

HANS-JÖRG KELLNER und GISELA ZAHLHAAS, *Der römische Tempelschatz von Weißenburg i. Bay.* Mit Beiträgen von H.-G. Bachmann, C.-M. Hüssen, H. Koschik, Z. Visy und U. Zwickert. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz. 1993. IV, 162 Seiten mit 37 Abbildungen im Text, 23 Tabellen, 21 Farbtafeln und 114 Tafeln mit 291 Abbildungen.

Documents recording the contents of Roman temples are rare. Among the few that do survive are the partial inventory of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Cirta (CIL VIII 6981–2 = Dessau ILS 4921 a–b), and another from the area of Nemi, perhaps from a sanctuary of Isis (CIL XI 2215 = Dessau ILS 4423). As a consequence we have to depend on archaeological discoveries clearly related to temples, identifiable because of their iconography or because of inscriptions on them. Most temple treasures, however, suffered confiscation under Constantine and Theodosius, and so it is inevitable that most discovered hoards, though not all, will have been buried during the crises of the third century in the Rhenish and Danubian provinces and Gaul. To be more accurate, however, we depend not on discoveries of temple treasures but on the publication of those discoveries. For many years the material seemed not to be very extensive. Our knowledge was limited almost entirely to the great treasure of Berthouville in northern Gaul, discovered in 1830 and published in 1916 (E. BABELON, *Le trésor d'argenterie de Berthouville près Bernay, Eure* [1916]; now known to have been buried at the end of the second century or the beginning, not the middle, of the third century: H. U. NÜBER, *Silberfunde von Hildesheim und Berthouville*. *Bull. Mus. Royaux Art et Hist.* 6^e s., 46, 1974, 27–29). To this can perhaps be added a fourth-century silver treasure found in Trier in the seventeenth century but melted down at that time, which perhaps also belonged to a temple (W. BINSFELD, *Trierer Zeitschr.* 42, 1979, 113–127). In recent decades, however, we have been particularly well served with a number of high quality publications of third-century hoards from Gaul and Germany. The 1970s and 1980s saw the discovery, for example, of two hoards of Alamannic booty on the same stretch of the Rhine between Karlsruhe and Speyer, from Hagenbach and Neupotz, which included temple material far from their original sites (H. BERNHARD / H.-J. ENGELS / R. ENGELS / R. PETROVSZKY, *Der römische Schatzfund von Hagenbach* [1990]; E. KÜNZL, *Die Alamannenbeute aus dem Rhein bei Neupotz. Plünderungsgut aus dem römischen Gallien* [1993]). In 1981 François Baratte published the treasure of Notre-Dame d'Allençon, found a hundred years earlier, in 1837 (*Le trésor d'orfèvrerie gallo-romaine de Notre-Dame d'Allençon* [Maine-et-Loire]. 40^e suppl. à *Gallia* [1981]). The number of such finds, however, is very small, and so it has appeared all the more important that scholars from the Danube provinces have rounded out the picture with the publication of 'temple treasures' from their own area. Professor Noll in 1980 published the treasure from Mauer an der Url, found in 1937 (R. NOLL, *Das Inventar des Dolichenusheiligtums von Mauer an der Url* [Noricum]. *Der römische Limes in Österreich* 30 [1980]), and this must be considered in the same context as the hoards from Straubing (J. KEIM / H. KLUMBACH, *Der römische Schatzfund von Straubing* [1951]) and from Eining (H.-J. KELLNER, *Der römische Verwahrfund von Eining* [1978]). The treasure from Weißenburg in Bavaria, reviewed here, is another discovery – a „Tempelschatz“ – of the same period. Readers will expect that this handsome volume is a study which will draw together and assess all this group of material.

