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INTRODUCTION

For many decades, discussion of the function of Iron Age coinage has rested heavily on analogies with early state societies in the Mediterranean, supported by the few references to Gaulish social and economic practices in the written sources. At the same time, the lack of independent dating has inhibited research into the reasons behind particular monetary developments by drawing numismatic chronologies inexorably towards a few key historical fixed points like the Gallic war. Since the sources are mainly concerned with military and political events, this in effect prejudices the very issues we need to discuss. Only in the last few years has this problem finally begun to recede, as a result of new excavations on Iron Age settlements and sanctuaries in northern France, Germany and the Low Countries, which have allowed a revised chronology to be built up for continental Iron Age coinages based on the occurrence of specific coin types in independently dated archaeological contexts. It is now accepted, for example, that contrary to received numismatic wisdom, there was no link between the Gallic war and the introduction of potin coinage, which had in fact been in widespread use in transalpine Gaul for a least a century before the Roman invasion.

This paper examines one way of using this newly-acquired archaeological evidence to investigate how the role and circulation of Iron Age coinage varied between regions and through time. In principle at least, the incidence of coin finds at different types of site should provide an indication of which sectors of Iron Age society used coinage most frequently and for what spheres of activity, although in practice the overall picture is bound to be influenced by regional variations in the settlement pattern, as well as by the history of previous


4 Such as those between northern and southern Belgic Gaul; see N. Roymans, Tribal Societies in Northern Gaul, Cingula 12 (Amsterdam, 1990), pp. 169-213.
research. The latter is particularly relevant where certain categories of site appear to have received disproportionate attention, as in the case of the many cemeteries dug by Moreau in the Aisne department in the late nineteenth century, or the more recent focus on Iron Age sanctuaries in Picardy.5

Precisely where on a site, and in what circumstances, coins were deposited, is also significant. Many major fortified sites (oppida) and other large nucleated settlements have evidence of internal zoning, with specific areas being designated for different purposes.6 Coins lost individually in one part of a settlement as they passed from hand to hand are to be interpreted quite differently from a series of religious offerings deposited in another area of the same site. The date of deposition may also be highly relevant, given that the character of many sites changed significantly during the period that Iron Age coinage was in use. It is not unusual, for instance, to find shrines within fortified sites still being frequented long after the latter had been abandoned as centres of population.

Hoards and temple offerings apart, it is usually assumed that most coin finds on Iron Age sites were accidental losses. There is mounting evidence, however, to suggest that even on settlements many coins were deposited intentionally. At Acy-Romance (Ardennes) for example, 23 of the Iron Age coins excavated up to 1990 (43%) came from postholes belonging to the latest structural phase.7 In contrast, post holes of three previous building phases were devoid of finds. This is not a function of chronology, since coins occur in storage pits contemporary with the earlier buildings.8 It suggests instead that the coins in the latest postholes were deliberately put there when the buildings were demolished, presumably as some kind of closure deposit. At the nearby site of Damary (Aisne), the majority of coin finds again seem to be connected with the abandonment of the settlement.9 At a third site in the same region, Beaurieux Les Grèves (Aisne), a coin of Germanus Indutilli L (Scheers 216) was found in the base of one of the main post holes of an Augustan timber building; it appeared to have been carefully placed there when the building was erected.10

Similar examples of potentially deliberate coin deposition abound on Iron Age sites throughout both Belgic Gaul and Britain.\(^\text{11}\)

To understand why Iron Age coinage was deposited, we therefore need to look carefully at the archaeological context, although there is always likely to be an element of subjectivity in our preferred interpretation. For instance, many hoards were buried near springs and sources, which other evidence implies were often of sacred character.\(^\text{12}\) Does this mean, however, that they should be interpreted as offerings to the relevant deities, or were they merely placed there for safe keeping by those gods, but never recovered? The treasure that the Romans found in the sacred lakes at Toulouse can be interpreted either way, while Caesar mentions the power of religious sanctions in protecting sacrificed war booty from subsequent violation.\(^\text{13}\) Other difficulties of interpretation revolve around whether individual coin finds are still in their original context, or have been redeposited from elsewhere. The latter problem is especially acute on long-lived sites where earlier layers were repeatedly subjected to later disturbances.\(^\text{14}\)

In the long term, we need more research on all these different aspects of the archaeological context of Iron Age coin finds, both general and specific. As a first step, this paper will examine the types of site on which individual Belgic coin series have been found, with the aim of establishing what this can tell us about the circulation and use of Iron Age coinage. I envisage this very much as a preliminary study, which needs to be followed up by further, more detailed analysis. I will begin by reviewing the extent to which our knowledge of individual Belgic coin series and provenances has altered in the 30 odd years since Scheers compiled her corpus,\(^\text{15}\) and explain how my own database of findspots was assembled.\(^\text{16}\)

### METHODOLOGY

Altogether, we can recognise five main phases of Iron Age coinage in Belgic


\(^{13}\) Strabo, *Geography* IV, 1, 13 (quoting Poseidonios); Caesar *BG* VI, 17.


\(^{16}\) A preliminary version of this paper, employing data assembled up until 2000, will be published in the forthcoming proceedings of the Round Table ‘Die Kelten und Rom: neue numismatische Forschungen’ held at the Titelberg, Luxembourg, in 1998.
Gaul, spanning some three hundred years (Table 1). Gold coinage began in the third century BC (Stage 1) and was the only metal in use until the early second century BC, when potin was introduced (Stage 2). In the late second and early first centuries BC, some peoples began to strike silver or bronze, and a new weight standard was adopted for gold (Stage 3). After the Roman invasion in 57 BC, inscribed bronze supplanted potin throughout the region (Stage 4). The latest Belgic issues date to the reign of Augustus, by which time Roman coinage was coming into wider use (Stage 5). Inevitably, not all series fit neatly into this scheme, with some important coinages spanning more than one stage.

TABLE 1.

Chronological development of Iron Age coinage in Belgic Gaul.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>3rd century BC</td>
<td>half-stater gold coinages inspired by Greek models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>c.200-125 BC</td>
<td>broad flan gold coinages and introduction of potin coinage in southern Belgic Gaul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>c.125-60 BC</td>
<td>more regionalised gold and potin coinages; introduction of silver; struck bronze coinage in western Belgic Gaul; occasional use of inscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>c.60-20 BC</td>
<td>debased gold coinages; tri-metallic sets; replacement of potin by struck bronze; use of legends becomes general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>c.20 BC - early 1st century AD</td>
<td>last indigenous coinages; increase in Roman coinage in circulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Belgic Gaul, there were four main coin-using zones, some more homogeneous than others (Fig. 1). The Western zone covers most of modern Artois, Picardy and upper Normandy and essentially equates to the area which Caesar calls Belgium.18

Most of the gold coinages minted in this region also circulated in south-east England. The Southern zone covers northern Champagne and the eastern Paris basin and was occupied in Caesar's day by the Remi and the Suessiones. The Central zone extends northwards from the river Oise into modern Belgium; the Nervii and smaller groups known collectively as Germani Cisrhenani lived...
here. Lastly, the Eastern zone extends from the middle Meuse to the Rhine. Its inhabitants in the mid first century BC were the Treveri, Mediomatrici and Leuci. The peoples of the northern coastal regions did not produce coinage until the very end of the Iron Age.

![Fig. 1. Belgic Gaul showing the principal sites and coinage zones.](image)

To collect provenance information for every Belgic coinage – let alone for other Gaulish series that circulated in the region – is both impossible and unnecessary. A sample should be more than adequate to reveal the principal archaeological and chronological trends. Accordingly, I have restricted my enquiry to those series which had at least ten findspots in Scheers’ corpus. This has two advantages. First, in most cases, the territory of origin is fairly well defined, and, second, larger numbers of findspots should reduce the likelihood of bias in the archaeological patterns. At the same time, I have for simplicity opted to retain Scheers’ classification essentially as it stands, although certain aspects of it have now inevitably been modified by more recent discoveries.\(^{19}\)

In a few cases, it made sense to group closely related series. These include the early gold coinage of the Somme basin (Scheers 1-5); the Armorican style coins of the Moselle valley (Scheers 16-20); the ‘au bateau’ quarter-staters (Scheers 13-14); the silver of *Caledu* (Scheers 42-43); the central Belgic *Commios/Garmanos* issues (Scheers 45-46); the various Picardy thin silver types (Scheers 51-53); the eastern Belgic bronzes of *Ambactus* (Scheers 139-140); and the western Belgic ‘chevrons’ potins (Scheers 205-206; 208-209).\(^{20}\) I

\(^{19}\) e.g. Delestrée, ‘Monnayages’, pp. 19-30; Sills, ‘Gold Coinage’.

have also followed current opinion by grouping the early Hesperange staters from the Trier area with the ‘à la fleur’ and ‘à la rosette’ half- and quarter-staters found in the same region (Scheers 6-7);\(^2\) by including the ‘anchor’ variety of triple-tailed stater (British QA) within Scheers 26;\(^2\) and by dividing the ‘eye’ staters (Scheers 30) between the southern Belgic classes I-III and the eastern Belgic classes IV-VI.\(^2\)

Applying the ten findspot threshold generated a total of 67 series: 18 gold (some debased), 7 silver, 14 potin, 22 bronze; and 6 bi- or tri-metallic (Scheers 25, 27-29; 30a, 45-46).\(^2\) I have omitted one common potin type (Scheers 187) since its distribution is centred on the Aube department, south of the river Marne, placing it outside the limits of Belgic Gaul recognised by Caesar.\(^2\) To fill chronological and geographical gaps, I then added two series with fewer than ten findspots: the debased Morville stater type (Scheers 37); and the Villeneuve-Saint-Germain silver group (Scheers 30/1, 50 etc).\(^2\) Finally, I have included two series that were omitted by Scheers but which clearly belong to Belgic Gaul: the ‘Massalia imitation’ potins found in the area north of Paris;\(^2\) and the late triquetrum coinage of the northern coastal region.\(^2\) The latter series has antecedents in the middle Rhineland, but the distribution focuses on the Dutch river delta and I concur with Roymans in seeing it as locally minted, perhaps following the migration of a group of Chatti into this region.\(^2\) This makes 71 series in all, about one-third of the total number attributed by Scheers to Belgic Gaul.

In order to update her lists of findspots, I used a variety of sources. For Alsace-Lorraine and the Ardennes, more recent surveys of Iron Age coin finds

\(^{21}\) cf. Sills, ‘Gold Coinage’, pp. 44-6, his Hesperange and Cinéy types.

\(^{22}\) L.P. Delestrée, ‘Les monnayages en or de la Gaule Belgique, dérivés du statère “à flan large”, RN 152 (1997), pp. 104-5; Haselgrove ‘Belgic Gaul’, p. 137. I have not included the uniface and copper-rich derivatives of the anchor-type (Mack 59-61), which seem to be restricted to Britain.


\(^{24}\) Counting the cast (Scheers 190-III, IV) and struck (Scheers 190-I, II) ‘au rameau’ bronzes from the Central zone as separate series.

\(^{25}\) BG I, 1.

\(^{26}\) For the latter, see J. Debord, ‘Une production tardive en argent de l’atelier monétaire gaulois de Villeneuve-St-Germain (Aisne)’, Mélanges Colbert de Beaulieu (Paris, 1987), pp. 235-52.


\(^{29}\) Ibid. pp. 113-8, drawing on Tacitus, Germ. 29, 1 and Hist. 4, 12.
provided a starting point. For the rest of northern France, I relied primarily on the relevant volumes of the *Carte Archéologique de la Gaul*. These were supplemented by coin lists from recently excavated sites, by studies of specific coinages, and by a literature search. My main sources for Germany and Luxembourg were Loscheider’s study of the coinage of the Trier region, and Wigg’s list of potin finds. In the Low Countries, Scheers has analysed the Iron Age coinages of what became the *Civitas Tungrorum* and Van Heesch covers the rest of modern Belgium. For Britain, I used the published Iron Age coin gazetteers, supplemented by the *BNJ Coin Register*, the Coin Hoards section of this journal, and the Celtic Coin Index at Oxford.

