

Divindades indígenas em análise

Divinités pré-romaines - bilan et perspectives d'une recherche

Actas do VII workshop
FERCAN

Cascais, 25-27.05.2006



**Centro de
Estudos
Arqueológicos**
das Universidades de
Coimbra e Porto

Coordenação de José d'Encarnação

Coimbra • Porto • 2008

How to identify Celtic religion(s) in Roman Britain and Gaul

RALPH HAEUSSLER

University of Osnabrück

I. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to explore the gravity of sociocultural change between the late Iron Age and the Roman period (Section II) and its consequences for local religions. In Section III we will attempt to identify possible 'relics' of late Iron Age religion in the Principate, not only in epigraphy, but also in our archaeological record, in iconography and cult practices. We shall recognise the development of new hybrid religions that have been taking up substance from Greek, Roman and native cultures over many centuries, a process that intensified due to the intensified interaction after the Roman conquest. This created the so-called Gallo-Roman or Britanno-Roman religions. Isolated, sometimes even arbitrary adoptions from the in-coming Graeco-Roman culture by indigenous people initiated processes that created new religious belief systems, which, within a few generations, would have become illegible and unfamiliar (perhaps even alien) to a pre-Roman 'Celtic' worshipper. A polytheist religion easily adapts to changing societal needs: the experience of the social actor in pre-Roman and Roman times, and the environment within which he acts, are fundamentally different, so that the role of religion must reflect the beliefs and ideologies of their time; in addition, the global world of the Roman empire resulted in the simultaneous presence of so many cults and religions in a provincial community, causing new evolutions and signs of otherness.

As the name suggest, the aim of the F.E.R.C.AN. – project (*Fontes Epigraphicae Religionum Celticum Antiquum*) is the collection and analysis of epigraphic sources for ancient Celtic religion(s). Taking into account that the majority of our inscriptions were written in Latin and date to the Roman period, such an analysis would of course only be possible if we assume that there was a significant continuity between the late Iron Age and the Principate that made it possible that ‘relics’ of a distant ‘Celtic’ past survived into the Roman period. However, this seems rather unlikely considering the extent of sociocultural change that took place in the 1st century B.C. / A.D. – and since politics, society and religion are closely interrelated we must assume that religious practices and understandings were also transformed significantly.¹ This makes it also improbable to suggest that cultural appearances were merely superficial and that religious beliefs persisted for centuries behind a Roman façade, having been made visible “once the stimulus of the great Mediterranean traditions (...) took hold of the Celtic world”: can we really “observe Celtic gods through a window created by Rome”, as suggested for example by M. Green (1995, 466)? Is it really possible to strip away the Roman layers to reveal aspects of an unchanging Celtic religion underneath?²

For example, hundreds of Celtic names of deities, like Grannos, Belados, Cocidios, Maponos, Glanis and many more, are attested on Latin inscriptions, but we cannot take it for granted that these names already existed in pre-Roman times. The evidence might even suggest that the majority of people (other than druids, priests, etc.), had no direct access to divine knowledge, a limited idea about a god's functions and moreover that a god's name was not to be pronounced³. Strabo, for example, tell us that the Celtiberians worshipped a nameless god and that the Gallaecians were atheists⁴. It is also possible that this reflects forms of henotheism in some of the Iron Age religions, which seems to contradict the multitude of deities attested in Roman times.

These Celtic theonyms from Roman inscriptions can hardly shed any light on pre-Roman religious beliefs, nor do they indicate the unchanged survival of a pre-Roman cult. They show, above all, the beliefs of 2nd and 3rd century A.D. worshippers in the Roman provinces – the result of a long process of socio-religious

¹ Haeussler and King 2007b; Millett 1995; for earlier studies, cf. Haeussler 2001-2002; 2005a-b; 2007.

² Again and again, scholars refer to the contributions Roman texts make for our understanding of Celtic religion. Cf. for example Miranda Green who talks about a ‘native Celtic religion’ (2003, 7) and ‘deities who are entirely Celtic in concept’ (Green 51; 59), among them she lists the *matres*, Epona, Sucellos and Nodons, whose names are only known from Roman inscriptions.

³ Brunaux 2006b, 198-199.

⁴ Strabo 3.4.16; cf. Marco Simón 2007, 152. However, this need not be a mere negative stereotype to show the primitive level of ‘civilization’ of Gallaecians and Celtiberians, but an allusion to a more abstract divine concept related to some form of ‘druidic’ (?) religion.

change that was instigated and/or catalysed by the Roman conquest, and we can hardly describe the population of this period as 'Celtic', considering the extent of changes in self-identity, ethnicity, demography, social and cultural structures, and many more.

We also should not create a clash between a Roman and a Celtic religion, as if we were dealing with entities. On the one hand, the Romans were accustomed to a plurality of polis-religions and therefore had no intention to impose *their* cults on the provincial population. On the other hand, it is difficult to define Celtic religions: the term itself can merely serve as a convenient shorthand to describe a range of common elements, which we can identify in late Iron Age art and rituals across Western Europe (perhaps druids, sacred groves, human sacrifice, excarnation, the soul's immortality and the abstract art of the La Tène period?),⁵ but the archaeology also reveals an enormous degree of regional diversity (v. *infra*), which goes far beyond Caesar's distinction of diverse *institutiones* of the Aquitani, Belgae and Galli⁶, and which make it problematic to make rough generalisations of 'Celtic' or native beliefs on the basis of isolated finds from different parts of Western Europe. Moreover, religions (i.e. religious belief systems) are not static but constantly evolving and as we shall see, there were significant developments across Gaul and Britain already prior to the Roman conquest, so that the sociocultural developments in the Roman period merely served to catalyse and stimulate internal developments.

Religious beliefs systems had to be adjusted to suit changing societal structures. Here we must distinguish between gradual processes and relatively brisk changes. For example, we witness processes of rather incremental change in Southern Gaul from the 5th to the 1st century B.C.: among others, cults were adapted to forms of (proto)urbanism, we can note the construction of cult places in stone, the adoption of writing, the use of new votive offerings, anthropomorphic sculptures, as well as the natives' increasing knowledge of Greek art and mythology⁷. Such incremental changes might have been hardly recognisable to contemporaries as they took place over several generations. This contrasts with relatively abrupt changes around the Augustan period, such as the creation of many new cult places, their architectural appearance, the cult processes, the types of votive objects, the use of writing, the 'interpretatio romana', etc. As far as we can judge from the available archaeological evidence, many of these changes appear to have been far-reaching. But just how significant were these changes for local religions? Can we talk about the 'Romanisation' of religion: is it possible to change religious beliefs as easily as economic structures (production techniques, trade network, etc.) or as easily as the

⁵ Cf. Marco Simón 2007.

⁶ Caes. *BG* 1, 1.

⁷ Haeussler 2007; Garcia 2004.

adoption of a Roman lifestyle by the elites (adopting a particular range of artefacts, food, costume, architecture, etc.)? Such cultural preferences might have affected people's choice of votive objects, cult architecture and sculpture; any relics of pre-Roman religion could have been disguised by such 'superficial' external signs and symbols of the Roman period. But is it possible to imagine that, underneath the surface, the meaning and function of a pre-Roman cult remained unchanged?

In this respect we should bear in mind that the quantity, visibility and character of our sources are very different in the late Iron Age and the Principate. We can identify many more cult places, votive objects, sculptural representations, etc. in the Roman period. Epigraphy provides a wealth of information on the names of local deities, but it is a Roman medium (with the exception of a few 1st century B.C. Gallo-Greek dedications). This means that epigraphy was not used equally in all sanctuaries: even in the highly literate province Gallia Narbonensis, there are many cult places that have not yielded a single inscription. Epigraphy consequently provides a very *random* insight in cult activities, limited in time and space, and it therefore seems highly problematic to generalise on the basis of inscriptions alone.

II. Persistence and change

If late Iron Age religion experienced a rupture, we need to understand why since the Hellenistic, Oriental and Egyptian religions of the eastern provinces of the Roman empire never experienced any similar break. In Greece we can identify a number of changes, like the association of many important cult centres with the cult of the emperor⁸, but these changes were part of gradual processes of integrating cult places, like Delphi and Olympia, in the contemporary political make-up.

In the Gallia Narbonensis, the archaeological record allows us a closer look at religious developments in the pre-Roman Iron Age. It becomes obvious that the local religions were capable to adapt to new social challenges. This is especially apparent in the 2nd/1st centuries B.C. when more and more cult places were built in protourban sites, like the numerous porticoes, many of which were associated with the hero-ancestor cult⁹, and the 'fanum' of Nages (70 B.C.)¹⁰. Also Greek art, architecture and mythology could be integrated into local religions, like the use

⁸ Alcock 1997. Also cf. e.g. DeMaris 1995 showing changes to the cult of Demeter in Corinth before/after the city's destruction: in Roman times there is an emphasis on funerary and underworld association, instead of fertility associations as in the Classical and Hellenistic period.

⁹ García 2004; Arcelin and Brunaux 2003.

¹⁰ Py 1978.

of Ionic columns at several oppida, or the figure-capitals from a public building in Glanum showing Apollo, Hermes, but also indigenous deities.¹¹ Moreover, from c. 100 B.C. writing was increasingly employed for religious matters.¹² Epigraphy also reveals other innovations that might date to the Hellenistic period, namely the adoption of patron deities, similar to Greek-style patron deities or heroes, like *Glanis* in Glanum, *Nemausus* in Nemausus and *Vasio* in Vasio. Hellenisation is not the right term for this process, as people did not aim for a Greek identity and lifestyle. It was rather a form of bilateral *Gallo-Greek* (and perhaps also *Gallo-Italic*?) interaction, whereby the adoption of certain aspects from Greek culture enriched the repertoire of local society while retaining a distinct indigenous identity. Some of these developments took place in a nominally Roman period, perhaps even catalysed by the increased interaction (commerce; movement of people) after the Roman conquest. In other words, local religions in Southern Gaul were already evolving long before the Augustan period.

Cultural, social and religious rupture

We can hardly deny that social and religious patterns changed so significantly in the Roman West during the 1st century B.C./A.D. that we can postulate a *rupture*. But we need to explain how such a rupture comes about. Societies are not constituted of social phenomena that inevitably lead to sociocultural renewal without any influence from the people concerned. Nor can we assume that Romanised local elites would have been able to simply abandon the cults of their ancestors and create new ones. Instead we have to consider a complex make-up by which “individuals and groups inevitably produce social conditions which in some respect constrain and set limits to the possibility for future actions”.¹³ What does this mean for us? Usually, there would be a constant re-structuration of normative rules and principles, of social and cultural structures, resulting in gradual change, hardly visible to contemporary people, like the gradual changes to religious practices in the late pre-Roman Iron Age. And unless there were extremely exceptional circumstances, it would not be possible to just abandon one set of religious beliefs and cult behaviours and replace it with another, ‘Romanised’ set. Consequently a rupture like the one we recognise at the turn of the millennia can only have been instigated by a profound legitimating crisis within society, i.e. a profound clash of interests between social agents faced with alienated, obsolete social structures¹⁴. In this respect the end of La Tène culture across North Italy and Gaul must signify the end of a symbolic language which has

¹¹ Roth Congès 1997.

¹² Lejeune 1985.

¹³ Tilley 1982: 31; Shanks and Tilley 1987: 175-85.

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. Tilley 1982; for the example of North Italy cf. Haeussler 1997.

lost its meaning to the local population, whereby La Tène art has to be understood as a religious art, implying a significant break to the social, cultural and religious patterns in the late 1st century B.C.

What could have possibly triggered such a break up of existing ideologies and beliefs? On the one hand, there are certain disruptive factors, like the enormous displacement of people, the destruction of countless communities, the threat of dispossession, the increased monetisation, etc.¹⁵ But to each of them the local people could have found a strategy to adapt. On the other hand, there are integrative elements, like the large-scale enrolment of Gauls into the Roman army and the closer ties between Rome and Gaul through patronage structures, which gave locals a prospect for social advancement by-passing existing hierarchies and which is reflected for example in the large number of *oppida latina* in Southern France. The cenotaph of Glanum (c. 40B.C.) illustrates the degree of identification of local elites in Gaul with Roman politics: the reliefs celebrate the participation of the Glanici *Iulii* on Caesar's side in the Civil wars.¹⁶ The cenotaph also symbolises the emergence of contemporary 'hero-ancestors' as founding fathers of the new Roman-style municipalities, replacing pre-Roman forms of social organisation. The adoption of a Roman-style constitution allowed the local *decuriones* to select the official civic cults of the new Roman-style community¹⁷. New ideals motivated people's actions, especially those of the wealthy and governing elites – *humanitas*, *padeia*, *pax*, *clementia*¹⁸. The outcome was an urban-style society appropriate for the *zeitgeist* of the early Principate. As a result of the social integration of a large proportion of the provincial population, we might expect that certain aspects of the cultural repertoire of the Late Iron Age that mirrored indigenous social patterning probably were no longer appropriate and thus lost their meaning:

Let us take, for example, the archaeologically most visible cult in Iron Age Narbonensis, namely the hero-ancestor cult with its head cult (*têtes coupées*) and the statues sitting in a cross-legged position¹⁹. Having existed for more than five centuries, this cult seems to have lost its meaning in the course of the 1st century

¹⁵ An increase in trade can also be disruptive to local society and an increased monetisation means that social transactions were now commodified (i.e. paid workers instead of forms of dependent labour), thus further undermining existing hierarchies.

¹⁶ Roth Congès 2000.

¹⁷ Cf. for example the *lex coloniae Genetivae* from Urso: the new duumviri have to discuss with the decurions which public religious festival to hold in the city: paragraph LXIII: (...) *quos et quot dies festos esse et quae sacra fieri publice placeat et quos ea sacra facere placeat* (Gabba and Crawford 1996, 401). Cf. Van Andringa 2002 for the impact of municipalisation on the religions of Gaul.

¹⁸ Haeussler 1997.

¹⁹ This cult probably developed during the Iron Age, adapted to social necessities, it is therefore difficult to say whether the evidence indicates just an ancestor or hero or warrior cult. Cf. Arcelin and Brunaux 2003; García 2004; Haeussler 2008.

B.C., the period of intensifying interaction with the Romans. We can imagine different reasons for this, above all the alleged barbarian, bellicose character of the head cult which might have contradicted Roman elite virtues (*humanitas*). If these 'heroes-ancestors' were patron deities of the community, this role might now have been taken over by other deities, for example by the deities attested on Latin inscriptions (e.g. the goddess *Dexiva* for the *pagus Dexivates*,²⁰ *Hercules* and *Glanis* at *Glanum*, etc.)²¹. It is possible that the cult of the ancestors ceased once the land of the ancestors had been abandoned? But on the many hilltop sites that were abandoned in the 1st century B.C., we find cult places in the Roman period, perhaps a continued veneration of these pre-Roman ancestors.²² It is also feasible that these 'ancestors' were more closely related to individual clans or *gentes*²³. If this had been the case, such a cult might have become meaningless once the ideologies, which had supported pre-Roman hierarchies, lost their meaning in the Gallic and Civil Wars. The rejection of the ancestor cult might therefore have been a response by the lower classes of society to obsolete, alienated symbols of an old elite. This reminds us that the initiative in religious affairs was not limited to the elites: they could only modify cults or create new cults and cult places as long as these were considered meaningful to the local worshippers since cult practices and the meaning of a cult must be understood; they cannot be mere '*Selbstdarstellung*' of the élite²⁴. In this context we should avoid to make an artificial distinction between native and Roman elites: society was hierarchical and the municipal elite, whatever their ethnic origin, had similar cultural values and ambitions in the Principate.

As a result, the ancestor cult has completely disappeared by the end of the 1st century B.C. For a study on the persistence of Celtic religion this does of course cause a problem: the archaeology suggests a significant break in cult activities, while epigraphy attests c. 100 Celtic theonyms from the *Narbonensis* during the Roman period – can these be a relic of pre-Roman religious beliefs?

Some elements of the hero-ancestor cult may have survived in other form, perhaps in the Gallo-Roman semi-god *Hercules*, while the *têtes coupées* may have been represented by other symbolic elements, like the *Hermes* or the *Gorgon*.²⁵ In both Gaul and Britain, we often find Romano-Celtic temples that were built on top of burials, for example on top of an aristocratic burial as in *St. Albans* (*Folly Lane*,

²⁰ Inscriptions on the oppidum *Le Castellar*, *Cadenet*, *Vaucluse*; cf. Häussler 2005a.

²¹ Häussler 2005b.

²² E.g. on the *Titelberg*, cf. Metzler 2006.

²³ Häussler 2008

²⁴ For epigraphy as '*Selbstdarstellung*', cf. Alföldy 2001.

²⁵ Benoît 1970.

v. *infra*) and perhaps on top of an aristocratic Iron Age vehicle burial as in Hayling Island.²⁶

Considering the extent of societal changes, religious change can have hardly been superficial or merely masquerading the continuity of Iron Age cults. Instead we are dealing with profound changes: cults were adapted to new social values; this must have been especially true for the politically significant civic cults. This is no response to the diffusion of Roman cults, but it were local people who initiated these processes of change, creating new hybrid cults. In this respect, recent studies on post-medieval colonial encounters provide food for thought as they describe the cultural interactions amongst societies in an age of migration and increasing communications, comparable to the Roman period.²⁷ Such studies show how locals select particular elements from in-coming cultures, endow these with meanings different from those they possessed in the original culture and then creatively merge these with indigenous traditions to create totally new forms. While we should be aware of some structural differences (notably the imposition of Christianity), we should keep in mind the ways in which religious concepts can merge when talking about the adoption of Roman gods and of Graeco-Roman iconography. Let us take, for example, the god Mars Cocidios on Hadrian's Wall: this is surely an adoption of the Roman name *Mars*, but one might wonder whether a Roman passer-by looking at the sculptural depictions might still have recognised the god's Roman origin, while it might be futile to even consider any Britanno-Celtic origin of Mars Cocidios. In other words, there may be syncretic, hybrid deities that took up functions, meaning and iconography of diverse origin, so that they bear hardly any relation to pre-Roman gods.