Weißenburg, the Roman *statio* *Biricianis* of the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, lies north of the Danube and due north of Augsburg, and between the two points where the Raetian *limes* crosses the river Altmühl. The discovery of the Weißenburg treasure occurred in October, 1979, when a local teacher was planting a bed of asparagus in a garden about 70 m south of the site of the great Roman baths, which had been excavated two years previously. The finder proved to be curiously reluctant to cooperate with the professional archaeologists; but what eventually came to light were eighteen bronze statuettes and ten other bronzes, eleven silver votive plaques, three bronze helmets and one iron helmet, twenty bronze vessels, eighteen bronze fittings, and thirty-three iron objects, including a folding stool and a portable pair of scales.

The authors maintain (p. 143) that there can be little doubt that the find is connected with the troops stationed in the fort at Weißenburg. In place of a timber and earth fort built about 90, the fort was rebuilt in stone between 140 and 150/160, by the Ala I Hispanorum Auriana, a cavalry unit of five hundred men, which was stationed there from the fort's foundation until its end in the third century. A civil settlement of more than thirty hectares grew up outside the fort, except to the north. It was about 750 m across and had ancillary buildings, particularly a small bath-house for the fort, west of the west gate, which came to light in 1926. A second small bath building was found in 1978, north west of the north-west corner of the fort. In 1977, however, there came to light, about 200 m west of the fort, a very large set of baths, the Great Baths, which were so big that it was supposed that the Weißenburg was the capital of a civitas. These baths were finally destroyed by fire after 228/231. The fort seems to have come to an end at some time in the third quarter of the third century, for the latest issue in the small coin hoard which was found in 1892 on the Via principalis, near the Porta dextra, was an antoninianus of 251/253.

The exact date of the burial of the treasure is not certain; but analysis of the finds (summarized, pp. 144–145) shows that it belongs to the third century, most likely the first half, and the authors go on (pp. 145–146) to suggest, but not to insist, that the burial is connected with a raid by the Alamanni in 233, which is claimed as the date at which the great baths, only some seventy metres away, were destroyed, never to be rebuilt: „Schriftstellernachrichten, Ausgrabungsfunde und über 20 Münzschatze allein in Südbayern bezeugen das Ausmaß der Katastrophe, die hauptsächlich das Limesgebiet und den westlichen Teil der Provinz Raetien betroffen hat. Auch viele der hier wiederholt genannten Sammelfunde mit Paraderüstungsteilen, Bronzegehirr und Eisengerät sind wohl damals schon verborgen worden. Daß wohl auch das Kastell Weißenburg von diesen Ereignissen betroffen wurde, scheint der noch nicht veröffentlichte Befund der Ausgrabung der Großen Thermen anzudeuten. Nachdem also die Großen Thermen unweit der Fundstelle des Schatzfundes wahrscheinlich 233 n.Chr. zerstört und dann nicht wieder aufgebaut wurden, spricht vieles für Verheerungen in dieser Zeit“. The Weißenburg and other treasures, then, in the view of the authors, were emergency hoards, buried because of the attack by the Alamanni.

The authors clearly have a strong case. Nevertheless, caution needs to be exercised over the use of such arguments about treasures of this sort. In Gaul the context of the third-century silver treasures was based for many years on the work of Blanchet (A. BLANCHET, *Les trésors de monnaies romaines et les invasions germaniques en Gaule* [1900]), who stressed the importance of the third-century invasions for the burial not only of the coin-hoards but also of silver plate. It has become clear, however, that the deposition of hoards of coin and plate in Gaul in the second half of the third century cannot be linked directly with the passage of Germans through the area, as Blanchet thought, but that there was a more generalised panic and dislocation, which even resulted in the deposition of hoards of coins in Britain, in spite of the fact that there were no direct German raids there (E. M. WIGHTMAN, *Gallia Belgica* [1985] 195–197; A. KING, *Roman Gaul and Germany* [1990] 174–175). The debasement of the coinage may have been an important contributory factor in the hiding of these hoards of coins, and also in their not being recovered, simply because they had lost their value and so the labour of finding them was not worth the trouble (P. J. CASEY, *Carausius and Allectus: the British Usurpers* [1994] 26–29); but the hiding – and non-recovery – of treasures of silver plate, such as those from Chaourse, Rethel or Graincourt-lès-Havrincourt, in which the metal was always of high value, adds strength to the theory that some at least of the hoards of valuables were hidden because of the invasions or the threat of them. Thus it cannot be ruled out that, for similar reasons, the Weißenburg hoard might have been buried because of raids by the Alamanni.

