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Fig. 3.4 Plaster cast of the front and rear side of the stone from Rindern, dedicated by cives Remi for the well-being of the emperor Nero to their principal god Mars Camulus (CIL XIII 8701 = AE 1980 656; photographs RLM Bonn). The emperor’s name was partly deleted and erroneously restored soon after the discovery of the inscription in the early 16th century. The rear side shows a corona civica and an abbreviated text which should be read o(b) c(ives) s(ervatos), “for the rescue of the citizens”.

legionary commander C. Vibius Viscus Macrinus. Thanks to the mention of his name it can be dated to the middle of the 1st century. The first non-military inscription is that on the votive altar of Ruimel, dedicated to Magusanus Hercules and consecrated by a summus magistratus of the Batavi. The dating in the middle of the 1st century is based on a combination of three arguments, namely the precedence of the native name element in the invocation of the deity, the reference to a monocratic administration system and the absence of Roman citizenship in the case of this magistrate (fig. 3.3). The last two pre-Flavian inscriptions originate from altar stones from Rindern and Xanten. They were dedicated to the well-being of the emperor Nero and can therefore be dated in the period of his rule. On the basis of their similarities in style and formulation, it is assumed that they came from the same workshop. Their dedication possibly refers to the same historical event. The votive

---

68 Finke 1927, no. 274; Alfoldy 1967a, 5-6.
69 CIL XIII 8771 = AE 1994, 1281; Bogaers 1950; Bogaers 1960/61, 268-271; Willems 1984, 211 and 226-228 with fig. 127.
70 Rüger 1981b, who thinks of the revolt of C. Iulius Vindex, governor of Gallia Lugdunensis, against Nero in 68. Cf. here also the remarks by Instinsky (1959) on a similar inscription for the well-being of the emperor Nero from Mainz.
are of particular interest. The first is the group of inscriptions with ‘double names’ which appear to offer a promising entry to the study of the transformation of male deities. They form (together with their ‘pure’ Roman counterparts) the main topic of the following section. A second important group consists of the inscriptions for the indigenous goddesses, in particular the matronae. With their disproportionate share in the name material, their prominent place in the conceptual universes of the groups settled here is undeniable but, judging from the retention of the native name, their cult also appears at first sight to display an opposite tendency to that of their male counterparts. For this reason, they will be the main theme of the concluding section.

3.4 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, REGIONAL AND LOCAL CULTS

Essential to an understanding of the spatial patterns of Roman provincial cults is a distinction between various levels and forms of organization. A crucial concept in this respect is that of the cult community. By this I mean a group of people who together share the worship of a certain deity and the use of a cult place consecrated to that deity. At least two levels can be distinguished in the organization of the cults from the Roman period, namely a local and a regional level. In addition, a distinction can be made between public and private cults. Unlike our common usage, this distinction does not refer to the public or closed character of a cult as much as to its legal status. The incorporation of the local communities in the Roman state and their transformation into civitates signifies legally that they had become subject to Roman law. Of old in this law, a distinction was made between a public domain, which referred to the general interest of the state as a whole (the res publica) or of its official subdivisions (pagi), and a private domain concerned with the particular interests of individual citizens or certain social groups. Whereas the state was directly responsible for the public domain, it had only a supervisory role with regard to the private domain. This legal duality did not only exist in political and administrative matters but also in religious affairs. While the official rituals of the Roman public cult were performed by a magistrate or priest on behalf of and for the benefit of the community and were financed by the general fund, a cult which was considered private by Roman legal standards focused on the welfare of a sub-group in society which was expected to bear the costs itself. On the basis of these differences, the cults which were linked with the pagus or civitas may be regarded as public; they are by definition of regional importance. Private cults were generally organized on the basis of kinship or co-residence and therefore more likely to be of local importance. In exceptional cases they could also acquire regional or even supraregional importance. This occurs, for example, with the cults of patron gods of some professional groups organized in guilds.

If we wish to understand the changes in the conceptual universes as they existed in the pre-Roman period, the above distinctions are an absolute precondition. Apart from this, we have to become fully alive to possible correlations between patterns of worship on the one hand, and general social developments, certain ways of life and particular mentalities of the cult communities in question on the other hand. In order to achieve such connections, I shall repeatedly refer to the general characteristics of religious conceptions outlined in section 3.1. But let us start at the base and see first...

---

8) Fundamental are still Wissowa’s explanations (1912, 380 ff., esp. 398 ff.). See in addition Dumézil 1996 (1966), 554-555; Scheid 1991a; Bakker 1994, 1-3. Which cults were considered public and which private, was a matter for the civitas authorities. The public cults were marked on an official calendar, the private cults were only under their supervision.
On closer inspection of the dedications to gods with ‘double names’, one notices that the association between native and Roman names of gods is bound by strict rules. For a start, a large variety of native gods appears to be associated with a limited group of Roman gods. From the whole range of gods that populated the Roman pantheon, Mars and Mercury were chosen time after time as counterparts for native gods.\textsuperscript{64} The only other gods to be selected are Hercules, Apollo and Silvanus. Moreover, the associations appear to be limited in that a native god is always linked with the same Roman god.\textsuperscript{65} A clear regional differentiation also appears to exist in the option for Mars or

\textsuperscript{64} The dominance of Mars and Mercury in the associations with native gods is a well-known phenomenon. According to Thevenot (1968, 52-53), there are in Gaul c. 70 different local gods associated with Mars, against c. 25 with Mercury, 15 with Apollo and 12 with Jupiter.

\textsuperscript{65} Exceptions are sparse and only known from outside the study area. Thevenot 1955, 165.
Hercules, in which Mars appears as the counterpart of the gods in the civitates in the southern part of the study area and Hercules in those of the northern part (fig. 3.5). Finally, a system can also be observed in the distribution of the native name elements. However, the complexity of the matter requires that we discuss this in more detail. I shall deal with the double names one by one, and begin with those whose Roman name element is Mars.

In the distribution of votive inscriptions for local gods associated with Mars, a cluster can be observed in the Trier area (fig. 3.6). If we regard the votive inscriptions to Lenus Mars and Mars lovantucarus from the sanctuary of Trier-'Irminenwingert' as dedications to one and the same god, the dedications to this god are the most numerous (appendix 3.2). Moreover, they are spread over large sections of the civitas Treverorum, and they are connected with one of the most monumental sanctuaries in the study area, situated just outside the civitas capital of Trier. For these reasons, Lenus Mars is rightly considered the main god of the Treveri.

Against Lenus, to whom numerous inscriptions were dedicated, there is a whole series of other gods associated with Mars for whom only one or a few votive inscriptions have been preserved. For some of these gods the findspots of the inscriptions are concentrated in a small area surrounding a cult place which develops in the Roman period into a monumental sanctuary. This is, for instance, the case with the dedications to Mars Cnabetius around the sanctuary of Schwarzenbach and of Mars Loucetius around that of Ober-Olm (fig. 3.6). These gods may be tentatively interpreted as the principal gods of pagi.

A similar spatial clustering is not observable in the case of other gods associated with Mars. Nevertheless they too can be interpreted more or less easily as main gods of civitates or pagi. That the findspots of their inscriptions are so far apart is due to the sharply increasing mobility in the Roman period. This meant that private dedications to these gods could take place far beyond one's own civitas or pagus. That there is no question of clustering in the 'home area' of the god in question is usually connected with the general scarcity of inscriptions in the region concerned (cf. fig.

---

86 The spatial differentiation is more striking than the distribution pattern reveals at first sight, since we can be certain that two of the three dedicators of inscriptions to Mars in the Lower Rhine area came from the southern regions. See section 3.2 with notes 71-72. The dedications to Hercules Saxanus in the stone quarries of Norroy and the Brohdal have not been mapped here. They stem from a Roman perception of the landscape. Bedon 1984; Bauchhenß 1986; this study, section 3.1.

87 For studies of the local Mars gods in the Trier area, see Behrens 1941; Krier/Schwinden 1974, 131-132; Hatt 1979; Merten 1985; Roymans 1990, 53-58.

88 For example Roymans 1990, 57; Derks 1991, note 68. Cf. however Merten 1985, 53-61, who does not only oppose such an identification, but, on the basis of the epigraphical evidence even refuses to regard the sanctuary as a cult place of Lenus Mars. Merten's objections can be removed by assuming that, by the addition of the epithet 'lovantucarus', the indigenous name element Lenus is omitted. The same state of affairs possibly applies to the two votive inscriptions of Tholey, which were dedicated to Mercurius lovantucarus and Mercurius? Vijsucius (CIL XIII 4256 and 4257 resp.).

