenchas (MD) relates that the Boyne owes its origin to Boand, who defied the magic powers of the Well, which rose up, mutilating and drowning the goddess, and turning into a river (Ross 1967:21). A similar story (also from MD III 26 286ff) is told of the Shannon and the goddess Sinnan, though in other sources the well which destroys the goddess is the Coelrind (O’Rahilly 1946). In another topographic tale, the well Sen-Garmna was said to be so named because the hero Finn killed a woman of this name, set her head on a stake and threw her body in the well.

Wells sometimes occur as entrances to the otherworld. In the Pursuit of the Gillia Decair, Dermot encounters a wizard at a well and leaps with him into it, to find the otherworld at the base (Patch 1950), but generally the otherworld is reached by different means, most often through the Sid mounds, then sea voyages, lakes and mists (Wait 1985:226). Wells are, however, often the setting for supernatural events: Da Dergas Hostel opens as Echu Feidlech, King of Ireland, sees a woman at the edge of a well washing her hair.

Wells are also noted in other magical contexts. In the Battle of Maige Tuired, slain warriors were revived through being thrown into a well over which spells were cast (Sjoestd 1949:10). In addition to this material there is a vast body of more recent British folklore on wells (synthesised by Hope 1893 and Hull 1928) which is
frequently cited by Ross (1967), among others, as evidence for the 'Celtic' nature of rites involving such foci. Given their late and variable date, such data are of extremely limited value and are not considered further here.

The value of insular mediaeval data in relation to British Iron Age ritual activities is highly debatable. The general issues have already been considered (1.3.3) and will not be repeated here, but with specific reference to wells, the observation that archaeological evidence for wells/shafts as Iron Age cult foci in Ireland is as yet non-existent must cast some doubt over the assumption that insular accounts of wells in mythical contexts are drawing on traditions with Iron Age origins. The insular accounts could well have other bases: insular literature was tainted by Christian influences, and wells are not unknown in the context of miraculous events in Christian mythology. In addition, whilst there is much in the insular record which hints at a perception of wells as 'magical' loci, there is nothing, as Ross (1968:279) noted "which points directly and unequivocally to a knowledge of ritual shafts of the kind we are considering".

Finally, it is interesting to note that the insular literature is almost wholly confined to accounts of wells. One exception is the account of the entry of the Dagda into Formorians' camp in The Battle of Mag Tuired, which appears to include reference to a pit or shaft. A truce is granted, and a feast is prepared. An enormous porridge of milk, meal and fat, with added goats and pigs, is poured into a hole in the ground: the Dagda eats it all, scooping out the base of the hole with his finger. For Ross (1968:279) this "description of a ritual feast eaten from a pit by a well-attested pagan god..is suggestive of the type of cult legend which may have given rise to the ritual involved in creating..vast shafts and pits". The present writer would argue that
such assertions are founded on notions of 'pan-Celticism' noted earlier (1.3.1, 1.3.3).

Works arguing for the Iron Age origins of the use of wells and shafts as cult foci continue, nevertheless, to draw heavily on insular text, and in fact are predicated upon it. The pan-Celtic concept - the notion that what is good for one set of Celts some of the time is good for all Celts all the time - has created a text-led expectation that the Celts of Iron Age Britain employed wells as cult foci. This expectation has informed approaches to the archaeological database and coloured assessment of the site record; ultimately, as the present reassessment of the archaeological methodologies discussed above will already have indicated, and as will now be considered, it has weakened our approach to the archaeological database and led us to incorporate wells and shafts in the Iron Age ritual corpus in spite of the fact that independent archaeological evidence for this is almost non-existent.

5.6. **Conclusions.**

The Iron Age archaeological evidence for wells/shafts has been reviewed, and the variety of arguments attempting to show Celtic traditions in Roman period examples has been examined, as has the well-attested, and widely cited, insular textual evidence for wells as 'magic' phenomena.

It has become clear that in the archaeological designation of wells/shafts as cult foci, the identification process is inextricably linked with, and informed by, insular textual data, these data having created what may be termed a text-led expectation that Iron Age Celtic peoples in Britain used wells/shafts as cult foci. As noted elsewhere (1.3.3), the inherent limitations of insular textual data, as well as their temporal irrelevance to the British Iron Age, makes reliance on such data an unacceptable methodology by
which to assign site categories to the Iron Age ritual corpus. Yet this is exactly what has happened in the present case. Both the absence of relevant contemporary text on such practices, and the lack of independent archaeological data have been overruled in order to include these sites in the Iron Age ritual corpus.

5.6.1. The relaxing of archaeological rigour.

A clear relaxation of archaeological rigour characterises the identification of wells and shafts as ritual foci. Wait (1985) recognised and rightly criticised the intuitive basis on which Ross (1968) identified sites as ritual foci, but his own statistical analysis works on a corpus of sites which appear to have been accepted on a not dissimilar intuitive basis. Wait pointed to good criteria for identifying such sites, but failed to follow them; layering, for example, is attested in only 20% of his sample, and many of the sites in his corpus, like those in Ross (1968) have nothing to indicate a ritual function.

Archaeological rigour has also been relaxed in dating sites to the Iron Age. Wells and shafts have been accepted as of Iron Age date both when they are undatable, but also when there is actually evidence to the contrary (5.3 and App.5.1). It is debatable whether, in the absence of text-led expectations, any site in Wait’s (1985) catalogue would have been classified as an Iron Age cult focus.

Another obvious effect of text-led expectation is the consistent unwillingness to accept the possibility, indeed the likelihood, that post-Conquest wells and shafts are inspired by Graeco-Roman practices. Ross and Feachem’s analysis of the Newstead shafts is a case in point. Ross and Feachem (1976), accepting the post-Conquest date for the Newstead shafts (66), argued that despite their occurrence on a Roman military installation, and despite the presence of Roman votives
in the fill of some shafts, these were nevertheless 'Celtic' foci, filled during the early C2nd abandonment of the site and after the final Roman withdrawal. What is astonishing is that, despite the location of the shafts, Ross and Peachem nowhere suggest that they could have been filled during the Roman occupation, or, as Manning (1972) suggested, by the retreating Roman army.

5.6.2. Romano-British cult.

The present writer does not wish to suggest that in Iron Age Britain, ritual shafts (on wells, see below) did not exist at all. They clearly did elsewhere in Europe (5.4.4), and whilst the British evidence is extremely poor, we cannot dismiss the possibility for Britain. What must be questioned, however, is the validity of the processes by which wells and shafts have become entrenched in the Iron Age ritual corpus. Evidently, this has not been achieved on the basis of the meagre archaeological database noted above. Rather, text-led expectations have resulted, in the ways discussed above, in a lowering of expectations of the archaeological database, to an unacceptable level. Equally, text has allowed us to overlook the consequences of the fact that shafts were of cult importance throughout antiquity, in particular to the conquering culture which occupied Britain from 43 AD, and cannot be isolated as a 'Celtic' phenomenon.

Whilst Graeco-Roman use of shafts for ritual purposes, and the fact that wells and shafts appear as cult foci in the immediate post-Conquest period, have long been recognised, this has consistently been seen as a Celtic 'survival' rather than as the result of the adoption of new practices in Britain. Undoubtedly, this adoption generated new, idiosyncratic rites which should be considered as Romano-British rather than Roman or Celtic. The use of wells (in addition to the more common Graeco-Roman shafts) as cult foci in Roman period Britain
may be explicable in these terms. Whilst, as noted above it is in practice impossible to isolate the 'Celtic' phenomena on which the retrospective identification of Iron Age practices is dependent, it is clearly possible that the areas of 'shared ground' noted above (5.4.1) may both have facilitated the adoption of deep subterranean cult foci in post-Conquest Britain, and generated new, idiosyncratically Roman-British, processes involving these foci. The most unfortunate result of the persistence of the text-led thesis that wells and shafts are essentially 'Celtic' is that we have ignored the potential of wells and shafts in precisely this context.

This, the present writer would maintain, is how wells and shafts should be considered in future work; as a flowering of Romano-British cult. The nature of its development, and its implications, merit a consideration which is prevented by our text-led blindness to the fact that wells and shafts are not part of an Iron Age 'Celtic' tradition, but a Romano-British rite which has the potential to tell much about how such rites originated and developed.
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6.1. Introduction.

In 1978 Büchsenschütz offered the following definition of ‘enceintes quadrangulaires’, a term employed in France to denote what is argued to be a specific class of monument.

"Il s’agit d’enceintes en terre, quadrilatérales, entourées d’un talus et/ou d’un fossé qui délimite une surface voisine d’un hectare: elles se dressent indifféremment sur un terrain plat ou légèrement incliné." (1978:287)

Many workers (particularly Büchsenschütz himself 1978, 1984, 1989) have related a subgroup of ‘enceintes quadrangulaires’ in age and function to the group of Bavarian Viereckschanzen analysed and excavated by Schwarz (1959, 1962, 1975). This chapter documents the impact of the analogy on the dating and interpretation of the French sites, and questions the validity of these interpretations.

In France rectilinear enclosures are increasingly being discovered (for a recent summary: Büchsenschütz ed.1989). It is widely regarded as possible to isolate Viereckschanzen analogues among these, principally via morphological and topographical criteria (Schwarz 1962, Büchsenschütz and Olivier 1989:167-174: see 6.3.1; 6.4.1). Interpretations offered for the German series are held to apply to the French analogues, and as Brunaux (1989:7) has recently stressed, Viereckschanze is a loaded term:

"Parler d’une Viereckschanze ce n’est pas désigner simplement une enceinte de forme carré, c’est surtout sous-entendre une structure de function particulière et dont la datation bénéficie de ce même accord tacite". (1989:7).

The function implied is frequently ritual, the dating Late La Tène. An illustration of this approach is offered by Schwarz’ discussion ((1962:43) of La Londe (Vivier Gamelin, Eure), where a Gallo-Roman fanum and a
rectilinear enclosure are in close proximity:

"Bei dem Erdwerk handelt es sich um die klassische suddeutsche Form, so dass jetzt, nachdem die Zweckbestimmung dieser Denkmäler durch die Grabungen in Holzhausen im Bereiche des kultischen Brauchturns erweisen ist, an sich keine Bedenken bestehen, an diesem Platz eine luckenlose Tradition zu vermuten"

Much of the reasoning considered in this chapter is encapsulated in this example. The weaknesses may best be illustrated by noting that Büchsenschütz (1989:170-1) no longer lists La Londe amongst French Viereckschanzen.

This chapter opens with a consideration of LIA textual references to enclosures (6.2). The second part of the chapter comprises an historical review of the definition and classification of Viereckschanzen (6.3; 6.4), and an examination of criteria by which ritual function has been argued both across the series (6.3.1-2) and for individual enclosures (6.3.3; 6.5). The remainder of the chapter tests the relationship between French enclosures and Viereckschanzen by statistical comparison of a group of suggested French analogues (in the civitas Lemovices) and the Bavarian type series established by Schwarz (1959) (6.6).

6.2. Text and enclosure.

Classical references to enclosed or possibly enclosed cult foci are often recalled by workers analysing possible Viereckschanzen (especially Schwarz 1962, 1975), but whilst the LIA record points to a variety of cult loci (3.10), the data are of less value in the present context than the frequent recourse to them would imply.

6.2.1. Luvernius' enclosure.

One LIA reference to the Provincia has been argued to describe a Viereckschanze. Posidonius (Athenaeus 4.152 D-F) says that Louernius made a square enclosure
one and a half miles on a side. (he fenced off an area 12 stades square: ἕνεκα τετράγωνος ἑνάδυμον). This was filled with liquor and food, so that for many days all who wished could enter there and enjoy a feast (App. 2.3.5). The text has been argued by Berger (1963) to describe a Vierecksschanze. On the basis of this passage, with its at best quasi-cult context, Berger (1963) goes on to suggest that Vierecksschanzen were sanctified loci for secular group activities; a point often ignored by those arguing that Vierecksschanzen were loci for religious rites. This is clearly a possibility for some sites - if archaeologically difficult to define (6.5.3) - but this text cannot be said to support it. Even allowing for exaggeration, the enclosure described here is far larger than anything in the Vierecksschanzen series, and the simple fact of enclosure is insufficient to establish the association suggested by Berger. Equally, the textual data are problematic; the account is not based on direct observation, but draws on quasi-legendary material of pre-core period date (App.2.3.5).

