Religious Acculturation and Assimilation
in
Belgic Gaul and Aquitania
from
the Roman Conquest
until
the End of the Second Century CE:
selected aspects.

Volume II: Appendices

Alasdair John Malcolm Watson

A thesis submitted to
The University of Edinburgh
for the Degree of PhD

November 2004
Appendix One

Notes

Chapter One
Problems and Presuppositions

5 Badian:77-78; Garnsey & Saller:20-42; Millett 1991:37.
13 Harris, W.V.:47; Slofstra:71; Reece:30; Millett 1991:37; Millett, Roymans & Slofstra:1; Haselgrove 1991:45 and 46.
14 Slofstra:71.
17 Slofstra:71.

Examples from Southern Africa are the Secretary for Native Affairs, who administered policy regarding the black indigenous peoples, Native Customary Law, which was not applicable to white settlers, and certain military units in the colony of Natal in South Africa composed of persons from various indigenous tribes being called the Natal Native Contingent, Natal Native Horse or Natal Native Pioneer Corps.

IIronically, with reference to the indigenous inhabitants of America, it is now not only acceptable, but even obligatory to use the word “native”.

12 Slofstra:71.
16 Geertz:40.
17 Darda, Motykova & Rybova:200.
19 Bertin:68.
21 Bertin:69
22 Brunaux 1996:152; Birkhan:826.
25 King 1991:221.
26 Haselgrove 1987:105.
28 Crumley: The title of the diagram is misleading giving the impression that the interpretations are based on Caesar’s accounts, when, in the case of Crumley, they are specifically based on archaeological, not just literary, evidence.
31 King 1991:221.
Judaism's doctrine of the Resurrection and the operation of certain practices and rituals as a result of external changes, such as the development of the synagogue during the Exile, the lapping of sacrifices after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE and the introduction of new festivals, such as Purim and Hanukkah, are some examples of change. It is as difficult to write of a pure, Celtic religion as it is to write of a pure Judaism, which once had the three groups, Sadducees, Pharisees and Essenes, and now has Orthodox, Reformed and the mystical element Kabbalah, or a pure Islam, which, soon after Mohammed's death, split into Sunni and Shi'ite with the mystical movement Sufism, or a pure Christianity, with Roman Catholicism and the multitude of post-Reformation denominations in the West alone, quite apart from the Eastern variants.

It is possible to reconcile the two functions by saying that Mars was a Protector god (Lambrechts 1959:127; Benoît 1970:95).

Liebeschuetz (Liebeschuetz:83) holds that his rôle as a god of healing was minor.
Chapter Two
Sources and Method

1 Vendryes 1948:239.
2 King, A. 1990:132.
3 Brunaux 1995b:140.
5 Bober:14.
7 Clark & Byrne:7.
8 Yinger:7.
9 Clark & Byrne:6.
10 Spiro:96.
11 In the archaeological context, prehistory is the study of a period of history for which there are no written records; a prehistoric culture is a culture about which nothing contemporaneous with has been written. Proto-history is the study of a history of a people written by people of a contemporary, but different culture; a proto-historic culture is a culture, which has nothing written about itself, but is the subject of literature of a contemporary, but different culture.
12 It may be said that “rituals and practices” can be considered material because they involve physical objects. But, while beliefs are expressed physically through rituals and practices, the actual rituals and practices, once performed, leave no remains except the objects in which and with which they were performed; but these objects are necessary for the reconstruction of the ritual.
13 Brunham:124.
14 Ross 1986:104.
15 Ross 1986:104.
16 Webster, J. 1992:35.
17 The following are a few. It was manufactured in the 4th or 3rd century BCE (Green, M.J. 1989a:8) or the 2nd-1st century BCE (Bergquist & Taylor:21 and 22; Taylor:6; Green, M.J. 1993:14) or the 2nd or 1st century BCE (Bober:15 and 20) or the 1st century BCE (Krause:VII; Lambrechts 1942:180; Benoît 1955:27; Jenkins:61; Hatt 1966a:11; Powell 1971:205; Olmsted 1976:95; Olmsted 1979:53 and 99-102; Powell 1980:182; Duval 1982:102; Gricourt & Hollard 1990:290; Olmsted 1994:4; Green, M.J. 1996a:24, 142 and 147) or the Augustan period (Duval 1957:19) 2nd – 3rd century CE (Voss:413) or in the imperial epoch (Benoît 1970:93) or even in the 7th century CE (Reinach: 456-458.) on the lower part of the Danube (Drexel 1915:1-36; Lambrechts 1942:15; Benoît 1955:32; Duval 1957:19; Powell 1980:182; Bergquist & Taylor:11 and 22; Taylor:68) or on the middle or lower Danube (Grenier 1945:281; Megaw No.209) of in Thrace (Green, M.J. 1989a:8) or Pontus (Voss:367-414) or in northwest Gaul between the Loire and the Somme (Olmsted 1979:101 and 102) or in the Jutland, the Cimbri Chersonnese (Benoît 1970:93) for Celts, such as the Scordisci (Grenier1945:281; Bergquist & Taylor:22; Taylor:68), or the Cimbri (Bergquist & Taylor:22) with images which are either definitely Celtic (Olmsted 1976:95; Powell 1980:182; Green, M.J. 1989a:8; Green, M.J. 1993:14), too idiosyncratically Celtic to be other than Celtic (Green, M.J. 1989a:8) of Celtic inspiration (Duval 1957:19; Green, M.J. 1993:14) or are a combination of Graeco-Roman themes with indigenous figures (Benoît 1970:93) or are Thracian (Bergquist & Taylor:16-21) or Mithraic (Voss:367-414; Laet & Lambrechts:304-306) or Indian (Taylor:69-71).
18 Vendryes 1948:252.
20 Green, M.J. 1995a:103.
21 Green, M.J. 1995a:103.
22 Duval 1957:56.
23 Krüger 1941:55.
24 Krüger 1941:7
25 Krüger 1941:12.
26 Krüger 1941:55.
29 Krüger 1941:33.
However, the possibility that a cauldron, lost in the 1st century BC, preserved almost intact and then found by accident in the 19th century, should depict the very scene mentioned by Scholiasts writing in the 10th century AD is too remarkable.

It may be the Continental equivalent of the scene at the Battle of Mag Tured, in which the god of healing placed mortally wounded or dead warriors into a cauldron to heal or revive them; although de Vries (de Vries 1961:47) considers such an interpretation to be perverse, the line of horsemen and line of infantrymen with a carynx-player on the plate seems to support this idea.

It is interesting that even modern authors can fall prey to making value judgements; Green (Green, M.J. 1997:76; Green, M.J. 1995:172,174, 175, 176, 178 and 182; Aldhouse Green 2001b:140) displays ethnocentrism by calling human sacrifice “ritual murder”.

This consisted of the separate ownership of scattered strips of land, each strip of one owner lying between those of different owners to ensure everyone had a piece of good as well as indifferent land, and the strips were reallocated among the farmers at intervals (Smout:121-122).
Greek writers gave the names of Greek deities to Egyptian ones (Hdt.II.42.2 and 8, 47.2, 50.1, 144.2 and 145.1 (Vendryes 1948:262); Arr.II.16.2). Herodotus also applied *interpretatio Graeca* to the deities of the Assyrians, Arabians and Persians (Hdt.I.131.3), the Libyans (Hdt.II.50.3) and the Scythians (Hdt.IV.59.1-2); sometimes Herodotus actually includes the name of the indigenous deity (Hdt.I.131.3, II.42.2, 42.8 and IV.59.1-2). Megasthenes practises *interpretatio Graeca* with respect to the deities of India (Strab.XV.1.58), Strabo applies *interpretatio Graeca* to the Carmanians (Strab.XIV.2.14) and the Lusitanians (Strab.III.3.6) and various ancient authors apply *interpretatio Graeca* to the patron deity of Tyre (Diod.V.20.2; XX.14.1; Arr.II.16.1), who is known to have been the god Melkart (Vendryes 1948:262), and of Carthage (Diod.XX.14.4.). Curtius Rufus uses *interpretatio Romana* also to say that the patron deity of Tyre was Hercules (Curt.IV.4.5) and that the Tyrians worshipped Neptune (Curt.IV.4.5). *Interpretatio Graeca* was even applied to Celtic deities: Polybius equates a deity of the Insibrian Gauls with Athene (Polyb.II.32.5-6); and Plutarch refers to a Celtic deity as Chronos (Plut.De def.or.18; De fac.26; De Super.XIII; De Sera Num.Vind.552A and Reg. et Imp. Apoph.175A). Examples of *interpretatio Romana* regarding Gallic deities other than Caesar can be found in Florus, who says that the Insibrian Gauls worshipped Mars and Vulcan (Florus.I.ii.4.4 and I.ii.4.5) and Ammianus Marcellinus, who says that the Scordisci sacrificed to Bellona and Mars (Amm.Marc.XXVII.4.4); Tacitus uses *interpretatio Romana* with reference to German deities (Tac.Germ.XLIII.4), Jordanes to Gothic (Jordanes.Get.V) and Tertullian and Minucius Felix to the supreme Carthaginian deity (Tert.Apol.IX.2; Min.Fel.Oct.XXX.3).
This is of form. Therefore, it is both 1.445).

Greek, has practices, their on depending can who provides the interpretation and therefore the relation between the vision and that 'vision', that is of piercing this 'vision' is called ignorance and consequential misinterpretation. (Green, M.J. 1993:14). A means of discerning the interpretation, that is of choice or chance of recording and by cultural separation, ignorance and consequential misinterpretation. (Bal:100). The focalizor is the person who provides the interpretation and therefore the narrative (Bal:102). The way a focalizor presents details can reveal information about the focalizor (Bal:106). Due to a variety of focalizations, depending on the source, aspects of the religion of the Gauls, such as their beliefs, their deities and their practices, cannot be relied on without critical analysis. An example of this is the statement by Diodorus that the Druids, in believing that the human soul is immortal and can enter a new body, followed Pythagoras (Diod.V.28.6.). While this Druidic doctrine is mentioned by Caesar (Caes.B.G.VI.14.5), he does not mention Pythagoras. Diodorus is later than Caesar and, more importantly, did not travel among the Gauls; consequently he has focalized their beliefs in a Noble Savage manner and has portrayed them as barbarian philosophers, capable of thought equal to Greeks. Simultaneously, however, when he claims that the Druids followed Pythagoras, he, being an urbanised Greek, has focalized their belief in an ethnocentric manner and basically says that, while capable of wisdom, the Druids still got their ideas from a civilised Greek.
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Such as at Divodorum [Metz] (Mediomatrici tribal territory) (Esperandieu:V.4425), Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves] (Treveri tribal territory) (Esperandieu:IX.7265) and at Grand (Leuci tribal territory) (Esperandieu:VI.4898). The capitals of a pillar at Durocortorum [Reims] (Remi tribal territory) (Esperandieu:V.3746) had the head of Radiant Apollo, Diana surmounted by a crescent and two unknown bearded god, possibly Jupiter and Hercules and on one at Bagacum [Bavay] (Nervii tribal territory) (Esperandieu:IX.7216) had Jupiter and Juno can be seen (Benoît 1970:90).

Benoît 1970:93.


Benoît 1970:95.

Benoît 1970:96.

de Vries 1961: 34; Bauchhenss: 21.


Bauchhenss: 16.

Benoît 1970: 88 and 97.


King 1990: 141.


Green, M.J. 1984: 176; Bauchhenss: 17.

Bauchhenss: 19.


Benoît 1970: 95.

de Vries 1961: 37; Bauchhenss: 19; Ross 1986: 130.


Benoît 1970: 96.

Thévenot 1951: 138; Oaks: 77.


CIL XIII. 7555a.


Pauly-Wissowa unter Epomea.

Linduff: 821; Aldhouse-Green: 110.

One hundred and thirty examples (Oaks: 78).

The Remi tribal territory.

Esperandieu: V. 3672.

The Treveri tribal territory.

Esperandieu: V. 7736.

The Mediomatrici tribal territory.

Esperandieu: V. 4353.

The Bituriges Cubi tribal territory.

Esperandieu: II. 1562.

The Arverni tribal territory.

Esperandieu: II. 1618.

The Pictones tribal territory.

Esperandieu: 8948.

Oaks: 78; Linduff: 821 and 822.


Magnen: 9.


CIL XIII. 5622; Espérandieu: II. 1588; VIII. 5942.


MacCulloch: 345.


565 “Katarnos”:50.
566 CIL III.7750 and 12579.
567 Hubert:192.
568 Thévenot 1949:400; Thévenot 1951:139; Oaks:82.
569 Dumézil 1954:5.
571 Duval 1957:90.
572 CIL XII.4218. L COELIUS RUFUS/JULIA SEVERA UXOR/L COELIUS MANGIUS f/DIVANNONI/DINOMOGETIMARO/MARTIB(us)/V S L M.
573 Duval 1957:90.
574 Belgic Gaul: Esperandieu:V.3653 and 3731; VI.4726 and 4839; Lantier:24 and 42, fig.5; Coudrot & Moitreux:387.
576 The Remi tribal territory.
577 Esperandieu:V.3653.
578 The Mediomatrici tribal territory.
579 Coudrot & Moitreux:387.
580 The Santones tribal territory.
581 Esperandieu:II.1319.
582 The Pictones tribal territory.
583 Esperandieu:II.1539.
584 Esperandieu:IV.3133.
585 Bober:30
586 CIL XIII.3026c
587 Bober:21.
588 Lambrechts 1942:25; Jenkins:63.
590 Esperandieu:II.1319 and 1539; Lantier:48 and 49.
591 Jenkins:63.
592 Esperandieu:V.3653.
593 Jenkins:64.
594 Bober:31.
595 Bober:33.
596 The Remi tribal territory.
597 Esperandieu:VI.4839.
598 Bober:43.
599 Paus.IV.33.4, V.15.8; Esperandieu:V.4346.
600 Bober:44.
601 Peter, R. “Dis Pater”, Roscher i, col.1179-1188.
602 Lantier:44, fig.8.
603 Lambrechts 1942:33; Powell:156. It may be claimed that the Tricephalic deity is not indigenous and that the examples of it are merely provincial translations of the Roman deity Janus Quadrifons, the absence of the fourth face being due to it not being possible to execute it in relief or the fourth side of a full round statue would be to the wall. The simplest explanation for the fourth face not being executed is that the image is of the Tricephalic deity and not Janus Quadrifons. The Three-headed deity is a recognised Celtic deity.
604 Belgic Gaul: Esperandieu:V.3651-2, 3654-9, 3661, 3751, 3756, 3762; VI.4729 and 4937; IX.7233/7234 and XI.7700.
605 The Suessiones tribal territory.
606 Esperandieu:XL7700.
607 The Petrucores tribal territory.
608 Esperandieu:II.1316
609 Lambrechts 1942:33; Clarus:41.
610 Esperandieu:V.3651, 3652 and 3654-3661; Lambrechts 1942:33.
611 Lambrechts 1942:33.
Bober:38.
Bober:38.
Birkhan:158.
Bober:38.
Renard 1955:207.
Bober (Bober:37 and 38) disagrees saying that the vases cannot be forced into the framework of deities of the Days of the Week.
Birkhan:158.
Lambrechts 1942:36; Birkhan:158.
Renard 1955:207.
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Bober (Bober:37 and 38) disagrees saying that the vases cannot be forced into the framework of deities of the Days of the Week.
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Lambrechts 1942:36; Birkhan:158.
Renard 1955:207.
Bober (Bober:37 and 38) disagrees saying that the vases cannot be forced into the framework of deities of the Days of the Week.
Birkhan:158.
Lambrechts 1942:36; Birkhan:158.
Renard 1955:207.


Esperandieu:V.3668, 3962, 4288, 4324, 4346, 4488 and VI.4579 and 4709; CIL XIII.2831; 4123; 4192; 4193; 4194; 4195; 4208; 4311; 4683; 4684; 4685; 4705; 4732; 5677; 5939; 6222; 6263; 7683; 11263; 11696; MacCulloch:43; Schleiermacher:113; Grenier 1945:349; Duval 1957:55 and 93; Benoît 1959:64; Schindler:85; de Vries 1961:118, 141; Bémont 1969:23 and 33; MacCana:49; Wightman 1970:210, 225; Wightman 1985:182; Wightman 1986:551, 556; Green, M.J. 1989a:42, 45, 54 and 55; Green, M.J. 1993:41; Green, M.J. 1995a:125; Green, M.J. 1995b:474; Green, M.J. 1996:28.

The Treveri tribal territory.

Horne & King:441.

CIL XIII.4235, 4237- MERCURIO/ET ROSMER(tae)/MESSOR/CANI/LIBERTUS.


Duval 1957:55-56.


The Leuci tribal territory.

Esperandieu:VI.4709.

de Vries 1961:118.

MacCulloch:43.


Green, M.J. 1989a:57.

Green, M.J. 1989a:57.


Green, M.J. 1995a:127.

Green, M.J. 1989a:43 and 57.

Green, M.J. 1989a:57.

Green, M.J. 1989a:57.


Green, M.J. 1995a:126 and 127; Green, M.J. 1995b:474.

Green, M.J. 1989a:60; Green, M.J. 1995a:126.

Green, M.J. 1989a:42.


Green, M.J. 1989a:57.


Derks:117.

The Tungri tribal territory.

Esperandieu:VI.4828.


Wightman 1985:182.


Birkhan:621.


Grenier 1945:828.

On the border of the Treveri tribal territory and the province of Upper Germany.

Esperandieu: XIV.8436.

Esperandieu: XIV.8435 and .

Birkan: 622.

Horne & King: 441.


Esperandieu: V.4470.


Green, M.J. 1995a:103; Green, M.J. 1996b:30.

IG IV.952.

Jenkins: 65.


Significantly, the name of the site is the equivalent of the Celtic name Icovellauna, which means “Good Water” and is a goddess worshipped at the octagonal Nymphaeum of Sablon near Divodurum [Metz] (Grenier 1958:828).

Green, M.J. 1995a: 103; Green, M.J. 1996b:30.

IG IV.952.

Jenkins: 65.


Also known as the temple of Lenus Mars (Horne & King: 481).

The Treveri tribal territory.


Green, M.J. 1993:22.

Also known as the temple of Lenus Mars (Horne & King: 481).

The Treveri tribal territory.


CIL XIII.4119.


Hettner: 31; Hatt 1979:129, 133.

P-W 1955.264; Grenier 1958:876.


Hettner:31; Hatt 1979:129 and 133


Green, M.J. 1996b:30.

Grenier 1945:349; Duval 1957:57 and 93; de Vries 1961:141; MacCana:49; Green, M.J. 1989a:45; Green, M.J. 1995b:474. See page CLXXXVI.

Duval 1957:57 and 93.


de Vries 1961:141.


The Mediomatrici tribal territory.

Esperandieu: VI.4566.

CIL XIII.4542.

Esperandieu:4566, CIL XIII.4542; Esperandieu:4568, CIL XIII.4543.

Green, M.J. 1989a:42 and 54; Green, M.J. 1995a:130.

Linckenheld:89.

Linckenheld: 60 and 90.

Esperandieu: VI.4566, CIL XIII.4542; Esperandieu: VI.4568, CIL XIII.4543.
747 Linckenheld:60.
748 Linckenheld:60 and 85; Green, M.J. 1986a:97; Green, M.J. 1989a:42 and 47; Green, M.J. 1992:212; Green, M.J. 1995a:128; Birkhan:611.
749 Reinach:46; Linckenheld:60 and 85; Green, M.J. 1986a:97; Green, M.J. 1989a:42, 47 and 48; Green, M.J. 1992:211; Green, M.J. 1995a:128; Birkhan:611.
750 Esperandieu:VI.4566.
751 Green, M.J. 1995a:128.
752 Esperandieu:VI.4568.
753 Green, M.J. 1995a:131; Birkhan:611.
755 Linckenheld:90.
756 Linckenheld:91.
757 Linckenheld:78.
758 Esperandieu:VI.4566 and 4568.
759 Esperandieu:VI.6000.
760 Green, M.J. 1995a:130.
761 Green, M.J. 1995a:130.
762 Green, M.J. 1989a:73; Aldhouse-Green:106.
763 Green, M.J. 1989a:73.
766 Toutain:243.
767 von Petrikovits:105.
769 Duval 1957:63.
770 Esperandieu:VI.4678.
771 The Leuci tribal territory.
772 Esperandieu:VI.4937.
773 The Treveri tribal territory.
775 Green, M.J. 1986a:78.
776 Rhys:100; MacCulloch 1911:44; MacCulloch 1948:29; Duval 1957:52 and 55; de Vries 1961:120 and 121; MacCana:49; Powell:155; Green, M.J. 1986:81; Green, M.J. 1989b:100; Green, M.J. 1993:54; Green, M.J. 1995:106; Clarus:40.

XXVI
Rhys:100; MacCulloch 1911:44; MacCulloch 1948:30; Duval 1957:52 and 54; MacCana:49-50; Powell:155; Green, M.J. 1986a:81, 82 and 210; Green, M.J. 1989b:105; Green, M.J. 1995:54; Clarris:40; Deyts 1992:60.

Esperandieu:VIII.6307, 6309, 6337, 6342, 6344, 6349, 6353, 6401, 6412, 6559, 6560; IX.6563, 6567, 6569; XI.7760, 7761, 7764, 7766 and 7777.

Lambrechts 1942:43.

The Nervii tribal territory.


MacCulloch 1911:44.

Lambrechts 1942:43.

The Pictones tribal territory.

Esperandieu:II.1394.

Linckenheld:66.

Bober:39.

Toutain:245.


The Ambiani tribal territory.

The Mediomatrici tribal territory.

The Treveri tribal territory.


Linckenheld:69.

Linckenheld:69.

Linckenheld:70.

MacCana:49.

Aldhouse-Green:111.

Bhreathnach:246; Aldhouse-Green:111.

Belgic Gaul: Esperandieu:V.3670 and 3673 (Cybele), V.3666, 3783, 4116, 4126, 4132, 4140, 4143, 4151, 4214, 4429, 4430, 4472, 4477, 4482, 4495, 4497 and VI. 4641, 4797, 4939, 5017, 5107, 5236, 5250, 5252 (Diana), VI.5127 (Diana and Apollo), V.4003-4, 4141, 4247, 4286 and VI. 4662, 4899, 4936, 4940, 4950, 5028, 5067, 5081, 5125, 5128 and 5248 (Fortuna), V.3793, 4299 and VI.4982 (Isis), V.3796, 3930, 3992, 4123, 4141, 4214, 4212, 4212-6, 4219-30, 4132, 4135, 4225, 4228, 4232, 4359, 4425, 4485, 4498 and VI.4628, 4717, 4895, 4918, 4927, 4930-31, 4933, 5022, 5100, 5116, 5129, 5230, 5233, 5235 and 7592 (Minerva), VI.4671 (Minerva and Mars), V.3660, 3671, 3681, 3792, 3984, 3989, 4015, 4227, 4338 and VI.4510, 4623, 4688, 4718-19, 4722, 4725, 4759, 4797, 4824, 4827, 4834, 4836, 4945, 4994-85, 5028, 5090 and 5130 (Venus), V.3664 and VI.5127 (Venus and Vulcan) and V.4130 (Venus and Mercury).

Aquitania: Esperandieu:II.892, 1242, 1399, 1408 (Cybele), II.892, 929, 1076, 1243, 1261, 1324, 1372 (Diana), II.1416 (Fortuna), II.926-7 and 1056 (Isis), II.1418, 1528, 1563 and 1580 (Abundantia), II.892, 898, 906-7, 916, 1009, 1065-6, 1240, 1245, 1323, 1392, 1408, 1410, 1706, 1720 and 1724 (Minerva), II.1593 (Minerva and Mars), II.901-905, 917-8, 1005, 1052, 1066, 1076, 1204, 1215, 1256, 1259, 1286, 1302, 1305, 1541, 1604, 1639 and 1715 (Venus), II.1593 (Venus, Apollo and Mercury).

Dhronecken: Cybele and Venus (Bertin No.71; Cabuy:272); Fliessem/Otrang: Diana (Cabuy:279); Graach: Cybele (Cabuy:282); Gusenburg: Cybele; Diana; Fortuna; Venus (Cabuy:284); Hochsherd: Diana (Bertin No.102), Cabuy, Fortuna and Venus (Cabuy:293); Hofstadte-lès-Alost: Cybele (Bertin No.103); Martelange: Diana and Venus (Cabuy:360); Möhn: Fortuna and Venus (Cabuy:303); Nattenheim: Diana (Bertin No.139); Serrig: Diana (Cabuy:337); Tawern: "Artemis of Ephesus" and Isis (Cabuy:343); Velosne: Victory(?) (Bertin No. 223; Cabuy:344).

Belgic Gaul: CIL XIII.3459, 3605, 4104, 4469 and 4471 (Diana); 3461 (Isis); 4467 (Venus). Aquitania: CIL XIII.83, 504-525, 572-573, 947 and 11042 (Cybele/Magna Mater); 382 and 1495 (Diana); 153 (Isis).
Finally, Sucebellus or a woman a basket offruits, and has been proved for the first time in ancient author. This is based on two points. The first is the Sulzbach monument in southern Germany, which depicts a seated couple, the man holding an unrolled scroll, the woman a basket of fruits, and has an inscription CIL XIII.6322- DEAE SANCTAE (?) AERECVRAE ET DITI PATRI) identifying the god as Dispater; therefore, it is reasoned that, since this is the god Caesar calls Dispater, from the inscription and if Dispater is depicted with no mallet, dog or olla, then the god with the mallet is not Dispater. This is apparently confirmed by the fact that there are no images of the god with the mallet in the region of “Dispater” and Aerecura and no image of this deity in the area of the god with the mallet. The second point has three prongs. First there are a large number of monuments of Sucebellus in which one can recognise Silvanus and has led some to assign all monuments of Sucebellus to Silvanus; Linckenheld (Linckenheld:75) is right to suggest that this is fallacious. Second, some monuments with the name of Silvanus depict him with a mallet or an olla. Finally, Sucebellus is sometimes depicted with a pruning knife or a syrinx, attributes of Silvanus.

Birkan 610.  
Bober 40; Duval 1957:79; de Vries 1961:93; Deyts 1992:90. This is based on two points. The first is the Sulzbach monument in southern Germany, which depicts a seated couple, the man holding an unrolled scroll, the woman a basket of fruits, and has an inscription CIL XIII.6322- DEAE SANCTAE (?) AERECVRAE ET DITI PATRI) identifying the god as Dispater; therefore, it is reasoned that, since this is the god Caesar calls Dispater, from the inscription and if Dispater is depicted with no mallet, dog or olla, then the god with the mallet is not Dispater. This is apparently confirmed by the fact that there are no images of the god with the mallet in the region of “Dispater” and Aerecura and no image of this deity in the area of the god with the mallet. The second point has three prongs. First there are a large number of monuments of Sucebellus in which one can recognise Silvanus and has led some to assign all monuments of Sucebellus to Silvanus; Linckenheld (Linckenheld:75) is right to suggest that this is fallacious. Second, some monuments with the name of Silvanus depict him with a mallet or an olla. Finally, Sucebellus is sometimes depicted with a pruning knife or a syrinx, attributes of Silvanus.
Linckenheld’s (Linckenheld:46-49) explanation is based on the fact that Celtic deities can sometimes be assimilated to one Roman deity and his image, sometimes to another, depending on which activity is emphasised. Therefore, in southern Germany the Celtic Disputer had the form on the Sulzbach monument, while in the Rhone valley he resembled Sucellus; this is explained by the fact that that region was a heavily-Romanised province due to the presence of the Roman army. Logically, Linckenheld contends, this would mean that there was no form of a god with a mallet in southern Germany or a deity like that from Sulzbach in the Rhone valley or in that region where images of Sucellus have been found and this is indeed the case. As regards the identification of Silvanus, a fertility deity, with Sucellus Linckenheld argues that in the cases where the images of Sucellus had the attributes of the Roman Silvanus, Sucellus’ *numen* had imported some traits, but had not changed his distinct nature. In iconography and literature Silvanus was part-human and was identified with Pan. One of the three aspects of Silvanus was Silvanus *domesticus*, protector of the home (the others were *agrestis* and one for the boundaries); Linckenheld argues that Sucellus imported the clothing and attributes of Silvanus because there was no other deity in the Roman pantheon, who expressed so well the fertility and domestic functions of Sucellus. This is confirmed by the fact that Silvanus’ consort, Diana, who did not express the same functions as Nantosuelt, is represented only in the very Romanised, but Nantosuelt is represented everywhere else and the fact that the assimilation of Sucellus with Silvanus was in the highly Romanised Lower Rhone.

Birks:610.

Heichelheim & Housman:308; Duval 1957:62 and 63; Deuts 1992:94; De Vries (De Vries 1961:95) disagrees, although accepting that the club connects the Dagda with Succellus (De Vries 1961:38).

Sterckx 1995:12.

Aquitania:Higounet:61.

York:91. De Vries (De Vries 1961:95) disagrees, although accepting that the club connects the Dagda with Succellus (De Vries 1961:38).

Belgc Gaub;Vendryes 1948:286-287; Aquitania:Higounet:64.


Birks:100.

Birks:91.

CIL XIII.4304- Divodurum [Metz] in the Mediomatrici tribal territory.

CIL XIII.7781- In the Treveri tribal territory.

CIL XIII.3659 (In the Treveri tribal territory) and 4500 (Kreuzwald-pres-Metz in the Mediomatrici tribal territory).

CIL XIII.4564-Marsal in the Mediomatrici tribal territory.

CIL XIII.4256- Tholey on the border of the Treveri and Mediomatrici tribal territories.

CIL XIII.4308- Divodurum [Metz] in the Mediomatrici tribal territory.

CIL XIII.4130- Bitburg in the Treveri tribal territory.

CIL XIII.3660 (Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Treves] in the Treveri tribal territory) and 4257 (Tholey on the border of the Treveri and Mediomatrici tribal territories).

CIL XIII.1517, 1525 and 4550- Le Donon on the border of the Leuci, Mediomatrici tribal territories and Upper Germany.

CIL XIII.1522- Puy-de-Dôme in the Arvernan tribal territory.


CIL III.1368- Puy-de-Dôme in the Arvernan tribal territory.

CIL XIII.1532- Puy-de-Dôme in the Arvernan tribal territory.


CIL XIII.577- Burdigala [Bordeaux] in the Bituriges Vivi tribal territory.

CIL XIII.3980 (Orolaunum [Arlon] in the Treveri tribal territory) and 8701 (Set up by inhabitants of the Remi tribal territory) and AE 1935.64 (Divodurum [Reims] in the Remi tribal territory).

CIL XIII.4507, 6455 and 6572- Pons Sarravi [Sarrebrück/Sarrebourg] in the Mediomatri tribal territory and CIL XIII.4258- Tholey on the border of the Treveri and Mediomatrici tribal territories.

CIL XIII.3632, 3653 and 11313- Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trièves] in the Treveri tribal territory.
The Temple of Trier-'Irminenwingert in Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trièves] in the Treveri tribal territory.

CIL XIII.3654 (Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trièves] in the Treveri tribal territory) and Finke 20 and 21 (The Temple of Trier-'Irminenwingert in Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trièves] in the Treveri tribal territory).

CIL XIII.4119- Möhn in the Treveri tribal territory.

CIL XIII.4049- Dalheim in the Treveri tribal territory.

CIL XIII.4366- Loudenvielle.

CIL XIII.1353- Berry in the Bituriges Cubes tribal territory.

CIL XIII.87- Gourdon.


CIL XIII.1516- Auvergne in the Arverni tribal territory.


CIL XIII.1516- Auvergne in the Arverni tribal territory.


CIL XIII.1516- Auvergne in the Arverni tribal territory.
CIL XIII.15- Caumont in the Ruteni tribal territory.
CIL XIII.41- Saint-Béat in the Volcae Tectosages tribal territory.
CIL XIII.63- Saint-Pé d’Ardet in the Convenae tribal territory.
CIL XIII.64 (Saint-Pé d’Ardet), 70 (Ourde), 71 (Ourde) and 73 (Malvezie) in the Convenae tribal territory; AE 1951.117- Saint-Pé d’Ardet in the Convenae tribal territory.
CIL XIII.31- Saint-Béat in the Volcae Tectosages tribal territory.
CIL XIII.323- Cier-de-Luchon in the Convenae tribal territory.
CIL XIII.301- Redous in the Convenae tribal territory.
AE 1957.227- Gensac-de-Boulogne.
CIL XIII.1326- Genouilly in the Bituriges Cubes tribal territory.
CIL XIII.109- Tardets in the Tarbelli tribal territory.
CIL XIII.65- Saint-Pé d’Ardet in the Convenae tribal territory.
CIL XIII.42- Saint-Beat in the Volcae Tectosages tribal territory.
CIL XIII.370, 372 and 374- Cadeac in the Convenae tribal territory.
CIL XIII.96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 107 and 108- Ardiège in the Convenae tribal territory.
CIL XIII.11082- Avaricum [Bourges] in the Bituriges Cubes tribal territory.
CIL XIII.11153- Gièvres in the Bituriges Cubes tribal territory.
CIL XIII.586- Burdigala [Bordeaux] in the Bituriges Vivi tribal territory.
CIL XIII.11162- Sagonne in the Bituriges Cubes tribal territory.
CIL XIII.950- Périgueux in the Petrucores tribal territory.
CIL XIII.164- Saint-Placard in the Convenae tribal territory.
CIL XIII.11162- Sagonne in the Bituriges Cubes tribal territory.
CIL XIII.146- Eoux.
CIL XIII.58- Eup.
CIL XIII.397- In the Pyrenees.
CIL XIII.181- Montégut.
CIL XIII.49- Ore.
CIL XIII.345, 346, 347 and 348- Luchon; AE 1939.50-Montauban-de-Luchon
CIL XIII.231- Tibiran.
CIL XIII.154- Mondilhan.
CIL XIII.334 and 335- Garin.
CIL XIII.142- Alan.
CIL XIII.388- Asque.
CIL XIII.130- Arbas.
CIL XIII.4142- Murlenbach in the Treveri tribal territory.
CIL XIII.755a-b- Wederath in the Treveri tribal territory.
CIL XIII.4297- Divodurum [Metz] in the Mediomatrici tribal territory.
985 **KLT 180** - The Temple of Trier-’Irminenwingert in *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves] in the Treveri tribal territory.

986 **KLT 301** - The Alctahtal temple precinct in *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves] in the Treveri tribal territory.

987 *AE* 1968.311- Strée-Lez-Huy in the Tungri tribal territory.

988 **Van Andringa 2002**.302-304.

989 **ILTG** 168- Vernais in the Bituriges Cubes tribal territory.

990 **ILTG** 155- Rivières in the Santones tribal territory.

991 **CIL XIII.1376-7**- *Aqua Neri* [Néris] in the Bituriges Cubes tribal territory.
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152 1km south of the river Aisne (Fichtl:108).
155 Lambot:68.
157 5km from the frontier with the Ambiani (Cadoux 1981:282).
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Chapter Five
Gallic Religious Rituals
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Significant emphasis
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   The emphasis is on giving up and deprivation
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   Death is a necessary factor in all sacrifice
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30 In Greece and Rome, white victims were for sky deities and black victims for chthonic deities and, in the Vedic avamedha sacrifice, the horse had to be red and a stallion. It seems that in the sacrifice recorded by Pliny (Pliny.H.N.XVI.250-251) it was essential that the victims were white.
32 Hubert & Mauss 1964:29, n.159.
33 This tripartite division of sacrificial victims is reflected in and supported by the tripartite division of those to be sacrificed after the war between the Hermundari and the Chatti (Tac.Ann.XIII.57) and of the booty by three German tribes, the Cherusci laying claim to the horses, the Suebi to the gold and silver and the Sicambri the prisoners (Flor.II.iii.12.24-25).
36 Aldhouse-Green 2001:139.
37 Although it can be seen that the vast majority of examples of human sacrifice in Greek literature was in myths, the reference by Plutarch (Plut.Them.XIII.2) contradicts Green’s statement that “for the Classical Greeks...human sacrifice was acceptable only in terms of a mythical past” (Green, M.J. 1998:171).
38 Aldhouse-Green 2001:142.
39 Aldhouse-Green 2001:139.
40 Aldhouse-Green 2001:140.
41 Aldhouse-Green 2001:139.
42 Aldhouse-Green 2001:139.
43 Human sacrifice has been an allegation used as black propaganda against individuals: Apollodorus, tyrant of Cassandreia (Diod.XXII.5.1; Polyaenus.Start VI.7.2; Plut.De Sera Num. Vind.556d; Ael.V.H. XIV.41); Diegylis, tyrant of Thrace (Diod.XXXIII.14.5); supporters of the Tarquinii (Plut.Publ.IV.1); Catiline (Sall.Cat.XXII.1-2; Flor.II12.4; Plut.Cic.X.4; Dio.XXXVII.30.3; Tert.Apol. IX.9; Min.Fel. Oct.XXX.5); Marius (Plut.Parallele Graec.Rom.XX); Pompey (Plin.Ep.IX.22 Dio.XLVIII.48.5); Octavian (Vell.II.74.4; Sen.Clem.I.11.1-2; App.B.Civ.V.48-49; Suet.Aug.XV; Dio.XLIII.14.4) and against whole groups: the Jews (Jos.Ap.II.92-96 and 121; FGrHist.730); bad Emperors (Commodus (SHA.Comm.IX.6); Didius Julianus (Dio.IXXII.15.5); Elagabalus (Dio.LXXIX.11; SHA.EI.VIII.1-2)) and anti-Christian emperors (Valerian (Eus.HE.VII.10.4); Maxentius (Eus.V.Const.1.36); and Julian (Theodoret.HE.III.26-27)).
44 Brown:168; Aldhouse-Green 2001:139.
45 Royal sons, such as those of Athamas, Erechtheus, Idomeneus, Manasseh and Ahaz, Kings of Judah, and Mesha, King of Moab; the children of Greek or Carthaginian nobility; boys of Persian noble families; captured nobles, such as the Trojans and Persians sacrificed by Achilles and the Greeks respectively; high-born virgins, such as the daughter of the warlord and governor Jephthah; royal virgins, such as Iphigenia or Agesilaus’ daughter; or captured royal virgins, such as Polyxena.
46 Aldhouse-Green 2001:140.
49 Webster, J. 1992:131
51 Aldhouse-Green 2001:122 and 139.
52 Aldhouse-Green 2001:122. A 30 year old woman with osteoporosis was strangled and buried at Elling in Denmark in last centuries BCE (van den Sanden:141), a boy, 14, with a deformity and dated to 2nd or 1st century BCE, was strangled and buried at Kayhausen and the 40 to 50 year old Tollund Man, c.250 BCE, had rheumatism in his thoracic vertebrae (Aldhouse-Green 2001:122-123).
53 Aldhouse-Green 2001:139.
54 Hubert & Mauss 1964:25.
55 Hubert & Mauss 1964:25.
Reinach 1912:26; Tylor:375; Beattie:31; Hughes:3. Beattie (Beattie:31) differentiates between a deity and an unidentified supernatural force, but Aldhouse-Green (Aldhouse-Green 2001:34) rightly considers this division to be unnecessary and spurious. Beattie:32.
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Green, M.J. 1998:84.

Beattie:37.

Beattie:32.

82 Wait 1985:3-4.

Another form of manipulation of the deity to act in a certain way (Wait 1985:6).

They impart to persons or institutions the authority of religious beliefs (Wait 1985:6). The rest are: mortuary and funerary rituals (Wait 1985:5); rites of passage (Wait 1985:5) and divination (Wait 1985:5).

Yerkes:5.

Beattie:32.


Hubert & Mauss 1964:14.

Hubert & Mauss 1964:14.

Brunaux 1996:121.


Although Green (Green, M.J. 1998:172) says there is no justification to mistrust all the evidence and at least some may be relatively trustworthy (Green, M.J. 1998:174).

The terms “ritual”, “sacrificial ” or “ceremonial murder”, used by some modern authors, such as Le Roux (Le Roux 1967a:320), Green (Green, M.J. 1993:68; Green, M.J. 1997:76; Green, M.J. 1998:172, 174, 175, 176, 177,178 and 182) and Aldhouse-Green (Aldhouse-Green 2001:140) are loaded, culturally-based value judgements, which should be avoided. Such ethnocentricity is ironic in view of Green’s justifiable criticism of the ethnocentrism of the Greek ethnographer (Diod.V.32.6) (Green, M.J. 1997:76) and admonishments to avoid imposing modern value-judgements on the past (Green, M.J. 1998:171).


Jullian 1909:160; Chadwick:37. Brunaux (Brunaux 1996:118) rightly says that Jullian’s approach is unconnected with the rite but arises from the fact that Jullian considers himself to be a direct descendant of the practitioners of human sacrifice.
The Canaanites: (2 Kii.17:31); the Israelites (Jdg.11:31, 34 and 39; 2 Kii.3:27; 21:6 and 23:10; 2 Chr. 28:3; Ps.106:37-38; Jer.7:31, 19:4-5 and 32:35; Ezk.16:20-21, 20:31, 23:37 and 39,); the Phoenicians (Curt. IV.3.23; Euseb.Praep.evang.I.10.45 and IV.16.11; Porphyry.Absbt.II.56.1) the Carthaginians (Apollod.Epit. III.21-22; Enn.Ann. VII.Frag 221; Cie.De rep. III.9.1; Dion. XIII.86.3 and XX.14.4-5; Dion. Hal.Ant.I.38; Sil.Pun.IV.765; Paus.III.9.3; Plut.De Superst.XIII C-D and De Sera Num. Vind.552A; Sext. Emp.Pyr.III.221; Porphyry.Absbt.II.27.2; Lactant.Dev.Inst.1.21.4; Tert.Apol. IX.2-3; Min.Fel.Oct.XX.X; Justin.Epit.XIX.1.10; August.De civ.D.VII.19 and 26; Oros.IV.6.3-5); and the Egyptians according to Cicero (Cie.De rep. III.9.15), Diodorus Siculus (Diod.I.88.4-5); Ovid (Ov.Ars Amo.I.649-652), Plutarch (Plut.Parallela Graec.Rom.XXXVIII) and Minucius Felix (Min.Fel.Oct. XXX.4), but denied by Herodotus (Hdt.II.45). Even the Persians are alleged to have performed it once (Hdt.VII.114; Plut.De Superb.XIII).

In Greek mythology and literature there is the sacrifice by Idomeneus, the King of Crete, of his son (Serv.Aen.III.121 and XI.264), by Erechtheus of his daughter (Eur.Ion.278; Lycurg.Leoc.98-101; Apollod.Bibl.III.15.4; FGrHist 325 F 4; Porphyry.Absbt.II.56; Clemen.Exhortad gr.III), of Iphigenia to Artemis by Agamemnon (Aes.Ag. 224-230; Soph.EL570-572; Eur.IA.1547-1550 and 1578-1583 and I.T.34), of Phrixos by Athamas (Hdt. VII.197; Apollod.Bibl.I.9.1) of captured Trojan nobles by Achilles at the grave of Patroclus (Hom.II. XXXIII.175-184) of Polyxena by the Greeks at the grave of Achilles (Eur.Hec.220-225; Tro.622-623; Ov.Met.XIII.441-452), of two boys by Menelaus (Hdt.II.119), of the daughters of Hyacinthus (Apollod.Bibl.III.15.8 and Epit.1.7; FGrHist 325 F 4) and of Leos (Ael.V.H.XII.28; Paus.I.5.2), of a virgin by Demophon (Eur.H.F.408-409 and 492-493), of noble daughters for victory (Paus.IX.17.1), of noble maidens to stop a plague (Plut.Parallela Graec.Rom. XXXV) and of the victims to the Minotaur (Plut.Thes.XXXIII); in Greek history there is the record of a sacrifice of Persian noble prisoners (Plut.Them.XII), the sacrifice to Artemis Tridaria (Paus.VII.19. 1-5), to Phoebus Apollo (Ov.Ib.465-466), of criminals to Apollo (Strab.X.2.9), Agesilaus’ failure to sacrifice his daughter (Plut.Agis.VL.4-6; Paus.III.9.3), Pelopidas’ failure to sacrifice a virgin (Plut.Pelop.XXI.XXII) (Hughes:73-136). The Romans practised human sacrifice early in their history (Ov. Fasti.V.625-634) and sacrificed two Gauls and two Greeks in the Forum Boarium in the preparation for war against the Insubres in 225 BCE (Plut.Marc.III; Oros.IV.13.3), in panic after the battle of Cannae in 216 BCE (Liv.II.XII.56.9; Dio.XII.50.4; Plin.H.N.XXVIII.3.12; Plut.Quaest.Rom.LXXXIII; Min.Fel.Oct.XX.XX.4) and even, according to Rives, in 114 BCE (Liv. Per.63); even Aeneas was allowed to perform human sacrifice at the funeral of Pallas (Verg.Aen.XI.81-82). It was practised by the Italians (Plut.Parallela Graec.Rom.XXXV and XXXVIII) and the Syracusans were instructed to perform it to stop a plague (Plut.Parallela Graec.Rom.XIX),

James:99, such as in West Africa, among the Khonds of Bengal, the Aztecs of Mexico and the Inca Empire of Peru.