89 Gose 1955. For other indications, see the discussion in section 4.6 about the exedrae found in this sanctuary.

90 The sanctuary of Schwarzenbach is still unpublished. A large Gallo-Roman temple was excavated at the foot of an oppidum here. The excavation of the sanctuary at Ober-Olm dates from the end of the 19th century. A plan is not known. Architectural fragments of the temple (particularly of wall-tablets and floor slabs of imported stone sorts) and a monumental spring and rich mobilia from excavations and more recent investigations point to an important sanctuary.

Fig. 3.6 Findspots of votive inscriptions to originally indigenous gods associated with Mars (numbering corresponds to that in appendix 3.2).

A Lenus Mars/Mars lovantucar/us; B Mars Loucetius; C (Mars) Intarabus; D Mars Camulus; E (Mars) Cnabetius; F other gods associated with Mars (larger symbol: more than two inscriptions).

3.2). Mars Camulus, despite the fact that he is only mentioned in a single isolated inscription in Reims (cf. fig. 3.11), can be regarded as the principal god of the Remi. The inscription found in Reims can be supplemented with others from Rindern and Rome in which the dedicators explicitly describe themselves as citizens of the North Gallic civitas. Conversely, gods from other parts of the empire who had undergone the same transformations as those in the study area could be invoked here by worshippers from their 'home land' who travelled abroad. Examples are the singular dedications to Mars Cicolluis and Mars Caturix whose centres of worship lay outside the study area in the territory of the Lingones and Helvetii respectively. I therefore assume that, generally speaking, the cults of the Romanized gods associated with Mars are connected with civitates and pagi.

---

92 For a discussion of this inscription, see infra with note 136.
93 See supra, note 72 (Rindern); CIL VI, 46 (Rome).
94 Enumerations of the votive inscriptions to these gods can be found in Thévenot 1955, 43-45; Hatt 1979, 129.
Arguments for this can be derived from the existence of official priestly offices (table 3.4), the involvement of magistrates and the monumental nature of the sanctuaries connected with these cults. In addition the distribution of votive inscriptions by private worshippers and the ethnic identity of some dedicators may be adduced as supporting evidence. On the basis of such arguments it is certain that the worship of Lenus Mars was registered as a public cult in the official calendar of the civitas Treverorum. For the other Mars gods, the public character of their cult can be assumed with more or less certainty.

If the local gods which transformed into Roman Mars served primarily as official protectors of dedites and pagi, the same public role may probably also be assumed for the god (or hero?) who transformed into Hercules in the Lower Rhine area. Though the number of inscriptions on which we can base our argument in this case is considerably smaller, we may assume that Hercules Magusanus at any rate was the principal god in the civitas Batavorum.

With regard to the cult of Mars Camulus, for example, one could point to the monumental character of the lettering on the stone from Reims (cf. fig. 3.11), to the characteristic association with the imperial cult as well as to the status of the dedicator (see infra).

Bogaers 1955, 173; Raepsaet-Charlier 1994, 54.

The dedication of the Empel sanctuary to Hercules Magusanus is based on the find of a votive inscription by a veteran which mentions the name of the deity (cf. fig. 3.12 and infra, note 152), as well as on the find of a statuette of Hercules and of many Roman militaria. The votive inscription of the summus magistratus possibly originally came from the sanctuary of Empel. See AE 1994, 1281 = Roymans/Derks 1993, 1994a.

For the inscriptions from the civitas Batavorum, see appendix 3.1. With the exception of the inscription from Westkapelle all inscriptions from the Netherlands listed there originate from Batavian territory. For the inscription from Rome, CIL VI 31162.

Table 3.4 Priests known from the Gallo-Germanic provinces who were involved in the public cult of the principal god of their civitas.
Fig. 3.7 Findspots of votive inscriptions to originally indigenous gods associated with Mercury, Apollo or Silvanus (numbering corresponds to that in appendices 3.3 to 3.5).

A dedications to gods associated with Mercury; B dedications to gods associated with Apollo; C dedications to a god associated with Silvanus (larger symbol: more than two inscriptions).

among these groups (cf. fig. 3.2), the small number of inscriptions cannot exclude the possibility that this demigod also served as a principal god there.

Dedications to gods associated with Mercury are spread over the entire Central and Lower Rhine area (fig. 3.7). In the distribution of native name elements, however, hardly any clustering can be observed. In addition, it is striking that the sanctuaries in which these gods were worshipped are generally rather simple and modest. They are either simple cult buildings without a *porticus* or soberly-designed Gallo-Roman temples of a modest size. Finally, in the building inscriptions of sanctuaries dedicated to Mercury, foundations by private individuals predominate. The conclusion imposes itself on us that the cult of Mercury was generally of a private nature and mainly of local importance.

" Cf. appendix 4.2. Exceptions are the sanctuaries where the cult of Mercury was clearly linked with that of the emperor, *i.e.* those at Melun (*CIL* XIII 3010-3014), Berthouville (*CIL* XIII 3183; Grenier 1960, 768 ff.; *Gallia informations* 1992-2, 70) and Cologne (*CIL* XIII 8326 = Galsterer/Galsterer 1975, no. 121), and possibly also the sanctuary at Wasserbillig (*CIL* XIII 4208; Raepsaet-Charlier 1986).
More or less the same can be said of the cult of Apollo. Wherever this deity is invoked by a double name, this is usually Grannus (cf. appendix 3.4). None of the dedications to this god, however, was made by a magistrate or priest and other evidence for a public cult such as the link with a monumental temple is also lacking. Findspots and texts of votive inscriptions in which only the Roman name Apollo appears do not usually contain any indications for a public cult either, so that we must assume that the cult of Apollo in Northern Gaul was also mainly of local importance.

Silvanus, finally, is only indisputably associated with an indigenous god in a dedication from Gérouville and in a Felsinschrift from Busenberg. It concerns the local god Sinquates and the mountain god Vosegus respectively (cf. appendix 3.5). The singularity of the example and especially the nature of the Busenberg inscription make a public character of the cult highly improbable. For the moment, we can summarize our conclusions therefore as follows. While, judging from the geographical distribution of their inscriptions, their association with monumental sanctuaries and the involvement of official priests or magistrates, the gods associated with Mars and Hercules can be linked with a public cult of regional importance, dedications to Mercury, Apollo and Silvanus must be regarded as expressions of private cults whose importance remained primarily restricted to a local community.

Now that we have discovered some patterns in the associations between native and Roman gods and have acquired some insight in the organization and distribution of the various cults, we arrive at one of the main issues of this chapter. How are the observed patterns to be explained? Who may be held responsible for the realization of the associations, and what is their precise significance? Are they basically no more than a superficial veneer, as most authors would have it, or should we assume a deep transformation of the originally indigenous gods? In answering these questions the emphasis will lie on the gods associated with Mars and Hercules. The other divinities will be discussed, more briefly, in the second instance.

A first conclusion is that the limited variety in Roman counterparts can only be meaningfully interpreted as an indication of a specific selection connected with a native perception of the Roman pantheon. Not only does Roman history convincingly show that, as long as public order was not threatened, Rome did not seek any interference with the religious life of her subjects, but also the rationale of an imperial guidance of the various local communities in different directions is difficult to understand. I assume therefore that the associations were in essence products of local inter-

---

The great thermae complex cum sanctuary at Aachen, which is expressly connected with the Roman army (see section 4.6), I shall not discuss here. For a public cult of Apollo Grannus outside the actual study area, I refer to the inscription of Neuenstadt am Kocher (CIL XIII 6462), dedicated by a decurio of the civitas Aureliae G in honour of the deified imperial house, and to the sanctuary of Faimingen (Weber 1978; Eingartner et al. 1993).

Exceptions are the sanctuaries of Grand and Nizy-le-Comte, where the cult probably had a public character. In the case of Grand, this assumption is based mainly on historical mentions of the place as a sanctuary in combination with the monumentality of the theatre (cf. Wightman 1986, 569; Gallia 26, 1968, 394 ff.; Gros 1991a, 140; Gschaid 1994, note 313). For Nizy we have an inscription (CIL XIII 3450) in which deus Apollo figures as the tutelary deity of the pagus Venecis belonging to the civitas of the Remi. Cf. also for the provincial capital of Cologne, Galsterer/Galsterer 1975, nos. 4-5.