III. How to recognize 'Celtic' religion in the Roman period

If we keep in mind these potential sociocultural changes and transformations, as well as the possible bias in our archaeological and historical sources, then we can start to search for any possible remnants of a pre-Roman, autochthonous religion in this rapidly changing sociocultural environment. Bearing in mind the dialectic relationship between persistence and change, we want to explore five different aspects: pan-Celtic deities, Celtic theonyms, the persistence of rituals and cult practices, iconography and sculpture, and finally the survival of Celtic beliefs and mythology.

²⁶ Some 30–40 human bones, together with horse bones and fragments from chariots and horse tack may imply that an Iron Age vehicle burial was the reason for the creation of a cult place, cf. King and Soffe 2001, 116. For Folly Lane, cf. Niblett 1992; Forcey 1998; Niblett 1999; Haussler 2008.

²⁷ Cf. Webster 2001 for the study of 'creolization' in the Roman provinces; for studies on modern religious creolization, e.g. in Latin America, cf. e.g. Garrard-Burnett 2007.

3.1. Pan-Celtic deities – Which pan-Celtic deities?

Unlike the numerous Celtic theonyms attested epigraphically, most of which have only a very limited geographically distribution, pan-Celtic deities are those that can be found across the Celtic world. Comparable to the twelve Olympic deities of the Greeks, one may assume that they would have been at the core of indigenous mythology. Names like Taranis, Toutatis, Esus, Cernunnos, Lugus, Epona, Belenos, Tarvos Trigaranus, etc. come to mind. But there are a number of problems: Did these deities really exist in pre-Roman times and did they survive into the Roman period and if so, how can we recognise them and which sources inform us about pan-Celtic deities?

There are two fundamental texts: Caesar (1st century B.C.) and Lucan (1st century A.D.)

XVII. They worship as their divinity, Mercury in particular, and have many images of him, and regard him as the inventor of all arts, they consider him the guide of their journeys and marches, and believe him to have great influence over the acquisition of gain and mercantile transactions. Next to him they worship Apollo, and Mars, and Jupiter, and Minerva; respecting these deities they have for the most part the same belief as other nations: that Apollo averts diseases, that Minerva imparts the invention of manufactures, that Jupiter possesses the sovereignty of the heavenly powers; that Mars presides over wars.

CAESAR, BG VI. 16-18

And those who pacify with blood accursed Savage Teutates, Hesus' horrid shrines, And Taranis' altars, cruel as were those Loved by Diana goddess of the north; All these now rest in peace.

LUCAN *PHARSALIA* 1.444-447²⁸

The problem is that the triad of deities mentioned by Lucan (Esus, Teutatis, Taranis) seems to have disappeared in the Roman period. Only rarely do we find dedications mentioning these theonyms²⁹. This is even more suspicious since hundreds of other Celtic theonyms were recorded on inscriptions. Lucan ascribes

²⁸ *Et quibus immitis placatur sanguine diro Teutates, horrensque feris altaribus Hesus, Et Taranis Scythicae non mitior ara Dianae.*

²⁹ Cf. Häussler 2001-2002; Jufer and Luginbühl 2001.

cruel rituals to some of them, which may be the reason for their abandonment. Even more, we have to wonder whether they ever existed. Perhaps these deities survived under a different name. In a process which Tacitus called *interpretatio romana*, Caesar mentioned four gods and one goddess by their Roman name, deities which, according to Caesar, have similar functions to those of the Romans: Mercury, Mars, Jupiter and Apollo and one female deity (Minerva); later Caesar mentions Dispatēr – a chthonic deity whom all Gauls claim to be descended from (BG 6.18). Assuming that Caesar provides a valuable piece of information, it remains problematic to equate Caesar's Roman theonyms with the Celtic ones. The *Bern Scholia* provide additional explanations but also add confusion. According to their sources, Teutatis can be identified both as Mercury and as Mars; likewise Esus was Esus Mars when he receives a human sacrifice and Esus Mercurius when worshipped by merchants; Taranis can be both Dispatēr and Jupiter³⁰.

Does the *Pilier des nautes* from Lutetia provide the key to the Celtic pantheon³¹? Dating to the reign of Tiberius (AD 14-37) and dedicated to Jupiter Optimus Maximus by the Parisian *nautes*³², the shippers and traders on the Seine, it provides a unique epigraphic and sculptural attestations for a series of deities. How can we make sense of this pillar? The individual panels are labeled, thus allowing us to associate theonyms with iconographic representations, showing a combination of Roman and indigenous deities:

top row: [.]ernunnos || Castor || [Pollux?] || Smer[ri?]os;
2nd row: Iovis || Tarvos Trigaranus || Vulcanus || Esus;
bottom row: [---] || [---] Fort[una?] || [- -]V[---] || [---]

The top block³³ depicts, on neighbouring panels, Castor and Pollux (known to be common Celtic deities, more widely worshipped in Gaul than in any other province³⁴), as well as the horned god [C]ernunnos (in cross-legged position) and the god Smer[trios/tullus?] (who is killing a serpent). The second row shows Jupiter (with sceptre and lightning), Vulcanus (perhaps representing Sucellos and/or Dispatēr?), followed by Esus and Tarvos Trigaranus. The bottom block shows

³⁰ *Bern Scholia* to Lucan 1.445-446.

³¹ For the *Pilier des nautes*, cf. Esp. IV 3132-3135 = ILS 4613 = CIL XIII 3026a ; CAG-75, pp. 445-452, 760* (with further bibliography); Hatt 1952 ; Saragoza, F. *et al* 2003 ; d'Arbois de Jubainville, G. 1898 (on Esus and Tarvos Trigaranus); also cf. now Jacomin 2006 and Goudineau and Verdier 2006 for more astronomic interpretations.

³² Text of the dedication : *Tib(erio) Caesare | Aug(usto) Ioui Optum[o] | Maxsumo nautae Parisiaci | publice posierunt (!) || Eurises || Senani U[s]jeiloni*.

³³ The size of the blocks indicates their vertical arrangement, but not the actual alignment. But cf. now Jacomin (2006) who suggests that the Jupiter block was on top of the pillar, based on astronomic observations.

³⁴ Duval 1993, 86-7.

eight deities, including some of the divine couples, so widely attested in Gallo-Roman sculpture: Mars and a female deity ([---]V[---] may suggest Venus, Minerva, Boudana?³⁵); this is followed by Mercury together with his consort (Rosmerta, Juno or Minerva); the third panel shows Fortuna, probably accompanied by Juno carrying a sceptre; finally there is Venus and another unidentified female deity³⁶. A number of panels show mythological scenes, like the three-horned bull Tarvos Trigaranus with the three cranes and the willow tree³⁷, another willow tree is cut down by Esus, while Smertrios fights a snake.

How do these deities fit together? Do Latin theonyms represent Roman gods or does Jupiter merely stand in for the indigenous god of thunder ('Taranis')? It seems that no deity was represented twice by both its Roman and Celtic name, i.e. we find Smertrios instead of his Gallo-Roman counterpart, there is Esus instead of Mars/Mercury, Vulcanus instead of Sucellos, etc. Interestingly, Taranis, Teutatis, Ogmios, Epona, Belenos and other theonyms of pan-Celtic deities are not attested on this Jupiter column. It is also difficult to identify the supreme Celtic goddess: it is remarkable that female deities only appear on the panels of the bottom block. As a whole, the '*Pilier des nautes*' provides a glimpse in the ongoing cultural debate, taking up elements from local and Roman religion.

Our task must be to explore whether there really were any pre-Roman theonyms with which we can identify pre-Roman deities. For example, there might have been a deity in pre-Roman times that had the functions which we generally attribute to the god Taranis, i.e. a celestial deity, a god of thunder and lightning, the kind of weather-god that we can recognise in Hittite, Greek, Roman and other Indo-European religions³⁸. Thereby Taranis might just be one word to denote his function as the 'thunderer' and the characteristics and titles of this deity may have varied across western Europe.

Let us look at some of these allegedly pan-Celtic deities in more detail:

Toutatis

The word *toutatis* derives from *touta* 'populus, people, tribe' (as in Old Irish *tuath*) and hence denotes the 'guardian of the tribe or city'³⁹. Toutatis therefore merely

³⁵ Ceres has also been suggested. In Gaul we often find Victoria or Nemetona as Mars' consort.

³⁶ Venus often appears together with Vulcanus (cf. Häussler 2007b), but this is not the case here.

³⁷ Cf. Botheroyd & Botheroyd 2004, p. 308-311, s.v. Stier; Duval 1976, p. 35-7; Heichelheim, RE A.IV (1932), s.v. Tarvos Trigaranus; also cf. S. Worrell (2006, p. 449-450) for the copper-alloy figurine of a three-horned bull from Holbrook (Suffolk) with a *dorsuale* around his body, suggesting that he was prepared for sacrifice (and therefore could not have been divine).

³⁸ For Taranis, cf. Duval 1976, 29: 'le maître du ciel'.

³⁹ Delamarre 2003; De Bernardo Stempel 2007.

means the local patron deity which may have many faces and characteristics (and hence can be Mercury or Mars in Roman times or one of the many local toponymic deities). The actual theonym *toutatis* is rarely attested: There is a Mars Toutatis at Barkway, Kelvedon (Britain) and Seckau (Austria);⁴⁰ the related epithet Teutanus is thrice attributed to Jupiter, Toutanis twice to Mercury, and Toutiorix once to Apollo⁴¹. This shows that we are not dealing with a *god* Toutatis, but with an *epithet*, i.e. there were many Toutates.⁴²

Esus

Esus⁴³ is one of the deities depicted on the '*Pilier des nautes*'⁴⁴, but he is hardly ever attested on other Latin inscriptions. There is an Esus from Cherchel in Algeria(!)⁴⁵ and another Aesus from Noricum.⁴⁶ As W. Meid has convincingly argued, the name Esus/Aesus merely means 'god'⁴⁷, and not 'good' or 'good master' as has often been assumed⁴⁸. Only the mentioning on the '*Pilier des nautes*' suggests that this name was used to denote a deity at that time; Esus could have had a place in local myth, as suggested by the recurring image of the cutting of a willow tree, whose exact symbolic meaning escapes us. According to the *Bern Scholia* he was identified both as Mercury and Mars, and there is also a Mercury statuette from Lezoux (Puy-de-Dôme) dedicated to Esus by a certain Apronius: *Apronios ieuru sosi Esu*⁴⁹.

Taranis

What do we know about Taranis, the alleged celestial deity associated with thunder, which so frequently is being referred to as the supreme Celtic deity. Does the theonym Taranis really exist in pre-Roman times?⁵⁰

The earliest attestation comes from a nominally Roman period (1st century B.C.) when a certain Vebrumaros set up a Gallo-Greek dedication to the thunder

⁴⁰ RIB 219; RIB II.8, 2503.131; CIL III 5320; there are a number of inscriptions TOT from Britain which are usually expanded as *To(u)t(at)is* (cf. RIB II.3, 2422).

⁴¹ Cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, p. 66-67.

⁴² From Pannonia there are c. 15 dedications to IOMT – perhaps I.O.M. T(outatis?); cf Szabó 2006.

⁴³ For Esus, cf. Duval 1976, 34-5; Botheroyd and Botheroyd 2004, 107-110; RE VI (1909), s.v. Esus.

⁴⁴ CIL XIII 3026.

⁴⁵ AE 1985, 934: *Peregrinus [---] / quod Esus fuit iuben[s--]*.

⁴⁶ Piccottini 1996. Also cf. the epithet in Mercurius Esunertus ('Force d'Esus') from Pfalsbourg (Upper Germany, CIL XIII 11644; Delamarre 2003, p. 235, s.v. nerto- 'force, vigueur, puissance').

⁴⁷ Meid 2003.

⁴⁸ Cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001; Duval 1957/1993, p. 34-35.

⁴⁹ Botheroyd and Botheroyd, p. 108f.; Fleuriot 1980.

⁵⁰ Duval 1976, 92; Also cf. Olmsted 1994, 40-47 on the 'Gaulish Sky Father' with comparative material across the Indo European cultures.

god *Ταραννοῦ* (dative of Taranus, with *-us* ending!) at Orgon (Bouches-du-Rhône, Gallia Narbonensis)⁵¹. The word describes the god of thunder and in the same area of Southern France (Provence and Gard) we find the widespread custom of setting up *fulgur-conditum* inscriptions⁵², i.e. the cult of the place where lightning has struck might be linked to the cult of an indigenous deity of lightning and thunder. Interestingly, the distribution of these *fulgur-conditum* altars correlates with that of Jupiter altars depicting the wheel – a possible symbol of ‘Taranis’ (representing the sun or the thunderbolt) which was already known in pre-Roman iconography (v. *infra*)⁵³. The only other possible attestation of Taranis comes from Amiens/*Samarobriva*: *Taranuos*.⁵⁴ There are also two dedications to a deo Taranucno (‘son of Taranis’?), found east of the Rhine in a military context⁵⁵; in Pannonia there is one to *Iovi Taranuco* ‘Jupiter, son of Taranis’ or ‘son of the Thunderer’⁵⁶. The *I.O.M. Tanaros* from Chester is no misspelling of Taranis, but a variant byname, like *tonitrator* as epithet for Jupiter.⁵⁷

There are some indications about the function of this god of thunder from across the Celtic world. First, there is the mythological, cosmological conflict between celestial and chthonic forces. Rare epigraphic testimonies, such as a dedication to *Iovi et Ter(r)ae mat(ri)*⁵⁸, allude to this relationship between heavenly and earthly forces (v. *infra*). This ambivalent relationship appears to be depicted rather frequently, like the sculptures of a Jupiter riding on horseback leaping over a giant whereby symbolising the triumph of the heavenly over the chthonic forces, with the latter being represented by the giant. With lightning this native god fertilizes the earth and becomes the Jupiter frugifer attested on inscriptions.⁵⁹ According to Caesar, Mercury was the most important deity in Gaul and there are certainly more sculptures and dedication in his honour, but the countless Jupiter columns, starting with the ‘Pilier des nautes’, show that Jupiter hierarchically dominated the various panthea (or ‘polis’ religions) of Roman Gaul.

⁵¹ RIG I, G-27. There is also an inscribed bone from Tesero di Sottopendonda (Trente, Italy) reading *Taranis* (4th-3rd century B.C.) (Szabó 2006, 205).

⁵² Cf. Rémy and Buisson 1992 on *fulgur conditum* inscriptions in Gallia Narbonensis.

⁵³ Cf. Green (1984) for index of wheels in Britain and Gaul. Cf. Duval 1976, 73-76; Bauchhenß 1981, 73-9; Scherrer 2004. But the wheel also seems to be known from Rome where wheel-shaped cakes were given to (Jupiter) Summanus (Olmsted 1994, 41).

⁵⁴ AE 1966, 269.

⁵⁵ From Godramstein CIL XIII 6094; from Heilbronn CIL XIII 6478.

⁵⁶ Scardona, Hungary, CIL III 2804.

⁵⁷ RIB 452. Cf. De Bernardo Stempel 2006; only one epigraphic attestation of *I.O.M. Tonitratori* from Sarajevo (ILS 3045).

⁵⁸ CIL XII 3071, Nîmes.

⁵⁹ E.g. *Iovi Frugifero* from Saint-Zacharie (CIL XII 336 = ILN-3, 154 = ILS 3017); perhaps *Io(vi) O(ptimo) F(rugifero?)* from Lamanon (Bouches-du-Rhône) (AE 1992, 1171); otherwise Frugifer was a common epithet and in North Africa he was even worshipped as god.

We also find Jupiter accompanied by a goddess, Juno Regina, especially on Jupiter columns in Gaul (less in Britain and the Narbonensis).⁶⁰ Since this kind of divine couple is unknown in Rome (where one worshipped the Capitoline triad instead),⁶¹ it seems probable to associate Juno Regina with the indigenous mother goddess. Like the Rhiannon of the Mabinogion and the adversary relationship between Dagda (=Taranis/Jupiter) and Brigit in Irish myth, the Jupiter-giant sculpture probably symbolises this contradiction between celestial and chthonic forces, while the enthroned couple Juno Regina and Jupiter might allude to the union of female and male powers (a central theme in Irish and Welsh mythology), which was indispensable in order to create fertility of land, animals and people.⁶²

It is hardly conceivable that the essence of this mythical figure had hardly changed since Caesar's conquest. The 'Gallo-Roman' Jupiter may represent functions and characteristics deriving from a pre-Roman deity. But this does not mean that Jupiter is Taranis; instead, a syncretic deity has evolved, typical for the *zeitgeist* of the local people in the Roman Empire, whose character was shaped by local beliefs⁶³.

Caesar's 'Minerva'

The question of *terra mater* and Jupiter's consort lead us to the identification of the supreme female deity whom Caesar called Minerva and for whom no Celtic name seems to have been recorded. The fact that Caesar only lists one goddess is consistent with C. Sterckx's postulation that there can only be one unique and polyvalent goddess in the Celtic pantheon; but this goddess had different names according to her functions and she could be at the same time mother and wife of all other gods.⁶⁴ This suggests that we might have to expect different theonyms similar to Irish mythology where we find different incarnations of the goddess Brigit (Macha, Morrigan, Badh, Nemain, etc.)⁶⁵. Brigit's name relates to Romano-Celtic deities, most obviously the goddess Brigantia, attested seven times in Britain. The root *briga-* can be found across the Celtic-speaking world in the Roman empire

⁶⁰ Bauchhenß 1981. A sculpture from Hyères is said to depict Taranis and Rigani, cf. CAG-83, 1, fig. 476; Bémont 1986 nos. 29-30.

⁶¹ Though not too dissimilar to the Greek couple Zeus and Hera; RE X 1124-44 (1918), s.v. Iuppiter (Thulin).

⁶² In this respect an inscription from Moesia Inferior is interesting because of Iuno's bynames: it shows the union of I.O.M. and Iuno which provides fecundity: *I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) | et Iunoni | Cereri Frugif(erae)* (AE 1963, 174).

⁶³ The main exception are official dedications to the Roman state god, but these are mainly limited to dedications by military officials in military sites.

⁶⁴ Sterckx 1986, 48-50.

⁶⁵ Cf. Le Roux and Guyonvarc'h 1991, 114-5 for six variants in the Irish myth.

both in toponyms and theonyms⁶⁶: the Matres Brigiatae from Peñalbo de Castro⁶⁷, the Brigindona from Auxey (Côte d'Or)⁶⁸, and Bricta/Brixta from Luxeuil-les-Bains (Haute-Saône)⁶⁹. Further, the functions of Brigit are similar to the 'Gallo-Roman' Minerva. And unlike most other deities, Minerva usually takes no theonym, which may reflect her character as a universal deity and not a localised one, like the various types of Mars Toutatis and other toponymic deities.