**IMPACT OF NEW FINDSPOTS**

On average, the number of known findspots for each series has very nearly doubled since 1977 (98%). Metal by metal, the increase is greatest for silver (111%) reflecting the proportionally greater impact of new excavations and metal detecting on what was previously the smallest database. Potin (102%) and
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gold (96%) are both close to the average, whilst struck bronze shows the lower increase (83%), for no reason that is readily apparent. Table 2 shows the types with the highest recorded increases. Some of these have been the subject of new studies, which explains their position on list, whilst in other cases we can point to a combination of factors. For example, the figure for thin silver (Scheers 51-53) has clearly been boosted by the number of recent sanctuary excavations in Picardy, aided by better excavation techniques and on-site metal detecting, factors that also apply to the tiny 'segments of circles' quarter-staters (Scheers 152).

TABLE 2.

Belgic series showing an increase in findspots of > 150% since 1977.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Increase in findspots</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 152 AV, AR, AE ¼</td>
<td>357%</td>
<td>Doyen 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 31 AV</td>
<td>275%</td>
<td>Scheers 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 6-7 etc</td>
<td>225%</td>
<td>Sills 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 55 AR</td>
<td>219%</td>
<td>Loscheider 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 54 AR</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 199 Potin</td>
<td>192%</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 200 Potin</td>
<td>158%</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 162 AE</td>
<td>157%</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 45-46 AR, AE</td>
<td>155%</td>
<td>Van Heesch 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 51-53 AR</td>
<td>155%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3.

Belgic series showing an increase in findspots of less than 33% since 1977.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Increase in findspots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 23 AV ¼</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 41 AR</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 143 AE</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 164 AE</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 153 AE</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 37 AV</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 28 AV, AR, AE</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 42-43 AR</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the series with relatively small increases in findspots belong to the fringes of Belgic Gaul (Table 3). These areas received least emphasis in the literature search and may well be under-represented. Some of the relevant
Coinages may not even be Belgic: the early Pegasus quarter-staters (Scheers 23) are found on both sides of the Rhine, while the Caledu silver types (Scheers 42-43) and A. Hir Imp bronzes (Scheers 153) possibly originated west of the Seine. The wide dispersal of the Ateula Vlatos series gives little clue to the area of origin, but its distribution seems to thin out in the Belgic heartlands, which may explain the below average increase in findspots. The type has close affinities with the Caledu coins and may therefore have been minted in Celtic Gaul. The distribution of the Roveca (Scheers 28) and Epenos/Ἐπνόος series (Scheers 143) centres on Seine-et-Marne, a region not yet covered by the Carte Archéologique. The low increases for the Morville staters (Scheers 37) and Suticos/Ratumacos bronzes (Scheers 164) is less easy to explain, as both are from regions with recent surveys, but might be a function of the overall rarity of the series, or of the sites on which they circulated.

To what extent do these figures reflect the real increase in findspots over the last 25 years? In general terms, a relative lack of new publications on coinages that originated within modern France resulted in less information being collected than for series which circulated primarily in Germany or the Low Countries. As Roymans notes, the picture is also influenced by the archaeological reporting regimes in the different countries. His data on the triquetrum coinage illustrate this point very well.37 In 1981, only 22 findspots were known for this series, slightly more of them in Germany than in the Netherlands. Fifteen years later, Scheers could list 45 findspots,38 whilst I noted 89. Although high, an increase of this magnitude (305%) is within the range in Table 2. Roymans’ study, however, produced a further 90 findspots, bringing the total for the Netherlands alone to 111.39 Much of his data came directly from detectorists. In consequence, the Netherlands now has twice as many findspots as Germany, despite research there too,40 and the sample, which I have analysed, is only half the known total (49.7%).

The situation in the Netherlands may be exceptional, but nevertheless provides an insight into the number of metal detector finds that go unrecorded elsewhere. Before the Treasure Act was introduced, de Jersey estimates that no more than one-third of Iron Age finds were reported in Britain, even in areas with sympathetic recording regimes,41 and it is still too early to judge to what extent the situation has now improved. In France, the reporting rate appears to be lower still, judging from the number of Gallo-Belgic finds recorded on opposite sides
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40 J. Heinrichs, Regenbogenschüsselchen der Nördlichen (Triquetrum-) Gruppe. Typologie, Provenienz, historische Bedeutung (in preparation).
of the Channel since 1977, although this may be partly because finds reported to regional archives or museums have yet to find their way into the literature. Nevertheless, I can see no particular reason why the data that I have assembled for northern France should be markedly less representative of the types of sites on which coins occur than for anywhere else.

It is worth looking briefly at the series with over 100 findspots. Four are gold, three potin, and the others bronze (Table 4). The most 'prolific' of all is the uniface type (Scheers 24), which circulated on both sides of the Channel, just over half the findspots being British (54%). The next commonest are the 'boar-standard' and 'torc-bearer' potins (Scheers 186, 191) and the late Germanus Indutilli L type (Scheers 216). Amongst the others are three more Gallo-Belgic types: the broad-flan and biface series (Scheers 8-9) and the 'boat' quarter-staters (Scheers 13). The proportion of British findspots for Scheers 9 (49%) and Scheers 13 (57%) is comparable to Scheers 24, whereas Scheers 8 is much commoner in Britain (75%). This may have implications for where the series were minted and in which direction they crossed the Channel.

TABLE 4.

Most prolific Belgic series by Σ findspots (>100 findspots).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Σ findspots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 24 AV</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 186 Potin</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 191 Potin</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 216 AE</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 190 Potin</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 8 AV</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 9 AV</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 13-14 AV</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 217 AE</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 146 AE</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rank order shows few changes from 1977. The exceptions are Scheers 13-14 and 217, each of which had fewer findspots than the Ateula Vlatos silver (Scheers 41) and the tri-metallic Criciru series (Scheers 27). Scheers 13-14 and

42 From the new provenances listed in Sills, ‘Gold Coinage’, pp. 59-62, 135-9, 151-7 etc, the reporting rate in France for gold seems currently to be around half the British figure. The number of continental findspots of Scheers 1-5 has increased by 44%, insular findspots by 80%. For Scheers 8, the equivalent increases are 24% and 46%.
Scheers 217 have both been subjected to new studies, whilst their numbers have been further boosted by specific circumstances (the many sanctuary excavations in Picardy; the high reporting rates in the Netherlands), showing that such factors do influence our knowledge.

IDENTIFYING AND CLASSIFYING SITE FINDS

Scheers' listings do not always specify if coins came from excavations or known sites. In order to check the findspots, I consulted a range of sources. Detailed inventories exist for Iron Age oppida and fortified settlements; Iron Age and Gallo-Roman sanctuaries and temples; and Gallo-Roman nucleated settlements; whilst Chevallier provides a useful gazetteer of sites in areas of northern France not yet covered by the *Carte Archéologique* and also includes the Low Countries. For Germany, there are regional studies of Roman sites for all but one of the relevant Länder. For Britain, I updated my own previous listing of coin-yielding sites.

Problems arise in linking coin finds to rural settlements and in determining the character of sites known only from surface finds, or excavated a long time ago. In these cases, I relied on a range of publications and annual round-ups. David Wigg, Jeannot Metzler, and Nico Roymans all generously checked queries against their own records and provided me with information about additional sites in Germany, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Even so, some sites will have escaped my attention.

Not all finds are closely provenanced. Many records refer only to the commune or town, others are even more imprecise. This creates difficulties in evaluating the evidence, particularly when more than one site is known in the
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vicinity. I therefore used the same approach as in my study of British coinage and distinguished between exact findspots (F1) and other reliable findspots lacking a precise location (F2).\textsuperscript{52} Provided the two sets of data are consistent, the information can be amalgamated, whereas if major discrepancies are revealed, these need to be investigated.

Unless there were firm indications to the contrary, I treated coins recorded as 'found near' a place (F3) as non-site finds, although some of them probably are from sites, known or otherwise. Vaguer provenances like 'in the department' I omitted altogether. Where a coin is one of several from the same location, but there is no evidence of a hoard, it is classed as a 'multiple find'.\textsuperscript{53} Hoards were also recorded separately, unless associated with other archaeological remains, in which case they are entered under the relevant site. I have also separately listed coins found in rivers and other wet locations. While some of these 'wet finds' could have been eroded out of dry land deposits, most of them were probably deliberately placed in water, as we shall see.

Information on provenance is poorest for the precious metals. As Table 5 shows, on average just over one-third of gold findspots are well documented, compared to over half for silver, over three-fifths for potin and nearly three-quarters for bronze. Gold coins have always attracted attention due to their value, but many older discoveries are poorly recorded, as are many metal detector finds. The only base-metal coinages to show clearly the impact of metal detecting are those from the Trier area, where Gilles has been active in recording finds.\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{TABLE 5.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>% of F1 findspots</th>
<th>% of F1 findspots known to be sites</th>
<th>% of all findspots known to be sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>76 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>55 %</td>
<td>95 %</td>
<td>81 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potin</td>
<td>63 %</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>82 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>93 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{52} Haselgrove, ‘\textit{Iron Age coinage}’, pp. 42-3. Here I have not differentiated between excavated sites and other precise findspots.

\textsuperscript{53} Haselgrove, ‘\textit{Iron Age coinage}’, pp. 67-9.

\textsuperscript{54} Gilles, \textit{op. cit.} n. 34.
The lack of closely-provenanced finds helps explain why only 43% of gold coins are site finds, compared to 80% or more for the other three metals. Nevertheless, as Table 5 shows, a significant minority of precisely provenanced gold coins (F1) are from locations with no other recorded remains (approximately 1 in 4), a pattern that has previously been noted for Britain.\(^{55}\) In contrast, only 1 in 50 definite findspots for bronze or potin coins are without known archaeological remains, and only 1 in 20 silver.

The implications are twofold. First, these figures imply that most less well-recorded bronze and potin finds are probably also from sites, and many less silver ones as well, although for gold we need to keep a more open mind. It follows that our data are probably more incomplete for coin types which were primarily associated with less visible types of site than for series that were used predominantly on obvious sites like *oppida* or nucleated settlements. Second, since F1 provenances for potin and bronze outnumber F2 finds by 2:1 and 3:1 respectively, the patterns are likely to be more reliable for these metals than for gold and silver.

I divided the types of sites yielding coins into ten categories: (1) *oppida* and other Iron Age fortified sites; (2) Roman *civitas* capitals and public towns; (3) secondary agglomerations; (4) rural sites; (5) industrial and craft sites; (6) large sanctuary complexes; (7) smaller cult places and isolated temples; (8) Iron Age/early Roman burials; (9) late Roman/early medieval burials; and (10) Roman military complexes. Classifying individual sites can be far from straightforward, owing to changes in the character of occupation. At Reims (*Durocortorum*), for example, the Roman *civitas* capital grew out of a La Tène D2 *oppidum*, which itself replaced a smaller La Tène D1 settlement.\(^{56}\) Many *oppida*, *civitas* capitals and nucleated settlements experienced early Roman military occupation, while some cult places inside fortified sites were frequented long after the main occupation had ended. Sometimes the nature of the site itself is unclear, not just for old excavations and surface scatters, but also with recently investigated sites. Was Beauvais, Les Aulnes du Canada (Oise) a cult enclosure (my preferred interpretation) or a settlement?\(^{57}\) In other cases, categories merge into one another: some important sanctuaries formed part of larger settlements, others were apparently isolated.

As far as possible, I have classified individual sites according to their status at the time when Iron Age coinage was in maximum use. Reims is therefore deemed an *oppidum*, whereas Amiens (*Samarobriva*) and Paris (*Lutetia*) are
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categorised as public towns, because – although Caesar mentions them both – the earliest known settlement dates to the Augustan period. The term 'sanctuary complex' is reserved for extensive religious sites like Ribemont-sur-Ancre (Somme) and Epiais-Rhus (Val d'Oise) where there is little evidence of habitation, whereas cult sites within residential agglomerations, as at Dalheim (Luxembourg), are not differentiated from the parent settlements. I have included vici attached to Roman forts in the 'Roman military' category, rather than trying to split them artificially into military and civilian components. The finds from the Alesia and Kalkriese battlefields are also entered under this heading.