6.2.2. Temenos: an enclosure interpretatio?

Text is principally employed to support the Vierecksschanzen 'cult' thesis via the term temenos. This is a common Greek word for a sacred enclosure (often used of the consecrated and enclosed area of land surrounding the god's altar in a temple complex, it can also denote enclosures without related structures) and occurs occasionally in Classical commentaries on Gaul (Diodorus (5.27,4) temenea, hiera kai temenea; Strabo (12.5,2) temenos (Galatia); hieron may also denoting temple complexes, and hence imply the presence of a temenos). The term is also employed by archaeologists with reference to Vierecksschanzen (see for example, Schwarz 1975, where Schwarz has abandoned the term Vierecksschanze for the even more meaning-laden temenos). But the supposition of a direct link between text and archaeology
which this usage implies is undermined by the quality of the text. Temenos, like almost all Classical descriptors of Gallic cult foci, is an interpretatio term largely void of descriptive detail except for that conveyed, ambiguously, by the interpretatio itself. In most cases it is impossible to tell whether the terminology was employed meaningfully: hiera kai temenea (like the Latin equivalent fanum templa:que) was a 'stock' phrase, frequently used to denote cult foci of non-Classical form, and the interpretational problems raised are similar to those which attend, for example, Caesar’s employment of vicus et aedificium (Büchsenschütz and Ralston 1986). The use of temenos with reference to Viereckschanzen invites identity with the textual loci, and imposes functional interpretation.

6.2.3. Other textual references to enclosures.

Whilst passages employing the temenos interpretatio are problematic, there is some clearer evidence for cult loci delimited by enclosure. Posidonius (Strabo 4.1,13) refers to ἕκκα in Tolosa: this can mean a sacred enclosure, or a shrine: according to Ammonius ἕκκεδ specifies a locus sacred to a hero: an interesting choice of descriptor for the Provincia (App.2.3.1). Posidonius account of Luvernius' quasi-cult enclosure, noted above, is also relevant here. Further references which could imply enclosure, though this is again uncertain, are: Caesar (6.13) on the druidic locus consecratus and Caesar (6.17,3-4) and (Livy 5.39,1) on weapons stockpiles (Livy’s text is historical). On archaeological approaches to these see 3.10.2.

The textual record thus points to enclosures in cult contexts, but information on the formal characteristics and functions of these is very limited. It is only by misapplication of the literary data that text can be used to support the thesis that Viereckschanzen are cult loci.
6.3. Morphological analyses of Viereckschanzen.

The identification of apparent similarities in the form of southern Germanic enclosures developed early into a notion of a single monument group with uniform construction, and 'across the board' interpretations of site function and date. As Mansfeld (1989:28) notes, Bersu (see Oberesslingen 6.5.2) cited uniformity of construction (monumental, non-causewayed entry, and one or two levels below the bank) in interpreting sites as defensive loci: for Bersu, a constructional 'model' had been imposed which he could only equate with defensive requirements. A little later the same perception of uniformity informed Drexel's thesis (1931) that the sites were cult loci: for Drexel, the only social mechanism capable of establishing norms, and imposing unity, across political boundaries was religion. Hence Viereckschanzen must have functioned as sanctuaries (cf. Mansfeld 1989:28). The concept that morphological uniformity is itself a cult criterion is implicit in much work on Viereckschanzen: like the other views discussed here it is undermined when the question of uniformity is examined.

The main work in classifying Viereckschanzen is that of Schwarz, whose Atlas der Spätkeltischen Viereckschanzen Bayerns (1959), established a type series on which subsequent morphological analyses have been based. Even among workers critical of the application of the Viereckschanze classification to France, the Atlas corpus is generally accepted as an homogenous monument category (Brunaux 1989 is the principal exception (6.3.1; 6.7). This assumption is also questioned in the present chapter (6.6). For the present, it is necessary to consider how Schwarz compiled the Atlas corpus.

6.3.1. The Atlas and selectivity.

Neither in the Atlas (1959) or elsewhere does Schwarz specify the policy by which four-sided enclosures
were included in the Atlas or excluded from it. At the same time, Schwarz makes no claims to have surveyed all bank and ditch rectilinear enclosures in Bavaria and clearly has a selection policy.

Publication of the Atlas occurred shortly after Schwarz' earliest excavations at Holzhauzen (6.3.3). Brunaux (1989:13) sees Schwarz' Atlas as a selection for which Holzhausen was the model—and the corpus thus biased towards sites c. 1 hectare in area, and not orientated to the north.

Equally, in his subsequent work Schwarz (1962, 1975) gave great emphasis to two morphological criteria which in his view suggest the ritual function of Viereckschanzen.

6.3.1.1. Rectangles and religion.

Rectilinear form (i.e. four sided, with opposite sides of equal length) is one of the two morphological characteristics isolated by Schwarz as pointing to ritual function. Schwarz (1962, 1975) emphasised the numerous ways in which rectilinear enclosures feature in religious (mainly funerary) settings in the IA. Square-ditched funerary enclosures are well known in eastern France, especially in the Marne and Ardennes (see Brisson, Hatt, Roualet 1970). Schwarz (1962:55) notes La Tène I examples at Ecury-le-Repos, Pierre-Morains, and Vert-la-Gravelle. Later sites are, for example, Ville-sur-Retoue, Ardennes, where funerary enclosures delimited Tène III cremations (Gallia 1973:402, Flouest and Stead 1977) and Mesnil-Annelles (Ardennes), also La Tène III in age (Gallia 1973:400). These small enclosures are principally found in Champagne, and it is interesting to note that Chossenot (1989:107-155), reviewing the IA enclosures of Champagne concludes that 'Viereckschanzen sensu stricto' did not occur here. Rather, the large BA Final-Hallstatt Final rectilinear 'sanctuaries' at cemetery sites like Aulnay-aux-Planches ((Brisson and
Hatt 1953) were superceded by the small square enclosures noted above. The early Champagne rectilinear 'sanctuaries', and examples elsewhere, such as Libenice, (Czechoslovakia) are often noted as cult comparables by Viereckschanze workers, despite their early date and frequent mortuary contexts.

Some 'Belgic' sanctuary sites have rectilinear enclosing works and/or structures (e.g. Vendeuil-Caply, Oise, Piton and Dilly 1985:45), and both Schwarz (1975) and Brunaux (1987:24ff) point to British rectilinear enclosures in cult contexts, such as at Hayling Island, (a square palisaded enclosure surrounding a circular shrine) and Gosbecks (a square multi-ditched LIA enclosure, overlain by a circular temple of the Clst AD, set in a temenos: Collis (1989:15-18) argues for Gosbecks as a British Viereckschanze).

Whilst rectilinear forms clearly had cult associations, it is too simplistic to see the mere fact of rectilinear form as a cult criterion: the majority of LIA dwellings (and granaries) outside Britain are rectilinear in form, and whilst rectangularity may have been a symbolic referent, occurring in many contexts, it is clearly not a cult-specific morphological trait.

Schwarz' arguments in this context were allied with a retrospective appeal to the rectilinear form of Romano-Celtic fana, suggesting that Viereckschanzen were forerunners of these. The distinctive design of the typical Romano-Celtic temple, (rectangular, with greatest dimensions from front to back, and with an internal cella and concentric ambulatory), is frequently argued as 'Celtic in inspiration' (Wilson 1975:3-5). The naivety of the approach, criticised by Henig (1984:38, 157-9), need not be discussed in detail here. See 7.3 on retrospective processes.

6.3.1.2. Orientations.

Schwarz' second argument concerns entrance
orientation. The majority of Atlas sites and suggested Viereckschanzen analogues have east-facing entrances. This is also true of later sites with an obvious ritual function, such as some of the 'Belgic' enclosures of northern France (Brunaux 1988:11ff), and Romano-Celtic fana (the latter, again, allowing Schwarz to argue cult function retrospectively). Schwarz, by inferring a solar aspect, argued that this feature shows Viereckschanzen to have been cult foci. Again, the principal weakness of the argument is that this feature was not limited to cult loci. As Wait (1985:177) noted for Britain, many domestic sites have east-facing entrances. The frequent occurrence of this trait simply indicates that this orientation was a symbolic referent informing spatial delimitation in many contexts: enclosures exhibiting this feature need not have been cult loci.

Schwarz almost certainly biased the Atlas towards east-facing sites. Certainly, incomplete Atlas sites with no entrance on three surviving sides, are assumed by Schwarz to have had no entrance if this would entail setting an entrance on a missing north side.

Biasing factors of this type may be expected to have falsely enabled an homogenised Atlas corpus. Nevertheless, as the following section suggests (6.4), and as statistical analysis demonstrates (6.6), the Atlas corpus exhibits considerable variety. The significance of this point is considered at 6.6.

6.3.2. Subsequent approaches to Schwarz' corpus.

Schwarz' definition of a Viereckschanze was offered implicitly in his Atlas plans (6.3.1). In the absence of a specific statement, subsequent workers attempted to define Viereckschanzen by culling characteristics from the Atlas corpus.

Büchsenschütz (1978) noted that the following characteristics could be culled from the Atlas:
1. Regularity of form.
2. Topography militates against defensive function.
3. Entrance orientation is solstice related.

Büchsenschütz (1989: 6) defined 'regularity' as comprising sides of equal length (6.4.1), yet of the German sites suitable for statistical analysis, only two (26 and 59) are perfect squares. 38 sites have an axial ratio A:B > 0.9, and there is a tendency towards four sides of equal length (Fig. 6.1); but the majority of the Atlas sites do not achieve this.

As noted above (6.3.1.2) there is a tendency for entrances to face east in both French and German sites (see Schwarz 1975:344, Abb.19). The total of 69 Atlas sites with east facing entrances would probably have been greater if more sites were complete: 57 of the sites with four intact sides have entrances in the eastern half of the compass. But Schwarz had a special interest in this feature: shared entrance orientation was one of the mainstays of his argument that Viereckschanzen were forerunners of post-conquest fana (6.3.1.2) and the Atlas almost certainly favours sites which conform to this. Given this, the point that numerous Atlas sites fail to conform to a morphological bias is more significant than the fact that others do (6.6).

Indifference to defensive potential (i.e. few sites are situated in summit or spur locations) is a common but not universal feature of the Atlas sites. Schwarz (1959) gives 23 sites located on summits, but omits the large number of off-summit locations which in many cases have defensive potential. In France, sites with Viereckschanzen characteristics, but with 'defensive' features, tend to be excluded from Viereckschanze lists: Büchsenschütz discounts a c. 1 hectare enclosure at Luant (Indre) with a zangentor entrance (Ralston 1983).

Finally, the emphasis Büchsenschütz generally places on size (see quotation at 6.1, and 6.4.1 No.1) has no basis in Schwarz: as the Atlas plans show, Schwarz
Fig. 6.1. Schwarz' (1959) *Atlas* Bavarian **Viereckschanzen** series: axial ratios of enclosures incorporated in statistical analysis.
included sites varying in area from 2240 to 24000 m² (Fig.6.2). As noted (6.3.1.1), Schwarz was elsewhere at pains to stress that Viereckschanzen could fluctuate widely in size, since this allowed him to compare the sites with a wide range of rectilinear cult foci of various sizes.

Ralston (1983) suggested two further salient points can be culled from Schwarz in addition to those noted by Büchsenschütz (1978); a) proximity of Romano-Celtic religious monuments, and b) of fortified sites.

None of the Atlas sites, following Schwarz location maps, which show surrounding areas for over 10 km radius and which map Gallo-Roman features, have fana in close proximity. Indeed, Schwarz noted (1962:35) that Viereckschanzen and temples had an almost mutually exclusive distribution. Close proximity of Viereckschanzen to Gallo-Roman cult loci is infrequent, and superposition is extremely rare. Later fana occur only inside enclosures at Briou (6.5.2), Oisseau-le-Petit (listed in Büchsenschütz 1984, but not subsequently), and the disputed Gournay-sur-Aronde (Oise), (6.4). Fana occur in proximity to La Londe (6.4), and to Offremont (Belfort) and Plaudren (Morbihan), the latter listed in Büchsenschütz 1978 and 1984 but not subsequently.

Assessment of proximity to defended sites is hampered by a lack of civitas-based analyses, and for the civitas Lemovices is complicated by both the general issue of 'oppidum' identification (Ralston 1988:791), and by the single oppidum (Villejoubert)-dominated site pattern. However, in only five cases are enclosures in the same commune as defended sites (Fig.6.7).