While the Roman Minerva and the related Celtic goddess(es) had similar functions (inventor of arts and crafts), Juno Regina represents a different divine function, namely the supreme goddess as consort of the celestial god, as in the numerous sculptures of enthroned Jupiter and Juno Regina that used to crown Jupiter columns in Gaul⁷⁰. The close connection between Minerva and Juno Regina may thus also explain why we find depictions of these two goddesses side-by-side on adjoining panels of Jupiter columns, sometimes even together on one panel⁷¹.

In this respect a number of dedications not to Juno Regina but just to Regina or dea Regina are interesting⁷², like altars from Leamington and Lanchester (Fig. 1a-b)⁷³. Perhaps Regina was the name chosen to address the supreme goddess of the Celtic pantheon (comparable to Irish Brigit which means 'l'Eminente'⁷⁴). The theonym Rigani is attested on a Celtic graffito from Lezoux (*E ieuri Rigani Rosmertiae*).⁷⁵ Dedications to Dea Regina Candida⁷⁶ may suggest that here too we might find different hypostaseis of the same deity according to the goddess's function: she could be Cantismerta/Fortuna,⁷⁷ Cathubodua,⁷⁸ or Rosmerta. On the

⁶⁶ Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, 31; Delamarre 2003, pp. 87-88, s.v. briga; brigantion.

⁶⁷ CIL II 6338.1.

⁶⁸ CIL XIII 2638.

⁶⁹ CIL XIII 5425-6; AE 1951, 231, e.g.: CIL 5426: *Luxovio et Brixtae*.

⁷⁰ Haeussler 2007b.

⁷¹ Esp. 6029 (Biebelnheim); 6161 (Bad Kreuznach). Also cf. a relief from Alzey showing Minerva perhaps associated with pre-Roman mother-goddess (Esp. 7751).

⁷² CIL XIII 8518; RIB 1084; AE 1950, 134; cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, 59, s.v. Rigani, Regina.

⁷³ Also at Chedworth (AE 1950, 134); Lanchester (RIB 1084); Wörringen (CIL XIII 8518).

⁷⁴ Delamarre 2003, pp. 87-8, s.v. brigantion.

⁷⁵ Graffito from Lezoux: the theonym Rosmerta is well known from Latin inscriptions (v. *infra*), hence the problem whether Rigani is merely an epithet for Rosmerta or whether these are both theonyms. Cf. Lejeune 1976-1977, 151-156.

⁷⁶ Attested at Frankfurt-Heddernheim, Osterburken and Strasbourg: Esp. VII 5642 = CIL XIII 6022; Esp. XIII 5612 = CIL XIII 6021; AE 1978, 535; 1985, 685; 1985, 695.

⁷⁷ Cantismerta at Chamalières (cf. Lambert 1995, 118-21) and in the Alpes Poeninae: *Cantismert(a)e, L(ucius) Quartilius Quartinus l(ibens) m(erito)* (Saint Clement, CIL XII 131). Cf. Delamarre 2001, 103-4, s.v. canti, canto.

⁷⁸ Cf. CIL XII 2571 = ILHSavoie 77 = ILS 4699 (Les Fins-de-Ley): *(C?)athuboduae Aug(ustae)*; After Delamarre (2001, p. 111, s.v. catu-) : Catubodua 'corneille de combat', i.e. battle crow – the crow was the symbol of the war goddess, cf. Delamarre, *loc. cit.*

Lezoux graffito, Rigani/Regina is associated with Rosmerta, a theonym for which there are c. 28-30 attestations, mainly from Eastern Gaul⁷⁹ (the Roman earth goddess Maia, symbolising life and rebirth, often takes the place of Rosmerta as Mercury's consort). Do these names refer to different functions of the same deity? A three-functional aspect of the mother goddess would of course create a link to the *matres* and *matronae* (first attested epigraphically at Glanum and Nîmes in the 1st c. B.C.).

To this list of mother goddesses we could add the theonym Herecura/Aerecura, which can be found across Gaul, often worshipped together with Dispater.⁸⁰ She seems to have been the goddess of death and fertility, similar to Greek Persephone.⁸¹ Her link to *terra mater* is evident from a 'stray' dedication to *Terrae Matr[i] Aerecurae Matri deum Magnae Ideae* set up by Popilia Maxima in *Thibilis*/El Announa,⁸² though we should avoid superficial parallels between Herecura, *terra mater*, the Greek Gaia and Cybele as such associations above all show how difficult it was to find identical counterparts in the various panthea. Moreover, Herecura could be an amalgamation of Hera and Kore.

Epona

The search of the supreme Celtic goddess also leads us to Epona⁸³. Sterckx has quite convincingly demonstrated the structural parallels between the Gallo-Roman Epona and the Rhiannon myth of the Mabinogion.⁸⁴ If this was the case, then Epona's function would have to be understood in the context of a complex myth concerning rebirth and fertility of men, animals and soil. The deity would be the 'mother goddess': mother and wife of (what Caesar called) Dispater and part of a perpetual cycle of life and death.⁸⁵ In pre-Roman iconography we might identify Epona and aspects of the Rhiannon myth on coins and sculpture: a goddess on horseback and, even more common, depictions of a mare, often accompanied by a her foal.⁸⁶ In Roman times, the image of Epona on horseback appears like

⁷⁹ Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, p. 60.

⁸⁰ Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, p. 18 (4/5 of Aerecura); p. 40 (5 attestations of Eracura/Erecura); p. 45 (5/6 of Herecura); cf. Haeussler 2007b for their distribution in Eastern Gaul.

⁸¹ Cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, pp. 18; 40; 45. Well-attested at Aquileia. For Sucellos/Dispater and Aerecura, e.g.: *[Diti patr]i | et Aerecurae | M(arcus) Aurelius | Gaurus | vet(eranus) ex voto | v.s.l.m.* (CIL V 725 = InscrAqu-3, 3256 = ILS 3966). A sculpture from Bad Cannstatt shows her as a seated woman holding a basket with apples on her lap, similar to the *matronae* and in particular to Nehalennia in Lower Germany.

⁸² CIL VIII 5524 (p 963, 1807) = ILS 3960.

⁸³ Sterckx 1986; Euskirchen 1993; Delamarre 2003, 163-4, s.v. epos 'cheval'.

⁸⁴ Sterckx 1986, 45-7; cf. e.g. bas-relief from Allerey with reclining pose of the goddess (Esp. 8235).

⁸⁵ Sterckx 1986, 92-3; Duval 1976, 49-51.

⁸⁶ Cf. e.g. coin of Catuvellauni and Trinovantes, c. A.D. 10-41 with Herakles on obv. and Epona on horseback on rv. (Van Arsdell's *Celtic Coinage of Britain* no. 2061; mare on rv. of BMC 78).

the female counterpart of the Jupiter-giant rider in the local pantheon.⁸⁷ All this associates Epona with the conflict between a celestial deity (Taranis) and a chthonic one (Terra mater), a struggle which had to be resolved by the union of male and female powers in order to create life. If this was the case, Epona might be one of the names to describe the indigenous mother goddess (we also find dedications to Epona Regina⁸⁸). But as we have seen, this 'union' was usually represented by the enthroned Jupiter and Juno Regina (and perhaps by other divine couples) in Roman times. At the same time Epona is usually depicted and worshipped on her own and not as another god's consort. It therefore seems that in Roman times (most of our epigraphic and iconographic attestations date to the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D.) Epona has largely been reduced to a functional deity which can be found in stables (as in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*), and especially in a military (cavalry) context, though there are some (feeble) indications for her role in a funerary context, guiding the souls into the otherworld.⁸⁹

If we could use the Rhiannon myth for improving our understanding of some aspects of pre-Roman and Gallo-Roman mythology, it becomes apparent that the mythical concept which we encounter in the Rhiannon myth has been 'split up' into different functions, i.e. we are not just dealing with different names which refer to particular functions and aspects of the same goddess, but we can recognise a process of specialisation resulting in distinct deities (Minerva, Iuno Regina, Rosmerta, Epona, etc.), whereby many of the worshippers of the 2nd–3rd century A.D. may be no longer aware of a possible common origin.

Apollo, Belenos, Sirona

This leads us to Apollo, one of the five gods mentioned by Caesar. Depictions of Apollo in Glanum suggest that he was already known as a healing deity in the 2nd century B.C., perhaps as equivalent to Belenos. He is conspicuously missing on the '*Pilier des nautes*' but this may be due to the meaning of the Parisian Jupiter column if we assume that the column was not meant to depict a series of deities but to visualise local mythology. If we assume that Apollo was an imported specialist deity in the context of healing cults, then we cannot assume that he was part of late Iron Age mythology. Apollo was probably adopted because he filled a gap in the evolving late Iron Age pantheon, similar to the reasons which caused his adoption into the Roman pantheon. It is possible that he occupied the place of other indigenous deities, like the chthonic deities that may be expected in the context of a spring

⁸⁷ Cf. Euskirchen 1993, 732-3.

⁸⁸ For Epona Regina, cf. Euskirchen 1993, no. 282 = AE 1973, 438.

⁸⁹ Cf. Euskirchen 1993.

sanctuary.⁹⁰ In this respect the theonym Belenos is interesting. It is mainly attested in North Italy and Southern France, with the majority of dedications coming from Aquileia (a flourishing cult in the 3rd century A.D.),⁹¹ and with the earlier dedications dating to the 1st century B.C.⁹² The occasional association with Apollo has inspired etymological explanation like 'the bright' and 'the brilliant'. This is rejected by Delamarre who suggests instead that Belenos means 'Maître de la Puissance'.⁹³ Perhaps this is the kind of chthonic deity which one would expect in pre-Roman times?

Otherwise it is difficult to determine whether there were pre-Roman gods of healing. Apollo can take a large number of epithets⁹⁴: many of them are only attested once or twice and most of which are deonomastic epithets or they describe Apollo's characteristics (e.g. Maponus 'son of Zeus', v. *infra*). An obvious exception is Grannus, a common theonym mainly attested in the Belgica and the Rhineland. One could assume that Grannus is merely a functional epithet,⁹⁵ perhaps even a deonomastic name (derived from toponyms like Grand (Vosges) and perhaps *Aquae Granni* (Aachen), sites of important Apollo Grannus sanctuaries).⁹⁶ It is difficult to determine whether there was a pre-Roman god Grannos,⁹⁷ but in Roman times he was associated with the goddess Sirona/Dirona, whose Celtic theonym (from stir/sir/dir 'star')⁹⁸ indicates not a celestial deity, but most likely a goddess of the night, and therefore of the underworld; it therefore might be more plausible to suggest that Sirona's consort was an indigenous god. Like Apollo Grannus, Sirona was very widely worshipped in the Rhineland and the Belgica, but we also find her for example at Bordeaux and Rome⁹⁹. We also find a number of more specialised theonyms of healing deities, like Borvo/Bormo for hot springs.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁰ Only one example, the role of Silvanus (i.e. the chthonic hammer god / Sucellos) as healing deity in the spring sanctuary at Glanum in Roman times (cf. Häussler 2005b; 2007).

⁹¹ Cf. Green 1992, 30-31, s.v. Apollo Belenus; DNP 2, 546-547; G. Bauchhenss, *LIMC* 2.1, 462ff., s.v. Apollo Belenus; Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, 28-29 (incl. very few dedications from Noricum; doubtful is Ausonius (prof. 4,7ff; 10,17ff) report of a Belenos sanctuary at Bordeaux).

⁹² E.g. the Gallo-Greek dedications RIG G-24, G-28, G-63.

⁹³ Delamarre 2003, p. 72, s.v. belo-, bello-.

⁹⁴ Twenty-three Celtic epithets of Apollo in Jufer and Luginbühl (2001, p. 94-96; fig. 3).

⁹⁵ De Bernardo Stempel 2007; also for Delamarre (2003, 183, s.v. grannos 'barbe?') it is a 'surnom'. Delamarre translates *grannos* as beard, i.e. '(celui qui a une) barbichette'; he considers the explanation of *grannos* meaning 'sun' or 'hot' as highly doubtful. The latter explanation has however recently been defended by Zeidler (2002) taking into account that there are no representations of a barbed Apollo Grannos.

⁹⁶ Cf. Green 1992, p. 32, s.v. Apollo Grannus. Grand was called *Andesina* in Roman times.

⁹⁷ There are only four dedications to Grannos alone (*Granno*, *Granni* at Bonn, Limoges, Thetford and Grand), otherwise it is always Apollo Grannos; cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, 43-44. Cassius Dio also mentions Grannus alongside Aesculapius and Serapis (*Hist.* 77.15.5).

⁹⁸ The etymology of Sirona is very controversial, cf. Delamarre 2003, p. 282, s.v. stir, sir, dir: does *sir-/dir-* mean 'star' or 'génisse' (from *ster- 'infertile').

⁹⁹ Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, p. 62-3.

¹⁰⁰ Delamarre 2003, p. 83, s.v. boruo, bormo.

Lugus

For some Lugus and Cernunnos are the oldest identifiable Celtic deities, but our testimonies consist of rather imprecise manifestation which are widely dispersed across Europe during the pre-Roman and Roman period.

The etymology of Lugus is controversial: 'le Lumineux', 'le Brillant', 'the Shining One' seem to be among the more satisfactory interpretations¹⁰¹. Words and toponyms derived from the theonym Lugus¹⁰² appear across the Celtic world from Celtiberia to the British Isles which would imply a very ancient divine being, from which the Irish Lugh and the Welsh Llew originate. For example, there are countless place names named after Lugus, like Lugdunum ('fortress of Lugus', modern day Lyon, Laudun, Laon, Leyde, etc.) or Luguvallo (Carlisle), and numerous theophoric personal names, including the Λουγους and Λουγουρ(εις) on Gallo-Greek inscriptions.¹⁰³ But if the god Lugus really existed, why is it that there are no dedications to him, especially considering the myriad of Celtic theonyms attested in the Roman period¹⁰⁴. The Luguie from Luzaga (Spain) is the closest we get¹⁰⁵. There appear to be a large number of theonyms that derive from the same root, but they do not necessarily refer to the same deity, rather they indicate a relationship with light, like the [L]ucutectus from Cucuron (Aqua Sextiae)¹⁰⁶, while in Mars Loucetius we are dealing with an epithet for Mars¹⁰⁷. Three inscriptions from Avenches, Osma (Tarragona) and Sinoza (Spain) attest the plural form Logoves: does this suggest a plurality (triad?) of Lugus's forces (which may remind us of the three-headed representations of Mercury)¹⁰⁸? Lugus seems to have contributed to the character and functions of the Gallo-Roman Mercury:¹⁰⁹ After Caesar, the Gaulish Mercury was the inventor of all arts, while the Irish Lugh is described as master of all crafts and skills.

Cernunnos

Throughout Europe and across time we can find various attestations of a horned god and yet it is difficult to confirm whether a god Cernunnos really existed. For example, there is the rock carving from Val Camonica in the Alps of the 4th century

¹⁰¹ Delamarre 2003, p. 211, s.v. lugus.

¹⁰² Cf. Delamarre 2003, p. 211, s.v. lugus 'nom d'un dieu'; Olmsted 1994, 308-316; Duval 1976; also cf. Mac Neill 1962 on the Lughnasa festival.

¹⁰³ RIG G-159; G-244.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. list in Lufer and Juginbühl 2001, p. 49.

¹⁰⁵ MLH III 633

¹⁰⁶ ILN-3, 203.

¹⁰⁷ 11 attestations for Loucetius, mainly from Upper Germany, esp. from the *civitas Vangionum*. *Leucetius* is explicitly only attested once at Marienborn (Germany), CIL XIII 7242.

¹⁰⁸ *Lugoves* (Avenches, CIL XIII 5078); *Lugovibus* (Osma, CIL II 2818); *Lucovebu[s] Ar(i)ovien(sibus)* (AE 1912, 12); cf. Mac Neill 1962; for triple-faced Mercury, cf. Green 1982, p. 149-150; Esp. 3137; 3756; 7700.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Duval 1993, p. 69-71.

B.C. showing a standing person with antlers and torques¹¹⁰. On the Gundestrup cauldron we find a cross-legged person wearing antlers and being surrounded by animals. Another cross-legged figure wearing antlers and torques is depicted on the Pilier des nautes identified as [C]ERNVNNO¹¹¹. We also find 'Cernunnos' at the centre of a votive stele from Reims, surrounded by Apollo and Mercury, and there is a three-headed Cernunnos nourishing two horned snakes from Autun¹¹². The only other comparable epigraphic attestation comes from a Gallo-Greek inscription from Montagnac (Hérault): Carnonos (Καρνονος, 3rd century B.C.?; RIG G-224). After Delamarre we should translate this name as 'dieu cornu, dieu à la corne'¹¹³. Taking into account the Indo-European root *ker-* 'to grow', we can suggest a deity of growth, fertility and rebirth¹¹⁴. The antlers of the stag may be a symbol for the cycle of growth and renewal, which might explain their frequent depiction in Gallo-Roman art. The stag might also have played a role in mythology though its exact function escapes us (there are numerous accounts of stags in Welsh and Irish mythology)¹¹⁵, and in Roman times, the stag was represented in various sculptural representations of gods that are not usually associated with it (for example with Vulcanus and Mercury): is this a reference to the same (Cernunnos) myth?¹¹⁶

It seems that this theonym describes a particular manifestation of a divine being. But like most of the other pan-Celtic deities discussed so far, epigraphic attestations to Cernunnos are extremely rare. Besides Paris and Montagnac, there is a Deus Cerunincus from Luxembourg, and in Portugal we find Carneus (at Arrayolós and Villaviciosa)¹¹⁷. Otherwise we find allusions to a horned god, like the I.O.M. Corniger (rather than Cornuto) from Montjustin (Vaucluse).¹¹⁸ Do the various allusions to antlers and stags which we can collect from across Western Europe refer to a single deity or mythical story or are they merely a symbol for the cycle of birth and death?

¹¹⁰ Cf. paper by Patrice Lajoye, this volume; Botheroyd and Botheroyd 2004, 56-59, s.v. Cernunnos; Bober 1951. For the word Cernunnos, cf. Delamarre 2003, p. 106f, s.v. carnnon 'corne, trompe'; for epigraphic attestations cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, 34.