In a few cases, I have arbitrarily classified sites according to the function of the main coin-yielding area: for instance, I have recorded the Martberg-bei-Pommern and Wallendorf in the Moselle Valley as cult sites, because, although both occupy fortified plateau locations, the vast majority of the coins found at the two sites were evidently deposited in a religious context. I have not differentiated 'villas' from other rural settlements, in view of the difficulty of applying such distinctions to Iron Age farmsteads, and to sites known only from surface finds.

As a rule, sites have been included in the database in one category only, even if there are indications of internal zoning. I have however recorded finds from burials and wet sites separately from associated settlements. At Paris, for example, the coins found in the Seine were distinguished from those found within the Roman settlement, while at Acy-Romance, the coins from the cemeteries at La Croisette and La Noue Mauroy were entered separately from the settlement finds. At this particular complex, Scheers 191 is therefore recorded three times in all. Wherever possible, I have also distinguished between early and later cemeteries, so that the reuse of Iron Age coins in Frankish and Merovingian graves can be investigated as a discrete phenomenon.

In interpreting the results, it is important to remember that many sites had multiple functions – not just oppida and civitas capitals, but also Roman forts, secondary agglomerations, and even sanctuaries. Coin lists from a single 'site' can reflect a wide range of activities. This paper is, however, concerned primarily with the question of what the incidence of specific coin types on different classes of site can tell us about how they were used.

58 BG V, 24; VI, 3. It seem likely that a number of later Gaulish (and British) civitas capitals originated as periodic meeting places, e.g. Fichtl, ‘La Ville Celtique’, pp. 201-4. Another possibility is that the name was transferred from an existing centre nearby.


In all, I have recorded 1128 archaeological sites which have yielded one or more coins belonging to the 71 Iron Age coin series considered here. At 870 of these sites (77%), the findspot of at least some of the relevant coins is known for certain. A total of 133 sites are in Britain (12%), virtually all the rest being in Belgic Gaul or adjacent areas of Celtic Gaul, Switzerland and Germany. Occasional Belgic coins occur yet further afield; the oppidum of Stradonice (Czech Republic), for example, has yielded both silver and potin types (Scheers 56, 186, 191).

As Figure 2 shows, easily the most important single category of coin-yielding site is the rural settlement, which accounts for nearly one-quarter of the total number (272 sites, 24%). This is not surprising. For over half the period coinage was in use, Belgic society was rurally based and this was still true of northern Belgic Gaul in the mid first century BC. It would be interesting to know what percentage of rural sites in a given area have coins, since this should provide a fair index of the extent to which coin use had penetrated different levels of Belgic society, but, as yet, only limited and contradictory data are available. In the middle Aisne Valley in southern Picardy, for example, nearly half the rural settlements have yielded Iron Age coins. Since not even large-scale excavations recover all the evidence, this implies that a majority of rural sites in this area had access to coinage. This is in marked contrast to the plateau and coastal plain north of the river Somme, where none of the recent excavations along the A16

Fig. 2. Proportions of archaeological sites of different types yielding Belgic coinage

autoroute yielded coins.\textsuperscript{62} At face value, the obvious reason for this difference might seem to be that potin – the principal site find in the Aisne Valley\textsuperscript{63} – was hardly used in north-west Picardy. However, differing votive practices on rural settlements may also be a factor, since the sites in the middle Oise Valley also lack coin finds despite lying within the potin-using zone.\textsuperscript{64}

The variable quality of the available information makes it difficult to generalise about the social and economic status of the rural settlements that yield Iron Age coins. Only a minority appear to have been occupied exclusively during the Iron Age (19\%), but they cover the full spectrum from small isolated farms to large hamlets. Perhaps more significantly, two-thirds of the rural sites that were occupied in Gallo-Roman times are classified as 'villas' (65\%). Although inconsistent use of the term 'villa' may have inflated the numbers, this trend supports the idea that coinage on the continent was preferentially associated with high-status rural settlements, as also seems to be the case in Britain.\textsuperscript{65}

It is unusual for individual rural sites to yield more than a handful of coins. This is in marked contrast to the next largest class, comprising Iron Age and Gallo-Roman cult sites and temples (174 sites, 15\%), where finds often run into hundreds, if not thousands. Whilst many of these coins were undoubtedly deposited after the Conquest and some of the sites are apparently Roman foundations, it is clear that the custom of making coin offerings on religious sites has earlier origins.\textsuperscript{66} More and more Gallo-Roman temples are yielding evidence of Iron Age activity, among them Bennecourt (Yvelines), Fesques (Seine-Maritime), and the Martberg-bei-Pommern.\textsuperscript{67} Many of the 24 larger sanctuaries (2\%) with coin finds such as Epiais-Rhus and Ribemont-sur-Ancre were also evidently already important foci in the pre-Roman period.\textsuperscript{68} These larger sites occur throughout Belgic Gaul, but are commonest in the west.


\textsuperscript{63} Six of the 18 rural settlements excavated in the middle Aisne Valley since 1974 have yielded Iron Age coins; another two previously excavated sites also have finds. Potin occurs at all eight sites, but only two have bronze and one gold. Three of the sites were occupied in La Tène C1-C2; the rest date to the later second or first centuries BC.

\textsuperscript{64} Wellington, ‘Placing Iron Age coinage’, pp. 239-42.

\textsuperscript{65} Haselgrove, ‘Iron Age Coinage’, pp. 151-61; 180-8.


\textsuperscript{67} L. Bourgeois, Le sanctuaire rural de Bennecourt (Yvelines), Documents Arch. Française 77 (Paris, 1999) ; E. Mantel, Le Sanctuaire de Fesques, Nord-Ouest Arch. 8 (Bercy-Sur-Mer, 1997) ; Wigg-Wolf, ‘Coins and ritual’.

A substantial number of wet sites have yielded Belgic coins (135 sites, 12%). The practice of depositing valuable objects in water and in other naturally significant locations is widely attested in Iron Age Europe.\(^6^9\) While some of these items could have been accidental losses, and others may have been concealed with the intention of eventual recovery, the consensus among archaeologists is that most of them were votive offerings – although there is often some ambiguity. The custom of making coin offerings in rivers and thermal springs is attested in the early Roman period at sites such as Condé-sur-Aisne and Bourbonne-les-Bains.\(^7^0\)

As Figure 3 shows, rivers account for two-fifths of the wet sites yielding coins (41%). Many of these finds are from the vicinity of bridges and were probably disturbed by building or dredging activities.\(^7^1\) Given this bias, we cannot be certain whether such offerings cluster at river crossings, but many of the relevant bridges are themselves of great antiquity and probably replaced still older crossings – the Römerbrücke at Trier is one example, the Pont au Change in Paris another – making this not unlikely. A number of other finds come from fords, although we might speculate whether the paving found at Condé-sur-Aisne was really the remains of a ford, or could have been part of an offering platform similar to the timber jetties found at La Tène.

---


Next in importance are coin finds from beaches and cliffs (21%), and springs or sources (20%). The greater frequency of beach finds in south-east England – 24 out of 28 coastal finds are from there – is one of the main differences between Britain and the continent. No simple explanation presents itself and it seems likely that we are dealing with divergent cultural practices, although the greater length of coastline in south-east England and the extensive coastal changes in the Rhine-Meuse delta area may well have exaggerated the differences. If beach finds are left out of the picture, the proportions of river (39%) and spring finds (23%) are very similar to the continent.

The small number of finds from lakes and ponds (2%) might seem surprising, given Poseidonios' claim that the practice of depositing gold and silver in lakes was widespread. He was however referring to Aquitania and Celtic Gaul, rather than Belgic Gaul. We should also remember that some of the bogs and marshes where coins have been found (13%) may still have been open water two thousand years ago; also coins lying at the bottom of a lake are possibly less likely to have been disturbed than those placed in rivers or springs.

If we add the wet sites to the dryland cult places, nearly one-third of the sites with Belgic coins probably had a primarily religious function (30%). This already high figure takes no account of coins from the two next most common findspots – secondary agglomerations (12%) and oppida (11%) – that are actually from religious precincts within these larger complexes. In many cases, the proportion is likely to be significant, as at the Titelberg oppidum in Luxembourg and the nearby nucleated settlement at Dalheim, both of which contain important sanctuaries. Also not to be overlooked within the wider category of ‘ritual’ is the inclusion of coins in burials. Belgic coins have been found at no fewer than 97 Iron Age or early Roman cemeteries (9%), although prior to the mid first century BC, it is unusual for coins to occur in more than one grave in the same cemetery. There are a few exceptions, however, such as the long-lived graveyard at Wederath-Belginum and the smaller burial grounds around Acy-Romance.

Curation of Belgic coins in late Roman or Merovingian burials is surprisingly common. No fewer than 69 cemeteries used at this period have yielded coins (6%). In some cases, the coins may have been disturbed when graves were dug through earlier deposits, as at Audun-le-Tiche (Moselle), where a Merovingian cemetery was established on the site of a Gallo-Roman fanum. In other cases,

72 ap. Strabo, Geography IV, 1, 13.
74 See Lagadec and Liéger, ‘La circulation monétaire’.
however, the careful placing of the coins or the addition of suspension loops leaves little doubt that they were deliberately included in the graves. This raises the intriguing question of how the people using these burial grounds acquired coins which were four or five hundred years old. Most of them are potins and bronzes of little intrinsic value. The likelihood is that they were simply taken from old cult sites, which had long since been abandoned. Sometimes coins collected in one place may even have been transported to a different area as a result of late Roman troop movements or the resettlement of Germanic mercenaries. For example, ‘torc-bearer’ potins (Scheers 191) are often found in Frankish graves near the Rhine, which is on the fringe of their distribution. In Britain, two Belgic potins reused as balance weights have been found in Anglo-Saxon graves.  

A significant number of civitas capitals (40 sites) and Roman forts (49 sites) have yielded Belgic coins; together they represent some 8% of coin-yielding sites. Many of the gold and silver coins from these two categories of site are poorly recorded, and are probably either incorrectly attributed, or survivals from earlier activity in the vicinity. This leaves production sites, of which there are a mere 13 with Iron Age coins (1%). This might seem surprisingly few given the assumed links between coinage and exchange, but may simply indicate that the products were normally exchanged elsewhere. Alternatively, most of the manufacturing activity may have been concentrated at the oppida and other major settlements, many of which had their own industrial quarters. Six of the 13 production sites with coins are associated with iron working, two with salt extraction, and two with pottery manufacture.

We can also examine the extent to which coins struck in different metals are associated with various types of site (Fig. 4). Only sites with well-recorded finds are considered (F1). Silver, unsurprisingly, is the rarest metal at ten of the 11 categories, the exception being Roman forts, where it is less rare than gold. The place of silver in the Roman monetary system and the siting of Augustan forts in areas where silver was previously used are probably both relevant. Conversely, silver occurs on more cult sites than on any other type of site, although a fair number of finds come from wet sites.

The correlation between gold deposition and cult activity is even more marked. Gold occurs more often at wet and sacred sites than at any other category, and it is by far the best-represented metal at the former. Rural settlements are the next commonest category of sites with gold, followed by

---


76 If some of the civitas capitals founded in the reign of Augustus were indeed on the site of periodic meeting places, this might help explain the number of precious metal finds in their vicinities.
oppida, nucleated settlements and cemeteries; over half the major sanctuaries also have gold finds. Silver, in contrast, occurs at more oppida and secondary agglomerations than rural sites. The reason for this is probably in part chronological: silver did not come into use until Stage 3, when settlement centralisation was gathering pace in several areas of Belgic Gaul.

Chronology is also a factor in the pattern of base metal deposition. Potin – which had its main period of use in Stages 2-3 – occurs at more rural settlements, cult sites and oppida (in that order) than any other metal. On the other hand, struck bronze coinage – although again commonest on rural settlements and cult sites – is found at fewer oppida and at more secondary agglomerations, public towns and Roman forts – all types of site that had their fullest development in Stages 4-5. Bronze is also found on more Iron Age and early Roman cemeteries, and industrial sites. Potin was favoured in late Roman and Merovingian burials, no doubt due to its glossy appearance and exotic designs, which made the coins popular as amulets or charms as well as setting them apart from Roman coinage of this date.