But, even if one accepts the idea of burial because of invasions, great care must be exercised over the chronology. Kellner and Zahlhaas reject the possibility of the hoard being buried because of the raid by the Alamanni on the eastern part of Raetia in 242 and prefer an incident in 233. The authors themselves, however, point out that the latest evidence of occupation in the fort is a coin hoard of the period of the German attack of 254, which caused disturbance and destruction as far as Gaul but left no direct evidence at Weißenburg. Burial of the Weißenburg treasure in 233, therefore, is an attractive hypothesis, but no more than that, and it is more useful, though less satisfying, to think of it, and discuss it, in terms of the second third of the century.

Do the contents of the Weißenburg hoard and of those comparable with it add weight to the argument that they are emergency hoards? What do the groups of contents within the hoard and the relationship of the groups suggest? The Weißenburg treasure includes statuettes, silver votive leaves, parade armour, vessels, iron tools and other objects. No religious building has been found in the vicus or the fort; but the authors suggest that the treasure is the buried contents of a temple belonging to members of the Ala I Hispanorum Auriana. There are a number of hoards which include a clear religious content but were not found within the remains or precinct of a shrine or temple. Such hoards are difficult to interpret and they are often the only evidence for the possible existence of a religious building. They include some smaller ones such as those from Wettingen (CH. SIMONETT, *Zeitschr. Arch. u. Kunstgesch.*

8, 1946, 1–15), Klein-Winterheim near Mainz (B. STÜMPPEL, *Mainzer Zeitschr.* 75, 1980, 255) and Xanten (H. H. WEGNER, *Bezirkstelle Niederrhein und neue Grabungen in Xanten*. In: *Rhein. Landesmus.* Bonn 3 / 1974, 38). It is comparatively easy to accept the small number of objects in these hoards as having a coherent religious significance. In the case of larger assemblages, however, it is often a problem to decide whether the whole hoard is religious or whether secular objects have been added to a religious core. The problem has been illuminated recently by the hoards from Hagenbach and Neupotz, which, although they include religious material, have been shown very satisfactorily to be not religious deposits but groups of various sorts of objects, gathered as booty for their usefulness or for their material value. The fourth-century Thetford hoard, similarly, although it contains groups of objects to do with the cult of Faunus (and may imply the existence of a temple devoted to the worship of the god), is most likely to be the result of a theft (C. M. JOHNS / T. W. POTTER, *The Thetford Treasure* [1983] 68–74). On the other hand, François Baratte showed in 1981 that the large assemblage from Notre-Dame d'Allençon, including a large number of vessels, is a treasure of objects offered to Minerva, from a sanctuary dedicated to her. The inscriptions, recording dedications to Minerva, were the decisive factor. They were reinforced, however, by the homogeneous character of the vessels, which suggested that they were manufactured nearby or at the shrine, and by the fact that vessels of this type are not found in use as household vessels and so must have been made specifically for pilgrims to dedicate at the shrine, just like the two silver leaves in the find.

In the case of the Weißenburg hoard, the authors find (summary, pp. 141–142) direct evidence of the religious character of the hoard as a whole in the statuettes, the silver votive leaves, the decoration on one of the bronze bowls (no. 44: with scenes of both Epona and Dionysos), and dedications to Epona on two of the other bronze vessels (nos. 46, 47). They find supporting evidence in the types of bronze vessels represented (and the exclusion of other types), and they have no difficulty in accepting other objects as religious in this context – the iron cooking vessels and many of the iron tools, a horseshoe, the lampstand, the folding stool and the parade armour. The silver votive leaves are considered only to be possible in a public temple, not in a private context, and so the whole is interpreted as a temple collection.