¹¹¹ CIL XIII 3026; RIG II.1, 166-169.

¹¹² Duval 1976, fig. 29-30; also cf. female deity with the antlers of deer, holding a cornucopia (Bronze statue from Broye-les-Pesmes (Haute-Saône), Duval 1976, fig. 31.

¹¹³ Delamarre 2003, p. 106, s.v. carnnon 'corne, trompe'.

¹¹⁴ Cernunnos as 'master of animals' probably was only a secondary function, analogue to Epona as protector of horses and travellers.

¹¹⁵ Green 1992, 198-9, s.v. stag; Botheroyd and Botheroyd 2004, p. 160-163, s.v. Hirsch.

¹¹⁶ For example in the civitas Vangionum, cf. Häussler 2007b.

¹¹⁷ Cf. P. Lajoye, this volume. AE 1989, 542, AE 1987 772 : *Deo Ceruninco Soltrius Pruscus v.s.l.m.* (Luxembourg); CIL II 125 : *Carneo Calantice(n)si Caecilia Q(uinti) f(ilia) ni cuis [...] r c vls* (Arrayolós); CIL II 126 : *[Deo?] Carneio Calantice[nsi?] Herme[s] Laus* (Villaviciosa). From Carnuntum (Austria) : *IOM K(ernunno)* (AE 1998, 1040), though Jupiter Karnuntinus seems a more appropriate reconstruction.

¹¹⁸ AE 1990, 711 = ILN-3, 180.

Dispater-Sucellos-Silvanus

There is also a chthonic deity whom in Roman times we can identify across the Celtic area by his hammer, which can be found on countless altars and sculptures mainly along the Rhône, Saône and Rhine valleys.¹¹⁹ Epigraphy provides the Celtic theonym for this hammer-god: Sucellos (composed of *su-* 'bon' and *cellos* 'marteau' or 'frappeur', hence 'le bon frappeur', 'the Good Striker'), attested 10 times across Gaul and once in Britain.¹²⁰ But he was mainly worshipped under the Latin name Silvanus, as suggested, for example, by the many Silvanus altars depicting a hammer and among others by a dedication to *deo Sucello Silvano* from *Borbetomagos*/Worms,¹²¹ though in some parts of Gaul he might also have been depicted as Vulcanus, another deity carrying a hammer. Silvanus therefore can hardly be considered a Roman rustic deity in many parts of Gaul, but a popular chthonic deity that even had an important role in healing sanctuaries, like Glanum.¹²² The hammer is his most important attribute, but its precise meaning escapes us.¹²³ Interestingly, Tertullian associates the hammer with the Roman Dispater,¹²⁴ but the hammer was above all the attribute of the Etruscan god Charu(n) where depictions of hammers seem to have served as an apotropaic device, like a 'talisman' to defend against evil.¹²⁵ Charu is also thought to guide souls on horseback to the underworld, which would help to explain the frequent depictions of horses and têtes coupées on pre-Roman cult reliefs in Southern France (v. *supra*).¹²⁶ These are just a few indicators that might suggest that in Gaul and Britain the hammer-god (Sucellos/Silvanus) was the Dispater mentioned by Caesar – a healing god and at the same time a god of the otherworld which would explain his continued popularity.¹²⁷

¹¹⁹ Green 1992, 110-112, s.v. hammer-god.

¹²⁰ Delamarre 2003, 113-4, s.v. cellos; 283-4, s.v. *su*; Duval 1976, 62-64; Dorcey 1987. For list of dedications in Gaul, cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, p. 63 including an object from York (RIB II.3, 2422.21); an possible addition might be [*d(eo)*] *Suc(ello?)* from Mehadia (Dacia) (CIL III 1575 = AE 1998, 1108). Sucellos' consort is only attested once at Sarrebourg: Nantosuelta 'Sonniges Tal' (CIL XIII 4542 = AE 1907, 201 = ILS 4614; cf. Delamarre 2003, 231-2, s.v. nantu-; Green 1992, 157-8).

¹²¹ CIL XIII 6224 : *Deo Su|celo et | [S]ilvano | Ti(berius) G P I P*. Also at Augst: *In honor(em) | d(omus) d(ivinae) deo Su|cello Silv(ano)* (AE 1926, 40).

¹²² Roth Congès 1997.

¹²³ M. Green (1992, 112) suggests, for example, that the hammer was a symbol of authority, a weapon to protect people and combat disease, a symbol of boundaries and prosperity, etc. But the hammer can also produce thunder and one might also see parallels with the Germanic god Thor (cf. Botheroyd and Botheroyd 2004, 152).

¹²⁴ Tert. *nat.* 1, 10, 47; cf. *apol.* 15; DNP 3, 689.

¹²⁵ Bonfante and Swaddling 2006.

¹²⁶ Also in Etruscan mythology the horse is a well-known funereal emblem, indicating the passage from one state of existence to another. An adoption of Etruscan features into local religion is possible in Roman times, but it might also date back to the time prior to the foundation of Marseille when there was a strong Etruscan presence in Southern France.

¹²⁷ BG 6.18; Duval 1976, p. 32.

Ogmios/Smertullus/Hercules

Another deity mentioned on the '*Pilier des nautes*' was Smert[---],¹²⁸ which could be expanded to either Smertrios (attested only once¹²⁹) or Smertullus¹³⁰ (also cf. the goddess Ro-smerta 'Grande-Pourvoyeuse', *supra*). In sculptural representations he may have been represented as Hercules considering that the snake caught by Smertullus on the '*Pilier des nautes*' is very similar to depictions of Hercules fighting the Hydra with the latter resembling a snake (also cf. similar depictions on the Gundestrup cauldron).¹³¹ Here the snake could be a symbol of regeneration or a connection between the world of the living and the dead;¹³² this association is also reflected in other common Hercules depictions in Gaul, like the apples of the Hesperides which were used in order to establish contact with the 'Otherworld'.¹³³ Moreover, Hercules and Smertullus seem to have similar characteristics: the hero, the semi-god and the champion of immortality. A dedication to Smertullus from Lyon, which can be associated with a (barbed) Hercules, further supports the association of these two deities¹³⁴, though on the few epigraphic attestations of Smertullus his name 'The Purveyor' was rather used as an epithet to describe the function of a local Mars, Dispatier and Jupiter¹³⁵.

On the other hand, Lucian of Samosata (c. A.D. 120-190) wrote that Hercules was equated with Ogmios, the 'god of eloquence'¹³⁶. It is doubtful whether Ogmios is attested on any Latin inscription¹³⁷. Consequently we have to wonder whether Ogmios really existed. Euskirchen recently assumed that he did, while Bauchhenß

¹²⁸ *Pilier des nautes*: Esp. 3132=ILS 4613=CIL XIII 3026a.

¹²⁹ CIL XIII 11975 (Liesmich, Germany), v. *infra*.

¹³⁰ E.g. *Smertu[---]* from Escolives-Sainte-Camille (France, AE 1967, 317); Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, 63. Delamarre 2003, 277, s.v. smero/smerto- 'prévoyant, qui prend soin de , pourvoyeur'. L. Fleuriot (1982) correlates this to Latin translations: *Domesticis Lugouibus, Matribus domesticis, Mercurium Domesticum, Mercurius mercator, nundinator*, etc. Personal names in *Smert-* are very popular across Gaul, cf. *Smertulianus* from Worms (CIL XIII 6230 = ILS 2496) and list in Delamarre, *loc. cit.* Jullian and Whatmough tried to read *Smer-* on a lead tablet from Eyguières which they assumed to have been a *tabula deuotionis*, cf. RIG G-9.

¹³¹ Hercules and the Hydra, e.g. on the Alzey relief (CSIR II, 1, 18-9); Cf. in general Olmsted 1979, and here esp. pl. 2A; ibd., 127 for the theme of Hercules and the Nemean lion already 'borrowed' for local myth on the Gundestrup cauldron.

¹³² Moitrieux 2001, 226; also cf. Olmsted 1979, 162-5 for Mercury with snake and the snake as manifestation of the sovereign Celtic goddess.

¹³³ Moitrieux 2001, 226.

¹³⁴ AE 1967, 317: *Smertu[lo-] | Aucella | Aug(u)sta(?) [- - -] | fil(ia) v.s.l.[m.]*.

¹³⁵ *lou[i] Smer(trio)* (Grignan, AE 1987, 756); *Marti Smertrio et [---] Vindoridio Boud[a]nae* (Liesenich, CIL XIII 11975 = ILS 9303); *Marti Sme[rtuli]t[a]no et [Anc]amnae, C(aius) G() Sec[---]* (Mohn, CIL XIII 4119 = AE 1983, 718); *[D]iti Smer[trio] Aug(usto) M Claud(ius) Rufus [et I]ulia Gemellina aedem fecerunt l(ibentes) m(erito)* (Grossbuch, AE 1950, 98 = ILLPRON 121); Also cf. AE 1984, 641: *Apollini Augusto Atesmerti* and AE 1925, 98 *Atesmert(a)e*.

¹³⁶ Zwicker 1935, 78 for Lucian of Samosata; Ort194.

¹³⁷ Two possible *defixiones* from Brigantium dedicated to Ogmios, but reconstruction is doubtful, similarly the reconstruction of Ogmios in CIL XIII 11295: *Ogl(...) Aug(usto, -ae?) sac(rum)*. Cf. Bauchhenß 2007; Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, p. 57; Duval 1976, p. 79-82.

denies this¹³⁸. There is of course the Irish Ogma – a strong man and champion like Hercules – who made up a triad together with Dagda and Lug. In Roman times, we also learn about another myth after which the Gauls were the descendents from Hercules and not from Dispat (as in Caesar's account, *supra*)¹³⁹, but this might not be more than an attempt to integrate Gauls into the Graeco-Roman civilised world by creating a mythological ancestry.

Altogether it seems that the meaning and appearance of the Gallo-Roman Hercules was enriched by a variety of deities, like Smertullus, Ogmios and Herakles, a process that might have already started in the 2nd century B.C. This created a particular kind of Hercules - the *Hercules gallicus* attested at Allife in Italy.¹⁴⁰

Victims of interpretatio

There are superficial parallels among Indo-European religions (Greek, Roman and Celtic), which create the impression that deities have similar functions and symbols (e.g. there is always a weather god represented by thunder and lightning). However, Celtic and Graeco-Roman religions seem incompatible at the eve of the Roman conquest and consequently it was impossible for contemporaries to find a one-to-one equivalent for a Celtic deity in the Roman pantheon. For example, Esus was identified with both Mars and Mercury, Sucellos with Silvanus and Vulcanus, deities which had very different functions in the Roman pantheon, but there must have been certain common characteristics in the eyes of the local worshipper. Similarly the tribal protector (Toutatis) was usually Mars in Southern Gaul and Mercury elsewhere. And for the mother goddess, there are countless equivalents depending on her function: Iuno Regina, Minerva or, reflecting the plurality of her forces, matres, matronae, lunones, Suleviae, Parcae, etc.

It seems that pan-Celtic deities were victims of *interpretatio indigena*. It was at first the important deities to whom provincial elites attributed Roman names on Latin inscriptions, especially during the creation of a Roman-style municipal order¹⁴¹. Here we might think of the of the giant statue of Mercury built by the Arverni¹⁴², about which Greg Woolf wrote that 'the re-imaging of Arvernian Mercury provides a rare snapshot of one of the ways in which Gallo-Roman religion was created, a process in which Gallic elites, Mediterranean craftsmen and Roman governors each played a part'¹⁴³. We should not rule out the possibility that some processes of *interpretatio*

¹³⁸ Euskirchen 2001, 120-121; Bauchhenß 2007.

¹³⁹ Zwicker 1935, 20. A similar origin myth with variant names in Diodor 4.24.2-3.

¹⁴⁰ CIL IX 2322.

¹⁴¹ The multitude of local deities make an appearance in a different phase, 2nd century A.D.

¹⁴² Pliny *NH* 34, 45-47. Cf. now Hofeneder 2007.

¹⁴³ Woolf 1998, 216.

had started long before the Roman conquest, like the association of Hercules and Smertullus (v. *supra*) or the adoption of Apollo into the local pantheon¹⁴⁴.

The inadequate evidence for Taranis, Esus, Cernunnos, Lugus, Smertullus, Ogmios and many other deities raises doubts whether these names really denote deities either in pre-Roman or Roman times. However, the functions of these divine embodiments, which might have varied regionally, must have represented the quintessence of indigenous religion (a focus of power and authority, providing an understanding of the world; mythical relationships between these figures, etc.). In other words, Roman theonyms – even without any epithet – indicate the essence of the most important and powerful local deities in the Roman West¹⁴⁵. Sometimes sculptures indicate the indigenous character of such deities by diverging from the common Graeco-Roman iconography: a four-headed Mercury from Bordeaux¹⁴⁶; a three-headed god with Mercury's attributes (cockereel and turtle) from Reims¹⁴⁷; there are also two reliefs of *deus Mercurius* from York and Vindolanda¹⁴⁸, and the *Mars D(e)us* from Tre Owen (Newton, Powys) whose depiction is similar to the representations of Mars Cocidios on Hadrian's Wall (Fig. 2a-c).¹⁴⁹

Also the various divine couples, often combining a Latin god and an indigenous goddess show that we are dealing with local beliefs, as these pairs are typically 'Celtic' and uncommon in Roman religion¹⁵⁰: Mercury and Rosmerta/Maia, Mars and Nemetona/Victoria, Vulcanus and Venus, Jupiter and Juno Regina. Again there are regional variations, as these divine couples are more common in Eastern Gaul than in Britain or Narbonensis. Benoît¹⁵¹ considered that Mars and Mercury are widely interchangeable; but although both Mars and Mercury can stand in for Esus or the tribal god (Toutatis), there are clear distinctions: for example, Mars (unlike Mercury) can take a large variety of epithets; moreover they have different consorts, namely Rosmerta/Maia for Mercury and Nemetona/Victoria for Mars.

In summary, it seems difficult to identify clearly pan-Celtic deities in pre-Roman times, but there seems to be certain religious concepts (the weather god,

¹⁴⁴ E.g. 2nd century B.C. representations of Apollo and Hercules in Glanon/Glanum, cf. Roth Congès 1997.

¹⁴⁵ This does not mean that the meaning had remained unchanged since pre-conquest times. Official dedication to Roman 'state gods' are rare and largely limited to official dedications in a military context.

¹⁴⁶ Bronze statuette, Duval 1976, fig. 49.

¹⁴⁷ Duval 1976, fig. 48.

¹⁴⁸ *Deo Mer(curio)* (York, CSIR I.3, 7); *Deo | Mer|curio* (Vindolanda ; CSIR I.6, no. 79).

¹⁴⁹ *Britannia* 9, 1978, 473, no. 4 from Tre Owen (e.g., Mars Cocidios (Bewcastle, RIB I 986)).

¹⁵⁰ Already J. Vendryes 1948, 269: "Une particularité de la religion des Celtes est le culte rendu à des divinités accouplées". However, in Greek religion we find comparable pairs: Zeus and Hera as well as Aphrodite and Hephaistos.

¹⁵¹ Benoît 1959.

the mother goddess, etc.) that can be recognised in a comparable form across the Celtic world. In Roman times, the Celtic theonyms of these deities – like Taranis, Cernunnos, Esus, Lugus, etc. – are hardly attested, but together with sculptural evidence we can suggest that their characteristics (function, myth) are now part of new ‘hybrid’ deities bearing Latin theonyms, taking substance from both indigenous and Graeco-Roman beliefs. If we look for the survival of indigenous beliefs, we have to analyse first of all the new syncretic deities, like Jupiter, Mercury, Minerva, Hercules, Silvanus and their local variations.¹⁵² From the initial adoption of a Latin theonym or a Graeco-Roman representation, it was a long way to the end product of the 2nd century A.D. The actual act of adoption merely ‘set in motion the socio-psychological process’¹⁵³ that created a change in social behaviour – a process that lasted several generations so that also the characteristics and meaning of Gallo-Roman deities continued to evolve, making possible many of the 2nd-3rd century representations and epithets, which probably many inhabitants of the 1st century B.C./A.D. would not have understood.

3.2. Celtic theonyms

Considering the rarity of pan-Celtic deities in the epigraphic record, it might be surprising that some 800 Celtic theonyms are attested in the Roman period.¹⁵⁴ How is it possible that allegedly important deities like Lugus, Ogmios, Taranis and Esus are hardly attested at all, while there are countless dedications to often very regional deities like Belatocadros, Cocidios, Nehalennia, Endovellicos and many more? This is why we need to explore the nature of these theonyms. What is their relationship to pre-Roman religion? Do they represent pre-Roman cults or religious beliefs? Did the theonyms already exist in pre-Roman times? Do they denote deities or are they mere epithets? Is it possible that Celtic theonyms were created in the Roman period, perhaps personifications of abstract concepts or translations of Graeco-Roman expressions into Celtic? And why chose Celtic epithets or theonyms in the context of Latin epigraphy?

It seems unlikely that Celtic theonyms were relics of a pre-Roman religion. Besides the theonyms mentioned by Lucan (v. *supra*), there are only very few epigraphic attestations from pre-Augustan times, mainly on Gallo-Greek inscriptions from Southern

¹⁵² Also cf. now papers in Brouquier-Redde *et al.* 2006.

¹⁵³ Thurnwald 1932: 557-69, not unlike more recent psychological approaches on the ‘internalisation’ of cultural behavioural models, for which cf. e.g. papers in Strauss and D’Andrade (ed.).

¹⁵⁴ In addition there are many variant spellings, cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001 for inventory.

France: Taranus¹⁵⁵, Rokloisia¹⁵⁶, Belenos¹⁵⁷, Belesami¹⁵⁸, Matres¹⁵⁹, Andounna¹⁶⁰, Carnonos¹⁶¹; more doubtful are Camulus(?)¹⁶², Lougous(?)¹⁶³, Vlatiabo/Konnou(?)¹⁶⁴ and Ala[---]jeinouï(?)¹⁶⁵. They largely date to the 1st century B.C. when indigenous cult practices had already entered a new development due to the intensifying interaction in post-conquest Narbonensis.