Elsewhere in France, enclosures occur inside oppida at Mont Beuvray (Morvan) and Gournay (6.4). Some German sites are located inside oppida; for example, the Donnersberg (Bittel 1930, Drda et al 1971) and outside Germany, at Zavist (Czechoslovakia; though the enclosure
Fig. 6.2. Schwarz' (1959) *Atlas* Bavarian Viereckschanzen series: area (sq. m) of enclosures incorporated in statistical analysis.
here may pre-date the oppidum). Others are in close proximity to oppida (Manching, Kelheim, and Finsterlohr; Drda et al 1971).

6.3.3. Schwarz at Holzhausen: function and morphological prediction.

From 1957-63 Schwarz dug one of two enclosures at Holzhausen (Lkr. Wolfratshausen) to test the hypothesis that Viereckschanzen were cult loci (Schwarz 1959, 1962 (interims), 1975; Atlas no.41). Largely on the basis of this excavation, Schwarz argued that all Viereckschanzen are cult foci. His argument that Holzhausen can be used as a functional model for other enclosures is grounded, again, in the concept of morphological uniformity. In this way, Holzhausen has been the greatest single factor in promoting the ritual hypothesis.

The excavated enclosure measures 92 m x 59 m with banks 9-10m wide and 2m high, and in some phases an external ditch. Schwarz identified five 'temenos' phases (Schwarz 1975:324-58). These are:

Temenos 1: marked by a palisade on the west side, an upright in the north west corner and two areas of burning. One of three shafts (the north-east) originated here, or in phase 2.

Temenos 2: marked by a palisade on the south-west and north-west, and a probable entrance (defined by two posts) on the south-east. The second (south-west) shaft certainly belonged to this phase, as perhaps did the north-east shaft. Burning occurred in situ in both shafts and also in the south and west corners, and along the south-west side.

Temenos 3: now marked on four sides: a palisade on the north and west sides and fencing on the east and south. Some fencing also occurred in the interior, delimiting two narrow enclosed spaces on the west and north sides. The entrance on the south east was in this phase unequivocal. In the western corner, on the site of an earlier burning
place, a structure was erected (temple 1). In this phase the south-west shaft continued in use, but that on the north east did not.

Temenos 4: an earth bank and ditch were constructed with an internal palisade. Initially, the internal fencing from phase 3 was retained and incorporated into the internal palisade, and new fencing added on the south and east sides. A third, northern, shaft was cut and the south-west shaft continued in use. The internal structure was rebuilt (temple 2). Later, a new palisade was erected, covering part of the south west shaft.

Temenos 5: the palisade was removed, and the ditch deliberately infilled. The entrance gap in the bank was widened, and the entrance itself extended. The northern shaft was closed.

Datable material from the site is meagre, and the LIA date which Schwarz suggested for Holzhausen, is, as Brunaux (1989:13) has recently stressed, insecure. Schwarz (1958:208) dated the enclosure on late la Tène pottery from the palisade trench on the south-west side, but as Brunaux notes, on examining Schwarz’ two major statements (1962 and 1975), almost the only datable find pointing to the Celtic era is a fleshhook (see below).

Even accepting an LIA date, Schwarz interpretation of the site as a cult locus is questionable. Schwarz arguments for cult function are:

1.-no internal occupation level, but repeated, aligned reconstruction of the enclosure. Neither feature is a priori evidence for cult activity.

2.-an internal structure, argued to be a ‘temple’. This structure is simply delimited by two rows of posts surrounded on either side by smaller posts, and offers no artifactual evidence of cult activity. At other sites, rectilinear structures which occur in enclosures (e.g. Oberesslingen (Bersu 1926) and Enhigen (Planck 1985: see 6.5.2) are not interpreted by the excavators as cult related.
3. the fill of the three shafts.
The shafts form the crux of Schwarz’ argument for cult activity.
1. North-east shaft: 35.5m deep (upper diam 3.6m); predates the bank. The shaft had an inner wooden casing, and underwent in-situ burning in Phase 2.
2. South-west shaft: 18.5m deep; open during Phases 2 and 3, filled in Phase 4. 1.5m above the base was a 75 cm thick layer of charcoal, containing traces of fat and bone. Wood (probably oak) and animal fat had burnt together at a very high temperature to form this layer. After standing open for some time, the shaft was filled in four successive periods. Schwarz argued that the infill was deliberate, each deposit being topped with a layer of loam. When the Phase 4 palisade was constructed over the shaft, two burning episodes occurred at the top of the shaft, against the new palisade, and a fleshhook was placed vertically in the fill. Schwarz argued this implied formal closure of the shaft.
3. Northern shaft: 7m deep; belongs to Phases 4-5. A wooden stake was placed vertically in the base of the shaft (as at Tomerdingen: see 7.5.1). It was surrounded by three successive layers containing organic materials, possibly from the breakdown of flesh. Again, each of the deposits was topped by a layer of loam, and was argued by Schwarz to have been deliberate.

Schwarz argued the shafts were for the disposal of sacrificial remains. Although preservation conditions were good (wood is preserved in two shafts), the fill of all three was largely sterile. Schwarz’ ritual criteria for the shafts are:

a) the presence of organic material, from the breakdown of blood. This is not an a priori ritual criterion: rubbish pits containing butchered meat remains would produce similar evidence. Brunaux (1989:13) remarks that if the shafts had been used to deposit the remains of animal sacrifice, one would have expected them to produce
more bone; as it is, the quantities are negligible. This could however reflect the soil chemistry of the shaft fills.

b)-fires within the shafts: *in-situ* burning in one or more phases is a feature of each shaft (burning also occurs in other places in the enclosure, throughout its use). These burning areas were almost sterile, and Schwarz' suggestion that they related to the disposal of sacrificial debris remains hypothetical; certainly *in-situ* incineration in a shaft is difficult to explain, but it is worth noting that, firstly, with the exception of the south-west shaft, burning episodes occur only at the top of the shaft fills, and secondly, that this is a far from common feature of other ritual and putatively ritual shafts: among the many British and European examples noted in Chapter 5, the only example of *in-situ* burning which can be cited occurs at Warbank Keston (App.5.1.17a) and this post-dates the LIA.

c)-deliberate placement of artefacts: principally, the stake in the northern shaft, and the fleshhook in the south-west. As argued elsewhere (5.2.3), deliberate placement of artefacts is a useful criterion for cult activity. The wooden stake in the smallest of the Holzhausen shafts clearly fits this category, being vertically positioned within stone packing. The stake lies at a vertical angle of 62 degrees. Schwarz calculated that this is 3 degrees off the position of the sun at noon on the summer solstice (see Schwarz 1975:340 Abb 14), and argued for a solar element to the ritual: while this putative solar alignment of the stake is tortuously argued, the fact of its deliberate placement remains. The fleshhook in the south-west shaft was also placed vertically.

d)-layered fill: As suggested by Wait (1985:52) (see 5.2.3) deliberate layering is is the single most convincing criterion by which to categorise shaft contents as of ritual origin. The Holzhausen shaft
fills, characterised by alternating sterile and organic layers, are thus possible candidates. The fills are, nevertheless, largely sterile and lacking artefactual associations. In most cases of deliberate layering, sterile layers alternate with others containing distinctive artefacts, the latter often fulfilling other relevant criteria such as patterning (see later 5.2.3 and Apps.5.1-2).

Equally, the loam layering in the Holzhausen shaft fills need not imply deliberate infilling, but could result from natural soil development within the shafts. This would have huge implications for the duration of these features. In this context, Schwarz has no chronological control for the material from the bases of the shafts (specifically, there is no C14 date on the stake from the northern shaft) and it is possible that the earliest use of these could considerably pre-date the LIA.

Finally, there is no direct evidence that any deliberate actions informing the shaft fills were cult-inspired. Mansfeld (1989:32), for example, dismissed Schwarz’ arguments that the fill of the two deepest Holzhausen shafts points to ritual process. He suggested that the south-west and north-east shafts were in fact wells, and their fill a secondary, profane, process. The same argument is advanced by both Mansfeld (1989:31) and Plank (1985) for Fellbach Schmiden (6.5.1). The wooden lining in the Holzhausen south-west shaft, as at Fellbach, may point to water storage.

Finally, dating evidence for the most likely ritual locus, the northern shaft, is meagre. Whilst wooden stakes appear in LIA and earlier contexts (most specifically the Tomerdingen shaft: 6.5.1), they also occur in pre- and post-LIA contexts: the La Bernard shaft (Vendée), containing a cypress stem, is, for example, Gallo-Roman (Baudry and Ballereau 1873). Given that neither a commencement or closure date for Holzhausen
have been established, the age of some comparable examples for the northern shaft should be borne in mind.

Brunaux (1989:13) notes how seductive the thesis of Holzhausen as cult site appears; the enclosure is a temenos, the structure a temple, the hearths are altars, and the shafts are centres for the deposition of sacrificial remains. But for Brunaux, evidence for the thesis is singularly lacking. In particular, he questions the cult interpretation afforded to more-or-less sterile shafts, and argues forcibly that this site is neither certainly of IA date, nor of ritual function.

Whilst Brunaux perhaps dismisses the cult hypothesis at Holzhausen too easily, the fact that Holzhausen, both in terms of form (6.3.1) and in interpretation of function, has served as the model for the Viereckschanzen category, the doubts he raises are highly significant.

6.4. Earliest comparisons of French and German sites.

The view that certain French enclosures could be considered analogous to Viereckschanzen, and hence to Holzhausen, gained early currency. As early as 1899 Schumacher, who had excavated at Gerichtstetten (6.5.2), noted similarities between that site and Amplepuis (Rhône) (6.5.2). Among the first French workers to compare French and German enclosures was Deglatigny (1925). But the thesis that French enceintes and German Viereckschanzen are exactly similar was argued most influentially - though not most explicitly - by Schwarz (1962).

Schwarz (1962:38) stated that sites in the Forêt de Blois corresponded "perfectly" to those in Bavaria, and listed French sites, mainly in Eure, which in his opinion were certain Viereckschanzen (1962:74-5). By 1975 (326:Abb 2) he had added further sites in central France. But Schwarz nowhere gave explicit details on this correspondence, simply noting (1962:38) that some sites occur in pairs, as at Holzhausen. At variance to his
thesis, he remarked that some French sites have particular features (a fifth "corner" and later constructional details) which distinguish them from Bavarian examples.

Most recently, Büchsenschütz (1989:7-8) argued that in France there are Viereckschanzen which relate point by point to criteria defined half a century ago in Germany (by whom is unstated), and lists principal characteristics of the group (6.4.1).

The problems of defining French 'Viereckschanzen', even for those like Büchsenschütz whose work is founded on the belief that this is possible, are illustrated by considering Schwarz' Eure 'Viereckschanzen' in the context of the later French catalogues (Büchsenschütz 1978, 1984, Büchsenschütz and Olivier 1989).

Schwarz (1962:74-5) noted nineteen 'definite' Eure Viereckschanzen and four possibilities. Büchsenschütz' lists are initially similar (1978) (see Fig.6.3), although in this list he discounted two sites (Les Colets, Les Rosiers). However, by 1984, Büchsenschütz had removed three more (Origny-le-Butin, and two examples at La Londe: 6.1). Finally, Büchsenschütz and Olivier (1989) include only eight of Schwarz' sites, among which Origny-le-Butin is reinstated! Thus, Büchsenschütz now discounts eleven sites which, according to the originator of the German type series, are certain Viereckschanzen.

Debate as to the 'Viereckschanze' status of the enclosure at Gournay-Sur-Aronde (Oise) is similarly instructive. Büchsenschütz argued (1984:236) that this site removed lingering doubts as to the ritual function of Viereckschanzen. Gournay was certainly a cult locus, comprising a rectilinear enclosure which in its first (C4th BC) phase measured 45 x 38m, and was defined by a ditch and very low bank. In the C4th /Mid C3rd BC a palisade was added on the external edge of the ditch, and subsequently (late C3rd/early C2nd BC), a second ditch
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bois-Jerome</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosguerard</td>
<td>y*</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champigny</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conches</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conde-sur-Risle</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francheville</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosley</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ille-ville</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarville</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Londe 1</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Londe 2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Mesnil-Jourdain</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Colets</td>
<td>y*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Rosieres</td>
<td>y*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'habit</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louviers</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montaure</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origny-le-Butin</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasnes</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Andre-de-l'Eure</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Cyr-du-Vaudreuil</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Martin-du-Parc</td>
<td>y*</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serquigny</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* sites noted as uncertain by Schwarz (1962).