O’Curry:9; MacCulloch 1911:236 and 238; Wallace:65.

Stokes:35.

MacCulloch 1911:236, 237 and 239.

MacCulloch 1911:234.

Green, 1979:71.

Green, 1979:71.


Branaux 1996:129.

The Cimbri (Strab.VII.2.3; Oros. V.16.6; Flor.II.iii.12. 24) and the Getae are also reported as sacrificing prisoners of war, the latter, like the Scordisci, to Mars (Jordanes.Get.V). The references to human sacrifice by the Greeks and Romans are often of prisoners of war (Hom.II.XXXIII.175-184; Plut. Them.XIII.2; Verg.Aen.XI.59-93 and, according to Aldhouse-Green (Aldhouse-Green: 142), Plut. Marc.III; Livy.XII.57.6; Plin.H.N.XXVIII.3.12.

Kendrick:122 and 122-123.


Kendrick:123.

MacCulloch 1911:233-234.

Bayet:64.

Bayet:64.

Bayet:64.

Bayet:65.

XLVII
ironically, Bayet then seems to try to undermine his argument by suggesting that it is an uncharacteristic example, based on the fact that Diodorus is the only one to record this event, the suggestion being that, because of this, it is wrong, and on the fact that Diodorus himself refers to it as an act \(\text{βουδικάς} \text{κοί} \text{πεντελώς} \). Neither of these prove that it is unusual. Firstly, it is illogical to assume that the uniqueness of a report automatically renders it false or even unreliable. In fact, the very uniqueness of the report could be viewed as supporting its accuracy; most ancient authors wrote about the Western Celts and the Gauls specifically with few examples about the Galatians and, therefore, it would be strange if this incident had been reported by many people. Secondly, Diodorus' criticism of the act does not mean it was unusual, but is an ethnocentric value-judgement typical of Diodorus, as seen in his remark about sacrifice by impalement (Diod.V.32.6).

Bayet:65.

Bayet:69.

Bayet (Bayet:69) claims that a second example is when the Aedui take Roman citizens into slavery (Caes.B.G.VII.42.3); however, these Romans seem to have been civilians and, therefore, were not actual prisoners of war.

Koch & Carey:22.

Bayet:69.


Strabo, in a different context entirely (Strab.IV.4.6), claims that the Celts smeared their arrows with the poisonous juice of a fruit, which Strabo describes. Although it is not mentioned as being concerned with sacrifice, it is possible that this poison was used in this particular sacrifice. Whether poisonous arrows were used or not, it is reasonable to conclude that it was the arrows which were the instrument for the infliction of death of the victim and not the impalement, which was probably just the means to display the victim \(\text{ἐν} \text{τόσι} \text{τερπότις} \). Spence (Spence:107) says that this sacrifice recalls the record of Boudicca's impalement of the women of Londinium [London] (Dio.LXII.7). Dio (Dio.LXII.7.2) describes how the forces under Boudicca impaled the noblest of the captured women during their sacrifices and festivities in their sacred places; as described by Dio, it has the appearance of the sacrifice conducted in a summary fashion, but, as de Vries (de Vries 1961:224) says, it may have been just an act of revenge.

Green, M.J. 1997:71. This is incorrect; Caesar mentions the presence of archers at the siege of Alesia (Caes.B.G.VII.80.3 and 7).


Spence:106.


Jullian 1909:158.


King, A. 1990:52.

MacCulloch1911:235.


Brunaux 1988:122.

Bayet:74; Webster, J. 1992:133.


Wallace:64.

Kendrick:122.

The Getae are reported as consecrating the first fruits of booty (Jordanes.Get.V).

Reinach points out and Bayet (Reinach, S. 1912:215; Bayet:67) agrees that the words \text{postis repetitis ab armis} (Lec.I.450-451) are not concerned with sacrifices prior to battle, but, as Koch and Carey (Koch & Carey:25) translate, with the suspension of hostilities.

MacCulloch 1911:233.


Bayet:68.

Bayet's (Bayet:63) suggestion, that the killing of the women and children was not a sacrifice to bring about victory but, faced with overwhelming odds and certain defeat, was to prevent them becoming slaves, is a possible alternative explanation. It is supported by the fact that, as Bayet (Bayet:63) points out, although Justin interprets the massacre as an expiatory sacrifice, the Gauls are described as \text{in furorem versi} and by similar acts by Cimbri women (Flor.I.iii.3:16-17) and women of
the Cenni (Dio.LXXVIII.14.2). But Callian women acted the same (Paus.X.22.4), ironically to avoid capture by Gauls.

150 Julian 1903:53; MacCulloch 1911:234.
151 MacCulloch 1911:239.
152 Bayet:68.
153 Bayet:68, 71 and 78.
154 Bayet:71.
155 Bayet:
157 Strangely Brunaux (Brunaux 1986a:129) implies that Caesar is the only one to talk of this sacrifice.
159 Tierney and Green (Tierney:189-275; Green, M.J. 1998:175) accept that they both got the information from Posidonius.
160 Bayet:72 and 74.
163 O'Cathain:24.
165 Spence:104.
167 Hamilton:130.
169 Aldhouse-Green 2001:68.
170 Julian 1909:158.
171 Bayet:78.
172 Le Roux 1955a:57.
173 Le Roux 1955a:56.
175 Green (Green, M.J. 1998:175) infers this.

Applying his theory of the tripartite division of the society of the ancient Indo-European peoples (First function-sacerdotal; second function-warrior; and third function-production and commerce) to human sacrifices, Dumézil (Dumézil 1953:118-159), assuming that separate sacrifices were once performed for the deities of the three different functions, argues that death by hanging is a ritual of the first function and death by drowning is a ritual of the second function. Ward (Ward 1970:135) accepts the idea, interprets each of the sacrifices recorded by the Berne Scholiasts as corresponding to one of the three social functions, and states that, in Celtic religion, hanging by a noose was a sacrifice of the first function, death by fire was a sacrifice of the second and drowning was a sacrifice of the third function. This seems to be confirmed by two points. The use of fire by Vercingetorix to execute men reluctant to perform military service, second function duties, and the presence of this Indo-European concept in Finnish, and therefore non-Indo-European, lore, spread by diffusion; Talley (Talley:143) points out that death by fire and drowning correspond to the second and third functions respectively, although burial has replaced hanging for the first function. But it does not explain the use of fire to kill Valerius Procillus and to execute wives convicted of murdering their husbands. Unless
the reasons are that Procillus was the envoy of a general and it is used only for wives of nobles, who perform the second function. But the first idea is unconvincing and there is no suggestion by Caesar that the second is the case.

Wallace:70; Wait 1985:7.

Wallace:70.


Birkan:800.

Bayet: 75.


The description of the sacrifice to Esus has received a lot of attention. Deonna (Deonna 1958:9) points out that the word arbor can also have the sense of execution post, as in the phrase arbor infelix, and asks which is the meaning used by the Berne Scholiasts? Le Roux and Thévenot (Le Roux 1955a:53; Thévenot 1957b:443) point out that a dead man hung by the neck does not bleed and a wounded man would soon die and stop bleeding; both hold that a wound is needed and Deonna (Deonna 1958:10) agrees. Deonna (Deonna 1958: 11) says that the victim would have been hung from the tree so as to have his throat cut more conveniently by the sacrificer with a javelin. Presumably he would have been left to hang until all the blood runs out as in the preparation of kosher food. Duval, Le Roux and Benoît (Duval 1954:17; Le Roux 1955a:34; Benoît 1955:31; Duval 1957:22) all note that the Latin term suspenditur does not indicate a hanged person, but a suspended person. Both Le Roux and Thévenot conclude that the victim was not hung by the neck. Le Roux (Le Roux 1955a:53), questioning the idea that the victim was hung by the neck, proposes that s/he was hung either by the arms or by the limbs after having been wounded, which Deonna (Deonna 1958:11) considers as possible. Thévenot (Thévenot 1957b:445) points out that the verb digessit does not appear to have a subject and de Vries (de Vries 1961:98) feels that the phrase membra digessit is unclear. De Vries asks if this phrase means that the body is torn up or cut up or if it means that, after the blood has flowed out, the limbs go slack. Thévenot (Thévenot 1957b:445-447) attempts to answer these points and concludes that the victim was actually suspended in the branches of the tree, that the tree is the subject of the verb digessit and that the tree slowly kills the person; according to him the term in arboire does not mean that the victim was hung from the tree in the ordinary way, in which case the words de arboire or arbori would have been used, but means that the victim was fastened in the branches of the tree, not hung by the neck. Deonna (Deonna 1958:10) agrees with Thévenot that the victim was suspended and supports Le Roux’s suggestion by saying that this would also prefer the term ‘suspend’ rather than ‘hang’. Deonna (Deonna 1958:12) expands on Thévenot’s idea and says the victim is not just suspended in the tree, but broken; Deonna says that the tree is an active agent in the sacrifice, not a passive support, but an instrument of torture, bearing witness that the god has accepted the sacrifice and showing its will by its branches, bent the wrong way, being released and dismembering the body and letting the blood flow. Thévenot (Thévenot 1957b:444) points out that loss of blood does not bring about dislocation of the limbs, but is the result of it, a point accepted by Deonna (Deonna 1958:11). For this reason, according to Deonna (Deonna 1958:11), Duval and Thévenot use such words as “dilaceration” (Duval 1954:17), “démembrement” (Duval 1957:37) and “écartèlement” (Thévenot 1957b:445). Sergent (Sergent:393), although accepting that neither hanging nor suspension would cause a loss of blood and, therefore, that an external agent was necessary, contends that death was neither by strangling nor by dismemberment. On the basis that the phrase usque donec implies an interval of time between the suspension and the dismemberment, Sergent posits that death came about through a loss of blood, per cruorem, from a laceration and the body, abandonded in the tree, rotted and came apart, membra digessit. The proposed scenario, therefore, is that the victim was suspended in the tree and, while suspended, was lacerated, died from loss of blood and was left until the body came apart through putrefaction, the torture itself, therefore, dispersing the limbs. Sergent (Sergent:398-399) claims that human remains dating to the 3rd to 2nd centuries BC found at, inter alia, Danbury, Gournay-sur-Arond, Llyn Cerrig Bach, Ribemont-sur-Ancre, Manching, Mont-Berny and Titelberg and characterising Celtic sanctuaries, is archaeological evidence, not for the sacrifice, but for the custom of exposing bodies for a long period, until they fell apart from putrefaction, recalling the phrase usque donec... membra digessit, and that this demonstrates that it was a Celtic custom. Admittedly in these cases the bodies are, unlike those in the sacrifice, decapitated bodies of, probably, warriors killed in battle.

Vendryes 1948:315; Duval 1957:24; Sjoestedt:55.
Le Roux (Le Roux 1955a:47-48) contrasts the three forms of violent death (liquid, fire and iron), mentioned in the three-fold death of a king in Irish myth, in a vat, in a redness of fire and surrounded by the iron of lances (Ramnoux:217), to the three types of sacrifice mentioned by the Commentary; the fire is devoted to Taranis, the liquid Teutates and Esus is connected to wood, not iron. Consequently, for the Continental Celts, violent death comes under the combined or separate efforts of liquid, fire and, unlike Ireland, wood. Vendryes (Vendryes 1948:315), on the other hand, followed by Powell (Powell 1980:182), suggests that the three methods of sacrifice may symbolise the three elements associated with vegetation and, therefore, fertility: water [Teutates]; air [Esus]; and fire [Taranis], something which Green (Green, M.J. 1998:177) finds suspiciously neat and, consequently, advises caution. The last element represents burning, which is the simplest method of replenishing the earth with nitrates.

Wallace:70; Wait 1985:7.
Sergent:397; Birkhan:800.
Hughes:139-165; Aldhouse-Green 2001:144.
Aldhouse-Green 2001:144.
Brunaux 1986a:133.
Aldhouse-Green 2001:144.
Aldhouse-Green 2001:144.
Brunaux 1986a:133.
Wallace:59.
Grenier 1945:359.
Ross 1986:166.

Lei di εξωμισθατειν, ὡστε τινὰ ἐμπίπτειν τὴν τοῦτο πεισσομένων.
Wallace:65.
Bayet:70.
Delattre:310-311.
Delattre:307.
Dandoy, Selinsky & Voigt:46-49.
Aldhouse-Green 2001:86.
Green, M.J. 1993:68; Cunliffe 1997:192; Green, M.J. 1998:179; Aldhouse-Green 2001:51 and 87. Interestingly two of the three methods used on this person leave no trace.
251 O’Flóinn:140.
256 Briggs:168-182.
258 Limbs and torso from Danebury; a piece of skull from Hayling Island; and the dismembered remains of a child from Wandlesbury.
259 Henig:23.
263 Lambot & Ménial:66-83.
264 Lambot & Ménial:84; Aldhouse-Green 2001:130.
266 Ménial 2001:83.
268 Brunaux 1996:120.
270 Brunaux 1986a:134; Brunaux 1996:120.
271 Fichtl:35.
272 Lambot:75.
273 Brunaux 1996:118.
274 Brunaux 1996:119.
275 Brunaux 1996:120.
276 Brunaux 1996:120.
277 Brunaux 1986a:134.
279 Brunaux 1996:120.
280 Brunaux 1996:120.
283 Brunaux 1996:119-120.
287 δαφροὶς by Strabo and Diodorus Siculus (Strab.IV.4.5; Diod.V.32.6) and homo by Caesar (Caes.B.G.VI.16.2, 3 and 4), as opposed to the word for “man” δαφρός and vir respectively.
288 Hubert 1934:245.
289 Kendrick:122; Hubert 1934:244.
290 Kendrick:122.
292 He cites the substitution of a faun for Iphigenia and a lamb for Isaac as examples.
295 Unless one dismisses it all as Caesar’s propaganda.
Unless one is expected to believe that they disapproved of and disagreed with the practices being conducted under their auspices and control, but stood by and did nothing, which makes them morally inferior to the sacrificers.

MacCulloch 1911:236.

Captain Cook in the South Pacific witnessed an example of human sacrifice within a much shorter time than Caesar’s presence in Gaul.

There is no indication that Procillus was going to be sacrificed; the intended burning to death may have been a form of execution.

Bayet:70, 78 and 80.

Either stated (Diod.XX.14.4; Porph.Abst.II.56; Euseb.Praep.evang.I.10.45; Orosius.IV.6.3), obvious (2 Kings.3:27; Lact.Plac.Comm.inStatiiTheb.X.793; Serv.adAen.III.57; Gloss.Luc.adLuc. X.334) or implied (Diod.XIII.86.3 and XXXI.13; Curt.IV.3.23; Just.Epit.XXVI.2.2).

Zecchini:40.

Brunaux 1996:121.

Wait 1985:151.

Webster, J. 1992:130.


Webster, J. 1992:130. Webster proposes that the passage by Parthenius (Parth.Amat.Narr.30) “is the only probable reference to the sacrifice of animals by individuals”. It is difficult to see how this can be, since the passage contains no reference to the act or even concept of sacrifice.

Contrary to the translation by Koch and Carey (Koch & Carey:22) there is no mention of burning, merely sacrificing, there is no translation of in unum locum and, as will be seen, “the rest”, the inanimate objects, were left untouched in loci consecrati.

de Vries 1961:47 and 223.

MacCulloch 1948:53.

Brunaux 1996:104.

καθαρίζωσιν and κατακάδοσιν (Diod.V.32.6).

Obviously interpretatio Graeca for a Gallic goddess.

Brunaux 1996:105.

Brunaux 1996:105.

Green, M.J. 1996c:25.

Brunaux 2001:56.

Brunaux 1996:103.

Méniel 1987:118.

Méniel 2001:78.


Brunaux 1986a:120 and 121.


Méniel 1987:134.

Méniel 1987:134.

Brunaux 1986a:120; Green, M.J. 1993:70; Aldhouse-Green 2001:43.


Méniel 2001:78.

Méniel 2001:78.

Méniel 1987:127.

Méniel 1987:127.

Méniel 1987:127.

The list of domestic animals is small, consisting of only six species: sheep, cattle, pigs, goats, horses and dogs. This list is often reduced to only the first four, to which are added wild mammals, such as the hare, and birds, both domestic and wild, especially the corvidae family (Méniel 1987:121).

Méniel 1987:121.
At Gournay-sur-Aronde approximately 1,500 remains of cattle have been gathered in the ditch surrounding the enclosure on either side of the entrance, both providing the majority of cattle bones at this site and forming at least 40 examples of cattle (Méniel 1987:134; Méniel 1991:260; Brunaux 1996:74). These sacrificed animals are unusual because of both their advanced age and the abnormally high proportion of males, oxen and bulls (Brunaux 1986a:123; Méniel 1987:134; Méniel 1991:258) a majority of the animals (Brunaux 1986a:123).
First, and most obviously, the term is intimately linked with the suppression of doctrinal heterodoxy, any threat to the papal supremacy or even merely social change; none of these are present in Gallic society prior or even after the Roman Conquest. Secondly, although excommunication does not directly affect a person’s afterlife, the exclusion from the sacraments can affect the duration of his soul in Purgatory and, therefore, indirectly refers to the post mortem destination of the excommunicated party; there is no indication of this in the passage and the interdict refers solely to the present life of the interdicted person/s. Thirdly, excommunication can be reversed so that the excommunicated party can be restored to their previous state; the punishment by the Druids is permanent and nothing done by the interdicted party will restore their previous status. Finally, although excommunication has both a religious and a social result, s/he is not released from social obligations and even the social exclusion may be reduced in its effect if another’s interests are
affected; the Druidic prohibition affects not just religious activities, such as sacrifices, but also all social interaction completely.

Baumeister & Leary:497. This is called the Belongingness Hypothesis.

Forsyth:60 and 62.

Brunaux 1986a:124; Brunaux 1996:73. This sacrifice involved consumption but not by any human agent and deserves special examination. It is the only known example of the rite and only cattle are involved (Brunaux 1986a:123). Most of the victims were old bulls (Ménél 1987:134; Ménél 1991:258), about forty specimens (Ménél 1987:134), which means, according to Brunaux, that they used the most valuable animal in the herd (Brunaux 1986a:123). The victim would have been kept either near the sanctuary or even in the interior in the small enclosure and death would probably have been inflicted at the centre (Brunaux 1986a:124; Brunaux 1996:108); Brunaux (Brunaux 1986a:124) suggests that it may have been decorated. After the animal had been put to death with a blow to the rear part of the skull (Ménél 1991:258), it was the subject of an unusual ritual, which terminated in the deposit of bovine bones in the enclosure ditch on either side of the entrance (Brunaux 1986a:125; Ménél 1991:257 and 260). The carcass was untouched, with no flesh removed and not even any bones being broken, and, in fact, the head was the only part of the animal to show any marks of blows or of carving (Ménél 1987:130 and 136; Ménél 1991:258; Brunaux 1996:74). The presence in this central pit of three very small bones called sesamoids (Brunaux 1986a:125; Ménél 1987:131; Ménél 1991:257; Brunaux 1996:73 and 108), forgotten or overlooked in the systematic cleaning of the pit (Brunaux 1996:73), demonstrate that the sacrificed ox was deposited in the central pit of the sanctuary (Brunaux 1986a:124; Ménél 1987:131 and 136; Green 1993:76; Bûchsenschütz:559; Brunaux 1995b:145; Brunaux 1996:74 and 108) and was left to decompose (Ménél 1987:131 and 136; Ménél 1991:258; Brunaux 1995b:145; Brunaux 1996:74). The decomposition would have been the object of particular attention for the officiants (Brunaux 1995b:145). The duration period of decomposition, depended on so many factors that a precise estimate is impossible, although Brunaux (Brunaux 1995b:145) says that it would have been well defined, and would have varied from between weeks and several months (Ménél 1987:137-138); Brunaux suggests that it may have been as much as six or eight months (Brunaux 1986a:124-125; Brunaux 1996:74 and 108).

Brunaux (Brunaux 1986a:125; Brunaux 1996:108) suggests, and Ménél (Ménél 1991:258) agrees, that the end of the period of decomposition was when the joints could be separated and only the vertebral, the vertebral ligaments being the last to decompose (Ménél 1987:136; Ménél 1991:258), were still linked together; the skull was separated from the rest of the carcass and the jaw was cut (Brunaux 1986a:125; Ménél 1987:136; Brunaux 1996:74 and 109) in order, Ménél (Ménél 1987:136) proposes, to facilitate the skull’s exposure. The bones of the carcasses to which they had been attached were taken away by the officiants (Brunaux 1995b:145) and were deposited in the ditch (Ménél 1991:258; Brunaux 1996:74). At its excavation the ditch contained 3,000 bones (Bûchsenschütz:559), the skulls were either exposed or stored, but protected from the weather (Brunaux 1986a:124 and 125; Ménél 1987:138). While Ménél (Ménél 1991:260) says that this destination is unknown, Brunaux (Brunaux 1996:77 and 109) posits that the animal skulls were hung on the entrance porch with the weapons and human skulls for several years and that, if this were so, it indicates that the Gauls considered these skulls to have remembrance value and not just as to be sources of food; however, the latter theory is a hypothesis upon hypothesis. The separation of the skulls was not the last adjustment to the remains. Before their deposit in the ditch, the bones were manipulated (Ménél 1991:258). Not only were some bones disconnected and may even have been put through several intermediary ritual stages (Brunaux 1986a:125), but some were even removed (Brunaux 1986a:125; Ménél 1987:131), such as the tail bones and hoof bones (Ménél 1987:137; Brunaux 1996:109) which are missing. The remains were then deposited in the ditch on either side of the entrance (Brunaux 1986a:125; Ménél 1987:134; Ménél 1991:257; Brunaux 1996:109). In view of the fact that the remains do not form complete skeletons, but consisted of certain long bones, of vertebral columns still attached by ligaments, of ribs and of the skulls of all the sacrificed animals (Ménél 1987:130 and 137; Brunaux 1996:109), Ménél (Ménél 1987:130 and 137) says that this deposit of cattle remains in the ditch was not the simple deposit of bovine bodies. The skulls were inserted between the bones deposited in the ditch and immediately covered (Brunaux 1986a:125; Ménél 1987:138; Ménél 1991:260; Brunaux 1996:109), possibly immediately after a length of time, and had their faces turned towards the sky (Ménél 1991:260). Brunaux (Brunaux 1986a:125) says that these heaps of cattle bones and skulls guarded the entrance in an apotropaic way. Ménél
(Méniel 1987:132) posits that the bones were not considered as waste, but had acquired value as witnesses of a sacrifice, as tangible evidence, for eternity.

The remains of the oxen were all mixed together as if deposited at the same time, but there is the evidence of erosion on some bones by agents in the atmosphere indicating that the act of filling the ditch was halted at various points with the resultant exposure of the bones to the open air for several seasons, possibly years (Brunaux 1986a:125; Méniel 1987:138; Méniel 1991:258 and 260); the bones were in successive layers, each layer being a distinct sacrifice (Cunliffe:204). It is possible to determine, from the eroded bones, that there was a succession of four collections of remains (Méniel 1987:138; Méniel 1991:260), each placed at regular intervals (Méniel 1987:139), each the result of an accumulation of remains over a long period, indicated by the typology of the arms in each deposit (Méniel 1987:138) and each contains the remains of ten or twelve oxen (Méniel 1987:139; Méniel 1991:260). Brunaux and Méniel (Brunaux 1986a:123 and 125; Méniel 1987:139; Méniel 1991:260) propose a twelve or ten year interval between sacrifices. Perhaps it was at the end of each period that the skulls were deposited with their remains.

Méniel 1987:139; Méniel 1991:260

Méniel 1987:139
Méniel 1987:139.
Green, M.J. 1993:76.
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704 recent rectangular shape

Nearly all the shields of the late 1st century were furnished with a brassard (Tisserand:62-63). Shields of the type (oval, lozenge-shaped, rectangular, hexagonal and octagonal) ranging in size from 5cm to 17cm in length; 213 shields (oval, lozenge-shaped, rectangular, hexagonal and octagonal) ranging in size from 4.5cm to 17cm; 25 lance points; 8 lances with poles; 5 axes; and 2 arrowbraces (Tisserand:62; Cabuy:308). Nearly all the shield had bosses (Tisserand:62; Cabuy:308); the examples where the reverse is furnished with a brassard are rare and these are the lozenge-shaped and octagonal shields (Tisserand:62-63). Shields of the Roman scutum type are present under the ancient oval form and the recent rectangular shape (Tisserand:63).
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Dhronecken.- The temple at Dhronecken seems to have been dedicated to the Gallic deity Mars Smertius. Smertius means “Provider”; the epithet has the syllable *smer-, which is an ancient Indo-European root (Vendryes 1937: 133; Duval 1952-53:223) and forms part of a number of Celtic names (Duval 1952-53:223). A figure of a young god holding a fruit in his left hand and a bird in his right, possibly representing Mars Iovantucarus (Hatt 1979:134). Iovantucarus means “protecting the young”) is on the altar. There are also six, small, identical, bronze statuettes of Mars, naked, carrying his weight on the right leg, the right arm raised holding a lance (Grenier 1958:881; Hatt 1979:134), interpreted as Mars Smertius (Grenier 1958:882; Raepsaet-Charlier:230). Despite the position of the statue postulated as being that of Mars Iovantucarus, it has been suggested that the bronze statuettes of Mars Smertius have priority (Grenier 1958:882).

Gusenberg:- In the temple at Gusenberg there was a small, very corroded bronze of Mars, of the same type as those at Dhronecken (Grenier 1958:884), that is naked, carrying his weight on the right leg, the right arm raised holding a lance, and, therefore, representing Mars Smertius, if the interpretation of the statue at Dhronecken is correct, and fragments of terracotta figurines of Mars (Grenier 1958:884). These show that the sanctuary was used for the worship of Mars Smertius.

Möhn:- The evidence for the main sanctuary at Möhn being for the worship of Mars (Grenier 1958:876) is a dedication (CIL XIII.4119-MARTII SMERI, IJO ET...MANAE C.G. SEC.; P-W 1955.264; Hettner:31; Duval 1952-53:224; Thévenot 1955:165; Grenier 1958:876, n.2; Wightman 1970:214; Bertin No.125; Hatt 1979:129.) found, according to Grenier (Grenier 1958:876), in the cella or, according to Hatt (Hatt 1979:133), actually inscribed on the altar.

Unfortunately the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum does not clarify the situation; it merely says that the dedication was found “in maiore templo”.

The inscription is to a Gallic form of Mars and his consort. There are different opinions about the reading of the inscription. According to Hettner and Hatt (Hettner:31; Hatt 1979:129 and 133), the Gallic epithet is Smeritus; the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum increases the size of the space, reading the inscription as MARTII SME[...][IJO ET...MANAE, and constructs the cognomen as being Smertitus. Extraordinarily Cabuy (Cabuy:303) represents the inscription as MARTI SME[RTVI][T][A]NO ET [ANC]AMNAE, which would mean that the epithet was Smertulitanus, which is unique. According to Pauly-Wissowa, Grenier, Bertin, the Raepsaet-Charliers, Horne and King and Wightman (P-W 1955.264; Grenier 1958:876; Bertin No.125; Raepsaet-Charlier:230; Horne & King:433; Wightman 1970:214 and 223), it is Smertius. The most likely is that it refers to Mars Smertius and certainly the name Smertius fits the missing space, whereas the Smertatus version requires three letters to fit a space for two.
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LXXVI
The idea of four sacred islands is repeated in Irish Vernacular Literature, in the Book of the Invasions, in the section concerned with the Battle of Mag Tured, as the places where the Tuatha Dé Danann studied science, magic and other skills and arts; as Le Roux (Le Roux 1962b:1061) says the number four cannot be a coincidence.
Appendix Two

Relevant Sources

Chapter One
Problems and Presuppositions

Greek
Hesiod
Theog. 116.

'Η τοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ' αὐτῶν.
Γαλ' εὐρύστερνος, ποιντὶν ἐδος ἁσφάλες αἰεὶ

Plato
Leg. VIII. 847A.

ἀλλ' εἰς μίαν ἑκάστος τέχνην ἐν πόλει κεκτημένος ἀπὸ ταύτης ἀμα
cοι τὸ ᾧν κτάσθω.

Latin
Cato
De Agri. 141.(2-3).

Mars pater, te precor quaesoque uti sies volens propitiis mihi domo familiaeque
nostrae quoius re ergo agrum terram fundumque meum suovetaurilia circummagi
iussi, uti tu morbos visos invisosque, viduertatem vastitudinemque calamitates
intemperiasque prohibessis defendas averruncesque;
Utique tu fruges, frumenta, vineta, virgultaque grandire beneque evenire siris,
pastores pecuqae salva servassius quisque bonam salutem valetudinemque mihi
domo familiaeque nostrae;

Juvenal
Sat. VI. 172.

Parce, precor, Paean, et tu, dea, pone sagittas;

Livy
IV. 25.3.

Aedis Apollini pro valetudine populi vota est.

IV. 29.7.

Ch. Julius consul aedem Apollinis absente collega sine sorte dedicavit.
Macrobius
Sat.I.17.5.

Virtutem igitur solis quae divinationi curationique praeest Apollinem vocaverunt, quae sermonis auctor est Mercurii nomen accepit. Nam quia sermo interpretatur cogitationes latentes, Ἐφεξίς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμηρεύειν propria appellatione vocitatus est.

Sat.I.17.15.
namque virgines Vestales ita indigitant: Apollo Medice, Apollo Paean.

Ovid
Fasti.III.176.

Hoc solam ne se posse Minerva putet

Tacitus
Agr.XX.2.

Iam vero principum filios liberalibus artibus erudire, et ingenia Britannorum studiis Gallorum antefere, ut qui modo linguam Romanam abnuebant, eloquentiam concupiscerent. Inde etiam habitus nostri honor et frequens toga.

Varro
De Ling.Lat.V.74

Feronia, Minerva, Novensides a Sabinis.
Chapter Two
Sources and Method

Greek
Arrian
II.16.1.
'Εστι γὰρ ἐν Τύρῳ 'ιερὸν 'Ἡρακλέους παλαιότατον ὅν μνήμη
ἀνθροπίνη διασώζεται, ὥς τοῦ 'Αργείου 'Ἡρακλέους τοῦ 'Ἀλκμήνης'
πολλάκις γὰρ γενείας πρότερον τιμᾶται ἐν Τύρῳ 'Ἡρακλῆς ἢ Κάδμου
ἐκ Φοινίκης ὄρμηθέντα Θήβας κατασχεῖν

II.16.2.
σέβομαι δὲ καὶ Αἰγυπτίων ἄλλον 'Ἡρακλέα, σὺν ὄντες Τύριοι ἢ
'Ελληνες, "Αθηναίους

Athenaeus
IV.152d.
'Ετι ο Ποσειδώνιος διηγούμενος καὶ τὸν Λουερνίου τοῦ Βιτείτος
πατρὸς πλούτον τοῦ ὑπὸ 'Ρωμαίων καθαρευθέντος φησί δημαγωγοῦντα
αὐτὸν .........φραγήμα τε ποιεῖν δωδεκαστάδιον τετράγωνον.

Cassius Dio
XII.50.4.
'Οτι Αἰμίλιος ἔτοις Ἰνσοῦμβροις νικήσας τὰ ἑπινίκια ἤγαγε, καὶ ἐν
αὐτοῖς τοὺς πρότων τῶν ἀλόντων ἐς τὸ Καπιτάλλων ὁπλισμένους
ἀνεκόμισεν ἑπισκώπτων σφίσιν, ὅτι ὀμοιοκότας αὐτοῖς ἠσθετο μὴ
πρότερον τοὺς θάρακας ἀποδύςηθαί πρῶς ἐς τὸ Καπιτάλλων
ἀναβήματι.

Diodorus Siculus
V.20.2.
ἐν ἦ [Tyre] τὰ τὰ ἄλλα κατεσκεύασαν ὅλείσι τοῖς τόποις καὶ ναὸν
'Ἡρακλέους πολύτελῆ, καὶ θυσίας κατεδείξαν μεγαλοπρεπεῖς τοῖς τῶν
Φοινίκων ἐθελὶ διοικούμενας.

V.27.4.
Ιδιον δὲ τι καὶ παραδόξων παρὰ τοῖς ἀνὴν Κελτῶν ἐστι περὶ τὰ τεμένη
τῶν θεῶν ψυχόμενον. Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς 'ιεροῖς καὶ τεμενεσίν ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας
ἀνεμένοις ἔρριπται πολὺς χρυσὸς ἀνατεθειμένος τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ τῶν ἐγχωρίων οὐδεὶς ἀπετέλετο τούτον διὰ τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν, καίπερ ὄντων τῶν Κελτῶν φιλαργύρων καθ’ ὑπερβολήν.

V.29.4-5.
Τῶν δὲ πεσόντων πολεμίων τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀφαίροντες περιαπτοῦσι τοῖς αὐχέσι τῶν "υππιων,...καὶ τὰ ἄκροθίνια ταύτα ταῖς οὐκιαίς προσηλύσαν ὄσπερ οἱ ἐν κυνηγίοις ταῖς κεχειρωμένοι τὰ θηρία.
Τῶν δὲ ἐπιφανεστάτων πολεμίων κεφρώσαντες τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐπιμελῶς τηροῦσιν ἐν λάρνακι καὶ τοῖς ξένοις ἐπιδεικνύουσι σημαννόμενοι, διότι τῆς τῆς κεφαλῆς τῶν προγόνων τις ἢ πατήρ ἢ καὶ αὐτῶς πολλά χρήματα διδόμενα οὐκέλαβε. Φασὶ δὲ τινὰς αὐτῶν καυχάσθαι, διότι χρυσὸν ἀντίσταθην τῆς κεφαλῆς οὐκ ἔδεξαντο, βάρβαρον τίνα μεγαλοπριγίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι· οὗ γὰρ τὸ μή πωλεῖν τὰ σύστημα τῆς ἀρετῆς εὐγενές, ἀλλὰ τὸ πολεμεῖν τὸ ὁμόφυλον τετελευτηκὸς θηριώδες.

XX.14.1.
Διότερ οἱ Καρχαιδόνιοι νομίζοντες ἐκ θεῶν αὐτοῖς γεγονέναι τὴν συμφοράν, ἑτράπησαν πρὸς παντοῖαν ἑκείσιαν τοῦ δαιμονίου, καὶ νομίζοντες μάλιστα μηνίεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἡρακλέα τὸν πορὰ τοῖς ἀποίκοις, χρημάτων πλῆθος καὶ τῶν πολυτελεστάτων ἀναθηματῶν ἐπεμψαν ἑἰς τὴν Τύρον οὐκ ὀλίγα.

XX.14.4-5.
Ἡ τείνοτο δὲ καὶ τῶν Κρόνων αὐτοῖς ἐναντιοῦσθαι, καθ’ ὅσον ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν χρόνοις θύσινες τούτω τῷ θεῷ τῶν νιῶν τῶν κρατίστων, ἔστερον ὑμνούμενοι λάθρα παϊδας καὶ θρέγαντες ἐπέμπουν ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν καὶ ζητήσεως γενομένην, εὑρέθησαν τινὲς τῶν καθιερωρυγεμένων ὑποβολιμαίοι γεγόνοτες.

XXII.9.4.
ὅτι Βρέννος ο Τῶν Γαλατῶν βασίλευς εἰς ναὸν ἐλθὼν ἄργυρον μὲν ἄλλου χρυσοῦν οὐδεὶς εὗρεν ἀνάθημα, ἀγάλματα δὲ μόνον λίθινα καὶ ξύλινα καταλαβὼν κατεγέλασεν, ὅτι θεοῦς ἀνθρωπομορφοὺς εἶναι δοκούντες ἑστασαν αὐτοὺς ξυλίνους τε καὶ λιθίνους.

LXXXI
Herodotus

I.131.
kaléousi de 'Aσσύριοι tìn 'Αφροδίτην Μύλιττα, 'Αράβιοι de
'Αλιλάτ, Πέρσαι de 'Μίτραν.

II.42.2.
thetaús gar dé ou tòus aútous ápathe ómóiws Aigúptioi sèbontai,
plh'n' Istdos te kai 'Oσíris, tôn dé Diónuson eínai léghousi:

II.42.8.
'Amovn gar Aigúptioi kaléousi tôn Día.

II.47.2.
tois mév un alliesi theósi theúein òc ou dikaièus Aigúptioi, Selýmη
de kai Diónusow moúnoi toú aútou chrónou, t' aútì páunselíaí, de'
tous òc thúsan esti patéontai twn krevn.

II.50.1.
Scheðou dé kai pántwv tás sýnómatà tón theón ex Aigúpton eëllhuthè ès
tìn 'Elláda.

II.50.3.
oútoi dé moi dokéousi upo Pelașgów oñomásthnav, plhn
Poseiđéwos: touton dé toûn theón para 'Libýwn építhwto:

II.144.2.
ústathon dé aútìs bástileusai 'Oρon tôn 'Oσíris paíða, tôn
'Apóllonà 'Ellhlhes ónomásthv:.....'Oσíris dé èstí Diónusos kata'
Elláda glóssan.

II.145.1.
pas' Aigúptioi dé 'Páv menèn òrhoiòtatos

IV.59.1-2.
thetaús mév moúnoys tou's dé iásakontai, 'Istíthn menèn màlístà, épì de
Día kai Ghn, ëmpizóntes tìn Ghn tòu Díos èíhai gynáika, méta dé
toutous 'Apóllonà te kai oíraíthn 'Aphrodíthn kai 'Hráklea kai

LXXII
Ἀρεα. τούτους μὲν πάντες Σκύθαι γενομίκασι, οί δὲ καλεόμενοι βασιλῆις Σκύθαι καὶ τῶν Ποσειδέων θύουσιν. οὐομάζεται δὲ σκυθιστὶ Ἰστίη μὲν Ταβιτί, Ζεὺς δὲ ὀρθότατα κατὰ γνώμην γε τὴν ἐμὴν καλεόμενος Παπαίος, Γῆ δὲ Ἄπτι. Ἀπόλλων δὲ Γοιτόςφυρος, σιρανίθε Ἡ Ἀφροδίτη Ἡ Ἀγάπασα, Ποσειδέων δὲ Θαγμασάδας.

Plutarch
De Def. or. 18.
Ο δὲ Δημήτριος ἔφη τῶν περὶ τὴν Βρεττανίαν νήσων εἶναι πολλάς ἐρήμων σποράδως, ὅν εἰναὶ δαίμονων καὶ ἤρωων ὄνομαζεσθαι. Πλεῦσαι δὲ αὐτὸς ἱστορίας καὶ θέας ἐνεκα πομπῇ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τὴν ἐγγίστα κειμένην των ἐρήμων, ἐχοῦσαν οὐ πολλοὺς τούς ἐποικουόντας τε ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἀσίλους πάντας ὑπὸ τῶν Βρεττανῶν ὄντας. Ἀφικομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ νεωστὶ σύγχυσιν μεγάλην περὶ τὸν ἀέρα καὶ διοστίμας πολλάς γενέσθαι καὶ πνεύματα καταρραγῆμαι καὶ παρεῖν προστήρης. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐλάφησε, λέγειν τοὺς νησιώτας, ὡτὶ τῶν κρείσσονι καί τὸν ἐκλείψεις γέγονεν. "Ὡς γὰρ λύσιος ἀναπτόμενος" φάναι "δεινὸν ὁ δὲ ἔχει, σβεννύμενος δὲ πολλοῖς λυπηρὸς ἔστι, οὕτως οἷς οἱ μεγάλαι ψυχαὶ τὰς μὲν ἀναλάμψεις εὑμενεὶς καὶ ἀλλοποὺς ἐχουσιν, οἱ δὲ σβέσεις αὐτῶν καὶ φθορὰ πολλάκις μὲν, ὡς νυνὶ, πνεύματα καὶ ξάλας τρέφουσι, πολλάκις δὲ λοιμικοῖς πάθει τῶν ἀέρα φαρμάκτουσιν". Ἔκεί μὲν δὲκαὶ καὶ δὲν αὐτῶν εἰναι νήσουν, ἐν ᾐ τοῦ Κρόνου καθείρχθαι φουροῦμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Βριάρεω καθεύδοντα: δεσιμον γὰρ αὐτῶν τὸ ὑπὸν μεμιχανῆθαι, πολλοὺς δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν εἰναι δαίμονας ὁπάδους καὶ θεράποντας.

De fac.26.
.....καθ’ Ὀμερον.... Ὑγνύη τις νῆσος ἀπόπερθεν εἰν ἄλι χεῖται δρόμων ἠμερῶν πέντε Βρεττανίας ἀπέχουσα πλέοντι πρὸς ἐσπέραν. Ἐπεραι δὲ τρεῖς ἔσον ἐκείνης ἀφεστώσαις καὶ ἀλλήλων ἐνοευναι μᾶλλα κατὰ δύσμας ἥλιον θεριοῦ; ὅν ἐν μιᾷ τοῦ Κρόνον ὁ βάρβαροι καθείρχθαι μυθολογουσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς, τῶν δ’ ὡς ὑπὸν ἐκοινοφουροῦν τῶν τε νῆσων ἐκείων καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, ἴν Κρόνιον πέλαγος ὄνομαζοιτιν, πέραν κατικίζον.
Polybius

II.32.5-6

Ὅ τε τῶν Ἰσομήκων προεστῶτες θεωροῦντες ἀμετάθετον οὖσαν τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῶν 'Ῥωμαίων ἐκρίναν τῆς τύχης λαβεῖν πείραν καὶ διακινδυνεύσαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὀλοσχερῶς.

Συναθροίσαντες οὖν ἀπάσας (τὰς ὑπαρχούσας δυνάμεις) ἐπὶ ταύτων καὶ τὰς χρυσὰς σημαίας τὰς ἀκινήτους λεγομένας καθελόντες ἐκ τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱεροῦ καὶ τάλλα παρασκευασάμενοι δεόντως μετὰ ταύτα τεθαρρυκότας καὶ καταπληκτικῶς ἀντεστρατοπέδευσαν τοὺς πολέμοις.

Quaest.Rom.

CXXXIII.

Διὰ τί τοὺς καλομέμενους Βλετονησίους βαρβάρους διναὶς ἀνθρωποὶ τεθυκέναι θεοί πυθόμενοι, μετεπέμψαντο τοὺς ἄρχοντας αὐτῶν ὡς κολάσουντες, ἐπεὶ δὲ νόμῳ τινὰ τούτη ἐφαίνομεντο πεποιηκότες, ἐκεῖνοις μὲν ἀπέλυσαν, ἐκώλυσαν δὲ πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν; αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑπὸ πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ἐμπρόσθεν διὸ μὲν ἄνδρας δύο δὲ γυναῖκας ἐν τῇ βοῶι ἄγορα λεγομένη, τοὺς μὲν Ἄλληνας, τοὺς δὲ Γαλάτας, ξώντας κατώρξαν· φαίνεται γὰρ ἄτοπον ταύτα μὲν ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς, ἐπιτιμᾶν δὲ βαρβάροις ὡς ὑπὸ διὸ συνεισυ.

ἐκεῖνοι [Vestal Virgins] μὲν οὖν ἐκολάςθησαν ἐξελέγχθεισαι, τῆς δὲ πράξεως δεινῆς φανείσθης, ἔδοξεν ἄνερέσθαι τὰ Σιβύλλεια τοὺς ἱερεῖς. εὑρεθήσαν δὲ φασὶ χρησίμους ταύτα τε προδηλοῦντας ὡς ἐπὶ κακῷ γενησόμενα, καὶ προστάττοντας ἄλλοκτοις τις δαίμονι καὶ ξένους ἀποπροπῆς ἐνέκα τοῦ ἐπιόντος προέσθαι διὸ μὲν Ἄλληνας, διὸ δὲ Γαλάτας ξώντας αὐτῶθι κατοργύγναντας.