Among these Celtic theonyms are many toponymic name (e.g. Vintur as deity of the Mont Ventoux, Vasio for Vaison-la-Romaine, etc.) and many epithets (like the many epithets attributed to Mars¹⁶⁶). But on the basis of the linguistic evidence (especially P. De Bernardo Stempel's recent study on British theonyms¹⁶⁷) we can single out certain theonyms that might indicate a 'proper' deity, representing a certain divine embodiment. We find, for example, Ancasta 'the Very Holy (goddess)',¹⁶⁸ Niska 'the Purifying (goddess)',¹⁶⁹ the Suleviae 'the Well Leading (goddesses)',¹⁷⁰ Sucellos 'He who strikes well',¹⁷¹ Arciacu 'the Prayer (god)'.¹⁷² However, this category of theonyms appear like evocative surnames and perhaps even personifications of abstract terms and divine functions. Is it therefore possible to imagine that a series of theonyms could refer to the same god or goddess? Ancasta and Niska, for example, may not be actual names of distinct goddesses, but merely names to describe the Celtic mother goddess. If these were deities in their own right, we might expect them to be part of

¹⁵⁵ *Taranoou* (RIG G-27, Orgon).

¹⁵⁶ Dedication by Cornelia to Ποκλοισια (RIG G-65, Glanum), the 'hearing goddesses' (cf. dedication *Auribus* from Glanum).

¹⁵⁷ *Beleino* (RIG G-28, Saint-Chamas, Calissane) ; *[Be]len[ou]* (RIG G-63, Glanum). Uncertain: *[Be]len[-?]-[ou]* (RIG G-24, Marseille).

¹⁵⁸ *Belesami* (RIG G-153, Vaison-la-Romaine) ; cf. *Minervae Belisamae* (Saint-Lizier, CIL XIII 8); *deo Belisamarus* (Saint-Marcel-les-Chalon, CIL XIII 11224).

¹⁵⁹ *Matrebo Glanikabo* (RIG G-64, Glanum); *Matrebo Namausikabo* (RIG G-203, Nîmes).

¹⁶⁰ *Andounna* 'eaux en bas': Delamarre 2003, 324, s.v. *unna* 'eaux' ; RIG G-183 ; mother goddesses for Cóléra 2003.

¹⁶¹ *Karnonou*, specified by a toponym in the genitive: *Al[i]sa[nt]jeas* (RIG G-224, Aumes/Montagnac).

¹⁶² *Kamulati*: theonym *Camulos* or rather a personal name? (RIG G-67, Glanum).

¹⁶³ *Lougous* – probably a personal name and not a theonym (RIG G-159, Alès).

¹⁶⁴ For RIG G-184, Lejeune proposes two reconstructions: a male deity *Konnou* or female deities, *[ou]latiabo* 'potentibus' (vlati 'puissance')

¹⁶⁵ Reconstruction by Lejeune 1985, RIG G-206 (Nîmes).

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, 97-104.

¹⁶⁷ De Bernardo Stempel 2007.

¹⁶⁸ RIB 97 (Bitterne) – only known attestation of this theonym.

¹⁶⁹ After De Bernardo Stempel 2007. The Niskas were evoked on lead tablets from Amélie-les-Bains (Pyrénées Orientales), probably water nymphs (Coromines 1975); on a curse tablet from the Hamble estuary (Hamshire), Roger Tomlin read *Niske et Neptuno* and suggests the male counterpart to Niska (AE 1997, 977 = *Britannia* 28, 1997, 455-458); in both cases we seem to be dealing with water deities.

¹⁷⁰ Found across Gaul, Britain and in Rome, cf. Jufer and Luginbühl 2001, 64.

¹⁷¹ E.g. from York: RIB II.3, 2422.21. V. *supra* for Sucellos.

¹⁷² RIB 640 (York) – only known attestation of this theonym; there is a *deo Mercurio Arcecio* from Bregenz (CIL III 5768).

a mythological, genealogical structure, interrelating with other deities. We also must bear in mind that the etymology of a theonym may reveal a deities' original meaning, but not necessarily the characteristics and functions at the time of the dedication.

The large number of theonyms in Celtic might reflect the attempt to foster a sanctuary's local identity among the myriad of cult places in Roman times and may have been necessary to create new cults with distinct characteristics. The invention of a new cult or a new god is not unknown in the Graeco-Roman world, like the 2nd century A.D. snake god Glykon created by Alexander in Abonuteichos, who forged a new cult out of heterogeneous rituals and practices,¹⁷³ or the conscious creation of syncretic deities for political reasons (e.g. Serapis).

Much easier than inventing new deities is the invention of new names. Many theonyms might relate to already well-established deities of pre-Roman times, but by creating names for particular local incarnations, one could imagine that these deities experienced a further specialisation of their function and characteristics. Maponos is an interesting case, since he appears to be a 'proper' deity (also linguistically because of its *-onos* ending) and as Mabon this theonym survived in Welsh mythology¹⁷⁴. But Maponos means 'the godly son' as in *Apollo Maponos*, i.e. '*Apollo, son of Zeus*'. Could this be a case of translating an epithet from Greek into Celtic (v. *infra*)¹⁷⁵. At the same time it shows how an epithet or surname develops into a deity in its own right: Mapon becomes the name to describe the son of Zeus as in the Mabinogion where Mabon was also called 'son of Mellt', the 'lightning', i.e. son of Taranis/Jupiter/Zeus.

There are many other theonyms which, at first sight, could be taken as deities in their own right, like Mogons, Vernostonos, Toutatis and Condatis. Mogons for example, means 'mighty'¹⁷⁶. It is not a deity as such, but an epithet that can be associated with a number of deities (e.g., Grannus, Veteris, Matres, etc.) and it therefore seems reasonable to follow P. De Bernardo Stempel and call it an 'unspecific or polyvalent epithet'.¹⁷⁷ Similarly, Vernostonos means the 'by far superior [god]'¹⁷⁸ and Toutatis means the 'guardian of the tribe/people' (*supra*). Theonyms like Condatis and Deus Tridam(...) are deonomastic names, deriving from a toponym (*Condate*) and ethnic name (*Tridamī*) respectively. But it is interesting to see how such epithets can stand alone without reference to the actual deity, as in the case of Maponus.

¹⁷³ Cf. Miron 1996.

¹⁷⁴ Jufer and Luginbühl (2001, 51) list 8 attestations, only half of them make an association with Apollo (*deo Apollini Mapono* from Corbridge and Ribchester, in contrast to *deo Mapono* from Vindolanda, *Mapono* from Glanum (IAG 213).

¹⁷⁵ De Bernardo Stempel 2007; Delamarre 2003, p 216-217, s.v. mapo-.

¹⁷⁶ De Bernardo Stempel 2007

¹⁷⁷ Term by De Bernardo Stempel 2007. Also cf. the Matres Mogontiones from Agonès (AE 1986, 471), the Mogons Vitiris from Nehtherby (RIB 971).

¹⁷⁸ Vernostonos Cocidios from Ebchester (RIB 1102).

Like the identification of indigenous deities with Roman ones (*supra*), we would of course expect theonyms and epithets to have been translated into Latin during the Roman period. Jupiter, for example, usually takes Latin epithets even if they indicate local beliefs: for example Jupiter corniger ('the horned Jupiter'), Jupiter tonans ('thundering')¹⁷⁹, Jupiter conservator ('saviour'), Jupiter depulsorius ('protector')¹⁸⁰, and Jupiter frugifer ('fertile'), many of which could have been translations of theonyms and epithets attributed to the supreme Celtic celestial deity (i.e. 'Taranis').¹⁸¹ But there are also Celtic epithets some of which seem to be translations from Latin and Greek into a Celtic language. I only want to give a few British examples as identified by P. De Bernardo Stempel: *Mars corotiacos*¹⁸² 'Mars of the armies' appears to be a translation from *Mars militaris*; *Mars bar(ios)* 'the furious Mars' translates the Greek *Ares* βάριος, *Antenociticus*¹⁸³ derives from ἀντενοκίτης, *Faunus cranos*¹⁸⁴ from κράνος 'with a ram's head', and *Matres Ollotoutae*¹⁸⁵ means *Matres omnium gentium*.¹⁸⁶

Already above we talked about mother goddesses, the *Matres* and *Matronae*. Can we recognise this triad in the pre-Roman Keltiké? In their Gallo-Roman form of worship we seem to be dealing with a typical Graeco-Roman concept, namely the triad of the *Parcae*, *Fates* or *Moirai*: the Roman *Nona*, *Decuma*, *Morta*, the Greek *Clotho*, *Lachesis*, *Atropos*¹⁸⁷. Are the Gallo-Roman *Matres*/*Matronae* pre-Celtic deities going back to common Indo-European roots and/or are their form and their characteristics in Roman times inspired by Graeco-Roman concepts (first attested in the 1st century B. C. in the Narbonensis: the *Matrebo* in Nîmes and Glanum)?¹⁸⁸

Despite the wealth of theonyms attested, epigraphy is not representative in order to improve our understanding of local religion. This can be seen in many provinces of the Roman West, but the situation in Britain is extremely revealing¹⁸⁹.

¹⁷⁹ But also cf. that Augustus dedicated a temple to Jupiter Tonans (Aug. *Res gestae* 19 : (...) *aedes in Capitolio Iouis Feretri et Iouis Tonantis (...) fecit*). This took place around the same time when the temple to Jupiter Tonans was constructed in Vernègues (Bouches-du-Rhône). Tonans need not be a Roman concept; thunder as attribute of the weather god has parallels in several Indo-European religions.

¹⁸⁰ For the therapeutic aspect of Depulsor, cf. Lavagne 1979: 188-9; for Depulsor in a military context, cf. Hainzmann 2004. For Jupiter Repulsor in Lusitania, cf. Beltrán Lloris 2004.

¹⁸¹ Here we might cf. the various epithets given to the Irish Dagda (Olmsted 1994, 45) and the much longer list of bynames given to the Greek Zeus (Olmsted 1994, 77-78).

¹⁸² RIB 213 (Martlesham).

¹⁸³ RIB 1327-1329 (Benwell).

¹⁸⁴ RIB II.2, 2420.15-16 (Thetford).

¹⁸⁵ RIB 574 (Heron Bridge); RIB 1030-1032 (Binchester).

¹⁸⁶ Cf. De Bernardo Stempel 2007.

¹⁸⁷ *Parcae* and *Fates* are used synonymously; cf. Varro: Gell. 3.16.10 for the names of the *Parcae*.

¹⁸⁸ Interestingly, there are virtually no epigraphic attestations for *matres* and *matronae* from Rome; for a later dating of the Glanum and Nîmes inscriptions cf. Mullen 2008.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. already my paper at the 2nd and 3rd Fercan workshop: Häussler 2001-2.

Fig. 3 shows two divergent distribution patterns: one of Romano-Celtic temples in Britain, the other of epigraphic dedications. At the current stage of research many Romano-Celtic temples (*Umgangstempel*; *fanum*) seem to originate in pre-Roman cult places (v. *infra*).¹⁹⁰ These sanctuaries therefore seem to be the best indicators to explore the persistence of cult activities. We can see that these were gradually evolving from pre-Roman to Roman times, gradually adopting new cult practices, new votive objects and new cult architecture (sometimes very late, for example at Witham in Essex a Romano-Celtic was only constructed in the late 3rd century A.D.). And although these sanctuaries were being frequented for several centuries, most of them have not revealed a single inscription. The only inscription at Hayling Island, for example, was set up by a soldier in the 3rd century A.D.; other sites, like Wood Eaton and Lydney have produced a large number of individual letters cut out of bronze sheet of unknown purpose, but no votive inscriptions in stone have been found¹⁹¹. Even in highly literate Narbonensis, there are cult places without any inscriptions, like at Ambrussum and Colombières-sur-Orb¹⁹², while writing was embraced at others, though not necessarily as votive inscription on stone, but for graffiti like at the Limetus sanctuary in Châteauneuf.

If Romano-Celtic temples indicate a certain persistence of indigenous cult activities, at least in Britain, then it is interesting to see that the distribution pattern of Romano-Celtic temples does not overlap with the distribution of dedications. Especially the myriad of Celtic theonyms attested on Hadrian's Wall, like Belatucadros, Cocidios, the Veteri, and many more, cannot be associated with pre-Roman cults; instead they relate to a military context. And since most Celtic theonyms and epithets are very localised, we cannot assume that these deities were imported from other parts of Britain or Gaul. Belatucadros therefore need not be a theonym of pre-Roman times, but an epithet that suits the war-like context on Hadrian's Wall: *Mars belatucadros* is 'the Mars strong in the battle', i.e. the victorious Mars¹⁹³. On the other hand, most of the deities worshipped at Romano-Celtic temples in Southern Britain remain anonymous, with some exceptions like Nodons at Lydney or Senua at Ashwell.

One would assume that Bath's thermal spring was already worshipped in pre-Roman times and dedicated to the goddess Sulis, a theonym that seems to

¹⁹⁰ King 2007a.

¹⁹¹ Wood Eaton, Islip, Oxfordshire: RIB 238-239; *Britannia* 1998, p. 435, no. 6; there are also a number of small fragments of text: RIB I 236 ([---]Jedo), RIB I 237 + *addit.* p. 760 (---]NENOV[---]NDVX[---]JIT[---]); there is also a triangular gold leaf with Greek letters which seems to refer twice to *Adona(i)e* 'Lord' in the vocative (*Britannia* 1970, p. 305 (fig. 11)). At Lydney, besides the 47 letters (RIB I 308), there are also votive Bronze inscriptions and defixiones (RIB I 305 + *addit.* p. 761; RIB I 307), and *defixiones* (RIB I 306 + *addit.* p. 761).

¹⁹² For Ambrussum, cf. Fiches and Mathieu 2002.

¹⁹³ De Bernardo Stempel 2007.

resemble that of the mother goddesses Suleviae. But at the centre of the sanctuary there was no Romano-Celtic temple, but a typically Roman podium temple (the only one known from Britain besides Colchester); perhaps a Roman temple was appropriate since many dedicants had a military context.¹⁹⁴ Also the theonym Sulis ('the eye') or Sulis Minerva 'Minerva of the eye' could be argued, as P. De Bernardo Stempel does, to be inspired by the Greek Athena¹⁹⁵.

3.3. Rituals & cult practices

Perhaps it helps to study the evolution of cults and cult practices. It is important not to polarise between pre-Roman and Roman religious practices, as if we were comparing two static religious systems. Already late Iron Age religion was evolving, in Gallia Narbonensis¹⁹⁶, in Central Gaul¹⁹⁷, but also in Britain where new cult architecture was employed, for example in Heathrow and Danebury as early as the 2nd century B.C.¹⁹⁸ It is apparent that site continuity does not necessarily mean cult continuity since at many places the cult practices changed and the new cult architecture provided a new setting for cult activities. Many of the cult places that continued to be frequented in Roman times adopted new forms of architecture. Certain cult activities might have been merely streamlined into new cult places; for example, springs that have seen more occasional, seasonal votive offerings in pre-Roman times, were now architecturally monumentalised, which suggest a more constant 'exploitation', perhaps to cater for a larger catchment area. Healing cults become more widespread since they are typical for the '*zeitgeist*' of the Roman Empire. Already in the Iron Age, votive deposits show the importance of rivers and sources in the pre-Roman landscape, but the way how these natural sacred places were used differed significantly in the late Iron Age and the Roman period. For example at Springhead (Kent)¹⁹⁹, it is difficult to see whether the springs were actually utilised in the pre-Roman period; a late Iron Age ditch might have enclosed the springs and created a kind of sacred space. However, this kind of utilisation is very different from the Roman period when the construction of temples, shrines and associated buildings suggests an important healing centre profiting from the passing Watling Road. At many cult places we have to inquire to what extent cult activities and the cult's meaning evolved (perhaps beyond recognition). Even at

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Millett 1995.

¹⁹⁵ *i*-stem genitive **sul-ei-s*. De Bernardo Stempel 2007. For Athena, cf. also her epicleseis; for Athena, cf. *DNP* 2, 160-167. P.-Y. Lambert (1980) prefers to translate Sulis as the goddess of the 'Bonne Vue'.

¹⁹⁶ E.g. Garcia 2004; Haeussler 2007a.

¹⁹⁷ Large sanctuaries in Gaul from the 4th century BC, cf. Brunaux 2006 ; Poux 2006.

¹⁹⁸ King 2007a.

¹⁹⁹ Andrews 2007.

Glanum, where the pre-Roman sanctuary was already monumentalised by a series of buildings in the 2nd century B.C., the character of cult activities was adapted in order to suit contemporary society of the Principate: the healing aspect of the cult was emphasized to the detriment of other cult associations, like the pre-Roman hero-ancestor worship, the 'rock sanctuary', Glanum's political role, etc.²⁰⁰ Such adaptations might have been necessary for the survival of a pre-Roman cult place. Especially in Gaul, many sanctuaries had their peak in the 1st century B.C., but they declined and disappeared soon after.²⁰¹

In this respect, the appearance of the Romano-Celtic temple is of course an interesting phenomenon: how is it possible that a particular form of 'indigenous' cult architecture developed and spread across Celtic-speaking Europe in Roman times²⁰². What forms of communication made this possible? Why is the Romano-Celtic temple so appropriate for indigenous cult activities, and was the Roman podium temple inappropriate or unpractical? Was there a reason why the 'cella' had to be surrounded by an ambulatory? Perhaps we can relate this to the colonnades at the 'fanum' of Nages (70 B.C.) or the porticoes that surround so many late Iron Age and Gallo-Roman sanctuaries. We also have to understand the functioning of the Romano-Celtic temple in its wider context: it is usually just part of a wider complex consisting of an enclosure or '*temenos*', which creates a closed, demarcated place, surrounded by walls, that was reserved for the assembly of *deis et hominibus*.²⁰³ Cult activities therefore take place inside many 'cellae' of temples and shrines, but also in different zones of the *temenos*.²⁰⁴

In addition to those Romano-Celtic temples with no or few inscriptions, or other cult buildings of non-Roman appearance (like those at Lioux (Vaucluse)²⁰⁵), we must assume that there are many cult places without any cult building at all, and which are therefore very difficult to identify. There was, for example, a cult place at Lowbury Hill in Oxfordshire whose find assemblages are comparable to other cult places, like Harlow, Great Chesterford and Uley. But there was no Romano-Celtic temple; a rectangular enclosure has been interpreted as a kind of artificial sacred

²⁰⁰ Cf. Haeussler 2007a.