Fig. 6.3. The occurrence of Eure enclosures in *Vierckschanzen/ enceintes quadrangulaires* catalogues.
was added outside the first. From its construction in the 4th BC until c. 30 BC, the primary ditch was used to deposit over 2000 broken weapons and 3000 animal bones ((Brunaux et al 1980, 1985, 1988).

The cult nature of this enclosure cannot be doubted, but even accepting the wide morphological variations within the Viereckschanze series (6.3), Gournay is considerably smaller than most of the Atlas corpus, and there is considerable dispute as to whether the enclosure is a Viereckschanze. Büchsenschütz, despite the preliminary comment noted above, now discounts the enclosure as a Viereckschanze (1989:8). Brunaux (1987:11 1989:12) refuses to classify the site as a Viereckschanze. The issue underlines the methodological confusions which characterise Viereckschanzen studies.

Büchsenschütz' own inclusion/exclusion policy for individual sites is not discussed, but it is probably related to increasing refinement of the criteria (Büchsenschütz 1989) now to be considered.

6.4.1. Büchsenschütz and Viereckschanzen definition.

Büchsenschütz (1989:7-8) lists eleven Viereckschanze characteristics:
1. Surface area c. 1 hectare.
2. Form: - quadrilateral, with sides of equal length,
   - angles slightly rounded, and regular,
   - bank slightly higher at corners, and overall very slight, no higher than 2m.
3. Ditch neither deep nor wide (no dimensions offered),
   often subsequently degraded. Not causewayed at the entrance to the enclosure.
4. Entrance a simple gap in the bank. Never opens to the north, and most frequently oriented east or west.
5. Flat internal surface, in some cases elevated relative to the exterior ground surface.
6. Indifferently located in flat or slightly sloping
terrain. Enclosing works do not follow contour lines.
7. Frequently on poor soil, unsuitable for agriculture.
8. Distribution pattern very irregular.
9. Excavation of interior reveals sparse occupation traces. Pits of the type found on habitation sites are absent, food preparation traces rare, occupation levels almost non existent. Finds, where available, date to La Tène finale, and generally occur in the ditch, or outside the enclosure, around the entrance.
10. Internal constructions of three types: palisades predating the bank/ditch construction, pits of varying depths, and single rectilinear buildings.
11. Frequently associated with other structures: oppida and other fortifications, and tumuli.

This, the most detailed of the many definitions, is almost wholly dependent on morphological and topographical criteria: only two of the criteria (9 and 10) need be determined by excavation. Almost all the criteria are extremely loosely drawn. Büchsenschütz (1989:6) does not, for example, specify what variation would be acceptable from an area "of the order of " 1 ha (No 1., above). Elevated interior surface (No 2., above) can hardly be a Viereckschanzen criterion if this occurs in only some cases, and the effect of artificial raising of enclosure interiors on Büchsenschütz’ bank height criterion (No. 2) is not considered. Although noting the possibility of ditch silting, Büchsenschütz specifies a particular ditch profile (No. 3), and does not mention the possibility of deliberate ditch infilling (as was noted at Holzhauzen; 6.3.3).

For Büchsenschütz these features are the ‘model’ for a Viereckschanze: a composite drawn up over several years by comparing numerous sites. Büchsenschütz offers, in effect, a prototype, which for most sites is unattainable. That Büchsenshütz actually predicts variation from this model is important for the present study. The implication that sites will fail to satisfy
some of his criteria raises the question, as Büchsenschütz admits, of which sites to include or exclude. Büchsenschütz' response is that this can only be decided by excavation, but this refutes the basis on which the model rests; the designation of Viereckschanze on morphological grounds. Büchsenschütz fails to address this paradox.

One way to test these criteria, which, despite Büchsenschütz' acceptance of variability, are predicated on a concept of morphological homogeneity, is to quantify the morphological variations within the loci thus designated (6.6).

In this context, however, some hypotheses predict spatial patterns which analysis performed on criteria specific to the enclosures themselves would be unable to identify. Drda et al (1971), for example, argued that the scale of the enclosing works at Viereckschanzen decreases in proportion to oppida proximity. The picture is complicated for the selected field area, the civitas Lemovices, by the lack of obvious oppida outside the Villejoubert (though St Gence could be classified as a 'major enclosure' (Ralston 1988:791), but assessed against the LIA defended sites noted in Ralston (1988:792), this hypothesis fails for Limousin (see Figs.6.4 and 6.7). It is, of course, possible that other, unrecognised, factors influenced site morphology in similar ways to that suggested here.

6.5. Excavated sites: ritual criteria.

6.5.1. Enclosures with shafts.

The argument for Holzhausen as a cult locus centres, as noted, on the shafts. Schwarz (1962:70) gives other examples of shafts in excavated enclosures. The 1958-9 excavation at Tomerdingen (Ldkr. Ulm), concurrent with the first excavation at Holzhausen ((Zürn 1971), examined
Enclosures with fortified sites in same commune:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Bank high</th>
<th>Bank high</th>
<th>Bank wide</th>
<th>Ditch deep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interior</td>
<td>exterior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feyt</td>
<td>Not loc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>St-Etienne-au-Clos</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jabrèilles</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>St-Denis-des-Murs</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Villejoubert</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clustered enclosures sorted on the above parameters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank high</th>
<th>Bank high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interior</td>
<td>exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosiers</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villejoubert</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdoueix</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Denis</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Etienne</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videix</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bussière</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnac</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabrèilles</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigueuil</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Ditch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wide</td>
<td>deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosiers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videix</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabrèilles</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigueuil</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Etienne</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnac</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villejoubert</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Denis</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bussière</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdoueix</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6.4. *Enceintes quadrangulaires* of the civitas Lemovices: proximity to fortified sites.
an enclosure c.70 x 70 sq. m defined by both bank (now 0.5m high) and ditch, with no trace of internal or external revetment. A 9m wide entrance lay on the south; a row of post holes inside this was tentatively seen as a gatehouse. The western half of the interior contained an irregular distribution of post holes and pits (0.5-2m diam.) containing sherds, animal bone and charcoal. Direct traces of burning occurred in only two areas. In the south west corner an irregular trough, with two pits in the base had possibly served as a cistern. The Tomerdingen 'shaft' (7m diam at the top and only 5.5m deep; thus not a shaft sensu stricto following the criteria set out in 5.1.4) lay below, and hence predated the western bank. The earth fill was largely sterile, but three la Tène bowls, one broken, lay 2.4m below the modern surface and had apparently been deliberately positioned (Zürn 1971:226). At the base of the shaft was a stone setting for a wooden post. As at Holzhausen, deliberate placement is a criterion here (see the discussion at 6.3.3), and in this case the shaft fill is clearly dated to the LIA.

Schwarz (1962:70) also noted a partially excavated shaft at Schonfeld (Ldkr. Tauberbischofsheim), which, again, predated a later bank, and argued, on topographic evidence, for a possible further shaft at Kreutzpullach (Ldkr. München): this is speculative.

The recent excavation at Fellbach Schmiden, Rems-Murr-Kreis (1977-80) has also produced a shaft (Planck 1985): the initial report is interesting because the shaft is discounted as a cult feature. This enclosure (east-west axis length 104m), extensively disturbed by quarrying and possibly never completed, is represented only by a ditch (width c. 4.3m, depth c. 1.6m) with one surviving (north-east) corner. The ditches have a uniform three-phase fill, the two uppermost layers containing animal bone, ceramics and iron slag. The absence of bank, palisade traces or internal features is
possibly due to extensive plough disturbance.

The Fellbach shaft, 5m south of the surviving corner, has a well-preserved oak lining. The fill included ceramic fragments, two vessels at the base of the shaft, and three wooden deer figurines found near the base (see below). Wooden elements from the shaft lining were dendro-dated to 123 BC, and construction of the shaft is argued for that year. The site dating overall is uniformly La Tène.

The shaft is interpreted as a functional well (see also Mansfeld 1989:31-2). The fill is not layered, and none of the finds were certainly deliberately positioned, suggesting the shaft was not used for sequential deposition. Fragments of a wooden ladder inside the shaft, and the remains of a bucket, led the excavators to conclude that the shaft was an utilitarian well, ensuring the water supply for what is nevertheless argued to be a cult enclosure. This conclusion appears to be reached solely on the occurrence of the wooden figures. These are not suggested to be votive offerings - the interpretation of the shaft fill as a secondary, profane, process is apparently seen to preclude this (although the figures could originally have been votives). Instead, they are suggested to be fittings from an as yet unlocated shrine. Two of the figures (90 cm high) have a human hand carved on one side and may originally have been joined by an anthropomorphic figure (for a possible reconstruction see Planck 1985:). The third figure, part of a prancing stag, appears to be part of a larger image. Webster (1986a:95 and Fig 12A), interpreting a scene on a Nene Valley sherd from Grandford as representing a wooden effigy of a boar being offered as a votive gift, suggests that the Fellbach figures could be seen in this context. The stag has frequently been suggested as a Celtic symbolic referent (see e.g. Green 1989:134-9): Fellbach is one of the few enclosures to produce artefacts for which this may be said (see 6.5.3).
Two suggested French Viereckschanzen may be noted here. Amplepuis (Rhône) excavated by de Varax (1891), with limited later re-examination (Perichon 1966) is a ditched enclosure 84 x 70m. Ditch material had been thrown up into the interior, but there was no clear evidence for a formal bank. Perichon tentatively suggested that charcoal in the ditch points to a palisade, destroyed by fire. Perichon’s excavation, confined to a small section of the west ditch left untouched by de Varax, showed that a clay layer at the ditch base was superseded by a 20cm thick deposit with a very high quantity of charcoal and many of ceramic fragments. Finds here, exclusively of ceramics, comprised portions of two amphorae (Dressel IA), Campanian wares and painted wares. The Campanian A (Lamboglia) was dated 110-79 at Grand Congloué. Perichon (1966) argued for a cult interpretation. The ditch dimensions do not point to defence (though the steep plateau locale could); the enclosed areas is too small for permanent habitation, and no structures were located. Perichon rejects (without explanation) the possibility of a cattle corral, and argues instead for a ritual function. In support of this he quotes de Varax’ description of a pit located on the interior (no dimensions noted). de Varax noted the bases and rims of a dozen vessels at the base of the pit, and higher up the remains of more, some containing a black deposit. For Perichon - citing Holzhausen - this proves the ritual nature of the site. This pit is distinguished by its relatively rich assemblage; its closest analogues would appear to be ceramic-filled ‘puits funéraires’ well documented in the Provincia (see 5.4.4) and largely dating to the Gallo-Roman era. While these are undoubtedly ritual deposits, this could suggest that the Amplepuis enclosure should be seen in the light of regional practices.

Finally, an equally poorly documented pit was excavated in the western corner of a large enclosure at
Chatellier aux Hages in 1909 (Couderc 1989:73), and in this case contained Gallo-Roman material.

The majority of excavations (though generally these are limited in scope) have not produced pits or shafts. It is thus unsurprising that whilst the presence of shafts is almost invariably seen as a cult criterion, the absence of shafts is not felt to preclude this interpretation (see e.g. Planck’s (1985:353) comment on Ehningen: on this site see below).

6.5.2. More excavated sites.

The earliest excavators did not argue for a cult role. Hardheim Gerichtstetten (Neckar-Odenwald-Kreis), excavated by Schumacher (Schumacher 1899) summarised by Deglatigny (1927:24), and plan V; Bittel (1981); Mansfeld (1989)), was originally interpreted as a farmstead. Located in forest, close to the Limes, the enclosure formed an irregular quadrilateral 103 x 131 x 123.5 x 111m, delimited by an earth bank (1.65m max. height) and a ditch (1.5m max. depth). No palisade was noted. Schumacher argued for three entrances, marked only by breaks in the inner face of the bank, on the north, south and west sides. It is not clear that all three represent entrances (Bittel 1981). Burnt remains in the western ditch, interpreted by Schumacher as the remains of a wooden bridge, may indicate an entrance here (though a similar feature at Amplepuis was interpreted as a palisade trace). Post-holes either side of the break on the south, seen by Schumacher as vestiges of two wooden buildings, may more feasibly point to a monumental entrance.