The eighteen statuettes seem to be the key to the interpretation of the find. ZAHLHAAS shows in an impressive study that the statuettes are an important group in their own right for their condition, the association of gods represented, and their varied places and dates of manufacture. They represent the gods of Italy (the Capitoline triad: Jupiter, Juno and Minerva), as well as gods more commonly worshipped in the northern provinces (Mercury, Venus, Apollo [as a native god in Roman dress], and Hercules). The statuettes originate from Rome and Italy, Gaul and Raetia in the west, to the area of Syria and Asia Minor in the east. They were manufactured over a period of more than fifty years. Only one piece (no. 11, Venus) may date from the beginning of the third century. The rest are of the second century, with the majority dating from the last quarter of that century.

What is the significance of this group of statuettes, both as a group in its own right and for the hoard as a whole? From the dating evidence it follows that at the time of burial (c. 235–265) the statuettes were eighty or more years old, and the result is that the statuettes contribute nothing to a discussion of the date of deposition of the hoard. According to the authors (p. 142), however, what the statuettes do show through the combination of deities represented, their geographical origins and their age on burial, is that they come from a shrine of some sort. Although no shrine of any kind has yet been found at Weißenburg, either in the fort or in the settlement, the authors conclude on the grounds of size, place of origin and date that the statuettes come from a „Heiligtum von Rang und Bedeutung“ and not from a private *lararium*, and moreover that they reflect the military connections of the site: „Die Angehörigen des Militärs, die in Weißenburg ja sicher den Ton angaben, hatten weitläufige Beziehungen, wenn sie nicht selbst viel herunkamen“. There is little information, however, about the relationship of size of statuettes and the nature of the shrines from which they come. The authors offer no argument in support of their assertion. They might perhaps have pointed to the fact that, while the heights of the Weißenburg statuettes mostly range between 13,3 and 25,9 cm, the heights of the such statuettes as the four found in *Insula 5* in Augst are 9,4, 6, 6,2 and 11,6 cm, and unlike the Weißenburg figures are in scale with the *lararium* also found in Augst, in *Insula 24* (A. KAUFMANN-HEINIMANN, *Römische Bronzestatuetten aus Augst und Kaiseraugst*. In: *Augster Museumsh.* 5 [1983] 12–15). The statuettes from the wooden chest found in *Kaiseraugst-Schmidmatt* are also rather small, between 9 and 9,9 cm (A. KAUFMANN-HEINIMANN, *Die Bronzestatuetten aus Kaiseraugst-Schmidstatt*. *Jahresber. Augst u. Kaiseraugst* 7, 1987, 291–318). The authors might also have pointed to the small scale of figures known, or rather presumed, to have been used as table-decorations at dinner, for example the nine silver figurines from *Mâcon*, of which the heights range between 6,3 and 11,2 cm, and the silver statuette in the *Kaiseraugst* treasure, which is 11,2 cm high (F. BARATTE / K. S. PAINTER, *Trésors d'orfèvrerie gallo-romains* [1989] 187–197; 261). Nevertheless, the group of six bronze statuettes from a Roman house in *Schwarzenacker* (Saarland), are

clearly from a lararium (Die Römer am Rhein. Ausstellungskatalog, Köln [1967] Nr. H 3e). Their heights are 27,4 cm, 20,5 cm, 16,3 cm, 12,6 cm, 11,7 cm and 10,5 cm, and so the sizes of this group suggest that the Weißenburg statuettes also could well be from a lararium. What, then, might be the size of statuettes to be expected in a temple? The figure of Mercury from Berthouville, 56,6 cm high, may give an indication (BARATTE / PAINTER *op. cit.* 97, no. 27); but this does not mean, of course, that all statuettes need to have been this big. What must be remembered is that the quantity of evidence is small and therefore unreliable: the size of statuettes should be used with extreme caution and is not sufficient on its own in this context to support the authors' conclusions.