²⁰¹ E.g. the sanctuaries of Acy-Romance (Ardennes) and Saumeray 'Le Bas des Touches' (Eure-et-Loir), cf. Lambot 2006, p. 188.

²⁰² Cf. King 2007a for the idea that the concept of the Romano-Celtic Umgangstempel derived from Britain.

²⁰³ As it says on the Gallo-Latin bilingual inscription from Vercelli (RIG II.1 *E-2) which probably attests the dedication of such a cult place (called *campus* at Vercelli) for an annual festival.

²⁰⁴ The excavation of the sanctuary of the Arverni at Corent (Puy-de-Dôme) shows the various activity zones: the ditch surrounding the sanctuary, the entry, the court, the temples, the porticoes, etc.; cf. now Poux 2006 with further bibliography. Votive offerings and votive inscriptions can frequently be found inside the 'cellae' of shrines and temples, like inside the rectangular shrine at Glanum and Lioux; cf. Häussler 2007a for bibliography.

²⁰⁵ Borgard and Rimbart 1994, 90-94.

grove²⁰⁶. We must therefore assume that there is a number of cult places in the Roman empire where Latin epigraphy and Roman architecture were not considered appropriate or were beyond the means of the indigenous population.

Among the evolution of cult practices from the 2nd century B.C. to the 1st century A.D., one important observation concerns the dedicants: the earlier Iron Age votive deposits reflect communal (or at least high status elite) sacrifices, while through time ex-votos become less and less prestigious, reflecting more and more individual sacrifices and also sacrifices by non-elites, perhaps also an opening-up of sanctuaries to a wider section of the population by the 1st century B.C.²⁰⁷

This leads us to the vow, like the vow for healing from illness, for a good return after a journey, etc. In Roman times, the archaeological record largely consists of a relatively standardised range of votive objects, which also includes imported artefacts (like the 'mass-produced' Venus clay-pipe figurines which can be found across Gaul and Britain). There are also votive inscriptions with the typical *votum solvit libens merito* formula, which has its parallel (and perhaps its origin?) in the 1st century B.C. Gallo-Greek formula δεδε βρατου δεκαντεμ ('has offered in gratitude').²⁰⁸ Brunaux suggested that the vow and the associated ex-votos had already been typical for Iron Age religion so that the ex-voto in stone would be a refinement from earlier sacrifices, like the sacrifice of an animal with the aim to achieve healing from illness or to guarantee good health.²⁰⁹ However, inscribed vows were already known in Greek and Roman religion, with c. a dozen dedications attested in 7th-4th century B.C. Rome.²¹⁰ The concept of the vow was certainly known in pre-Roman Gaul, but the character of votive offerings has changed: no longer for the well-being of the collective, but for individuals and their private concerns (health, fertility, travelling, careers, etc.).

Roman intervention in local cults only took place in exceptional circumstances, like the outlawing of human sacrifices and druidic activities (since they were considered to be a threat to Roman order).²¹¹ But with regard to human sacrifices, Brunaux has already shown that there are certain *topoi* on the cruelty of Celtic sacrifice in Classical literature (esp. the *têtes coupées* and human sacrifices), which

²⁰⁶ For Lowbury Hill, cf. King 2005, 344-5; Fulford and Rippon 1994.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Brunaux 2006.

²⁰⁸ Delamarre 2003, 85-86, s.v. bratu 'en gratitude': 'en accomplissement du vœu', 'ex voto'; Lambert 1993. Cf. Mullen 2008 who compares it with Italic/Oscan formulae.

²⁰⁹ Brunaux 2000, 146-7.

²¹⁰ Circa twelve 7th - 4th century B.C. dedications in Degraasi, *Inscriptiones Latinae liberae rei publicae*, 1957-1963. Cf. DNP 12, 345-346, s.v. Votivkult.

²¹¹ Augustus prohibited Roman citizens to participate in druidic rituals which must have also affected certain high status local elites in Gaul; under Claudius druids were prosecuted (e.g. destruction of their centre on Anglesey A.D. 59 by Suetonius Paulinus, Tac. *ann.* 14.30). In the 4th century A.D. Ausonius does however refer to druidic succession from father to son, cf. Booth 1978; Ausonius, *Prof.* 4.7; 10.27.

seem very doubtful and which contrast sharply with more positive descriptions in Classical texts.²¹² It is therefore unlikely that human sacrifice was still common at the beginning of the 1st century B.C. (e.g., at Acy-Romance (Ardennes) the inhumation of ritually killed humans ceased by c. 100 B.C., having been replaced by the mass slaughter of sheep²¹³). At many sanctuaries, the archaeological evidence on human sacrifices and head cult needs to be reconsidered;²¹⁴ human remains, for example, might relate to different forms of ancestor cult. Similarly, the role of religion and warfare has to be put in relation. In the Iron Age the bellicose nature of cult activities might have been overrepresented if votive deposits mainly originated from large-scale annual gatherings of the adult male population. On the other hand, everyday religious beliefs were probably largely concerned with other issues, like the fertility of land, birth and death – rituals that might have taken place in individual households.

The bone evidence from sanctuaries mirror the development of cult practices in the Iron Age, most of the evidence comes from structured deposits, often on hilltop sites. In Roman times, animal sacrifice continued and the choice of sacrificial animal and their ritual treatment and deposition suggest a certain persistence. For example, the continuing high percentages of sheep/goat bones (which was typical for British Iron Age sites) at most Romano-British temples reflects a continuation of an Iron Age ritual, especially when considering the general dietary shift towards more ox and pig.²¹⁵ Similarly in Gaul, at Corent (Puy-de-Dôme), sheep/goat dominate at the sanctuary, while predominantly beef and pork were consumed in the surrounding rural set elements, which may even indicate that sheep/goat could have been the attributes of the deity.²¹⁶ At some sanctuaries (e.g. Uley, Harlow, Acy-Romance), the age-at-death data for the animals suggest seasonal sacrifice patterns (perhaps pilgrimages) in spring and (above all) in autumn – a time corresponding for example to the two seasonal festivals *Beltain* (1st May) and in particular *Samain* (*samonios* on the Coligny calendar; 1st November, a festival that is known to include the slaughter of animals); *Samain* was a time ‘when gods visited men, supernatural beings changed shape and the year died and was reborn’²¹⁷. Interestingly, from healing temples there is hardly any faunal evidence (e.g. none at all from the Sulis Minerva sanctuary at Bath)²¹⁸.

²¹² Brunaux 2000, 157ff.

²¹³ Lambot 2006, 183-4.

²¹⁴ Brunaux 2000, 153-6.

²¹⁵ King 2005: 363-4, though this was also the case in Gaul where we lack a comparable pre-Roman tradition.

²¹⁶ Poux 2006, p. 124.

²¹⁷ Quote from Green 1992, 186; King 2005, 363 (for British sanctuaries); Lambot 2006, 185 (for Acy-Romance); also cf. Isserlin 1994; Green 1992, p. 42, s.v. Beltene; 185-6, s.v. Samhain.

²¹⁸ King 2005, 361.

At many sites one can recognise a certain continuity in cult practices between Iron Age and Roman period. For example, the sanctuary of Harlow was frequented from the 1st century B.C. down to 4th century A.D., with a first temple being constructed in the late 1st century A.D. Throughout the Late Iron Age and Roman period, the ratio of animal sacrifices hardly changed: more than 80% of bones belong to sheep/goat bones and considerably fewer bones from pigs, oxen and even less from horses and dogs²¹⁹. Also at Hayling Island, the ratio of c. 55% bones of sheep/goat, c. 45% of pig and 2% of ox remained relatively stable during Iron Age and Principate. Were sheep and pig the attributes of the deity worshipped here (perhaps the Mercurius Moccus?)²²⁰. At Uley, the ratio evolves very gradually from the 2nd century B.C. to the 4th century A.D. with more and more sheep/goat being sacrificed (rising from c. 70% to 90% to the decrement of oxen, perhaps due to economic reasons). In the Romano-Celtic temple (2nd-4th century A.D.) chicken become increasingly important, perhaps a reminder of Mercury's attribute, the cockerel²²¹.

Can sacrifices help us to identify the deity worshipped at those sites without any associated dedications? For example, animal sacrifices at the Mercury sanctuary of Uley mainly consisted of goat, sheep and increasingly chicken (*v. supra*). This assemblage is similar to the sanctuaries in Harlow,²²² Great Chesterford, Lowbury and Chelmsford. Does this imply that (a kind of local) Mercury was worshipped at all five sites, considering that the cockerel and the ram were his attributes²²³? We have to be cautious to make such a connection as the same animal sacrifice might have been common for a variety of deities. Moreover, the Roman animal sacrifice, the *suovetaurilia* (the sacrifice of pig, ram and bull), seems rather similar to those that we recognise in the bone assemblages from many British cult sites.

Evidence for horse sacrifice is an interesting issue because of the horse's role in indigenous religion, its widespread depiction on reliefs (e.g. at Mouriès and Glanum (Bouches-du-Rhône) where it is associated with the hero-ancestor and *têtes coupées* cult); there are also the numerous horse burials across the Celtic World in the Iron Age and the early Roman period²²⁴. Horse sacrifice is virtually unknown from Graeco-Roman religion, but it is present in small numbers in the Roman West in both pre-Roman and Roman times; small quantities of horse bones can be found in

²¹⁹ King 2005, 335-336.

²²⁰ Cf. King 2005, 338; already during the late Iron Age there was a large percentage of pigs as sacrificial animals. Moccus means pig (cf. Delamarre 2003, 228, s.v. moccas 'porc, sanglier'; Green 1992, 149, s.v. Mercury Moccus; only attested once at Langres, CIL XIII 5676: *In h(onorem) d(omus) d(ivinae) deo Mercur(io) Mocco*).

²²¹ King 2005, 332-334.

²²² Dedication to Mercury from Harlow: AE 1975, 542.

²²³ For a discussion of the bone evidence cf. King 2005, 357.

²²⁴ For horse burials cf. e.g. Jerem 2007.

most sanctuaries. The evidence suggests a different treatment of horses compared to other sacrificial animals: they were not consumed and usually not taken apart; we very often find complete skeletons, and their treatment, down to the end of the Iron Age, is comparable to that of humans.²²⁵ For example at the sanctuary of Vertault (Côte-d'Or), altogether some 30 horses (all male) were discovered which had been ritually killed, exhibited in the open, before being deposited as a whole in a large ditch at the beginning of the 1st century A.D.²²⁶ Interestingly at many British sanctuaries, the number of horse bones even seems to increase during the Roman period. Important British sites include Witham, Bancroft, Chelmsford and above all Folly Lane (St. Albans) where almost 50% of bone fragments consist of horse bones²²⁷. At Witham (Ivy Chimneys, Essex), where a kind of wooden Romano-Celtic temple was constructed in the late 3rd century A.D., finds of horse bones increased from just 11 in the Late Iron Age to c. 140 in the period A.D. 50-200 and to some 1,700 in the 3rd-5th century A.D.²²⁸ Does this suggest the persistence of Iron Age rituals and beliefs?

Other votive objects and sacrifices

What other typically pre-Roman Iron Age types of votive offerings and sacrifices did persist into the Roman period? In the late Iron Age we can recognise the deposition of large quantities of arms, armour and precious metals – objects that were often intentionally mutilated, thus removed from the human sphere to that of the gods. The scale of these deposits suggests elite or communal sacrifices. Down to the 2nd century B.C. one particular votive offering consisted of the deposition of weapons in sanctuaries, which we can find in its extreme form in the display of arms and bodies in Picardie (Ribemont-sur-Ancre)²²⁹. Votive objects also mirror the evolution of local cults and ritual practices and we can recognise the deposition of an increasingly wide range of votive offerings during the 1st century B.C., including coins, statuettes, jewellery, *fibulae*, rings, coins, statuettes, model objects, pottery, etc.²³⁰ Such a diversification reflects changing socioeconomic patterns and the emergence of a

²²⁵ Méniel 2006, 173-4.

²²⁶ Méniel 2006, 173-4; Lepetz and Méniel 2002, 52-3; Méniel and Jouin 2000 (who show the more exclusive role of horses and dogs from the 1st century A.D.); Lepetz 2000 (for 3rd century A.D. burial of horses and dogs); King 2005: 361 (British examples). For horse burials, also cf. Jerem 2007 showing horse (and dog) burials in the territory of the Eravisci (Hungary), especially in vici and cemeteries, in both pre-Roman and early Roman times.

²²⁷ King 2005, p. 340, fig. 13. At Folly Lane (St. Albans) some 170 horse bones have been found at different find spots: Romano-Celtic temple, enclosure, pits and mainly shafts, but none date from the late pre-Roman Iron Age

²²⁸ King 2005, 349; Turner 1999.

²²⁹ Cf. Brunaux 2000, 145.

²³⁰ Also at Ambrussum in the Narbonensis do we find mainly pottery as ex-votos, but there is an increasing diversification from c. 30 B.C. (Fiches, J.-L. and V. Mathieu 2002).

new 'middle class' of individuals capable of making their own offerings.²³¹ These objects were usually exhibited and then deposited in the sanctuary: in structured deposits (ditches, pits) in pre-Roman times, while in Roman times we often find small rectangular shrines that contain votive offerings. The term *fassissae* seems appropriate to describe such shrines: they were depositories into which cult material was deposited at the end of its working life, like at the sanctuary of Lachar (Varces-Allières-et-Risset (Isère)), while at the sanctuary of Tintignac (Corrèze),²³² numerous carnyx, swords, helmets, lances, etc. were buried after the Gaulish War, which were probably previously exhibited as precious gifts (or *anathemata*²³³) in the sanctuary or used in now obsolete rituals.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the changing role of all possible votive offerings and cult practices in the late Iron Age and the Principate. Instead we have to limit ourselves to a few examples. The votive offering of coins, for example, had already become increasingly common in the 2nd century B.C. Coin offerings are common at many water cults (rivers and springs)²³⁴, like Coventina's Well and the Bath Spring in Britain, at Bourbonne-les-Bains and Condé-sur-Aisne in Gaul²³⁵, while they are rare, or even absent, at other cult sites²³⁶. Although coin deposition at temples may usually have been deliberate, sometimes recovery might have been intended, if we follow a remark by Arrian (writing in the 2nd century A.D.) that, in relation to hunting, Celts collected the coins deposited in the course of the year in order to pay for an annual sacrifice to Artemis.²³⁷ Coins also shows the application of another ritual that was carried over from the La Tène to the Roman period, namely the mutilation of votive offerings, rendering them unusable. The evidence from late Iron Age Gaul, particularly from Villeneuve-au-Châtelot (Aube) and Bourbonne-les-Bains (Haute-Marne), suggests that this must have been a widespread practice in Gaul²³⁸. In Britain we find mutilated coins in a ritual deposit of 5,1000 Durotrigan coins from Hampshire as well as in the two British temples Hayling Island and Bath²³⁹.

²³¹ Cf. Kiernan 2007; G. Webster 1986a-b, 222.

²³² Maniquet 2005.

²³³ For comparison between Greek and Iron Age ritual, cf. Brunaux 2000, p. 145.

²³⁴ Haselgrove 2007 discusses among others the types of coins used - gold, silver and potin; the latter was replaced by struck bronze coins from the middle of the 1st century B.C.

²³⁵ Sauer 2005.

²³⁶ King 2007b; Coins are very rare e.g. at Chanctonbury Ring (West Sussex), Titsey (Surrey) and Collyweston Great Wood (Northamptonshire). For Gaul cf. Aubin and Meisssonier 1994, 143 with similar variations in coin deposits.

²³⁷ *Cyn.* 33. For further discussion of this passage, see Brunaux 1987, 160; 2000, 135-6; Aubin and Meisssonier 1994, 150.

²³⁸ Kiernan 2001, 28 for British sites; King and Soffe 2001, 120; forthcoming. The Gallic evidence is discussed by Aubin and Meisssonier 1994 and Sauer 2005, 79-86.

²³⁹ Kiernan 2001.

Another category of objects, frequently encountered at Gallo-Roman sanctuaries are miniature objects. These can serve to substitute ritual activities and real objects (*pars-pro-toto*) and sometimes they had merely symbolic values (e. g. the Taranis wheel?).²⁴⁰ M. Green also suggested that the shrinking of an object places it in the realm of supernatural use, adding to its ritual potency²⁴¹. But we are not dealing with an exclusive 'Celtic' ritual as miniature objects are also well known from Graeco-Roman sanctuaries. The Iron Age ritual of mutilation was also applied to many of the new miniature votive objects in Roman Gaul and Britain; thus we probably deal with a hybrid of Iron Age and Roman practices²⁴².

In Roman times there is a wide range of miniature objects. One particular type of object, which we already encounter in the pre-Roman period, are the model wheels. Lead wheels were deposited in large numbers (such communal dedications finally die out in the 1st century A.D.), while the deposition of individual bronze wheels continued in the Roman period. Are the wheels material manifestations of the main attribute of the indigenous weather-god (Jupiter/Taranis)²⁴³? In Roman times we find bronze wheels, for example, at Augusta Raurica (1st-3rd century A.D.), and there is a large tin wheel from the Matagne-la-Petite sanctuary in Belgium, which carries a dedication to Jupiter Optimus Maximus.²⁴⁴

Model arms seem to be more common during the transitional period (1st century B.C.-A.D., e.g. 1,500 1st century B.C. lance points from Acy-Romance²⁴⁵). They appear to be true substitutes for the large scale deposition of weapons that used to take place in the Iron Age (perhaps a lack of weaponry due to the *pax Romana*?), and like the 'real' thing they seem to have been exhibited in the open.²⁴⁶ But there is one particular type of miniature weapon that continues from the Iron Age right down to the 2nd century A.D., namely model axes. Since axes have not been used in warfare, they might represent those used in (animal and human) sacrifices, like those found in the sanctuary of Acy-Romance.²⁴⁷ P. Kiernan suggests that model axes recall much older pre-Roman rituals, but it is difficult to associate them with any particular indigenous deity; from Allmendingen there are inscribed model axes dedicated to Jupiter, Mercury, Neptune, matres, matronae and Minerva,²⁴⁸ while a

²⁴⁰ For the following cf. Kiernan 2007 with further bibliography.

²⁴¹ Green 1992.

²⁴² Cf. Kiernan 2007.

²⁴³ Kiernan 2007; Poux 2006, 128 suggests that they were used for voting in an assembly, which might have taken place in some of the large sanctuaries.