Strabo

III.3.7.

τραγοφαγοῦσι δὲ μάλιστα, καὶ τῷ Ἄρη τράγον [the Lusitanians] θύουσιν

III.4.18.

ἐχεῖ γὰρ τινὰ γυναικοκρατίαν. Τούτῳ δὲ οὖ πάνυ πολιτικὸν.

IV.1.13.

Καὶ τοὺς Τεκτοσάγας δὲ φασὶ μετασχεῖν τῆς ἐπὶ Δελφοὺς στρατείας

LXXXIV
(καὶ) τοὺς τε θησαυροὺς τούς Εὐρεθέντας παρ’ αὐτοῖς ὕπο Καπίανος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τῶν Ρωμαίων ἐν πόλει Τολώση τῶν ἐκείθεν χρημάτων μέρος εἶναι φασί, προσθέτει δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων οἶκων ἄνιεροντας καὶ ἐξιλασκομένους τοὺς θεὸν . . . . Πιθανότερος δ’ ἔστιν ὁ Ποσειδώνιον λόγος. Τά μὲν γὰρ εὐρεθέντα ἐν τῇ Τολώσῃ χρήματα μυρίων που καὶ πεντακισχιλίων ταλάντων γενέσθαι φησί, τὰ μὲν ἐν σηκοῖς ἀποκείμενα, τὰ δ’ ἐν λίμναις ιεραῖς, οὐδεμίαν κατασκευὴν ἔχοντα, ἀλλ’ ἀργὸν χρυσίον καὶ ἄργυρον. . . . Τὰ μὲν γὰρ εὖρεθέντα ἐν τῇ Τολώσῃ χρήματα μυρίων που καὶ πεντακισχιλίων ταλάντων γενέσθαι φησί, τὰ μὲν ἐν σηκοῖς ἀποκείμενα, τὰ δ’ ἐν λίμναις ιεραῖς, οὐδεμίαν κατασκευὴν ἔχοντα, ἀλλ’ ἀργὸν χρυσίον καὶ ἄργυρον. . . . Αὐτίκως δ’ αὐτοί οκτώ λίμναι τῇ ἄσυλίᾳ παρεῖχον, εἰς ὁς καθεσθαν ἄργυρον καὶ κρύσσον βάφθη. . . . Εἰ δὲ τῇ Τολώσῃ καὶ τῷ ἱερῷ οὐκ ἄγγισιν, τιμώμενον σφόδρα ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων, καὶ τὰ χρήματα ἐπιλείψατε διὰ τούτῳ, πολλῶν ἀνατιθέντων καὶ θησαυροῦς προσάπτεσθαι ταραττοῦντος.

IV.4.3-6.
Τὸ δὲ περὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας, τὸ διηλάβαθαι τὰ ἐργα ὑπεναντίας τοῖς παρ’ ἡμῖν, κοινῶν καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους συχνῶς τῶν βαρβάρων ἐστί.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀκεραίῳ φησιν εἶναι νῆσον μικράν σφ πάνυ πελαγίαν προκειμένην τῆς ἐκβολῆς του Λείγηρος ποταμοῦ. Οὔκειν δὲ ταύτην τὰς τῶν Σαμιτῶν γυναίκας Διονύσω κατεχομένας καὶ ἱλασκομένας τὸν θεὸν τούτον τελετάς τε καὶ ἄλλας ἱεροποιίας (ἐξίλεουμένας). Οὔκ ἐπιβαίνειν δὲ ἀνδρὰ τῆς νῆσου, τὰς δὲ γυναίκας αὐτὰς πλεούσας κοινωνεῖν τοῖς ἀνδράσι καὶ πάλιν ἔπανεναι. Ἐθος δὲ εἶναι κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἄπαξ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀποστεγάζεσθαι καὶ στεγάζεσθαι πάλιν αὐθημερον πρὸ δύσεως φορτίου ἐπιφερούσης. Ἡς δ’ ἀν ἐκπέσῃ τὸ φορτίον, διασπάθαι ταύτην ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων. Φεροῦσας δὲ τὰ μέρη περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν μετ’ ἐνασμοῦ μὴ παύεσθαι πρότερον, πρὶν παύσωσιν τῆς λύτης. Ἀεὶ δὲ συμβαίνει, ὡστε τινὰ ἐμπίπτειν τὴν τούτο πεισμένην.

XII.5.1. ἡ δὲ τῶν δώδεκα τετραρχῶν βουλὴ ἄνδρες ἠσον τριακόσιοι, συνήγοντο δὲ ἐίς τὸν καλούμενον Δρυμέμετον.


XV.1.58. Περὶ δὲ τῶν φιλοσόφων λέγων τούς μὲν ὅρεινοὺς αὐτῶν φησιν ὡμητας εἶναι τοῦ Διονύσου,

**Latin**

Ammianus Marcellinus

XXVII.4.4. *Et partem earum habitavere Scordisci, longe nunc ab isdem provinciis disparati, saevi quondam et truces, et, ut antiquitas docet, hostis captivorum Bellonae litantes et Marti, humanumque, sanguinem in ossibus capitum cavis bibentes avidius*

Caesar

B.G.I.12.7. *Qua in re Caesar non solum publicas sed etiam privatias iniurias ultus est, quod eius soceri L. Pisonis avum, L. Pisonem legatum, Tigurini eodem proelio quo Cassium interfecerant.*

LXXXVI
B.G.IV.33.1-2
Genus hoc est ex essedis pugnae. Primo per omnes partes perequitant et tela coniciunt atque ipso terrore equorum et strepitu rotarum ordines plerumque perturbant, et cum se inter equitum turmas insinuaverunt, ex essedis desiliunt et pedibus proeliantur.
Aurigae interim paulatim ex proelio excedunt atque ita currus collocant, ut, si illi a multitudine hostium premantur, expeditum ad suos receptum habent.

In omni Gallia eorum hominum, qui aliquo sunt numero atque honore, genera sunt duo. Nam plebes paene servorum habetur loco, quae nihil audet per se, nullo adhibetur consilio.

B.G.VI.13.3.
Sed de his duobus generibus alterum est druidum, alterum equitum.

B.G.VI.13.10.
Hi [the Druids] certo anni tempore in finibus Carnutum, quae regio totius Galliae media habetur, considunt in loco consecrato.

B.G.VI.14.4.
Id mihi duabus de causis instituisse videntur, quod neque in vulgum disciplinam efferi velint neque eos, qui discunt, litteris confisos minus memoriae studere; quod fere plerisque accidit, ut praesidio litterarum diligentiam in perdiscendo ac memoriam remittant.

B.G.VI.15.1.
Alterum genus est equitum. Hi, cum est usus atque aliquod bellum incidit (quod fere ante Caesaris adventum quotannis solebat, uti aut ipsi iniurias inferrent aut illatas propulsarent), omnes in bello versantur,

B.G.VI.16.4.
Alii immani magnitudine simulacra habent, quorum contexta viminibus membra vivis hominibus complent; quibus succensis circumventi flamma exanimantur homines.
B.G.VI.17.4.

_Multis in civitatibus harum rerum exstructos cumulos locis consecratis conspicari licet;_

B.G.VI.22.2.

_Neque quisquam agri modum certum aut fines habet proprios; sed magistratus ac principes in annos singulos gentibus cognitionibusque hominum, qui una coierunt, quantum et quo loco visum est agri attribuunt atque anno post alio transire cogunt._

_Cicero_

_Pro Font.XIII.31._

_Quis enim ignorat eos usque ad hanc diem retinere illam immanem ac barbaram consuetudinem hominum immolandorum? Quam ob rem quali fide, quali pietate existimatis esse eos, qui etiam deos immortales arbitrentur hominum scelere et sanguine facillime posse placari?_

_De Div.I.15.25-26._

_Auspicia vero vestra quam constant! Quae quidem nunc a Romanis auguribus ignorantur......a Cilicibus, Pamphyliis, Ptsidis, Lyciis tenentur._

_Nam quid ego hospitem nostrum, clarissimum atque optimum virum, Deiotarum regem, commemorem? Qui nihil umquam nisi auspicato gerit. Qui cum ex itinere quodam proposito et constituto revertisset, aQualae admonitus volatu, conclave illud, ubi erat mansurus, si ire perexisset, proxima nocte corruit._

_De Div.I.41.90._

_Eaque divinitionum ratio ne in barbaris quidem gentibus neglecta est, si quidem et in Gallia Druidae sunt, e quibus ipse Divitiacum Aeduum hospitem tuum laudatoremque, cognovi, qui et naturae rationem, quam Φυσιολογιαν Graeci appellant, notam esse sibi profitebatur et partim auguriis, partim coniectura, quae essentutura, dicebat._

_Curtius Rufus_

_IV.2.2._

_Ille [Alexander] dona ut ab amicis accipi iussit benignaque legatos allocutus Herculi, quem praecipue Tyrr coerent, sacrificare velle se dixit;_

_IV.4.5._
Utrisque laetus fuit beluae aspectus; Macedones iter iaciendo operi monstrasse eam augurabantur, Tyrii Neptunum, occupati maris vindicem, applicuisse beluam ad molest, brevi profecto ruituram.

Florus
Lii.4.4.
Mox Ariovisto duce vovere de nostrorum militia praedia Marti suo torquem.
Lii.4.5.
Viridomaro rege Romana arma Volcano promiserant.

Jordanes
Get.V.
Adeo ergo fuere laudati Getae, ut dudum Martem, quem poctorum fallacia deum belli pronuntiat, apud eos fuissi dicanse dictur. Unde et Virgilius
Gradivunque patrem Geticus, qui praesidet arvis.
Quem marcem Gothi semper asperrima placavere cultura. Nam victimae eius mortes fuere captorum: opinantes bellorum praesulem aptius humani sanguinis effusione placandum.

Livy
XXII.57.6.
Interim ex fatalibus libros sacrificia aliquot extraordinaria facta; inter quae Gallus et Galla, Graecus et Graeca in foro bovario sub terram vivi demissi sunt in locum saxo consaeptum, iam ante hystis humanis, minime Romano sacro, imbutum.

XXIII.24.11
Ibi Postumius omni vi ne caperetur dimicans occubuit. Spolia corporis caputque praecisum ducis Boii ovantes templo quod sanctissimum est apud eos intulere.

Minucius Felix
Octavius.XXX.4.
Romani Graecum et Graecam, Gallum et Gallam sacrificii viventes obruere hodieque ab ipsis Latariis Jupiter homicidio colitur, et quod Saturni filio dignum est, mali et noxii hominis sanguine saginatur.

LXXXIX
Pliny the Elder
H.N.XXVIII.12.
boario vero in foro Graecum Graecamque defossos aut aliarum gentium cum quibus

tum res eset etiam nostra aetas vidit.

Tacitus
Eodem anno Frisii, transrhenanus populus, pacem exuere, nostra magis avaritia
quam obsequii inpatientes.
Tributum iis Drusus iusserat modicum pro angustia rerum ut in usus militares coria
boum penderent, non intenta cuiusquam cura quae firmitudo, quae mensura, donec
Olenius e primipilaribus regendis Frisiiis inpositus terga urorum delegit, quorum ad
formam acciperentur.

Ann.XIV.30.3.
cruore captivo aditore aras et hominum fibres consulere deos fas habetant

Germ.XLIII.4.
sed deos interpretatione Romana Castorem Pollucemque memorant.

Tertullian
De Anim.57.10.
Nam et Nasamonas propria oracula apud parentum sepulcracomansitando captare, ut
Heraclides scribit vel Nymphodorus vel Herodotus, et Celtas apud virorum fortium
busta/eadem de causa abnoctare, ut Nicander affirmat.

Apol.XXIV.7.
Unicuique etiam provinciae et civitati suus deus est, ut Syriae Atargatis, ut Arabiae
Dusares, ut Noricis Belenus.

Ad nationes II.8.
Quanti sunt qui norint visu vel auditu Atargatim Syriorum, Caelestem Afrorum,
Varsutinam Maurorum, Obodan et Dusarem Arabum, Belenum Noricum.

Commenta Scholia Bernensia ad Lucanum ad I.445
Mercurius lingua Gallorum Teutates dicitur, qui humano apud illos sanguine
colebatur. Teutates Mercurius sic apud Gallos placatur: in plenum semicupium
homo in caput demittitur, ut ibi suffocetur. Hesus Mars sic placatur: homo in arbo
suspenditur, usque donec per cruorem membra digesserit. Taranis Ditiis pater hoc
modo apud eos placatur: in alveo ligneo aliqud homines cremantur. Item aliter
exinde in aliis invenimus Teutates Mars sanguine diro placatur, sive quod proelia
numinis eius instinctu administratur, sive quod Galli antea soliti ut alii diesel huic
quoque homines immolare. Hesum Mercurium credunt, si quidem a mercatoribus
colitur, et praesidem bellorum et caelestium deorum maximum Taranin Jovem
adsuetum olim humanis placari capitibus, nunc vero gaudere pecorum.

Old Irish
Book of Leinster
1629-1632
Impá dún in carpat, a gillai, arís for cúlu dáig ar bíth tongu-sa na dé dá n-adraim, ní
rag-sa ar cúl co brunni mbrátha co rucur cend na herre út lim I tasselbad, cend Con
Culaind.
Chapter Three
Gallic Deities

Greek
Athenaeus
IV.152b.
ὅταν δὲ πλείονες συνδειπνοῦσαι, κἀθημεῖ τὸν ἐν κύκλῳ,

XIII.576a.
Τὸ ὁμιοίως ἔστορε γενέσθαι καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης, ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίαιν πολιτείᾳ γράφων οὕτως: Φωκαῖος οἳ ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ ἐμπορίᾳ χρώμενοι ἐκτίσαν Μακεδονίαν. Εὐξένως δ’ ὁ Φωκαῖος Νάνῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ - τοῦτο δ’ ἦν αὐτῷ - ἦν ξένος. Οὕτως ὁ Νάνος, ἐπιτελεῖα γάμους τῆς θυγατρός, κατὰ τύχην παραγενόμενον τοῦ Εὐξένου παρακέκληκεν ἐπὶ τὴν θοίνην. Ὁ δὲ γάμος ἐγιγνετο τόνῳ τῶν τρόπων. Ἑδει μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον εἰσελθοῦσαν τὴν παιδα κηρευσμένην ὁ βούλιοτο δοῦναι τῶν παρόμοιων μυστήρων ὃ δὲ δοίη, τούτων εἶναι νυμφίον. Ἡ δὲ παίς εἰσελθοῦσα δίδωσι, εἶτε ἀπὸ τύχης εἶτε καὶ δι’ ἄλλην τινα αἰτίαν, τῷ Εὐξένῳ δύνα με δ’ ἦν τῇ παιδὶ Πέττα. Τούτων δὲ συμπεσόντος καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρίστους, ὡς κατὰ θεὸν γενομένης τῆς δόσεως, ἔχειν αὐτὴν, ἔλαβεν ὁ Εὐξένος γυναῖκα, καὶ συνάψευς μεταθέμενος τοῦν Αριστοτέλην. Καὶ έστι γένος ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνθρώπου μέχρι χιλιῶν Πρωτάδαι καλούμενον Πρωτίς γαρ ἐγενετο ύιὸς Εὐξένου καὶ τῆς Αριστοτέλης.

Cassius Dio
LXXII.12.1.
"Οτι Ἄστιγμοποιοί δὲν ὁ Ράδος τε καὶ ὁ Ραπτος ἠγουντο, ἔλθουν μὲν ἐς τὴν Δακίαν οἰκήσαν ἐλπίδι τοῦ καὶ χρήματα καὶ χώραν ἐπὶ συμμαχία λήφθεσθαι,

LXXVIII.15.6.
Οὔτε γὰρ ὃ Απόλλων ὁ γράννος οὔθ’ ὁ Σάραπις καίπερ πολλά ἰκετεύσατο αὐτῷ [Caracalla] πολλά δὲ καὶ προσκαρτήσαταν ὑφέλησεν.
Diodorus Siculus

IV.56.4.
'Αποδείξεις δὲ τούτων φέρουσι, δεικνύως τοὺς παρὰ τὸν ὄκεανον κατοικοῦντας Κέλτους σεβομένους μάλιστα τῶν θεῶν τοὺς Δίοσκόρους· παραδόσιμον γὰρ ἔχειν αὐτοὺς ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων τὴν τούτων τῶν θεῶν παρουσίαν ἐκ τοῦ ὄκεανοῦ γεγενημένην.

V.28.4.
δειπνοῦσι δὲ καθήμενοι πάντες σὺν ἐπὶ θρόνων, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ὑποστρώμασι χρωμένοι λύκων ἢ κυνῶν δέρμασι.

Pausanias

I.30.4.
δεικτοῦται δὲ καὶ χῶρος καλούμενος κολωνὸς ἢππος, ἐνθα τῆς Ἀττικῆς πρῶτον ἠλθεὶν λέγουσιν Οἰδιπόδα.....καὶ βασιλεύς Ποσειδώνος Ἰππίου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς Ἰππίας, ἤρων δὲ Πειρίθου καὶ Θησέως Οἰδιπόδος τε καὶ Ἀδράστου.

VIII.25.5.
Πλανωμένη γαρ τῇ Δήμητρι, ἡνίκα τὴν παιδα ἐξῆτει, λέγουσιν ἐπεσθαί τὸν Ποσειδώνα ἐπιθυμοῦντα αὐτῇ μικθῆαι, καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐς ἢππον μεταβαλούσαν ὅμοι ταῖς ἢπποις νέμεσθαι ταῖς Ὠγκίοις, Ποσειδών δὲ συνήτησεν ἀπατώμενος καὶ συγγίνεται τῇ Δήμητρι ἀρσενι ἢππο καὶ αὐτὸς εἰκασθείς.

VIII.25.7.
Τὴν δὲ Δήμητρα τεκεῖν φασίν ἐκ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος θυγατέρα, ἢς τὸ ὄνομα ἔς ἀτελέστους λέγειν οὐ νομίζουσι, καὶ ἢππον τὸν Ἀρείονα·

X.23.3.
Καὶ οἱ [the thunder and lightning] μὲν ἐξέπληθτον τε τοὺς Κέλτους καὶ δέχεσθαι τοὺς ὡς τὰ παραγγελλόμενα εκώλυν,

Plutarch

Parallelēla Graec.Rom.XXXIX
ΦΟΥΛΟΥΙΟΣ Στέλλος μισῶν γυναίκας ἢππο συνεμίσγετο· ἢ δὲ κατὰ χρόνον ἔτεκε κόρην εὐμορφόν καὶ ὀψωμᾶσαν Ἐποναν· ἔστι δὲ θεὸς.
πρόνοιαν ποιουμένη ἵππων ὡς Ἀγεσίλαος ἐν τρίτῳ Ἰταλικῶν.

Parallela Graec.Rom.XXXV.

ΛΟΙΜΟΥ κατασχόντος Φαλερίους καὶ φθορᾷς γενομένης, χρησμὸς ἐδόθη λαφῆσαι τὸ δεινὸν, ἐὰν παρθένον τῇ Ἡρα θύσαιν κατέκοψον. ἂν δὲ τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας μενούσης κατά κλήρον λαχομένη Οὐαλερία Δουπέκα σπασαμένη τὸ ξίφος, ἀντός καταπτάς ἥρπασε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θυμάρων ἐθηκε βάρδον μικράν ἔχουσαν σφύραν, τὸ δὲ ξίφος ἐπέβαλε δαμάλει τινι παρὰ τῶν μικρὸν βοσκομένην. οὕσασα δὲ ἡ παρθένος καὶ τὴν βοῦν θύσασα καὶ τὴν σφύραν ἄρασα, κατ’ οἰκίαν περιήλθε, καὶ τοὺς ἀισθενοῦντας ἥρμα πλήττουσα διήγειρεν, ἄφροθηκεν ἐνὶ εκάστῳ λέγοντα. θεν καὶ νῦν τὸ μυστήριον τελεῖται ὡς Αριστείδης ἐν ἐννεακαϊδεκάτῳ Ἰταλικῶν.

Polybius

Π.32.5-6

Οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἴνθομῆρων προεστώτες θεωροῦντες ἀμετάθετον ὁμον τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἔκριναν τῆς τύχης λαβεῖν πεῖραν καὶ διακινδυνεῦσαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὀλοκληροῦς. Συναθροίσαντες οὖν ἀπάσας (τὰς ὑπαρχοῦσας δυνάμεις) ἐπὶ ταύτων καὶ τὰς χρυσὰς σημαίας τὰς ἀκινήτους λεγομένας καθελόντες ἐκ τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱεροῦ καὶ τάλλα παρασκευασμένοι δεόντως μετα ταύτα τεθαρρήκτως καὶ καταπληκτικῶς ἀντεστρατοπέδευσάν τοῖς πολεμίοις

Strabo

IV.4.3.

χαμελοῦνσι δὲ καὶ μέχρι νῦν οἱ πολλοὶ, καὶ καθεξήμονει δειπνοῦσιν ἐν στιβάσι.

VII.3.8.

Φησὶ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Δάγου κατα ταύτην τὴν στρατείαν συμμίζει τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ κελτοῦς τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἀδριαν φιλίας καὶ ξενίας χάριν δεξάμενον δὲ αὐτοὺς φιλοφρόνως τὸν βασιλέα ἔρεσθαι παρὰ πότου, τί μάλιστα εἴη ὁ φοβοῖντο, νομίζοντα αὐτῶν ἔρειν. Αὐτοὺς δ’ ἀποκρίνασθαι, ὅτι οὐδένα, πλὴν εἴ ἀρα μὴ ὁ οὐρανὸς αὐτοῖς ἐπιπέσαι φιλίαν γε μὴν ἁνδρὸς τοιοῦτον περὶ παντὸς τίθεσθαι.
Ammianus Marcellinus

*Huic [the Treveri tribal territory] annexa secunda est Belgica, qua Ambiani sunt, urbs inter alias eminens, et Catelauni et Remi.*

Caesar

*B.G.VI.17.1-2.*


De his eandem fere, quam reliquae gentes, habent opinionem: Apollinem morbos depellere, Minervam operum atque artificiorum initia tradere, Jovem imperium caelestium tenere, Martem bella regere.

*B.G.VI.18.1.*

Galli se omnes a Dite patre prognatos praedicant idque ab druidibus proditum dicunt.

Eutropius

IX.13.

Superavit [Aurelianus] in Gallia Tetricum apud Catalaunos ipso Tetrico prodente exercitum suum, cuius adsiduas seditiones ferre non poterat.

Juvenal

VIII.155-157.

Interea, dum lanatas robunque iuvencum
more Numae caedit Iovis ante altaria, iurat
solam Eponam et facies olida ad praesepia pictas.


Galli Esum et Teutaten humano cruore placabant

Livy

XXI.39.9.

Neque hercule montibus his [the Poenine Alpine range], si quem forte id movet, ab transitu Poenorum ullo Seduni Veragri, incolae iugi eius, nomen inditum, sed ab eo, quem in summo sacratum vertice Poenimum montani appellant.
Lucan
1.441-442.
Tu quoque laetatus converti preolia, Trevir, et nunc tonse Ligur,
1.444-446.
Et quibus inmitis placatur sanguine diro
Teutates horrensque feris altaribus Esus et Taranis Scythicae non mitior ara Dianae.

Servius
ad Aen. VI.273.
Alibi ait qua Ditem patrem emersisse ab inferis putant. Dicimus autem et hic Dis et hic Ditis.

Solinus
XXII.10.
In quo spatio magna et multa flumina, fontes calidi opiparo exculti apparatu ad usus mortalium: quibus fontibus praesul est Minervas numen, in cuius aede perpetui ignes numquam canescunt in favillas, sed, ubi ignios tabuit, vertit in globos saxeos.

Tacitus
Germ.XLI.4.
Apud Nahavarlos antiquae religionis lucus ostenditur. Praesidet sacerdos muliebri ornatu, sed deos interpretatione Romana Castorem Pollucemque memorant.

Vergil
Aen.XI.483.

Armipotens, praeses belli, Tritonia virgo

Commenta Scholia Bernensia ad Lucanum ad 1.445
Adnotationes super Lucanum ad I.445.
Teutates] Mercurius sic dicitur, qui a Gallis homonibus caesis placatur.

Esus] Mars sic dictus a Gallis, qui hominum cruore placatur.

Adnotationes super Lucanum ad I.446.

Glossae Lucani ad I.445.
Teutates id est Mercurius, unde Teuconici; Esus id est Mars.

Glossae Lucani ad I.446.
Tharanis Juppiter. Hi [the Gauls] omnes in Teutonicis partibus colebantur a taranu.

Apparatus criticus ad Juvenalem ad VIII.157
Eponam] Hippona dea erat equarum et agasonum; ἤτοι est equus.

Commentarius ad Juvenalem e codice Colonensi
Nota quod Ypona templum Romae habebat, in cuius templo et presepia et eque, quomodo ad praesepe erant ligate, pictum.

Old Irish
Cath Maige Tuired
11.
Isen cath-sin dano robenad a lámhe de Núadad .i. Sregg mac Sengaidn rophone dei hf. Go tarad Dién Cécht an liaigh láim airgid foar co lúth cecai láma 7 Crédhne in cerd ag cungnam fris.

55-68.
"Fil sunn Luch Lonnandsclech mac Céin meic Dién Cécht 7 Ethne ingine Baloir. Dalta siden Taill[t]ne ingine Magmóir rí Espáine 7 Echtach Gairuh meic Dúach.
Roffoarfaig ion dorsaid do tSamhilldánuch, “Cía dán frisa ng[n]éie?” al sé, “ar ní téid nech cin dán i Temruid.”
“Déne mo athcomarc,” ol sé. “Am sáer.”
Friscort an dorsaid “Níd-regaim i leas. Atá sáer lenn cenu .i. Luchtai mac Lúachadhae.”
Atpert-sum, “Atum-athcomairec a dorrisoid: am gobhae.”
Frisgart ion dorsaid dóu, “Atá gobaie liond cenu .i. Colum Cúalléinech téorae núagrés.”
Atpert-som, “Atom-athcomairec: am tréinfer.”
Friscart in dorsaid, “Níd-regoim a les. Ata tréinfer lend cenu .i. Oghmae mac Ethlend.”
Níd-regaim a les. Atá crutiri lenn cenu .i. Auhcán mac Beicelmois, ara-n-utgatar fir trí ndéa I sídoib.”
Atpert-sum, “Atom-athcomairec: am níadh.”
Atpert-sum farum, “Adum-athcomairec, a dorsaid. Am file 7 am senchaid.”
Níd-regam I les. Atá file 7 senchaíní cenu .i. Én mac Ethomain.”
Atpert-sum, “Atom-athcomairec;” ol sé, “Im correguinich.”
Nít-recom e les. Atáut correguini dh lioinn cheno. At imdou ar ndruith 7 ar lucht cumhachtai.”
“Nít-regam a les. Atá Déan Cécht do liaigh lenn.”
“Nít-regom a les. Atá deogbaire linn cenu .i. Delt 7 Drúcht 7 Daithe, Taei 7 Talom 7 Trog 7, Gléi 7 Glan 7 Gléisi.”
Atbert, “Atom-athcomairec: am cert maith.”
“Nít-regom e les. Atá cert lind cenu .i. Crédne Cerd.”
Luid in dorsaid isin rigtech far sudiu co n-éicid dong riogh ulei. “Tánic ócláech ion doras lis,” al sé, “Samilldánach a ainm; 7 na huili dáno arufognot det muntir-si, atá le ule a óenor, conedh fer cecha dánai ule éi.”

98-99.
“Os tusai, a Déan Cécht,” or Lug, “cifa cumogg conicid-si ém?”
“Ní anse,” ol síe. “Nach fer gientor ann, acht mona bentor a cedn de, nó mani tesctar srebonn a inchinde nó a smír s[m]entuinde, bodh ógsláun lim-su ‘sin cath arabhároch.”

123.
Is edh dano doberiud bruth isna hógaib nogontais ann, comtar ániu farnauháarch: fo bith roboi Déin Cécht 7 a dí mac 7 a ingen .i. Ochttriúil 7 Airmedh 7 Má.char oc dúcetul foran tibráit .i. Sláine a hainm. Focertdidis a n-athgoite indte immairlestis; botar bí notédis esde. Bati[r] slán a n-athgoite tre nert an dícetul na cethri lege robátar imon tibráit.

124.
Tníc didiu frisna Fomore annísin, go tuciset-som fer n-úadaíbh de déscin cathai 7 cosdotha Túath nDéa .i. Rúadán mac Bresi 7 Bríghi ingene in Dagdai.

LG
VII.313.
Baí dána EOCHAID OLLATHAIR .i. in Dagda Mór

VII.317.
Brigit banfili, ingen in Dagda,

VII.333.
Bai trá Eochaid Ollathair .i. in Dagda Mór

VII.344.
Brigit banfile, ingen in Dagda,

VII.365.
Bai tra Eochaid Ollathair, .i. in Dagdha Mor

VII.369.
Brigid banfile, ingean in Daghdha,
Chapter Four
Gallic Sanctuaries

Greek
Diodorus Siculus
V.27.4.
'Iδίον δὲ τι καὶ παράδοξον παρὰ τοὺς ἅγιους Κελτοῖς ἐστι περὶ τὰ τεμένη τῶν θεῶν ψινόμενον. Εν γὰρ τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ τεμένεσιν ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας ἀνειμένοις ἔρρηται πολὺς χρυσὸς ἀνατεθειμένος τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ τῶν ἐγχώριων οὐδεὶς ἀπτεταί τούτου διὰ τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν, καὶ περὶ ὄντων τῶν Κελτῶν θαλάγγυρων καθ' ἑπερβολήν.'

Latin
Caesar
B.G.VI.17.4.
Multis in civitatibus harum rerum exstructos cumulos locis consecratis conspicari licet;

Livy
I.6.4.
Quoniam gemini essent necaetatis verecundia discrimen facere posset, ut dii, quorum tutelae ea loca essent, auguris legerent, qui nomen novae urbi daret, qui conditam imperio regeret, Palatium Romulus, Remus Aventinum ad inaugurandum templum capiunt.

Lucan
III.404.
structae diris altaribus aerae,

Servius
Aen.I.92.
Extemplo ilico statim. Et est augurium sermo. Templum enim dicitur locus manu designatus in aere, post quem factum ilico captantur auguria.

Tacitus
Ann.XIV.30.3.
cruore captivo adolere aras et hominum fibres consulere deos fas habentant
Varro

_De Ling.Lat.VII.8._

_In terris dictum templum locus augurii aut auspicii causa quibusdam conceptis verbis finitus._

Vitruvius

_De Arch.III.2._

_Aedium autem principia sunt, e quibus constat figurarum aspectus; et primium in antis, quod Graece ‘naos en parastasin’ dicitur, deinde pro stylos, amphipro stylos, peripteros, pseudodipteros, hypaethros. Horum exprimitur formationes his rationibus._

_In antis erit aedes, cum habebit in fronte antas parietum qui cellam circumcludunt, et inter antas in medio columnas duas supraquae fastigium symmetria ea conlocatum, quae in hoc libro fuerit perscripta. Huius autem exemplar erit ad tres Fortunas ex tribus quod est proxime portram Collinam._

_Prostylos omnia habet quemadmodum in antis, columnas autem contra antas angulares duas supraque epistyla, quemadmodum et in antis, et dextra ac sinistra in versuris singula. Huius exemplar est in insula Tiberina in aede Iovis et Fauni._

_Amphipro stylos omnia habet ea, quae pro stylos, praetereaque habet in postico ad eundem modum columnas et fastigium._

_Peripteros autem erit, quae habebit in fronte et postico senas columnas, in lateribus cum angularibus undenas. Ita autem sint hae columnae conlocatae, ut intercolumnii latitudinis intervallum sit a parietibus circum ad extremos ordines columnarum, habeatque ambulationem circa cellam aedis, quemadmodum est in portico Metelli Iovis Statoris Hermodori et ad Mariana Honoris et Virtutis sine postico a Mucio facta._

_Pseudodipteros autem sic conlocatur, ut in fronte et postico sint columnae octonae, in lateribus cum angularibus quinae denae. Sint autem parietes cellae contra quaternas columnas medianas in fronte et postico. Ita duorum intercolumniorum et unae crassitudinis columnarum spatium erit ab parietibus circa ad extremos ordines columnarum. Huius exemplar Romae non est, sed Magnesiae Dianae Hermogenis Alabandei et Apollinis a Menestehe facta._

_Dipteros autem octastylos et pronaet postico, sed circa aedem duplices habet ordines columnarum, uti est aedis Quirini Dorica et Ephesi Dianae Ionica a Chersiphrone constituta._

_Hypaethros vero decastylos est in pronoet postico. Reliqua omnia eadem habet quae dipteros, sed interiore parte columnas in altitudine duplices, remotas a
parietibus ad circumicionem ut porticus peristylorum. Medium autem sub divo est sine tecto. Aditus valvarum et utraque parte in pronao et postico. Huius item exemplar Romae non est, sed Athenis octastylos et temple Olympio.
Chapter Five
Gallic Religious Rituals

Aelian
V.H.II.31.
Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔννοιαν ἔλαβε τοιαύτην, ὡσαν Ἐνήμερος ὁ Μεσσήνιος ἢ Διογένης ὁ Φρύξ ἢ Ἡ Ἰπποκόπος ἢ Διαγόρας ἢ Σωσίας ἢ Ἑπίκουρος οὔτε Ἰωνός οὔτε Κελτός οὔτε Ἀιγύπτιος. Λέγουσι δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων οἱ προειρημένοι καὶ εἶναι θεοῦς καὶ προσεεῖν ἡμῶν καὶ προσημαίνειν τὸ μέλλοντα καὶ διὰ ὁρνίθων καὶ διὰ συμβόλων καὶ διὰ σπλάγχων καὶ δι’ ἄλλων τινῶν μαθημάτων τε καὶ διδαχμάτων ἀπερ οὖν ἔστι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις διδασκαλίας ἐκ τῆς παρὰ τῶν θεων εἰς αὐτοὺς προνοίας. Καὶ δὴ ὑπέρων δὲ λέγουσι καὶ δὴ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀστέρων πολλὰ προδηλοῦσθαι.

V.H.XII.23.
τρόπαια ἐγείροντιν, ...καὶ ἱπποιματα αὐτῶν τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπολείπουντες Ελληνικῶς

Aeschylus
Ag.224-230.

 thơηρ γενέσθαι θυγατρός,
 γυναικοποίνων πολέμων ἄρωγαν
 καὶ προτέλεια ναῶν.

 λιτὰς δὲ καὶ κληρόνας πατρῴωσ
 παρ’ οὐδὲν αἰῶν τε παρθένειοι
 ἔθεντο φιλόμοχοι βραβής.

Arrian
Cyn.23.2
Κελτῶν δὲ ἔστιν σίς νόμος, καὶ ἐγκαύσια θύειν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι: οἱ δὲ καὶ θησαυρὸν ἀποδεικνύουσι τῇ θεῷ: καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν λαγῷ ἀλὼν διὸ ὀβολῷ ἐμβάλλοντι εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν ἐπὶ δὲ ἀλῶπεκι δραχμήν, ὅτι ἐπίβουλον τὸ χρήμα, καὶ τοὺς λαγός διαφθείρει: τούτου ἐνεκα πλεῖον ἐμβάλλοντι, ὡς ἐπὶ πολεμίῳ ἀλὼν ἐπὶ δὲ δορκάδι τέσσαρας δραχμὰς, ὅτι μέγα τὸ ζώον, καὶ ἡ θήρα ἐντιμοτέρα.
Athenaeus

IV.152d.
Καὶ τοὺς θεῶς προσκυνοῦσιν [the Gauls] ἐπὶ τὰ δεξιὰ στρεφόμενοι.

IV.154.
ἄλλοι δὲ ἐν θεάτρῳ λαβόντες ἀργύριον ἢ χρυσίον, οἱ δὲ οἰον κεραμίων ἁριθμὸν τινα, καὶ πιστωσάμενοι τὴν δόσιν καὶ τοὺς ἀναγκαῖοις φίλοις διαδοχησάμενοι ὑπτίοι εκταθέντες ἐπὶ τυρεών κεῖνται, καὶ παραστάς τις ξίφει τὸν λαιμὸν ἀποκόπτει.

IV.160e.
ὁ Μάγνος· ὁ μὲν πάντα ἄριστος, ἐφι, Λαρῆνιος δέξως καὶ καλῶς ἀπήντησε τῷ γαστρίδι κυνὶ περὶ τοῦ κόγχου. Ἑγὼ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ Παφίου Σωκράτου Γαλάτας παρ’ οὗ ἔθος ἦστιν, ἤνικ’ ὅποι προτέρημά τι ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις λάβωσι, θύειν τοῖς θεοῖς τοὺς οἰχιμαλώτους, <τοὺς> Γαλάτας μιμούμενος κάγῳ κατακαύσειν ἡμέρᾳ τοῖς δαίμοσι διαλεκτικοὺς τρεῖς τῶν παρεγγεγραμμένων.

Cassius Dio

XII.50.4.
‘Οτι Αιμιλίοςζτονς’ Ιουσούμβρων νικήσας τα ἐπινίκια ἠγαγε, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοὺς πρῶτοι τῶν ἀλόντων ἐς τὸ Καπιτάλιον ὡπλισμένους ἀνεκόμισεν ἐπισκόττων σφίσιν, ὅτι ὁμοιόκτος αὐτοὺς ὧθετο μὴ πρῶτον τοὺς θάρακας ἀποδύσεσθαι πρὶν ἐς τὸ Καπιτάλιον ἀναβήναι.

LXXVIII.14.2.
τούτων [the German tribe the Cenni] γυναικεῖς ἀλοῦσαι ὑπὸ τῶν ’Ρωμαίων, ἐρωτήσαντος αὐτὰς τοῦ ’Ἀντωνίου πότερον πραθήμαι ἢ φονευθῆναι βούλονται, τοῦθ’ ἐιλουτο· ἐπειτ’ ἀπεμποληθεῖσαι πάσαι μὲν ἑαυτάς, εἰσὶ δ’ αἱ καὶ τὰ τεκνὰ ἀπέκτειναι.

Diodorus Siculus

V.27.4.
‘Ιδιὸν δὲ τι καὶ παράδοξον παρὰ τοὺς ἄριω Κέλταϊς ἔστι περὶ τὰ τεμένη
τῶν θεῶν ψυνόμενον. Εν γὰρ τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ τεμένεσιν ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας ἀνειμένοις ἔρρηται πολὺς χρυσὸς ἀνατεθειμένος τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ τῶν ἐγχώριων οὔδεὶς ἀπέτεια τούτου διὰ τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν, καὶ περὶ ὄντων τῶν Κελτῶν φιλαργύρων καθ’ ὑπερβολήν.

V.31.2-4.
Εἰσὶ δὲ παρ’ αὐτοῖς καὶ ποιηταὶ μελῶν, οὓς βάρδους ὑνομαζοῦσιν. Οὕτως δὲ μετ’ ὄργανον ταῖς λύραις ὁμοίων ἄδοντες οὗς μὲν ἴμνοῦσιν, οὓς δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. Φιλόσοφοι τε τιτές εἴσι καὶ θεολόγοι περιττῶς τιμῶμενοι, οὓς δρουίδας ὑνομαζοῦσι.

Χρώνται δὲ καὶ μάντεσιν, ἀποδοχῆς μεγάλης ἀξίουντες αὐτοὺς. Οὕτως δὲ διὰ τῆς ὀἰωνοσκοπίας καὶ διὰ τῆς τῶν ἱερεῖων θυσίας τὰ μέλλοντα προλέγονσαί τε καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ἔχουσιν ὑπήκουσιν. Μάλιστα δ’ ὅταν περὶ τινῶν μεγάλων ἐπισκέπτωνται, παράδοξον καὶ ἀπίστον ἐχουσι νόμιμον ἀνθρώπων γὰρ κατασπείσαντες τύπτουσι μαχαίρα κατά τὸν ἐπὲ τὸ διάφραγμα τόπον, καὶ πεσόντος τοῦ πληγέντος ἐκ τῆς πτώσεως καὶ τοῦ σπαραγμοῦ τῶν μελῶν, ἔτι δὲ τῆς τοῦ αἵματος ρύσεως τὸ μέλλον νοοῦσι, παλαιὰ τινὶ καὶ πολυχρώνῳ παρατηρήσει περὶ τούτων πεπιστευκότες.

Ἐθος δ’ αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ μηδένα θυσίαν ποιεῖν ἀνευ φιλοσόφου. Διὰ γὰρ τῶν ἐμπειρῶν τῆς θείας φύσεως ὡσπερεὶ τινῶν ὄμοφών τὰ χαριστήρια τοῖς θεοῖς φασὶ δεῖν προσφέρειν, καὶ διὰ τούτων οἶονται δὲν τάγαθα οἰτείσθαι.

V.32.3.
Αγριωτάτων δ’ ὁδηγῶν τῶν ὑπὸ τὰς ἀρκτοὺς κατοικοῦντων καὶ τῶν τῇ Σκυθίᾳ πλησιοχώρων φασὶ τινὰς ἀνθρώπους ἐσθίειν, ὡσπερ καὶ τῶν Πρεπτακῶν τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν ὑνομαξομένην Ἀριων.

V.32.6.
Ἀκόλουθως δὲ τῇ κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἀγριότητι καὶ περὶ τὰς θυσίας ἐκτόπως ἀσέβουσιν τοὺς γὰρ κακοῦργους κατὰ πενταετηρίδα φυλάζοντες ἀνασκολοπίζουσι τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ μετὰ ἄλλων πολλῶν ἄπαρχῶν καθηγίζουσι, πυρὰς παμμεγέθεις κατασκευάζοντες. Χρώνται δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀιχμαλωτοῖς ὡς ἱερεῖσις πρὸς τὰς τῶν θεῶν τιμὰς. Τινὲς δ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ κατὰ πόλεμον ληφθέντα χάζα μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀποκτείνουσιν ἢ κατακάουσιν ἢ τισὶν ἄλλαις τιμωρίαις ἀφανίζουσιν.
XIII.86.3.
'Ιμίλκας δὲ θεωρῶν τα πλήθη δεισιδαιμονοῦντα πρῶτον μὲν ἐπαύσατο καθαίρων τὰ μνημεία, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἰκετεύε τοὺς θεοὺς κατὰ τὸ πάντων ἔθος τῷ μὲν Κρόνῳ παῖδα σφαγίασας, τῷ δὲ Ποσειδώνι πλῆθος 'ιερείων καταποντίσας.

XX.14.4-6.
'Ητιώτῳ δὲ καὶ τὸν Κρόνων αὐτοῖς ἐναντίον, καθ’ ὅσον ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν χρόνοις θύουνες τούτῳ τῷ θεῷ τῶν υἱῶν τοὺς κρατίστους, ὑστερον ἀνυόμενοι λάθρα παῖδας καὶ θρέψαντες ἐπεμπόν ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν καὶ ζητήσεως γενομένης, εἰρέθησαν τινες τῶν καθιερωγμένων ὑποβολιμάλιοι γεγόνοτες.
Τούτων δὲ λαβόντες ἔννοιαν, καὶ τοὺς πολέμους πρὸς τοὺς τείχεσιν ὀρῶν τειχισμένοντος, ἐδεισιδαιμόνοις ὡς καταλελυκότες τὰς πατρίδας τῶν θεῶν τιμάς. Διορθώσασθαι δὲ τὰς ἁγνοίας σπεύδοντες, διακοσίους μὲν τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων παῖδων προκρίνοντες θυσάν δημοσία: ἄλλω δ’ ἐν διαβολαίς ὄντες ἐκουσίως καυτοὺς ἐδοσαν, οὐκ ἐλάττως ὄντες τρικασίων.