Here I disagree with all those who wish to link the 'double names' with Tacitus' interpretatio Romana, and thus, whether or not intentionally, hold the Roman authorities responsible for the associations. Cf. Derks 1991, 236-237 (esp. note 13), 248-249. Nor can I agree with the view of Webster, who places the 'dou-
interpretations. Probably they were first made shortly after the Roman conquest. For the Gallic interior, this would have been the period between Caesar and Augustus, for the Lower Rhine area the Augusto-Tiberian period. The initiative must have been taken by members of the elite. Not only did they have most knowledge of Roman religious ideas and values, but they also were most open to ‘symbols of Romanitas’ due to their intermediary position. Those deserving special attention in this respect are the magistrates who were responsible for part of the public cult, and the priests, especially those who were connected with the cults of the gods in question (table 3.4). Little is known about the latter group, certainly in the earliest periods, but those we are introduced to in the scanty epigraphical evidence, appear to have served, prior to their appointment as priest, as commanders of auxiliary troops with the Roman army or to have held important offices in the civitas.¹⁰⁴

A second conclusion is that the gods which eventually were associated with Mars or Hercules must have been of vital importance at the time of the Roman conquest. In their quality as protectors of civitates and pagi, they were certainly consulted in affairs of war and peace.¹⁰⁵ It is conceivable that Roman military superiority was attributed to the power and superiority of Rome’s gods. From this view, the principal local gods would preferably have been associated with those gods of the Roman pantheon to whom the local elite had assigned special martial capacities: Mars and Hercules. The role of Mars in Roman military affairs is evident. It is visible primarily in the temple dedicated to him at the Forum of Augustus in Rome (fig. 2.1), as well as in the rituals performed there.¹⁰⁶ Also the well-known lustratio of arms on the Campus Martius could be mentioned, which opened and closed the warlike season in spring and autumn.¹⁰⁷ In the Rhineland, his relation with the army is expressed in various votive inscriptions in which, according to epithets such as Militaris, Propugnator and Victor, he is invoked explicitly for his role on the battlefield.¹⁰⁸ Martial qualities can also be attributed to Hercules, as seen in inscriptions from Bonn and the Brohldal in which he is invoked as Victor and Invictus, respectively,¹⁰⁹ and as shown on a Roman military belt fitted with gold plates depicting the deeds of Hercules.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴ Derks 1991, 252-253. We should not, of course, forget that apart from these priests who were open to Roman ideas, there were others who were far less amenable to change. These included, at any rate, the druids, whose activities were finally forbidden by the emperor Claudius (after earlier suppression by the emperors Augustus and Tiberius of rituals led by them). Cf. Piggott 1974, 108 ff.

¹⁰⁵ Compare here chapter 4, note 149, and chapter 5, note 84.

¹⁰⁶ See section 2.1.

¹⁰⁷ Wissowa 1912, 144; Dumézil 1996, 206.

¹⁰⁸ CIL XIII 8019, Bonn (building inscription by the commander of the army camp of legio I M); CIL XIII 8017, Bonn-Beuel (collective dedication by the legio I M cum auxiliis); CIL XIII 8831, apud Batavos reperta (collective dedication by gladiatores CGPF).

¹⁰⁹ CIL XIII 8011; 7695-7696. It is probably precisely this Roman custom of using epithets which served as a model for the syncretisms. Local inhabitants and Romans could both recognize something of their own world of experience in it. The indigenous population perhaps mainly heard the old, vernacular name (which comes first in some dedications), while to Roman ears, syncretisms such as Hercules Magusanus probably sounded no less familiar basically than a god’s name such as Hercules Saxanus.

¹¹⁰ The belt was found with an iron coat of mail as a grave gift in Grab 622 of the Germanic cemetery at Kemnitzz. Geisler 1973 (catalogue); idem 1984 (description).
Though the option for Mars or Hercules is understandable from these considerations, the next question arises as to why Mars was chosen in some civitates and Hercules in others. There must have been other motives involved. To explain my point, I must refer to what I have already discussed in section 3.1. There I contested the view that there is a specialization between gods, in which each god is thought to be active in just one domain. All gods are omnipotent and in principle active in all fields of life. It is in their ways of intervention that they differ from each other. It is there too that the differences between Mars and Hercules may become visible.

Mars intervenes as a defender. “Whatever may be the objects which he is charged with protecting, he is the sentinel who operates at the front, on the threshold”.\textsuperscript{111} As such he could be equally active at the edge of the field of crops, as on the sickbed (cf. fig. 3.1) or the battlefield. Crucial to the understanding of Mars’ defensive interventions in the agrarian cycle is the famous passage from Cato’s De agricultura, in which the farmer receives the advice to implore Mars with the offering of sacrificial animals led around the estate “to obstruct, drive back and ward off visible and invisible plagues, infertility and destruction, disasters and storms”\textsuperscript{112}. While the example is among those cited most to demonstrate an agrarian function of Mars, it may illustrate his role as a defender rather than his involvement in the mysterious processes which perpetuate life.\textsuperscript{113} Similarly, in the ritual of the Ambarvalia, Mars is addressed for his protective, rather than for some presupposed regenerative powers. Apart from the fields, Mars may also watch over the herds. In the same prayer which is mentioned by Cato, Mars’ help is also requested for the rescue of herdsmen and livestock\textsuperscript{114}, though it is clear that Cato’s thoughts are initially for the crops in the fields.\textsuperscript{115} At this point it is important to stress that the most important rituals associated with Mars’ protective powers in the agrarian cycle, those of the lustratio, presuppose the domesticated land of a fundus whose boundary may be guarded by the watchful god. I am inclined to conclude that, though Mars was sometimes invoked for the protection of individual animals, this was certainly not the most prominent aspect of his cult. In this respect it may be revealing that in the famous armour-clad cult image of Mars Ultor in Rome, it is not depictions of animals but of cornucopiae and vine-branches which decorate its cuirass.\textsuperscript{116}

The reverse seems to apply to Hercules. He is the invincible hero, who, time and again, comes back victoriously to his point of departure, whether returning from a military campaign or some other difficult trip. As such, he could be the patron of soldiers, merchants and herdsmen. In Rome his most reputed monuments and temples are to be found on the Forum Boarium, the ‘cattle-market’ (fig. 3.8).\textsuperscript{117} Here was the temple of Hercules Invictus, the sanctuary for the public cult of the demigod, where the praetor urbanus annually brought his offerings. Here private cult organizations built their monuments in honour of their tutelary deity, the oil merchants their famous marble tholos

\textsuperscript{111} Dumézil 1996, 231.

\textsuperscript{112} The Latin text reads: uti tu (= Mars, TD) morbos visos invisosque viduertatem vastitudinemque calamitates interpe­riasque prohibesis defendas averuncesque (Cato, De agricultura 141, 2). For the interpretation, see also Wissowa 1912, 141 ff; esp. 143; Dumézil 1996 (1966), 231-234; Versnel 1981, 19; Scheid 1992, 38-39.

\textsuperscript{113} Dumézil 1996, 229.

\textsuperscript{114} Cato, De agricultura 141, 3: pastores pecuaque salva servas­sis. For the use of the verb servare, see also supra notes 39 and 72. Cf. also Dumézil 1996, 234-235, citing Cato’s, De agricultura 83, on a votum for oxen.

\textsuperscript{115} The text speaks of fruges frumenta vineta virgulaque and refers to arable farming and viniculture. Compare also my remarks in section 2.1 with note 47.

\textsuperscript{116} The cornucopiae are to be found on the two shoulder flaps, while the vine-branches form the background for two griffins placed centrally on the armour, symbols of Mars’ defensive power. Zanker 1988, 200 with fig. 155.

Fig. 3.8 Plan of the *Forum Boarium* and immediate surroundings in Rome indicating the monuments connected with a cult of Hercules (after Coarelli 1974, 280-281).