![Fig. 4. Breakdown of archaeological sites yielding Belgic coinage by metal (F1 only)](image)

In general, the types of site on which Belgic coins are found in Britain mirror those on the continent, particularly fortified and nucleated settlements, but there are also some differences, notably the lower representation of rural settlements,
cemeteries, and Roman military sites, and higher incidence of wet places and cult sites.\textsuperscript{77} Again, the differences are, to some extent, chronological: the majority of Belgic coins found in Britain date to a period when the settlement pattern in many areas of south-east England was still dominated by hillforts, whilst by the time the Romans conquered Britain, no continental Belgic coinages had been minted for at least a generation.\textsuperscript{78} Otherwise, the differences are probably functional: the majority of Belgic coins found in Britain are of gold, which as we have seen, is particularly common on wet sites and cult sites, a tendency which the large number of insular beach finds has further exacerbated.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPRESENTATION OF COIN TYPES BY PERIOD**

**Stage 1 (third century BC)**

Having looked at general patterns, we can examine some more specific chronological and geographical trends. In the third century BC, all the coinages circulating in Belgic Gaul were of gold.\textsuperscript{79} Two main series can be defined: the Picardy group of half- and quarter-staters (Scheers 1-5) and the Hesperange-Ciney group of staters and divisions (Scheers 6-7 etc). The distribution of the first group is focused on western Belgic Gaul, but extended to southern England, whilst the latter coinages seem to have circulated primarily in the regions bordering the rivers Meuse and Moselle, in eastern Belgic Gaul.

Both coinages were probably originally fairly extensive, but few examples have survived, suggesting that at this period, gold was generally deposited only in exceptional circumstances. Contemporary hoards are unknown and the only stratified finds are from much later contexts.\textsuperscript{80} As Table 6 shows, around two-thirds of the recorded provenances for Scheers 1-5 have no obvious archaeological associations, most being single finds.

It is however possible that some of these findspots are in fact unrecognised sites, especially as many of them are poorly recorded older finds. Middle La Tène settlements are generally small and would not easily be recognised without excavation, any more than would religious shrines that lack physical structures. Ditched cult enclosures like Gournay-sur-Aronde or Ribemont-sur-Ancre were still rare in the third century BC, and it is widely presumed that in this era the

\textsuperscript{77} In Britain, 28.8\% of the archaeological sites with Belgic coins are wet sites and another 21.1\% cult sites of one kind or another, compared to figures of 9.9\% and 14.7\% for the continent.

\textsuperscript{78} Richborough is the only Roman military site in Britain to which Belgic coins can certainly be provenanced.

\textsuperscript{79} Haselgrove, ‘ Belgic Gaul’, pp. 120-5.

\textsuperscript{80} A number of multiple finds might originally have been hoards, as at Amiens (Somme), Milton (Kent) and Orsett (Essex), particularly the latter which includes coins of second century BC date. Two worn Scheers 4 coins formed part of a much later (first century AD) hoard at Waltham-St-Lawrence (Berkshire).
Gauls mainly used places like woods, groves, or trees for ritual purposes along with wet sites.\(^{81}\)

Since the majority of Scheers 1-5 coins from known sites – including all four F1 finds – come from cult places rather than settlements, this seems most likely to be the case with finds from any unrecognised sites as well. The novelty – and presumably value – of the coins militates against many of them having been accidental losses, whilst the recent discovery at Ribemont-sur-Ancre of several ‘sword’ type half- and quarter-staters originating in lower Normandy in association with third century BC weaponry seems to confirm that gold coins were deposited on sacred sites from a fairly early date, at least occasionally.\(^{82}\) A Scheers 1 quarter-stater and another of uncertain type which were found in a later context on the same site could well have been deposited around the same time as the ‘sword’ coins, but disturbed by the later rebuilding of the sanctuary.\(^{83}\)

The Hesperange-Ciney group displays a broadly similar pattern to Scheers 1-5, with single or multiple finds again accounting for some three-fifths of the provenances. The main difference is the much smaller proportion of finds from cult sites, although a Hesperange half-stater (Scheers 6) found in the old bed of the river Lesse outside the cave at Hans-sur-Lesse (Namur) appears to be a good

---

\(^{81}\) See n.12. As Webster ‘Sacred places’, p. 448, notes, however, this concept of Gaulish sacred space depends mainly on classical texts dating to the first century AD and might be misleading. The only earlier reference – Artemidorus’ mention of an open air ritual in c.100 BC at Cape St Vincent – relates to Spain not Gaul and – like Poseidonios’ comment on lakes – is passed on to us by Strabo (Geography, III, 1, 4).

\(^{82}\) The coins – together with the remains of what may have been a purse and half a gold torc (which seems to have been crudely refashioned into an armlet) – were found amongst a mass of La Tène C1b weaponry and headless human remains just outside the enclosure ditch; see L.-P. Delestrée, ‘L’or du trophée laténien de Ribemont-sur-Ancre (Somme) témoin d’une bataille oubliée’, RN 157 (2001), pp.177-215. The origins of this complex deposit, known as the charnier, has given rise to much debate. Some consider it to be the collapsed remains of a trophy erected to commemorate a battle, whilst others argue that the bodies and their possessions were simply left to decompose there; most seem to agree however that the associated weaponry is so homogenous that it probably originated in a single event.

If, as Delestrée argues, the coins belonged to a dead warrior, they should not be materially later than the latest weapons in the charnier, but until this complex site is published in detail, it would be unwise completely to exclude the possibility that they were a secondary deposit, which somehow became mixed with the mass of weaponry and human remains, prior the rebuilding of the sanctuary in the first century BC. There is certainly a small amount of La Tène C2-D1 material from the site, implying that it was still frequented in the second century BC.

\(^{83}\) Delestrée, ‘Monnayages’, p. 85. I am not persuaded by Lambot’s suggestion that the ‘sword’ coins were not deposited until the mid first century BC and almost immediately disturbed by the rebuilding. In that case, one might expect some of the numerous first century BC Gaulish coins from the site to have found their way into the charnier, not just the ‘sword’ types. Lambot does however draw attention to various difficulties with the interpretation of the stratigraphy, again underlining the need to reserve final judgement until the evidence is published in full; see B. Lambot, ‘Les monnaies gauloises en or de Ribemont-sur-Ancre (Somme). Réflexion sur leur datation, RAP 1/2 (2004), pp.123-38.
example of ritual deposition at a naturally significant location.\textsuperscript{84} Settlement finds spots include a villa and two 'secondary agglomerations', but none of the relevant coins are securely provenanced, whilst two of the settlements seem to be Roman foundations. The third, Yverdon-les-Bains (Vaud), was occupied in the third century BC, but its thermal springs – which were certainly venerated in the Roman period\textsuperscript{85} – may perhaps be a more plausible context of discovery for a coin that had travelled so far from its territory of origin than the settlement itself.

### TABLE 6.

Provenances of early Belgic gold types (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin type</th>
<th>Number of findspots</th>
<th>Single-find</th>
<th>Multiple-find</th>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Wet-find</th>
<th>Religious site</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 1-5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperange-Ciney</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 8</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 16-20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 32-33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 2 (c.200-125 BC)**

Second century BC gold coinages survive in far greater numbers and are distinguished from the earliest types by their broader flans and lower weights.\textsuperscript{86} In western Belgic Gaul, they comprise the flamboyant Apollo head coins (Scheers 8, Gallo-Belgic A) and related 'defaced' types (Scheers 10, Gallo-Belgic B), along with the scarcer 'crescent' series (Scheers 11). Important eastern Belgic series included the 'Pegasus' types of the middle Rhineland (Scheers 23); the 'Armorican style' coins of the Trier area (Scheers 16-20); and

\textsuperscript{84} Later silver and potin coins have also been found at the site; see Scheers, ‘Frappe et circulation’, p. 36.


\textsuperscript{86} Haselgrove, ‘Belgic Gaul’, pp. 125-34.
the 'backward-looking horse' and 'janiform head' series in eastern France (Scheers 32-33; Scheers 34). Most of these Eastern zone coins are struck in much poorer alloys than their western counterparts. 'Globules-à-la-croix' (Scheers 15) were the only gold coins used in southern Belgic Gaul in Stage 2 and they probably only appeared late in the period.

During Stage 2, gold deposition in western Belgic Gaul and south-east England increased greatly in intensity, but in other ways repeats many of the patterns established in Stage 1 (Table 6 above). On average, two-thirds of the provenances for Scheers 8, 10 and 11 are again single or multiple finds without known archaeological associations, although the proportion falls to nearer one-third when only F1 finds are considered. Hoards do now occur – although substantial finds like Behringen or Tayac are still very much the exception – and more coins were deposited at beaches and other wet sites.87 The Tayac hoard (although in Aquitania, not Belgic Gaul) falls into this class, being buried within 50m of two springs. Like the 1999 find at Ribemont-sur-Ancre, both the Behringen and Tayac hoards contained coins from further afield as well as gold torcs.88 Cult places and sanctuaries are the most frequent single source of site finds, followed by rural settlements. In Britain, there are finds from second century BC hillforts like Cholesbury and Oldbury as well as later nucleated settlements such as Braughing and Heybridge.89

Stage 2 gold coinages in the Eastern zone follow the same basic trends as their western counterparts, but there are differences, such as the lack of definite hoards. In the middle Rhineland and the Moselle Valley, the number of single finds seems to be lower than elsewhere (i.e. for Scheers 16-20, 23), which might imply some differences in the way that gold was treated there. More generally, Stage 2 Eastern zone coinages mirror the earlier Hesperange-Ciney types by occurring more often on settlements, including several oppida.90 Scheers 23 quarter-staters, for instance, are known from the Dornburg (Hessen), Manching (Bavaria) and Geneva (Switzerland), the latter both well outside the normal distribution. The reason why Eastern – but not Western – gold types occur at oppida in Stage 2 is probably primarily chronological; oppida developed earlier

87 Apart from Tayac, the more sizeable hoards containing Scheers 8 are all from Britain. Most of these insular hoards also contain later coins, implying that Scheers 8 was not as comprehensively withdrawn there as it was in Picardy. The proportion of single finds in Britain is double the figure on the continent.


89 Eight out of 20 dryland sites with F1 finds of Scheers 8 or 10 are religious sites (40%); four rural settlements (20%); three hillforts (15%); and two nucleated settlements (10%). None of the finds from major settlements in northern France are well documented.

90 Five of the 15 archaeological sites with Scheers 23 are hillforts or oppida (33%); as are four of 23 sites with Scheers 16-20 (17%).
east of the Rhine and some of the baser coins were still in circulation when they started to become widespread on the left bank as well. Whether the motivation was political or economic, it is clear that gold was used in long distance transactions between these larger centres from a relatively earlier stage.

Wet finds are known in the Moselle and the middle Rhine regions, but not in eastern France. The later, more debased types (i.e. Scheers 16-20; 32-33) occur more often at dryland cult sites than the earlier Pegasus and Janiform head types, possibly because, in a reversal of the chronological trend just noted above, formal temples and sanctuaries are a later development in eastern Belgic Gaul than in Picardy. The percentage of rural settlement finds is directly comparable to that of western Belgic types. 91 A scatter of finds from secondary agglomerations and Roman forts should also be noted, although it is as yet uncertain whether this reflects previous use of these locations, or is simply coincidence. The only known burial finds are all much later in date: a 'janiform head' coin from a Gallo-Roman cremation at Cambrai, and a Pegasus quarter-stater mounted into a ring from a grave beneath the church of Saint Severin at Cologne. 92

The 'globules-à-la-croix' (Scheers 15) display a quite different pattern from the other Stage 2 coinages. This series came into circulation in southern Belgic Gaul in the later part of the second century BC. It was hoarded relatively frequently, whilst single finds are uncharacteristically rare (Table 6). Wet sites and cult places between them account for one-third of all findspots, the former divided between major rivers like the Loire, Rhine and Seine, and beach finds from either side of the Channel. A further one-third are settlements, divided fairly evenly between rural sites (13%), oppida (11%) and nucleated settlements (9%). The finds from rural sites include a hoard of 242 globules-à-la-croix placed in a pot in one of the post holes of a first century BC building at Saint-Denis-lès-Sens (Yonne), 93 either a foundation deposit, or concealed there for safe keeping. Whichever interpretation is correct, the find implies that by this period even apparently modest farmsteads had access to large amounts of gold.