Ἀν δὲ παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἀνδρίας Κρόνου χαλκοῦ, ἐκτετακὼς τὰς χεῖρας ὑπτίας ἐγκεκλημένας ἐπὶ τὴν γην, ὡστε τὸν ἐπιθέσαντα τῶν παῖδων ἀποκυλίσθαι καὶ πίπτει εἰς τι χάσμα πλῆρες πυρὸς. Εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ τὸν Εὐριπίδην ἐντεύθεν εἰληφθέαν τὰ μυθολογούμενα παρ’ αὐτῷ περὶ τὴν ἐν Ταύρῳ Θυσίαν ἐν ὅς εἰσάγει τὴν Ἰφιγένειαν ὑπὸ Ὀρέστου διερατωμένην.

Τάφος δὲ ποίος δέξεται μ’, ὅταν θάνατις
Πύρ’ 'ιερὸν ἐνδον χάσμα τ’ εὐρατὸν χθονὸς.

XXII.9.2.
Βαρυνόμενος [Brennus] δὲ καὶ πρὸς θάνατον, συμβουλεύσας αὐτοῖς ἑαυτὸν καὶ τοὺς τραυματίας ἀπαντας ἀποκτείναι, καὶ τὰς ἀμέλεις καυσαντας εὐξάνουσι εἰς τὰ οἰκεία ἐπανελθείν.

XXXI.13.
"Οτι δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων Γαλατῶν στρατηγὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ διαγωμοῦ γενόμενος καὶ συναθροίσας τοὺς σχιμαλάτους πράξειν ἐπετελέσατο βαρβαρικὴν καὶ παυτελῶς ὑπερήφανον. Τοὺς τε γὰρ τοῖς εἶδοι καλλίστους καὶ ταῖς ἡλικίαις ἀκμαίοτάτους καταστέψας θυσε τοῖς θεοῖς, ἐκ γε τῶν
θεών δέχεται τάς τοιαύτας τιμάς. Τούς δὲ ἄλλους πάντας κατηκόντισεν, πολλῶν μὲν ἐν αὐτοῖς γνωριζόμενων διὰ τάς προγεγενημένας ἔπιζευγάζεις, οὐδένος δὲ διὰ τὴν φιλίαν ἔλεοςμένου. Καὶ θαυμαστὸν οὖν εἶ, εἰ βάρβαροι παρ’ ἐλπίδας κατορθώσαντες ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπων ἐχρήσαντο τῶς εὐπτυχήμασιν.

Dioysius of Haicarnassus
Ant.Rom.1.38.2
Λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἐπιτελεῖν τῷ Κρόνῳ τοὺς παλαιοὺς [the Italians], ὡσπερ ἐν Καρχηδόνι, τέως ἡ πόλις διέμεινε, καὶ παρὰ Κελτοίς εἰς τόδε χρόνον γίνεται καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις τισὶ τῶν ἐστερίων ἔθνων ἀνδροθόνους, Ἡρακλέα δὲ παῦσαι τὸν νόμον τῆς θυσίας......

Euripides
I.A.1547-1550.

ος δ’ ἔσειδεν’ Αγαμέμνον ἀναξ
ἐπὶ σφαγὰς στείχουσαν εἰς ἁλὸς κόρην,
ἀνεστέναξε, κάμπτολι στρέψας κάρα
δάκρυα προῆκεν, ὦμμάτων πέπλον προθείς.

I.A.1578-1583.

ἱεὶς δὲ φάσαγον λαβὼν ἐπηύξατο,
λαμὼν τ’ ἐπεσκοπεῖθ’. Ίνα πλήξειεν ἄν
ἐμοὶ δὲ τ’ ἁλγος οὐ μικρὸν εἰσῆξε φρενί,
κάστην νευευκώς· θαῦμα δ’ ἢν αἰφνὶς ὅραν
πληγῆς σαφῶς γὰρ πάς τις ἡσθετο κτύπου,
τὴν παρθένον δ’ οὐκ ὁδεν οὐ γῆς εἰσέδυν.


ὅθεν νόμοις τοίσιν ἤδειαι
Ἀρτεμίς κορτῆς· τοῦτοι δ’ ἡς καλὸν μόνον,
τα δ’ ἄλλα σιγώ, τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένης-
θῶς γάρ, ὄντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει,
δε γὰρ κατέληθη τήνδε γῆν Ἐλλήν ἀνήρ.

Hec.220-221.

ἐδοξ’ Ἀχαιοῖς παῖδα σήν Πολυξένην
σφάξαι πρὸς ὄρθον χώμ’ Ἀχιλλείου τάφου.
Tro.622-623.

Τέθηκε σοι παις προς ταφν Πολυζένη
σφαγείον' Αχιλλέως, δώρον ἀψύχω νεκρώ

Eusebius


Κρόνος τοῖνυν, ὅν οἱ Φοινικεῖς Ἑλη προσαγωγεύοντι βασιλεύων τῆς
χώρας καὶ ὑστερον μετὰ τὴν τοῦ βίου τελευτήν ἐπὶ τοῦ τοῦ Κρόνου
ἀστέρα καθερωθείς,....κυνδύνη ἐκ πολέμου μεγίστων κατατεληφότων
τὴν χώραν βασιλικῆς κοσμήσας σχῆματι τον ύιὸν βασιλέων τε
κατασκευασάμενοσ κατέθυσεν.

Homer

II.XXIII.175-184.

δώδεκα δὲ Τρώων μεγαθύμων υἱές εσθόλους
χαλκῷ δηίδων: κακα δὲ φρεσί μήδετο ἅργα:
ἐν δὲ πυρὸς μένος ἤκου σιδήρευν, ὅφρα νείμοιτο.
μοιξέν τ’ ὄρ’ ἐπείτα, φίλον δ’ οὔκ ἔχειν έται-ρον’
“Χαίρε μοι, ὁ Πάτροκλε, καὶ εἰν ‘Αἴδαο δόμοις:
πάντα γαρ ἢδη τοι τελέω τα πάροιθεν ὑπεστην.
δώδεκα μὲν Τρώων μεγαθύμων υἱές εσθόλους
τους ἄμα σοι πάντας πῦρ ἔσθει: "Εκτὸς δ’ οὖ τι
δώσω Πριαμίδην πυρὶ δαπτέμεν , ἀλλὰ κύνεσσιν.”

Pausanias

X.21.1.

Προελθὼν οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἡρακλείας, ἐπινυθάνετο γὰρ παρὰ αὐτομόλων
τους συνειλεγμένους εἰς Πύλας ἀπὸ ἐκάστης πόλεως, ὑπερεφρόνει τε
τοὺ ‘Ελληνικοῦ καὶ ἤρχεν εἰς τὴν ἐπιου-σαν μάχης ἄμα ἀνίσχυντι τῷ
ήλιῳ, οὕτε Εὔληνα έχον μάντιν οὕτε τ’ ἱεροὶς ἐπιχορίσιοις χρώμενος, εἰ
dὴ ἔστι γε μαντεία Κελτικὴ.

X.22.1.

Τῷ δὲ Βρέννῳ λογίσμος παρίστατο ὡς εἰ ἀναγκάσει τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς
ὁδικάδε ἐς τὴν Αἰτωλίαν ἀναχωρήσαι, ῥαβὸν ἢδη γενησίτο ὁ πόλεμος
εἰτῷ πρὸς τὸ Εὐληνικόν

X.22.3-5.
καὶ τὰ ἐς Λαλλίεας Κόμβουτις οἱ ἐργασάμενοι καὶ Ὀρεστόριος ἤσαν,
ἀνασιώτατα τε ὧν ἀκοή ἐπιστάμεθα καὶ οὐδὲν τοῖς ἀνθρώπων
tολμήμασιν ὁμοία. Γένος μὲν γε πάν ἐξέκοψαν τὸ ἄρσεν, καὶ ὕμως γέρουντες καὶ τὰ νήπια ἐπὶ τῶν μητέρων τοῖς μαστοῖς ἐφονεύετο·
tούτων δὲ καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ γάλακτος πιότερα ἀποκτείνοντες ἐπινόν τε
ὁ Γαλάται τοῦ αἵματος καὶ ἕπτοντο τῶν σαρκῶν.
γυναῖκες δὲ καὶ ὅσαι ἐν ὀρα τῶν παρθένων, ὅσαι μὲν φρονήματος τι
αὐτῶν εἶχον, εαυτὰς ἐφθησαν ὡς ἠλίσκετο ἡ πόλις διειργασμέναι·
tας δὲ ἔτι περιούσας εἰς ἰδέαν ὑβρεώς πάσαν μετὰ ἀνάγκης ἤγον
Ἰσχυρᾶς, ὅτε ἰσον μὲν ἐλέον, ἰσον δὲ τὰς φύσεις καὶ ἔρωτος
ἀπέχοντες, καὶ σαὶ μὲν τῶν γυναικῶν ταῖς μαχαίραις τῶν Γαλατῶν
ἐπετύχθησαν, αὐτοχειρία τὰς ψυχὰς ἠφίεσαν ταῖς δὲ οἷς μετὰ πολὺ
ὑπάρξειν τὸ χρεῶν ἐμελλὲν ἢ τε ἀστίτια καὶ ἡ ἀστίτια, ἀστέγων
βαρβάρων ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἀλλήλους ὑβριζόμενων οὐ δὲ καὶ ἀφιείσαις τὰς
ψυχὰς, οὗ δὲ καὶ ἡδὴ νεκράς συνεγίνοντο ὅμως.
Αἰτωλοὶ δὲ πεπυμένοι τε παρὰ ἀγγέλων ἤσαν ὅποιας σφάς
κατειλήφσαν συμφορὰ καὶ αὐτίκα ὡς τάχους εἶχον ἀναστῆσαν
tῶν Θερμοπυλῶν ἀναστῆσαν ὑπείγοντο ἐς τὴν Αἰτωλίαν,

Plato
Leg.VIII.828C.
ἐτε δὲ καὶ τῶν χθονίων καὶ ὅσους αὖ θεοὺς συρανίους
ἐπονομαστέον

Plutarch
Vit.Them.XIII.2.
tούτοις ἡ Ἑυφραντίδης ὁ μάντις, ὡς ἄμα μὲν ἀνέλαμψεν ἐκ τῶν
ἰερῶν μέγα καὶ περιφανεῖς πῦρ, ἄμα δὲ παρμος ἐκδεξίων ἐσῆμην,
tὸν Θεμιστοκλέα δεξιωσάμενος ἐκέλευσε τῶν νεανίσκων
κατάρξασθαι καὶ καθιερώσαει πάντας ὁμοτῇ Διονύσῳ
προσευξάμενον·

Vit.Them.XIII.3.
οἱ πολλοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄμα κοινὴ κατεκαλοῦντο φωνῇ καὶ τοὺς

CIX
οίχμαλώτους τῷ βωμῷ προσαγαγόντες ἴνα γιαγκασαι, ὡς ὁ μάντις ἐκέλευσε, τὴν θυσίαν συντελεσθήμαι.

Vit.Marc.III.4.
Τότε τοῦ πολέμου συμπεσόντος ἴνα γιαγκάσθησαν εἶδαι λογίας τισὶν τῶν Σιβυβλείων, καὶ δύο μὲν Ἕλληνας, ἄνδρα καὶ γυναῖκα, δύο δὲ γαλάτας ὁμοίως ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ βοῶν ἀγορᾷ κατορύζαι ζῶντας,

Vit.Caes.XXVI.8.
ἐδοξέ δὲ κατ` ἄρχας τι καὶ σφαλῆναι, καὶ δεικνύοντιν Ἄραβην ξιφίδιον πρὸς' ἵππον κρεμάμενον, ὡς δὴ Καίσαρος λάφυρον. Ὁ θεοσάμενος αὐτὸς ὦστερον ἐμειδίσας καὶ τῶν φίλων καθελεῖν κελεύοντων σὺν εἶασεν ἵππον ἱγούμενος.

Vit.Caes.XXVII.5.
Καὶ κύκλῳ περὶ τὸν Καίσαρα καθεζόμενον [Vercingetorix] ἠλάσας, εἶτα ἀφελόμενος τοῦ ἑπει τὴν μὲν πανοπλίαν ἀπέρριψεν, αὐτὸς δὲ καθίσας ὑπὸ πόδας τοῦ Καίσαρος ἰσχύσκι ἤγεν,

De Super.XIII.
Οὐκ ἀμείνον οὖν ἢν Γαλάτας ἐκείνος καὶ Σκύθαις τὸ παράπαν μῆτ' ἐννοοῖν ἐχεῖν θεῶν μῆτε φαντασίαν μῆθ' ἵστορίαν η θεοὺς εἶναι νομίζειν χαίροντας ἀνθρώπων σφαττομένων αἵματι καὶ τελεωτάτην θυσίαν καὶ ἵππουργίαν ταύτην νομίζοντας; τί δὲ; Καρχηδονίοις οὐκ ἐλυσιτέλει κρίτων λαβόσεν ἢ Διαγόραν νομιθέτην ἢ ἐπιχθῆς μὲν τινα δαιμόνων μὲν θεῶν νομίζειν ή τοιαύτα θείεν οία τῷ Κρόνῳ ἔθνος; οὐχ ὥσπερ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς φησί τοῖς τα ζώα θυντών καθαπτόμενοι

Μορφὴν δ' ἀλλάξαντα πατήρ φίλον ἐπὶν ἀείρας

Σφάζει ἐπευχόμενος μέγα νῆπιος,

ἀλλ' εἰδότες καὶ γιγυνώσκοντες αὐτοὶ τὰ αὐτῶν τέκνα καθιέρευνον, οἱ δ' ἀτεκνοὶ παρὰ τῶν πενήτων ἤσυχοι διὰ βιασία κατέσφαξον καθάπερ ἄριστας καὶ ἱερασίως, παραειπῆκε δ' ἡ μήτηρ ἀτεγκτός καὶ άστένακτος

. . . ομοιοριστὶ δ' ἦν Ξώρξον γυνῆ δώδεκα κατώρυξεν ἄνθρωπος ζῶντας ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τῷ Ἁδη,
Quaest.Rom.LXXXIII.

Διὰ τὶ τοὺς καλουμένους Βλετονησίους βαρβάρους δύτας ἄνθρωπον τεθυκέναι τιθείτων, μετατημάσας τοὺς ἄρχοντας αὐτῶν ὡς κολάσοντες, ἔπει δὲ νόμῳ τινὶ τούτῳ ἐφαίνοντο πεποιηκότες, ἐκείνους μὲν ἀπέλυσαν, ἐκάλυψαν δὲ πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν; αὐτοὶ δὲ συν πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ἐμπροσθεν διὸ μὲν ἄνδρας δύο ἔγερσαν ἐν τῇ βοῶν ἀγορῇ λεγομένη, τοὺς μὲν "Ἐλληνας, τοὺς δὲ Γαλάτας, ἡμῖν κατώριζαν" φαίνεται γὰρ ἄτοπον ταῦτα μὲν ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς, ἐπιτιμῶν δὲ βαρβάροις ὡς οὐκ ὅσια ποιοῦσιν ἐκεῖνοι [Vestal Virgins] μὲν σὺν ἐκολάσθησαν ἐξελεγχθεῖσαι, τῆς δὲ πράξεως δεινῆς φανερῆς, ἔδοξεν ἀνερέσθαι τοῖς Σιβύλλεσι οὓς ἑπρεπεῖ δὲ φασὶ κρισμοὺς ταύτα τε προδηλοῦντας ἡμῖν κακῶς γενησόμενα, καὶ προστάτον τὰς ἀλλοκτόνας τις ὑϊόμαι καὶ ξένοις ἀποτροπῆς ἑνεκα τοῦ ἐπιόντος προέσθαι διὸ μὲν "Ἑλληνας, δυοὶ δὲ Γαλάτας ἡμῖν κατοργувέντας.

Quaest.Rom.XXXVII.

Διὰ τί τῶν τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπατηθεμένων μόνα τὰ σκύλα γενόμεναι περιορίζοντο ἀφαινόμενα τῷ χρόνῳ, καὶ μήτε προσκυνεῖν, μήτε ἐπισκεύαζεν; Πότερον ἰνα τὴν δόξαν σώματος τῶν πρώτως συνεκλίπειν, ἀεὶ τί πρόσφατον ὕπομνημα τῆς ἁρετῆς ἰητῶσι κομίζειν; Ἡ μάλλον, ὅτι τοῦ χρόνου τὰ σημεῖα τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους διαφοράς ἀμαυρωῦντος, αὐτοὺς ἀναλαμβάνει καὶ κατοικοῦν ταύτης ἐπιφθοῦν ἐστὶ καὶ φιλαπεχθήμον; Οὐδὲ γὰρ παρ’ Ἐλληστιν οἱ πρῶτοι λιθυνοὶ καὶ ἀλκοοὶ στῆσάντες τρόπαιον εὐδοκίμωσι.

Parallelia Graec.Rom.XIX.

KYANIPPOΣ γένει Συρακούσιος μόνω Διονύσῳ οὐκ ἔθεκεν. Ο δὲ θεός ὀργισθεὶς μέθην ἔνεικηκεν, καὶ ἐν τόπῳ σκοτεινῷ τὴν θυγατέρα ἐβιάσατο Κυάνην ἢ δὲ τὸν δακτύλιον περιελομένη ἔδωκε τῇ τροφῇ ἐκσέμουν ἀναγνώρισμα. Λοιμοζάντων δὲ καὶ τοῦ Πυθίου ἐπιόντος μὲν δεινὸν τὸν ἀσεβὴ τροπαίος θεον διεφορᾶσαι, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἀγνοοῦντων τὸν χρησιμόν, γνοῖσα ἡ Κυάνη καὶ ἐπιλαμβάνειν τῶν τριχῶν εἰλκε, καὶ αὐτὴ κατασφάξασα τον πατέρα ἐαυτὴν ἐπέσφαξε.

Parallelia Graec.Rom.XXIII.

META τὴν Ἦλιον πὸρθησιν ἐξεβράσθη Διομήδης εἰς Λιβύην, ἐνθά
Λύκος ἦν βασιλεὺς ἔθος ἔχων τοὺς ξένους. Ἀρεί τῷ πατρὶ θύειν....
ΚΑΛΠΟΥΡΝΙΟΣ Κράσσος ἀνήρ τῶν ἐπισήμων. Ῥηγούλω
συστρατευόμενος, ἐπέμφθη εἰς Μασσύλους πορθήσων φρούριον τι
δυσάλατον τοῦτον Χαραίτιον. Αἰχμάλωτος δὲ ληφθεὶς ἐμελλε
θύεσθαι τῷ Κρόνῳ.

Parallelēla Graec.Rom.XXXV.
ΛΟΙΜΟΥ κατασχόντος Λακεδαίμονα, ἐχρηστεὶν ὁ θεὸς παύσασθαι, ἐὰν
παρθένον εὐγενῆ κατὰ έτος θύσαι.....
ΛΟΙΜΟΥ κατασχόντος Φαλερίους καὶ φθοράς γενομένης, χρησίμος
ἐδόθη λαφῆσαι το δεινόν, ἐὰν παρθένον τῇ Ὁρα θύσαι κατ’
ἐνιαυτόν.

Parallelēla Graec.Rom.XXXVIII.
ΒΟΥΣΙΡΙΣ, παῖς Ποσειδώνος καὶ Ἀνώπης τῆς Νείλου, τοὺς
παριόντας ὑπολύω φιλοξενία κατέθυε......
ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ τῶν Γερμώνοι βοῦς ἐλαύνουν δι’ Ἰταλίας ἐπεξενώθη
Φαῦκα βασιλεῖ, ὃς ἦν Ἠρμοῦ παῖς καὶ τοὺς ξένους τῷ γεννήσαντι
ἐθενεν.

De Sera Num.Vind.552A.
Γέλων δὲ καὶ προτολεμήσας ἄριστα καὶ κρατήσας μάχη μεγάλη
Καρχηδονίων, οὗ πρότερον εἰρήνην ἐποίησατο πρὸς αὐτοὺς δεσμόνυς
ἣ καὶ τοῦτο ταῖς συνθήκαις περιλαβεῖν, ὅτι παύσονται τὰ τέκνα τῷ
Κρόνῳ καταθύουστες.

Reg. et Imp. Apoph.175A.
Γέλων ὁ τύραννος, ὃτε Καρχηδονίους πρὸς Ἰμέρα κατεπόλεμησεν,
εἰρήνην ποιούμενος πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἴνα γκαζασὲν ἐγγράψαι ταῖς
ὁμολογίαις ὅτι καὶ τὰ τέκνα παύσονται τῷ Κρόνῳ καταθύουστες.

Porphyry
De Abstinentia
II.27.2.
'Αφ' οὖν μέχρι τοῦ ήπιο σῶκ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ μόνον τοῖς Λυκαίοις ο佃' ἐν
Καρχηδονί τῷ Κρόνῳ κοινῆ πάντες ἀνθρωποθυτοῦσιν. Ἐνεπείθον οὖν
μεταθαίνοντες ὑπάλλαγμα πρὸς τὰς θυσίας τῶν Ἰδίων ἐποιοῦντο σωμάτων τα τῶν λοιπῶν ζώων σώματα.

II.56.1.
Φοινικες δὲ ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς ἡ πολέμων ἡ λοιμῶν ἡ σύμμων ἔθνων τῶν φιλτάτων τινα ἐπιψηφίζοντες Κρόνως,

Pseudo-Plutarch

_De fluv._VI.4.
Παράκειται δ' αὐτὴ ὁρας, Λούγδουνος καλομένων μετονομάσθη δὲ δι' αὐτῶν τοιαύτην. Μάμφωρος καὶ Ἀτεποῖμαρος ὑπὸ Σεστρονέως τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐκβληθέντες κατὰ χρησιμοῦ προσταγὴν εἰς τούτον τὸν λόφον ἠλθοῦν πόλιν κτίσαι θέλοντες. Τῶν δὲ θεμελίων ὑρυσσομένων οἰνφιδίως
Κόρακες ἐπιψηφίζοντες καὶ διαστημαζόμενοι τὰ πέριξ ἐπιλήμασαν δεῖξαν. Μάμφωρος δὲ, ὁιωνοσκόπησας ἐμπείρος ὑπάρχουν τὴν πόλιν Λούγδουνος προσηγόρευσαν λογίου γὰρ τῇ σφῶν διαλέκτῳ τοῦ κόρακα καλοῦσι, δοῦνον δὲ τόπον ἔδειξον:

Polybius

II.32.5-6
Ὅτι δὲ τῶν Ἰνσόμβρων προεστῶτες θεαρουντες ἀμετάβεντον οὕναν τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐκρυπνα τῆς τύχης λαβεῖν πειράν καὶ διακινδυνεύσαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὀλοκληρώς.
Συναθροίσαντες οὖν ἀπάσας (τὰς ὑπαρχοῦσας δυνάμεις) ἔπὶ τοιοῦτον καὶ τὰς χρυσὰς σημαίας τὰς άκινήτους λεγομένας καθαλύτες ἐκ τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἵερου καὶ τάλλα παρασκευασμένοι δεόντως μετὰ ταῦτα τεθαρρηκτός καὶ καταπληξίκες ἀντεστρατοπέδουσαν τοῖς πολεμίοις....

Sextus Empiricus

_Pyr._III.208.
Τὸ τε ἄνθρωπος ἀμαίνειν αἰματι βωμῶν θεοῦ παρ’ ἕμῖν μὲν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἄθεσιν,...,ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ Κρόνῳ θύσωτε ἄνθρωπον τινας, καθάπερ καὶ Σκύθαι τῇ 'Αρτέμιδι τοὺς ἐξένους.
Pyr.III.221.
Τῷ Κρόνῳ <οί Καρχηδόνιοι> θύουσιν ἀνθρώπων,

Sophocles
El.570-572.
Κάκ τούδε μηνίσασα Λητῶς κορή
Κατείχ’ Ἀχαιόις, ἔως πατήρ ἀντίσταθημον
Τοῦ θηροῦ ἐκθύσει την αὐτοῦ κόρην.

Strabo
III.3.6.
Σπλάγχνεύονται [the Lusitanians] δὲ καὶ δι’ ἀνθρώπων αἰχμαλώτων,
καλύπτοντες σάγοις· εἰδ’ ὅταν πληγή ὑπὸ τὰ σπλάγχνα ὑπὸ τοῦ
ἱεροσκόπου, μαντεύονται πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ πτώματος.

IV.1.13.
Καὶ τοὺς Τεκτοσάγας δὲ φασὶ μετασχεῖν τῆς ἐπὶ Δέλφους στρατείας
(καὶ) τοὺς τε θησαυροὺς τοὺς Εὐρεθέντας παρ’ αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ Καυτίωνος
τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τῶν Ρωμαίων ἐν πόλει Τολῶσση τῶν ἐκείθεν
χρημάτων μέρος εἶναι φασὶ, προσθείναι δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐκ
τῶν ἱδίων οἰκῶν ἀνιεροῦντας καὶ ἐξιλασκομένους τὸν
θεόν……Πιθανῶτερος δ’ ἔστιν ὁ Ποσειδώνιος λόγος. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ
εὑρεθέντα ἐν τῇ Τολώσση χρήματα μυρίων που καὶ πεντακισχιλίων
tαλάντων γενέσθαι φησί, τὰ μὲν ἐν σηκοῖς ἀποκείμενα, τὰ δ’ ἐν
λίμναις’ ἱεραῖς, οὐδεμίου κατασκευήν ἑχοντα, ἀλλ’ ἄργον χρυσίου
καὶ ἄργυρον……Ἀλλ’, ὡσπερ εκείνος τε ἐξημείως καλάλλιο πλείους, ἡ
χώρα πολύχρυσος οὕσα καὶ δεισιδαιμόνων ἀνθρώπων καὶ οὐ
πολυτελῶν τοὺς βίους πολλαχοῦ τῆς Κελτικῆς ἔσχε θησαυροῦς.
Μάλιστα δ’ αὐτοίς οὐκ λίμνη τὴν ἀσυλίαν παρείχον, εἰς ἃς καθίσαν
ἄργυρου ἢ καὶ χρυσοῦ βάρη….Ἐν δὲ τῇ Τολώσσῃ καὶ τὸ ’ ἱερὸν ἢν
ἀγιον, τιμώμενον σφόδρα ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων, καὶ τὰ χρήματα
ἐπελεησας διὰ τοῦτο, πολλῶν ἀνατιθέντων καὶ μηδενὸς
προσάπτεσθαι θαρροῦντος.

IV.4.4-6.
* Ὑποκρίνεται δὲ φορὰ τοῖς ἰν, ὕπορ αὐτὸ καὶ τῆς χώρας νομίζουσιν ὑπάρχειν.
* Ἀφθάρτους δὲ λέγουσι καὶ σῶτοι [the Druids] καὶ [οἱ] ἄλλοι τᾶς ψυχῆς

Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὥκεανῷ φησιν ἐνιαύνην μικρὰν οὐ πάνυ πελαγίαν προκειμένην τῆς ἐκβολῆς τοῦ Λείγηρος ποταμοῦ. Ὁκεῖν δὲ ταύτην τὰς τῶν Σαμιτῶν γυναίκας Διονύσω κατεχομένας καὶ ἱλασκομένας τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου πελάταις τε καὶ ἀλλαίς ἱεροποιίαις (ἐξελευμέναις). Οὐκ ἐπιβαίνεις δὲ ἄνδρα τῆς νήσου, τὰς γυναίκας αὐτὰς πλεούσας κοινωνεῖν τοῖς ἀνδράσι καὶ παλίν ἐπανεῖναι. Ἡθος δ᾽ εἶναι κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν ὅπαξ τὸ ' ἱερὸν ἀποστεγάζεσθαι καὶ στεγάζεσθαι πάλιν αὐθημέρων πρὸ δύσεως φορτίων ἐπιφεροῦσης. Ἡς δ᾽ ἀν ἐκπέσῃ τὸ φορτίον, διασπάσθαι ταύτην ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων. Φεροῦσας δὲ τὰ μέρη περὶ τὸ ' ἱερὸν μετ᾽ ἐνασμοῦ μὴ παυεῖσθαι πρότερον, πρὶν παύσανται τῆς λύπης. Ἀεὶ δὲ συμβαίνει, ὅστε τινὰ ἐμπίπτειν τὴν τούτω πεισμένην.

IV.5.4.

περὶ ἱς οὐδὲν ἐχομεν λέγειν σαφές, πλὴν ὅτι ἀγριωτέροι τῶν Βρετανών ὑπάρχουσιν οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν, ἀνθρωποφάγοι τε ὀντες καὶ πολυφάγοι,...καὶ ταῦτα δ᾽ οὕτω λέγομεν, ὡς οὐκ ἔχοντες ἀξιοπληθοὺς μάρτυρας

VII.2.3.

Τοῖς οὖν αἰχμαλώτοις διὰ τοῦ στρατοπέδου συνῆντων ξιφίρεις, καταστέψασασα δ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἤγγον ἐπὶ κρατήρα χαλκοῦν ὅσον.
**Latin**

**Ammianus Marcellinus**

XXVII.4.4.

Et partem earum habitavere Scordisci, longe nunc ab isdem provinciis disparati, saevi quondam et truces, et, ut antiquitas docet, hostis captivorum Bellonae litantes et Marti, humanumque, sanguinem in ossibus capitis cavis bibentes avidius.

**Augustine**

De Civ. Dei VII.19.

Deinde ideo dicit [Varro] a quibusdam pueros ei [Saturn] solitos immolari, sicut a Poenis, et a quibusdam etiam maiores, sicut a Gallis, quia omnium seminum optimum est genus humanum.

**Caesar**

B.G.I.53.7.

Is [Procillus] se paesente de se ter sortibus consultum dicebat utrum igni statim necaretur, an in aliud tempus reservaretur:

B.G.V.36.2.

Ille [Ambiorix] appelatus respondit: si velit secum colloqui, licere; sperare a multitudine impetrari posse, quod ad militum salutem pertineat; ipsi vero nihil nocitum iri, inque eam rem se suam fidem interponere.

B.G.V.42.2.

Haec et superiorum annorum consuetudine a nobis cognoverant et quosdam de exercitu nacti captivos ab his docebantur;

B.G.VI.13.4.

Illi [the Druids] rebus divinis intersunt, sacrificia publica ac privata procurant, religiones interpretatuntur;
B.G.VI.13.6-7.
Si qui aut privatus aut populus eorum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Haec poena apud eos est gravissima.
Quibus ita est interdictum, hi numero impiorum ac sceleratorum habentur, his omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiant, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant, neque his potentibus ius redditur neque honos ullus communicatur.

B.G.VI.16.2-5.
atque ob eam causam, qui sunt adfecti gravioribus morbis quique in proeliis periculisque versantur, aut pro victimis homines immolant aut se immolaturos vovent, administrisque ad ea sacrificia druidibus utuntur, quod, pro vita hominis nisi hominis vita reddatur, non posse deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur, publiceque eiusdem generis habent instituta sacrificia.
Alii immani magnitudine simulacra habent, quorum contexta viminibus membra vivis hominibus complent; quibus succensis circumventi flamma exanimantur homines. Supplicia eorum, qui in furto aut latrocino aut aliqua noxia sint comprehensi, gratiora dis immortalibus esse arbitrantur; sed, cum eius generis [criminals] copia deficit, etiam ad innocentium supplicia descendunt.

B.G.VI.17.3.
Huic [Mars] cum proelio dimicare constituerunt, ea, quae bello ceperint, plerumque devovent; cum superaverunt, animalia capta immolant, reliquas res in unum locum conferunt.
Multis in civitatibus harum rerum exstructos cumulos locis consecratis conspicari licet;
Neque saepe accidit, ut neglecta quispiam religione aut capta apud se occultare aut posita tollere auderet, gravissimumque ei rei supplicium cum cruciata constitutum est.

B.G.VI.19.4.
Funera sunt....omniaque, quae vivis cordi fuisse arbitrantur, in ignem inferunt, etiam animalia, ac paulo supra hanc memoriam servi et clientes, quos ab iis dilectos esse constabat, iustis funebribus confectis una cremabantur.

B.G.VII.4.10.
Nam maiore commisso delicto igni atque omnibus tormentis [Vercingetorix] necat, leviore de causa auribus desectis aut singulis effossis oculis domum remittit, ut sint
reliquis documento et magnitudine poenae perterreant alios.

B.G.VII.20.9-10
[Vercingetorix] Producit servos, quos in pabulatione paucis ante diebus exceperat et fame vinculisque excruciaverat. Hi iam ante edocti quae interrogati pronuntiarent, milites se esse legionarios dicunt;

B.G.VII.42.3.
Bona civium Romanorum diripiunt, caedes faciant, in servitutem abstrahunt.

B.G.77.12.
Quid ergo mei [Critognatus] consili est? Facere, quod nostri maiores nequaquam pari bello Cimbrorum Teutonumque fecerunt; qui in oppida compulsi ac similis inopia subacti eorum corporibus qui aetate ad bellum inutiles videbantur vitam toleraverunt neque se hostibus tradiderunt.

B.G.VII.89.5.
Vercingetorix redditur, arma projiciuntur.

Cicero
Pro Font.XIII.31.
Quis enim ignorat eos usque ad hanc diem retinere illam immanem ac barbaram consuetudinem hominum immolandorum? Quam ob rem quali fide, quali pietate existimatis esse eos, qui etiam deos immortalis arbitrentur hominum scelere et sanguine facillime posse placari?

De rep.III.9.15.
Quam multi, ut Tauri in Axino, ut rex Aegypti Busiris, ut Galli, ut Poeni, homines immolare et pium et diis immortalibus gratissimum esse duxerunt!

Nam quid ego hospitem nostrum, clarissimum atque optimum virum, Deiotarum regem, commemorem? Qui nihil unquam nisi auspicato gerit. Qui cum ex itinere quodam proposito et constituto revertisset, aquilae admonitus volatu, conclave illud, ubi erat mansurus, si ire perexisset, proxima nocte corruit.
De Div. I. 50. 113.
Nec vero umquam animus hominis naturaliter divinat, nisi cum ita solutis est et vacuus ut ei plane nihil sit cum corpore, quod aut vatibus contingit aut dormientibus. 
....Sed quoniam dant aliquid, idque non parvum, vaticinationes cum somniis, nihil est quod cum his magnopere pugnemus, praesertim cum sint qui omnino nullam divinationem probent.

De Div. I. 50. 114.
Ergo et ei, quorum animi spretis corporibus evolant atque excurrunt illa profecto quae vaticinantes pronuntiant; multisque rebus inflammantur tales animi qui corporibus non inhaerent;....Credo etiam anhelitus quosdam fuisses terrarum quibus inflatae mentes oracula funderent.

De Div. I. 51. 115.
Viget enim animus in somnis libere est sensibus omni ac impeditione curarum iacente et mortuo paene corpore. Qui quia vixit ab omni aeternitate versatusque est cum innumerabilibus animis, omnia, quae in natura rerum sunt, videt, si modo temperatis escis modicisque potionibus ita est affectus ut sopito corpore ipse vigilet. Haec somniantis est divination.

De Div. I. 41. 90.
Eaque divinitionum ratio ne in barbaris quidem gentibus neglecta est, si quidem et in Gallia Druidae sunt, e quibus ipse Divitiacum Aeduum hospitem tuum laudatoremque, cognovi, qui et naturae rationem, quam Φωσθόλογικαν Graeci appellant, notam esse sibi profitebatur et partim auguriis, partim coniectura, quae essent futura, dicebat.

Curtius Rufus
IV. 3. 23
Sacrum quoque, quod equidem dis minime cordi esse crediderim multis saeculis intermissum repetendi auctores quidam erant, ut ingenuus puer Saturno immolaretur.

Ennius
Ann. VII. Frag. 221
Poeni suos soliti sacrificare puellos

CXIX
Florus

I.ii.4.4.
Mox Ariovisto duce vovere de nostrorum militum praeda Martii suo torquem.

I.ii.4.5.
Viridomaro rege Romana arma Volcano promiserant.

I.iii.3.16-17.
Nec minor cum uxoribus eorum pugna quam cum ipsis fuit; cum objectis undique plaustris atque carpentis altae desuper securibus contisque pugnarent. Perinde speciosa mors eorum fuit quam pugna. Nam cum missa ad Marium legatione libertatem ac sacerdotium non inpertrassent (nec fas erat), suffocatis elisique passim infantibus suis aut mutuis concidere vulneribus aut vinculo e crinibus suis facto ab arboribus iugisque plaustrorum pependerunt.

I.iii.4.1, 2 and 3.
Post Macedonas, si dis placet, Thraces rebellant,...Nihil interim per id omne tempus residuum crudelitatis fuit in captivos saevientibus; litare diis sanguine humano, bibere in ossibus capite... Saevissimi omnium Thracum Scordisci fuere,

II.iii.12.24-25.
Inde validissimas nationes Cheruscos Suebosque et Sicambros pariter adgressus est, qui viginti centurionibus in crucem actis hoc velut sacramento sumpserant bellum, adeo certa victoriae spe, ut praedam in anticessum pactione diviserint. Cherusci equos, Suebi aurum et argentum, Sicambri captivos elegerant;

Jordanes

Get.N.
Adeo ergo fuere laudati Getae, ut dudum Martem, quem poctorum fallacia deum belli pronuntiat, apud eos fuisse dicant exortum. Unde et Virgilius Gradivumque patrem Geticus, qui praesidet arvis.

Quem martem Gothi semper asperrima placavere cultura. Nam victimae eius mortes fuere captorum: opinantes bellorum praesulem aptius humani sanguinis effusione placandum.
Justin
Epit.XXIV.4.3.
Portio Illyricos sinus ducibus avibus – nam augurandi studio Galli praeter eberos
callent – per strages barbarorum penetravit et in Pannonia consedit.

Epit.XXVI.2.2.
Quibus cognitis Galli, cum et ipsi se proelio pararent, in auspicia pugnae hostias
taunt, quarum extis cum magna caedes interitusque omnium praedicaretur, non in
timorem, sed in furorem versi sperantesque deorum minas expiari caede suorum
posse, coniuges et liberos suos trucidant, auspicia belli a parricidio incipientes.

Epit.XXXII.3.9.
Tectosagi autem, cum in antiquam patriam Tolosam venissent comprehensisque
pestifera lue essent, non prius sanitatem recipere quam aruspicum responsis
moniti aurum argentumque bellis sacrilegiisque quaesitum in Tolosensem lacum
mergerent,

Epit.XLIII.5.5.
Dux consensu omnium Catumarandus regulus eligitur: qui cum magno exercitu
lectissimorum virorum urbem [Massilia] obsideret, per quietem minis torvae
mulieris, quae se deam dicebat, exterritus ulter pacem cum Massiliensibus fecit,
petitoque ut intrare urbem et deos eorum adorare liceret, cum in arcem Minervae
venisset, conspecto in porticibus simulacro deae, quam per quietem videret, repente
exclamat illam esse, quae se nocte exterruisset, illam, quae recedere ab obsidione
iussisset.

Galli Esum et Teutaten humano crunore placabat

‘Lactantius Placidus’
Comm. in Statii Theb.X.793.
Lustralemne lustrare civitatem humana hostia Gallicus mos est. Nam alius quid
egentissimus proliciebatur praemiis, ut se ad hoc venderet. Qui anno toto publicis
sumptibus alebatur purioribus cibis, denique certo et sollemni die per totam
civitatem ductus ex urbe extra pomeria saxis occidebatur a populo.
Livy

V.39.1.
Et ipsis [the Gauls] pavore defixi primum steterunt, velut ignari, quid accidisset; deinde insidias verer; postremo caesorum spolia legere armorumque cumulos, ut mos eis est, coacervare.

XXII.57.6.
Interim ex fatalibus libris sacrificia aliquot extraordinaria facta; inter quae Gallus et Galla, Graecus et Graeca in foro bovario sub terram vivi demissi sunt in locum saxo consaepturn, tam ante histis humanis, minime Romano sacro, imbutum.

XXIII.24.11-12.
Ibi Postumius omni vi ne caperetur dimics occubuit. Spolia corporis caputque praecisum ducis Boii ovantes templo quod sanctissimum est apud eos intulere. Purgato inde capite, ut mos iis est, calvam auro caelavere, idque sacrum vas iis erat quo sollemnibus libarent poculumque idem sacerdotibus esset ac templi antistibus.

XXXI.21.18.
Placentini captivi, ad duo milia liberorum capitum, redditi colonis.

XXXVIII.47.12.
Quotiens agri eorum vastati sint, quotiens praedae abactae, referant, cum vix redimendi captivos copia esset, et mactatas humanas hostias immolatosque liberos suos audirent...

XLI.18.3.
Captivoscum foeda laceratione [the Ligurians] interficiunt; pecora in fanis trucidant verius passim quam rite sacrificant.

Lucan

I.444-446.
Et quibus inmitis placatur sanguine diro
Teutates horrensque feris altaribus Esus
et Tarantis Scythicae non mitior ara Dianae.
Et vos barbaricos ritus moremque sinistrum
Sacrorum, Druidae, positis repetitis ab armis.

Omnisque humanis lustrata cruribus arbor.

Minucius Felix
Octavius.XXX.3-4.

Orosius
IV.6.3.
Sed cum inter cetera mala etiam pestilentia [Carthaginians] laborarent, homocidiis pro remediiis usi sunt: quippe homines ut victimas immolabant aetatemque inpuberem, quae etiam hostium misericordiam provocaret, aris admovebant.

V.16.6.
vestis discessa et proiecta est, equi ipsi gurgitibus inmersi, loricae virorum concisae, phalerae equorum disperditae

V.23.18.
Raptis, cum poculo opus esset, humanorum capitum ossibus cruentis capillatisque adhuc ac per interiores cavernas male effuso cerebro oblitis utebantur

Ovid
Fasti.V.625-634
Fama vetus tunc, cum Saturna terra vocata est,
Talia fatidici dicta fuisse Iovis:
“falcifero litata seni duo corpora, gentes,
mittite, quae Tuscis excipiantur aquis:”
donec in haec venit Tirynthius arva, quotannis
tristia Leucadio sacra peracta modo;
ilium stramineos in aquam misisse Quirites:
Herculis exemplo corpora falsa iaci.

Met.XIII.441-452.

hic subito, quantus, cum viveret, esse solebat,
ext humo late rupta similisque minanti
temporis illius vultum referebat Achilles,
quo ferus iniustum petiti Agamemnonia ferro
“innemores” que “mei disceditis,” inquit “Achivi,
obrutaque est mecum virtutis gratia nostrae!
ne facite! utque meum non sit sine honore sepulcrum,
placeat Achilleos mactata Polyxena manes!”
dixit, et inmiti sociis parentibus umbrae,
rapt sinu matris, quam iam prope sola fovebat,
fortis et infelix et plus quam femina virgo
ducitur ad tumulum diroque fit hostia busto.

Met.XIII.454.

Admota est sentisque sibi fera sacra parari,

Pliny the Elder
H.N.XVI.249-251.

Non est omittenda in hac re et Galliarum admiratio. Nihil habent Druidae – ita suos
appellant magos – visco et arbores in quae gignatur, si modo sit robustus, sacratius. Iam
per se roborum eligunt lucos, nec ubi sacra sine earum fronde conficiunt, ut inde
appellati quoque interpretatione Graeca possint Druidae videri; tum vero quidquid
adgnascatur illis e caelo missum putant signumque esse electae ab ipso deo arboris.
Est autem id rurum admodum inventum et repertum magna religionem petitur et ante
omnia sexta luna, quae principia mensum annorumque his facit et saeculi post
tricesimum annum, quia iam virium abunde habeat nec sit sui dimidia. Omnia
sananctem appellant suo vacabulo. Sacrificio epulisque rite sub arborie comperaris
duos admovent candidi coloris tauros, quorum cornua tum primum vinciantur.
Sacerdos candida veste cultus arborum scandit, falce aurea demetit, candido id
excipitur sago. Tum deinde victimas immolant precantes, suum donum deus
prosperum faciat iis quibus dederit. Fecunditatem eo poto dari cuicumque
animalium sterili arbitrantur, contra venena esse omnia remedio. Tanta gentium in rebus frivolis plerumque religio est.

H.N.XXV.106.
Quidam non distinguunt [the two types of sacred plants] et unum omnino genus faciunt, quoniam utraque eosdem effectus habeat. Utraque sortiuntur Galli et praecinunt responsa, sed magi utique circa hanc insaniunt.