13 temple of Hercules Victor; 18 arch of the money-changers; 19 Aemilian temple of Hercules; 20 temple of Hercules at the Ara Maxima; 21 altar of Hercules (ara Maxima); 24 temple of Hercules Pompeianus.
and the moneychangers and cattle-dealers their monumental gateway to the square, decorated with reliefs of Hercules. Here too was the *ara maxima Herculis*, the imposing, Greek-style altar, which was considered to be at the origin of the cult in Italy. As these monuments and their connection with various cult communities may prove, in much the same way as in the case of Mars, the interventions of Hercules were not simply limited to a setting of violence. When it comes to the agrarian cycle, however, his special relationship with livestock, particularly cattle, is better-known than anything else. According to Roman mythology, Hercules managed, no less than three times, to bring back cattle stolen from him to Rome, where they found their pastures on the Forum Boarium. Moreover, in the western Mediterranean, Hercules was above all the patron of wandering herdsmen who sought a safe return for men and flocks. It is in this way that the association of many of his most important sanctuaries with market places along transhumance routes may be understood. From all this I am inclined to conclude that in Roman-Mediterranean conceptions there was a tendency to

---

119 KP, s.v. Cacus.
120 Cf. for example Coarelli 1987, 85 ff. (with respect to the large sub-urban sanctuary at Tivoli); Van Won
terghem 1992, 330-331 (with regard to the sanctuary in the city centre of Alba Fucens); Gros 1995 (regard-
ing the sanctuary at Glanum).
associate Mars more with agriculture and Hercules more with cattle-breeding, despite their being active in both fields.

If we now compare the distribution of votive inscriptions with Mars and Hercules associations to the agrarian practices of the local communities settled in the study area, a remarkable correlation occurs. The Mars dedications appear to come from those parts of the study area where the *villa* landscapes oriented on arable farming and viniculture predominate, whereas the Hercules dedications correlate to the area where cattle-breeding must have been dominant (cf. figs. 2.10 and 3.5). This can be no coincidence. We may conclude that the local elites, who as intermediaries were responsible for the associations, were well aware of the mythological tales connected with the various Roman gods, and in the choice of a tutelary god for their *civitas* or *pagus* opted deliberately for a deity who, in all his aspects, was most in keeping with their own perception of the world. The southern groups, which concentrated on agriculture, chose the god who could be seen as the protector of martial and urban values, while the Lower Rhine groups, who until recently had themselves practised raiding, opted for the hero who, by his deeds epitomized martial and pastoral values.\(^{121}\)

That, in the perception of the local *civitas*-elite, the agricultural practices were in fact under the protection of these gods, may, in the case of Mars, be demonstrated by the example of the sculptural decorations of the so-called *Porta Martis* in Reims (cf. fig. 3.10).\(^{122}\) This monumental arch was part of a pair or even a series of four arches, which originally stood over the two principal access roads to

\(^{121}\) The choice of Hercules may, for that matter, have been boosted by the fact that he was born a hero. In the cultural history of Northwest Europe, heroes, raiding and a subsistence economy based on stockbreeding appear to have been closely linked. Cf. here for example Irish mythology.

\(^{122}\) Esp. 3681; Picard 1974; Lefèvre/Legros 1985; Lefèvre 1988. The earliest mention of the name occurs in the ecclesiastical history of Reims by Flodoard (for the passage, see Heller/Waitz 1881, 413) dating from AD 952. It is generally taken to be genuinely Roman (note however the hesitations of Picard 1974, 60) and though Flodoard’s description of the arch’s decoration is succinct, there is no doubt as to the identification of his *Porta Martis* with the arch I am referring to here. The monument may perhaps be dated in the second half of the 2nd century (Picard 1974, 68).
the monumental city centre of Reims. The one discussed here, was situated at its northwest boundary and was built over the town's *cardo maximus.* Though the sculpture that once decorated the arch is now heavily damaged and parts of it even completely lost, drawings and engravings from the 17th century and later still provide a basis for discussion. The reliefs which for the moment are most relevant to our argument, are those which were attached to the ceilings of the three arcades that constituted the arch's gateways (fig. 3.9). The centre of each of these ceilings was filled with a mythological representation set in a square frame. In the frame of the central arcade (fig. 3.9, right) we find a series of scenes derived from agricultural life in the Reims countryside. We see, successively, the mounting of a horse, the whetting of scythe and sickle, a still life with rural produce, the harvesting of corn (with the Gallic mowing-machine, the *vallus*), the ploughing of a field, the gathering in of the grape harvest, the slaughtering of a pig and the use of cattle as draught animals. The composition in a frame around a central representation suggests that both parts of the decoration may be related to each other. Since the frame originally comprised twelve scenes, probably representing the twelve months of the agrarian cycle, specialists are inclined to interpret the main figure of the central scene as the Genius of the year. This may seem an attractive explanation at first sight, since it brings the various depictions into a coherent whole representing the elapsing of time, an interpretation which in addition seems to be corroborated by the fact that the main figure is surrounded by four *putti,* probably representing the four seasons. But it is certainly not without problems. In my opinion no definite objection can be adduced why the central figure could not be Mars as on the basis of the name of the arch may be expected. As we will see, such an interpretation has the same potential to organize all the representations into a coherent program and, moreover, it may define time and space in direct relation to the history and place of the Remi themselves rather than in purely abstract terms. If, for the time being, we assume that the main figure in the mythological scene placed in the most central position of this three-way arch, *i.e.* in the vault of the central arcade, is Mars himself, the god who gave the arch his name, the combination with the scenes in the frame may probably be taken as an indication that, in the perception of the Remian magistracy, their Mars

---

133 *Gallia* 12, 1954, 97; Neiss 1980, esp. 64-65 and pl. C; Neiss 1984, esp. 182 and pls. II, VIII.

134 Stern 1951; Picard 1974, 70-71. Others have suggested an interpretation as Tellus or Felicitas (Lefèvre 1988, 154, 157).

135 In the drawing of Espérandieu one is missing, but cf. for example, Legros 1971, pl. XII.

136 First, it does not account for the name of the arch. This problem can only be solved by either holding it for an abbreviation of, for example, *Porta ad templum Martis* in which case the name referred to a monument or building in the immediate vicinity of the arch rather than to the arch itself (as Lefèvre 1988), or by considering it a post-Roman invention (cf. *supra,* note 122). Second, iconographically the enthroned pose is more characteristic of a god than of a Genius, since Genii are normally depicted in a standing pose. Moreover, the prominent position on the monument seems unconventional for such an abstract figure. Finally, there is the possibility of an iconographical program, linking this arch with its counterpart at the southeast edge of the town, the so-called Porte Bazée. From drawings made before the demolition of the latter arch in 1752 we may conclude that the arcades of both arches had similar decorations on their ceilings. Since the central mythological scene of the narrower west arcade of the Porte Bazée shows Venus (Fouqueray/Neiss 1976, pl. 2; cf. also Esp. 3680), it is an attractive suggestion that here too the origin myths of Rome and the Remi were depicted. See for this, the discussion below.

137 While the occurrence of the *vallus* defines the countryside in a general sense as North Gallic (Burnand 1974, 91), the identity of Mars with the principal god of the Remi may point to the Remian territory in particular. On the notion of time, see *infra,* esp. note 135.
protected the fields no less than the town. It was his watchful eye that ensured high yields and a prosperous life in peace alike.

Before engaging in the discussion of the other associations, I shall first ask the key question as to the significance of the Mars and Hercules associations for the native cosmologies. Many have assumed that these did not undergo anything but a superficial change. Although this may very well have been the case with broad and, in particular, illiterate groups in society, I am of the opinion that for those who were responsible for the monuments which serve us as our source material, the traditional conceptual universes had undergone essential changes, though I must immediately add that the structural core remained more or less the same. I shall attempt to elucidate my point in the case of both Mars and Hercules. I shall start with the former deity, and also take a closer look at the other sculpture work of the arch of Reims. It may serve as an example of how in the official public cult one dealt with Roman ideas on the cosmological world.

The representations on the ceiling of the central arcade, referred to above, were paralleled by others on the ceilings of the narrower east and west arcades (fig. 3.10). While in the frame of the central representation in the central arcade we found depictions of the agrarian cycle, in those of the side arcades it is a frieze of shields, helmets, swords, cuirasses and greaves, in the middle of which a seated Victoria is inscribing a shield with the name of the defeated enemy. In the east arcade we find the she-wolf with the suckling twins, Romulus and Remus, surrounded by the shepherds who willingly received the foundlings and brought them up (fig. 3.9, left). In the west arcade we see Leda and the swan as which Zeus had disguised himself in order to beget Helena. Finally, in each facade of each of the four pylons of the arch, there was a high, rectangular niche containing statues of, among others, Venus and Aeneas, and Rhea Silvia and Mars, four leading figures in the foundation myth of Rome (fig. 3.10).