Two rectilinear structures were located near the north east corner of the interior: one of poorly-dressed limestone (c. 8 sq. m) the other of wood (7.5 x 4.2m), delimited by four post-holes. Inside and around the latter, a 10cm deep layer of debris contained fragments of pottery, bone, and also white clay with marks of
branches, suggesting clay walls. Four post-holes, and another layer of debris 10-25cm deep were found in the area of the southern 'entrance' (see above). The debris here underlay and thus predated the bank. Similar debris was also located inside the north-west corner and elsewhere.

The southern bank partly overlay a funnel-shaped depression, 60-80 cm deep on its west and 1.75m deep on the east side. Tree root disturbance limited excavation, but it was established that a 60 cm layer of carbon and ashes mixed with sherds and bones filled the base.

According to Schumacher, the earliest phase, represented by the southern 'entrance' arrangement and the pit fill, cannot predate the bank construction by much, because pottery found in the base of the ditch and in the wooden structure are similar. The stone structure was clearly contemporary with the bank. Finds date to La Tène C-D1 (though some pottery dates to La Tène B).

Schumacher interpreted the site as agricultural in function.

Bersu, who excavated numerous enclosures in Southern Germany, argued for a defensive function for these. His earliest work, at Einseidel and Tübingen (Bersu 1912), was largely confined to the excavation of the banks. The enclosures measured 98 x 92, and 128 x 134m respectively, and had rounded, emphasised corners. Successive contructional phases were noted in the Einseidel banks and a monumental entrance, defined by twelve post holes, was recovered here. The sites were dated on La Tène D2-early Roman period ceramics from the ditches.

Bersu also excavated three of a group of five enclosures at Riedlingen (Bersu and Paret 1922). These again produced La Tène D ceramics, principally painted wares and amphorae, concentrated in the ditches and around the entrances. The enclosures were located on soils unsuitable for sustained agricultural use, and produced small assemblages. These factors, Bersu argued,
pointed to non-continuous occupation. He suggested the sites were temporary refuges during Germanic incursions.

Oberesslingen, also excavated by Bersu (1926), was the first of his sites to produce internal structural evidence. In the south-west corner twelve stone slabs, forming a rectangle 8 x 10m were framed by post-holes, the whole forming a structure 17 x 8m. This building and, again, a monumental entrance, were the only constructional features recovered. Again, the enclosure was dated on La Tène D ceramics.

Bersu interpreted the structure here as a barn, but did not revise his assessment of putative Viereckschanzen as military refuges. He noted that the occupation horizon was of too short a duration and too ‘clean’ to suggest permanent occupation, and the soil too poor to support a farm. The scale of the enclosing works also influenced his opinion that the site was not principally agricultural in function.

Evidence for the function of the few excavated French enclosures is even less clear than in Germany.

At Briou, Forêt-de-Marchenois (Loir-et-Cher) a bank and ditch enclosure excavated by Piron (Picard 1969:339-442) delimits an area 155 x 125m. A structure dated to La Tène III was superseded by a Gallo-Roman fanum of C3rd AD (Büchsenschütz 1978:291). Büchsenschütz noted the temptation to assign function to the former retrospectively, despite the failure to demonstrate continuity of occupation. At Château-Gontier, Aze, (Mayenne) an enclosure (80 x 60m) with three concentric ditches and three entrances aligned on the perpendicular axis, was extensively excavated (Lambert and Rioufreyt 1977). No traces of a palisade or internal structures were noted. The meagre assemblage mainly comprises a few late La Tène ceramics, principally from the top of the ditch fill, suggesting the possibility of substantial decay of the banks by the end of La Tène finale.

At this site, cult function is proposed almost by
default. Lambert and Rioufreyt (1977) stress that: (1) the topography and the alignment of the entrances argue against a military function; (2) the area enclosed by the inner ditch is only 22.52 ares, and as the interior is 'clean', the enclosure is unlikely to have been permanently occupied; (3) the elaborate nature of the enclosing works argue against a cattle corral. Principally because function cannot be determined positively, a cult function is assigned negatively, the one factor cited to support it being that the enclosure is aligned (to within half a degree) on the summer solstice.

The only other site to have been fully excavated is a German example at Ehningen (Lkr.Boblingen), which produced several four-poster arrangements, but no shafts (Planck 1985:353).

The Czech site of Msecke Zehrovice (Venclova 1989) is an interesting case. This double enclosure 190 x 110m, divided by a transversal bank and ditch, saw limited sondages in the 1960’s. Venclova classified the site as a Viereckschanze and suggested that it may have been a sanctuary. In 1970, a La Tène settlement was located to the immediate east of the enclosure, the eastern side of which was subsequently excavated. In 1985, structures were revealed along and below the eastern bank, and a habitation horizon, producing ceramics, iron slag and 'sapropelite' (a type of shale), was defined. The finds lay on the western edge of the LIA settlement, which is stratigraphically earlier than the enclosure itself. Below the east bank were traces of a probable palisade, pointing to an earlier enclosure phase, as did a non-homogenous layer with sporadic La Tène material, located below the bank and on interior, and probably used to raise the interior of the site. A later feature was a vast burning area (3 sq. m) in the north-east corner of the site. Two structures were contemporary with this feature, and date to La Tène D or possibly to the C-D
transition.

Venclova (1989:41) does not consider the structures to be cult related, and the traces of specialised production here point to a non-cult role. Venclova is nevertheless unwilling to suggest that the enclosure had not, at some stage, served a cult function.

The well-known stone head, buried in a pit 888 x 900m outside the south-west corner of the enclosure, is often cited to suggest cult activity here (Collis 1984:147). The head, broken in antiquity, was apparently deliberately buried, with some pottery sherds (including Graphittonkeramik) bones of domestic animals, five broken or unfinished pieces of sapropelite rings, a whetstone and a piece of iron wire (Megaw and Megaw 1988:630 citing Jansova 1968). The associated finds date the deposit to the late C2nd BC, though recent reappraisal of the figure itself suggests a date no later than C3rd BC, and possibly earlier, on stylistic grounds (Megaw and Megaw 1988). This find, although outside the enclosure, has long influenced interpretations of the enclosure as a cult locus.

The recently excavated site of St Arnoult (Yvelines) has also been seen as artisanal in character (Baray 1989:81-95). Situated in the Bois-de-Reculet, Longvilliers, the enclosure (68 x 90m) is denoted by a bank and ditch, and has an internal dividing bank, again with a ditch, and a causewayed entrance. No palisade was traced. Areas of debris (36 sq. m) on the north side of the interior occurred in two distinct zones, separated by a hearth. Two vessels were found in situ at the base of the level, which probably had a paved floor. Two parallel rows of three post-holes were located in the same area, and interpreted as a dwelling g. 6.5 x 5.5 m. The site is dated on Dressel 1B amphorae necks, and fine black wares, to the late independence-early Augustan era. The enclosure was probably occupied in the final quarter of the C1st BC. The excavator is very critical of the
imposition of function on morphological grounds, and in arguing for secular activity points out that a site provided no evidence which could be said to point to cult use. The occupation traces were too sparse, and of too narrow a time span to suggest permanent occupation, and the recovery of iron slag is suggested to point to artisanal activity.

Finally, two of the sites in the civitas Lemovices, La Motte at Serandon (5) and Rosiers d'Egletons (2), have seen limited exploration, and a third, Montrollet (31), is presently being examined. Initial interpretations at this last site are not cult-related; the enclosure is tentatively suggested to be a temporary fortification (Gallia 1985:490-2). Construction of the bank is dated, mainly on ceramics, to Clst BC.

6.5.3. Excavation summary.

The above review indicates that ritual interpretations, which proliferated in the wake of the Holzhausen excavation, have been advanced less readily in very recent years. This section sums up the independent evidence for ritual activity at excavated sites.

The fallacies of assigning function on a priori morphological grounds are demonstrated by the excavated corpus. A wide variety of interpretations are offered for sites which, according to morphological predictions, are similar in function and date. Interpretations range from military refuges (Oberesslingen and Montrollet), through artisanal loci (Arnoult) to cult loci (Holzhausen and Fellbach Schmiden).

Secondly, there are no secure criteria for ritual activity, where this is suggested. The Holzhausen shafts, interpreted as cult features by Schwarz are argued as utilitarian by Mansfeld (1989:32). Equally, features argued at one site to suggest ritual activity are argued at others to imply the opposite. For example,
virtually sterile shafts at Holzhausen are the principal basis for the ritual interpretation (6.3.3), but at Fellbach, a shaft whose fill produced possibly symbolic items is discounted as a ritual feature. Similarly, while the presence of shafts is argued to suggest cult activity, their absence at the few fully excavated enclosures (Ehningen, Lkr. Boblingen, and Château-Gontier, Azé) is not argued to suggest non-ritual use of these (Planck 1985:353).

The lack of secure ritual criteria is related to another shared characteristic: the paucity of datable material. Sites are generally dated on meagre quantities of ceramics, which frequently make up the entire excavated assemblage. Wait (1985:156) noted that a criterion used implicitly to denote religious structures, is that these should not be directly associated with 'domestic' rubbish. In this context, the meagre assemblages at excavated sites are sometimes argued to point to the ritualised cleansing or formal closure of cult loci. This proposal is largely untestable, but whilst such sites have little domestic debris, it is at the same time true that Viereckschanzen very rarely have positive associations with artefacts which are clearly symbolic with supernatural referents; Wait's (1985:156) own suggested criterion for a 'shrine'. The Fellbach figurines (6.5.1) are one possible exception. Berger's (1963) hypothesis that Viereckschanzen were collective assembly points (6.2.1) has also been advanced as a possible explanation for sterile interiors (see for example, Brunaux 1987:36-7).

6.5.3.1. The question of date.

Of the 20 French sites which Büchsenschütz and Olivier (1989:173) list as having produced some datable material (mainly as chance finds) ten have produced La Tène material, two La Tène and Gallo-Roman and eight Gallo-Roman alone. Despite the unsystematic generation
of much of this material, this does beg the question whether 'enceintes quadrangulaires' should so frequently be assumed to be LIA in date. Date like function, has overwhelmingly been assigned on morphological grounds. Both interpretations, it has been suggested, are questionable.

6.6. Field survey and cluster analysis.

As the above has documented, Schwarz' Atlas type series is considered by many workers to represent an homogenous monument category, with which French loci can be morphologically equated. On this basis, date and function are predicted for the latter. Statistical analysis of morphological parameters was undertaken to obtain a measure of the similarity between French and Bavarian sites.

As Brunaux argues, there is much to suggest that the Atlas corpus is biased towards sites which fulfilled Schwarz main morphological interests, and which showed Holzhausen characteristics (Brunaux 1989:13-14). On this basis, we may have expected the Atlas Vierecksexanzen to be closely similar. The same may be said of French Vierecksexanzen analogues, classified with reference to the Atlas series. In fact, in spite of the data selection biases discussed which might be expected to falsely homogenise the database (6.3.1.1-2; 6.3.3), considerable morphological variation exists across the Atlas group and the proposed French analogues. Given this, the variability which remains after the biasing process is telling.

It must however be stressed that whilst Schwarz' Atlas series was perceived even prior to statistical analysis to mask more than one group of sites, and while statistical analysis would be measuring the homogeneity of the Atlas group, it was considered outside the scope of this chapter to examine the meaning of Bavarian groupings thrown up by statistical analysis. The
principal purpose of the analysis was a statistical comparison of the French and Bavarian sites, to determine
a) whether the French sites are different to all or any of the Bavarian sites.
b. Whether the French sites look like each other.
All this chapter offers on the Atlas groupings is an initial statement, as a basis for future work (see 6.7, and for initial comments on the Bavarian groups App. 6.2.5).

Examination of morphological variability, for France, is hampered by a lack of systematic fieldwork and site plans. Many enclosures have been published, but the plans are often rudimentary (see e.g. Andre 1959, Zuber 1978, July 1975-80). Deglatigny’s early fieldwork in Eure (see below) is a notable exception. Work has tended to concentrate on small groups of enclosures, rarely extending into a civitas-wide assessment, and recent attempts to establish a pan-French synthesis (Büchsenschütz 1978, 1984, Büchsenschütz and Olivier 1989) have been heavily dependent on local studies. Büchsenschütz and Ralsön (1975), Lambert and Rioufreyt (1977) and Ralston (1983) are the only considerations of French enclosures in a civitas settlement context.