Isolated finds of these bullet-shaped objects possibly go unreported more often than coins with elaborate designs, but this seems unlikely to be the only factor behind the lack of single finds. The series originated in the Paris Basin or perhaps Champagne, but is widely dispersed outside the presumed territory of origin – a feature it shares with other fairly plain types like the Mussels staters.

91 13% for Scheers 23 and 17% for Scheers 16-20, compared to 16% for Scheers 8 and 13% for Scheers 10.
92 Scheers, ‘Traité’, p. 333. A Scheers 10 quarter-stater found in old excavations at the early Medieval cemetery at Chelles (Oise) may also be from a burial.
of Bohemia. Perhaps the very simplicity of the designs made these coins more acceptable both for external transactions and ritual deposition than conventional types? Continued production of Scheers 15 in the earlier part of Stage 3 may be another reason for its different pattern of circulation.

Potin coinages seem to have appeared in the early second century BC and from the start had quite different patterns of deposition from the gold. As I indicated above, a much higher proportion of potin findspots are known sites. Single and multiple finds represent a minority of discoveries, usually no more than 10-25% of all findspots and between 0-5% of F1 finds. In Table 7, I have therefore only shown the breakdown of potin finds between types of site. All told, potins occur on more sites than Belgic coins in any other metal and on nearly twice as many sites as gold. With very few exceptions, a greater proportion of these are settlements (between 30-55%), whilst the percentage of wet sites tends to be lower.

It now seems that the ‘Massalia imitations’ found in the area north of Paris (BN 5284-5314) were one of the earliest Belgic potin coinages. This series closely resembles the prototype and several examples have been excavated in settlement contexts containing exclusively La Tène C2 finds (c.200-150 BC). As Table 7 shows, this series is extremely well represented at cult sites, on which it is in fact more common than any of the other Belgic coinages discussed here. Conversely, these potins hardly ever occur on nucleated settlements and other types of site that tend to be late in date.

The overall spectrum of sites yielding BN 5284-5314 potins is very similar to the western Belgic ‘chevrons’ series (Scheers 205-206, 208-209). Around three-fifths of the findspots for this latter coinage are religious sites (albeit this time including several wet places), followed by rural settlements, which in turn outnumber oppida by more than two to one. The ‘chevrons’ potins undoubtedly originated in Stage 2, since examples have been found at Bennecourt in a

---

94 The Netherurd (Scotland) hoard of Scheers 15 coins (and torcs) is 900 km beyond the main distribution, while the Saint-Louis/Kegelriss hoard contained both Scheers 15 and Mussels staters. Other hoards containing Mussels staters or related types include Tayac and the recent Manching find; see S. Sievers, ‘Le Trésor de Manching’, L’archéologue Hors-Série 2 (2000), p. 41. Some of these hoards could be war booty, as perhaps at Ribemont-sur-Ancre, but most were probably gifts to cement inter-regional alliances and kinship ties between the elite, like those Caesar records, e.g. BG I, 2-4, 53; II, 14.


96 See Table 5 above.

context dating at latest to La Tène D1a (c.150-120 BC), although unlike BN 5284-5314, the series probably continued into Stage 3.

### TABLE 7.

Archaeological sites yielding Belgic potin types (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin type</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Wet site</th>
<th>Religious site</th>
<th>Rural site</th>
<th>Oppidum</th>
<th>Nucleated settlement</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>LR/HMA cemetery</th>
<th>Public town</th>
<th>Roman military</th>
<th>Production site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 185</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 186</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 190-III, IV</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 191</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 194</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 195</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 196</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 197</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 198</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 199</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 201</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 203</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 205-209</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN 5284-5314</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In southern and eastern Belgic Gaul, the earliest potin coinages included the ‘boar-standard’ (Scheers 186) and ‘torc-bearer’ (Scheers 191) series, together with a third type, Scheers 203. The latter made its debut in La Tène C2 and is probably the earliest, whereas both the other types continued to be minted in Stage 3; some variants of the eastern Belgic ‘boar-standard’ type may still have been current when Caesar invaded. This type occurs much more frequently at settlements – rural sites, oppida, and nucleated settlements – than at religious

98 In the lower fill of the sanctuary ditch; Bourgeois, ‘Bennecourt’, pp. 34-5, 181-3, and table, p. 91. The overlying fill yielded more ‘chevrons’ potins, found together with examples of BN 5284-5314 and another early potin type, Scheers 203.

99 A fourth potin series, with an outlined helmeted head (LT 7388-7405), is often associated with these other types, but was not included in Scheers’ ‘Traité’ and was excluded here. It may have originated in the same area as the ‘globules-à-la-croix’; Haselgrove, ‘Belgic Gaul’, p. 133 n. 98.
sites, whereas Scheers 203 – which also has the most westerly distribution of the three series, essentially complementary to the ‘chevrons’ coins\textsuperscript{100} – is strongly associated with religious sites.

The ‘torc-bearer’ series, which is geographically central, is better represented at wet sites than any other early potin type apart from the ‘chevrons’ coins, but otherwise has intermediate values for several of these categories. This implies that the differences between the various Stage 2 potin series may well be partly geographical in origin. As I noted above, oppida developed earlier in the east, whilst the earliest formal cult sites are concentrated in Picardy and upper Normandy. This would explain why Scheers 186 is better represented at the former and the western Belgic types at the latter, particularly if some of the larger sanctuaries performed a role in the political and economic integration of western Belgic communities similar to that of oppida elsewhere.

We can also discern a number of secondary trends, which reinforce the idea that Scheers 203 – like BN 5284-5314 in the Paris area – went out of use earlier than the two series with which it circulated. The type is found noticeably less often at later sites such as Roman forts and secondary agglomerations than the ‘boar-standard’ and ‘torc-bearer’ potins. Moreover, both latter types were more regularly included in Iron Age burials\textsuperscript{101} – a practice that only gained momentum during La Tène D1 – than Scheers 203. Scheers 186 and 191 were also more frequently reused in much later graves.

Stratified finds of Scheers 191 potins have been the subject of a detailed analysis, which shows how further insights can be derived by taking the chronological context of deposition into account.\textsuperscript{102} Deposition seems to have peaked about the end of the second century BC, although finds from nucleated settlements founded after the Conquest imply that some examples were still circulating in Augustan times. Coins found in later contexts are, however, either residual, or – in the case of grave finds – deliberately curated. Many of the earliest finds of ‘torc-bearer’ coins are from rural sites in northern Champagne and southern Picardy, which seems to be the core of the distribution. In La Tène D1b, the number of finds at oppida and religious sanctuaries rose sharply, reflecting the wider changes in Belgic society at this period. Many of the relevant sites are well outside the primary area of circulation, implying that, like gold, potin was used in dealings between distant communities. In La Tène D2, however, especially after the Conquest, an increasing proportion of finds come

\textsuperscript{100} Bourgeois, ‘Bennecourt’, figs. 141-142. The combined distribution of Scheers 203 and 205-209 mirrors that of the ‘running/squatting figure’ bronzes (Scheers 163); these appeared in Stage 3 and probably replaced one or both potin series.

\textsuperscript{101} Scheers 186 or 191 potins are known from La Tène D1a burials at Marienborn (Rheinhessen) and Ornavasso San Bernardo (Italy); and in La Tène D1b burials at Acy-Romance, La Croisette (Ardennes), Mietisheim (Bas-Rhin), Uffhofen (Rheinhessen) and Wederath-Belginum (Rheinland-Pfalz).

\textsuperscript{102} Haselgrove, ‘Potins’, pp. 51-9.
from religious sites, suggesting that potins were often used as offerings after they had become redundant in their primary functions.

Stage 3 (c.125-60 BC)

The three-quarters of a century leading up to the Conquest saw a substantial increase in the number and diversity of Belgic coin types. The broad-flan stater (Scheers 8) was replaced by the smaller biface type (Scheers 9, Gallo-Belgic C). This served as the model for several other series in Britain and on the continent, before itself giving way to uniface types (Scheers 24, Gallo-Belgic E). Many of these derivatives were still current when Caesar invaded. There were also two significant quarter-stater series: the 'boat' type (Scheers 13-14, Gallo-Belgic D), which circulated in the same regions of northern France and southern England as Scheers 9 and 24; and the 'segments of circles' types of the Southern and Central zones (Scheers 152).

Although the greater regionalisation of gold coinage in Stage 3 complicates the overall picture (Table 8), some more general trends do emerge. The proportion of single finds is usually significantly lower than before, although this is partly balanced by a rise in non-site hoards and – in some cases – multiple finds. Gold is also found at far more sites, although a smaller proportion are rural settlements. For the first time, a few Belgic gold coins were included in burials; a plated Scheers 9 stater at Acy-Romance and a boat type quarter-stater at Westhampnett (West Sussex).

There is also considerable variation in the way that the same series were treated in different regions. The contrast between Scheers 9 and 13-14 in Britain and Gaul is a good example. Taking British and continental finds together, Scheers 9 shows a marked decrease in single finds and an increase in multiple finds and hoards compared to Scheers 8, which Scheers 13-14 shares apart from hoards. However when British and continental finds are distinguished, it soon becomes apparent that the changes were mostly confined to south-east England.


104 The main continental derivatives are the Southern ‘triple-tailed horse’ (Scheers 26) and ‘eye’ series (Scheers 30-I); the ‘epsilon’ series of the Central zone (Scheers 29); and the Eastern ‘eye’ (Scheers 30-IV) and ‘triskeles’ types (Scheers 31).

105 The dating of the various derivatives of Scheers 9 remains a matter of controversy, with some authors still linking their inception directly to the Gallic war (Stage 4), whilst others, including myself, would now place their beginnings up to half a century earlier.

In Belgic Gaul, the proportion of multiple finds is unchanged and that of single finds actually rises slightly.\textsuperscript{107}

### TABLE 8.
Provenances of later Belgic gold types (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin type</th>
<th>Number of findspots</th>
<th>Single find</th>
<th>Multiple/find</th>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Wet/find</th>
<th>Religious site</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 9</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 13-14</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 24</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 29</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 30-I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 30-II, III</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 30-IV</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 30-V, VI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 152</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the continent, Scheers 9 occurs at the same types of site as its predecessor, with religious sites continuing to outnumber rural settlements by a factor of three or four to one,\textsuperscript{108} whereas in Britain, the decrease in single finds is accompanied by a trebling in the incidence of religious sites,\textsuperscript{109} as well as a slight increase in wet finds. This supports the idea that many earlier findspots without any recognisable archaeological associations were in fact 'natural' cult places. The building of formal shrines and cult places is one of a number of continentally-inspired changes which took place in south-east England around

\textsuperscript{107} On the continent, 38% of Scheers 8 provenances are single finds and 19% multiple finds/hoards; for Scheers 9, the figures are 46% and 17%; and for Scheers 13-14, 44% and 18%. In Britain, the figures for single finds are 71% (Scheers 8); 50% (Scheers 9); and 28% (Scheers 13-14); for multiple finds/hoards, 16%, 30% and 19%.

\textsuperscript{108} On the continent, 44% of Scheers 8 site provenances are religious sites, and 50% of Scheers 9; the proportions of rural settlements are 13% and 12%.