What are all these apparently 'pure' Roman depictions doing on a city gateway in Northern Gaul? For a start I conclude that the sculptural decoration was an expression of the public ideology of the Remi. Subsequently, I point out that city walls and gates often serve as symbolic limitations of urban culture and the norms and values which stand for it. The gods and demigods depicted

---

128 Cf., for example, Thevenot 1955, 13-14; 1968, 9-10.
129 In this context, most authors think of the birth of the Dioscuri, who were also offspring from Leda and the disguised Jupiter (cf. Picard 1974, 72; Lefèvre/Legros 1985, 9). The choice of preferring the Dioscuri to Helena seems to be determined by the parallel with the wolf twins at the other side of the central passage, but, in my view, makes little sense. See infra, esp. note 135.
130 In addition to these four, there is also agreement on the presence of Dea Roma in one of the niches. For the place of these heroes and divinities in the official Roman myths of origin, cf. section 2.1 with note 21.
131 The difficult question as to who commissioned the monument, is in this context irrelevant. In my view, the arguments for local munificence (Lefèvre 1988, 157) prevail over imperial patronage (Legros 1971, 697; cf. also CIL XIII 3255). Fouqueray and Neis (1976) point to some (smaller) differences between this arch and the one at the other end of the cardo, which may lend support to the view of different patrons being involved each realizing an arch at different moments in time. However, even if some form of imperial patronage cannot be excluded, for the interpretation of the representations this does not make much difference. In both cases, they can only be meaningfully understood if the ideas depicted were sustained by the local community.
132 Cf. here the telling passage inTacitus, Hist. 4, 64, in which a delegation of the transrhenine Tencteri, who visited Cologne during the Batavian revolt, demanded the demolition of their muros coloniae, munimenta servitis in exchange for the restoration of the old bonds of friendship with the Ubii.
Fig. 3.11 Votive inscription from Reims for Mars Camulus, dedicated by T. Iucundinius, member of the Roman college of priests of the Laurentes Lavinates (AE 1935, 64 = Wuilleumier 1963, no. 351; photograph Musée Saint-Remi, Reims).

Here must therefore have been regarded by the town administrators responsible as the protectors of the civitas. This implies that the local elite did not only conceptualize the tutelary deity of their civitas, Camulus, to an excessive degree as a Roman Mars, but that they also traced back the origin of their people to the same Trojan ancestors as the Julian house (and the Julio-Claudian imperial house) in Rome. This can only have happened as a result of an interweaving of the native myths of origin with those of Rome. It is these interlacements that prove that there was a fundamental internalization of Roman ideas.

The identification of the local sovereign god Camulus with the Roman Mars which can be concluded from inscriptions, formed one of the links connecting the mythologies of the Remi and the Romans. Another possible connection may be considered. If we start from the widespread pattern in which a tribe or people traces its origin to an eponymous forefather, the mythical ancestor of the Remi would have been called Remus. His name immediately evokes an association with the identi-

133 As an example, I mention the Latini with their king Latinus, the Trojans (in Latin: Ilii) with their king Ilus and the Celts with their ancestor Celtus. See supra, with note 35 and KP, s.v. Latinus (Eisenhut).
cally named twin brother of Romulus, the founder of Rome. It seems unlikely that the Remi were unaware of this similarity in name. The identification of their forefather with the Roman Remus offered them the excellent opportunity of presenting themselves as brothers and equals of the Romans! If one accepts this version, the above-described representations on the town gate suddenly acquire a completely different significance. It is no longer exclusively the gods and founders of a foreign power that are depicted here, but also (or primarily) those of the civitas Remorum.

Let us finally turn our attention to the only votive inscription dedicated to Mars Camulus found in the territory of the Remi, the previously-mentioned inscription from Reims (fig. 3.11). The text of the inscription tells us that the dedicator was a member of the Laurentes Lavinates, the religious community which in name inhabited Lavinium on the coast of Latium. This town, which was considered to be founded by Aeneas, was the mother town of Rome. The bonds between both towns were expressed mainly in religious terms. In the conceptions of both peoples, for example, the sacra brought by Aeneas from Troy and kept after that in Lavinium, did not only represent the personification of the origin of Latium, but also that of Rome. Directly after their accession to office, newly elected Roman magistrates accompanied by the most prominent Roman colleges of priests, went in a solemn procession to the Latin town to make an offering to the dii Penates populi Romani in the temple of Vesta. Represented by its most eminent dignitaries, the entire population of Rome

114 The identification of both namesakes is recorded in the 10th-century ecclesiastical history of Flodoard, who himself disapproved of the Roman origin of the story, as widespread among the local population (Heller/Waitz 1881, 412). Although, according to some scholars (Desportes 1977, 778, note 36; Lefèvre 1983, 52), this connection does not go back any further than somewhere in the 9th century, and must be linked with a conflict between the bishop of Reims and the pope about the coronation right of the Frankish king (on which occasion the bishop is said to have attempted to establish his claims with an appeal to the identification), this does not prevent the local church leader falling back on tales originating from the Roman period (cf. Barlow 1995). The argument with which these authors appear to wish to exclude a pre-medieval association, which is the same as that used by Flodoard, namely Romulus’ fratricide, is not very convincing to say the least. It ignores the creative element characteristic of every adoption of myths by outsiders, countermovements or marginal groups. See Wiseman 1995, esp. 144 ff., who argues that, in the early-Augustan period, it was the variant with the fratricide which was actually denied!

115 It has been noted that Mars, Rhea Silvia, Aeneas and Dea Roma had a place in the niches of the pylons east of the central gateway, whereas Venus is in one to the west of it. If we combine the positions of these figures on the monument with the themes of the central representations on the ceilings of the arcades, we may conclude that the west part of the arch refers to the Trojan origin of the civitas (Helena being eventually the cause of the Trojan war), while the east part of the gate represented the Italian part of the myth (foundation of Rome by the twins). The centre of the monument is reserved for the Remi themselves. It is thanks to their principal god Mars that they enjoy, here and now, the wealth displayed in the most prominent position of the monument. Lefèvre 1988.

116 AE 1935, 64 = Wuilleumier 1963, no. 351; Lefèvre 1983. I doubt whether this is a building inscription of a temple. If we assume this was a monumental temple, the size of the letters (the largest in the first line being no taller than c. 7 cm) is too small for such an interpretation. Perhaps it is a monumental votive gift, which was possibly set up on the forum.

117 This means through the intervention of Alba Longa. See RE XII, s.v. Lavinium (Philipp); Thomas 1990 and here chapter 2, note 22. Lavinium is generally localized at the present Pratica di Mare. For a quick, English-language introduction to the archaeology of the town, see now Ross Holloway 1994, 128 ff.

118 Thomas 1990, passim, but esp. 156 and note 3. The actual accession to office took place by making public
moved, as it were, once a year to the place where tradition localized its principia, its origin. The annual processions of the Roman magistracy to the cosmological centre of Rome must have been more than a simple legitimation of Rome’s hegemony over Latium for which they are often held, since the tradition was continued when Lavinium gradually became completely depopulated in the course of the 3rd century BC. At any rate, thanks to the genealogical bond between the Julian dynasty and the Trojan exiles and the resulting attention of the emperor Augustus in particular, the cult place regained its old glory in the Imperial period. A new settlement was founded near the ruins of the legendary town, and, more important, a religious community was established which was nominally based in ancient Lavinium. The members of this cult community, referred to as Laurentes Lavinates, were recruited from the nobility; their appointment required imperial approval. The organization of the cult community was modelled on the Roman civitas, complete with ‘magistrates’, ‘colleges of priests’ and ‘citizens’. The inhabitants of this religiosa civitas were actually distributed throughout the empire. They only met in Lavinium for the annual celebration of the origin of Rome.

The dedicator of the Mars inscription from Reims, as a member of a cult community founded at the instigation of the emperor, was explicitly involved in the performance of the public rituals with which Rome commemorated her origin. Unfortunately, we do not know his origin. If he was a foreigner in Reims, his dedication may have been simply intended to pay tribute to the god and civitas who had received him in their city. It may also be taken as a sign that the claims made by the Remi were officially recognized by Rome. Finally, his presence in Reims bears witness to an exchange of ideas between members of local and Roman colleges of priests which, among other things, may have underlain the deep transformation of local cosmologies we have seen. If, however, Lucundinus originated from Reims, his dedication may be taken as another indication that at the time of his dedication the Roman myths of origin were actually no less associated with this Romanized Camulus than with Roman Mars.