The earliest French studies centred on Normandy, Brittany and the southern Paris basin. Deglatigny (1925) examined sites in the forests below Rouen and around Louviers (Eure) and André (1959) drew attention to enceintes in Morbihan (Brittany) but without detailed plans. Cotton and Frere (1961) give more detailed plans of a limited number of sites in Limousin, and Büchsenschütz and Ralston (1975) synthesised the available data for Berry, but again without detailed plans. Zuber (1978) produced rudimentary sketch plans of enclosures in the Forêt-de-Rambouillet (Paris basin). Leymarios (1973) noted a concentration in the Forêt-Marchenoir (Paris basin) again giving only rudimentary
sketch plans.

Examination of the pan-French series has mainly been by Büchsenschütz (1978:287-298; 1984:230-36; Büchsenschütz and Olivier 1989:167-174: see (6.4.1). The earliest list of French 'Viereckschanzen' was produced by Schwarz (1962:74-5), though this was heavily biased towards the Eure, emphasising the lack of plans outside the Eure of comparable quality to Schwarz' own for Bavaria (Schwarz 1959).

This situation persists. Even the Eure plans proved inadequate for the purposes of statistical comparison with Schwarz. Establishing a data base of reliable plans was both a desirable end in itself, and for statistical purposes, a necessity. A field survey was therefore undertaken.

6.6.1. Field Area: the civitas Lemovices.

The field area selected was the Limousin. The level of previous work in this area (e.g. Nash 1976b:162-80), and the extent of recent fieldwork in this area (Cotton and Frere 1961, July 1975-80, Büchsenschütz and Ralston 1981, and Ralston 1983) meant that selected sites were well documented, if not adequately surveyed. More importantly, much field work had focused on the distribution of sites within one civitas, that of the Lemovices. A civitas based analysis was required, in part in order to examine existing hypotheses concerning enclosure variability in relation to defended sites (Drda et al 1971) (6.4.1). Most studies had not considered enclosures in a landscape context (either topographical or in relation to other sites) and one meaningful way to examine this was within one civitas. Another factor influencing the choice of field area was that 20% of the French sites offering some dating evidence (Büchsenschütz and Olivier 1989:173) are located in the civitas Lemovices.

The extent of former fieldwork perhaps indicates that
this area is less likely than some to produce large numbers of as yet unknown enclosures, although it must be expected that subsequent fieldwork will produce new sites. The loss of hitherto undocumented sites must also be anticipated: agriculture and, more recently, afforestation programmes, will have dictated this (eight of the documented sites cannot now be located: App.6.1) and the present corpus of 32 sites must be regarded as incomplete.

The civitas (20, 000 sq. km in area) is broadly assimilable with present-day Limousin, comprising the départements of Corrèze, Creuse and Haute-Vienne, and also the eastern part of Charente-Maritime (Perrier 1964 see Fig.6.5); incorporating the last adds two sites (Montrollet and Brigueuil) to the corpus.

The territorial organisation suggested by the LIA record for Limousin (Ralston 1983, 1988) is radically different even to that of the neighbouring Biturigan civitas. In Berry, fortified sites (the majority ranging from 5-10 ha) occur frequently. In Limousin, by contrast, the LIA site record is dominated by the oppidum of Villejoubert (Haute-Vienne), at 330 ha the largest confirmed example in France (Desbordes 1985). Fortified sites elsewhere in the civitas are generally on a small scale (Ralston 1983, 1988:786-94, Nash 1978:262-80) and lack the settlement continuity into the Gallo-Roman era noticable, for example, in Berry. Results of the present analysis are thus strictly specific to one civitas.

The field project aimed to locate and survey, where possible, all rectilinear enclosures within the civitas Lemovices which have been advanced in the literature (pre 1989) as possible Viereckschanzen or Viereckschanzen analogues. The total number of sites considered is 32. The majority are incorporated in Ralston (1983) who noted 22 possible Viereckschanzen, discounting three further enclosures (see Fig.6.6). The two Charente-Maritime sites (31-2) are listed by Büchsenschütz and Olivier
Fig. 6.5. The civitas Lemovices: département boundaries of the Limousin and possible boundaries of the civitas Lemovices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BUCHS 1978</th>
<th>BUCHS 1984</th>
<th>RALSTON 1984</th>
<th>BUCHS 1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rosiers</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>St-Etienne</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>(y)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Serandon</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>(y)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>St-Priest</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Espartignac</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boussac-Bourg</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lafat</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lourdoueix</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>La Souterraine</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Arnac</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Châteauneuf</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>(y)</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jabrailles</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Javerdat</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rilhac</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>St-Denis</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>St-Leger</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Verneuil</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Videix</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Montrollet</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Brigueuil</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- not applicable
- d discounted as a Viereckschanze
- (y) term Viereckschanze not employed

Fig. 6.6. The occurrence of enclosures of the civitas Lemovices in Vierckschanzen/enceintes quadrangulaires catalogues.
(1989:170-1). Büchsenschütz (1984:233) included as Viereckschanzen only 14 sites in the civitas Lemovices (assuming 'St-Pierre-au-Clos' as a misprint for St-Etienne-au-Clos (3)). He did not include five unlocated examples which Ralsön (1983) noted as tentative possibilities: but neither did he incorporate seven sites identified by Ralsön; St-Priest-du-Gimel (4), Boussac-Bourg (8), Jabreilles-les-Bordes (21), Javerdat (22), Rilhac-Lastours (23), St-Denis-des-Murs (24) and Videix (29) (the last catalogued in Büchsenschütz (1978) but discounted in 1984). The most recent synthesis (Büchsenschütz and Olivier 1989:170-171) gives only 11 Limousin enclosures, discounting five from 1984 but now including St-Denis-des-Murs. Finally, sites proposed after Ralsön's work (1983) and apparently discounted or not considered by Büchsenschütz (1989) are: Bussière-St-Georges (9), Gajoubert (20) and Villejoubert (25).

These fluctuations in the Limousin 'Viereckschanzen' corpus (shown in Fig.6.6) testify eloquently to continuing uncertainties as to the criteria by which French sites should be defined. These doubts stem, in turn, from assumptions that the category is a single, readily identifiable entity. The proposal that these sites represent a number of types, readily explains the difficulties expressed in Fig.6.6 concerning their identity.

Attempts were made to locate all of the 32 sites noted in the civitas Lemovices, except for Espartinac (6) and St Gence (30) (see App.6.1). Nine of these sites could not be located. In total, 21 sites were surveyed (for descriptions and plans see App.6.1).

Suggested Viereckschanzen analogues in the civitas are not evenly distributed (Fig.6.7): this is also true of the Bavarian sites (see Fig.6.8). A high proportion of sites are located in Creuse, and in this département particularly, sites tend to occur towards the northern border of the civitas. This may reflect a fieldwork
Fig. 6.7. The *civitas* Lemovices: distribution of enceintes quadrangulaires.
Fig. 6.8. Schwarz' (1959) Atlas Bavarian Viereckschanzen series: distances between Viereckschanzen.
bias, but only in Haute-Vienne are sites distributed fairly evenly across the département, and here, as in Corrèze, border locales appear to be favoured. This phenomenon was also noted by Ralston 1983:508. Sites with border proximity did not form discrete groupings in cluster analysis. No correlations were observed between geographical location and the groups defined by cluster analysis for either the Bavarian or French data sets.

Although five Limousin enclosures occur in communes with defended sites, there is no apparent correlation between the distribution of 'enceintes quadrangulaires' and known LIA defended and settlement sites in the civitas. The 'parish church' view of rectilinear enclosures (Collis 1984:147) does not work well here.

6.6.2. Cluster analysis: rationale.
6.6.2.1. Methodology.

Fifteen measures of site variability deemed significant were employed as variables. These measures were obtained on all those sites from Schwarz' Atlas der Spätkeltischen (1959), and from the Limousin corpus, for which data on all variables were available. Assessment of the Bavarian sites was limited to Schwarz' published plans, and the variables had thus to be limited to what Schwarz had measured.

Most of the variables deemed significant in fieldwork were given by Schwarz, or strategies could be devised to extract them from his plans (App.6.2.1). A fault with the Atlas plans is the lack of relative heights. Schwarz gives only one measured profile for each site, and these are often measured upslope, necessitating correction of the figures for statistical purposes (App.6.2.1). The one feature not measured by Schwarz, but considered important by Büchsenschütz (1989), and which ideally should have been incorporated into the analysis, is the emphasis of corners. In all, 15 variables were employed: 1. Aspect, 2. Bearing, 3. Ratio (A:B axis), 4. Average

These variables were measured consistently for both data sets, following the procedures set out in App 6.2.1. The measurements are set out in App.6.2.2.

Numerous data limitations must be noted. The most important of these is that the degradation processes which have affected sites to varying degrees cannot be statistically quantified. The principal long-term processes, besides natural erosion (itself differential), are ploughing and ditch silting. Ploughing has radically altered the bank profiles at certain sites, and silting, similarly, affects original ditch profiles. It is likely that some sites classified, in field survey, as having no ditch, are in fact ditched (see Montrollet (31); some ditches may have been deliberately infilled, as was the case at Holzhausen (6.3.3). In an effort to standardise data collection, only those features visible on the ground at excavated sites have been incorporated.

Only sites with four extant corners were suitable for statistical analysis, but damage and erosion at many enclosures is such that only 80 of the 150 Atlas sites and 11 of the Limousin sites fulfilled all the criteria. (Numbered 81-91 on the data sheets). Thus a 91 case data set was clustered. The number of French sites is thus much smaller, though the percentage of accepted sites is much the same for both data sets.

Two clustering methods were employed; Complete Linkage or 'furthest neighbour' analysis (Aldenderfer and Blashfield 1984:43-45, Shennan 1988:212-3) and Ward's Method (Aldenderfer and Blashfield 1984:40-43, Shennan
1988:217-20) performed using the SPSS software package (see App.6.2.3). Both are hierarchical agglomerative techniques (Shennan 1988:212-4), frequently employed in archaeological quantification. The distance measure used was squared euclidean distance (for discussion of which see Aldenderfer and Blashfield 1984:24-28, and App.6.2.3). The raw data (App.6.2.2) were standardized prior to analysis. The cluster analyses are recorded in App.6.2.4. For the resultant dendrograms see Fig.6.9 (French sites marked •).

Cluster solutions were chosen on the 'fusion coefficient versus number of clusters' test described in App.6.2.3. This gives, in both cases, a break at approximately stage 80 ((Fig.6.10) and hence a 10 cluster solution for Complete Linkage, and 11 for Ward's Method.

6.6.2.2. Interpretation.

Despite some obvious anomalies, the two cluster methods produce similar cluster sequences: the main distinction (the large group distinguished on Complete Linkage) probably reflects the fact that Ward's method, designed to optimize the minimum variance within clusters, tends to find (or create) clusters of relatively equal sizes (Aldenderfer and Blashfield 1984:43): thus in the present Ward's solution, the groups are of broadly similar proportions, whereas using Complete Linkage, over 50 % of sites occur in cluster A (see Fig.6.9a).

As expected, the Bavarian sites do not, on either solution, form a single integral group. The Complete Linkage solution, in which 51 sites occur in one group (A), could indicate that the Atlas type series is statistically more homogenous than first impressions would suggest (though the 'cult' archetype, Holzhausen, (No.18) does not fall into this major group). Following Ward's method, the data are considerably more fragmented, and it is as well to stress that different clustering
Fig. 6.9a. Statistical comparison of encientes Bavarian Viereckenscharen series dendrogram showing results of complete linkage analysis.
Fig. 6.96. Statistical comparison of encintes quadrangulares and Schwarz, (1957) Atlas Bavarian Viereckschanzen series: dendrogram showing results of Ward's method analysis.
Fig. 6.10. Statistical comparison of enceintes quadrangulaires and Schwarz' (1959) Atlas Bavarian Viereckschanzen series: Cluster solutions. Fusion co-efficient plotted against number of clusters.

a. complete linkage, b. Ward’s method.
methods can and do generate different solutions to the same data set.