\textsuperscript{109} From 13% for Scheers 8 to 39% for Scheers 9. Insular cult sites with coin offerings dating to Stage 3 include Essendon, Hayling Island and Snettisham.
the end of the second century BC and it seems likely that there was a major change in the basis of cross-Channel relations at this period.\textsuperscript{110}

Scheers 13-14 probably originated a little later than Scheers 9. On the continent, the series occurs at proportionately fewer religious sites than Scheers 8, whereas in south-east England, there is a significant increase, although not quite as marked as for Scheers 9.\textsuperscript{111} The incidence of wet finds is higher than for any gold coinage apart from Scheers 15, with the majority coming from the coastal areas of Britain.\textsuperscript{112} Scheers 13-14 occurs at more sites than either Scheers 8 or 9, and the higher proportion of finds from nucleated – as opposed to rural or fortified – settlements is particularly striking. On both sides of the Channel, such sites were primarily a development of the later first century BC.\textsuperscript{113}

The ‘uniface’ and ‘epsilon’ series (Scheers 24, 29) from the later part of Stage 3 have nearly identical profiles (Table 8), although non-site finds of Scheers 24 – which circulated on both sides of the Channel – are once again more common in Britain than in Belgic Gaul.\textsuperscript{114} The main difference between the two is the greater proportion of Scheers 24 coins from rural settlements (17%) and Scheers 29 from nucleated settlements (19%). The latter became a particularly prominent feature of the settlement pattern in the Central zone in the later first century BC. It is likely that the inscribed ‘epsilon’ types (Scheers 29-IV) were not minted until this period, which would help explain the discrepancy.\textsuperscript{115} Interestingly, there are proportionately fewer finds of either stater type from religious sites than for Scheers 9 and a corresponding increase in wet finds, especially on the continent, and for Scheers 24.\textsuperscript{116} This could reflect different cultural practices in the northern coastal regions; on the other hand, it is possible that the Roman invasion led communities to deposit more gold in wet places rather than on dryland cult sites, which could be – and frequently were – stripped of valuables by Caesar’s army.

\textsuperscript{110} Other significant changes in south-east England at this period included the adoption of wheelmade pottery, cremation burial and a greater concern with personal ornaments and status indicators. There was also a marked switch in gold finds away from settlements between Scheers 8 (47%) and Scheers 9 (8%).

\textsuperscript{111} Up to 32%, as opposed to 39% for Scheers 9.

\textsuperscript{112} As a proportion of site finds only, the proportion of wet sites (32%) is not that different from Scheers 8 (26%), although much higher than for Scheers 9 (18%).

\textsuperscript{113} 58% of settlements with Scheers 13-14 finds are nucleated, compared to 27% for Scheers 8 and 14% for Scheers 9.

\textsuperscript{114} 70% in Britain, compared to 60% on the continent.

\textsuperscript{115} Inscribed \textit{Viros}; see Haselgrove, ‘Belgic Gaul’, p.154.

\textsuperscript{116} 23% of continental site finds of Scheers 24 are wet, compared to 4% for Scheers 9. The relevant finds include hoards buried close to springs (Frasnes-lez-Buissenal, Mont d’Or); on river banks (Solre-le-Château); or overlooking a lake (Largny-sur-Automne); as well as several multiple finds from marshy areas (La Mer-des-Flines, Hensies, Seclin, Thulin).
The two main southern Belgic series, the ‘triple-tailed horse’ and ‘eye’ types (Scheers 26; 30-I) also share fairly similar profiles, even though one series (Scheers 26, Gallo-Belgic F) circulated extensively in southern England, but not the other.\footnote{117} Like the slightly earlier ‘globules-à-la-croix’, these series stand out from other Stage 3 coinages on account of the high proportion of finds from oppida, of which large numbers were constructed in the Southern zone during La Tène D1b.\footnote{118} The marginally higher figure for 'eye' staters accords well with the archaeological evidence, which indicates that the aggregation of the population into fortified sites began earlier in the territory of the Remi, who issued Scheers 30-I, than among the Suessiones.\footnote{119} Both series also occur at more nucleated settlements than rural sites, another indication of increasing social and political centralisation in the first century BC. This trend does not however extend to southern England, where rural findspots predominate.

The 'segments of circles' quarter-staters (Scheers 152) overlapped in circulation with the two stater types, although they continued in use somewhat longer. Generally these coins occur on the same classes of site, but the incidence of settlement provenances is even higher and off-site finds are almost non-existent (Table 8). The poor quality of the alloy is probably the main reason for this. Scheers 152 coins in good gold are extremely rare and the vast majority are debased or plated, or in silver or bronze.\footnote{120} Hence, they may always have been perceived differently from staters in good alloy and over time may have come to be treated essentially as base metal issues. All told, a third of the findspots are religious sites, whilst finds from oppida and nucleated settlements outnumber those from rural sites by nine to one, a pattern we also find for many Stage 4 bronzes belonging to the Southern zone.

There are relatively few findspots of eastern Belgic 'eye' staters (Scheers 30-IV). Unusually for Eastern types, the combined proportion of non-site and multiple finds is higher than for many contemporary coinages further west. They also differ from the Eastern zone gold coinages of Stages 1 and 2 in being represented at fewer settlements than religious sites. In contrast, the 'triskeles' staters (Scheers 31) – which derive elements from Scheers 30-IV and from the Rainbow staters of the Mardorf group – conform to the more normal pattern of eastern Belgic types, with relatively few non-site finds and a predominance of religious site finds. Like other later Stage 3 coinages which circulated freely on the Flanders coastal plain (e.g. Scheers 24, 29), they often occur on wet sites.

\footnote{117} This does however account for the only significant differences between the series: the much higher proportion of hoards and wet finds for Scheers 26. The bulk of the relevant finds are in southern England.\footnote{118} 69\% of continental settlement provenances for Scheers 30-I and 57\% of Scheers 26 are oppida. \footnote{119} For the attributions, Delestrée, Monnayages, pp. 137-9; Pion, ‘L’Or des Rèmes’. For the relative dating of the major oppida, see Haselgrove, ‘Roman impact’, pp. 147-52; and Pion, ‘Les habitats Laténiens’.

\footnote{120} Doyen, ‘Les subdivisions’.
Settlement finds are divided fairly evenly between nucleated and rural sites. Not one coin is from a fortified site. This reflects the particular nature of settlement developments in central and northern Belgic Gaul, with rural sites predominating until the Conquest and larger agglomerations appearing in the later first century BC.\textsuperscript{121}

A small number of Belgic silver coinages were minted during Stage 3. From the outset, their depositional patterning differs from gold, being closely associated with known archaeological sites (Table 9).\textsuperscript{122} The thin silver types of western Belgic Gaul are probably the earliest (Scheers 51-53). In keeping with their geographical origin, nearly three-fifths of the findspots are religious sites, although the number of finds from oppida like Condé-sur-Suippe, and Silchester in other regions implies that they were sometimes used in transactions further afield, or left the region for other reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin type</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Wet site</th>
<th>Religious site</th>
<th>Rural site</th>
<th>Oppidum</th>
<th>Nucleated settlement</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>LR/HINA cemetery</th>
<th>Public town</th>
<th>Roman military</th>
<th>Production site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 42-43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 51-53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘head/horse’ and 'sitting person' quinarii of the Moselle valley (Scheers 54, 55) are concentrated on cult sites, oppida, and nucleated settlements. Although most of the settlements are of later date, they could well have been preceded by sanctuaries like the one on the Martberg. The absence of the earlier Scheers 54 type from rural sites may well be a function of chronology, since a similar pattern obtains on the right bank of the Rhine. There, the earlier ‘Nauheim’ series (Scheers 56) is strongly associated with fortified sites, which

\textsuperscript{121} I would place the type towards the end of Stage 3, whereas Roymans dates it early in Stage 4; see e.g. N. Roymans and J. Aarts, ‘Coins, soldiers and the Batavian Hercules cult. Coin deposition in the sanctuary of Empel in the lower Rhine region’, in Haselgrove and Wigg-Wolf, ‘Ritual’, p. 339.

\textsuperscript{122} The quinarius types minted at Villeneuve-Saint-Germain are omitted from Table 9. Only five findspots are known outside the oppidum, all but one of them relatively local.
however started to decline in numbers after the La Tène D1/D2 transition, whereas the later ‘dancing man’ series (Scheers 57) is more often found at religious sites and also occurs in rural settlements. Both series are present at later civitas capitals and especially Roman forts, but whether this indicates earlier, Iron Age, activity in the vicinity, or merely continued use of the coins, is so far uncertain.

As I noted, several of the potin series introduced in Stage 2 continued to be produced well into Stage 3 (Scheers 186, 191, 205-209), by which time the settlement pattern was becoming significantly more centralised. This is evident from the profiles of the 'sitting person' and 'bucranium' types (Scheers 194, 195) which replaced Scheers 191 in southern Belgic Gaul (Table 7 above). The percentage of finds at nucleated settlements and especially oppida is higher for both series, apparently at the expense of rural sites, which are down to half the previous level, while the proportion of finds from religious and wet sites is broadly maintained. Both types are attributed to the Remi.

Scheers 194 and 195 can be compared to the potin series issued at Villeneuve-Saint-Germain and other sites in the territory of the Suessiones and Bellovaci (Scheers 185; 196-198). All four types are found more often on oppida than on any other type of settlement, whilst the proportion of finds from cult sites is much higher than for the Remi series. Why there should be this difference is unclear, but the greater frequency of cult sites in Bellovaci territory may be a factor. Alternatively, the reduced prestige of the Bellovaci and the Suessiones following their defeat by Caesar may have resulted in more of their coins being discarded as offerings on sacred sites than those of their neighbours.

The potin coinages of eastern Belgic Gaul (Scheers 199-201) tend to occur more frequently at cemeteries (although these are mostly coins in Roman burials) and rural sites than their southern Belgic counterparts. Except for Scheers 201, the proportion of wet finds is also lower, a trait they share with the local gold and silver. All three types were probably minted at the Titelberg – although they may have been produced at other sites too – and they are mostly confined to Treveran territory. Scheers 201 is probably the earliest since it copies the ‘torc-bearer’ type and has the most confined distribution, while Scheers 199 – which is inscribed and has marginally the widest dispersion – is probably the latest. Possibly the issue of Scheers 200 coincided with a temporary aggregation of population into fortified sites similar to episodes in other parts of Belgic Gaul, whilst Scheers 199 was current after the number of fortified sites had started to decline again, rather like the 'dancing man' silver.

The other major potin series to appear in Stage 3 was the central Belgic 'au rameau' series (Scheers 190). The findspots reflect the very different character

123 The exception is Scheers 196, which is equally common at oppida and religious sites.
of the settlement pattern in the Central zone. Finds at rural sites predominate, followed by cult sites, and then nucleated settlements. The few finds from fortified sites (which are almost non-existent in the core circulation area) tend to be in other parts of Belgic Gaul, or even further afield, as at Basel Münsterhügel and Mont Beuvray. The incidence of Scheers 190 potins at rural sites is much higher than for local gold types like Scheers 29, presumably reflecting the different depositional practices for the two metals.

By the middle of Stage 3, struck bronze had begun to replace potin in parts of western Belgic Gaul. The earliest coins include 'bearded head' types, which cluster in Oise (Scheers 120-121), and the 'running/squatting figure' series, which has a distribution extending further south and west (Scheers 163). Like other regional coinages, all three coinages are very closely associated with religious sites – more so than the 'chevrons' potins that preceded them – and the incidence of settlement finds is generally low (Table 10). A Scheers 120-I coin from a La Tène D1b cremation at Acy-Romance (outside the primary distribution) is one of a number of cemetery finds. The ‘bearded head’ types had probably largely passed out of use by the mid first century BC, whereas Scheers 163 carried on into Stage 4, reflected by its presence on a wider range of sites.