The authors will object, of course, that they have not relied only on the size of the statuettes for their argument. They cite the geographical origin of the statuettes and their age on burial. As to geographical origin, their concrete evidence is the attribution of two of the statuettes, an Apollo (no. 5) and a Venus (no. 10) to east Mediterranean workshops. The presence of these two in the group is best explained, they suggest, by the supposed service of the Ala I Hispanorum Auriana in the near east during Marcus Aurelius' Parthian War in 162–166. This might be possible if one accepts the date of the 160s given for both these statuettes given on pp. 38, 49, but unlikely if one takes the date of the 170s, given on p. 142. Even in its own right, the argument seems to have the weakness of being circular, coming close to saying that: (a) the east Mediterranean statuettes have military connections and must therefore come from a public shrine, and (b) the statuettes come from a public shrine and in the context must therefore have military connections (with the Ala I Hispanorum). The truth is, however, that we know little about how common statuettes from the east Mediterranean were in contexts north of the Alps, and there certainly seems to be no supporting evidence that the occurrence of such pieces points to military rather than civil ownership. The late first- or early second-century statuette of Venus, 20 cm high, for example, from the cellar of building XIV 5, at Verulamium (S. FRÈRE, Verulamium Excavations I. Reports Research Comm. Soc. Antiqu. London 28 [1972] 103–108; 140–143), deposited AD 300–315, can scarcely have military connections. As to the age of the statuettes on burial, we know so little of the nature of public and private hoards of statuettes that it clearly is not possible to adduce the age of the pieces in support of a particular argument. We must await the results of the current study of groups and hoards of statuettes by Dr Annemarie Kaufmann-Heinmann.

The most unambiguously religious group of objects in the hoard is the silver votive leaves. All eleven of them have figured decoration, showing the Capitoline triad (2), Mars (1), Mercury (1), Hercules (1), a genius (1), Luna (1), Fortuna (3), and Victoria (1). Only one carries an inscription (DEO HERCVLI); but the many comparable finds, principally but not solely from the provinces north of the Mediterranean (list in NOLL *op. cit.* 72–75, supplemented by Kellner and Zahlhaas, p. 69; see also the discussion by KÜNZL *op. cit.* 83–89), leave no doubt that these are votive. The authors insist (p. 142) that the leaves must be from a public shrine, and not a private context: „Gänzlich undenkbar ist... die Aufstellung der... Silbervotive in einer privaten Sphäre“. They are undoubtedly right that the evidence of the votive leaves points in this direction.

The authors illustrate the character of the bronze vessels (p. 87) by a comparison with the two hoards from Augst and Kaiseraugst (T. TOMASEVIC-BUCK, Ein Depotfund in Augusta Raurica, Insula 42. Bayer. Vorgeschbl. 45, 1980, 91–117; T. TOMASEVIC-BUCK, Ein Depotfund aus Augusta Raurica [Dorfstraße 1, Kaiseraugst, Kt. Aargau]. Bayer. Vorgeschbl. 49, 1984, 143–196). These two Swiss hoards consist of domestic table and cooking vessels. A few of the forms in these two hoards, such as various jugs, sieves and bowls, are found in the Weißenburg hoard; but most of the types, such as Hemmoor buckets, oval handled dishes, jugs with half covers and various forms of drinking vessels, are missing. This basic difference leads the authors to the conclusion that the bronze vessels from Weißenburg, unlike those in the Hagenbach and Neupotz hoards, are not kitchen and table vessels from a household. They go on to deduce (p. 87) that the vessels were for ‚another use‘: „Man kann also davon sagen daß es sich bei den Gefäßen aus dem Fund von Weißenburg nicht um Geräte aus dem Haushalt, sondern um solche für eine andere Verwendung gehandelt hat“. Readers who have the persistence to read the catalogue itself will find that the ‚other use‘ in the authors' minds is religious, for there are dedications on two of the pieces to the goddess Epona (p. 98 nos. 46 and 47).