The principal finding for present purposes is that in both solutions the French enclosures exhibit a tendency to cluster discretely from the Bavarian ones. If 'enceintes quadrangulaires' are Viereckschanzen analogues we would expect them to cluster closely to the Bavarian sites, but this is not the case. The French sites have no integral regularity (they neither cluster alone or to one Bavarian group) and, especially on the Wards solution, tend to cluster away from the bigger Bavarian groups into small, discrete clusters of their own. On the Complete Linkage solution, only one French site (81) occurs in the major cluster (A); clusters E and G contain only French sites; cluster J has only two sites, one of which is French, and cluster 6 only three sites, one of which, again, is French (Fig.6.9a).

The Ward's solution shows an even clearer tendency for the French sites to cluster away from the biggest (and hence presumably most typical) Bavarian groups (Fig.6.9b): Cluster E is a discrete group of four French sites; cluster J a single French example (again, site 81), and two of the four sites in cluster D are French. The remaining French examples are all associated with small clusters (F, I and J).

This suggests that if there is a relationship between the French and Bavarian sites, it is with the least typical of the latter. The major observable distinction between the French and German sites is that the scale of the enclosing works in the former tends to be more massive (though this is a generalisation), and to some extent the cluster groups clearly reflect this. Site 81, clustered alone in both groups, has the deepest ditch of all sites clustered, and has very wide banks. The two French sites (84 and 86) making up Complete Linkage group 7 have wide ditches and very similar orientations.

In summary, cluster analysis refutes the concept
that the French sites are morphological analogues of the Bavrian Viereckschanzen. At the same time, the concept of the Viereckschanzen type series as an homogenous group is also seriously undermined.

Initial analysis of the clusters suggests that there is no correlation between clusters and location. Complete Linkage cluster H, (also a discrete group in Wards method: cluster K) is comprised of sites with no entrance, and the notional use of '1000' to denote absence of entrance (App.6.2.1) has clearly been the dominating factor in forming this group, over-riding other parameters. However, this value emphasises the observation (cf. Schwarz 1962, 1975) that absence of entrance is of major significance and required weighting. Sites apparently lacking entrances should necessarily be considered as discrete entities, but the bias imposed by this consideration inevitably distorts any relationships these sites have with the bulk of sites on other criteria.

Wards method Group A, similarly, is possibly influenced overly by the imposition of bearing value 1000; most of the sites in this group are on summits. However, the sites are among the most square, so bearing does not appear to have over-ridden all other variables. The remaining nominal measures do not appear to have biased groupings. On the distinguishable features of the Bavarian groups see App.6.2.5.

The Viereckschanze type series may thus quite possibly subsume several quite separate monument categories. Without excavation, it is impossible to test this assertion. As stressed, the fragmentation of the Viereckschanzen classification suggested by statistical analysis does not negate the possibility that certain enclosures or enclosure groups served as cult loci. The morphological criteria on which the groups are clustered do not, in themselves, enable us to determine cult status (though Schwarz has tried to argue this for entrance
One, simplistic, approach to this question is to examine the cluster positioning of Holzhausen (No.18), the only excavated Bavarian site in the statistical analysis, and still the principal candidate for a cult focus (6.3.3). The site clusters as follows:

Wards: 13, 18, 83, 91
Complete linkage: 11, 12, 13, 18, 25, 30, 43, 48, 52, 63, 71, 74, 83, 91,
In both cases, the same four sites (13, 18, 83, 91) cluster sequentially, and on this basis two of Holzhausen's most readily comparable sites are French (Rosiers d'Egletons (2) and Videix (29). The hypothesis that the Holzhausen cluster represents cult loci could clearly be tested by excavation of one of these sites (though material recovered from limited sondages at Rosiers d'Egletons (2) in the 1930s suggests a post-conquest date for this enclosure, and emphasises the point that morphological similarity is a poor basis on which to assume similar dating).

In neither method, however, does Holzhausen occur in a major cluster. Statistically, Holzhausen and those sites most similar to it form a very minor part of the Atlas series.

6.7. Conclusion.

Several contributors to the most recent French 'Viereckschanze' summary (Bushsenschutz and Olivier eds. 1989) question the influences of the 'Viereckschanze' concept on archaeological approaches to 'enceintes quadrangulaires'. Brunaux, as comments throughout suggest, is among these workers. Baray (1989) is another. He compares French and Central European approaches to enclosure interpretation:

"pour ces dernier, la discussion ne porte pas sur la définition functionelle de l'enclos à partir d'une définition morphologique, mais sur l'interpretation
functionelle (cultuelle ou non) des vestiges archéologiques découverts” (Baray 1989:91)

This chapter, too, has questioned the validity of an identification process which is predicated on a priori morphological definitions, and the inappropriateness of such procedures has been stressed.

An attempt has been made to quantify the morphological variability which is increasingly felt to undermine such an approach to ‘enceintes quadrangulaires’. Statistical analysis demonstrates that the supposition of a 'relationship' between Viereckshchanzen and French enceintes quadrangulaires’, on which assessments of date and function are predicated, is baseless.

At the same time, cluster analysis has raised the possibility that the Bavarian data base subsumes a variety of monument groups. Brunaux (1989:13) deduced from an analysis of Schwarz data collection methods that the Atlas 'type series' was in reality an anhistoric collection of sites approximating roughly to 1 ha. in area. The statistical analysis undertaken here may be argued to quantify these fears. An excavation programme, related to statistically defined groupings, is the only way to test function and date against group. In the mean time, ritual function can only validly be assigned on the basis of independent excavation criteria at individual sites. In these terms, unexcavated enclosures, and the majority of excavated sites, cannot be seen as cult loci.
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7.1. Introduction

This study has employed the archaeology of LIA religious ritual as a forum for the examination of aspects of the archaeology of protohistory.

Protohistoric periods are characterised by the limited availability of text (1.2.1). Protohistoric archaeology cannot ignore text, in an effort to strive to equal prehistoric archaeology (1.2): rather, methodologies are required for the integration of text and archaeology within protohistoric study. As an initial contribution to this aim, a definition of the characteristics of the LIA literary record for religious ritual has been attempted (Chapters 2-3), and a series of case studies have examined how text has functioned in the archaeology of LIA religious ritual (Chapters 4-6).

It is fair to conclude, from the present case studies, that ritual identities are not primarily assigned on criteria derived from LIA material data. Instead, ritual identities are advanced using textual and retrospective processes. The case studies bear out the premise (1.2.2) that text is over-privileged in Iron Age archaeology (7.2), but at the same time suggest that appeals to post-Conquest data (7.3) are as influential as text in assigning sites to the LIA ritual corpus. The preceding chapters suggest the principal factors which have informed the archaeology of LIA ritual are, thus:

1. The availability of limited textual data.
2. The availability of archaeological evidence for post-Conquest activities under the Roman hegemony.

The use of both inform LIA archaeology in general to varying degrees. In the archaeology of ritual, this thesis has suggested, the privileging of these databases ensures:
a. That ritual identities assigned on these bases are often questionable.
b. That archaeological methodologies for the identification of ritual and religion are precluded.

This conclusion reiterates the characteristics of LIA archaeological employment of text (7.2) and retrospection (7.3). It is suggested that the two are aspects of a single process (7.4), reliance on which:

1. Causes a relaxation in archaeological rigour (7.5).
2. Prevents the devilling of LIA-specific methodologies (7.6).

Future methodological advances depend on recognising and combating these processes, by a more rigorous approach to the LIA textual and archaeological data, in the contextual integration of the two (7.7). Finally, some implications of current perspectives on LIA religious ritual are noted (7.8), and suggestions are offered for future work (7.9).

7.2. Archaeological approaches to text.

There is much to suggest that LIA archaeology has not reached beyond a simplistic, positivist view of the relationship between text and archaeology, in which supposedly independent sources of information correlate and are thus presumed more likely to be correct. In practice, as the case studies performed here indicate, archaeological confidence that we perform text free archaeology, then cite text to ratify our interpretations, is misplaced.

7.2.1. Prioritising text.

Archaeological approaches to wells and shafts (Chapter 5) provide the clearest example of text-led archaeology. Here, it is argued (5.5), privileging of
Medieval texts has created a text-led expectation that wells and shafts were Celtic cult loci. This has informed approaches to the material data and coloured assessment of the site record.

More generally, in this particular branch of the discipline, the privileging of text is evident in the observation that archaeology rarely challenges text. Despite increasing archaeological evidence for pre-Conquest structural loci (3.10) and iconography (3.11), the long-held view of Iron Age religion as aniconic and apectonic, drawn in part from misuse of text (3.13.1), has not been fully challenged.

7.2.2. The failure to maximise textual data.

Archaeological reasoning is one casualty of the privileging of text: another is the literary record itself. Some issues may be briefly re-iterated.

7.2.2.1 Anecdotal use of text.

The ‘timeless Celticity’ (Fitzpatrick 1989:28, and forthcoming) on which use of text is predicated (1.3.2) has meant that the potentials of textual data have not been realised. Workers call for more attention to the contextual specifics of textual data (Champion 1985:17, Hill 1989:18) but the approach to text remains an anecdotal one (1.3.1), in which data are not adequately ranked according to the specific contexts of their production and reproduction.

This leads to careless generalisation. Where such conclusions form a basis for archaeological inference, archaeology may be compromised. For example, water sources are frequently regarded as LIA Gallic cult loci, in spite of the absence of references to such loci in Gallic cult contexts before the Clst AD (4.2.1).

This thesis has stressed the need to prioritise LIA texts above others (1.3), and to weigh these texts according to a framework established in Chapters 2-3.
It has been a contention of this work that recognition of the inappropriateness of non-LIA texts is essential (1.3.3).

7.3. The LIA and retrospective inference.

A second major process informing the archaeology of LIA religious ritual is retrospective use of post-Conquest archaeological data. Each of the present case studies reflects this to some degree. Water source loci (Chapter 4) offer the clearest example. Here, in the near total absence of LIA material (4.3.4), retrospective arguments based on post-Conquest assemblages (4.4.1-2) are the principal means by which LIA cult activity has been inferred (4.4 - 4.5.3).

Retrospection also plays a major role in the archaeology of wells and shafts (5.4). Here, again in spite of a paucity of LIA data (5.3), widespread post-Conquest evidence for wells and shafts as cult foci is employed to infer similar pre-Conquest rites (5.4.2).

In the case of rectilinear enclosures (Chapter 6), retrospective appeals are employed to infer the cult nature of LIA activity. Thus, Schwarz' (1962, 1975) argument for the cult function of LIA loci involved a retrospective appeal from the rectilinear form of Romano-Celtic cult loci (6.3.1).

7.3.1. Forms of retrospection.

The forms of retrospective inference recognised in the preceding chapters may be summarised as follows:

1. Retrospection as replacement for LIA data: in the absence or near-absence of LIA data, pre-Conquest rites are inferred from Gallo-Roman practice. This form of retrospection actually predicts a paucity of LIA data (4.3,2), presupposing the loss of post-Conquest horizons through subsequent activity. Hence, in the case of water sources, absence of LIA data is explained by inferring the clearance of captions, favissae and structural
obliteration (4.3.2.). It is suggested here that whilst post-Conquest activity may limit the availability of LIA data, it cannot serve as a substitute for LIA material when assigning sites to the LIA ritual corpus (4.3.2).

2. Retrospection and cult continuum: where LIA horizons occur, the demonstration of post-Conquest cult activity is employed to infer that pre-Conquest horizons were also cult related. The paucity of LIA data in the present case studies is such that this argument has been less frequently applied than (1), though it is has been used to suggest that pre-Iron Age horizons at some water sources served cult functions (4.3.3: Fontaines Salées and Grisy) and to argue for the function of LIA rectilinear enclosures (6.3.1). More generally, this process frequently informs discussion of pre-Conquest horizons at Gallo-Roman fana.

3. Retrospection and 'Celtic tradition': features of post-Conquest loci are suggested to represent post-Conquest survivals of Celtic traditions. Examples here are wooden statuary (4.4.1) and epigraphically-attested Celtic divine names (4.4.2) at water source loci, and numerous find categories in well and shaft fills (5.4.1). The weaknesses of the approach are two-fold. First, the difficulty of isolating 'Celtic' behaviours undermines such proposals (5.4.1). Second, even where features may be considered indigenous, their post-Conquest employment at specific loci may be a response to Graeco-Roman stimuli (5.4.1).