The example of the Remi, which could be described in considerable detail thanks to the fortuitous wealth of historical, epigraphic and archaeological sources, is not an isolated case. For other civitates too, a similar fundamental transformation of the principal god may be assumed in the official sphere of the public cult, and there also, the association between the local god and Mars must have gone hand in hand with an incorporation of the legendary past of Rome in that of the local community. Unambiguous, for instance, is Lucanus’ condemnation of the Central-Gallic Arverni, who had dared to boast of originating from Latium and of being the brothers of the Roman people, of Trojan blood, settled there. Just as with the Remi, the myth of origin of this tribe must have become interwoven with that of Rome, though in this case we have no idea how the links were made.

vows at the Capitol in Rome.

Cf. Thomas 1990. The Latin expression for this concept of origin is derived from an inscription found in Pompeii by a priest involved in the celebration of this sacra. CIL X, 797.

Thomas 1990, 164 with references to reports of archaeological investigations carried out there so far. It appears that the exchange with the mythical ancestors which took place during the rituals was considered a precondition for the functioning of new magistrates.

The inhabitants of this settlement refer to themselves in inscriptions found at the spot as Laurentes viro Augustano.

Thomas 1990; cf. also Latte 1960, 295, 407. For a list of the more than 70 inscriptions by Laurentes Lavinates known so far, see Saulnier 1984. The establishment of this unusual civitas is one of Augustus’ religious reforms.

Lucanus, BC 1, 427-428: Arvernique ausi Latio se fingere fratres sanguine ab Iliaco populi.
Caesar's qualification of the Aedui as brothers and blood-relatives of the Roman people, which has generally been interpreted in socio-political terms, can probably also be read in this sense. Again, mythological traditions must have been interwoven and the local community will have appropriated the legendary past of Rome. Roman reactions to such claims could actually differ. While it is established that the claims of the Aedui received official recognition in a decree of the Roman senate, at the same time the claims of the Arverni appear to have been rejected by Rome.

Scarce clues in the archaeological sources indicate that the principle of appropriation of Roman mythological stories sketched above was widespread among the communities of Northern Gaul and was certainly not restricted to the public cult. The Trojan legend cycle in particular exerted a great attraction. The Gallic usurper Carausius, for example, a Menapian by birth, displayed himself as a new Aeneas in one of his coin issues, and certain motifs from the Trojan cycle still appear to play an important part in the self-image of some groups in Northern Gaul even in the Early Middle Ages. Finally, sculptured representations of Aeneas and his kin on rich burial monuments in the Rhineland prove that among members of the elite the classical myths of origin were not only known, but were deeply incorporated into personal life. Pius Aeneas had become an example of the pater familias for these aristocrats and from the reward for his exertions of admittance to the circle of the gods they derived hope of eternal life.

The popularity of the Trojan legends apparent from historical and archaeological sources is an indirect indication that the originally indigenous gods were in due time conceptualized as a fully Roman Mars. At least, that is what the co-existence of both local and imperial origin myths suggest. Epigraphic evidence for transformations of this kind exists in inscriptions in which a 'double-named' Mars shares the dedication with a Roman god or goddess. To conclude my argument, I will give two examples relating to the cult of Mars Loucetius. The first concerns an altar for this god together with Victoria, discovered in the vicinity of the Roman castellum at Großkrotzenburg. It was dedicated by a father of two sons, referred to in the inscription as cives Treveri, so that there can be no doubt as to the Gallic background of the dedicator. The second is an altar stone dedicated to Mars and Victoria which was found in the sanctuary of Mars Loucetius and Nemetona in Ober-Olm. Again, the dedicator of this stone, L. Bittius Paulinus, must have been of Gallic origin. In both cases, due to the association with the Roman goddess Victoria, there can be no misunderstanding about the fact that the dedicators visualized the originally indigenous god Loucetius to a considerable degree as a Roman Mars.

In the case of the local god or hero associated with Hercules, a similar transformation is harder to prove, especially with regard to the public cult. There are no monumental public buildings with a generous series of statues, and the epigraphic and iconographic evidence in the Lower Rhine area is scanty and almost completely private in character. Nevertheless there are a few leads. For a start

144 Caesar, BG 1, 33: Aedusos frates consanguineosque saepe numero a senatu appellatos (cf. also the capita 36, 43 and 44). Caesar's remarks are confirmed by various contemporary and later classical sources. For an enumeration, see Braund 1980, note 3. For the older discussion, see Roymans 1990, 27 and the literature cited there.

145 Cf. supra, note 144.

146 Telling here is the absence of positive indications and the pejorative connotation of the term ausi used by Lucanus, which refers to a deed of recklessness. Cf. supra, note 143.

147 Barlow 1995.


149 CIL XIII 7421 = Krier 1981, no. 97 (with photograph).

150 CIL XIII 7249 = Behrens 1941, no. 17 and Abb. 15.
there is the fact that the monumental sanctuaries of Empel and Elst, probably linked with the cult of Hercules Magusanus, are both strongly influenced by classical architecture (cf. fig. 4.7): they both belong to the so-called classicized variant of the Gallo-Roman temple. It may be assumed that the cult images in these temples, no less so than the cult buildings, were influenced by Mediterranean conceptions.

Furthermore, an argument can be derived from the material culture of the sanctuary of Empel. The discovery of a votive inscription by a probably Batavian veteran (fig. 3.12), of many parts of...

---

518 See for this section 4.3.
519 In favour of a Batavian origin of the dedicator is the date of the inscription in combination with the history of the legion and the name of the veteran. According to the military titles of honour linked in the inscription with the legion pia fidelis and the absence of the honorary title Domitiana which originally belonged to it but which was later discarded, the dedication has to be dated after AD 96 (Saxer 1967, 75). If we assume a regular term of military service of 25 years, this would mean that the dedicator was recruited in 71 at the earliest. At that time, the 10th legion was stationed in Batavian territory, where, from the end of the Batavian revolt in 70 to c. 102/104 (Mann 1962) it had its base on the Hunerberg in Nijmegen. Since from the end of the 1st century the legions originally recruited in Italy were increasingly open to provincials in the encampment area of the legion (Forni 1974), a Batavian origin of a soldier is theoretically possible. Now, according to his name, the dedicator had Roman citizenship, which his ancestors had probably received from Caesar, or, more probably, from one of the emperors of the Julian house (27 BC–AD 41). From the historical and epigraphic Roman name material it may be concluded that these emperors conferred Roman citizenship in the Rhineland on a relatively large scale (cf. the Iulius names in Tacitus, Hist. and the map in Alföldy 1967b, 19ff, esp. fig. 4). Moreover the civitas of the Batavi is certainly underrepresented in the epigraphic documentation of Iulius names in the specific distribution pattern of inscriptions linked with the 'epigraphic culture' [see my fig. 3.2]. In Spain, where the legion was stationed before the Batavian revolt and which is the only other alternative for the origin of the dedicator in the case of a period of service longer than 25 years and a non-Italic origin, the same emperors conferred citizenship on a much smaller scale. If we also realise that in Northern Gaul more soldiers were recruited for the auxiliary troops among the Batavi than any other tribe (cf. fig. 2.6), the most plausible scenario would be that the father or grandfather of Genialis served as an auxiliary and acquired Roman citizenship for himself and
Roman militaria left behind as offerings and of numerous signet rings and seal boxes connected with a writing culture and a votive practice on Roman lines, points to the prominent position of soldiers in the cult community of this sanctuary. It has indeed been established that Magusanus was perceived in military circles as a local variant of the Mediterranean Hercules. This is evident from depictions on monuments dedicated to him and which refer to various episodes from the mythological cycle of the Graeco-Roman demigod. Examples of this are a statue and a votive altar from Xanten and Bonn, respectively, both dedicated by a legionary. In both cases, Hercules is depicted standing and naked with a lionskin around his shoulders and his right hand resting on his club. In the statue from Xanten, he offers the apples of the Hesperides in his extended left hand, and in the altar from Bonn (fig. 3.13) he holds in check with the same hand the triple-headed hell-hound Cerberus on a chain. The military link of the Empel sanctuary makes it likely that representations such as those of the votive monuments from Xanten and Bonn also existed among the visitors to this sanctuary.

This is more or less confirmed by the bronze image of the demigod found in the sanctuary. It shows the hero with a drinking cup in his extended right hand. The cup may be interpreted as an allusion to Hercules’ apotheosis. Important to the interpretation is the conclusion that the attribute was added later. The adaptation must have been made at the express request of the patron, who apparently wanted at all costs to see his beloved hero in his capacity as a member of the Olympic family. That the appropriation of Mediterranean ideas implied by these examples was not limited to the private devotion of individual dedicators but formed part of the official tradition of the civitas Batavorum becomes feasible against the background of the status of the Magusanus sanctuary at Empel and of the massive supplies of troops by the Batavi for the Roman auxiliary forces.