²⁴⁴ Green 1984, 78-80; Kiernan 2007.

²⁴⁵ Lambot 2006, 186.

²⁴⁶ Kiernan 2007; Lambot 2006, 186-7.

²⁴⁷ Cf. Lambot 2006, 186.

²⁴⁸ Kiernan 2007; Forrer 1948, 15-17, 72, nos. 1.1-6. pl. 3.1-6 and 4.2-6; CIL XIII 5158/2855.

lamella from Cadenet (Vaucluse, Narbonensis) testifies the votive offering of an axe to Mars and Dexiva (Fig. 4).²⁴⁹

3.4. Iconography & sculpture

We have already mentioned earlier that sculpture and iconography can reveal local and possibly autochthonous forms of cults and deities. There was of course the Taranis-wheel (attributed to the local Jupiter) and the hammer of the hammer god (Sucellos/Silvanus). Indigenous deities might be represented by divergences from Classical images, i.e. sculptural representations that cannot be explained by Graeco-Roman religion and mythology, like the three-headed Mercury (=Esus?), divine couples (e.g., Mercury and Rosmerta) or a god's unusual attributes (*v. supra*); however, most representations follow standard Graeco-Roman models, perhaps due to a lack of anthropomorphic representations of deities (other than ancestors or heroes) in pre-Roman times.

Let us consider the attributes of Nîmes' local god Nemausus which are represented on the panel opposite to the depiction of I.O.M. Heliopolitanus (the Syrian Ba'al-Biq'ah)²⁵⁰: they consist of the Celtic *carnyx* and a Celtic shield, precisely the kind of objects that was deposited at the Tintignac sanctuary (*supra*). Considering the 3rd century A.D. date of this altar we may wonder whether they are meant to indicate Nemausus military character, or merely a remembrance of long-gone rituals or processions, or perhaps the insignia of Nîmes' protective deity.

Other motifs, which are common on altars from the Roman West, have been frequently associated with 'Celtic' religion: the tree obviously plays an important role, judging from its appearance with Esus, Smertullus and Tarvos Trigaranus on the Parisian '*Pilier des nautes*'; there are also certain animals, like the goat, the stag, the dog, the bird and the snake that seems to have played an important role in native mythology. As Bauchhenß has shown²⁵¹, many of these motifs are not used exclusively for a particular Romano-Celtic deity which for him would rule out any association with any particular myth. Furthermore he shows that these motifs are also common in Rome herself, like the image of a tree with three goats whereby animals on a pasture show the fertility of the land and are a widespread theme across the Roman West since the Augustan period.²⁵² Similarly the motif of the tree with a snake can be found since Homeric times and since Hadrian it is used to depict Salus on Roman coins.

²⁴⁹ ILN-3, 221.

²⁵⁰ CIL XII 3072 = ILGN 406 = ILS 4288: *I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) Heliopolitan(o) et Nemauso*.

²⁵¹ Bauchhenss 2005.

²⁵² Bauchhenss 2005, 152-3.

However, we always have to distinguish between the origin of a motif and its usage. In other words, many representations on Romano-Celtic sculptures might have Greek or Roman artistic predecessors, but these motifs can be put to another usage. We also should not rule out that certain symbols and images have similar functions in different Indo-European religions. The Jupiter-giant columns, for example, are meaningful for the religious beliefs in Eastern Gaul down to the 3rd century A.D. as they serve to depict local mythology, even though the image of the battle between Jupiter and the giant might have been inspired by Classical Greek images of Zeus and/or by cavalry tombstones from Upper Germany.²⁵³ Similarly the divine pair Vulcanus and Venus was inspired by local beliefs, like the two-sided relief from Alzey (near Borbetomagos/Worms)²⁵⁴, where Venus is depicted naked, holding her hair with her left hand (probably inspired by wall paintings), while Vulcanus wearing the exomis and holding hammer and tongs, is depicted with a stag in the background. There is of course the pair Hephaistos and Aphrodite in Greek mythology,²⁵⁵ but here we seem to be dealing with the union of the mother goddess (*terra mater*) with the chthonic god (Vulcanus is here probably the hammer god (Dispater?), as suggested by his attributes, hammer and stag), and hence popular fertility gods and protectors of nature²⁵⁶.

In other words, a pictorial theme from Graeco-Roman art may have influenced local artists, thus creating a new, syncretic art that took up substance from various cultural horizons whereby the adoption of foreign art has initiated processes resulting in the evolution of local religious beliefs.

3.5. Survival and transformation of 'Celtic' beliefs & mythology

We have already seen the importance of afterlife beliefs: the number of myths and symbols related to birth and rebirth, like the stag (and his antlers) or Hercules as champion of the dead; there is also a certain ancestor cult that can be identified across the Celtic world in various form (*v. supra*). It becomes apparent that unlike in Rome, there is no division between the worship of god and funerary rituals in Roman Gaul and Britain: we find Romano-Celtic temples as focus points of cemeteries and every so often a high-status burial was the *raison d'être* of a temple.²⁵⁷ It therefore seems essential to take into consideration the evolution of funerary rituals in order to investigate the survival of late pre-Roman Iron Age afterlife beliefs into the Roman period. At many Roman period cemeteries we can recognise the persistence

²⁵³ Haeussler 2007b.

²⁵⁴ CSIR II 1 no. 28; Brommer 1973, 26-7.

²⁵⁵ Also cf. Verg. *Aeneid* 8.370-415 for the marriage of Venus and Vulcanus.

²⁵⁶ Haeussler 2007b.

²⁵⁷ Cf. Forcey 1998; Haeussler 2008.

of a number of Iron Age rituals, most obviously the mutilation of grave goods. There is also the choice and number of grave goods, for example the large quantity of funerary goods which may reflect indigenous understandings of life after death.²⁵⁸ Also the face urns may go back to pre-Roman beliefs.²⁵⁹ In this respect the site of Baldock (Hertfordshire) is very interesting due to the long-term continuity of population, religious beliefs and cult practices from the 1st century B.C. through to the Roman period (and beyond).²⁶⁰ But at Baldock and elsewhere, afterlife beliefs did evolve. Some changes were significant, like the adoption of new burial practices or the Charon coin;²⁶¹ also the dedicatory formula to the *diis manes* reflects Roman afterlife beliefs, an apparent contradiction to pre-Roman beliefs when druids are said to have denied the existence of the *manes*.²⁶²

At the same we should be aware of the evolution of local religion during the 1st-4th centuries A.D. Rituals, cult meaning and mythology constantly evolved in order to remain meaningful to the contemporary societies in the Roman provinces. Already above we have explored that Minerva, Juno and Epona might have all derived from the pre-Roman concept of a mother goddess, but because of the further developments in the Principate, a worshipper of the 2nd century A.D. might have failed to see the common origin. Local gods may derive from Iron Age ('Celtic') beliefs, but this knowledge may have been lost. Despite all superficial parallels with other Romano-Celtic cults and a certain legibility throughout the empire due to certain reference points (e.g., Graeco-Roman iconography and theonyms), we can hypothesise that there was an increasing discrepancy between regional cults during the Principate. Also the Irish Táin and the Welsh Mabinogion are no relics of a distant past, but the result of a long process of adaptation which included the insertion of myth into a local environment, creating specific sacred landscapes in Ireland and Britain respectively.

IV. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to explore the possibilities of religious survival from the late Iron Age to the Principate. Judging from the gravity of religious

²⁵⁸ Cf. Martin-Kilcher (1998) for the cemetery of Ornavasso in Cisalpine Gaul.

²⁵⁹ Green 1992.

²⁶⁰ Burleigh *et al* 2006, 291-2.

²⁶¹ For example, the adoption of the Charon coin in the La Tène cemeteries of the Cisalpine Lomellina date to the first half of the 1st century B.C. (cf. Vannacci Lunazzi 1996)

²⁶² According to the *Bern scholia* to Lucan 1.454.

change, we have seen that 'Romanisation' is no suitable term to describe religious change in the Roman West. There might be local elites who aspired for a Roman lifestyle, the fashions of the imperial court, or even a career at Rome, but religious beliefs cannot be transformed as easily. These people might chose the latest artistic techniques and Graeco-Roman sculptures to express their religiosity (a cultural statement showing the dedicant's *Selbstverständnis*²⁶³), but all of this had to be meaningful to the cult. Interestingly, many of the cult places where we can postulate a strong continuity of cult practices from the late Iron Age to the Roman period, are conspicuously void of Roman-style architecture, epigraphy and sculpture throughout the Principate. Though there are pre-Roman Iron Age rituals and beliefs that did persist, which can be mainly recognised in archaeology, we also have to be aware of the processes of change: in pre-Roman and Roman times belief systems and cult practices were constantly evolving and many of the allegedly 'Celtic' elements that can be recognised in the Principate may not even have existed prior to the 2nd or 1st century B.C.

We have seen how the locals selected particular elements from in-coming cultures, endow these with religious meanings different from those they possessed in Graeco-Roman culture and then creatively merge these with indigenous traditions to create totally new forms. But the first adoption of an alien element, like a Mercury statue to represent Lugus or Esus, only initiated long-term transformations with the result that by the 2nd/3rd century A.D. religious belief systems might have changed beyond recognition and the memory of pre-Roman mythology might have been lost. For example, we have explored the idea that goddesses like Epona, Minerva, Juno Regina derive from an indigenous mother goddess, and the Irish and Welsh mythology provides some useful parallels as support, but in the Principate these goddesses acquired a more and more specialist role in the local panthea of the Roman West, incongruent with their presumed pre-Roman role.

For the majority of cults in Roman times we are not dealing with a process of acculturation by which foreign features were chosen rather arbitrarily into the local repertoire. Instead, depending on a sanctuary's sociopolitical role, the municipal elites had an interest in maintaining existing cult places as focus points of new social groupings, like *pagi*, *vici* or the Roman-style municipalities. This is a complex process: the actions of a 'Romanised' elite created sanctuaries whose functions and appearances were comprehensible across the empire, while at the same time (native) local elites also had to be satisfied in order not to disengage the local worshippers on whom local elites based their power.²⁶⁴

²⁶³ Cf. papers in Alföldy 2001 for inscriptions as 'Selbstverständnis'.

²⁶⁴ Cf. Häussler 2005a, 2005b, 2007 on the Gallia Narbonensis.

I hope to have shown that there is a significant discrepancy between late Iron Age and Roman religions which implies that local beliefs can hardly have been disguised beneath an external Roman veneer. We therefore cannot reconstruct 'Celtic' religion on the basis of Roman sources. Pre-Roman belief systems had been adapted to suit the society of the early Principate, and as a result, there developed new hybrid cults taking up substance from both local-indigenous and Graeco-Roman religions. Our epigraphic evidence, as we have seen, is not representative for cult activities; the study of inscriptions disregards the beliefs of the majority of worshippers and their cult practices at most cult places; and since most dedications date to the 2nd-3rd century A.D. they are also very limited in time. A Celtic theonym therefore is no evidence for a pre-Roman cult. People may have used Celtic-names in Latin dedications as a statement of otherness, a sign of local identity, while other Celtic theonyms may reflect a deity's colloquial name bestowed by a Celtic-speaking population (including for example Celtic-speaking worshippers on Hadrian's Wall).

It is highly problematic to focus only on the parallels across the Celtic-speaking world in Roman times since our evidence is highly scattered and scarce. Certain names of deities and sculptural representations may be found across the Roman West, but there are no supra-regional deities and instead regional variations dominate our record. Ultimately we are dealing with a polis religion and we can therefore expect to find discrepancies in cult practices, sculpture and choice of deities which create an almost unique arrangement in each *civitas* of the Roman West. However, it seems doubtful that we can still talk about Celtic or autochthonous deities, beliefs or religion in the 2nd century A.D.

Abbreviations

- CAG 13/1 = F. Gateau, *Carte archéologique de la Gaule 13/1. L'Etang-de-Berre*, (Paris), 1996
 CAG 13/2 = F. Gateau and M. Gazeau, *Carte archéologique de la Gaule 13/2: Les Alpilles et la Montagne* (Paris) 1999
 CAG 30/1 = J.-L. Fiches and M. Amandry, *Carte archéologique de la Gaule 30/1 Nîmes* (Paris) 1996 (1997)
 CAG 30/3 = M. Provost *et al.*, *Carte archéologique de la Gaule 30/3. Le Gard* (Paris) 1999
 CAG-75 = Busson, D., *Carte archéologique de la Gaule, 75 – Paris*. (Paris) 1998.
 CAG 83/1 = Brun, J.-P., *Carte archéologique de la Gaule, 83/1 – Var* (Paris) 1999.
 CSIR II 1 = E. v. Künzl, *CSIR Deutschland, vol. II: Germania superior, part 1: Alzey und Umgebung* (Bonn) 1975.
 DNP = *Der Neue Pauly*.
 Esp. = É. Espérandieu, *Recueil général des bas-reliefs de la Gaule romaine* (Paris) 1907-1938
 IAG = H. Rolland, « Inscriptions antiques de Glanum », *Gallia* 2 (1944) 167ff.
 ILGN = É. Espérandieu, *Inscriptions latines de la Gaule Narbonnaise* (Paris) 1929
 ILHSavoie = B. Rémy (ed.), *Inscriptions latines de Haute-Savoie* (Annecy) 1995

- ILLPRON = M. Hainzmann and P. Schubert, *Inscriptionum lapidarium Latinarum provinciae Norici usque ad annum MCMLXXXIV repertarum indices* (Berlin) 1986-1987
- ILN-3 = J. Gascou, *Inscriptions Latines de Narbonnaise (I.L.N.) III. Aix-en-Provence* (44e supplément à Gallia) (Paris) 1995
- ILN-4 = J. Gascou, P. Leveau, J. Rimbart, *Inscriptions Latines de Narbonnaise (I.L.N.) IV. Apt* (44e supplément à Gallia) (Paris) 1997
- ILS = H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, (Berlin) 1892-1916
- InscrAqu = J.B. Brusin, *Inscriptiones Aquileiae*, 3 vols., (Udine) 1991-1993.
- RIB = R. G. Collingwood and R. P. Wright (edd.), *The Roman inscriptions of Britain*, (Oxford).
- RIG I = M. Lejeune, *Recueil des Inscriptions Gauloises (R.I.G.), vol. I, Textes gallo-grecs* (45e supplément à Gallia) (Paris) 1985
- RIG II.1 = M. Lejeune, *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises (RIG). Vol. II, Fascicule 1 : Textes gallo-étrusques, textes gallo-latins sur pierre*. (Paris, XLVe supplément à Gallia). 1988.

Bibliography

- Alcock, S. E. 1997. "Greece: a landscape of resistance," in D. J. Mattingly (ed.), *Dialogues in Roman imperialism. Power, discourse and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire* (JRA supplement 23) 103-116
- Alföldy, G. (ed.) 2001. *Inschriftliche Denkmäler als Medien der Selbstdarstellung in der römischen Welt* (Stuttgart)
- Andrews, P. 2007. "Springhead, Kent – Late Iron Age ceremonial landscape to Roman healing centre?" in: Haeussler and King (ed.) 2007, vol. 1 (in print).
- Arcelin, P. and J.-L. Brunaux (edd.) 2003. "Un état des questions sur les sanctuaires et les pratiques culturelles de la Gaule celtique," *Gallia* 60, 1-268.
- Aubin, G. and J. Meisssonier 1994. « L'usage de la monnaie sur les sites de sanctuaires de l'ouest de la Gaule et de la Bourgogne », in: C. Goudineau et al. (edd.), *Les sanctuaires de tradition indigène en Gaule romaine* (Paris) pp. 143-152.
- Bauchhenß, G. 1981. *Die Jupitergigantensäulen in der römischen Provinz Germania superior* (Bonn)
- Bauchhenß, G. 2005. „Ziegen, Vögel, Baum und Schlange. Zu den Rückseiten zweier Matronenaltäre vom Bonner Münster“, in: W. Spickermann and R. Wiegels (edd.), *Keltische Götter im Römischen Reich* (Osnabrück) pp.149-163.
- Bauchhenß, G. 2007. „Hercules in Gallien – facts and fiction“, in: Haeussler and King (edd.), 2007, vol. 2.
- Beltrán Lloris, F. 2004. « Iuppiter Repulsor(ius) y Iuppiter Solutorius: dos cultos provinciales de la Lusitania interior, » in : J. Gorrochategui and P. De Bernardo Stempel (edd.), *Los Celtas y su religion a través de la epigrafía* (Vitoria) 2004, pp. 117-128.
- Bémont, C. 1986. « À propos des couples mixtes gallo-romains, » in : *Iconographie classique et identités régionales* (BCH Suppl. 14), pp. 131-153.
- Benoit, F. 1959. *Mars et Mercure. Nouvelles recherches sur l'interprétation gauloise des divinités romaines* (Gap).
- Benoit, F. 1970. *Le symbolisme dans les sanctuaires de la Gaule* (Bruxelles).
- Bober, P. F. 1951. "Cernunnos: Origin and Transformation of a Celtic Divinity", *American Journal of Archaeology* 55/1 (January 1951), 13-51.
- Bonfante, L. and J. Swaddling. *Etruscan Myths* (University of Texas Press) 2006