TABLE 10

Archaeological sites yielding early Belgic bronze types (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin type</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Wet site</th>
<th>Religious site</th>
<th>Rural site</th>
<th>Oppidum</th>
<th>Nucleated settlement</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>LR/HMA cemetery</th>
<th>Public town</th>
<th>Roman military</th>
<th>Production site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 120</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 121</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 151</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 154</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 155</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 163</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of southern Belgic bronze types probably originated at the end of Stage 3 and carried on into Stage 4. They include the crude Kalou coins attributed to the Remi (Scheers 151); the uninscribed janiform head types attributed to the Suessiones (Scheers 154); and another crudely inscribed series, apparently in the name of Diviacius (Scheers 155).\(^{126}\) Scheers 151 has a

\(^{126}\) Several Scheers 155 coins and one Scheers 154 have been found at Alesia, as well as three Scheers 163; see Fischer and Gruel, 'Catalogue', pp. 36-37.
comparable distribution to the ‘sitting man’ and ‘bucranium’ potins (Scheers 194-195), whilst Scheers 154 is found over much the same area as the Villeneuve-Saint-Germain potins (Scheers 185; 196-198). The Diviacius series probably originated along the middle Seine.127

The incidence of Scheers 151 on oppida is slightly higher than for Scheers 194-195, whilst the proportion of religious sites is nearly twice the previous figure. Other settlement types and wet finds are correspondingly reduced. Scheers 154 is also strongly associated with oppida, but occurs at fewer religious sites and more nucleated settlements than either Scheers 151 or the Villeneuve-Saint-Germain potins; it is also found at far more rural and wet sites than the former. Given the similar settlement patterns of the Remi and Suessiones, the differences are difficult to explain, but the greater dispersion of Scheers 151 is presumably a factor. The one consistent trend – which begins in Stage 3 – is the strong association with oppida. Scheers 155 is also strongly associated with both oppida and religious sites.128 Like the early Western struck bronzes, all three southern Belgic series are well represented at cemeteries, although this figure has almost certainly been artificially boosted by the numerous excavations undertaken by Moreau in southern Aisne in the late nineteenth century.

Stage 4 (c.60-20 BC)

In the mid first century BC, inscribed bronze rapidly supplanted potin throughout the rest of Belgic Gaul, while minting of gold and silver declined sharply.129 The continuation of several Stage 3 series into Stage 4 makes it more difficult to assess the extent to which coin findspots changed after the Roman invasion, whilst we should beware of too readily assuming that any changes were due solely to the Conquest.

Stage 4 gold coinages include the Criciru and Roveca series of the Suessiones and Meldi (Scheers 27-28); various inscribed types which retained the ‘eye’ design issued by the Remi (Scheers 30-II, III) and Treveri (Scheers 30-V, VI); and – less certainly – the ‘à l’astre’ types of western Belgic Gaul (Scheers 25).130 Several of these coinages include related silver and bronze types. In date, they range between the 50s and the 30s BC. A particular characteristic of Stage 4 is the dramatic reduction in gold deposition – even of types that were minted in quantity – recalling the pattern in the third and early second centuries BC. The

127 The distribution of Scheers 155 offers little support for its traditional attribution to the Suessiones.
128 The apparently high incidence of finds at later civitas capitals is difficult to explain, but may be partly a function of the small sample size.
130 Some of the ‘à l’astre’ gold may belong to the closing part of Stage 3, although the series certainly continued into Stage 4; the tribal attribution is uncertain; see Haselgrove, ‘Belgic Gaul’, pp. 136, 156-7.
inscribed Remi types (Scheers 30-II, III), for example, employed at least 60 reverse dies, but have only 16 findspots between them. Their Treveran equivalents (Scheers 30-V, VI) have more provenances, but are nevertheless confined to fewer sites than most Stage 3 gold types.\textsuperscript{131}

Despite the limited evidence, the overall pattern is reasonably clear (Table 8 above). Most Stage 4 gold finds are from religious sites, followed – some way behind – by finds at oppida.\textsuperscript{132} Apart from a scatter of coins from rural settlements, most other site types are barely represented. The accompanying silver issues are also concentrated on religious sites, with a few finds from oppida, much as in the preceding period.\textsuperscript{133} This perhaps suggests that whereas silver had a relatively restricted function in Stage 3, in Stage 4 this now applied to both metals.

The commonest silver coinage in Belgic Gaul in Stage 4 is that of Ateula Vlatos (Scheers 41). This has a quite different pattern of deposition to the silver types discussed above (Table 9) and, as I indicated, may in fact have been minted outside the region.\textsuperscript{134} Along with the related Caledu issues (Scheers 42-43), it occurs in many of the mixed Gaulish and Roman silver hoards deposited in the 40s and 30s BC across a broad swathe of central and north-west Gaul.\textsuperscript{135} Both series are strongly associated with oppida and religious sites, although in the case of the latter not in quite the same numbers as other Stage 4 silver and gold types. There are also more finds from graves and wet sites, but almost none at rural settlements.

The occasional presence of Scheers 41 – but not Scheers 42-43 – on nucleated settlements is presumably a function of its wide dispersion. This might simply relate to the prestige of its issuers. More likely, however, it was one of the many types on the reduced quinarius standard used to pay auxiliaries serving with the Roman army in northern Gaul. From the finds at La Chaussée-Tirancourt (Somme) and the Titelberg, it appears that the army continued the practice, begun by Caesar, of quartering troops in native oppida for some time after the

\textsuperscript{131} The majority of the provenances are for the earlier staters of Pottina (Scheers 30-V) rather than those of Arda (Scheers 30-VI), who followed him. A Pottina stater has been found at Alesia Camp C, which implies that his coinage was in circulation by 52 BC, whereas Arda’s coinage may be no earlier than the 30s BC; see Haselgrove, ‘Belgic Gaul’, pp. 150-3.

\textsuperscript{132} For example, four of the five site provenances for Cricirv staters (Scheers 27) are temples (80%), the exception being Pommiers, where the series was minted.

\textsuperscript{133} Due to the small number of findspots, the majority of the Stage 4 silver coinages are not shown on Table 9. Arda silver coins (Scheers 30a) occur on a greater variety of site types than the others, but even so half of the ten findspots are religious sites.

\textsuperscript{134} Where the series was minted is uncertain. It may have been either in east-central France, or west of the Seine, in the area where the Caledu types seem to cluster.

\textsuperscript{135} Off-site hoards and multiple finds contribute 17% of the findspots for Scheers 41; for Scheers 42-43, the figure is 21%. There are also hoards from several fortified sites (Metz; Rozel) and cult sites, both dry (Limésy) and wet (Les Andelys; Rueil-la-Gadalière).
Conquest. Military use would explain the frequency of finds at fortified sites and would also provide a plausible context for the mixed hoards mentioned in the previous paragraph.

### Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin type</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Wet site</th>
<th>Religious site</th>
<th>Rural site</th>
<th>Oppidum</th>
<th>Nucleated settlement</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>LR/HMA cemetery</th>
<th>Public town</th>
<th>Roman military</th>
<th>Production site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 29a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 30a</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 109</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 137</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 138</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 139-140</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 143</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 145</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 146</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 147</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 153</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 162</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 164</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 190-I, II</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

136 *BG* VIII, 5. For a recent discussion of quartering of Roman troops in *oppida* after the conquest, see Fichtl, ‘*La ville celtique*’, pp. 151-5.

137 A La Tène D2b burial from Paris, interpreted as that of a Roman auxiliary, deserves mention in connection with payments to the army. The goods included a bronze coin of *Venextos* (Scheers 177), which has affinities with Scheers 155 and 163; see M. Poux, *Puits funéraire d'époque gauloise à Paris (Sénat): une tombe d'auxiliaire républicain dans le sous sol de Lutèce*, Protohist. Européen 4 (Montagnac, 1999). Examples of Scheers 177 have been found at both Villeneuve-Saint-Germain and Pommiers, indicating that it, too, dates around the Stage 3-4 transition. The series originated in the Paris area.
The provenances for the major struck bronze coinages attributed to Stage 4 are set out in Table 11. I will consider these by region in order to facilitate comparison with the preceding series. The two major inscribed coinages issued by the Remi (Scheers 146-147) are generally attributed to separate mints because of their contrasting styles. The difference extends to their site associations. The Remo Remo type (Scheers 146), which has the wider distribution, occurs freely on religious sites and at settlements of all kinds, although it is notable that finds from nucleated settlements outnumber those from oppida.

The Atisios Remos coins (Scheers 147), on the other hand, have a comparable distribution to Scheers 151 and – like that series – cluster at religious sites and oppida. As much as differential dispersion, chronology may be the key, since Scheers 146 – despite apparently being the earlier of the two types – seems to have remained in circulation longer. This would help explain why there are more finds of Scheers 146 from nucleated and rural settlements than of Scheers 147, since both types of site increased sharply in numbers in southern Belgic Gaul in the Augustan period.

The post-Conquest bronze coinages issued by the Meldi and Suessiones are less strongly associated with oppida than the previous series in that area. Cricirv and Roveca bronzes (Scheers 27, 28) occur at the same proportion of religious sites as the Kalou and Atisios coins of the Remi (two-fifths) and are equally rare at rural sites. The Epenos type (Scheers 143), on the other hand, occurs at rather more rural settlements and slightly fewer cult sites. Once again, the reason for this discrepancy may be chronological, since the Epenos series is probably the latest of the three. This would also help explain why it is found at twice as many civitas capitals as the others.

The western Belgic bronze coinages attributed to Stage 4 comprise a mixture of primarily uninscribed series, which could in some cases have originated before the Conquest (Scheers 59, 80), and inscribed coinages such as those of Viricius and Svticos/Ratvmacos (Scheers 109, 164). The association of these coinages with religious sites is, if anything, even stronger than before, implying that the bias towards sacred sites in western Belgic Gaul is a genuine one, not simply a product of recent archaeological work. Delestrée has plausibly suggested that many late western Belgic bronze series were actually minted at sanctuaries, in some cases never leaving the place where they were made.

There are, however, also more finds from oppida than previously, as a result of
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138 See Haselgrove, ‘Belgic Gaul’, p. 158. The early starting date for Scheers 146 rests on the supposed presence of two examples in the Alesia ditches, but they are not among the coins kept at the Musée des Antiquités Nationales and de Saulcy’s notes only mention an example from Mont Réa.


140 Delestrée, ‘Monnayages’, pp. 120-4; id., ‘Les offrandes monétaires, pp. 329-34.
the belated construction of several fortified sites near the Channel coast. Only Scheers 80 occurs at many nucleated or rural settlements, but these are mostly outside the core distribution, in Atrebatic territory or in Britain.

The provenances of the bronze coinage issued by the Atrebates (Scheers 46) and Nervii (Scheers 29a; 145; 190) reflect the settlement pattern in this part of Belgic Gaul. All four types are well represented at rural sites. However, the struck coins which continue the ‘au rameau’ series (Scheers 190-I, II) occur on far fewer sites than their predecessors (less than one-third), and twice as many of these are nucleated settlements. Whether this reflects a concentration of population in fewer, larger centres, or a fall in circulation velocity is more difficult to say. The Viros and Vercio types (Scheers 29a, 145) are also closely associated with larger agglomerations. The lower proportion of finds from cult sites is notable, although for Garmanos coins (Scheers 46) this is balanced by the higher proportion of wet finds. The equestrian types on Scheers 29a and 46 suggest that they are the latest of the four series, which in turn may explain why there are more of these types from civitas capitals.

The Treveran series inscribed A. Hirtivs (Scheers 162) and Arda (Scheers 30a) display a greater emphasis on rural settlements than the potins from the same region (Scheers 199-201), whereas nucleated settlement finds are at much the same level as the two later potin types (Scheers 199-200). The most interesting difference between the two bronze series is the far higher ratio of rural settlements to oppida for Arda (3:1) than for the earlier Hirtivs issues (1:1). The small percentage of Arda coins from fortified sites agrees well with other evidence indicating the existence of a flourishing rurally based elite in the area by the 30s BC, such as the Goeblingen-Nospelt burials. Both coin types were frequently employed as grave goods; the Lamadeleine cemetery outside the Titelberg yielded seven Hirtivs and two Carinas bronzes (Scheers 162-II) and one Arda. Overall, however, Arda types occur at more cemeteries than the Hirtivs coins. The unrelated series inscribed A. Hirtivs Imp. (Scheers 153) has very few findspots, but appears to have circulated on the western fringes of Belgic Gaul. It certainly shows the very strong emphasis on cult sites characteristic of coinages in this region and is also well represented at wet sites.