Apart from the above episodes referring to Hercules’ reputation as an invincible hooligan which were probably extremely popular among soldiers, other episodes from the mythical biography of the Graeco-Roman Hercules must also have been included in the official repertoire of myths connected with Magusanus. At any rate that is the implication of the proposition previously defended that the option for Hercules as the counterpart to Magusanus was partly connected with the mode of existence based more on livestock of the communities established in the Lower Rhine area, but unfortunately there is no concrete evidence for this.

On the basis of the above considerations we must assume that in the official public cult Magusanus was depicted to a considerable degree as a Roman Hercules. He enjoyed veneration as protector and perhaps also as founder of the civitas and as guardian of cattle. This does not mean that certain sub-groups could not feel attracted to Hercules Magusanus in their private cult for other rea-

his descendants at the end of his service, thus enabling his son or grandson to join a legion (Raepsaet-Charlier 1993, 77).

See the contributions in Roymans/Derks 1994. For the role of signet rings and seal boxes in the Roman vow, see section 5.3.

CIL XIII 8610 = BJ 110, 1903, Taf. 5.8 (Xanten); AE 1971, 282 = Horn 1970, Abb 1, 10-11 (Bonn). The depiction is in a niche on the front side of the altar.

From Bonn a second votive altar is known with a depiction corresponding to that of the Xanten representation. However, the votive inscription is so badly damaged that it is not possible to distinguish whether the altar was dedicated to a Roman Hercules or to Hercules Magusanus. BJ 161, 87-88, Taf. 17 = Horn 1970, Abb. 3.

Swinkels 1994.

For the former, cf. supra, for the latter, see section 2.3.

We may consider the myths of the cattle raid by Hercules, one of his twelve labours. It is quite possible that Magusanus, like his Roman counterpart, appeared as the patron of cattle markets held, for example, in the immediate vicinity of the great sanctuaries at Elst and Empel. Cf. supra, note 120.)
Fig. 3.13 Altar stone from Bonn depicting Hercules and the three-headed hound of hell Cerberus, dedicated by a legionary to Hercules Magnusanus \((AE 1971, 282\); photograph after Horn 1970, Abb. 1).

The former votive offering was probably once erected in the neighbouring sanctuary of Domburg, dedicated to Nehalennia. As is well-known, this local goddess was worshipped especially by traders and captains from the Gallo-Germanic provinces as the protectress of ship’s crews and merchandise. In her votive altars she is repeatedly depicted with a ship’s rudder in her hand or with a protective foot on the stem of a ship. It is interesting that on some altars the central representation of the goddess is flanked on the side panels by images of Hercules and Neptune, respectively.\(^{160}\) In the Mediterranean area, Hercules was also regarded as the patron of traders and travellers because of the many journeys connected with his heroic deeds, and the combination with the sea god Neptune makes it likely that

\(^{139}\) CIL XIII 8777; VI 31162.

\(^{160}\) Hondius-Crone 1955, nos. 3, 4, 6, 10 and 12; Deae 1971, no. 14.
he also figured on the Nehalennia altars in that capacity. It is certain that these aspects were also linked with Magusanus. On the altar dedicated to him by Batavian guards in Rome, they give as a motive for their dedication *ob reditum domini nostri*, *i.e.* for the safe return of the emperor to the eternal city. If we now assume that the dedicator of the altar found in Westkapelle, like those of the other votive offerings in the Domburg sanctuary, was a trader, captain or shipowner, it seems reasonable that he might have turned to Magusanus with the request for protection for his goods. Viewed in this way, conceptions again lie hidden behind the altars of Westkapelle and Rome which point to a fundamental transformation of the originally native deity. At the same time they show how different social groups interpreted foreign religious conceptions in their own way and incorporated them in their personal life.

At the end of this section I should like to discuss briefly the associations of local gods with Mercury, Apollo and Silvanus. I begin with Mercury, whose widespread popularity requires more detailed argument. From the idea of a division of labour between deities this god is traditionally represented as the god of trade. Here certainly lies one of Mercury's main fields of work, yet this god was theoretically active in all fields. The central concept from which his interventions can be understood is liminality. His field of activity can be defined in an abstract sense as an ambiguous border zone. He facilitates the passage of people and the circulation and transfer of money and goods. He accompanies the soul from here to the hereafter, is an intermediary between gods and men and is considered to be the patron of traders, travellers and thieves. In what way did the North Gallic population deal with these Mediterranean conceptions of the deity?

A first conclusion is that the cult places of Mercury have so far not produced any indications for pre-Roman roots. Two possible interpretations can be given. One is that we must assume that the expressions of the cult were originally so unspectacular because of its local and private character that they left no tangible remains. In this case there would be continuity in the location of the cult places without this being visible to us. Another, more likely option is that the cult was moved in the course of time. In this case we would not know any cult places where the local gods associated with Mercury were originally worshipped at all. In order to explain why the latter idea is preferable in my view, we shall have to take a closer look at a select group of votive inscriptions to Mercury. I opt for the inscriptions in which the god is worshipped together with the goddess Rosmerta.

The cult of this pair of gods appears to be spread throughout large sections of Gallia Belgica and Germania Superior. From this, we may conclude that once the association between Mercury and the male half of a couple of local gods had been made, it was subsequently fixed. Whereas the goddess continued to be invoked by her native name, the god eventually became so much identified with Mercury that in most cases he was only referred to by his Roman name. Due to increasing travel and the exchange of ideas connected with it, the cult of the pair of gods once worshipped locally spread over a large area in the course of the Roman period, leaving no trace of its origin.

If we examine the dedications to this divine couple as to their findspots, they appear to be found mainly in *vici*. In other cases, as in Andernach, Niederemmel and Dalheim-Buchholz, they can be linked with small sanctuaries along Roman roads. These locations are connected with a new or-

---

161 For the role of Hercules as patron of traders, see Bayet 1926, 459-461; Coarelli 1987, 99 ff; Hondius-Crone 1955, 106.

162 Scheid 1991a, 52 with note 57; idem 1995b, with note 33 and the literature cited there.

163 Boppert 1990, Abb. 1; Merten 1994, 113 ff. with Abb. 36.

ganization of the landscape and the gradual economic and cultural integration of the North Gallic communities in the Roman empire. They reflect a fundamental transformation of an originally native deity to a Roman Mercury. The changing role of the deity is expressed even more strikingly than in the topography of the sanctuaries in the dedication of an image to the divine pair from Wiesbaden. In the inscription on the base, the anonymus dedicator calls exclusively on Mercury, who is significantly addressed as Nundinator, as the one who watches over the place where goods pass from hand to hand, the weekly market or mundinae.\textsuperscript{165} It is in the light of the above information that, in the Roman period, the cult of the couple can rightly be qualified as a Roman provincial cult.

In the expressions of a cult of Mercury discussed so far we found ourselves in what we would call the commercial sector. However, even outside this circle, Mercury had his followers among the Roman provincial population, particularly as the bringer of material wealth.\textsuperscript{166} With the help of two examples, I shall illustrate the scope of his cult. First, I refer to a relief from Spachbach-lès-Woerth (Bas-Rhin). Here, Mercury is depicted with, on his arm, the child Bacchus holding a money-bag in one of his hands (fig. 3.14).\textsuperscript{167} The iconographical scheme goes back to a statue by the Greek sculptor Praxiteles dating from the 4th century BC, which was erected as a votive offering in the sanctuary of Hera near Olympia. It showed the Greek god Hermes who held out with his raised right hand a bunch of grapes to the child Dionysos carried on his left arm.\textsuperscript{168} Various arguments lead me to the idea that the dedicator in this case might have been a local villa-owner who had made his fortune in viniculture. For a start, it is significant that the findspot is situated in an excellent wine-growing area under the lee of the Vosges, where villae specialized in wine-growing are also archaeologically well-known.\textsuperscript{169} Moreover, the distribution of similar reliefs is limited to districts for which wine-growing in the Roman period can be proved or at least supposed.\textsuperscript{170} The most important argument is the conclusion that the relief is not a servile imitation but a creative transformation of the classical scheme. The most striking detail is that it is not Mercury, but Bacchus who is given the money-bag. It is tempting to assume here a deliberate choice on the part of the dedicator, who wanted to emphasize in a symbolic way the source of his material wealth.