- Booth, A. D. 1978. "Notes on Ausonius' 'Professores'", *Phoenix*, 32/3, autumn 1978, 235-249.
- Borgard, P. and Rimbart, J. 1994. « Un sanctuaire a édifices multiples: l'enclos cultuel de Verjusclas à Lioux (Vaucluse) », In: C. Goudineau, I. Fauduet, G. Coulon, (edd.), *Les sanctuaires de tradition indigène en Gaule romaine. Actes du colloque d'Argentomagus 8, 9 et 10 Octobre 1992*. (Paris) pp. 90-94.
- Botheroyd, S. and Botheroyd, P. 2004. *Keltische Mythologie von A-Z*, (Wien) (=Lexikon der keltischen Mythologie, München 1991).
- Brommer, F. 1973. *Der Gott Vulkan auf provinzialrömischen Reliefs* (Köln).
- Brouquier-Redde, Veronique, Estelle Bertrand, M.-B. Chardenoux, K. Gruel, M.-C. L'Huillier (edd.) 2006. *Mars en Occident: Actes du colloque international « Autour d'Allonnes (Sarthe). Les sanctuaires de Mars en Occident »*. Le Mans, Université du Maine, 4-6 Juin 2003. (Rennes).
- Brunaux, J.-L. 2000. *Les religions gauloises. Nouvelles approches sur les rituels celtiques de la Gaule indépendante* (Paris)
- Brunaux, J.-L. 2006. « Religion et sanctuaires », in Goudineau (ed.) 2006, pp. 95-116.
- Brunaux, J.-L. 2006b, *Les Gaulois*, Paris. Belles Lettres, 2006.
- Burleigh, G., Fitzpatrick-Matthews, K. and Aldhouse-Green, M. J. 2006. "A Dea Nutrix figurine from a Romano-British cemetery at Baldock, Hertfordshire", *Britannia* 37, 2006, 273-294.
- Cólera, C. J. 2003. "De Andoounnabo, Onno y Vxovne", *Études Celtiques* 35, 2003, 249-256.
- Coromines, J. 1975. « Les plombs sorothaptiques d'Arles », *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 91, 1975, 1-53.
- De Bernardo Stempel 2007. "Continuity, Translatio and Identificatio in Gallo-Roman Religion: The Case of Britain", in Haeussler and King (ed.) 2007, vol. 2.
- Delamarre, X. 2003, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise: Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental* (2nd ed., Paris).
- DeMaris, R.E. 1995. « Demeter in Roman Corinth: Local Development in a Mediterranean Religion », *Numen* 42/2, 1995, 105-117.
- Dorcey, P. F. 1987. *The Cult of Silvanus in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor).
- Duval, P.-M. 1976. *Les dieux de la Gaule* (2nd edition, Paris).
- Euskirchen, M. 1993. «Epona», *BerRGK* 74, 609-850.
- Euskirchen, M. 2001. „Ogmios – ein wenig bekannter Gott,“ in G. Brands, J.-N. Andrikopoulou-Strack, D. Dexheimer und G. Bauchhenß (Hrsg.), *Rom und die Provinzen. Gedenkschrift H. Gabelmann* (Beihefte Bonner Jahrbücher 53, Mainz) pp. 119-124.
- Fiches, J.-L. and V. Mathieu 2002. « Ambrussum. Villetelle (Hérault), » in : J.-L. Fiches (ed.), *Les agglomérations gallo-romains en Languedoc-Roussillon, vol. II* (Lattes) pp. 521-557.
- Fleuriot, L. 1980. « Inscriptions gauloises sur céramique et l'exemple d'une inscription de La Graufesenque et d'une autre de Lezoux », *Études Celtiques* 17, 111-144.
- Fleuriot, L., *Études Celtiques* 19, 1982, 125.
- Forcey, C. 1998. "Whatever Happened to the Heroes? Ancestral cults and the enigma of Romano-Celtic temples," In: C. Forcey, J. Hawthorne and R. Witcher, *TRAC 97. Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, April 1997*. (Oxford) pp. 87-98.
- Forrer, R. 1948. *Die helvetischen und helveto-römischen Votivbeilchen der Schweiz* (Basel).
- Fulford, M.G. and Rippon, S.J. 1994. "Lowbury Hill, Oxon: a re-assessment of the probable Romano-Celtic temple and the Anglo-Saxon barrow," *Archaeological Journal* 151, 158-211.
- Gabba, E. and Crawford, M.H. 1996. "Lex coloniae Genetiva", in Crawford, M.H. (ed.), *Roman Statutes*, London, pp. 393-454.
- Garcia, D. 2004. *La Celtique méditerranéenne. Habitats et sociétés en Languedoc et en Provence VIIIe-Ile siècles av. J.-C.* (Paris).

- Garrard-Burnett, V. 2004. «The Third Church in Latin America: Religion and Globalization in Contemporary Latin America», *Latin American Research Review* 39/3, 2004, 256-269.
- Goudinau, C. (ed.), 2006. *Religion et société en Gaule* (Paris).
- Goudineau, C. and P. Verdier 2006. « Religion et science », in Goudineau (ed.) 2006, pp. 27-77.
- Green, M. 1984. *The wheel as a cult-symbol in the Romano-Celtic world with special reference to Gaul and Britain* (Bruxelles)
- Green, M. 1992. *Dictionary of Celtic Myth and Legend*. (London)
- Guiraud, R. 1992, «Le fanum de Colombières-sur-Orb (Hérault)», in: Chr. Landes (éd.), *Dieux guérisseurs en Gaule romaine, Catalogue d'exposition, Lattes, Musée Henri Prades*, pp. 47-56.
- Haeussler, R. and King, A. (ed.) 2007. *Continuity and Innovation in Religion in the Roman West*, 2 vols (JRA supplement no. 67) Portsmouth, Rhode Island.
- Haeussler, R. 1997. "Ideology, power and the meaning of Roman culture. The changing motivational force of Roman culture," *Accordia Research Papers* 7, 93-111.
- Haeussler, R. 2001-2002. "Fusion and resistance in native religions in Gallia Narbonensis and Britain," *Veleia* 18-19, 79-116 (=J. Gorrochategui and P. De Bernardo Stempel (edd.), *Los Celtas y su religion a través de la epigrafía* (Vitoria) 2004, 79-116)
- Haeussler, R. 2005a. "Alte und neue Götter in der Römischen Provence," in W. Spickermann and R. Wiegels (edd.), *Keltische Götter im römischen Reich. Akten des 4. Internationalen Workshops „Fontes Epigraphici Religionis Celticae Antiquae“ (F.E.R.C.AN.) vom 4.-6.10.2002 an der Universität Osnabrück* (Möhnesee) pp. 59-93.
- Haeussler, R. 2005b. „Dynamik der Romanisierung der Religion. Zur Kultkontinuität in der Narbonensis,“ in: W. Spickermann (ed.), *Rom, Germanien und das Reich. Festschrift R. Wiegels* (St. Katharinen) pp. 340-369.
- Haeussler, R. 2007a. "The dynamics and contradictions of religious change in Gallia Narbonensis", in Haeussler and King (edd.), 2007, vol. 1 (in print).
- Haeussler, R. 2007b, "A new sacred landscape at the fringes of the Roman Empire: the civitas Vangionum", in: Haeussler and King (edd.), 2007, vol. 2 (in print).
- Hainzmann, M. 2004. "Jupiter Depulsor - Die norischen Befunde," in: Ruscu, L. et al. (Hgg.), *Orbis antiquus. Studia in honorem Ioannis Pisonis*, (Cluj-Napoca) 2004, pp. 224-234.
- Haselgrove, C. 2007. « Iron Age coin finds from religious sites and contexts in northern Gaul », in: Haeussler and King (edd.) 2007, vol. 2.
- Hatt, J.-J., 1952. "Les monuments gallo-romains de Paris, et les origines de la sculpture votive en Gaule romaine. Du pilier des nautes de Paris à la colonne de Mayence, » *Revue Archéologique*, 1952, 68-83.
- Hofeneder, A. 2007. „Mercurius Arvernus: Überlegungen zu Plin. nat. hist. 34, 45–47“, in Haeussler and King (ed.) 2007 (in print).
- Hupe, J. 1997. „Studien zum Gott Merkur im römischen Gallien und Germanien“, *Trierer Zeitschrift* 60, 1997, 53-227.
- Isserlin, R.M.J. 1994. "An archaeology of brief time: monuments and seasonality in Roman Britain,“ in S. Cottam (ed.), *TRAC94. Proceedings of the 4th Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, Durham 1994*, (Oxford) pp. 45-56.
- Jacomín, B. 2006. *Le pilier des Nautes de Lutèce. Astronomie, mythologie et fêtes celtiques*. (Montigny le Bretonneux).
- Jerem, E. 2007. "Applying interdisciplinarity in the research of Celtic religion: the case of the Eravisci." In: Haeussler and King (ed.) 2007, vol. 1 (in print).
- D'Arbois de Jubainville, G. 1898. « Esus, Tarvos, Trigaranus, » *Revue Celtique* 19, 1898, 245-251.
- Jufer, N. and T. Luginbühl 2001. *Répertoire des dieux gaulois* (Paris)

- Kiernan, P. 2007. « Symbols and substitutes: some observations on ritual model objects from the Roman North-West », in : Haeussler and King (edd.), 2007, vol. 1 (in print).
- King, A.C. 2005. "Animal remains from temples in Roman Britain," *Britannia* 36, 2005, 329-369.
- King, A.C. 2007a. "Romano-Celtic temples in Britain: Gallo-Roman influence or indigenous development?" in: Haeussler and King (edd.) 2007, vol. 1 (in print).
- King, A.C. 2007b. "Coins and Coin Hoards from Romano-Celtic Temples in Britain", in: Haeussler and King (edd.) 2007, vol. 2 (in print).
- King, A.C. and Sothe, G. 2001. "Internal organisation and deposition at the Iron Age temple on Hayling Island, Hampshire," in J. Collis (ed.), *Society and Settlement in Iron Age Europe (Actes du XVIII^e Colloque du l'AFEF, Winchester)*, (Sheffield Archaeological Monograph 11) pp. 111-124.
- Lambert, P.-Y. 1980. *Études Celtiques* 17, 1980, 175-8.
- Lambert, P.-Y. 1993. « Notes gauloises : 1 βρατουδεκαντεμ », in : W. Meid and P. Anreiter (edd.), *Die grösseren altkeltischen Sprachdenkmäler*. (Innsbruck) pp. 86-94.
- Lambert, P.-Y. « Compléments gallo-grecs », *Études Celtiques* 31, 1995, 118-21
- Lambot, B. 2006. « Religion et habitat. Les fouilles d'Acy-Romance », in : Goudineau (ed.) 2006, pp. 177-190.
- Lavagne, H. 1979. «Les dieux de la Gaule Narbonnaise: 'romanité' et romanisation',» *Journal des Savants* 1979, 155-197
- Le Roux, F. and C.-J. Guyonvarc'h 1991. *La société celtique dans l'idéologie trifonctionnelle et la tradition religieuse indo-européennes* (Rennes)
- Lejeune, M. 1976-1977. «Textes gaulois et gallo-romains en cursive latine,» *Études Celtiques* 15, 1976-1977, 151-6
- Lejeune, M. 1985. *Recueil des Inscriptions Gauloises (R.I.G.), vol. I, Textes gallo-grecs* (45^e supplément à Gallia, Paris).
- Legge, A.J.; Williams, J. and Williams, P. 2000, "Lambs to the slaughter: sacrifice at two Roman temples in southern England," in P. Rowley-Conwy (ed.), *Animal Bones, Human Societies* (Oxford) 2000, pp. 152-7.
- Lepetz, S. 2000. "Sacrifice et inhumation de chevaux et de chiens en France du nord au III^e siècle après J.-C.", in : L. Bodson (ed.) *Ces animaux que l'homme choisit d'inhumer. Contribution à l'étude de la place et du rôle de l'animal dans les rites funéraires* (Liège) pp. 93-125.
- Lepetz, S. and Méniel, P. 2002. "Les dépôts d'animaux non consommés en Gaule romaine, » in: S. Lepetz and W. Van Andringa, 2002, *Archéologie du sacrifice animal en Gaule romaine. Volume des pré-actes* (Paris) pp. 47-56.
- Mac Neill, M. 1962. *The Festival of Lughnasa: A study of the survival of the Celtic festival of the beginning of the harvest* (Oxford).
- Maniquet, C. 2005. « Le dépôt gaulois de Tintignac, » *Archéologia* 419, 02/2005, 16-23
- Martin-Kilchner, S. 1998. „Gräber der späten Republik und der frühen Kaiserzeit am Lago Maggiore: Tradition und Romanisierung,“ *Xantener Berichte. Grabung – Forschung – Präsentation* 7, 1998, 191-252.
- Meid, W. 2003. „Keltische Religion im Zeugnis der Sprache.“ *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 53, 2003, 20-40 (= Gorrochategui, P. and De Bernardo Stempel, P. 2004, *Die Kelten und ihre Religion im Spiegel der Sprache*, Vitoria 2004, pp. 175-195).
- Méniel, P. 2006. „Religion et sacrifice d'animaux“, in: Goudineau (ed.) 2006, pp. 165-175.
- Méniel, P. and M. Jouin 2000. "Les inhumations d'animaux de Vertault (Côte-d'Or, début de notre ère)", in : L. Bodson (ed.), *Ces animaux que l'homme choisit d'inhumer. Contribution à l'étude de la place et du rôle de l'animal dans les rites funéraires* (Liège) pp. 65-91.
- Metzler, J. 2006. „Religion et politique. L'oppidum trévire du Titelberg“ in: Goudineau (ed.) 2006, pp. 191-202.

- Millett, M. 1995. „Rethinking Religion in Romanization“, in: Metzler, J. et al. (ed.) *Integration in the Early Roman West. The role of culture and ideology*. (Luxembourg) 1995, pp. 93-100.
- Miron, A.V.B. 1996. „Alexander von Abonuteichos. Zur Geschichte des Orakels des Neos Asklepios Glykon“, in: Leschhorn, W. et al. (edd.), *Hellas und der griechische Osten. Festschrift für Peter Robert Franke*. (Saarbrücken), pp. 153-188.
- Moitriex, G. 2001. *Hercules in Gallia. Recherches sur la personnalité et le culte d'un dieu romain en Gaule*. (Paris).
- Niblett, R. 1992. „A Catuvellaunian chieftain's burial from St. Albans“, *Antiquity* 66, 1992, 917-929.
- Olmsted, G.S. 1979. *The Gundestrup Caulon* (Bruxelles).
- Olmsted, G.S. 1994. *The gods of the Celts and the Indo-Europeans*. (Innsbruck).
- Piccottini, G. 1996. „Aesus“, in: *Carinthia* I 186, 1996, 97-103.
- Poux, M. 2006. « Religion et société. Le sanctuaire arverne de Corent », in Goudineau (ed.) 2006, pp. 117-134.
- Py, M. 1978. *L'oppidum des Castels à Nages, Gard, fouilles 1958-1974* (35^e supplément à Gallia, Paris).
- Remy, B. and Buisson, A. 1992. „Les inscriptions commémorant la chute de la foudre dans les provinces romaines de la Gaule. À propos d'un nouveau document découvert à Saint-George-en-Valdaine (Isère)“, *Revue Archéologique de Narbonnaise* 25, 1992, 83-104.
- Roth Congès, A. 1997. „La fortune éphémère de Glanum: du religieux à l'économique“, *Gallia* 54, 1997, 157-202.
- Roth Congès, A. 2000. *Glanum. De l'oppidum salyen à la cité romaine* (Paris).
- Saragoza, F., Pariselle, C., Meyohmas, M.-E. 2003. « Le pilier des nautes retrouvé. Histoire d'une métamorphose ». *Archéologia* 398, mars 2003.
- Sauer, E. 2005. *Coins, Cult and Cultural Identity: Augustan coins, hot springs and the early Roman baths at Bourbonne-les-Bains* (Leicester).
- Scherrer, P. 2004. „Taranis im Donauraum? – Überlegungen zu lokalen Gottheiten in Noricum und Pannonien“, in: *Festschrift Gerhard Winkler zum 70. Geburtstag*, (Linz), pp. 91-108.
- Shanks, M. and Tilley, C. 1987. *Social Theory and Archaeology*. (Cambridge).
- Sterckx, C. 1986. *Éléments de cosmogonie celtique* (Bruxelles).
- Strauss, C. and D'Andrade, R. G. (edd.) 1992. *Human motives and cultural models*. (Cambridge).
- Szabó, D. 2006. „Par Taranis? Par Toutatis? Par Teutanas? Le culte de Jupiter Teutanas chez les Celtes danubiens. » In : Goudineau (ed.) 2006, pp. 203-206.
- Thurnwald, R. 1932. „The Psychology of Acculturation“, *American Anthropologist* N.S. 34, 1932, 557-69.
- Tilley, C. 1982. „Social formation, social structures and social change“, in: Hodder, I. (ed.), *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology* (Cambridge), 1982, pp. 26-38.
- Turner, R. 1999. *Excavations of an Iron Age Settlement and Roman Religious Complex at Ivy Chimneys, Witham, Essex 1978-1983*. (Chelmsford, East Anglian Archaeology Report 88).
- Van Andringa, W. 2002. *La religion en Gaule romaine. piété et politique (Ier - IIIe siècle apr. J.-C.)* (Paris).
- Vannacci Lunazzi, G. 1996. „Un aspetto della romanizzazione del territorio: la necropoli di Gambolò-Belcreda (Pavia)“. *Quaderni della Soprintendenza di archeologia del Piemonte* 14, 1996.
- Vendryes, J. 1948. *La religion des Celtes* (Paris).
- Webster, G. 1986a. *The British Celts and their Gods under Rome* (London).
- Webster, G. 1986b. „What the Britons required from the gods as seen through the pairing of Roman and Celtic deities and the character of votive offerings“, in M. Henig and A. King (edd.) *Pagan Gods and Shrines of the Roman Empire* (Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph no. 8, Oxford).

- Webster, J. 2001. « Creolizing the Roman Provinces », *American Journal of Archaeology* 105, 2001, 209-25.
- Woolf, G. 1998. *Becoming Roman. The origins of provincial civilization in Gaul* (Cambridge).
- Worrell, S. 2006. "Finds Reported under the Portable Antiquities Scheme", *Britannia* 37, 2006, 429-466.
- Zeidler, J. 2002. "On the etymology of *Grannus*", *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 53, 2002, 77-92.
- Zwicker, J. 1934-1936. *Fontes historiae religionis Celticae*, 3 vols.



■ FIG. 1a

Regina-altar from Lanchester (Durham, RIB 1084)



■ FIG. 1b

dea Regina from Leamington (Glos., RIB 125)



■ FIG. 2 a

Deo Mer(curio) from York
(after RIB I 655 = CSIR I. 3, p. 4, no. 7 (plate 2))



■ FIG. 2 b

Deo | Mer|curio relief from Vindolanda
(RIB I 1963 = CSIR I. 6, no. 79 (plate 21))



■ FIG. 2 c

Ma(r)t(i) Do() from Tre Owen
(*Britannia* 9, 1978, 473, no. 4;
pl.XXXb = CSIR I. 5, p. 14, no. 15 (plate 6))



■ FIG. 3

Distribution of Romano-Celtic temples (left) and of votive inscriptions (right) (after Millett, 1990).



■ FIG. 4

Dedication of an axe to Mars and Dexiva; lammella in form of a sacrificial axe blade (after ILN-3, 221)