When it comes to the iron objects the authors are less enigmatic. They conclude (p. 121) that the kitchen objects were used for sacrifice and cult, and they support this by pointing out that a similar collection of iron objects, for use both in the kitchen and in woodworking, is found in the hoard from Mauer an der Url. They repeat their conclusion in the discussion on p. 142, where they reason that the kitchen objects were religious because, like the bronze vessels, they could have been used for religious purposes: „Äxte und Messer, Säge und Fleischspieß mögen bei Opfer und Opfermahl ebenso verwendet worden sein, wie Kochgeräte, Dreifuß und verschiedene Bronzegefäße für Libation, Reinigung und Opfermahl“. The authors are of course right when they say that the iron objects could have been used for the preparation of cult- or offering-meal as that they were for secular cooking. Whichever use was

intended, they may not be out of place in a religious hoard, for the authors could have quoted the inventory of a church at Constantine in Numidia, made in 303, which included not only altar vessels but also everyday objects such as tunics, shoes, jars and chests (M. M. MANGO, *Silver from Early Byzantium* [1986] 264). Nevertheless, the iron objects themselves do not give us any information which enable us to decide in what circumstances they were used.

The significance of the parade armour in the hoard is more difficult to decide. In the catalogue of these pieces (pp. 80–85) the authors confine the discussion to the use and ownership of the helmets as military equipment, with nothing on their place in the Weißenburg group. In the discussion of the hoard as a whole they comment (p. 142) on the subject in a single sentence, „Auch für die Paraderüstungen wird ja eine Verwendung im kultischen Bereich angenommen“. In the footnote they refer the reader to a passage by J. GARBSCH (*Römische Paraderüstungen* [1978] 35–37), which turns out to be a discussion, based on Arrian (*Tactica*, 34ff.; also discussed by Keim in J. KEIM / H. KLUMBACH, *Der römische Schatzfund von Straubing* [1951] 10; and by H.-J. KELLNER, *Der römische Verwahrfund von Eining* [1978] 40–41), of the connection between face masks, horse sports and funeral games. It can scarcely be doubted, of course, that the ἱππικὰ γυμνάσια and the arms and armour which were used in it belonged at least in part to the realm of cult and ritual. But is this all that KELLNER and ZAHLHAAS had in mind? How might such objects then have found their way into a temple – and from there into a temple treasure?

It would have been helpful if the authors had devoted some pages to a discussion of the possible nature of the burial of hoards, and of this hoard in particular. Much might have been written on the subject, and indeed should have been, given the authors' main thesis for their book. Noll at least addressed the question in his book on the comparable hoard from Mauer an der Url (NOLL *op. cit.* 112–114). More recently Ernst Künzl has shown how such things should be done with his discussion of the sacred and votive objects in the Neupotz hoard (KÜNZL, *op. cit.* 85–104).

Noll pointed out there are at least four possible motives and interpretations for the burial of such a find: burial of rubbish; burial of objects destroyed in war or in religious conflict; ritual burial in a *favissa*; and finally burial in a hiding-place for safety during a crisis. Noll and the present authors elect for burial for safety, concluding that the hoard was buried in times of invasions. Kellner and Zahlhaas might point out that Noll, dealing with the similar hoard from Mauer an der Url comes to a similar conclusion and opts for the disturbances of the same period, the second third of the third century. It is to be noted, however, that Noll comes to his conclusion by comparing his assemblage with the Weißenburg find (NOLL *op. cit.* 113–114). Thus the combined arguments become circular.