My second example concerns two votive reliefs from Archettes which, together with other votive monuments, coins from the 2nd-4th century and traces of a rectangular building point to a simple Mercury sanctuary at that spot (fig. 3.15). The reliefs are made of local sandstone and are of an unmistakably local style. They portray a naked man who can only be identified as Mercury by a provi-

\textsuperscript{165} CIL XIII 7569. Cf. Schleiermacher 1965, 323. Compare here my earlier remarks about a relation between Hercules and the cattle market in Rome. Here again we have an example of the different angles at which deities can be active in the same field of work.

\textsuperscript{166} Cf. CIL XIII 2031 where Mercury \textit{lucrum promittit}. For such an unambiguous request to the gods for wealth, see also the vow to the \textit{matres} made by a farmer or trader who, in case of new profits promises to apply gold letters to the text of his stone. \textit{RIB} 2059 (Bowness-on-Solway).

\textsuperscript{167} Esp. 5569 = CIL XIII 11684a.

\textsuperscript{168} Roebuck 1966, 344-345; Richter 1974, 144-147 with figs. 193-194.

\textsuperscript{169} See section 2.4.

\textsuperscript{170} Parallels are known from Onsdorf (Rheinland-Pfalz: Esp. 5162 = Binsfeld \textit{et al.} 1988, no. 208) and Hatrize (Meurthe-et-Moselle: Esp. 4413) in the valley of the Moselle, from Godramstein (Rheinland-Pfalz: 5908) in the valley of the Rhine and also from Bierbach (Rheinland-Pfalz: 4485), Cocheren-'Le Hérapel' (Moselle: 4471), Lohr (Bas-Rhin: 4491) and Carignan (Ardennes: 8463). The reliefs from Hatrize and Godramstein with their depiction of Mercury with raised right arm and bunch of grapes correspond entirely with the original scheme of Praxiteles' statue.
Fig. 3.14 Stone relief with votive inscription from Spachbach-lès-Woerth (Bas-Rhin) with a representation of Mercury accompanied by a cock and bearing the child Bacchus on his arm (Esp. 5569 = CIL XIII 11684a; photograph Musée archéologique, Strasbourg).

Sionally indicated money-bag. All other elements from the Roman iconography of the god, such as the herald’s staff, winged sandals and travelling hat (references to his role as messenger of the gods), are lacking. Apparently, for the local dedicators of these anepigraphic votive monuments the quintessence was denoted by the money-bag! A more selective adoption of ideas in connection with the cult of Mercury is hardly conceivable.

In conclusion, let us discuss the question of those who must be held responsible for the association of native gods with this Roman deity. As was the case with the previously-mentioned associations of indigenous gods with Mars and Hercules, there is no direct evidence. We could consider Roman negotiatores, who, with the soldiers of the Roman army, were among the first to enter the territories of the Gallo-Germanic provinces and disseminate Mediterranean ideas. It is, however, most unlikely that they also made the associations with the indigenous gods. Their local trading partners would probably have been responsible for this. The trend set by the latter may quickly have been followed by other groups. That there will have been a varying degree of refinement in the interpretation of Mediterranean conceptions by different social groups is made clear by the examples previously given.

As to Silvanus and Apollo, I shall be brief. The evidence concerning a cult of these gods is extremely scarce for the study area. Silvanus is associated in inscriptions only with Sinquates and the topical deity of the Vosges. Apollo (whether or not associated with Grannus) has to share the dedication with the originally native Sirona in almost all inscriptions. Dedications to this pair of gods are found throughout large parts of the Gallo-Germanic provinces and, as far as is known, are always linked to a source. In the sanctuary of Essarois (Côte-d’Or), dedicated to Apollo Vindonnus and the Fontes, the god was apparently worshipped for his healing properties according to stone ex-


178 Heurgon 1948.

179 See supra, note 78.

180 Cf. here the relief with the inscription from Arlon, found near the sources of the Semois, where the god has at his feet a jar from which water flows. De- man/Raeppaet-Charlier 1985, no. 64.
votos in the form of limbs ad other parts of the body.\textsuperscript{173} He was also known for these qualities in the Mediterranean area.\textsuperscript{176} However, at cult places in the study area there are no such explicit references to healing. Perhaps the cult of Apollo had a more prosaic significance here, as might be concluded from the context of the source sanctuary at Ihn.\textsuperscript{177} It was closely linked with a neighbouring \textit{villa} which was in use at the same time as or prior to the sanctuary. Maybe its Romanized inhabitants regarded the Roman god as the divine giver simply of water, which, even without medicinal effects, was vital to the agrarian success of the farm.\textsuperscript{178}

\textsuperscript{173} Esp. 3411-3439; \textit{CIL} XIII 5644-5647; Deyts 1994, esp. 12 ff.
\textsuperscript{176} Cf. Caesar, \textit{BG} 6, 17.
\textsuperscript{177} Miron 1994.
\textsuperscript{178} Cf. here also the remarks of Weisgerber (1975, 102ff.) and Merten (1994, 116ff.) about the iconography of Sirona. Attributes such as corn sheaves and fruit make it clear that this goddess is not exclusively considered a water nymph.
ble sign of above-ground marking. In other cases the cremated bones were stored in an urn of Roman pottery, and with stones collected on the surface a marking was made surrounding the central burial. The most strikingly marked graves are typified by a square borderline of squarely-hewn stones. Gravestones with an inscription are highly exceptional; the funerary inscription on the only tombstone known so far stands out by a rustic *ductus*. Despite excellent possibilities for monumental burial architecture none is found here at all.

Having come to this conclusion, the question immediately rises of how representative the picture of the community at Haegen actually is. To restrict ourselves to the cult places, those which had a cult building seem to be comparable to that of Haegen. In addition, a large number of open air cult places from the Vosges and their foothills are known, usually centred around a source. Because of the specific geology of the area and the relatively large amount of rainfall, sources are unusually numerous, and were not infrequently used as the ritual focus of a cult place. However, with these cult places there are even fewer Roman architectural forms. In general, they could only be identified as such on the basis of the presence of *Felsreliefs* or freestanding sculptures (which are then to be regarded as representations of gods), or on the basis of coin finds identified as votive offerings. An exception to this rule is the sanctuary of Deneuvre whose architecture, despite the absence of a temple, shows similarities to that of Mediterranean source sanctuaries. The position of this sanctuary on the transition between the Vosges and the plateau of Lorraine does make it tempting to ascribe its architecture to people other than mountain dwellers.

Gallo-Roman sanctuaries are also a rare occurrence in the other mountainous regions. The two sanctuaries in the Northern French part of the Ardennes only have cult buildings of the traditional type without ambulatory. In Mouzon, a first rectangular cult building from the early-Augustan period was succeeded even before the beginning of the Christian era by a small square cult building (sides c. 4 m) which is reminiscent in all respects of the temple at Haegen. When the sanctuary was reorganized in the 2nd century, significantly another single-celled temple without *porticus* was built. The sanctuary of Bouvellemont is less well known, but it is certain that the three cult buildings which have so far been excavated are all traditional in style. In the Belgian part of the Ardennes, only one sanctuary with a plan is known, that of Tavigny. The temple here is of the Gallo-Roman type, but the sanctuary is located on a plateau which, because of the presence of an aeolian loam cover, offers good prospects for agriculture and also has a reasonable number of *villae*, though not in the density of the loess areas previously mentioned.

---

115 Gallia 40, 1982, 368-369, fig. 20.
116 Cf. however supra, note 27.
117 See note 39.
118 Similar in many respects to the cult place of Deneuvre is the source sanctuary of Bad Tönisstein in the Brohl valley which is dedicated to Apollo and the nymphs. There is no temple here either. According to votive altars from a veteran, a soldier from the 22nd legion, a praefect of a *vexillatio* of the *classis Germanica* and a *centurio* of the *cohors I avium Romanorum* respectively, the foundation of the cult place must be linked with the presence of the Roman army in neighbouring stone quarries (Klein 1887; *CIL* XIII 7691-7692, 7728; Schillinger-Häfele 1977, no. 140). In Deneuvre, however, a link with the Roman army would appear to be out of the question (Moitrieux 1992, esp. 131-134).
121 De Maeyer 1937, 250 ff. and map I; Cabuy 1991, 248 ff., who, moreover, remarks that the Roman road connecting Cologne to Reims via the Ardennes, ran c. 2 km from the sanctuary.