The inscribed bronze series issued by the Leuci (Scheers 137) and Mediomatrici (Scheers 138-140) all have relatively few findspots. Allowing for possible distortion due to the small sample size, they seem to be more closely
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141 The proportion of Scheers 46 from rural settlements may have been exaggerated by the way some sites have been classified. A number of coins from Vaulx-Vraucourt and Beugnatre (both Pas-de-Calais) are from sites which are recorded as villas, but might in fact be part of larger agglomerations.

142 Van Heesch, ‘Muntcirculatie’, pp. 45-53, 189, has suggested that all three Nervian bronze types are actually of Augustan date, owing to the lack of stratified examples from earlier contexts.

associated with major settlements (especially oppida) and religious sites, than do the Treveran bronzes. This might be a function of our relatively poor knowledge of rural settlements in Lorraine, but the recent survey added hardly any findspots for these types, implying that they may genuinely be restricted to relatively few sites.

Standing back from the evidence, we can see significant variations in the pattern of bronze finds in different regions. Whilst offerings at religious sites were a common phenomenon everywhere, the exceptional concentration in western Belgc Gaull underlines the central role of cult sites and sanctuaries in the integration of the peoples who were collectively known by the Romans as Belgae. The continued importance of sanctuaries in maintaining the social and political order after the Conquest is shown by new building at sites like Gournay-sur-Aronde and Ribemont-sur-Ancre soon after the mid first century BC, where coin offerings clearly took over some of the functions of display and sacrifice previously fulfilled by weaponry. Wet cult sites appear to have been most important in southern and central Belgc Gaul.

The various southern Belgc bronze series dating to the end of Stage 3 and to Stage 4 have a particularly strong association with oppida, which only very gradually diminishes, presumably reflecting the continued importance and prestige of fortified sites in this region after the Conquest. The widespread dispersion of the bronze series issued by the Remi is presumably a function of their enhanced position in Belgc Gaul after Caesar’s victory, but may also reflect the scale of their military contribution. The changing character of the settlement pattern in central Belgc Gaul is reflected in the higher proportion of finds from nucleated settlements.

The number of rural settlement finds in Treveran territory is more unexpected, but is consistent with other evidence indicating that the essentially rural nature of Treveran society was not significantly interrupted by the Conquest. From their layout, it seems likely that the Titelberg and other local oppida like the Martberg initially functioned primarily as places of assembly and refuge, and were not permanent centres of population on the same scale as southern Belgc sites like Condé-sur-Suippe or Villeneuve-Saint-Germain. The two regions do however share similar cremation burial traditions, which increasingly included the provision of bronze coins as grave goods.

**Stage 5 (c.20 BC onward)**

The decision to organise Belgc Gaul into a province was probably taken in 27 BC, soon after Augustus assumed his new title, although the measures may not have been fully implemented until 16-13 BC, when he again visited Gaul. This visit coincided with the installation of military bases along the Rhine in preparation for the forthcoming German campaign. Partly to pay these troops,
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144 Lagadec and Liéger, ‘La circulation monétaire’.
the mint at Nîmes started striking bronze coinage in c.15 BC, followed by Lyon in c.7 BC. In the areas where the troops were stationed, the quantity of Roman coinage in circulation rose rapidly as a result, although it seems to have penetrated the interior of Belgic and Celtic Gaul much more gradually.

Despite the slow rate at which Roman bronze came into circulation outside the military zone, hardly any Belgic coinages seem to have been minted after the Augustan reorganisation. There is nothing to imply that this was the result of official prohibition, so we can only assume that the diverse range of bronze types minted in the previous decades, and mostly still in circulation, sufficed to meet local needs for base-metal coinage in the interior of the province. This supposition is further strengthened by the fact that two of the three principal native coinages that can be attributed to Stage 5 actually belong to the military zone.

The one major new coinage in the hinterland was the Romanized Germanus Indutillli L type (Scheers 216). It is found throughout Belgic Gaul and occurs on a wider range of sites than any previous series, although religious sites remain the commonest single category, and together with wet sites, account for two-fifths of the total (Table 12). Interestingly, one in five findspots are either civitas capitals or oppida, with local centres not far behind. This could support the idea that the series enjoyed a degree of official recognition, whilst the fairly low proportion of rural finds is what we might expect if transactions involving coinage mostly took place at the larger settlements.

Scheers 216 is occasionally found on Augustan forts in Germany, but never in any quantity. This differentiates it from the other two late coinages, both of which have close associations with military sites on either bank of the Rhine. The first of these series, which is inscribed Avaucia on the earliest coins (Scheers 217-Ia), probably originated in the territory of the Tungri. The first coins may date to Stage 4, but it is clear that most of the series was minted at the very end of the first century BC. The other series, the debased...
triquetrum coinage of the eastern Dutch river delta, may also have originated earlier, but was clearly still in widespread circulation when the first Roman forts were founded and is therefore conveniently considered alongside Scheers 217.

**TABLE 12.**

Archaeological sites yielding Stage 5 Belgic coin types (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin type</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Wet site</th>
<th>Religious site</th>
<th>Rural site</th>
<th>Oppidum</th>
<th>Nucleated settlement</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>LR/HMA cemetery</th>
<th>Public town</th>
<th>Roman military</th>
<th>Production site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 216</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheers 217</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triquetrum</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roman forts and their civil settlements represent a quarter of the find sites for both series, with the difference that Scheers 217 coins are often present in their hundreds, whereas the numbers of triquetrum coins are much lower. Otherwise, the patterns seem to reflect the contrast that existed between the by now partly Romanized territories west of the Rhine and the area of the delta itself. Scheers 217 occurs at more than twice as many nucleated settlements as rural sites, a ratio even higher than for the Nervian bronzes in Stage 4, whilst the proportion of religious sites and wet cult places is broadly the same. However with the triquetrum coins, the ratio of nucleated settlements to rural sites is reversed, whilst the ratio of wet finds to cult sites is higher than for any other series included in this study, tendencies which would seem to reflect the decentralised nature of the communities inhabiting the Dutch river delta. The triquetrum coins are occasionally hoarded, but invariably outside the primary circulation area in the river delta.

Two minor features that differentiate the Stage 5 coinages from earlier types are the virtual absence of finds in late Roman and Merovingian graves and the consistent presence of small numbers of coins at industrial sites. The first is difficult to explain, since Scheers 216, at least, is found in the same areas as the Remo Remo type (Scheers 146), which was often placed in late graves. The
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151 Ibid., Table 1.

152 Roymans considers that many triquetrum coins recovered from wet places were eroded or deposited from adjacent rural sites, and classifies them accordingly in his study (‘Triquetrum coinages’, pp. 135-41), whereas I kept wet finds separate. This helps to explain the much higher proportion of rural sites in his analysis (although it is not the only factor), whilst underlining the difficulty of applying a single classification at site level.

153 Apart from Bochum, the relevant hoards tend to favour coins in better alloy.
latter tendency is chronological and reflects a growth in the scale of industrial production in the Roman period, partly linked to the activities of the army.

These series effectively brought Belgic coinage to an end, although the relatively slow rate at which Roman coinage penetrated the interior of the province and particularly its rural hinterland, ensured that the existing Iron Age coins continued in use well into the first century AD. When local minting did resume in some areas of Belgic Gaul in the reign of Claudius I, it was to produce imitations of Roman types, although it is not clear whether this was to meet a shortage of official issues, or to satisfy an increased demand for small denominations as these came to be used in an ever wider range of transactions.

CONCLUSION

It may be useful to conclude this paper by reiterating the main points. In the third century BC, gold coins were rarely deposited, and then usually individually, and in locations away from known sites (Stage 1). Few of them are likely to have been accidental losses: the evidence suggests that the majority were offerings or sacrifices at natural loci used as shrines, like the smaller number of coins from early formal sanctuaries. A few, however, could be from unrecognised rural settlements. During the second century BC, gold deposition greatly increased in intensity, whilst other changes included the use of gold at fortified sites in the areas where these existed and in payments outside the territory of origin (Stage 2). It is noteworthy that over two-thirds of the rural settlements with gold finds dating to Stages 1 or 2 later became villas. Whilst it is doubtful how far back in the Iron Age we can project such high status affiliations, this would certainly not contradict the idea that the middle La Tène elite used coinage in dealings with one another from the very start, to seal marriage alliances for example, or to buy military support.

In the last quarter of the second century BC, we begin to see significant changes in the treatment of gold, which continued and intensified into the first century BC (Stage 3). There was a marked reduction in single finds (especially in Britain) and an equivalent increase in multiple finds and hoarding. Settlements yielding gold coins now greatly outnumber sacred sites, although the particular character of the sites depends on the region: southern Belgic coinages are commonest at oppida, reflecting the centralised character of late Iron Age settlement in southern Picardy and northern Champagne, whereas other series are more often found at rural sites, reflecting the nature of settlement in the areas where they circulated. Following the Roman invasion, the pattern again changed abruptly (Stage 4). Gold coins were rarely deposited, and generally only at religious sites or occasionally oppida. Most Belgic silver
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154 Haselgrove, ‘Roman impact’, pp. 147-54.
155 e.g. Scheers 24 and 31.
Coinages show a similarly restricted pattern; the only one to achieve widespread circulation, the late *Aetula Vlatos* series, may have originated in Celtic Gaul.

Potin was introduced in the earlier second century BC, followed later by struck bronze. Unlike gold, base metal issues were virtually all deposited at archaeological sites, although the types of site vary according to the nature of the regional settlement pattern. In the Western zone, finds from religious sites predominate; in the Southern zone, finds from *oppida*; and in the Central zone, finds from nucleated settlements. Despite their disparity in date, potin and bronze tend to occur at the same classes of site; most differences between them can be explained by changes in settlement pattern over the period base metal coinage was in use. One trend that is however significant is the reduced incidence of rural finds in the later first century BC although whether this was due to the aggregation of population into larger centres, or the result of a slowing down in coin circulation after the Conquest, as Pion has argued, needs further investigation. This trend persisted into the Julio-Claudian era and would help explain the poor representation of official Roman bronze on rural sites in the interior of the province.

As I indicated at the start of the paper, this is a preliminary study and needs to be followed up by more detailed regional studies like the one that Roymans has undertaken for the *triquetrum* coins. The crucial point is that we cannot understand the use of Iron Age coinage just by studying distributions; we also need to place the findspots in an archaeological context. Superficially identical distributions can mask quite different patterns of circulation and deposition, depending on whether or not the coins come from the same types of site. On complex sites, what may be most important is the character of the particular zone where the coins were lost or discarded. We should also be aware that on all sites, modern ideas of economic sense and rational behaviour may offer little clue to the motivation behind Iron Age coin deposition.

Nor can we take the role of specific classes of site as fixed, since in differing social and political circumstances, what we perceive as similar sites could have functioned quite differently. For example, in central Belgic Gaul prior to the development of larger agglomerations, certain rural settlements – where the elite lived, for example – may have functioned as central places for otherwise dispersed communities. Where *oppida* or other central foci existed, rural sites would not have had this role. Conversely, what might seem to us distinct categories of site could nevertheless have had similar functions. This is well illustrated in western Belgic Gaul, where the major sanctuaries seem to have served to integrate society economically and politically in much the same way.
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as oppida elsewhere. Only by studying Iron Age coinage in its wider archaeological and geographical context can we therefore hope to form a clear idea of how it functioned in particular societies.

Analysis also needs to be more sensitive to the real complexity of the data. Qualitative comparison can be revealing, as this exercise has shown, but is bound to hide more subtle patterns of variation. Apart from differentiating later cemetery finds, the analysis took no account of the dating of individual sites, the stratigraphic context of the coins, or the relative quantities of coins deposited on different categories of site. It is important to know, for example, whether the finds from a given site relate to the period when the relevant types were at the peak of their circulation, or whether the picture is distorted by secondary deposition after the main occupation ceased, or after the coins had lost their original monetary significance. Analysis of stratified finds should indicate whether circulation patterns changed during the lifetime of individual coinages, while a fully quantitative and contextual approach will help us to reconstruct other intricacies of deposition and function, as I hope to demonstrate with more detailed studies in the future.