H.N.XXVIII.12.
boario vero in foro Graecum Graecamque defossos aut aliarum gentium cum quibus tum res esset etiam nostra aetas vidit.

H.N.XXVIII.25.
in adorando dextram ad osculum referimus, totumque corpus circummagimus, quod in laevum fecisse Galliae religiosus credunt.


Pomponius Mela
De Situ Orbis III.2.18.
Gentes [of Gaul] superbae, superstitiones, aliquando etiam immanes adeo, ut hominem optimam et gratissimam diis victimam crederent. Manent vestigia feritatis iam abolitae, atque ut ab ultimis caedibus temperant, ita nihilominus, ubi devotos altaribus admovere, delibant.
Servius

ad Aen.III.57.
Tractus est autem sermo ex more Gallorum. Nam Massilienses quotiens pestilentia laborant, unus se ex pauperibus offerebat alendus anno integro publicis <sumptibus> et purioribus cibis. Hic postea ornatus verbenis et vestibus sacris circumducebatur per totam civitatem cum execrationibus, ut in ipsum reciderent mala totius civitatis, et sic proiciebatur.

ad Aen.III.121.
Pulsum regnis cessisque paternis non dicit quare. Sed talis historia est: Idomeneus de semine Deucalionis natus, Cretensum rex, cum post eversum Troiam reverteretur, in tempestate devovit sacrificaturum se de re, quae ei primum occurrisset. Contigit, ut filius eius primus occurreret: quem cum, ut alii dicunt, immolasset, ut alii vero, immolare voluisset et post orta esset pestilentia, a civibus pulsus regno Sallentinum Calabriae promunctorium teruit, iuxta quod condidit civitatem, ut et Sallentinos obsedit milite campos Lyctius Idomeneus. Relatio ergo provinciam ire non poterant.

ad Aen.XI.264.
Versosque penates Idomenei. Idomeneus rex Cretensium fuit: qui cum tempestate laborarent, vovit se sacrificaturum Neptuno de ea re quae ei primum occurrisset. Casu ei primus filius occurrerit: quam cum, ut alii dicunt, immolasset, ut alii, immolare vellet, ob crudelitatem regno a civibus pulsus est: unde est fama volat pulsum regnis cessisque paternis Idomenea ducem. Alii dicunt quod obscidens cuidam suum commendaverat regnum, qui per eius absentiam occupavit imperium et reversum pepulit.

Silius Italicus

Pun.V.652-653.

nec vos paeniteat, populares, fortibus umbris
hoc mactare caput:

Pun.IV.765-769.

mos fuit in populis, quos condidit advena Dido, poscere caede deos veniam ac flagrantiibus arts, infandum dictu! Parvos imponere natos. Urna reducebat miserandos annua casus, sacra Thoanteae ritusque imitata Dianae.
Solinus
XXII.2-3.
Multis insulis nec ignobilibus circumdatur [Britannia]. Quarum Hibernia et proximatis magnitudine, inhumana incolarum ritu aspero ...... Illic nullus anguis, avis rara, gens inhopita et bellicosa. Sanguine interemptorum hausto prius victores vultus suos oblinunt. Fas ac nefas eodem loco ducunt.

Suetonius
Iul.54.2.
In Gallia fana templaque deum donis referta [Caesar] expilavit

Calig.XIV.2.
non defuerunt qui depugnatores se armis pro salute aegri quique capita sua titulo proposito voverent.

Calig.XXVII.2.
Alterum, qui se periturum ea de causa voverat, cunctantem pueris tradidit, verbenatum infalatumque votum reposcentes pe vicos agerent, quoad praecipitaretur ex aggere.

Tacitus
Ann.XIV.30.3.
cruore captivo adolere aras et hominum fibres consulere deos fas habetant

Germ.XII.1.
Prodiiores et transfugas arboribus suspendunt, ignavos et imbelles et corpore infames caeno ac palude, iniecta insuper crate, mergunt.

Germ.XXXIX.1-2.
Vetustissimos nobilissimosque Sueborum Semnones memorant; fides antiquitatis religione firmatur. Stato tempore in silvam auguris patrum et prisca formidine sacram omnes <eiusdem> nominis eiusdemque sanguinis populi legationibus coeunt caesoque publice homine celebrant barbari ritus horrenda primordia.

Germ.XL.2.
Nec quicquam notabile in singulis, nisi quod in commune Nerthum, id est Terram matrem, colunt eamque intervenire rebus hominum, invehi populis arbitrantur. Est in
insula Oceani castum nemus, dicatumque in eo vehiculum, veste contectum; attingere uni sacerdoti concessum.

Germ.XL.5.
Mox vehiculum et vestis et, si credere velis, numen ipsum secreto lacu ablutur. Servi ministrant, quos statim idem lacus haurit. Arcanus hinc terror sanctaque ignorantia, quid sit illud, quod tantum perituri vident.

Tertullian
De Anim.57.10.
Nam et Nasamonas propria oracula apud parentum sepulcra mansitando captare, ut Heraclides scribit vel Nymphodorus vel Herodotus, et Celtas apud virorum fortium busta/eadem de causa abnoctare, ut Nicander affirmat.

Apol. IX.2-3.
Infantes penes Africam Saturno immolabantur palam usque ad proconsulatum Tiberii, qui eosdem sacerdotes in eisdem arboribus templi sui obumbraticibus scelerum votivis crucibus exposuit, teste militia patriae nostrae, quae id ipsum munus illi proconsuli functa est.
Sed et nunc in occulto perseveratur hoc sacrum facinus.

Apol.IX.5
Maior aetas apud Gallos Mercurio prosecatur.

Valerius Maximus
I.4.2.
Deiotaro vero regi omnia fere auspicato gerenti salutaris aquilae conspectus fuit, qua visa abstinuit se ab eius tecti usu, quod nocte inequenti ruina solo aequatum est.

Vergil
Aen.XI.81-82.
vinxerat et post terga manus, quos mitteret umbris inferias, caeso sparsurus sanguine flammas,
Commenta Scholia Bernensia ad Lucanum ad 1.445.
Sanguine diro Teutates horrensque feris altare| Mercurius lingua Gallorum Teutates dicitur, qui humano apud illos sanguine colebatur. Teutates Mercurius sic apud

Commenta Scholia Bernensia ad Lucanum ad I.451.
An quoniam glandibus comestis divinare fuerant consueti.

Adnotationes super Lucanum ad I.445
Teutates] Mercurius sic dicitur, qui a Gallis homonibus caesis placatur.

Esus] Mars sic dictus a Gallis, qui hominum cruore placatur.

Adnotationes super Lucanum ad I.446

Glossae Lucani ad Lucanum X.334.
Massilienses dum frequentaret tempestate laborarent, uno de plebe electo per annum cibis delicatis paverant. Anno finito sumvit furcam in manum, et ductus est per singulaos vicos, et de qualibet domo familia cum execratione omnia mala illius anni sibi imposuit. Postea conscendit montem, unde cum furca precipitabatur. Ille quoque fucifer dicebatur.

Hebrew
Exod. 12:5.

Deut.
15:21.
17:1.
לאחר שנים רבות שות קרה נאש, כי ביהו כל דבר ביהו הושבח הוזה. המלך

Judg.
11:31.
הנה מיתוף יאש, מנחלות ביהו, קטארה וזרחן ובשלהי מבנ דו ויבש טחית לתחו

11:34.
כנאת ראש המחנה ואיש עהו, ו الصحيح ישה לחרותה, ובחים ובחמותה, ויכ ליאו

11:39.
יתר ממחין ישבים והם נשבו ואילו ישב לחרות יאשר בראש ויהו אלהים

2 Ki.
17:31.
העימה עשו יבחל, ויאמרו להם ומקדרים, שירים את-כרכיהם כשב לארבעים, בצק

השבני את-לבני כשב והילו רשה ואובד-יהו, וחרתה לעשות תכונה ויבשה ועשת לתוכה.

23:10.
העימה את-התשה. אשר כל-ocaly, חמה כל-לחמה. אשר את-ברוני, ואת-ברני, חמה כל-לחמה.

2 Chr.28:3.
והי הקAppBar בני הכנוב, ואזרפיא, כשב מקברות מחלים, את-ללנה ואחרי

Ps.106:37-38.
והcourtesy comentário לא-כרכיהם של חיים.

עמשה על כל- BigDecimalים, ובו-כל-なのだן, אשר-כל- שמחה, אשר-כל- שמחה.
Jer.
7:31.
תקע קסועה. חמשה: אשא, אשא בהלמה. קורא אָהָרַנְנִים, בַּעֲלֵיהֶם. כָּאָשָׁא כָּשָׁא, אֵלַה שב נַחַר.

19:4-5.
ינָא אַבָּרְן שָׁנֶּקֶר גַּבֵּרָה אֲנָהָּסָהָּוָּתָוָּוָּו. חַלְחַלְלֶהוֹ רוֹאָשׁ. לַחַלְחַלֶּהוֹ לָא. לַדָּרַשׁ הָהָגָת.

32:35.
נִכְבָּד אוֹרַכְּפָהְוַתְוַתְו. אֵלַה, בֵּית בָּרֵיחַו קַלְקַלְקִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו לָאָלֶּהֶלָּה.

Ezk.
תֹּאֲרָה אוֹרָבְקָר אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֵלַה, אֵלַה נַטָּרֵה לָכְּחַשׁ. לְהוֹאָרָה לִכְחַשׁ. לְהוֹאָרָה לִכְחַשׁ.

20:31.
בְּכָפָרָה, מִנִּיאֲרָהְוַתְוַתְו. בְּכָפָרָה, בְּכָפָרָה. בְּכָפָרָה, בְּכָפָרָה. בְּכָפָרָה, בְּכָפָרָה.

23:37.
כְּכָפָרָה מִנִּיאֲרָהְוַתְוַתְו. מִנִּיאֲרָהְוַתְו. מִנִּיאֲרָהְוַתְו. מִנִּיאֲרָהְוַתְו. מִנִּיאֲרָהְוַתְו.

23: 39.
אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו אֲרַכְּבָּרְנִיָּו

CXXXI
Malachi 1:6-14.
Chapter Six
Headhunting

Greek
Arrian
IV.17.7.
'Ως δὲ ἐξηγγέλλετο αὐτοῖς Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν ὁρμῇ ὧν ἐπὶ τὴν ἔρημον ἐλαύνειν ἀποτεμόντες τοῦ Σπιταμένους τὴν κεφαλήν παρὰ Ἀλέξανδρου [the Massagetaean Scythians] πέμπουσιν, ὡς ἀποτρέψοντες ἀπὸ σφῶν αὐτῶν τούτῳ τῷ ἔργῳ.

Athenaeus
IV.154.
ἀλλοι δὲ ἐν θεάτρῳ λαβόντες ἀργύριον ἢ χρυσίου, οἱ δὲ σύν κεραμίων ἀριθμόν τινα, καὶ πιστωσάμενοι τὴν δόσιν καὶ τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις φίλοις διαδιστημήσαμεν ὑποτε ἐκταθέντες ἐπὶ θυρεῖν κεῖνται, καὶ παραστάσις τις ξίφει τὸν λαιμὸν ἀποκόπτει.

Cassius Dio
XLIII.24.3-4.
καὶ οὐ πορτερον γε ἐπαύσατο ταραττόμενοι πρὶν τὸν Καίσαρα ἄφνω τε αὐτοῖς ἐπελθεῖν καὶ κρατήσαντα τινὰ αὐτοχειρία πρὸς τιμωρίαν παραδοῦναι.

Diodorus Siculus
V.29.4-5.
Τῶν δὲ πεσόντων πολεμίων τάς κεφαλάς ἀφαίρεσθε περιάπτουσι τοῖς αἰχέσι τῶν ἵππων, ..καὶ τὰ ἀκροθῖνα ταῦτα ταῖς οἰκίαις προσηλούσιν ἄστεροι οὐ ἐν κυνηγίοις τισὶ κεχειρώμενοι τὰ θηρία.
Τῶν δὲ ἐπιφανεστάτων πολεμίων κεδρώσαστες τάς κεφαλάς ἐπιμελῶς πηροῦσιν ἐν λάρνακι καὶ τοῖς ἕξοις ἐπιδεικνύοντες σεμιτυμενόνοι, διότι τήσει τῆς κεφαλῆς τῶν προγόνων τις ἡ πατήρ ἢ καὶ αὐτὸς
πολλά χρήματα διδόμενα οικέλαβε. Φασί δε τινας αυτών καυχάσθαι, διότι χρυσών αυτόσταθον τής κεφαλής οὐκ ἐδέξαντο, βάρβαρον τινα μεγαλοψυχίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι· οὐ γὰρ τὸ μη πολείν τὰ σῶσττα τῆς ἀρετῆς εὐγενείς, ἀλλὰ τὸ πολεμεῖν τὸ ὀμόφυλον τετελευτηκός θηριώδες.

V.32.6.
τοὺς γὰρ κακούργους κατὰ πενταετηρίδα φυλάξαντες ἀνασκολοπίζουσι τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ μετ᾽ ἀλλαῖς πολλῶν ἀπαρχῶν καθαγίζουσι, πυρᾶς παμμεγέθεις κατασκευάζουσι. Χρώνται δὲ καὶ τοῖς σιμομαλῶτοις ὡς ἱερεῖοι πρὸς τὰς τῶν θεῶν τιμὰς. Τινὲς δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ κατὰ πόλεμον ληφθέντα ξάμα μετὰ τῶν ἀσθρώπων ἀποκτείνουσιν ἢ κατακάσουσιν ἢ τίσιν ἄλλαις τιμωρίαις ἀφανίζουσι.

ΧΙ.115.5.
οί γὰρ Κελτοὶ τὴν μὲν πρώτην ἡμέραν διετέλεσαν ἀποκόπτοντες τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν τετελευτηκότων κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἐθος·

Herodotus
IV.64.1-2.
ἐπειδὴ τῶν πρῶτων ἄνδρα καταβάλη ἀνὴρ Σκύθης, τοῦ σώματος ἐμπνευσάτο, ὅσους δὲ ἄν φονεύση ἐν τῇ μάχῃ, τούτων τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀποφέρει τῷ βασιλείᾳ. Ἀπενείκας μὲν γὰρ κεφαλὴν τῆς λήπης μεταλαμβάνει τὴν ἄν λάβωσι, μη ἔνεικας δὲ οὐ.
ἀποδείκηται δὲ αὐτὴν τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· περιταμών κύκλω περί τὰ ὁτα καὶ λαβόμενος τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐκείθει, μετὰ δὲ σαρκίσας βοῶς πλευρῆ δέσση ἄνθρωπος, ὄργασας δὲ αὐτὸ ἄτο χειρόμακτρον ἐκτητοί, ἐκ τούτου ἐξαπτητί καὶ ἀγάλληται· ὁ γὰρ ἄντο νεότα ἔρματα χειρόμακτρα ἔχη, ἀνὴρ ἀριστος οὕτως κέκριται.

IV.65.1-2.
Ταῦτα μὲν δὲ οὕτως σφι νενόμισται, αὐτὰς δὲ τὰς κεφαλὰς, οὔτε πάντων ἄλλα τω‐ν ἐχθρίστων, ποιεῖται τὰδε· ἄπορρίας ἐκατος τὸν τὸ ἐνεργεῖ τῶν ὀφρών ἐκκαθαίρει· καὶ ἲν μὲν ἡ πένης, ὃ δὲ ἐσωθεν δὲ καταχρυσώσας οὕτω χράται ποτηρίω.
ποιεύσι δε τούτο και έκ τῶν οίκημιν ἢν σφι διάφοροι γέννωνται καὶ ἢν ἐπικρατήσῃ αὐτοῦ παρά τῷ βασιλεί. Ξείνων δὲ οἱ ἐλθόντων τῶν ἀν λόγον ποιήται, τὰς κεφαλὰς ταύτας παραφέρει καὶ ἐπιλέγει ὡς οἱ κοῦντες οἰκήμοι πόλεμον προσεθήκαντο καὶ σφενών αὐτὸς ἐπεκράτησε, ταύτην ἀνδραγαθίαν λέγοντες.

**Josephus**

A.J.XVIII.115.

ὁ δὲ ὑπή ἕφερν τὴν Ἀρέτα ἐπιχείρησιν, γράφει πρὸς Ωιτέλλιον πόλεμον ἐξενεγκεῖν, καὶ ἦτοι ζωὸν ἐλόντα ἀμαγαγείν δεδεμένον, ἡ κτεινομένου πέμπτειν ἡν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπ' αὐτὸν.

**Paradoxographener**

No.46, 112.6

Οὔτοι [the Celts] περὶ πόλεμου Βουλεύμενοι ταῖς γυναικὶν ἀνακοινοῦνται, καὶ ὁ τι ἄν γινόσιν οἱ γυναίκες, τοῦτο κρατεῖ. Ἐὰν δὲ ἡττηθῶσι πολεμοῦντες, τῶν γυναικῶν, οἱ συνεβουλεύσαντο πόλεμον ἀρασθαί, τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀποτεμόντες ἕξω βίπτοντι τῆς γῆς.

**Pausanias**

I.21.3.

ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Νοτίου καλουμένου τείχους, ὁ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἐς τὸ θεάτρον ἔστι τετραμένον, ἐπὶ τούτῳ Μεδούσῃς τῆς Γοργόνος ἐπίχρυσος ἀνάκειται κεφαλή

**Plutarch**

Vit.Crass.XXV.12.

tας δὲ κεφαλὰς τῶν περὶ τοῦ Πόπλιον ἀποκόψαντες ἡλαυνὸν εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τοῦν κράσον.

Vit.Crass.XXVI.4.

οἱ δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ Πόπλιον κομίζοντες ὑπὲρ αἵματος ἀναπετηγοῦαν ἐγγὺς προσελάσαντες ἀνέδειξαν, ἦβρει πυθανόμενοι τοκέας ἀυτοῦ καὶ γένος:


οἱ δ' οὐ φασίν, ἀλλ' ἔτερου μὲν εἶναι τον ἀποκτείναντα, τούτον δὲ
κειμένου την κεφαλήν ἀποκόψαι καὶ τὴν δεξιάν.

Vit.Crass.XXXII.1.
Ὁ δὲ Σουρήνας τὴν κεφαλήν τοῦ Κράσσου καὶ τὴν χείρα πρὸς Υράδην ἐπεμψενεῖς Αρμενίαν,

Vit.Crass.XXXII.2.
ἐξήρτητο δὲ τῶν βάρδων βαλάντια καὶ παρὰ τοὺς πελέκεις πρόσφατοι κεφαλαὶ Ρωμαίων ἀποτετμεμέναι.

Vit.Crass.XXXIII.2.
Εὐδοκιμοῦντος δὲ αὐτοῦ Σιλλάκης ἐπιστάς τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ προσκυνήσας προὔβαλεν εἰς μέσον τοῦ Κράσσου τὴν κεφαλήν.

Polybius
II.28.10.
ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ συνέβη Γάιον μὲν τὸν ὑπατὸν παραβόλως ἁγιωτάτευσεν ἐν χειρὶν νόμῳ τελευτήσας τοῦ βίου, τὴν δὲ κεφαλήν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς βασιλέας ἐπανενεχθῆναι τῶν Κελτῶν·

III.67.3.
καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν [the Gauls] ἀπέκτειναν, οὐκ ὀλίγους δὲ κατετραμμάτισαν· τέλος δὲ ταῖς κεφαλαῖς ἀποτεμότες τῶν τεθνεῶταν ἀπεχώρουν πρὸς τοὺς Καρχηδονίους,

XXI.38.4-6.
ὡς διαβάντες οἱ Γαλάται τὸ χρυσὸν ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ καὶ παρελάμβανον Χιομάρων, ἢ μὲν ἀπὸ νεώματος προσέταξαν ἐνὶ παῖσαι τοῦ Ῥωμαίου σπαζόμενον αὐτὴν καὶ φιλοφρονούμενον, ἐκείνου δὲ πεισθέντος καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποκόψαντος, ἀραμένη καὶ περιστείλασα τοὺς κόλποις πῆλανεν.
ὡς δὲ ἠλθεὶ πρὸς τοῦ ἀνδρα καὶ κεφαλὴν αὐτῷ προὔβαλεν,

Strabo
IV.4.5.
Πρόεστι δὲ τῇ ἀνοίᾳ καὶ τῷ βάρβαρον καὶ τῷ ἐκφυλον, ὅ τοις προσβόροις ἔθνεστι παρακολουθεῖ πλείστον, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης
άπιόντας τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν πολεμίων ἡξάπτειν ἐκ τῶν αὐχένων τῶν ἱππιων, κομίσαντας δὲ προσπαθαλεύειν [τὴν θέαν] τοῖς προπυλαίοις....Τὰς δὲ ἐνδόξοις κεφαλὰς κεδρούντες ἐπεδείκνυν τοῖς ξένοις καὶ συδὲ πρὸς ἴσοστάσιον χρυσὸν ἄπολυτροῦν ἥξιον. Καὶ τούτων δ᾽ ἐπαυσαν αὐτοῖς

Ῥωμαίοι καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς θυσίας καὶ μαντείας ὑπεναντίως τοῖς παρ᾽ ἡμῖν νομίμοις." Αὐθρωπον γὰρ κατεσπεισμένου παίσαντες εἰς νότον μαχαίρα ἐμαντεύοντο ἐκ τοῦ σφαδασμοῦ. Ἕθην δὲ σύκ ἄνευ δρυίδων. Καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ἀνθρωποθυσίων εἰδὴ λέγεται· καὶ γὰρ κατετόξευον τινας καὶ ἀνεσταύρουν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ κατασκευάσαντες κολοσσόν χῶρτον καὶ ξύλων, ἐμβαλόντες εἰς τούτον βοσκήματα καὶ θηρία παντοῖα καὶ ἀνθρώπους, ὅλοκαυτοὺς.

XV.2.14.

γαμεῖ δ᾽ οὕδεις, πρὶν ἂν πολεμίου κεφαλῆς ἀποτεμοῦ ἄθηκέργη ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλέα· ὁ δὲ τὸ κρανίον μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλείων ἀνατίθησι,

**Latin**

Ammianus Marcellinus

XXVII.4.4.

hostis captivorum Bellonae litantes et Marti, humanumque, sanguinem in ossibus caput cavis bibentes avidius

Caesar

B.G.15.4.

Boiosque, qui trans Rhenum incoluerant et in agrum Noricum transierant Noreiamque oppugnarant, receptos ad se [the Helvetii] socios sibi adsciscunt.

V.58.5-6.

Magna proponit [Labienus] eis qui occiderint praemia; summittit cohortes equitibus subsidio. Comprobat hominis consilium fortuna, et cum unum omnes peterent, in ipso fluminis vado deprehensus Indutiamarus interficitur, caputque eius refertur in castra:
Curtius Rufus
IV.9.25.
Insignis eo die pugna equitum et praecipue Aristonis fuit; praefectum equitabus Persarum Satropaten directa in guttur hasta transfixit fugientemque per medios hostes consecutus, ex equo praecipitavit et obluctanti gladio caput dempsit. Quod relatum magna cum laude ante regis pedes posuit.

Florus
L.iii.4.2-3.
litare diis sanguine humano, bibere in ossibus capitum

Gellius
Dum se Gallus iterum eodem pacto constituere studet, Manlius iterum scuto scutum percutit atque de loco hominem iterum deiecit; eo pacto ei sub Gallicum gladium successit atque Hispanicum pectus hausit; deinde continuo umerum dextrum eodem successu incidit neque recessit usquam, donec subvertit, ne Gallus impetum in ictu haberet.
Ubi eum evertit, caput praecidit, torquem detraxit eamque sanguinulentam sibi in collum inponit.

Justin
Epit.XXIV.5.6.
Ptolemaeus multis vulneribus saucius capitur; caput eius amputatum, et lancea fixum, tota acie ad terrorem hostium circumfertur.

Epit.XXIV.6.3-5.
Itaque cum victi Macedones intra muros urbium condidissent, victor Brennus nemine prohibente totius Macedonieae agros depraedatur.
Inde quasi terrena iam spolia sorderent, animum ad deorum immortalium templum convertit, scurriliter iocatus locupletes deos largiri hominibus oportere.
Statim igitur Delphos iter vertit, praedam religioni, aurum offensae deorum immortalium praeferen: quos nullis opibus egere, ut qui eas largiri hominibus soleant, affirmabat.
Livy

III.5.9.
Is [Titus Quinctius] intentos in castra Romana Aequos legatique caput ferociter ostentates

IV.19.5.

V.34.1, 4-5 and 8-9.
De transitu in italiam Gallorum haec accepimus:.....
Belloveso huad paulo laetior in Italian viam di dabant.
Is quod eius ex populis abundat, Bituriges, Arvernos, Senones, Haeduos, Ambarros, Carnutes, Aulercos excivit.
Ipsi per Taurinos saltus saltumque Duriae Alpes transcenderunt; fusisque acie Tuscis haud procul Ticino flumine, cum in quo consederant agrum Insibrium appellari audissent, cognominem Insibribus, pago Haedorum, ibi omen sequentes loci condidere urbem; Mediolanum appellarunt.

VII.10.5-6.
armatum adornatumque adversus Gallum stolide laetum et – quoniam id quoque memoria dignum antiquis visum est – linguam etiam ab inrisu exserentem producunt.
Recipiant inde se ad stationem, et duo in medio armati spectaculi magis more quam lege belli destituuntur, ne quaquam visu ac specie aestimantibus pares.

VII.10.11.
Iacentis inde corpus ab omni alia vexatione intactum uno torque spoliat, quem respersum cruore collo circumbedit suo.

X.26.10-11.
Deletam quoque ibi legionem, ita ut nuntius non superesset, quidam auctores sunt, nec ante ad consules, qui iam haud procul a Clusio aberant, famam eius cladis perlatam quam in conspectu fuere Gallorum equites, pectoribus equorum suspensa gestantes capita et lanceis infixa ovantesque moris sui carmine.

XXIII.24.11-12.
Ibi Postumius omni vi ne caperetur dimicans occubuit. Spolia corporis caputque
praecisum ducis Boii ovantes templo quod sanctissimum est apud eos intulere. Purgato inde capite, ut mos iis est, calvam auro caelavere, idque sacrum vas iis erat quo sollemnis libarent poculumque idem sacredotibus esset ac templi antistitibus.

XXIV.14.7. 
*Qui caput hostis rettulisset, eum se [Tiberius Gracchus] extemplo liberum iussurum esse;*

XXVII.51.11. 
*C. Claudius consul cum in castra redisset, caput Hasdrubalis, quod servatum cum cura attulerat, proici ante hostium stationes,*

XLII.60.2. 
*Postquam rediere in castra victores, omnes quidem laeti, ante aliquos Thracum insolens laetitia eminebat; cum cantu enim superfìxa hastis capita hostium portantes redierunt.*

**Orosius**

*Hist. ad Pag.V.23.18. raptis, cum poculo opus esset, humanorum capitum ossibus cruentis capillatisque adhuc ac per interiores cavernas male effuso cerebro oblitis utebantur*

**Silius Italicus**

*Pun.IV.213-215.*

Demetit aversi Vosegus [a Gallic warrior] tum colla, iubaque suspensam portans galeam atque inclusa preempti ora viri, patrio divos clamore salutat.

*Pun.V.652-653.*

nec vos paeniteat, populares, fortibus umbris hoc mactare caput;

*Pun.XIII.482-483.*

At Celtae vacui capitis circumdare gaudent ossa, nefas, auro ac mensis ea pocula servant.
Tacitus
Ann.1.61.4.
simul truncis arborum antefixa ora

Ann.XIV.57.
Sulla interius cur cum epulandi causa discumberet. Relatum caput eius inlusit.
Nero tamquam praematura canitie deforme.

Ann.XIV.59.
talem eum [Plautus] centurio trucidavit...caput interfecti relatum.

Ann.XIV.64.
additurque atrocius saevitia quod caput [Octavia’s] amputatum latumque in urbem
Poppaea vidit.

Valerius Maximus
VI.1.Ext.2
Exercitu et copiis Gallograecorum a Cn. Manlio consule in Olympe monte ex parte
deletis ex parte captis, Orgiangonte reguli uxor mirae pulchritudinis a centurione, cui
custodienda tradita erat, stuprum pati coacta, postquam ventum est in eum locum, in
quem centurio misso nuncio necessarios mulieris pretium, quo eam redimerent,
adferre iussiterat, aurum expendente centurione et in eius pondus animo oculisque
intento Gallograecis lingua gentis suae imperavit, ut eum occiderent. Interfecti
deinde caput abscisum manibus retnens ad coniugem venit abiecto ante pedes
eius injuriae et ultionis suae ordinem exposuit.

Velleius Paterculus
II.119.5
Vari corpus semiustum hostilis laceraverat feritas; caput eius abscisum latumque ad
Maroboduum et ab eo missum ad Caesarem gentilici tamen tumuli sepultura
honoratum est.

B.Hisp.XXXII.2.
Ex hostium armis scuta et pila pro vallo, pro caespite cadavera collocabantur,
insuper abscisa in gladiorum mucrone capita hominum ordinata ad oppidum
conversa universa, ut et viderent et vallo circumcluderentur adversarii.
Hebrew

I Sam.18:27.

בְּנֵךְ צַדִּיקְךָ וְיַעֲשֵׂה יִתְכֹּל בָּאָלְשֵׁה יִתְכֹּל אֶלְּךָ וְיַעֲשֵׂה יִתְכֹּל בָּאָלְשֵׁה יִתְכֹּל (ךָ הָעָלְשֵׁה יִתְכֹּל)

Old Irish

Book of Leinster

568-570

Impádar Cú Chulaínd friu 7 tópacht a cethri cinnu díbh colléic 7 tuc cend cech fir díbh ara beind do bennaib na gabla.

1243-1246

Luid iar sain in t-ara do saigid a thigerna, 7 cid luáth condráíne in gilla, luáthiu conarnic Cú Chulaínd 7 tópacht a chend de Órlab, & turcbais 7 tasbénais do feraib Hérend in cend.

1629-1632

Impá dún in carpat, a gillai, arís for cúlu dáig ar bíth tongu-sa na dé dá n-adraim, ní rag-sa ar cúl co brunni mbrátha co rucur cend na herre út lim I tasselbad, cend Con Culaind.

2171-2172

Bághais Follomain ná ragad ar cúlu co hÉmain co brunni mbrátha 7betha co mberad cend Ailella leis cosin mind óir boí útaso.

2527-2529

Imsoe Cú Chulaínd friu-som ’no 7 eiscis a dá cend déc dá bh fé chétoir & sádis dá lia déc leó i talmain. Acus atbert cend cach fir díbh bara lífic & atbert cend Ferchon Lonsig ’no bar[a] lífic.

4035-4041

And sein drieuc[h]trais in Líath Macha ba Sualtaí & táníc reme fa urdreich na hÉmna.Is and sain imsúí a scáth féin bar Sualtaí co tópacht bil a scéith féin a chend de Sualtaí. Luid in t-ech féin bar cúlu arís I nÉmain 7 in scáth barsinn eoch 7 in cend barsin scáth. Agus rabert cend Sualtaí na briathra cétna: “Fir gondair, mná berdair, báe aegdair, a Ultu,” bar cend Sualtaí

CXLII
14300
Ba bes d’Ultaib ind inbaidsin *cach* curaid no marbdais ar galaib oenfir no gatta a n-inchind assa cendaib 7 commesctha ael airthib co ndenad liathriote cruade dib & in tan no bítis i n-immerbaig ro chomramaib dobertis doib co mbítis inna lamaib.

14310
Is *ed* dolluidside dar faidchi na hEmna 7 tri laechcind leis do Ultaib.

14315
*Cach* cath 7 *cach* irga no bíd do Chonnachtaib fri Ulto dobered Cet in n-inchind inna chriss dúis in tetarhad écht n-amra d’Ultaib do marbad di. Tain bo Culnee
Chapter Seven
The Celtic Afterlife

Greek
Aelian
N.A.X.22.
Βακκαίοι......τούς δὲ ἐν πολέμω τοῦ βίου καταστρέψαντας καλούς καὶ ἀγαθούς καὶ ἀρετῆς μετειληχόντας γυψὶ προβάλλουσιν, ἵερον τὸ ζῴον εἶναι πεπιστευκότες.

Diodorus Siculus
V.28.6.
Ἐνισχύει γὰρ παρ’ αὐτοὶς ὁ Πυθαγόρου λόγος, ὧν τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀθανάτους εἶναι συμβέβηκε καὶ δι’ ἐτῶν ὁμισομένων πάλιν βιοῦν εἰς ἑτερον σώμα τῆς ψυχῆς εἰσδυμένης. Διὸ καὶ κατὰ τὰς ταφὰς τῶν τετελευτηκότων ἐνίους ἐπιστολὰς γεγραμμένας τοῖς ὀἰκείοις τετελευτηκόσιν ἐμβαλλεῖν εἰς τὴν πυρᾶν.

Diogenes Laertius
Prooem.6.
Καὶ φασὶ τοὺς μὲν Γυμνοσοφιστὰς καὶ Δρῦδας ἀνιγματωδῆς ἀποφθέγματις φιλοσοφήσαι, σεβεῖν θεοὺς καὶ μηδὲν κακὸν δρᾶι καὶ ἀνδρεῖαν ἀσκεῖν

Homer
II.XXIII.71-74.
θάπτε μὲ ὁτι τάχιστα, πύλας ὢ Αἴαοο περήσω.
τῆλε μὲ εὑργούσι ψυχαί, εἰδώλα καμόντων,
οὐδὲ μὲ ποὺ μίσγεσθαι ἕπερ ποταμοῖο ἔσωσιν,
ἀλλ’ αὐτῶς ἀλάλημαι ἀν’ εὑρυπυλεῖς ὢ Αἴοδος δὼ.

II.XXIII.161-177.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τὸ γ’ ἀκουσέν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνον,
αὐτίκα λαὸν μὲν σκέδασεν κατὰ νῆ-ας ἔσσας,
κηδεμόνας δὲ παρ’ αὐθι μένου καὶ νῆου ὕλην,
ποίησαν δὲ πυρῆν ἐκατόμπεθον ἐνθὰ καὶ ἐνθὰ,
ἐν δὲ πυρῆ ὑπάτῃ νεκρὸν θέσαν ἄχνιμου κήρ.
πολλαὶ δὲ ὑφία μῆλα καὶ εἰλιποδας ἐλικας βοῦς.
πρόσθε πυρής έδερον τε καὶ ἀμφεπον· ἐκ δ’ ἄρα πάντων δημῶν ἐλών ἐκάλυψε νέκυιοι μεγάθυμος. Αχιλλεύς ες πόδας ἐκ κεφαλῆς, περὶ δὲ δρατα σώματα νήει. ἐν δ’ ἐτίθει μέλιτος καὶ ἀλείφατος ἀμφιφορῆς, πρὸς λέεια κλίκων πίσυρας δ’ ἐρίωχενες ἢ ἱπποὺς ἐσσυμενως ἐνέβαλλε πυρή μεγάλα στενακίζον. ἐπεὶ τῷ γε ἄνακτι τραπεζῆς κύνες ἦσαν, καὶ μὲν τῶν ἐνέβαλλε πυρή δύο δειροτομήσας, δώδεκα δὲ Τρώων μεγαθύμων ύλες ἔσθλους χαλκῷ δηίσων κακὰ δὲ φρεσί μηδετο ἐργα· ἐν δὲ πυρὸς μένος ἢκε σῑδήρεσσ, ὀφρα νέμοιτο.

Od.X.508-512.

ἀλλ’ ὁπὸτ’ ἀν δὴ νηὶ δι’ Ὀκεανοῖο περήσης, ἦνθ’ ἀκτῆ τε λάχεια καὶ ἄλσεα Περσεφονείς, μακραὶ τ’ άγιεροι καὶ Ίτεαί ώλεσίκαρποι, νήα μὲν αὐτοῦ κέλσαι ἐπ’ Ὀκεανα βαθυδύνη, αὐτὸς δ’ εἰς Αἰδεω’ ἵναι δόμον εὑράεινα.

Od.XXIV.11-14.

Παρ δ’ ἑσεν’ Ὀκεανοῦ τε καὶ Λευκᾶδα πέτρην, ἴδε παρ’ Ἡλλίοιο πῦλας καὶ δῆμον δυείρων ἡσαν’ αὔγουν δ’ Ἰκοντο κατ’ ἀσφοδελῶν λειμῶνα, ἐνθα τε ναίσουσι ψυχαί, εἶδωλα καμόντων.

Pausanias

X.21.6-7.

Τότε δὲ ἐν ταῖς Θερμοπύλαις οἱ μὲν Ἑλληνες μετὰ τὴν μάχην τοὺς τε αὐτῶν θεαπτον καὶ ἐσκύλευον τοὺς βαρβάρους, οἱ Γαλάται δὲ οὔτε ὑπέρ ἀναίρεσεος των νεκρῶν ἐπεκτυπυκεύοντο ἐποιουντο τε ἐπ’ ἴσης γῆς σφάς τυχείν ἢ θηρία τε αὐτῶν ὀρύθων. ὁλγώρως δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐς τῶν ἀπογινυμένων ἑχειν τὰς ταφὰς δύο ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν τα ἀναπείθουτα ἴδν, πολεμίους τε ἄνδρας ἐκπλήξαι καὶ ὅτι ἐστὶ τεθνεώτων οὐ δι’ ἔθους σίκτος αὐτοῖς.
Plutarch
De Def. or. 18.
'Ο δὲ Δημήτριος ἐφη τῶν περὶ τὴν Βρεττανίαν νῆσων εἶναι πολλάς ἐρήμους σποράδας, ὥν ἔνιας δαμόνων καὶ ἡρώων ὀνομάζεσθαι. Πειθοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τοιαῖα καὶ θέας ένεκάν πολιτή τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τὴν ἐγχιστα κειμένην τω-ν ἐρήμων, ἔχουσαν σφ πολλοὺς 'τούς ἐποικοῦντας 'ιεροὺς δὲ καὶ ἀσύλους πάντας ὑπὸ τῶν Βρεττανῶν ὑπό. 'Αφικομένοι δ' αὐτοῦ νεωτί σύγχυσιν μεγάλην περὶ τὸν ἀέα καὶ διοσμίας πολλάς γενέσθαι καὶ πνεύματα καταραγήναι καὶ πεσεῖν πρηστῆρας. 'Επεὶ δ' ἐλώθησε, λέγειν τοὺς νησιώτας, ὅτι τῶν κρεισσόνων τινὸς ἐκλεισὺς γέγονεν. "Ως γὰρ λύχνος ἀναπτύμενος" φάναι "δεινὸν οὐδὲν ἔχει, σβεννύμενος δὲ πολλοῖς λυπηρός ἑστιν, οὕτως αἱ μεγάλαι ψυχαὶ τὰς μὲν ἀναλάμψεις εὕμενεῖς καὶ ἀλύπους ἔχουσιν, αἱ δὲ σβέσεις αὐτῶν καὶ θοραὶ πολλάκις μὲν, ως υἱῆ, πνεύματα καὶ ἄλας τρέφουσι, πολλάκις δὲ λομικοῖς πάθει τὸν ἀέα φαρμάττουσιν". 'Εκεῖ μέντοι μίαν εἶναι νῆσον, ἐν ἧ τοῦ Κρόνου καθείρθησι φουρούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Βριάρεω καθεύδοντα· δεσμὸν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸν ὑπὸν εὐμηχανήσθαι, πολλοὺς δὲ περὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι δαιμονας ὑπαδοὺς καὶ θεράποντας.

Strabo
IV.4.4
"Ὅταν δὲ φορὰ τούτων ἥ, φορὰν καὶ τῆς χώρας νομίζουσιν ὑπάρχειν. Αφθάρτους δὲ λέγουσι καὶ σώτω [the Druids] καὶ σῶτα [the Druids] τῶς ψυχῶς

Latin
Avienus
Ora Maritima.164-165.

..........post pelagia est insula
herbarum abundans adque Saturno sacra.

Caesar
B.G.VI.13.6-7.
si qui aut privatus aut populus eorum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Haec poena apud eos est gravissima.
Quibus ita est interdictum, hi numero impiorum ac sceleratorum habentur, his omnes decedant, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant, neque his petentibus ius redditur neque honos ullus communicatur.

B.G. VI.13.11-12.
Disciplina in Britannia reperta atque inde in Galliam translata existimatur, et nunc, qui diligentius eam rem cognoscere volunt, plerumque illo discendi causa proficiscerent.

B.G.VI.14.5.
In primis hoc volunt persuadere non interire animas, sed ab aliis post mortem transire ad alios, atque hoc maxime ad virtutem excitari putant metu mortis neglecto.

B.G.VI.19.4.
Funera sunt....omniaque, quae vivis cordi fuisse arbitrantur, in ignem inferunt, etiam animalia, ac paulo supra hanc memoriam servi et clientes, quos ab iis dilectos esse constabat, iustis funebribus confectis una cremabantur.

Catullus
V.5-6

nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux,
nox est perpetua una dormienda.

Cl

Multas per gentes et multa per aequora vectus
advenio has miseram, frater, ad inferias,
ut te postremo donarem munere mortis
et mutam nequiquam alloquerer cinerem,
quandoquidem fortuna mihi tete abstulit ipsum,
heu miser indigne frater adeptae mihi.
Nunc tamen interea haec, prisco quoae more parentum
tradita sunt tristi munere ad inferias,
accipe fraterno multum manatia fletu, atque in
perpetuum, frater, ave atque vale.

CVIII.5-6.

lingua exacta avido sit data vulturio,

CXLVII
effosos oculos voret atro guture corvus,

Lucan
I.447-449.

Vos quoque, qui fortes animas belloque peremptas
laudibus in longam vates dimitis aevum,
plurima securi juditis carmina, bardi.

I.456-458.

regit idem spiritus artus
orbe alio ; longae, canitis si cognita, vitae
mors media est.

Pomponius Mela
De Situ Orbis III.2.19.

Unum ex his quae praeципiant in vulgus effluxit, videlicet ut forent ad bella meliores,
aeternas esse animas vitamque alteram ad manes. Itaque cum mortuis cremant ac
defodiunt apta viventibus. Olim negotiorum ratio etiam et exactio creditideferebatur
ad inferos, erantque qui se in rogos suorum velut una victuri libenter inmitterent......

Silius Italicus
Pun.III.341-343.

His [Celts] pugna cecidisse decus, corpusque cremari
tale nefas: caelo credunt superisque referri,
impastus carpat si membra iacentia vultur.

Tertullian
De Anim.57.10.

Nam et Nasamonas propria oracula apud parentum sepulcra mansitando captare, ut
Heraclides scribit vel Nymphodorus vel Herodotus, et Celtas apud virorum fortium
busta/eadem de causa abnoctare, ut Nicander affirmat.

Valerius Maximus
II.6.10.

Vetus ille mos Gallorum occurrit, quos memoria proditum est pecunias mutuas, quae
his apud inferos redderentur, dare, quia persuasum habuerint animas hominum
inmortales esse.
Commenta Scholia Bernensia ad Lucanum. ad I.451.
Hi [Druids] dicunt redire animas in alium ordem.....Driadae negant interire animas aut contagione inferorum adfici; qui cum defunctis equos servosque et multam suppellectilem conburant quibus uti possint, inde animosi in proelia exeunt nec vitae suae parcunt, tamquam eandem reperturi in alio naturae secessu.

Commenta Scholia Bernensia ad Lucanum. ad I.454.
Manes esse non dicunt, sed animas in revolutione credunt posse constare

Adnotationes super Lucanum ad I.458.
Mors media est] cum ab hoc orbe ad alium orbem transeunt.
Appendix Three

The Presuppositions of Aniconism and Atectonism

Two presuppositions which have affected archaeological investigation of Celtic sacred sites and which must be avoided are that, prior to the Roman conquest, Celtic religion was “essentially aniconic and aetetonic”.