7.4. Protohistory, text and retrospection.

The retrospective and text-led procedures which have been identified as major factors in assigning sites to the LIA cult corpus are essentially similar. Most classical literature on Gaul post-dates the LIA, and few data predate the period (1.2.1). Thus, most archaeological use of text (which does not, as here, insist on prioritising texts of LIA date) involves
Retrospective appeals to later Classical literature, or even to Medieval texts. In this way, for example, the concept of a 'natural' religion, drawn almost entirely from the Clst AD texts (3.13.1), has dominated archaeological attitudes to LIA cult foci, despite the nature of the LIA textual data themselves.

In the same way, the post-Conquest archaeological and epigraphic records have been seen as more valid in writing the LIA than the nature, or lack, of LIA archaeological evidence. It is often, rightly, recognised that LIA text is devalued by its Greek or Roman authorial perspective: yet the archaeology of LIA religious ritual itself adopts a Romanized perspective.

Retrospective inference, like text, is predicated on a notion of timeless Celticity which allows us to presuppose the validity of later data in defining the Iron Age. The end result of the use of both is an archaeology of LIA religion based less on contemporary data than on Gallo-Roman and Romano-British text, epigraphy, and archaeology. This thesis has questioned these procedures.

7.5. The relaxation of archaeological rigour.

Three site categories have been examined in this thesis, and it has been suggested that all three should be removed from the LIA ritual corpus.

Hill (1989) suggested that the availability of text, fused with naive ethnogenetic concepts on which the use of text is predicated (1.2.2) makes us practise archaeology less self-critically. It may be argued from the present case studies that a combination of text and retrospection makes us practise simply a less critical archaeology. The inclusion in the LIA ritual corpus of each of the site categories examined here has involved a notable relaxation of archaeological rigour with regard to the material data.
a. **wells and shafts**: relaxation is most noticeable in the dating of sites. Sites have been assigned to the Iron Age even where there is evidence to the contrary (5.6.1).

b. **water sources**: arguments for Iron Age date, at the few sites for which this is suggested, are very poor (4.3.3-4), and betray a retrospectively-fuelled desire to push the category into the LIA.

c. **rectilinear enclosures**: morphological criteria of the type employed here are *a priori* a weak basis on which to assign cult function (6.3), even before the assumption of morphological similarly is tested statistically (6.6).

The clearest evidence for weakened archaeological reasoning is the paucity of LIA data across the three groups. It is reasonable to suggest that a fundamental criterion for the identification of LIA ritual loci is the presence of LIA data: in two categories (water sources, wells and shafts) this base criterion is not clearly fulfilled.

### 7.6. The absence of methodologies

Methodologies for the identification of ritual are generally lacking for the LIA (1.5.2), though where LIA horizons are recognisable (for example, in the case of pit fills on British settlement sites) criteria for the identification of ritual are now being advanced (1.5.2). The lack of methodologies is in part attributable to reliance on text, and on Gallo-Roman data, with its own, text-aided, methodologies. But a further factor is the paucity of LIA data noted above. Of the site categories studied here, only in the case of rectilinear enclosures (Chapter 6) has ritual function been argued from dated LIA horizons. In the remaining cases, cult criteria are not advanced on the basis of LIA data, but via a double retrospective; that pre-Conquest horizons may be inferred
from post-Conquest ones, and that these horizons were cult related.

The paucity of LIA data within the site categories considered means that positive methodological proposals for the identification of ritual activity are largely absent from this thesis. Two points must be stressed here. First, the suggested withdrawal of site categories from the present ritual corpus is the result of a more rigorous approach to reviewing existing data, and as such represents a methodological advance. Second, it has been the contention of this thesis that in many areas the LIA database is so poor that the development of LIA-specific methodologies has been actively precluded; substituted, it has been argued, by inappropriate retrospective practices. In calling for greater chronological control of data, as a means to counter both the extent of reliance on retrospection, and our failure to realise the implications of this reliance (7.8.2), this thesis represents a methodological advance.

7.7. The archaeology of LIA religion: towards a methodology.

On the basis of the findings summarised above, the following are suggested to be essential for a valid archaeology of LIA religion:

1. Greater rigour towards the archaeological data: the demonstration of LIA horizons, independent of retrospective inference that these exist.
2. Having identified LIA horizons, criteria for their cult status should not chiefly comprise appeals to Gallo-Roman practice, and/or post-LIA text.
3. Where LIA text is employed to suggest cult status, this should take the form of a contextual integration of textual and archaeological data, avoiding the over-privileging of text.

The same, it may be suggested, is a general blueprint for
a protohistoric methodology.

7.8. Summary: The LIA as itself.

7.8.1. A different Iron Age?

Hill (1989:18, 21-2) suggested our ability to write a different Iron Age was principally hampered by the privileging of later textual evidence. The preceding chapters suggest that LIA archaeology is equally informed by the Gallo-Roman archaeological record: that the LIA we are writing is essentially one from a Roman perspective. Extrapolative appeals to the pre-Iron Age record are sometimes employed in addition to retrospective use of post-Conquest data (5.5.3) - and here it must be stressed that the assumed 'universality' of practices is a wholly inadequate substitute for period-specific archaeological data - but the principal influences remain retrospective.

There is no a priori reason- not least given the fact of conquest by an alien society which marks its inception- that the post-Conquest period is a better reference point for LIA ritual than is the EIA. The fundamental point here, however, is that whether our appeals are pro- or retrospective, and whether they are archaeology or text-based, in making them, we are failing to write the archaeology of LIA religion from its own data.

It may be objected that, as in the case studies performed here, LIA data are too sparse to allow for this. If this is in fact the case, it would be better to admit the inaccessibility of LIA ritual than to create a ritual corpus in the image of another period. However, there is much to suggest that our constant use of retrospective techniques actually prevents us from recognising evidence for LIA ritual. Hill (1989), documenting the recent recognition of the ritual use of former storage pits on British Iron Age settlement sites, attributed earlier inability to identify this
activity to reliance on text. The present author suggests such failures are also linked to continuing attempts to access and define LIA ritual via well-attested post-Conquest practices.

7.8.2. The LIA, syncretism and change.

In the LIA, for the first time, Gaul was exposed to continuous contact with the Roman world (1.4). This encounter, which renders the period protohistoric, is also its principal characteristic. Somewhat ironically, given the extent to which LIA ritual is defined in terms of post-Conquest data, the present LIA ritual corpus is infrequently viewed from an interaction perspective.

Water sources and deep shafts are widely-attested cult foci in the Graeco-Roman world (4.2.1, 4.3; 5.4.2, 5.5.2). Their employment in post-Conquest contexts in Britain and Gaul nevertheless continues to be seen less in terms of alien introduction than as the 'survival' of pre-Conquest practices. The proliferation of both categories of loci in the immediate post-Conquest period (4.6, 5.6.2), has infrequently been argued by previous workers to point to the adoption of new rites by conquered populations. Rather, the quantity of post-Conquest material has frequently been employed to suggest that Iron Age activity served as a model on which Graeco-Roman practices were grafted.

By adopting such a perspective, two factors remain inadequately addressed. The first is the possibility of rapid adoption of Graeco-Roman religious behaviours in the decades immediately following the Conquest, as has been suggested for two site categories examined in the present thesis (4.6, 5.6.2). This observation has implications for our understanding of early post-Conquest religious interaction. Secondly, by retaining the perspective that features of post-Conquest rites reflect Iron Age 'survivals' rather than insular responses to newly introduced beliefs and behaviours (4.4.1; 5.4.1,
5.6.2), an underlying dynamic of the LIA is ignored.

This dynamic is synthesis. Synthesis is central to the encounter between Graeco-Roman and Gallic religion in the LIA. One of the unexploited strengths of the textual data, it has been argued here (1.2.2.3, 1.4.2.2) is in highlighting this characteristic of the LIA. In the use of such figures as contrast (2.11.1) and interpretatio (2.11.2) the LIA literary record encodes synthesis. But text, written entirely from Greek and Roman viewpoints, offers an unbalanced picture, reducing the dynamics of synthesis to a one-sided syncretism (2.11, 3.4). Archaeological data potentially provide a more balanced view. That features of the early post-Conquest record should be seen in terms of adaption and change by both invading and insular populations has been argued in the present thesis (e.g. for Romano-British wells and shafts 5.4.1, 5.6.2). Seen in these terms, such loci as water sources and wells do not represent evidence for Celtic Iron Age religion but for the Romano-British and Gallo-Roman synthesis which characterises the post-Conquest LIA.

7.9. Proposals for future work.

The present thesis has examined only a limited range of proposed LIA cult foci. Other areas of the ritual corpus are clearly heavily text-influenced, and the framework provided here (Chapters 2-3 and Apps 1-2) offers a basis for assessing archaeological approaches to text in such areas.

An examination of the influence of text on archaeological interpretation of human skulls in Iron Age contexts is suggested, particularly given the date range for post-mortem decapitation rites offered in the present work (3.12.1-1.2). The influence of text on assessment of Gallic deities would also merit study. Textually-attested deities are often regarded as major figures, even where epigraphic and iconographic support is wanting
The portrayal of Esus, Taranis and Teutates as major pre-Conquest deities by Hatt 1970:271ff, Brunaux 1988:68-9 and others, is influenced by Lucan (Pharsalia 1.391-465). Text is privileged even when interpretatio influenced: much of the study of Gallic gods has comprised attempts to link epigraphically-attested deities to Caesar’s account 6.17,1-2 (3.5.- 3.5.2).

The LIA pantheon is, in this context, an area defined by constant reference to the Gallo-Roman record (cf. especially Green 1986, 1989). The inequalities of post-Conquest syncretism confound attempts to define LIA gods on this basis (3.5.1-2), and an assessment of the value of retrospective arguments in defining LIA deity is long overdue. Equally, a study of post-Conquest epigraphy and iconography is required from a similar perspective.

As noted above (7.3.1) the interpretation of Iron Age artefacts and stratigraphic horizons at Gallo-Roman cult loci is influenced by retrospective processes. Re-assessment of the LIA archaeological data, and of the role of retrospection, is required here. For example, an analysis of putative IA cult loci at British Romano-Celtic fana sites, in which IA loci were ranked according to the extent of retrospective inference (as opposed to IA material evidence) informing their identification, would produce a more rigorously-defined corpus of IA structural cult loci. Such a corpus could in turn provide a basis for assessment of IA material subsequently recovered from fana sites.

Heavy reliance on textual and retrospective procedures is not confined to the archaeology of LIA ritual, and a number of areas may benefit from the type of assessment advocated here.

Understandably, Caesar’s Gallic War has exerted considerable influence on the archaeology of LIA Gaul and Britain. It is time to re-examine this influence. The
influence of Caesar’s account of Belgic immigration (5.12) on the archaeology of South-eastern Britain (briefly summarised in Megaw & Simpson (1984:415-7), is an obvious area of enquiry: Hachmann (1976) has stressed the problematic relationship between text and archaeology here. Similarly, archaeological approaches to the development of proto-urbanism in LIA Gaul have made heavy use of Gallic War (e.g. Nash 1976b. In this context, Buchsenschutz & Ralston (1986) have questioned the value of Caesar’s vocabulary for Gallic settlement sites).

Text has also played a significant role in archaeological analysis of Roman trade with pre-Conquest Gaul. Recent models, which stress the role of local elites in the receipt and control of imported goods (Haselgrove 1987, Millet 1990, 1.4.1.2), are based on a picture of pre-Conquest Gallic society drawn almost entirely from texts (Fitzpatrick 1989:28-9). Our understanding of the power-base of the Gallic elite, and of the underlying symmetries of the Gallic and Roman clientela systems - which commentators agree was a fundamental basis for fostering initial links and later Romanization (Fitzpatrick 1989:28-9, Millet 1990b:35-41, Haselgrove 1990:45) - is heavily text-led. Equally text-based is our assessment of commodities traded by Gaul (see Fitzpatrick 1989:40-1, & Table 2.1. on Strabo’s references to Gallic commodities).

A systematic study of textual evidence for Celtic clientage systems is itself long overdue. Despite limited analysis (e.g. Wightman 1975), systematic collation and evaluation of the textual evidence is wanting. It may be suggested that archaeological approaches to Gallic social structure, which have traditionally accorded considerable weight not only to Caesar’s Gallic War but to Medieval accounts of Celtic society, is subject to many of the same problems as the archaeology of LIA religious ritual.
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