But why should one not simply accept that these hoards, from Weißenburg and Mauer an der Url are temple treasures, the contents of temples (which happen to include some secular objects) hidden in a time of crisis? The problem is that there is a number of hoards of the same period, in the same area and with the same types of objects, except that parade armour and weapons were not found at Mauer an der Url. The parade helmets are very distinctive, and indeed they constitute by far the largest number of such helmets surviving from anywhere in the Roman Empire – about 40 % of all parade armour known (see GARBSCH *op. cit.*); but apart from these fine, decorated objects the hoards from Weißenburg, Mauer an der Url, Straubing, Eining and Künzing are remarkable for the similarity of their contents, and other finds could probably be grouped with them if we had sufficient information from the time of their discovery. A fairly crude categorisation of Weißenburg and its main comparanda gives the following table, most details of which are derived from Garbsch's 1978 catalogue.

	Weißenburg	Straubing	Eining	Künzing	Mauer a. d. Url
statuettes*	×	×	-	×	×
votive leaves*	×	-	-	-	×
PARADE ARMOUR					
helmets*	×	×	×	×	-
greaves	-	×	×	-	-
horse armour	-	×	×	×	-
BRONZE					
vessels*	×	×	-	×	×
fittings	×	-	-	-	×
scales and weights	-	-	-	-	×
IRON					
weapons	-	×	-	-	-
vessels	×	-	-	-	×
tools	×	×	×	-	×
cart- and harness-fittings	×	-	-	-	-
locks and chains	×	-	-	-	-
scales	×	-	-	-	-

* some but not all items include religious decoration or inscriptions.

I hope that readers will agree that the broad similarity of the contents of these hoards calls for some explanation. The groups of objects from Weißenburg and Mauer an der Url, the two temples, correspond, but differently, with aspects of the contents of the other hoards. Does this mean that the other hoards, from Straubing, Eining and Künzing, might also be from temples? The 'temples' of Weißenburg and Mauer an der Url, however, are a matter of conjecture by the scholars who have published these hoards, based to a great extent on the similarity of the contents of the two hoards to each other. This reasoning breaks down, however, if the similarity of the five hoards to each other is admitted, because it seems very unlikely that five temples would have such similar contents. The similarity, on the other hand, appears to rule out the idea that the hoards were put together by chance. Elements in the contents at the same time confirm a religious element. And the combination of these two factors suggests that, while some individual groups in each hoard must have come from shrines, whether large or small and whether public or private, each of these hoards as a whole is likely to be a religious deposit, not from a shrine or temple (and therefore also not a *favissa*), but religious in its own right.

But is it likely that such deposits would occur? Are there any parallels? Do they fit into the culture of the area? What the hoards may represent is evidence for a tendency in the northern and western (not the eastern) provinces of the Roman Empire, the 'Celtic' area, to entrust objects (coins are a different matter) to the ground for all sorts of complex reasons, not least religious, a habit which seems to be rooted far back in the prehistoric period. When such 'Celtic' hoards are found, there is then a fundamental problem in the interpretation of a group as the savings or valuables of an individual, or as booty, or as a sacred hoard. In the case of the Weißenburg hoard and the other finds from Raetia, it seems clear, because of the religious elements in the hoard and because of the apparent repeated deliberate selection of certain types of objects, that they cannot be booty and that, though not immediately from temples or shrines, they must all in some way be deliberate religious deposits in the ground. At the same time, however, there is no reason why the hoards should not also be valuables belonging to an individual or group, or that they should not be reserves of valuable metal. In any of these three cases such a hoard might have been left permanently in the ground or might have been recovered for re-use when convenient to its owners. The point is that the motives and intentions of the ancient owners of such hoards could have been, and probably were complex. How far such ideas are valid in the context of the Weißenburg hoard is not a matter to be solved in the course of a review; but it would have been helpful if the authors had discussed the problems at greater length in their publication. Overall, the authors may well not agree with the ideas put forward here; but it is a pity that they did not take the opportunity to review all the evidence which has now accumulated and to participate in the current debate about what such hoards as these tell us about an important period in the history of the area in which they live.