Aniconism

As Spence says, this is a controversial subject. According to Lambrechts it is a generally accepted fact that the Celts of the La Tène period did not know of anthropomorphic deities and “c’est un lieu commun de parler de l’aniconisme des Celtés”. It has always been accepted that that Gallic sculpture was simple and the Celts were incapable of reproducing their gods in the plastic arts, that Gallic cults “like those of Spain, were largely aniconic and anonymous”, that Gallic pre-Roman worship was largely aniconic, that the Celts had a “reluctance to construct images of deities”, that, prior to the Romans, images of Celtic deities were “relatively rare” and that the concept of portraying deities in anthropomorphic form was imported from the Graeco-Roman world. Vendryes is undecided as to whether they were representations of the gods or simple symbols. Unfortunately, the meaning of the words ‘aniconic’ and ‘aniconism’ are inherently inaccurate and there are different interpretations of its meaning.

Lambrechts points out that the word icon, έικόν, the basis of the word ‘aniconism’, is not applied solely to living beings, but also to inanimate objects. Therefore, since, according to him, art is the process of reproducing the image of an object, animate or inanimate, the phrase “aniconic art” is more or less a nonsense.

2 Lewis:4.
3 Spence:83.
4 Lambrechts 1942:53.
7 Ferri:26-27; Jacobsthal 1934:43-44.
8 Green 1987:791.
10 Green 1986a:35.
13 Vendryes 1948:311.
Despite the fact that his conception of art is a rather restrictive one limited only to representational art and that to call aniconic art a nonsense is an exaggeration, Lambrechts is right in saying that this strict interpretation of ‘aniconism’ cannot be applied to Celtic art because this would mean that Celtic religious art had no depiction of anything at all and this is certainly not true of Celtic art. There are many examples of zoomorphic art from all centuries. Therefore, ‘aniconism’ cannot mean the absence of any representation of anything.

Jacobsthal states that Celtic art was aniconic and zoomorphic, but, being at the westernmost end of the cultural belt stretching eastwards across Europe to Asia, it had no anthropomorphic art, since such art was absent from this cultural belt. Although, as Lambrechts has shown, this is actually a contradiction, Lambrechts points out that, while, for Jacobsthal, aniconism does not extend to the animal world, what Jacobsthal means by “aniconic” is that aniconic art does not reproduce anthropomorphism or the human form and that, “aniconic” is synonymous with “non-anthropomorphic”. As Lambrechts says, this is a new slant on the meaning of the word “aniconism”.

Grenier, apparently accepting the reality of human forms in Celtic art, contends that, originally, the human form was a form of decoration and that Celtic art before

---

15 Even if one excludes modern works, such as Jackson Pollock and some of the works of M C Escher, many examples of Celtic art and some art work displayed by Moorish artists in Spain, particularly at the Alhambra, who, due to the restrictions of Islam, were prohibited from using images of any living thing or even of anything at all, prove that intricate line designs and patterns and even, in the case of the Alhambra, the use of Arabic writing, can be classed as art.

16 There is a clay flask from Matzhausen engraved with pairs of animals (Megaw & Megaw: pl.121 and 122) and the definite feline appearance of the handle on the flagon from Kleinspergle in Germany, which has been dated to the La Tène A period, mid or late 5th century BC (Megaw & Megaw: pl.47; Laing & Laing: pl.37). Dated to the same period comes a gold bracelet from Rodenbach, Germany, with the images of ibexes or rams (Laing & Laing: pl.41). A war helmet, dated to the 3rd century BC, from Cuimești in Romania, has a raven or a crest (Green 1996a: pl.71). Celtic art has examples of figurines in the shape of animals, such as the bronze figurines of animals or animal heads (Dechelette: 1307, fig.568), the horse figurines from the 5th to 4th centuries BC (Green 1996a: pl.97), a bronze bull from Wetenburg in Germany dated to the period from 2nd to 1st century BC (Raftery, B. 1990: 19 and pl.93) and a stag figurine from Fellbach Schmiden, Germany dated to 123 BC (Green 1996a: pl.98).

17 Jacobsthal 1944:161. Or anticonic to use his term.

18 Presumably because of the abundant examples of zoomorphic celtic art.
the Conquest was essentially decorative\textsuperscript{24}, which, Lambrechts\textsuperscript{25} says, explains the disproportionate amount of decorated luxury items as opposed to sculptures. But, since Grenier\textsuperscript{26} contrasts this to the concept of an actual image of a deity in human form, which, he believes, supposes a series of particular mental operations, this seems to indicate that Grenier accepts the idea that Celtic art was aniconic. This means that Grenier has another definition of aniconism; Celtic art was anthropomorphic, but the figures were only in a stylised and decorative form\textsuperscript{27}.

In fact, none of the arguments supporting the claim that Celtic religious art was non-anthropomorphomorphic stands up to examination and the concept “has been increasingly challenged by archaeological evidence”\textsuperscript{28}. The presupposition of aniconism, like the presupposition of atetonism, owes its existence primarily to an unquestioning acceptance and reliance on Classical literary evidence, which supplies the evidence from which the idea has arisen and, until recently, to an almost complete lack of archaeological evidence. The arguments or explanations supporting aniconism can be placed in four categories. First, there is an argument, which is ostensibly based on the alleged religious attitudes of the Gauls, but is essentially derived from the philosophical attitudes of its exponents, then there are literary arguments, an archaeological argument, and an argument and a statement, which seem to be an attempt at a psychological approach.

**Argument based on the alleged religious attitudes of the Gauls**

The theory that Celtic religion was aniconic is derived from the idea that the Druids prohibited the depiction of the deities in human form\textsuperscript{29}. It has been pointed out and even accepted by the original exponent of this idea that there is no text to support it\textsuperscript{30}. Reinach\textsuperscript{31} attempts to prove indirectly that the Celtic religion was aniconic.

Reinach, mentioning the lack of archaeological evidence for anthropomorphic images\textsuperscript{32} and dismissing the literary references to images as mistaken identity or

---

\textsuperscript{24} Grenier 1945:282.
\textsuperscript{25} Lambrechts 1954:1.1
\textsuperscript{26} Grenier 1945:274.
\textsuperscript{27} Lambrechts 1954:12.
\textsuperscript{28} Webster 1992:154. Macbain (Macbain:155), one of the earliest opponents of this view, in 1907, holds that the Celts used statues, which were rough and unshapely and uninfluenced by Greek and Roman art.
\textsuperscript{29} de Vries 1961:201-202.
\textsuperscript{30} Reinach 1892:199; MacCulloch 1911:287 and 288; Spence:84.
\textsuperscript{31} Reinach 1892:193-199.
\textsuperscript{32} Reinach 1892:190.
referring to blocks of stone and wood\textsuperscript{33}, concludes that, at the time of the Roman Conquest, the Gauls still did not represent their deities in human form\textsuperscript{34}. Using the report that the Germans did not represent their deities \textit{in ullam humani oris speciem} (\textit{Tac.Germ.IX.1}), Reinach states that the reason given by Tacitus for this repugnance for images indicates a religious interdiction\textsuperscript{35} implying, on the basis of an analogy between the Germans and the Gauls, that the Gauls had no images in human form because of a religious interdiction. As will be seen later, there is now abundant archaeological evidence and Reinach’s dismissal of the literary evidence is specious and driven by his desire to prove aniconism; consequently his conclusion is false. His interpretation of the reason given by Tacitus for the absence of humanlike images among the Germans is also driven by this desire; the German reluctance to depict deities in human form appears to be more of a general cultural attitude rather than a religious interdiction. Moreover, even if an interdiction was the only possible interpretation, this does not mean that it can be applied to the Gauls.

Reinach\textsuperscript{36} states that a religious interdict could only make sense in a culture with a developed artistic skill and a people among whom there were abundant works of art, such as Gaul, and that only the Druids could have issued such a prohibition. However, while the latter could be true, in view of Caesar’s reports of Druidic authority and influence, and the former may be true, neither, alone or together, prove that such an interdict existed.

In order to prove that the Druids were pre-Celtic, and possibly also that they were powerful enough to issue and enforce such an interdict, Reinach\textsuperscript{37} states that the erection and construction of the megalithic monuments in Europe is comprehensible only with a hypothesis of religious aristocracy and resurrects the theory that the Druids were this religious aristocracy. Then, stating that societies, in which the invaders who establish political supremacy nearly always receive at least some of the indigenous religion into their own, particularly if they are polytheistic\textsuperscript{38}, Reinach\textsuperscript{39} claims that the religion of the Druids was imposed on the Celts “dans une mesure que nous ne pouvons pas préciser”. Reinach is thus implying that the interdict against anthropomorphic images is the indigenous teaching taken by the Celts. Firstly,

\textsuperscript{33} Reinach 1892:190-192.
\textsuperscript{34} Reinach 1892:192.
\textsuperscript{35} Reinach 1892:193.
\textsuperscript{36} Reinach 1892:193.
\textsuperscript{37} Reinach 1892:194.
\textsuperscript{38} Reinach 1892:195.
\textsuperscript{39} Reinach 1892:196.
Reinach resurrects a theory, which he himself calls “une théorie aujourd’hui assez discréditée”, to prove that the Druids were pre-Celtic, which undermines his theory immediately. Secondly, Reinach’s logic is faulty. It consists of the faulty syllogism: a religious aristocracy must have built the megalithic monuments; the Druids were a religious aristocracy; therefore the Druids built the megalithic monuments. Thirdly, how can one say that the prohibition of anthropomorphic images is the pre-Celtic teaching which the Celts inherit, when Reinach himself says that the pre-Celtic religion was imposed on the Celts in a measure which one is not able to define? Fourthly, the idea that the Druids were pre-Celtic is dependent on the belief that the invading dominant culture of the Celts would either replace their own priesthood with that of a subjugated people or would import the Druids into their culture because they had no priesthood or similar institution of their own, neither of which is credible. Finally, why is it even necessary for the Druids to be pre-Celtic and to separate ‘druidism’ from Celtic religion in order for the theory of a Druidic interdict to be acceptable?

The final, and most important, part of Reinach’s argument is to attempt to prove that the Druids rejected anthropomorphic images of deities40, which he claims to do by showing that they adhered to Pythagorean teaching41. The argument is as follows. Pythagorean doctrine prohibited or at least frowned upon the use of anthropomorphic statues42; the evidence for this is the statements that the application by Hesiod and Homer of the physical form of human beings to the gods was condemned by Pythagoras (Diog.Laert.VIII.21)43 and that no member of the Pythagorean Order must have an engraving of a deity on his ring (Diog.Laert.VIII.33)44, the report that Numa, the ancient king of Rome, forbade the Romans to use statues of deities in the form of men or animals and his laws are alleged to resemble the doctrine of Pythagoras (Plut.Numa.VIII.7-8)45 and the proposition that, if Pythagoras had been favourable to anthropomorphic statues, the discord between Numa and him would have been mentioned46. Secondly, many ancient writers report that the Druids taught Pythagoras47 (Diod.V.28.6; Val.Max.II.6.10; Hippol.Haer.1.2.17, 25.2; Clem.Al.

40 Reinach 1892.196.
41 Reinach 1892.198.
42 Reinach 1892.197.
43 Reinach 1892.198.
44 Reinach 1892.198.
45 Reinach 1892.197.
46 Reinach 1892.197.
47 Reinach 1892.198. Kendrick (Kendrick:109) says that there is not the slightest reason to think he obtained the concept of metempsychosis from the Gauls and Spence (Spence:93) calls the idea fantasy.
Strom.I.15.70.1; Amm. Marc.XV.9.8; Iambi.De vita Pythag.XXVIII.151); Reinach\(^48\) himself dismisses the report as without value, but says that the assertion is based on the analogy between Pythagoreanism and ‘druidism’, which he calls a fact, and claims that this indicates that the Druids had a similar teaching to the Pythagoreans and, therefore, prohibited images of deities in human form. Although the use of mythical laws of a mythical Roman king is questionable, the statements of Diogenes Laerterius support the contention that Pythagoras condemned anthropomorphism. However, there is no link between Pythagoreanism and the Druids. The alleged analogy between Pythagoreanism and the Druids is an illusion based on the superficial similarity between Pythagorean metempsychosis and the Celtic attitude towards death\(^49\). Even if one accepts the concept of a religious interdict and the pre-Celtic status of the Druids, with no link between Pythagorean doctrine and the Druids, the argument fails\(^50\). As de Vries\(^51\) says, Reinach’s proposition is “eine durchaus fadenscheinige Argumentation”.

Additional arguments against Reinach’s theory are that if, as archaeology shows, the British Celts had images, why would the iconoclast Druids in Gaul allow their students to go to Britain as Caesar claims (Caes.B.G.VI.13.12)\(^52\) and that the Gauls were polytheists, like the other Indo-European peoples, which means that they conceived of their deities as doing and willing beings and, from this, as having human-like characters\(^53\). Therefore, de Vries\(^54\) is right in saying that “wir haben überhaupt keinen Anlaß zu vermuten, sie hätten sich der Vorstellung der Götter als persönlicher Wesen widersetzt”. At the end of his argument Reinach admits that there is no actual text to support his claim and says that the discovery of such a text “serait un véritable trésor; mais je crois du moins en avoir trouvé la monnaie”\(^55\). Unfortunately, as has been shown, the coin is worthless\(^56\).

\(^{48}\) Reinach 1892:198.
\(^{50}\) de Vries 1961:202.
\(^{52}\) MacCulloch 1911:288.
\(^{55}\) Reinach 1892:199.
\(^{56}\) Despite this, the idea of a Druidic prohibition on anthropomorphic images has been unquestioningly accepted by some (Jullian 1909:153; Jacobsthal 1934:43-44; Brunaux 1986:74), ultimately driven, as de Vries (de Vries 1961:198) points out, by ideas derived from the attitude of ‘soft’ cultural primitivism towards certain ancient cultures.
Literary argument

According to Diodorus Siculus, Brennus, the leader of the Celts sacking the temple at Delphi, laughed at the anthropomorphic gods of the Greeks (Diod.XXII.9.4)\(^{57}\); this story has been accepted\(^{58}\) as indicating that the Celts not only had no concept of conceiving their deities in human form, but even found the very concept ridiculous. A second literary reference, by Maximus of Tyre (AD 125-185), in which the Celts are reported as worshipping “Zeus” in the form of an oak-tree (Maxim.Dialexeis. VIII.8)\(^{59}\), has been accepted as indicating that Celtic religious art was not only non-anthropomorphic, but was aniconic in its correct sense; MacCulloch\(^{60}\) suggests that the oak was a trunk rather than a growing tree. However, neither of these arguments based on literature is secure.

As regards the story of Brennus, firstly, as Webster\(^{61}\) points out, Brennus’ reaction to the sight of anthropomorphic deities is ambiguous. Is he laughing at the very idea of men conceiving of deities in human form or at the idea of making images of them? More importantly, Webster states that it is a story with little historical value and doubtful historicity\(^{62}\), the sack of Delphi being historically doubtful\(^{63}\), that it arose probably from “Greek theories of barbarian antipathy to anthropomorphs” and was a “clearly fictionalised account”\(^{64}\) and that it is a “set-piece of description by contrast” to imply the natural superiority of the Greeks\(^{65}\). Moreover, as will be seen with ateonism, it is a τόπος that the behaviour of barbarians is the opposite to that of civilised peoples; the reasoning would be that, since the Greeks are civilised and depict their gods in human form, the Celts, who are obviously barbarians, obviously would not. The argument based on the statement by Maximus of Tyre is also questionable. Firstly, while the worship of “Zeus” as an oak tree certainly seems to have been a vestige of animism, it does not mean that the Celts were incapable of conceiving of their deities in human form. The Greeks believed that Zeus spoke through the oak trees at Dodona, the oldest oracle in Greece and remarkably similar

\(^{57}\) Οτι Βρέννος ὁ τῶν Γαλατῶν βασιλεὺς εἰς ναὸν ἐλθὼν ἄργυρον μὲν ἢ χρυσόν οὐδὲν εὑρεν ἀναθήμα, ἀγάλματα δὲ μόνον λίθυνα καὶ ξύλινα καταλαβὼν κατεγέλασεν, ὁτι θεοὺς ἀνθρωπομορφῶς εἶχε δοκοῦντες ἰστασαν αὐτῶν ξύλινος τε καὶ λίθινος.


\(^{59}\) Κελτοὶ σέβοντι μὲν Δία, ἀγάλμα δὲ Δίος Κελτικὸν ὤψηλη δρύς.

\(^{60}\) MacCulloch 1911:284.

\(^{61}\) Webster 1992:554.

\(^{62}\) Webster 1992:154 and 556.

\(^{63}\) Webster 1992:553 and 556.

\(^{64}\) Webster 1992:154.

\(^{65}\) Webster 1992:556.
to the cult mentioned by Maximus, that Demeter and Persephone could be contacted at the cave of Eleusis and that Athena was represented by the olive tree on the Acropolis at Athens; yet none of these prevented the Greeks from conceiving of and portraying their deities in human shape. Macbain\textsuperscript{66} contends that the oak mentioned by Maximus was an example of emblems, which the Celts used before they used statues.

Not only is there no literary support for aniconism, but, on the contrary, there is actually literary support for the idea of religious statuary in human form. Caesar states that \textit{huius} [Mercury] \textit{sunt plurima simulacra} (\textit{Caes.B.G.VI.17.1}), an expression which has embarrassed the proponents of aniconism\textsuperscript{67}. Since Caesar must have seen something, it must be asked of the proponents of aniconism what Caesar saw\textsuperscript{68}; Reinach\textsuperscript{69} argues that the menhirs in Gaul reminded Caesar of the \textit{Hermae}, that he is using the word \textit{simulacra} to refer to these and, therefore, that the word \textit{simulacra} actually refers to pillars of stone, not statues in human form; Reinach feels the argument is supported by the fact that the word \textit{simulacrum} does not always refer to a statue\textsuperscript{70}. But Thévenot\textsuperscript{71} says that the term is too clear to allow that explanation. MacCulloch\textsuperscript{72} posits that perhaps Caesar meant “symbol” and was referring to boundary stones. Vendryes\textsuperscript{73} is undecided as to whether they were representations of the gods or simple symbols. On the other side, de Vries and Webster point out that the word \textit{simulacra} is used in the Graeco-Roman world to refer to images\textsuperscript{74} and deities or images of deities and, therefore, the human figure\textsuperscript{75} and, since Caesar does not qualify the word, the word would strongly suggest to his readership the idea of anthropomorphic images\textsuperscript{76}. Moreover, the word \textit{simulacrum} was used by Caesar to describe the figures in which human sacrifices were burnt (\textit{Caes.B.G.VI.16.4}); Webster\textsuperscript{77} points out that, in view of the fact that Strabo, referring to the same constructions, uses the word \textit{κολοφοσσόν} (\textit{Strab.IV.4.5}), a term which is usually used for large statues, it is clear that Strabo interprets the \textit{simulacrum} as being human in shape and this confirms the word \textit{simulacrum} and, therefore, the \textit{simulacra} of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Macbain}:155.
\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Thévenot} 1942:107.
\textsuperscript{68} \textit{de Vries} 1961:198.
\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Reinach} 1890:224-225; \textit{Reinach} 1892:190-191 and 192.
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Reinach} 1890:297.
\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Thévenot} 1946:108.
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{MacCulloch} 1911:284, 285 and 333.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Vendryes} 1948:311.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{de Vries} 1961: 199.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Webster} 1992:155 and 555.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{de Vries} 1961: 199; \textit{Webster} 1992:155 and 555.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Webster} 1992:155.
\end{flushright}
“Mercury” as being human in form. De Vries believes that Caesar definitely saw simulacra of Celtic deities and Powell states that one can deduce from Caesar’s statement that some pre-Roman images were obviously anthropomorphic. Caesar mentions only Mercury because either he considers him the most important deity to the Gauls and therefore the only one worth mentioning or he expects the reader to deduce that, if one deity has images, then the others do too.

Lucan mentions crude images of the Gallic gods (Luc. III.412-413), but Reinach argues that Lucan means nothing more than the trunks of trees and pillars of wood. But, as Thévenot says, the term simulacra is too clear for this explanation. From Lucan’s statement that people are less afraid of divine powers portrayed in familiar images (Luc. III.415-416) Reinach contends that, if the simulacra were actually anthropomorphic, they would not have inspired such fear, implying that fear of this kind could only have arisen because the representations were certainly not anthropomorphic, and, focusing on the words arte carent as meaning “unworked”, says that, if Caesar was referring to pillars of stone, Lucan wants to refer to pillars of wood. He feels that the report by Maximus of Tyre supports this. Webster points out that not only are the images of the deities described as lacking artistry rather than lacking human form and, not as trees and trunks, but as formed from trees and trunks, but also the very fact that Lucan seems to contrast the Gallic images with Roman statues and imagery is “instructive”. MacCulloch, de Vries and Piggott feel that such wooden statues may have been the simulacra seen by Caesar or his informants. Finally, Valerius Flacces refers to some simulacra of Jupiter (Val. Flac. Argonautica. IX.9); this is glossed as columnae, probably due to acceptance of aniconism.

As Webster says, taken together, the texts of Caesar, Strabo and Lucan suggest that the Gauls had human representations of their deities. In view of this the fact that the passage by Diodorus is contradicted by the reports of Caesar and Lucan and is supported by no other literary evidence further undermines its reliability and,
consequently, even if Diodorus’ passage shows that at one time, possibly because the Gallic images were crude or artistically different from Graeco-Roman figures, Graeco-Roman authors believed that the Celts had no images of their deities, it is surprising that such weight is given to and such reliance is placed upon this report instead of the reports of Caesar, confirmed by Strabo, and Lucan. Indeed, the strength of the argument based on Caesar and Lucan is seen by the fact that proponents of aniconism have had to change their theories. Jullianfaced with the passage of Caesar, not only accepts that, if an interdiction against images existed, it was no longer in force by the time of Caesar, but also, by saying “si cette interdiction a existé”, concedes the possibility that the Druidic prohibition of images never existed. Brunaux accepts that the simulacra were representations of deities, but reconciles this with his aniconism by saying that the simulacra were highly stylised and were not symbols.

D’Arbois de Jubainville states that a characteristic of Homeric deities is that they are anthropomorphic and are capable of having wives, children and sexual liaisons with human beings, that a person may be produced by a human and a deity and that these characteristics were common to Celtic deities, coming squarely in favour of the idea that Celtic gods were anthropomorphic. D’Arbois de Jubainville points to the existence of Greek names indicating divine parentage, such as Diogenes and Hermogenes, as well as a host of divine offspring in the Greek myths. As regards Celtic proper names d’Arbois de Jubainville gives five examples of these in literature and epigraphy. The argument is, therefore, that, since the Greek names which indicated divine parentage were acceptable and did not contradict Greek religious attitudes because the Greeks held the concept that deities had human

86 Webster 1992:556.
88 Caesar actually says that the simulacra of Mercury are most numerous, not, as Jullian (Jullian 1909:153) says, the simulacra of Teutates.
89 Brunaux 1986:74.
90 D’Arbois de Jubainville 1898a:224.
92 D’Arbois de Jubainville 1898a:229-230.
93 Camulogenus, meaning “son of Camulos”, Camulos being the name of a deity who is equated with Mars among the Remi, the Viromandui and the Menapii, was the name of a Gallic general (Caes. B.G. VII.57.3). Virdumarus, the chief of the Insubres, claimed descent from the Rhine river (Prop.IV.10.41). The names Esugenus (CIL XIII.4674), meaning “Son of Esus” (D’Arbois de Jubainville 1898a:229; MacCulloch 1191.39; Vendryes 1948:263; Duval 1954:16) or “Born of Esus” (Schmidt: 211; Olmsted 1994:321), and Esumopas (CIL XIII.3199), meaning “Son of Esus” (Schmidt: 211; Olmsted 1994:321), refer to descent from the Gallic god Esus (Luc.1.445). Three further inscriptions contain the name Totatigenus (CIL VI.2407), meaning “son of Totatis” or “of Toutatis”, later forms of the Gallic god Teutates (Luc.1.444-445) (D’Arbois de Jubainville 1898a:230), and Taranuncus (CIL XII.6094, 6478), meaning son of Taranus (Le Roux 1958a:33), a form of Taranis (Luc.1.446).
form\textsuperscript{94}, Celtic proper names which refer to divine parentage must indicate that this concept was acceptable to the Celts and, therefore, that the Celts had the concept of anthropomorphic deities.

Finally, Rankin\textsuperscript{95} points out that people, such as the Jews, who worshipped without any image of a deity recognisable to the Greeks and, therefore, probably with no physical characteristics, are described in Classical literature as άθεοι and yet the Celts were never described in this way. Indeed, Webster\textsuperscript{96} suggests that the very absence of this term with reference to the Gauls seems to indicate that the Celts might have represented their deities in an anthropomorphic way. All these points refer to Classical literature; Irish vernacular literature confirms that the Celts conceived of anthropomorphic deities\textsuperscript{97}.

**Archaeological argument**
An argument in favour of aniconism is archaeological finds or, rather, the lack of them and the fact that, until recently, all the images of deities, which have been discovered, come from the Gallo-Roman period\textsuperscript{98} or come from areas influenced by Rome. An example of this situation is the fact that, while cult images of Cernunnos prior to the Roman Conquest, are rare, with one from the 4th century BC and one from the 1st century BC\textsuperscript{99}, more than fifty representations of this deity have been found in the Roman period\textsuperscript{100}. This appears to be a reasonable argument, but closer examination reveals its flaws.

First, the representation of severed human heads and masks, which had great sacred power and religious significance, undermine this idea\textsuperscript{101}. Secondly, although pre-Roman Celtic stone iconography is rare\textsuperscript{102}, there are examples of pre-Roman stone sculpture, from between the 6th and 3rd centuries BC and from the 3rd to 1st centuries BC from areas unaffected by Graeco-Roman influence\textsuperscript{103}, as well as imagery in metal, primarily bronze\textsuperscript{104}, and there are many examples of such
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\textsuperscript{94} D’Arbois de Jubainville 1898a:228-229.
\textsuperscript{95} Rankin:260.
\textsuperscript{96} Webster 1992:154.
\textsuperscript{97} MacCulloch 1911:283; de Vries 1961:202; Wait 1985:187.
\textsuperscript{98} Proposed by Reinach (Reinach 1892:190) and mentioned by Lambrechts, Thévenot and de Vries (Lambrechts 1942:54; Thévenot 1942:107; de Vries 1961:200).
\textsuperscript{99} See pages .
\textsuperscript{100} Green 1993:147.
\textsuperscript{101} Powell 1980:161; Ross 1986:117-119.
\textsuperscript{102} Green 1986a:10.
\textsuperscript{103} de Vries 1961:201; Powell 1980:161; Green 1995b:466-467.
\textsuperscript{104} Green 1995b:468.
anthropomorphic art\textsuperscript{105}; according to Powell\textsuperscript{106}, the rarity of anthropomorphic representations in stone is due to the lack of craftsmanship necessary to work in stone, resulting in a small production of stone images, rather than to any aversion to images of deities in human form. Thirdly, while it is true that Gallo-Roman relief and statuary is based on Roman and Greek models, such as the representations of Mercury, Mars and Apollo and the use of the representation of the goddess Hygeia to depict Sirona, this does not actually prove that there were no Gallic anthropomorphic statues, merely that the Gallic artists preferred to use Graeco-Roman models, possibly to show loyalty, possibly because the Mediterranean versions were superior. It has been pointed out that, far from indicating that anthropomorphic representations of deities were non-existent in Gaul prior to the Conquest, the speed with which such Greek and Roman anthropomorphic models were accepted by the Gauls, in fact, indicates that they were fully acquainted with the concept of visualising and representing deities in human form and must already have had such images\textsuperscript{107}; unless one believes that they adopted an alien concept without a thought. Thévenot\textsuperscript{108} suggests that the Gauls were in the process of conceiving and of depicting their deities in human form at the time of the Conquest. Finally, the claim that the only images of deities come from the Gallo-Roman period does not take into account the fact that, although Thévenot\textsuperscript{109} mentions clay as a material, the primary and most common medium for sculpture and iconography among the Celts, as it was for buildings, was wood\textsuperscript{110}, due to its availability, cheapness and ease of use, and,

\textsuperscript{105} There is the cult wagon of a goddess, worshippers and stags from Strettweg in Austria dated to the period from the 7th to the 6th century BC (Laing & Laing: pl.27Green 1996a:142) and from the 6th century BC comes the statue of a Hallstatt warrior from Ditzingen-Hirschlanden in Germany (Green 1996a:74, pl.47). The “Janus” pillar or figure from Holzgerlingen dates from the 6th or 5th century BC (Early Celtic Art:14, pl.67; Megaw & Megaw:pl.84; Laing & Laing: pl.67). Dated to the 5th century BC are the stylised human face on a flagon from Dürrnbarg in Austria, second half of the La Tène (Megaw & Megaw:pl.86; Laing & Laing: pl.42), bronze harness with faces from Hořovický in the Czech Republic, late La Tène (Megaw & Megaw:pl.75; Green 1996:110 and pl.79). The 4th century produced, from Hallstatt in Austria, a scabbard on which there are pictures of infantry and cavalry, La Tène A (Megaw & Megaw:pl.92; Green 1996a:130, pl.65) and men holding a wheel (Megaw & Megaw:pl.VII), a bronze and iron plaque from Weisskirchen in Germany on which there are human faces (Laing & Laing:pl.38), a human head with part of a neck ring from Mâcon, France, La Tène A/B1 (Megaw & Megaw:pl.135) and a flagon with a human head on the handle from Waldalgesheim in Germany, La Tène A/Early La Tène B1 (Megaw & Megaw:pl.45; Laing & Laing:pl.48). There are human figures on a dagger handle dated to the 1st century BC from Tesson in France (Green 1996a:pl.67). Green (Green 1996a:147) says that one can assume that the images on the Gundestrup cauldron and other pre-Roman images represent deities.

\textsuperscript{106} Powell 1980:161.


\textsuperscript{108} Thévenot 1942:107.

\textsuperscript{109} Thévenot 1942:108.

\textsuperscript{110} MacCulloch 1911:288; Lambrechts 1954:11; Powell 1980:161; Ross 1986:117.
therefore, that most of the known examples of figures are not made of a lasting material\textsuperscript{111}.

The only materials mentioned in the ethnographies are twigs (\textit{Caes.B.G.VI.16.4}), straw and wood (\textit{Strab.IV.4.5})\textsuperscript{112}, although Webster\textsuperscript{113} points out that the purpose for which the material was used dictated the use of flammable material and that the texts seem to suggest that representations of deities must be made of impermanent material, Lucan says that the images, which were certainly not intended to be burnt, were wooden. These materials, unlike the primary Graeco-Roman media of stone and bronze, are perishable\textsuperscript{114} and either leave no trace or survive only in the right, usually accidental\textsuperscript{115}, conditions\textsuperscript{116} and that this occurs exceptionally\textsuperscript{117}. One should not have been surprised that no trace of such idols has been found, since the material has not been preserved\textsuperscript{118} and this explains their absence\textsuperscript{119} rather than the explanation mentioned by Lambrechts\textsuperscript{120}. However, archaeology, with anthropomorphic statuary, possibly of deities, continuing to be found\textsuperscript{121}, has increasingly challenged the concept of aniconism\textsuperscript{122} and has revealed that “images of Celtic divinities were...present in small numbers in the last few centuries before Christ”\textsuperscript{123}, all made of wood\textsuperscript{124}, indicating that stone was not the only medium of sculpture for the Celts before the Romans\textsuperscript{125}.

Anthropomorphic representations of Celtic deities are now known in wood\textsuperscript{126} and the
evidence suggests that the Celts had many various images and idols. It is accepted that there had been many wooden statues, which have been lost, and that pre-Roman Celtic religious sculpture in wood may have been far more abundant than was once thought. Green says “there is no doubt that images of gods were made in wood”, points out that those very few figures, and by very few she means in comparison with stone figures, which have survived indicate that wooden images of deities may have been common since the 7th century BC and that the wooden images “suggest a wealth of iconography which has not survived”. Laing and Laing believe that “many depictions of the human face or form are the images of gods or supernatural beings” and this may apply to 27 statues depicting entire human figures, which form part of the 190 carved wooden figurines discovered at the springs of the river Seine. It has been shown that the date the figures were deposited was in the middle of the 1st century AD, since the ceramic material associated with the figures has been dated to the period of Tiberius and Claudius; but this actually only proves that the offerings were only deposited at that time and merely suggests that this is the date of the figures. It is perfectly possible that they could have been made earlier and “they must themselves be earlier in date”. The fact that such a large number of wooden artefacts, large in view of the fact that wood needs exceptional circumstances to survive, has indeed survived indicates that great quantities must have been produced. The Irish had images and many objects similar to idols have been found in Ireland. Faced with archaeological evidence Brunaux has had to concede that representation did develop, possibly at the great sanctuaries such as Gournay-sur-Aronde, and posits that such representation was necessary because the deities had to attend these sanctuaries. This contradicts his statement that the Gallic deities lived away from the Gauls and did not attend cult ceremonies.

127 Ross 1986:117.
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Psychological approach

The two attempts at a psychological approach to support aniconism are provided by Jullian and Le Roux and Guyonvarc'h. Jullian states that a serious obstacle to idolatry must have existed in Gaul and that this obstacle must have been the Druids, who, if they did not proscribe the practice, discouraged it. Le Roux and Guyonvarc'h state that "l'anthropomorphisme n'est un fait religieux normal" and is a deviation the cause of which is Graeco-Roman thought. Both can be seen to be inadequate.

The first flaw in Jullian’s argument is that it is based on the presupposition, derived from literature and the lack of archaeological evidence at that time, that aniconism existed and consequently does not attempt to provide any evidence for it. However, Jullian goes on to make a statement, which, even if the case for aniconism had been proved, is remarkable. According to Jullian, a clergy does not have a very great interest in a person knowing the gods too well and on the day that a Gaul produces a figure of them, presumably Jullian means of a deity, and lodges them at his home, he would no longer need to request his priest to intercede on his behalf, because the prestige of the Druids was dependent on the fact that they alone were supposed to know that which was divine. The principal argument against this is the fact that the Roman Catholic Church, as well as the Russian Orthodox and the Greek Orthodox, tolerate and, indeed, encourage the use and production of religious images and figures and their use in religious activities, principally intercessory, by those outside the priestly class. Yet this has in no way reduced the authority of the priesthood of the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches, since the priesthood still has a monopoly over the more important religious activities, the sacraments, just as the Druids controlled the most important religious elements, the sacrifices and the selection of victims. Jullian’s proposition is all the more remarkable since he comes from a country, in which the majority of the population is ostensibly Roman Catholic.

As regards the statement by Le Roux and Guyonvarc’h, the first flaw with this statement is that, like that of Jullian’s, it also suffers from the fact that it is based on the idea that Gallic religion was aniconic, even though that idea is an unsupported presupposition. The other flaws are equally clear. The statement that anthropomorphism is an unnatural religious concept is not only contrary to Social-Anthropological evidence, but, even if one were to grant that the Celts acquired the
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142 See page.
concept from the Greeks and the Romans, if it is such an unnatural concept, where did the Greeks and Romans acquire it?

These facts and arguments counter the claim that human representation was repugnant to the Gauls143, show that Celtic religious art was, far from being aniconic, quite the reverse144 and that the Celts had their full share of the worship of anthropomorphic idols145 and prove that the idea that Celtic art was aniconic is now a modern myth146.

Atectonism
Jullian states that, at the time of Caesar, the general rule was that there was no building of temples to a deity and that worship was in sacred places, forests, especially those of oak, containing clearings or groves147 and that closed and covered sanctuaries remained exceptional even at the time of Caesar148; according to Jullian149, the holy places and woods set aside were carefully demarcated according to a mysterious surveying principle and they were temples only in the primitive sense, similar to the original meaning of the Latin templum. Jullian says that the majority of consecrated places were simply open spaces limited by ritual150. Cunliffe151 thinks it best to consider the temples of Entremont and Roquepertuse as a regional form.

This belief has been accepted and reproduced by some152 and, to a degree, by others153. However, not only does Powell reveal that archaeology has not discovered anything like a sacred grove154, but also, by 1948, even before the discovery of the great sanctuaries of Gournay-sur-Aronde and Ribemont-sur-Ancre, MacCulloch alters his opinion and believes that there were temples as well as groves155, granting
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that the *loci consecrati* mentioned by Caesar (*Caes.B.G.*VI.13.10; 17.4)\textsuperscript{156} may have been temples of a simple kind\textsuperscript{157} and that, although there are few references to temples in pre-Roman times, they show they existed, probably of wood rather than stone\textsuperscript{158}.

The general acceptance of this presupposition can be seen in the translation of a passage (*Dio.LXII.7.3*) in the Loeb Library Edition of Dio by E. Cary, dated 1955. The first part, ἐν τε τοῖς ἀλλοις σφῶν ἱεροῖς, is translated “in all their other sacred places”, but the second part, καὶ ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀγαθῆς μάλιστα, is translated as “but particularly in the grove of Andate”, although there is no word in the text for “grove” and the τῷ must refer to τοῖς ἱεροῖς and should be translated as “in the sacred place of Andate”. Yet, even though the only basis one has for translating ἐν τῷ as “in the grove” is if one already believes it means that, Henig, Green, Brunaux and even Webster\textsuperscript{159}, who does not accept the presupposition of aetetonism, accept this translation as literary evidence for sacred groves in Roman Britain.

The presupposition is alleged to be supported on three bases: literary references, which supply positive arguments and a negative one; etymology, which appears to supply only a positive argument; and archaeology, which allegedly provides a negative argument. Finally, any weaknesses in the arguments are apparently overlooked due to an attitude to Celtic and Druidic worship, which seems to view them in an idealised fashion. Each argument will be examined and it will be seen that each is essentially flawed and provides no support for the concept.

The literary argument

The literary support for the presupposition is alleged to lie both in a Greek author, Strabo (*Strab.*III.1.4, III.4.16. and IV.1.13)\textsuperscript{160}, and, principally, in the Latin authors Pomponius Mela, Lucan, Tacitus and Pliny the Elder (*Luc.*I.453-454, III.339-425;

\textsuperscript{156} Hi certo anni tempore in finibus Carnutum, quae regio totius Galliae media habetur, consistunt in loco consecrate (*Caes.*B.G.*VI.*13.10) and Multis in civitatibus harum rerum exstructos cumulos locis consecratis conspicari licet (*Caes.*B.G.*VI.*17.4).

\textsuperscript{157} MacCulloch 1948:63.

\textsuperscript{158} MacCulloch 1948:64.

\textsuperscript{159} Henig 1984:18; Green 1986a:21; Brunaux 2004:90; Webster 1992:166.

\textsuperscript{160} (*Strab.*III.1.4), Ἔνιοι δὲ τοὺς Καλλαῖκους άθεους φασί, τοὺς δὲ Κελτιβηρας καὶ τοὺς προσβόρρους τῶν ὄμορφων αὐτοίς ἀνανύμυν τιν θεῷ ταῖς παντελῆνοις νύκτιοι πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν, πανοικίων τε χορεύειν καὶ πανουχίζειν (*Strab.*III.4.16) and Εὐτεδέθειν μὲν ὄν ἡ παραλλα παρατείνει μέχρι τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῆς Πυρηναίας Αφροδίτης καὶ τούτο δ' ἐστιν ὄριον ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπαρχίας καὶ τῆς Ἱβηρικῆς (*Strab.*IV.1.13).
Pliny. H.N. XVI.103-4 and 250; and Tac. Ann. XIV.30.3)\(^{161}\), who associate woods, groves and such natural sites with Druids. It is claimed that Strabo provides evidence of the use of natural sites in his references to a description by Artemidorus at the beginning of the 1st century BC of an open-air ritual in western Spain (Strab. III.1.4), in which Artemidorus explicitly refers to the absence of structures, to the fact that the Celtiberians worshipped a nameless deity outside their houses (Strab. III.4.16) and, particularly relevant, to the practice of the Celtic tribe the Tectosages of leaving booty \(\varepsilon\nu \\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\delta\iota\varsigma\) (Strab. IV.1.13). Pomponius Mela says that Druids used to teach the noblest people secretly in specu aut in abditis saltibus (Pomponius. III.2.18). Tacitus in his description of the conquest of the island of Mona [Anglesey] by the Romans, mentions the destruction of luci saevis superstitionibus sacri, groves which were obviously cult places because in them there were altars (Tac. Ann. XIV.30.3).

Pliny the Elder describes the sacrifice of two bulls sub arbore (Pliny. N. H. XVI.250). But the cornerstone of the presupposition and the most frequently mentioned references are the statement in one context, that is the description of Gallic human sacrifices, that the Druids inhabit nemora alta remotis...lucis (Luc. I.453-454)\(^{162}\) and, in particular, in another context, the destruction of a sacred grove (Luc. III.399-425)\(^{163}\), which Powell says is the only example of a description of a sacred grove in Classical literature\(^{164}\). The Commentaries on Lucan by the Berne Scholiasts reinforce this image by claiming that the Druids sine templis colebant deos in silvis and semotos lucos incolant (Commenta Scholitae Bernensia ad Lucanum ad I.451).

However, the support these literary references provide is questionable. Firstly, not only were the descriptions deliberately spectacular, but the “ancient portrayal is, of course, shot through with prejudice, and is probably a literary conceit”\(^{165}\), no doubt intended to shock and revolt, as Henig himself seems to accept when he says that the description of the grove in Lucan (Luc. III.399-425) attests to “the rough and unwholesome aspect of native religion seen by an outsider”\(^{166}\). Secondly, these passages may also display Classical ethnocentrism in that the Classical authors seemed to think that, because the Gauls were less civilised, they were closer to nature

\(^{161}\) (Luc. I.453-454), (Luc. III.339-425), (Pliny. H. N. XVI.103-4), Sacrificio epulisque rite sub arbore conparatis (Pliny. H. N. XVI.250) and Praesidiumposthac inpositum victis excisique luci saevis superstitionibus sacri: (Tac. Ann. XIV.30.3).

\(^{162}\) MacCulloch 1911:282; Kendrick: 147; Spence: 118.


\(^{164}\) Powell: 167.

\(^{165}\) King: 222.

\(^{166}\) Henig 1984:18.
and so simplicity and naturalness in worship were expected and assumed. Perhaps this was influenced by the fact that the worship of divine beings in groves (Verg.Aen.VIII.352 and 597) and trees (Pliny,H.N.XII.3) was deeply rooted in Roman religion\textsuperscript{167}. In addition, not only could the association of druids with woodland groves be based on false etymology\textsuperscript{168} (Pliny,H.N.XVI.249), but, even if the druids did use such natural, and secret, loci, this may have been forced on them by the persecution under Claudius\textsuperscript{169} and again does not prove that such sites were used before the 1st Century AD. Finally, Wait\textsuperscript{170} points out that all these references, except Strabo’s, are dated to the 1st century AD, a point ignored by advocates of natural sites\textsuperscript{171}, and the Berne Scholiasts are even later, dated to between the 4th and the 9th centuries AD. Indeed, Webster\textsuperscript{172} states categorically that the assumption about sacred groves is not based on texts before the 1st century AD, because there are no such references. Not only do these references from the 1st century AD onwards give no indication of the practices prior to that century, but, by the 1st century AD, Roman control was complete and some legislation had been introduced restricting Celtic practices and Druidic rituals. Webster\textsuperscript{173} suggests that it is possible that the Imperial proscription of the Druids may have forced the use of secluded locations for worship; indeed, Lucan may be referring to this (Luc.I.451).

It may even be that the influence and acculturation of Roman religion, seen in the re-establishment of Gallic temples in stone and their consecration to deities with hybrid names, may have been seen as a loss of culture by some and such “true believers” may have taken to worship in groves because all the temples and the deities worshipped there had undergone admixture. Most likely, however, is the idea that the connection of Druids with groves, particularly oak groves, may be due to the etymology constructed by Pliny the Elder (Pliny,N.H.XVI. 249) by which the word Druid is derived from δρυς, the Greek word for “oak”\textsuperscript{174}. In short, as Webster says\textsuperscript{175}, the association of groves with Celtic religion may be a 1st century AD literary construct, a construct followed by the Berne Scholiasts because of the even greater temporal distance between them and the actual events. Finally, the 1st

\textsuperscript{167} Ferguson:65-69.
\textsuperscript{168} Chadwick 1966:38.
\textsuperscript{169} Webster 1995:448.
\textsuperscript{170} Wait 1985:155 and 204.
\textsuperscript{171} Webster 1992:168; Webster 1995:448.
\textsuperscript{172} Webster 1992:165 and 166.
\textsuperscript{173} Webster 1992:167; Webster 1995:448.
\textsuperscript{174} Chadwick 1966:38.
\textsuperscript{175} Webster 1992:167; Webster 1995:448.
century AD references are in stark contrast to the references to worship sites dated to
the 1st century BC, which, either implying formal structures \(^{176}\) (Strab.IV.1.3, IV.3.2, 
IV.4.5 and IV.4.6; Diod.V.27; Livy.XXII.2.9, XXIII.24.11 and Per.; Polyb.II.32; 
Cic. Pro Font.13.30), or enclosures \(^{177}\) (Strab.IV.1.13 and XII.5.2; Diod.V.27.4), 
suggest the formal structuring of space involving an enclosure \(^{178}\). Indeed, even all 
those 1st century BC references of Strabo, which, as has been said, are considered as 
referring to natural cult sites (Strab.III.1.4, III.4.16 and IV.1.13) actually imply the 
use of enclosures \(^{179}\). The fact that the vast majority of 2nd and 1st century BC 
references to Gallic cult sites indicate artificial structures and the references to 
natural sites are all dated to the 1st century AD supports the idea that it is a 1st 
century AD literary construct.

As regards the reference of Pomponius Mela (Pomponius.III.2.18) it does not 
actually refer to religion, but to the teaching of young nobility. It is therefore possible 
that, with the establishment by the Romans of schools for the aristocratic youth, the 
Druids, who must have feared the loss of their prestige and power as teachers and 
indoctrinators of the ruling class, and some nobles, who may have feared the loss of 
the Gallic culture and the encroachment of the Roman, may have participated in 
secret schools for the young Gallic nobility to be taught the “old ways” and the best 
location for this teaching would be in the woods and groves. The interpretation that 
this passage is concerned with religion is another indication of the automatic 
association of groves with Celtic religion.

Finally, the passage of Lucan is not the cornerstone it seems. The first point is that, 
while Lucan’s description of the grove is extremely atmospheric and suitably fear-
inducing, with birds fearing to sit in the branches (Luc.III.407), wild animals too 
scared to recline there (Luc.III.408), leaves moving even though no wind blew 
(Luc.III.408-409), trees burned but not engulfed (Luc.III.420) and dragon-like snakes 
bending around the trees (Luc.III.421), it is not only considered as being exaggerated 
and containing a note of outrage and ingination, by MacCulloch and Woodward \(^{180}\), 
but is described even by Henig \(^{181}\), who accepts the authority of Lucan, as “hardly a 
reliable eye-witness record”. It also contains various clichés regarding Gauls and

\(^{176}\) Webster 1992:147.
\(^{177}\) Webster 1992:147.
\(^{178}\) Webster 1995:447.
\(^{179}\) Webster 1995:448.
\(^{180}\) MacCulloch 1948:63; Woodward:51.
\(^{181}\) Henig 1984:18.
barbarians: there is the standard mention of human sacrifice as a characteristic of Gallic religion (Luc.III.404-405); the image conjured up by Lucan’s skill would inspire the reader to contrast the eldritch horror of the Gallic cult site with the clean, wholesome majesty of Roman temples; and the idea that the Gauls worship in groves can be viewed as another application of the standard cliché that barbarians behave in the opposite way to civilised peoples, so that here, since Romans, who are civilised, worship in artificial structures, Gauls, who are uncivilised, must therefore worship in natural areas such as groves and, consequently, are portrayed in this way.

The second point is that those who accept the presupposition of natural cult sites accept that the exceptions to this in Provence, such as Roquepertuse and Entremont, are the result of Greek influence emanating from Massilia [Marseilles], yet also accept that a sacred grove near Massilia [Marseilles] was still customarily used by Gauls. If the Gauls living only within the influence of Massilia [Marseilles] take up the concept of artificial cult sites before the 2nd century BC, as they must have done since both Roquepertuse and Entremont were destroyed in 125 BC, why are Gauls living near Massilia [Marseilles] still using sacred groves as late as 49 BC? Surely, if Greek influence was so strong, Gauls near Massilia [Marseilles] would have dispensed with sacred groves many decades before - or, if they did, why had they gone back to them?

In addition literary references from ancient authors, which provide evidence of formal structures are overlooked. Strabo (Strab.IV.4.6) describes an annual ritual performed by a group of women called the Samnitae on an island in the river Loire. This passage is important because the annual rite refers to the re-roofing of τὸ τερόν. This is the one 1st century BC reference which specifically mentions that a formal structure had a roof and, according to Piggott182, “seems clearly a covered shrine”. Although the reference is tainted by interpretatio, in the identification of the deity the women worship with Dionysus and possibly in his description of their frenzied activities, the roofing ritual, which has no equivalent in Dionysiac religion, does not seem to be a part which is affected. It may be alleged, by those supporting the aeteconic view, that the reason for Strabo’s interest is that a Gallic religious structure with a roof was unusual enough to merit mention; but it is clear that, as well as the supposed Dionysian resemblance, it is not the fact that τὸ τερόν is roofed, but the fact that it is re-roofed annually which is surprising and worthy of mention. The material must have been replaceable, because it took place annually, and portable,

because each woman carries a portion. Although Webster considers this to be "the only unambiguous reference to a roofed structure", Polybius states that the Insubres took their golden standards τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηναίς ἱεροῦ (Polyb. II.32), Livy states that, after the defeat of the Consul L. Postumius, the Boii, caputque praeecessum ducis Boii ovantes templum, quod sanctissimum est apud eos, intulere (Livy. XXIII.24.11), and, after the head was cleaned and gilded, it was used as a goblet sacerdotibus ac templi antistitibus (Livy. XXIII.24.12), Suetonius states that Caesar plundered fanum templique (Suet. Jul. 54. 2)185, and, finally, according to Plutarch, the Arverni hung a sword belonging to Caesar in a temple (Plut. Caes. XXVI.8)186, although Piggott considers even these to be ambiguous because, according to Piggott, templum and fanum can mean no more than an unroofed sanctuary.

As has been said, Webster points out that ancient literature before the 1st century AD is devoid of any reference to sacred groves. Advocates of the concept of sacred groves have proposed two explanations for this. It has been argued that this may be due to such worship in groves being considered so ordinary to the Roman author, who, as has been said, was the product of a religion involving the sacred nature of trees and groves as places of worship or abodes of deities, as not to be worth mentioning. However, as Webster points out, for Roman authors, a similarity between Roman and Gallic religions would provoke as much interest as a difference. The second explanation is that the rites in the sacred groves were not practised by the social elite and would therefore go unrecorded; but this is based on the assumption that there were such practices in the first places, an assumption for which there is no foundation.

Finally, ancient authors always fixed on the unusual and those aspects, which were different from Mediterranean custom. Examples of such topics were the habit of some Celtic warriors of fighting naked (Polyb. II.28; Diod. V.29.1), human sacrifice (Diod. V.32.6; Caes. B. G. VI.16.2-5; Strab. IV.4.5), head-hunting (Polyb. II.28.10; 183 Webster 1992:429.
188 Webster 1992:165 and 166.
189 Webster 1992:166.
190 See the “Ethnocentricity” sub-section of the section entitled “Classical Literature as a source of evidence” in the chapter Sources and Method.
Polyb.III.67.3; Diod.V.29.4, XIV. 115.4-5; Strab.IV.4.5; Livy.X.26.10-11; Sil.Ital. IV.213; Just.Epit.XXIV.5.6), belief in an immortal soul (Diod.V.28.6; Caes.B.G.VI. 14.5; Strab.IV.4.4; Pompon.III.2.19; Val.Max.II.6.10; Luc.I.455-458), and a liberal attitude to male homosexuality (Strab.IV.4.6). Yet none of the ancient authors, for whom the concept of a temple with a roof would have been commonplace, ever mentions any roofless temples or sanctuaries in Gaul, which would have struck them as differing from Greek or Roman religion and so as to be worthy of comment.

The etymological argument

The etymological source for the presupposition has its origins in the Gallo-Brittonic word 191 nemeton, the neuter form of the adjective nemetos 192, the plural of which is nemeta 193. For various reasons the word is regarded as meaning “clearing” 194, “grove” 195 or “sacred grove” 196 or implying any of these meanings 197, even though there is “little indication that it principally denoted such sites” 198. The only documentary evidence using this word other than in inscriptions or place names subsequent to the Roman Conquest is the reference to Drunemeton (Strab.XII.5.1) 199. D’Arbois de Jubainville 200 thought that it meant “great temple”, the first part, Dru-, being rendered as “great”. MacCulloch 201 thought it might have been a grove; Green 202 baldly states that it was a grove of sacred oaks, presumably translating Dru- as “oak”, because δρῦς is the Greek word for “oak”. However, while the reference to oaks is acceptable, there is no mention of grove in the passage. The translation of the word nemeton seems to depend on what the translator wants to see.

The main piece of evidence is that in the Ancient Laws of Ireland 203, dated much later than many Gallo-Roman inscriptions, the word fidnemed means “sacred

192 Guyonvarc’h 1960:192.
194 Macbain:153.
195 MacCulloch 1911:280; Spence:118; Henig 1984:17; Woodward:52; Birkhan:751. Although he says that nemeton means “grove”, Birkhan says that it can be translated into Latin as fanum, not nemus.
199
200 D’Arbois de Jubainville:203.
201 MacCulloch 1911:280.
203 Ancient Laws of Ireland I:164.
“sacred wood” or “grove” and, according to Vendryes, must go back to Vidu-nemeton meaning “sanctuary of wood”. Green bluntly states that “the Irish for nemeton is fidnemed”. Secondly, in the 8th century AD, the word nimidas is translated as “holy places of the woods” and pagan rites were performed in groves called nimidae. These arguments apparently find support in the fact that the word nemeton is a cognate of the Latin word nemus, nemoris, meaning either a forest with a clearing or the glade itself or a clearing or a sacred grove.

However, these pieces of evidence are not above question. Firstly, while fidnemed may mean “sacred wood” or “grove”, the Irish word nemed, a more direct derivation of nemeton, means “chapel” or “sanctuary” and has as its Latin gloss the word sacellum, meaning a “shrine” or “enclosure”, an artificial structure; despite this the word nemed is still used by Macbain to claim that nemeton means a “clearing” and by Vendryes to claim that nemeton does not necessarily mean a building and the Gallic nemeton was able to be a sacred wood. Secondly, both the words fidnemed and nimidae are in the context of a period when Christianity was the dominant religion and all other rites had to be practised in secret, such as in the woods. This would explain why fidnemed means “sacred wood” or “grove” and nemed means a, more official and more acceptable, “sanctuary”. Moreover, one cannot argue that because a word has a meaning in one temporal context, it had the same meaning centuries before; on that basis one could state that the ἐκκλησία of Athens of the 5th century BC was composed of believers in the Resurrection, because this was the meaning of the word 600 years later. The argument is even weaker for derivatives or cognates.

---

204 MacCuillogh 1911:280; Kendrick:147; Ross:112.
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According to Grenier\textsuperscript{219} *nemeton*, the Gallic term for a cult enclosure, means “delimited space”. Although Vendryes\textsuperscript{220} has proposed that the Celtic root *nem-* seems to have meant “sacred”, Brunaux\textsuperscript{221} says that the Indo-European root *nem-* means “to bend” or “to curve”. Supporting Vendryes more than Brunaux, Guyonvarc’h states that it is *nemetos* which has the exact meaning of “sacred\textsuperscript{222}”, which explains why the word *nemos* is reserved entirely for the concept “heaven”\textsuperscript{223}, and that the exact sense of the word *nemeton* is “sanctuary”\textsuperscript{224}; indeed, only the meaning “sanctuary” is attested by comparative Celtic linguistics\textsuperscript{225}. Guyonvarc’h\textsuperscript{226} confirms this with an inscription from Vaison\textsuperscript{227}, which can be translated as “Segomarus, son of Villoneos, of the territory of the Nemausates erected to Belisama this temple [*nemeton*]” and which Powell\textsuperscript{228} uses to support the argument that *nemeton* can denote a structure. Goudineau\textsuperscript{229} claims that the *nemeton* here is a grove, but, as Webster says\textsuperscript{230}, this is unlikely, because the context indicates an artificial arrangement of some kind. Piggott, after saying that the word *nemeton* may have included such concepts as enclosed space or consecrated area as well as that of natural wood clearings\textsuperscript{231}, says that it is a sanctuary word\textsuperscript{232}, supporting this with the fact that the name *Vernemeton* was explained in the 6th century AD by the Latin poet Fortunatus as Gallic for *fanum ingens*, “great sanctuary”\textsuperscript{233}. Even Vendryes\textsuperscript{234}, who adheres to the idea of Celtic worship in groves, accepts that the *nemeton* in the inscription from Vaison means a structure and that the -nemeton part of *Vernemeton* is the equivalent of the Latin *fanum*, which refers to a structure. Despite translating
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nemed as "sacred grove"\textsuperscript{235}, Ross, also using Fortunatus' statement as evidence, states that nemeton was the Celtic word for sanctuary and consequently translates Drunemeton as "Oak Sanctuary"\textsuperscript{236}. Even Brunaux, who still proposes the idea of sacred woods, accepts that the Celtic word meaning "sanctuary" is nemeton\textsuperscript{237} and states that Drunemeton can only be translated as "sanctuary of oak"\textsuperscript{238}. Birkhan\textsuperscript{239} proposes "the sacred" or "consecrated" as an alternative to "grove". Rivet and Smith\textsuperscript{240} gloss the word nemeton as "sacred grove", but suggest that nemeton also has several other meanings, some of which are "grove" or "clearing" as well as small shrine\textsuperscript{241}; this resembles the way that the word "church" can refer to the entire body of Christians or to the official body dictating and directing doctrine or to a building. Green\textsuperscript{242} states that nemeton means "sacred grove" and that it is possible that it may have been loosely used synonymously with "sanctuary", but, ironically, it seems that quite the opposite is the case.

In essence, the word nemeton cannot be fixed to one meaning and certainly not just to "grove". It has the idea of sacredness and separateness. MacCana\textsuperscript{243} suggests a translation "a sacred place", which Webster\textsuperscript{244} considers the most acceptable, probably because of its general application and imprecision.

The archaeological argument

As regards the archaeological basis, the belief that the Celtic religion made use only of "natural" cultic sites and the presupposition that Celtic sanctuaries were roofless are based on the fact that the evidence for artificial or tectonic sites is very little\textsuperscript{245} and that no sites with roofs have been discovered\textsuperscript{246}. However, in view of the fact that artificial structures would have been composed and constructed out of perishable material, primarily wood, and the most common materials for the construction of a roof would have been wood and thatch or some other material subject to decay, few traces would remain anyway and the proposition is difficult to test\textsuperscript{247}; consequently,
inferences drawn from the use of the rarity of those archaeological remains is false. However, although archaeological evidence for the existence of tectonic sites is few, there is more archaeological evidence for them than there is for “natural” sites; Powell points out that archaeology has not produced anything such as a sacred grove. Therefore, if the argument that only natural sites were used for Celtic religion and that artificial sites were not used for Celtic religion is based on the idea that little evidence indicates little use, then, ironically, one can argue all the more that, since no evidence means no use, the Celts never used “natural” sites.

The last support is really more of an attitude towards Celtic religion. This attitude seems to combine an image and a philosophy. The image is that of the Celts, and the Druids in particular, as intellectual Noble Savages; an example of such an adherent is Vendryes, who, despite the evidence from the inscription from Vaison, that nemeton meant an artificial structure, the gloss of nemed as sacellum, indicating that nemed meant an artificial structure, and the translation of Vernemeton by Fortunatus as fanum ingens, indicating that nemeton meant an artificial structure, still claimed that the Celts worshipped in groves, because of his image of the Druids as barbarian philosophers, seen in his use of the term “Druidism” as if it was separate from Celtic religion and his acceptance that the Druids were influenced by Pythagoras and believed in metempsychosis. The philosophy is the modern one that true spirituality is in the intuitive, the mystical, in short the natural, and that artificiality is rationalist and unspiritual. This attitude leads to enthusiasm for the idea of natural sites and to the rejection of the concept of artificial ones.

Although Piggott accepts that the meagre evidence implies that, in north-western Europe, there had been small, roofed sanctuaries of timber, which probably evolved from mortuary structures, he claims that there were also sacral enclosures in which the idea of roofing does not arise.

Thévenot is among the first to state that archaeology provides evidence for the use of formal structures for worship by the Celts; he points out that, if Gallo-Roman temples were totally inspired by foreign ideas, then they would reproduce the models
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exactly, yet all the excavated sanctuaries display two characteristics, a central *cella*, of square, circular or polygonal shape instead of a rectangular design, and a portico or terrace surrounding the temple, both characteristics absent from Roman temples, and that these anomalies, which are more than differences in detail, but are fundamental arrangements, and even the site of the temple can only be explained if they are considered to be the result of an indigenous tradition, in short the Gauls were acquainted with and had a tradition of using formal, artificial structures. The view of Celtic temples as being groves and natural sites and not being formal structures “is increasingly challenged by excavation, especially in northern France”\(^{255}\) and has “completely changed”\(^{256}\) with the excavations of Gournay-sur-Arondé and Ribemont-sur-Ancre, which “have completely altered our perception of Celtic religion”\(^{257}\), to such an extent that atectonism in Celtic religion can be called a “modern myth”\(^{258}\) and even Green seems to accept that “there is a steadily increasing body of evidence for wooden temples preceding Roman examples both in Britain and on the continent”\(^{259}\). Indeed, a view supported by Brunaux\(^{260}\) is that “atectonism” seems all the more unlikely, when one considers that it is difficult to believe that the Celts, who had roofs on houses (Strab.IV.4.3), because of the frequently inclement weather in Gaul, did not have roofs on their sanctuaries.

It needs to be pointed out that, although archaeological evidence indicates that the Gauls used artificial structures for worship and that there is no evidence for sacred groves, it is not suggested that the Gauls never used sacred groves, merely that it is wrong to suggest that they never used artificial structures. Indeed, in view of the fact that the majority of the pre-Roman Gallic sanctuaries cannot be dated to earlier than 250 BC\(^ {261}\), it is possible that, as Macbain and Thévenot\(^ {262}\) suggest, before this time the original places of worship for the Celts used clearings, groves and other “natural” areas for worship and then later erected buildings, which Macbain\(^ {263}\), wrongly as will be seen, thinks must have been similar in an unsophisticated way to Greek and Roman temples and made of stone, even though Strabo says that Gallic houses are made of wood and wicker with thatch roofs (Strab.IV.4.3); it is even possible, as
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Macbain and Cunliffe suggest\textsuperscript{264}, that the Celts continued to use groves at the same time that formal artificial structures were also employed. It is possible that the lack of archaeological evidence for sacred groves is because archaeological proof of them is difficult\textsuperscript{265}.
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Appendix Four

Etymology of the Names of Celtic Deities

Gallic Deities

The name Esus

One suggestion about his name is that it is connected with the Breton word (h)euzuz meaning ‘terrible’, possibly inspired by Lucan’s use of the word horrens. According to Stokes, who agrees with the suggestion, D’Arbois de Jubainville links it to the Indo-European word *is or *ish meaning ‘wish’, leading to the meaning for Esus being ‘he who fulfils wishes’, an interpretation with which Gray and Guyonvarc’h disagree and a description de Vries feels is lack-lustre. Bugge proposes that it may be connected to the Italian aisus, esus, meaning ‘god’, and the Etruscan Erus. Pokorny rejects this and, while stating that the name is more likely to be derived from *ais, meaning ‘desire’ and ‘to look for’, and it is less likely to be connected with *eis, meaning ‘to move violently’, ‘to bring to life’ or ‘energy’, states that his preference is for the explanation by D’Arbois de Jubainville. Guiraud connects the name with the Latin word (h)erus meaning ‘lord’ or ‘master’, a possibility not ruled out by Sjoestedt and accepted by Duval, Powell, Ross, Green, Olmsted and York. The idea that Esus may mean ‘god’ or ‘good master’ was accepted as a possibility by Duval in 1954 and 1957, although by 1973 Guiraud’s idea is considered as lacking certainty by Duval. Vendryes, following Rhys and Stokes, claims the name is derived from the Indo-European word *esu, meaning ‘good’, ‘excellent’ and ‘capable’, which may be related to the Greek ἰεῦς, meaning ‘good’, which gave Latin the word erus and which recalls, in particular, the Iranian ahur-, meaning ‘Master’, from which are derived the Avestan ahura- and the Indian āsura-, both designating ‘divinity’, and, therefore, the name Esus is a cognate of the...
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name of the Avestan deity Ahura and of the Sanskrit epithet Ásura. Similar to this, Jakobson\textsuperscript{19}, with whom Pokorny\textsuperscript{20} agrees, sees Esus as belonging to the same family of words as the Latin erus < esus, the Greek ἐὔξ, the Hittite assus, meaning ‘good’ or ‘suitable’, Iranian ahu- and Indian asu-, meaning ‘genius’ or ‘chief’, all of whom are ultimately derived from the Indoeuropean es-s-esu-s, literally meaning ‘existent’ or ‘essential’, which is itself derived from the verb es, meaning ‘to be’. Jakobson\textsuperscript{19}, with whom Pokorny\textsuperscript{20} agrees, sees Esus as belonging to the same family of words as the Latin erus < esus, the Greek ἐὔξ, the Hittite assus, meaning ‘good’ or ‘suitable’, Iranian ahu- and Indian asu-, meaning ‘genius’ or ‘chief’, all of whom are ultimately derived from the Indoeuropean es-s-sus, literally meaning ‘existent’ or ‘essential’, which is itself derived from the verb es, meaning ‘to be’. Jakobson\textsuperscript{19}, with whom Pokorny\textsuperscript{20} agrees, sees Esus as belonging to the same family of words as the Latin erus < esus, the Greek ἐὔξ, the Hittite assus, meaning ‘good’ or ‘suitable’, Iranian ahu- and Indian asu-, meaning ‘genius’ or ‘chief’, all of whom are ultimately derived from the Indoeuropean es-s-sus, literally meaning ‘existent’ or ‘essential’, which is itself derived from the verb es, meaning ‘to be’. Jakobson\textsuperscript{19}, with whom Pokorny\textsuperscript{20} agrees, sees Esus as belonging to the same family of words as the Latin erus < esus, the Greek ἐὔξ, the Hittite assus, meaning ‘good’ or ‘suitable’, Iranian ahu- and Indian asu-, meaning ‘genius’ or ‘chief’, all of whom are ultimately derived from the Indoeuropean es-s-sus, literally meaning ‘existent’ or ‘essential’, which is itself derived from the verb es, meaning ‘to be’. Jakobson\textsuperscript{19}, with whom Pokorny\textsuperscript{20} agrees, sees Esus as belonging to the same family of words as the Latin erus < esus, the Greek ἐὔξ, the Hittite assus, meaning ‘good’ or ‘suitable’, Iranian ahu- and Indian asu-, meaning ‘genius’ or ‘chief’, all of whom are ultimately derived from the Indoeuropean es-s-sus, literally meaning ‘existent’ or ‘essential’, which is itself derived from the verb es, meaning ‘to be'.

Guyonvarc'h\textsuperscript{21} agrees that other related Indoeuropean words, the Hittite a-aš-su-uš, meaning ‘good’, the Greek ἐὔξ or ἱράξ and the Latin erus, can all be drawn easily and directly to esu-s, but is of the opinion that the name Esus does not just mean ‘Lord’ as Vendryes suggests, but means ‘good’ or ‘best’. Pokorny and Evans\textsuperscript{22} suggest that Esus is derived from the Indoeuropean word ais, meaning ‘reverence’, ‘respect’ and ‘worship’. York\textsuperscript{23} thinks that Esus is derived from the root *ansu (*esu- and *xon-s-u-s, which can be compared to the Hittite word hassus, which York translates as ‘king’), which, according to Haussig\textsuperscript{24}, is also the root of the word asura. Cunliffe\textsuperscript{25} says that Esus may mean ‘good’ in the sense of all-competent. De Vries\textsuperscript{26} thinks that, in view of the description of his sacrifice, which he calls “gräßliche”, it is unlikely that Esus would be called ‘good’; this is not only ethnocentric, in his value judgement of the sacrifice and in assuming that because he and Lucan are appalled by the concept of human sacrifice, then the Celts who practised it must also have been, but also rather naïve, since, if the Celts did, in fact, find the sacrifices horrific, it is possible that the terms ‘good’ or ‘good god’ used for this deity were a euphemism, in the same way that the Furies were called the Kindly Ones, a point which de Vries does concede\textsuperscript{27}. De Vries himself prefers the association with the root *eis meaning ‘energy’ or ‘passion’\textsuperscript{28}, an explanation rejected by Guyonvarc'h\textsuperscript{29}, but admits that the name remains obscure and states that the proposed etymologies without any convincing value\textsuperscript{30}, that “du point de vue de l’etymologie le nom est une enigme”\textsuperscript{31} and that “man mit

\textsuperscript{19} Jakobson:591-592.  
\textsuperscript{20} Pokorny:342.  
\textsuperscript{21} Guyonvarc'h 1969:174.  
\textsuperscript{22} Pokorny:16; Evans:396.  
\textsuperscript{23} York:88.  
\textsuperscript{24} Haussig:135.  
\textsuperscript{25} Cunliffe:185.  
\textsuperscript{26} de Vries 1961:98.  
\textsuperscript{27} de Vries 1961:100.  
\textsuperscript{28} de Vries 1961:98.  
\textsuperscript{29} Guyonvarc'h 1969:172.  
\textsuperscript{30} de Vries 1953:20.  
\textsuperscript{31} de Vries 1953:16.
einer Etymologie nicht weit kommt"32. This follows the opinion of Duval33, who says that, despite the comparison with the Latin herus and the proposed meaning of ‘good master’, “le nom...ne nous apprend rien d’assuré”. Le Roux’s34 statements sum up the analysis - “Ceci fait qu’aucune étymologie n’est satisfaisante orthographique” and “les données linguistiques sont inutilisables”.

The name Taranis
The name is connected with the Celtic root tāran, meaning ‘to thunder’,35 and the Gallic stem tāran-, meaning ‘thunder’,36 and is related to37 tāran and torann, the Welsh and Irish words for ‘thunder’ respectively38, or, according to Le Roux39, tāran(n), the Irish , Welsh and Breton word for ‘thunder’, and, therefore, signifies ‘thunder’, according to Duval and Hatt40, or, according to Green, Sjoestedt and York41, means ‘Thunderer’. Therefore, it is reasonable to deduce that he was the god of thunder or a thunder-god42. As Lambrechts43 says, this seems to be accepted by everybody. York44 points out that the name Taranis therefore relates to the Lithuanian Perkunas, the Slavic Perun, the Norse Thor and the Germanic Donar. De Vries45 also says that Taranis can be directly linked with the Germanic deity Donar, but warns that tāran- and tanar- are not derived from the same root. Birkhan46 thinks that Tanarus, found on an inscription in Britain47, is the original form and could then be related to the name of the Germanic god of thunder.

32 de Vries 1961: 98.
34 Le Roux 1955a:53.
42 MacCulloch 1911:30.
43 Lambrechts 1942:65.
44 York:88.
45 de Vries 1961:63.
46 Birkhan:586.
47 CIL VII.168; RIB 452.
The name Teutates

It is derived, ultimately, from the Indo-European *teut⁴⁸, *teuta⁴⁹ or *teuta-⁵⁰ or *touta⁵¹ and from the Celtic *teuta, *touta, *tota⁵², *teuta, tota⁵³, teuta⁵⁴, teuta-⁵⁵, teuto or touto⁵⁶, teuto-⁵⁷ meaning 'tribe'⁵⁸ or 'people'⁵⁹, a word to which is related to: the Irish tuath⁶⁰, which means 'people'⁶¹, 'tribe'⁶², 'state'⁶³ or 'nation'⁶⁴, hence the Tuatha Dé Danaan, which means the 'Tribes of the goddess Dana'⁶⁵ or 'Peoples of the Goddess Danu'⁶⁶; the Welsh tuad⁶⁷; the Old English theod⁶⁸; Gothic thiuda⁶⁹; Breton tud⁷⁰; Umbrian tota⁷¹; Osca touto⁷²; and Old Norse þjóð⁷³. The name Teutates means 'national' or 'popular', 'tribe'⁷⁴, 'people'⁷⁵, '(the god) of the tribe'⁷⁶ or 'Father of the People' or 'Father of the Tribe'⁷⁷, 'Father of the Tribe' being an explanation first proposed by Martin⁷⁸. Lambrechts suggests that he was the god of the people, the public god or the god who protects the nation⁷⁹. According to Olmsted⁸⁰ 'the significance 'of the tribe' may be suggested by the agentive suffix —
ati". It is, according to Loth and Weisgerber\textsuperscript{81}, a haplology of *tutto-tatis*\textsuperscript{82}, although, from the fact that de Vries\textsuperscript{84} says that Loth "hat das sprachlich näher zu untermauern versucht", de Vries seems sceptical of this explanation, Guyonvarc'h states that the form *tutto-tatis* is an example of childish grammar and that there is no haplology\textsuperscript{85} and Olmsted\textsuperscript{86} thinks it is unnecessary to claim its existence. D'Arbois de Jubainville states that, according to the most ancient Latin grammar, the form Teutates should be Teutatis\textsuperscript{87} and it has been given the Greek suffix of *-ates* by Lucan instead of *-atis*\textsuperscript{88}. The reason for this is that the diphthong eu would be changed to ū, if the rules of Latin grammar of Lucan's day were applied, but Lucan probably wished to preserve the diphthong, which was in the Gallic form, since application of Latin grammar would have rendered the name unrecognisable, as a foreign name\textsuperscript{89}; the Greek language had preserved the diphthong €v and, therefore, since the name, if the Gallic form was kept, already had a Greek appearance, Lucan, used a Greek import\textsuperscript{90}. D'Arbois de Jubainville states that, although the form Teutates is a barbarism, it is too entrenched to be changed now\textsuperscript{91}. Contrary to all this Guyonvarc'h states that, while the word *tutto-* can mean 'people' or 'tribe'\textsuperscript{92}, the meaning which the majority of linguists take\textsuperscript{93}, another identical word *tutto-* means 'north', 'left' or 'magic'\textsuperscript{94}, just as in Irish *tuath* means both 'tribe', 'people', 'country', 'nation' or 'territory', *tuath* can mean 'north'\textsuperscript{95}. Therefore, Guyonvarc'h is stating that the deity Teutates is not the god of the tribe and, according to a statement by Le Roux referring to the article by Guyonvarc'h\textsuperscript{96}, seems to be saying that he is of Nordic origin.

\textsuperscript{81} Loth 1925:222; Weisgerber:68.
\textsuperscript{82} Loth 1925:222.
\textsuperscript{83} Clarus:31.
\textsuperscript{84} de Vries 1961:48.
\textsuperscript{85} Guyonvarc'h 1966:316.
\textsuperscript{86} Olmsted 1994:329.
\textsuperscript{87} d'Arbois de Jubainville 1893:250-251.
\textsuperscript{88} d'Arbois de Jubainville 1893:251.
\textsuperscript{89} d'Arbois de Jubainville 1893:251.
\textsuperscript{90} d'Arbois de Jubainville 1893:251.
\textsuperscript{91} d'Arbois de Jubainville 1893:253.
\textsuperscript{92} Guyonvarc'h 1966:317.
\textsuperscript{93} Guyonvarc'h 1966:320.
\textsuperscript{94} Guyonvarc'h 1966:317.
\textsuperscript{95} Guyonvarc'h 1966:317 and 320.
\textsuperscript{96} Le Roux 1967a:337.
Gallo-Roman Deities

The name Cernunnos

Le Roux\textsuperscript{97} accepts that the Antlered-god’s Gallic name is Cernunnos, but questions the reconstruction of the inscription as Cernunnus. The part of the inscription\textsuperscript{98} which gives the god’s name actually says ernunno and has been reconstructed as [C]ernunno(s)\textsuperscript{99}. Le Roux\textsuperscript{100} accepts the reinstatement of the initial C is valid, but argues that the addition of an s on the end, to form Cernunnos, is incorrect. Firstly, all the names of Gallo-Roman in epigraphy are in the Latinised form, that is ending in -us, not -os, such as Belenus, Grannus, not Belenos and Grannos, and, secondly, every dedication is in the dative\textsuperscript{101}. Therefore, the inscription is actually Cernunno, dative of Cernunnus, which is the Latinised form of the Gallic Cernunnos. The name Cernunnos has been translated as ‘the horned god’, according to Le Roux\textsuperscript{102}, on the basis of a phonetic connection between Cernunnos and the Celtic themes in the word korn\textsuperscript{103}. Although conceding that the words referring to ‘horn’ or ‘horned beasts’ in the Indo-European languages are related\textsuperscript{104}, Le Roux\textsuperscript{105} rejects this translation and states that it is obviously influenced by the iconography, is insufficient and is decidedly spoilt by Weisgerber’s\textsuperscript{106} statement that “die Dietung...aufwiesen”. Le Roux\textsuperscript{107} states that a correct etymology, based on the fact that the long Indo-European o found in the Italic language is changed in the Celtic languages into an a, not an e, is that karn, meaning a ‘horned beast’, is the cognate of cornu, not kern, and that it is not possible to link karn to kern\textsuperscript{108}. Therefore, according to this theory, the first syllable cannot refer to horn and, instead, the name is probably derived from *kern, the root of the Welsh cern, the Irish cern and the Breton kern, all meaning the ‘summit of the head’.

Le Roux\textsuperscript{109} says that the Celtic words corn and korn are in fact evidence of borrowing from the Latin cornu. Therefore, the first part of the deity’s name, Cern-, denotes the top of the head and a connection with Indo-European words

\textsuperscript{97} Le Roux 1953:324
\textsuperscript{98} CIL XIII.3026c
\textsuperscript{99} Le Roux 1953:324
\textsuperscript{100} Le Roux 1953:324
\textsuperscript{101} Le Roux 1953:325
\textsuperscript{102} Le Roux 1953:325
\textsuperscript{103} cornu (Lat.); κέρας (Gk.); karnon (Gal.); haurna (Got.)
\textsuperscript{104} Le Roux 1953:325
\textsuperscript{105} Le Roux 1953:328
\textsuperscript{106} Weisgerber:197
\textsuperscript{107} Le Roux 1953:326
\textsuperscript{108} Le Roux 1953:328 n.6
\textsuperscript{109} Le Roux 1953:328
describing horned beasts in general and the stag in particular\textsuperscript{110}. The translation of Cernunnos, according to Le Roux\textsuperscript{111}, is ‘he who has the top of the head like a stag’.

The name Epona

Her name has the root \textit{ep}-, found in many Gallic names\textsuperscript{112}, which is derived from \textit{epos}, the Gallic and British word for horse\textsuperscript{113} and equivalent to Latin \textit{equus} and Greek ‘\textgamma\textomicron\nu\omicron\zeta\rho\omicron\varsigma\zeta’, related to Zend. \textit{aspo} and Old Persian \textit{aspa}, derived from the Sanskrit \textit{a\textgamma\textomicron\nu\alpha\nu\omicron\omicron}\textit{h} and ultimately from the Indo-European \textit{*ekwo} \textsuperscript{115}, and -\textit{ona} which indicates divinity\textsuperscript{116}. Her name means Horse-goddess.

The name Nantosuelta

It had been posited by d'Arbois de Jubainville\textsuperscript{117} that her name means ‘brilliant in combat’ based on the two parts of her name. The first part of her name, \textit{Nanto-}, contains the theme of the Irish god of war Né̄t and has also been employed as a noun meaning ‘battle’ or ‘wound’\textsuperscript{118}; the second part, -\textit{suelta}, being the past participle of the verbal root \textit{suel} meaning ‘to shine’\textsuperscript{119}. This interpretation was considered to be confirmed by the connection between the meaning of the name of Nantosuelta’s companion, Sucellus, ‘the Good Striker’, and the fact that Né̄t was the grandfather of the god Balar, who was surnamed \textit{balc-béimnech}, ‘the Strong Striker’\textsuperscript{120}. However, Linckenheld\textsuperscript{121} states that this interpretation cannot be correct. This was replaced by another interpretation, not surprisingly, since the connection between \textit{Nanto-} and Né̄t is very thin, exceeded in tenuousness only by the supposed confirmation of the theory, and Nantosuelta’s attributes at no time appear in any way martial, except, perhaps, for the raven, which is a carrion-bird\textsuperscript{122}. The other interpretation is ‘the

\textsuperscript{110} Le Roux 1953:326
\textsuperscript{111} Le Roux 1953:329
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Epomanduos} [he who is busy with horses]; \textit{Epomeduos} [horse drunk]; \textit{Eposognatus} [well acquainted with horses]; \textit{Eporedorix} [running of horses]; \textit{Eposterovidos} [he who knows how to give zeal to horses]; and \textit{Atepomarus} [great rider].
\textsuperscript{113} \textit{("Vocabulaire vieux-celtique", Ogam VI/1 31 (1954), 48; Green 1995a:184; Birkhan:526.}
\textsuperscript{114} \textit{Vocabulaire vieux-celtique:48.}
\textsuperscript{115} Gruffyd:104. Loth (Loth:113-) is of the opinion that \textit{*ekuos} indicated a harnessed horse and that \textit{*markos} was a mounted horse, on the grounds that the war-chariot is a tactical Indo-European innovation and that the word \textit{*ekuos} is Pan-Indo-European whereas \textit{*markos} is only common to Celtic and Germanic cultures (Thévenot 1951:131; Le Roux 1955b:101).
\textsuperscript{116} Gruffyd:98.
\textsuperscript{117} D’Arbois de Jubainville:459.
\textsuperscript{118} Reinach 1896:51, n.1.
\textsuperscript{119} Reinach:51.
\textsuperscript{120} Reinach:51.
\textsuperscript{121} Linckenheld:88.
\textsuperscript{122} Green 1989a:48 and 54.
Brook, which sparkles (in the valley)’ or ‘the torrent, which sparkles and shines’\textsuperscript{123}. The first term, Nanto-, is translated as ‘valley’\textsuperscript{124} and by extension ‘torrent’ or ‘brook’\textsuperscript{125}; this may be confirmed by the fact that the word nant is Welsh for ‘brook’\textsuperscript{126}. The translation of the second term follows Reinach’s\textsuperscript{127} interpretation that -suelta is derived from the verbal root suel meaning ‘to shine’\textsuperscript{128}. Since then de Vries\textsuperscript{129} has suggested ‘she who makes the brooks glitter’ and Green has interpreted Nantosuelta’s name, though without supplying any etymological explanation, as ‘Winding River’\textsuperscript{130}, ‘Winding Brook’\textsuperscript{131}, ‘Winding Stream’\textsuperscript{132}, ‘Meandering River’\textsuperscript{133} or ‘Meandering Stream’\textsuperscript{134}. Olmsted suggests ‘Who Makes the Valley Bloom’ and Birkhan\textsuperscript{135} says that the name may be read as ‘winding valley’, ‘glittering brook’ or ‘valley on which the sun shines’, but the meaning is completely unclear.

The name Nemetona

Nemetona’s name is a combination of then word nemeton, meaning ‘sanctuary’ or ‘sacred place’, and the suffix -ona meaning ‘goddess’\textsuperscript{136}; according to Green\textsuperscript{137}, her name means ‘the goddess of the Sacred Grove’.

The name Rosmerta

According to de Vries\textsuperscript{138} the prefix ro- hints at power that is said to have great forces and thus indicates that she is an important goddess\textsuperscript{139}. Her name signifies the ‘Great

\textsuperscript{123} Linckenheld:89.  
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\textsuperscript{129} de Vries 1961:94  
\textsuperscript{130} Green 1986a:97.  
\textsuperscript{131} Green 1989a:42 and 47; Green 1995b:474.  
\textsuperscript{132} Green 1992:211.  
\textsuperscript{133} Green 1989a:42.  
\textsuperscript{134} Green 1995a:128.  
\textsuperscript{135} Birkhan:610.  
\textsuperscript{136} Gruffyd:98.  
\textsuperscript{137} Green 1995b:474.  
\textsuperscript{138} de Vries 1961:119.  
\textsuperscript{139} According to de Vries (de Vries 1961:118), because the second part of her name may be from the root *smer, which takes up the idea of “to save”, one reaches the meaning “goddess of plenty”. However, this is a non sequitur.
Provider\textsuperscript{140} or the ‘Good Purveyor’\textsuperscript{141}, the root *smer- meaning ‘foresight’ or ‘provision’\textsuperscript{142} or ‘brilliant’\textsuperscript{143}. Olmsted\textsuperscript{144} translates her name as ‘the Highly Foresighted’. Birkhan, however, suggests that the name means ‘the well-greased’\textsuperscript{145} or ‘well, heavily smeared’\textsuperscript{146} as a derivation of the Gallic element smer-(i)- and that her cult ritual might have involved the smearing of the idol with fat, blood or red chalk\textsuperscript{147}. Support for this may be the old Irish word smertha, meaning ‘smeared’ or ‘greased’,\textsuperscript{148} and the Indo-European root *smeru meaning ‘grease’, ‘fat’ or ‘marrow’.

The name Sirona

Her name is a combination of the word meaning ‘star’\textsuperscript{149} and the suffix –ona, which means ‘goddess’\textsuperscript{150}. Duval believes the meaning is confirmed by her association with Apollo in the east of Gaul\textsuperscript{151} and, according to Green\textsuperscript{152}, the name has astral associations and suggests night and darkness and light penetrating darkness. However, Birkhan, considering it beyond doubt that Sirona originally began with St-, connects her name with the Indo-European root *ster-, which means ‘immature cattle’,\textsuperscript{153} and thinks her names means she-calf\textsuperscript{154}. Birkhan\textsuperscript{155} also considers the possible identification of Sirona with the Old Irish goddess Gráinne, whose name means ‘she belonging to Grannus’.

The name Sucellus

It is generally held that the name Sucellus means ‘the Striker’\textsuperscript{156}, ‘Good Striker’\textsuperscript{157},
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'he who strikes to good effect'\textsuperscript{158} or 'he who strikes well'\textsuperscript{159}, which concurs with fact that one of his attributes was a hammer with a long shaft\textsuperscript{160}.

**Irish Deities**

**The name Brigit**

The Irish words bríg or bríg mean 'power' and 'authority'\textsuperscript{161}, and to the Welsh bri, meaning 'renown' or 'high estimation', according to Rhys\textsuperscript{162}, or 'dignity' or 'honour', according to de Vries\textsuperscript{163}. Pokorny\textsuperscript{164} says that the name is derived from *briginti and *bhrghnti, meaning 'the High One', which Olmsted and Birkan\textsuperscript{165} accept. If this were so the name Brigit would mean 'the exalted one'\textsuperscript{166}; this is supported by the fact that Brigit has a cognate with the Sanskrit word brhati meaning 'the Exalted One'\textsuperscript{167}.

**The names of the Dagda**

The name the Dagda means the 'Good'\textsuperscript{168} or the 'good god'\textsuperscript{169}, from either dago- meaning 'good'\textsuperscript{170} or a composite dago devos\textsuperscript{171} meaning 'the good god'\textsuperscript{172}, or 'Druid-God'\textsuperscript{173}. Eochaid or Eochu is derived from *ek'o meaning 'horse'\textsuperscript{174} or, according to Sterckx\textsuperscript{175}, "sans doubté" from each meaning 'horse' or 'stallion'. Ollathir means the 'Great Father'\textsuperscript{176}, 'Father of the Race'\textsuperscript{177} or 'Father of all' or 'Universal Father'\textsuperscript{178} or 'All-Father'\textsuperscript{179}. The last two meanings are accepted by
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Sterckx\(^{180}\), but the translation ‘All-Father’ is considered incorrect by Birkhan\(^{181}\); de Vries\(^{182}\), however, points out that the name of Odin, the Norse supreme god, was *Alfþodur*. His name was, therefore, *Eochaid* or *Eochu* the All-Father. *Ruadh* means either ‘lord’ or ‘red one’\(^{183}\) and, therefore, *Ruadh Rofhessa* or *Ruadrofessa* means ‘the Red one of Great Knowledge’\(^{184}\), ‘Red of the Perfect Knowledge’\(^{185}\), ‘the Red One who knows all’\(^{186}\), ‘Mighty One of Great Knowledge’\(^{187}\), ‘Lord of Great Knowledge’\(^{188}\) or ‘the red one with the great knowledge’\(^{189}\).

The name Dian Cecht

Dian Cecht, whose name means ‘with a long grasp’\(^{190}\) or ‘swift capture’\(^{191}\).

The name Donn

Donn, derived from the Indo-European *dhus-no-*, meaning ‘dark’\(^{192}\), means the ‘Brown One’ or ‘Dark One’\(^{193}\) and is a probable cognate with the Irish word *dú* meaning ‘earth’. Birkhan\(^{194}\) suggests that the name could be similar to *donn*-2 meaning ‘chief’, ‘noble’ or ‘ruler’.

The name Lug(us)

Although Lambert\(^{195}\) sees the Celtic root *lug-* in Lug as being derived from *lug*, meaning ‘burn’ or ‘enflame’, itself derived from *luk-*, meaning ‘bright’ and the name is usually connected with the Welsh word *lleu* meaning ‘light’, Olmsted and Birkhan\(^{196}\) think that the name Lug was more likely to have been derived from *leugh-*, *lough-* or *lugh-*, meaning ‘oath’ or ‘vow’\(^{197}\) or ‘to swear’\(^{198}\), related to the

---
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Old Irish *luige* and Welsh *llw*, both meaning ‘oath’\(^{199}\), and that Lug meant ‘Vow’ rather than ‘Bright’. According to van Hamel\(^{200}\), the name Lugus is derived from the animal the lynx, but, according to Krappe\(^{201}\), it is linked to the raven; indeed, van Tassel Graves\(^{202}\) says that the Indo-European root *leug* means ‘bent, curved, flexible’ and that this suggests the the shape of the claws or beak of the birds of the corvine family. However, Olmsted\(^{203}\) points out that Lugus, which is a u-stem, cannot be derived from the Gallic word for ‘crow’, which is the o-stem word *lugos*. The theory that Lug is derived from *lug* and ultimately from *luk-*, finds support in the connection between Lug(us), divination and ravens, since the raven is the sacred bird of Apollo, the god of divination and light. Birkhan\(^{204}\) suggests that another possibility is that the name is connected to the Old Irish word *lucht*, meaning ‘load’, ‘content’, ‘people’ or ‘mass’, the Welsh word *llwcht*, meaning ‘load’, ‘burden’ or ‘tribe’ and the Gallic *luchtos*, meaning ‘part’, all of which are derived from a root meaning ‘connect’ or ‘bind together’, and that Lugus was the god of gatherings. Birkhan\(^{205}\) claims that the name of the Welsh hero, Llew Llawgyffes, seems to be an etymological parallel to the name Lug(us). The epithet *samildánach* means ‘possessing many arts at the same time’ or ‘multiple artist’\(^{206}\) (*sam* = at the same time, *il* = many, *dán* = skills)\(^{207}\) and may be rendered in Greek by the term *sympolytekhnos*\(^{208}\). Birkhan\(^{209}\) says that the *ildánach* is also a magician. According to Birkhan\(^{210}\), a more frequent epithet is *lámhfhada* meaning ‘longhand’ and it probably had a military connotation.
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Appendix Five

Details of Gallo-Roman temples

Bellovaci

Estrées-Saint-Denis. Construction of the Gallo-Roman temples seems to have begun in the first half of the 1st century AD\(^1\). According to Massy\(^2\) there are four temples, three with ambulatories, and according to Woimant\(^3\) there are three. Whichever it is, the cellae are all square, 7m each side\(^4\) with general dimensions of 13.5m or 13m on each side\(^5\). An enclosure surrounding the temples, with the principal opening to the east, delimits a quadrangular zone first of 60m by 45m\(^6\), then of 80m by 67.4m\(^7\) or 82.8m by 67.4m\(^8\) or 83m by 67m\(^9\). On the southern exterior of the enclosure there was a pit containing ceramic items from the 3rd century\(^10\). Situated on the Roman road linking Augustomagus [Senlis] and Camaracum [Cambrai], the temple is 7Km south-west of the river Aronde and a dozen kilometres west of the river Oise and, therefore, the Bellovaci/Suessiones border\(^11\).

Vendeuil-Caply. A very Classical Gallo-Roman temple comprising a slightly rectangular cella (12.2m x 10.5m) and an ambulatory with the general dimensions of 20.2m by 18.5m\(^12\). The temple was erected in the time of Nero\(^13\) or at the end of the time of Nero and the beginning of that of Vespasian as was a vast portico\(^14\). The temple was situated on the Roman road from Lutetia [Paris] to Samarabriva [Amiens] at the point where the road from Caesaromagus [Beauvais] joins it and about 4Km from the source of the river Noye and the Bellovaci/Ambiani border.

Leuci

Saint-Amand-sur-Ornain/Naix-aux-Forges. There are two temples, A and B, both with ambulatories\(^15\). There is nothing precise about temple A, but the cella of temple B is exactly square (11.8m x 11.8m) and the ambulatory is 4.8m wide, giving the
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\(^{11}\) Woimant:164
\(^{12}\) Massy 1983:251
\(^{13}\) Massy 1983:251
\(^{14}\) Massy 1985:480
\(^{15}\) Bertin No. 245
general dimensions of 22m by 24m. The site is situated on a plateau at Nasium [Naix], the point where the Roman road from Tullum Leucorum [Toul] bends north to Durocortorum [Reims], almost 20km from the Leuci/Remi border.

**Sorcy-St. Martin.** There are three temples, 1A, 2A and 3B according to Bertin, the latter built on top of the first two, which were small. Temples 1A and 2A have *cellae* which can be regarded as square, although 2A is more oblong than others (Temple 1A: 6.7m; temple 2A: 4.7m x 6.8m); temple 1A has an ambulatory 1m to 3m wide with general dimensions of 12.75 by 14.4m and temple 2A has an ambulatory 2m wide. The *cella* of temple 3B is exactly square (7.4m x 7.4m) with an ambulatory 4.5m wide, resulting in the general dimensions of 19.8m by 19.9 by 18.9m by 19.1m. The dates of the temples are temples 1A and 2A in the 1st century, temple 3B from the 2nd until the 4th. The direction of the entrances of all three temples was east-north-east. Situated on a summit, not only near a spring and on the bank of the Maas/Meuse, the site is on the Roman road, which joins the road from Divodurum [Metz] to Tullum Leucorum [Toul] with the road from Tullum Leucorum [Toul] to Durocortorum [Reims], far from any border.

**Mediomatrici**

**Bierbach-Klosterwald.** This sanctuary is in the Mediomatrici tribal region, to the east of Pons Sarravi [Saarbrücken] and 4-5 km west of the town of Deux-Ponts or 10km north of Pons Sarravi [Saarbrücken]. The date of the site seems to be from the middle of the 2nd century to the middle or late 4th century AD. The Gallo-Roman temples are temples 1 and 5, according to Grenier, or A and B respectively, according to Horne and King, temple 5/B being immediately south of temple 1/A. Both temples are identical, each having *cellae*, which, although technically
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rectangular (4.1m x 5.1m)\textsuperscript{31}, can be considered square\textsuperscript{32}, an ambulatory\textsuperscript{33}, the wall of which they share\textsuperscript{34} they are so close, and a base for an altar or statue in the west side of each \textit{cella}\textsuperscript{35}. The temples were in a \textit{temenos}, which is the same one for both\textsuperscript{36}, their entrances orientated to the east-north-east\textsuperscript{37}; they were situated on a terrace on a hill-side\textsuperscript{38} in the valley of the river Blies\textsuperscript{39} and next to the river Erbach to the east\textsuperscript{40} near the road from \textit{Pons Sarravi} [Saarbrücken] to \textit{Upper Germany} to the north, and near the border between \textit{Belgic Gaul} and \textit{Upper Germany} about 10Km away.

**Nervii**

\textbf{Cantaing-sur-Escaut}. Built either 7Km north-west\textsuperscript{41} or south-west of \textit{Camaracum} [Cambrai] the temple is certainly square (16m x 16m) with an ambulatory\textsuperscript{42}. The orientation of its entrance is unknown, but it is situated on the river Escaut, about 8Km from the Nervii/Atrebates border and about 4Km west of the road from \textit{Camaracum} [Cambrai] to \textit{Augusta Viromanduorum} [St.-Quentin] and south of the road from \textit{Camaracum} [Cambrai] to \textit{Samarobriva} [Amiens].

\textbf{Hofstade-lès-Alost}. This temple is dated from the middle of the 2nd century AD to the 3rd century and has no ambulatory\textsuperscript{43}. Although each side of the \textit{cella} varies in length (6.75m x 6.85m x 6.6m x 7.1m), the difference does not alter the fact that it can be regarded as almost square\textsuperscript{44}. The temple had two entrances; one opened to the east and the other, half as wide, to the west\textsuperscript{45}. The temple is in an enclosure 23m by 15m by 48m on rising ground close to the river Dendre\textsuperscript{46}. Although on the Roman road linking \textit{Castellum Menapiorum} [Cassel] to \textit{Atuatuca} [Tongres]\textsuperscript{47}, it is over 10Km from the Nervii/ Menapii border.

\textbf{Liberchies-Bons-Villiers}. This temple, has a square \textit{cella} (ext.13m x 13m\textsuperscript{48};
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int. 11.5m x 11.5m⁴⁹) and, with the 4m wide ambulatory with 0.5m thick walls, overall dimensions of 23m by 23m⁵⁰. The orientation of its entrance is east⁵¹ or south-east⁵², the alignment of its four corners is with the four cardinal points of the compass⁵³ and the general alignment is north-west by south-east⁵⁴; it was positioned in a vast sacred enclosure measuring 100m by 76m⁵⁵, with a ditch, 3.5m wide and 1.8m deep, dated to the second half of the 3rd century AD⁵⁶, encircling the temple in a position imprecisely defined as between the wall with the colonnade and the wall of the sacred enclosure⁵⁷ on a plateau at the division of the rivers Maas/Meuse and Escaut with a gentle slope towards a small brook called Montplaisir, a tributary of the Tintia⁵⁸.

Fontaine-Valmont. This pair of Gallo-Roman temples, temple 1 and, north of it, 2, according to Bertin⁵⁹, or A and B respectively, according to Cabuy⁶⁰, dating from the beginning of the 1st century AD, founded under Claudius, to the end of the 3rd century⁶¹, have cellae which are technically rectangular (Temple 1/A: ext. 8.85m x 7.4m⁶², int. 7.25 x 5.8m⁶³; temple 2/B: 7.5m x 8.5m⁶⁴ or ext. 8.4m x 7.5m, int. 6.8m x 5.9m⁶⁵), but can be regarded as square, as Bertin⁶⁶ does, and each have an ambulatory (Width of temple 1/A ambulatory: 2.95m⁶⁷; width of temple 2/B ambulatory: 2.95m⁶⁸), although that of temple 2/B is incomplete⁶⁹; indeed, they share an ambulatory wall⁷⁰. The general dimensions of temple 1/A are 16.3m by 15.2m⁷¹, but those of temple 2/B are difficult to determine. The entrance of temple 1/A is
certainly to the east\(^72\); Bertin\(^73\) thinks that of temple 2/B is to the north, but Cabuy\(^74\) thinks it is probably to the east. Both temples are in a temenos enclosing a sacred area \((49.7\,\text{m} \times 49.6\,\text{m} \times 66.26\,\text{m} \times 65.96\,\text{m})\)\(^75\) on a plateau\(^76\) dominating the right bank of the river Sambre to the north, the river Hante to the west, the river Sartiau and the brook Rin-Wé to the south and the stream Moulin to the east\(^77\) and on the border between the Tungri and Nervii tribal territories\(^78\). But it is not near a Roman road.

**Suessiones**

**Champlieu.** Constructed in the second half of the 2nd century AD and in, according to Bertin, the tribal territory of the Suessiones 28Km north-east of Augustomagus [Senlis],\(^79\) the temple is certainly square \((22.3\,\text{m} \times 22.3\,\text{m})\) and has an ambulatory \((3.8\,\text{m})\)^80. The entrance is orientated east-north-east and it is on a plateau\(^81\) about 8Km from the river Oise, on the road from Augustamagus [Senlis] to Noviodunum [Soissons]\(^82\) and exactly on the Silvanectes/Suessiones border\(^83\).

**Les Tournelles.** An almost square temple \((6\,\text{m} \times 7.5\,\text{m})\), although it does not have an ambulatory\(^84\). It displays certain essential characteristics. Its entrance’s orientation is to the east\(^85\) and its close proximity to Champlieu means that it is also near water, near a road and near a border.

**Remi/Treveri**

**Mouzon.** This site, 110Km west of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trièves], has been assigned to either the Remi or the Mediomatrici, according to Bertin\(^86\), or to the Treveri, according to Cabuy\(^87\). There are two temples, of which temple B\(^88\), built during the Augustan period, was definitely Gallo-Roman in design. Temple B has an
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almost square *cella* (ext. 4.35m x 4.1m,\(^{89}\) int. 3.35m x 3.1m\(^{90}\)) without an ambulatory. At the front and back of this *cella* was a flagstone paving in the form of a nearly circular arc (Diam: ext. 7.50m, int. 4.40m), one of which was penetrated by pits for votive offerings. Both temples were in an enclosure, constructed in two phases, the Augustan, contemporaneous with temple B, and one dated to the 2nd century AD, contemporaneous with temple A\(^{91}\) and the entrances of both of the *cellae* open to the north-north-east\(^{92}\). The site, on a flat hill-top, dominates the left bank of the Maas/Meuse\(^{93}\) and is 3Km north east of the Roman road from *Durocortorum* [Reims] to *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Treves] and is on the Treveri/Remi border\(^{94}\).

**Treveri**

**Dalheim.** Few details are known about temples B and C, except that they have square or slightly rectangular *cellae* and ambulatories\(^{95}\) and the general dimensions of each are 20m by 20m\(^{96}\). All the temples are in an enclosed sacred area, the area is on a plateau, occupied from the 1st to the 4th centuries, and the site, 10Km from the Treveri/Mediomatrii border, is on the consular road from *Divodurum* [Metz] to *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Treves] built during the years 18-17 BC\(^{97}\).

**Dhronecken.** The temple, situated 6Km east of the modern Dhronecken\(^{98}\) and 30 Km east of *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Treves]\(^{99}\), has a *cella* (12.2m x 8.6m\(^{100}\) or 10.3m x 8.65m\(^{101}\)), considered as square by Bertin\(^{102}\), Cabuy being silent, and an ambulatory varying in width from 2.5m to 3m to 4m\(^{103}\) or 2.75m to 3.95m to 5.18m\(^{104}\) with general dimensions of 18.3m by 18.75m\(^{105}\) or 18.3m by 17.1m\(^{106}\). The date of the construction of the temple, according to Grenier\(^{107}\), can not go back
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earlier than the end of the 1st century or the beginning of the 2nd century AD, or, according to Hatt and Horne and King\textsuperscript{108}, was at the beginning of 1st century AD, and the site was occupied, according to Bertin\textsuperscript{109}, from the beginning of the 1st century AD to the beginning of the 5th century, or, according to Cabuy\textsuperscript{110}, from the 1st century, but effectively only at the beginning or middle of the 2nd up to the end of the 4th. The temple was in a rectangular enclosure (65m x 59.65m) of sacred space\textsuperscript{111} with an entrance orientated north-east\textsuperscript{112} high on a plateau\textsuperscript{113} on the right bank of the Mosel/Moselle\textsuperscript{114}; it is not near any border or Roman road.

**Fell.** The site is a dozen kilometres east of *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trois]\textsuperscript{115} and contains three temples. All the temples' *cellae* were rectangular, those of temples A (ext. 6.9m x 5.45m, int. 5.7m x 4.25m)\textsuperscript{116} and B (ext. 7.1m x 8.8m, int. 5.9m x 7.6m)\textsuperscript{117} more so than most of the other cellae examined, but all, and certainly that of C (ext. 6.1m x 5.3m, int. 4.9m x 4.1m)\textsuperscript{118}, can be considered as being square and far from as rectangular as Classical temples. Each of them was a *cella* with no ambulatory\textsuperscript{119} and remained so from the 2nd century AD until the third quarter of the 3rd century\textsuperscript{120}, when Temple A underwent a second phase with the construction of an ambulatory 2m wide resulting in the general dimensions of 11.9m by 10.45m\textsuperscript{121}. This remained the situation for them all from the end of the 3rd century until the third quarter of the 4th\textsuperscript{122}. The entrance of temple A was south-east and of temple B was north-east, while the direction of the entrance of that temple C is unknown\textsuperscript{123}. All three temples are on the north-east flank of a crest called the Burgkopf a little distance from the summit\textsuperscript{124}; temple A is closest to the summit\textsuperscript{125}, temple B 18m south\textsuperscript{126} with temple C further down\textsuperscript{127}; the crest is elevated at the confluence of the
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rivers Feller and Welgerbach.\footnote{Cabuy:274}

**Fliessem/Otrang.** This site, 25Km north-west of *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves]\footnote{Cabuy:277}, contains two temples, although only Temple A is typically Gallo-Roman with a slightly rectangular *cella* (ext. 6.65m x 5.7m, int. 5.45m x 4.5m) and an ambulatory 2.25m to 2.5m wide and resulting general dimensions of 12.25m by 11.5m. Occupation dates from the 1st century AD to the 4th. Temple B is a Classical design. Temple A’s entrance faces east. The temples, 700m east of the Roman road from *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves] to *Colonia Augusta* [Cologne]\footnote{Cabuy:278}, spread out at the mid-point of the slope of a plateau, which gently descends eastwards and thus lightly dominates the river Kyll valley, a tributary of the Mosel/Moselle\footnote{Cabuy:277} and are situated within a kilometre of the border between *Belgic Gaul* and *Upper Germany*.

**Graach.** The site, 35Km north-east of *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves]\footnote{Cabuy:281}, has been occupied since the end of the Iron Age\footnote{Cabuy:282}. The Gallo-Roman temple has no ambulatory and the *cella* (ext. 6.67m x 6.1m, int. 5.87m x 5.3m)\footnote{Cabuy:281} is only slightly rectangular; use of the site in the Roman period was from the 2nd century AD until the end of the 4th\footnote{Cabuy:282}. The four corners are aligned with the four cardinal compass points, but the orientation of the entrance is unknown\footnote{Cabuy:281}. It is situated on the south slope of the Mosel/Moselle valley in an enclosure (56.08m x 53.48m) demarcating a sacred area\footnote{Cabuy:281}; it appears to be close to neither a Roman road nor the border of the *Belgic Gaul* and *Upper Germany*.

**Gusenberg.** This site is 40Km east, according to Bertin\footnote{Bertin No.97}, or about 20Km southwest, according to Cabuy\footnote{Cabuy:283}, of *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves], little more than 1Km northeast of the village of Gusenberg\footnote{Cabuy:283} and approximately 15 Km from Dhronecken\footnote{Grenier 1958:882}. Although its construction is dated, according to Grenier\footnote{Grenier 1958:884}, to either the end of the Celtic era or the beginning of the Empire or, according to Hatt\footnote{Hatt:134}, to
either the end of Gallic independence or the beginning of the 1st century AD or, according to Cabuy\textsuperscript{144}, to the first half of the 1st century AD; the largest proportion of the objects, however, appears to be from the 2nd century AD\textsuperscript{145}. Technically rectangular, the \textit{cella} of temple A (7.8m x 8.5m\textsuperscript{146} or ext.9.05m x 9.7m, int.7.55m x 8.2m\textsuperscript{147}) is considered square by Bertin\textsuperscript{148} and has an ambulatory (2.5m wide\textsuperscript{149} or 2.5m wide (east wall), 2.7m wide (west wall), 2.9m wide (north wall) and 2.9m wide (south wall))\textsuperscript{150}, the general dimensions being 15.5m by 15.5m\textsuperscript{151} or 17.75m by 17m\textsuperscript{152}. In addition, although not near a border, the temple has some essential elements. The entrance is to the east-south-east\textsuperscript{153} or possibly the east\textsuperscript{154} and the temple is in a rectangular enclosure with no east side\textsuperscript{155} demarcating a sacred area\textsuperscript{156} (65.5m x 57.15m\textsuperscript{157} or 65.34m x 57.15m\textsuperscript{158}); the site is situated on the slope of a hill\textsuperscript{159}, overhanging the valley of the river Lösterbach\textsuperscript{160} 5Km north of the Roman road linking \textit{Augusta Treverorum} [Trier/Treves] and Tholey.

**Heckenmünster.** This site, 25Km\textsuperscript{161} or about 20Km\textsuperscript{162} north-east of \textit{Augusta Treverorum} [Trier/Trèves], seems to have been occupied from the second half of the 1st century AD until its destruction in the second half of the 3rd century\textsuperscript{163}. Each of the two quadrangular temples, temples 1 and 2\textsuperscript{164} or A and B\textsuperscript{165} respectively have a \textit{cella}, one of which is technically rectangular but considered as square\textsuperscript{166} and one is certainly square (Temple 1/A:5.8m by 6.2m\textsuperscript{167}, int. 4.9m x 4.4m\textsuperscript{168}). Temple 2/B:
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3.7m by 3.7m\textsuperscript{169}, int. 2.5m x 2.5m\textsuperscript{170} and an ambulatory (Temple 1/A: 4m wide\textsuperscript{171} or 1.9m to 2m wide\textsuperscript{172}, temple 2/B: 1.1m wide\textsuperscript{173} or 1.25m\textsuperscript{174}); the general dimensions of temple 1/A are 11m by 11.3m\textsuperscript{175} and of temple 2/B 7.7m by 7.7m\textsuperscript{176}. Although Bertin\textsuperscript{177} claims that the entrances of both temples face south-west, Cabuy\textsuperscript{178} says that the entrances open to the south-east. All three temples are in a demarcated area (77m by 33m)\textsuperscript{179} and are situated in the Hunsrück\textsuperscript{180} on the slope of a plateau\textsuperscript{181} on the left bank of the Mosel/Moselle\textsuperscript{182}. They are close to three springs, of which two are sulphurous\textsuperscript{183}, one called the “Victoria spring”\textsuperscript{184}, and have two wells inside the enclosure\textsuperscript{185}, one at the centre\textsuperscript{186} and are on the Roman road from Augusta Treverorum [Trier/ Trèves] to Upper Germany. The temples are not near a border.

**Hochsheid.** The temple, 50Km north-east of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/ Trèves]\textsuperscript{187}, had two phases. The first, in the second half of the 1st century AD\textsuperscript{188}, consisted of an almost square cella (6.25m x 6m\textsuperscript{189} or 6.25m x 6.75m\textsuperscript{190} or ext. 6.85m x 6.6m, int. 5.65m x 5.4m\textsuperscript{191}) erected alone\textsuperscript{192}. In the second phase, at the beginning of the 2nd century\textsuperscript{193}, the cella was unchanged, but an ambulatory, from 2m to 2.5m wide\textsuperscript{194}, was attached giving the general dimensions of 13.5m by 14m\textsuperscript{195} or 12.5m by 13m\textsuperscript{196} or 14m by 13.5m\textsuperscript{197}. In the first phase the entrance opened to the north-west, but in
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the second phase to the east\textsuperscript{198} or the north-east\textsuperscript{199}. The raison d'être of the site was the neighbouring spring which was directed into the centre of the temple\textsuperscript{200}. The site, 645m up on the north slope of the Idarwald in the south-west of the Hunsrück\textsuperscript{201}, is on very marshy soil\textsuperscript{202} and was situated on the Roman road from Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves] to Moguntiacum [Mainz/Mayence]\textsuperscript{203} and on the border of the Belgic Gaul and Upper Germany\textsuperscript{204}.

**Hottenbach.** Situated about 40Km east of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves]\textsuperscript{205} the temple has a *cella* with no ambulatory\textsuperscript{206}, the *cella* (ext. 4.9m x 4.45m, int. 4.2m x 3.75m)\textsuperscript{207} can be regarded as square. The entrance opened to the south\textsuperscript{208}. It is situated on the south-east slope of the Idarwald on the heights dominating the valley of the Ebesbach\textsuperscript{209} and about 2.5m from the Roman road from Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves] to Moguntiacum [Mainz/Mayence]\textsuperscript{210}. Although in the extreme east of the tribal territory\textsuperscript{211}, it is not close to the border of Belgic Gaul and Upper Germany.

**Izel.** The temple has a practically square *cella* (ext. 4.9m x 4.3m, int. 3.8m x 3.2m), an ambulatory 1.8m wide and general dimensions of 9.5m by 9.2m\textsuperscript{212}. Although it is not possible to determine the entrance\textsuperscript{213}, the temple is surrounded by a sacred space (22.9m x 20.10m) open on the east side\textsuperscript{214}; it is situated on the highland dividing the river basins of the Semois and the Chiers\textsuperscript{215}, within 10Km of the former and only 20m south of the Roman road from Durocortorum [Reims] to Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves]\textsuperscript{216}, but not near a border.

**Möhn.** Situated 10Km\textsuperscript{217} or a dozen kilometres\textsuperscript{218} north of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves]\textsuperscript{219} is a site containing three temples built at the end of the 1st century
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AD and destroyed at the very end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th. They are, according to Bertin\textsuperscript{220}, temples 1A-B-C and 2B or, according to Cabuy\textsuperscript{221}, temple A and B respectively and temple C, which had not yet been discovered when Bertin wrote. The cella of temple 1A-B-C/A was slightly oblong (11.5m x 12.75m\textsuperscript{222} or ext. 13.3m x 11.95m, int. 11.9m x 10.70m\textsuperscript{223}) with an ambulatory 2.5m\textsuperscript{224} or 3.08m to 3.25m\textsuperscript{225} wide and general dimensions of 20m by 21.2m\textsuperscript{226} or 20.5m by 19.2m\textsuperscript{227}. Temple C also has a slightly oblong cella (ext. 9.2m x 8.15m, int. 8.1m x 7m) and no ambulatory\textsuperscript{228}. Temple 2B/B, with a very oblong cella and an apse appears more Classical in design. The direction of the entrances of all the temples was south east\textsuperscript{229}. The site is situated on the first slopes of the Eifel\textsuperscript{230} on the left bank of the river Mosel/Moselle\textsuperscript{231}, with a spring, the reason for the temple, to the north west\textsuperscript{232}, near to\textsuperscript{233} and to the west of\textsuperscript{234} the Roman road from Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves] to Colonia Augusta [Cologne], but not near any border.

**Nattenheim.** Situated about 30Km north-west of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves], it existed from the period of the Antonines to that of Arcadius\textsuperscript{235}. The cella is described by Bertin\textsuperscript{236} as square, although the difference between the length and width in Bertin’s measurements (6.25m x 7.90m\textsuperscript{237}) is much greater than that measured by Cabuy (ext.7.25m x 7.77m, int.6.15m x 6.67m; walls 0.55m thick)\textsuperscript{238}, who describes the cella as rectangular\textsuperscript{239}. It can therefore be considered as almost square and its plan\textsuperscript{240} confirms this. It has an ambulatory (The width varying from 1.4m to 1.5m and with walls 0.55m thick) and the general dimensions are 10.25m by

---

\textsuperscript{220} Bertin No.125
\textsuperscript{221} Cabuy:300-302
\textsuperscript{222} Bertin No.125
\textsuperscript{223} Cabuy:300
\textsuperscript{224} Bertin No.125
\textsuperscript{225} Cabuy:301
\textsuperscript{226} Bertin No.125
\textsuperscript{227} Cabuy:301
\textsuperscript{228} Cabuy:302
\textsuperscript{229} Bertin No.125; Cabuy:301 and 302
\textsuperscript{230} Bertin No.125; Cabuy:300
\textsuperscript{231} Grenier 1958:875; Raepsaet-Charlier:230; Cabuy:300.
\textsuperscript{232} Bertin No.125; Cabuy:302
\textsuperscript{233} Hettner:Col.1; Grenier 1958:875; Raepsaet-Charlier:230; Horne & King:433.
\textsuperscript{234} Cabuy:302.
\textsuperscript{235} Cabuy:310
\textsuperscript{236} Bertin No.139
\textsuperscript{237} Bertin No.139
\textsuperscript{238} Cabuy:310
\textsuperscript{239} Cabuy:310
\textsuperscript{240} Cabuy:pl.LV
11.85m\textsuperscript{241}. Unusually the entrance faces south\textsuperscript{242}; it is situated on a high point, near the river Kyll\textsuperscript{243} and 5Km from the border between the provinces of Galli Belgica and Upper Germany.

**Niedaltdorf.** Temple A, occupied by the Romans from the 1st to the 4th centuries AD\textsuperscript{244}, is in the Treveri tribal territory\textsuperscript{245} 45Km south of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves]\textsuperscript{246}. Although Cabuy\textsuperscript{247} describes it as rectangular, on the basis of its measurements (ext.2.3m x 2.2m, int.1.1m x 1m)\textsuperscript{248}, the *cella* of temple A can be regarded as square, a view confirmed by its plan\textsuperscript{249}. It does not have an ambulatory. The *cella* has an entrance orientated to the east\textsuperscript{250}. It is situated in a sacred enclosure\textsuperscript{251}, with a spring within the enclosure\textsuperscript{252}, on the flank of the Hirnberg\textsuperscript{253}, 700m from the river Nie\textsuperscript{254}, a tributary of the Sarre\textsuperscript{255}, and near the Roman road from Divodurum [Metz] to Contiomagus [Pachten]\textsuperscript{256}, and then to Moguntiacum [Mainz/Mayence] and the border between the Treveri and the Mediomatrici\textsuperscript{257}.

**Newel.** This site is 7 to 8Km north-west of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves]\textsuperscript{258} and it covers the period from the end of the 1st century AD up to the middle of the 3rd\textsuperscript{259}. The *cella* was almost exactly square (ext.6.2m x 6m, int. 5.2m x 5m) with an ambulatory 2m wide and general dimensions, therefore, of 12.25m by 12.1m\textsuperscript{260}. The four corners are aligned with the cardinal points of the compass and the entrance is to the south-east\textsuperscript{261}, but there is no indication of a surrounding enclosure. The temple is on the western flank of a hill dominating the spring of the river Klinkbach\textsuperscript{262} 2Km
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west of the Roman road from Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves] to Colonia Augusta [Kölncologne]263. It is not near any border.

Otzenhausen. The site is 25Km from Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves]264. The temple seems to have been used from the 2nd century AD until the middle of the 3rd265. The cella is almost square (ext. 3.15m x 3.7m, int. 2.15m x 2.7m), but there is no trace of an ambulatory266. Although the entrance faces south and there is no mention of an enclosure, the site is on the southern slope of the Dolberg in the Hunsrück with the temple not far from the summit of a spur and the Roman road from Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves] to through Tholey to Upper Germany passes 10Km from it267.

Pachten. Constructed at the turn of the 1st and beginning of 2nd century AD268, the temples are in the heart of Contiomagus [Pachten], 45Km south of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves] beside the river Sarre269. Both temples, A and B, have exactly square cellae (Temple A: 6m x 6m; temple B: 5.6m x 5.6m), but only temple A has an ambulatory, which was 2.7m wide, with the general dimensions of 15.7m by 15m270. The orientation of the entrances is unknown, but the temples are in an area of sacred space at least 30m by 50m271. Contiomagus [Pachten] is where the Roman road from Divodurum [Metz] to Moguntiacum [Mainz/Mayence] crosses the Sarre river and the Roman road from Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves] to Pons Sarravi [Saarbrücken]272 and is more than 15Km from the Treveri/Mediomatri border.

Schleidweiler. This site of these two Gallo-Roman temples is 15Km north of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves]273 and dates from the 1st century AD until the 4th274. Each temple, temples IA and IB, according to Bertin275, or temples B and A, respectively, according to Cabuy276, has a cella which is exactly square (Temple IB/A (8m x 8m277 (ext.?)) or 5.25m x 5.25m278 (int.?)); temple IA/B (ext. 5.55m x
5.55, int. 4.5m x 4.5m, although Bertin\(^{279}\) claims it is 3m x 4.2m\(^{280}\), but only temple A has an ambulatory; this is 2m wide and produces the general dimensions of 13.3m x 13.3m\(^{281}\). While the entrance of temple B is known to face south-east\(^{282}\), Cabuy\(^{283}\) says that nothing precise is known of temple A’s\(^{284}\), although Bertin\(^{285}\) says it faces south-east. Situated on the east slope of the Kyll valley, the temples are relatively distant from any Roman road\(^{286}\) and border.

**Schwirzheim.** Little is known of this site, 55Km from north of *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/ Trèves]\(^{287}\), but it can be seen to have many of the elements of a typically Gallo-Roman temple. The *cella* was exactly square (ext. 9m x 9m, int. 7.7m x 7.7m) with an ambulatory 2.5m wide and general dimensions of 15.3m by 15.3m\(^{288}\).

**Serrig\(^{289}\).** This site, 20Km to the south of *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/ Trèves]\(^{290}\), Due to the little material published, the occupation of the site can be gauged as having been from the middle of the 2nd century AD to the end of the 4th\(^{291}\). The site consists of four temples, only one of which, Temple A, has an ambulatory. The *cella* of temple A is almost square (ext. 5.53m x 4.86m, int. 4.5m x 3.8m) and its ambulatory is 2.2m wide resulting in the general dimensions of 11.2m by 10.2m\(^{292}\). Temple B, 4m north-west of temple A, has a completely square *cella* (ext.5m x 5m, int. 4m x 4m) and Temple C, 4m south-east of temple A, has a *cella*, which is only slightly oblong (ext. 5.2m x 5m, int. 4.2m x 4m)\(^{293}\). Temple D, 4m south-east of temple C, has an almost totally square *cella* (ext. 3.64m x 3.56m, int. 2.6m x 2.5m)\(^{294}\). All four temples are at the north-east side of a vaguely hexagonal enclosure (118m x 88m) enclosing a sacred area, the entrance to which is in the north-east side about 15m from the temples\(^{296}\). Only temple A’s entrance is known and it faces north-east\(^{297}\). The temple site extends along the heights dominating the
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CCV
Sarre and 20m from the north-east side is the Roman road from *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves] to *Contiomagus* [Pachten]\(^{298}\); it is far from any border.

**Steinsel.** The site is 35Km west of *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves]\(^{299}\) and was occupied from the beginning of the 1st century AD up to the very end of the 4th\(^{300}\). The temple, with an almost exactly square (ext. 8.6m x 8m, int. 7.4m x 6.8m) cella and an ambulatory between 2m and 2.2m wide, has the general dimensions of 12.8m by 11.8m\(^{301}\). The temple, in the north half of a vast trapezoidal sacred enclosure 60m by 56m, is situated on the south-east slope of plateau dominating the valley of the river Alzette\(^{302}\) and 10Km north of the Roman road from *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves] to *Durocortorum* [Reims]\(^{303}\). It is far from any border.

**Tawern.** The site, a dozen kilometres south-west of *Augusta Treverorum* [Trier/Trèves]\(^{304}\), contains four temples, two (Temples A and D) with ambulatory walls on the north, west and south sides\(^{305}\). Temple A's cella (ext. 7.5m x 5.7m, int. 6.3m x 4.5m) could be considered as square and, the ambulatory being 2m to 2.2m wide, has the general dimensions of 9.8m by 10.8m\(^{306}\). Situated 2m south of temple A, the cella of temple B (ext. 4.55m x 3.9m, int. 3m x 2.3m)\(^{307}\) is almost square. Situated 1.75m south of temple A, temple C has a cella, which, although more rectangular than others, may be regarded as almost square (ext. 7.5m x 5.85m, int. 6.3m x 4.65m)\(^{308}\). Temple D's cella is square (ext. 5.5m x 5.45m, int. 4.3m x 4.25m), although the width of the ambulatory varies from 1.6m to 1.7m, with the general dimensions being 7.65m by 9.65m\(^{309}\). Only the entrance of temple A has been identified and it faces east\(^{310}\); there is a trapezoidal enclosure with a principal entrance in the east\(^{311}\). A well was found in the north-west exterior corner of temple D\(^{312}\). The temples stretch out along the crest of the Metzenburg on the slope of the
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CCVI
Mosel/Moselle valley\(^{313}\) on the Roman road from Divodurum [Metz] to Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves]\(^{314}\) far from any border.

**Velosne**\(^{315}\). A temple, erected in a reoccupied fortified town 39Km north of Verodunum [Verdun]\(^{316}\) and 85Km south-west of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Treves]\(^{317}\), consists of a an almost square (4.3m x 5.1m\(^{318}\) or ext. 5.2m x 4.35m, int. 3.8m x 3m\(^{319}\) cella with an ambulatory 2.3m wide\(^{320}\). The general dimensions are 10.4m by 11m\(^{321}\) or 11m by 10.5m\(^{322}\). The precise chronology is impossible to determine, but after the 2nd century AD at least until the 4th\(^{323}\). The entrance is to the east\(^{324}\) and the fortified town is a substitute for an enclosure\(^{325}\). Not only are there wells in the east-north-east of the town\(^{326}\), but the site, on a hillside called “La Romanette”, dominates the valley of the river Chiers about 100m away\(^{327}\). The site is more than 15Km from a Roman road, but is only about 5Km from the Treveri/Mediomatri
ci border\(^{328}\).

**Virton-Saint-Mard.** The village to which this temple was attached was created in the course of the middle of the 1st century AD and underwent considerable development in the middle of the century, reaching its height in the 2nd and surviving the invasions at the end of the 3rd with difficulty\(^{329}\). The measurements of the cella (ext. +/- 8.85m x 7.8m, int. +/-7.2m x 5.7m), ambulatory (+/-1.7m wide) are imprecise\(^{330}\); indeed, the general dimensions are unknown as is the direction of the entrance. The site, on the Roman road linking Verodunum [Verdun] to the road connecting Durocortorum [Reims] and Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Trèves], is on the south-east corner of a plateau dominating the confluence of the valleys of the Vire and the Ton\(^{331}\).
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Wederath. The village containing the temple, 35Km east of Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Treves]332, was occupied under Augustus, developed fully during the 2nd and 3rd centuries, but, suffering under the invasions towards AD 275, was of reduced importance in the 4th333. The cella is almost square (ext. 10.7m x 9.5m, int. 9.7m x 8.5m) and has an ambulatory; although the width of the latter is unknown, the general dimensions are 16.9m by 15.6m334. The temple, whose corners are aligned to the cardinal points, has an entrance to the north-east and is in an enclosure of sacred space of irregular shape (120m x 70m)335. The site is in the heart of the Hunsrück336, exactly on the Roman road from Augusta Treverorum [Trier/Treves] to Moguntiacum [Mainz/Mayence] between Dunno [Kirchberg] and Noviomago [Neumagen]337 and near the border between Belgic Gaul and Upper Germany338.

Tungri

Clavier-Vervoz. Temple A has two phases. The first dates from the middle of the 1st century AD until the end of the 1st or the beginning of the 2nd century when it was destroyed by fire; its second phase dates from the middle of the 3rd century up to the end of the 4th339. In the first phase, although technically rectangular, the cella can be called square (ext. 7m x 6.5m, int. 5.7m x 5.2m)340; there was an ambulatory 2.8m wide and the general dimensions were 14m by 13.4m341. In the second phase, the cella stayed unchanged, but the width of the ambulatory increased to between 3.3m and 3.4m342. The entrance of the temple was orientated south-east and both temples were in an enclosure343. The site, being on the flank of a small depression344, is technically on a high point; it is only a dozen metres from the brook the Ocquier, the principal tributary of the Néblon river345 and about 100m from the Roman road from Orolaunum [Arlon] to Atuatuca [Tongres]346. There were even a number of pits for
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deposits around the two temples, contemporaneous with phase I\textsuperscript{347} and even prior to temple B\textsuperscript{348}.

**Matagne-la-grande.** There are two temples. The *cella* of temple A is almost square (ext. 7.85m x 7.75m, int. 6.45m x 6.35m)\textsuperscript{349} and, with an ambulatory from 3.3m to 3.4m wide, has the general dimensions of 15.85m by 15.85m\textsuperscript{350}. Temple A is surrounded by a trapezoidal enclosure of sacred space (79m x 89m x 79m x 83m) of 66 ares with a monumental entrance in the south east side\textsuperscript{351}. An oval pit, about a dozen metres in diameter and 1.8m deep, was on the east side of this *temenos*\textsuperscript{352}. Temple B, 42m north east of temple A, had no ambulatory, but had an almost exactly square *cella* (ext. 5.9m x 5.8m, int. 4.7m x 4.6m)\textsuperscript{353}. The entrances of both temples face the south east\textsuperscript{354}. The first phase of the site, in which temple A and the oval pit belong, seems to have begun in the second half of the 3rd century AD and the second phase, in which temple B was built, is dated to the second half of the 4th and occupation seems to have ended at the beginning of the 5th\textsuperscript{355}. Situated on the slightly inclined, southerly part of a vast plateau 260m high\textsuperscript{356}, it is probably very close to the Roman road thought to go from *Augusta Viromanduorum* [St.-Quentin] to *Colonia Augusta* [Köln/Cologne]\textsuperscript{357}, but about 10Km from the nearest river.

**Matagne-la-petite.** The site, less than 2Km east of Matagne-la-grande, has two Gallo-Roman temples, temples A and B, both of which had ambulatories\textsuperscript{358}. Temple A has two phases and the indications are that the first was ended with the destruction of the temple by fire\textsuperscript{359}; as regards phase I, only the general dimensions, 18.6/18.67m by 18/18.05m, are known\textsuperscript{360} and in phase II it was square (ext. 10.38m x 97.5/9.8m, int. 8.8m x 8.25/8.3m) with an ambulatory 3.4m to 3.45m wide and the same general dimensions\textsuperscript{361}. Phase I of temple A is able to be dated from the middle of the 2nd century AD and phase II, when temple B was built, can be placed between the middle of the 2nd century and AD 260\textsuperscript{362} and they seem to have continued until

\textsuperscript{347} Cabuy:201
\textsuperscript{348} Cabuy:200
\textsuperscript{349} Cabuy:227
\textsuperscript{350} Cabuy:228
\textsuperscript{351} Cabuy:228
\textsuperscript{352} Cabuy:229 and pl.XXIa
\textsuperscript{353} Cabuy:228
\textsuperscript{354} Cabuy:228
\textsuperscript{355} Cabuy:232
\textsuperscript{356} Cabuy:227
\textsuperscript{357} Cabuy:229
\textsuperscript{358} *Horne & King*:431
\textsuperscript{359} Cabuy:235
\textsuperscript{360} Cabuy:235
\textsuperscript{361} Cabuy:235
\textsuperscript{362} Cabuy:239
the late 4th century AD\textsuperscript{363}. Temple B, immediately to the southwest of temple A, is attached to its south wall\textsuperscript{364}. Temple B has a square \textit{cella} (ext. 7.15m x 7.15m, int. 5.95m x 5.95m) with an ambulatory 2.92m to 3.03m wide and general dimensions of 14.4m by 14.15m\textsuperscript{365}. Temple A, in both phases, and temple B had a south-east facing entrance\textsuperscript{366} and temple A was in a walled \textit{temenos} of sacred space (114.7m x 62m x 115.9m x 62m) with a large entrance of 5m in the south east wall\textsuperscript{367}. The temples are on a plateau in a Roman settlement\textsuperscript{368} about 8 Km north of a tributary of the river Maas/Meuse and about 4.5Km north-west of the Roman road thought to go from \textit{Augusta Viromanduorum} [St.-Quentin] to \textit{Colonia Augusta} [Köln/Cologne].

**Viromandui**

Chilly. The Gallo-Roman temple at this site consists of a rectangular, but almost square, \textit{cella} (ext. 8m x 7.5m\textsuperscript{369}, int. 5.6m x 4.95m\textsuperscript{370}) and an ambulatory\textsuperscript{371}, resulting in the general dimensions of 14.05m by 15.1m\textsuperscript{372} or 14m by 15m\textsuperscript{373}. Cadoux\textsuperscript{374} asks himself if the temple was not constructed towards the end of the 3rd century or even only in the 4th. There are no traces of an entrance\textsuperscript{375}. A deposit pit was nearby to the north-east\textsuperscript{376}; two ditches earlier than the temple border it to the north-west and there was a pit at the centre of the temple\textsuperscript{377}. The temple was about two kilometres west of the Roman road from \textit{Camaracum} [Cambrai] to \textit{Augustamagus} [Senlis] and the same distance east of the Viromandui/Ambiani border and about 5Km north of the river Aube.
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\textsuperscript{365} Cabuy:235
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\textsuperscript{369} Cadoux 1981:282
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