

This dissertation provides a critical re-examination of the historical and literary interpretations of ancient druidic practices. It challenges the widely accepted associations made by scholars regarding Strabo's mention of bans on certain Gallic customs. It argues that these references should not be linked to the bans under Augustus's or Tiberius's reigns but rather to earlier laws, such as the *senatus consultum* of 97 BC or the *Lex Cornelia de Sicariis et Veneficis*.

It also disputes the commonly held belief that Pomponius Mela's work was written during the reign of Claudius (43–44 AD). It proposes the possibility of its origin during Caligula's reign, a stance previously mentioned but inadequately supported in the literature. Consequently, the work's creation likely occurred between 40 and 44 AD.

Further, the research scrutinizes the supposed Claudian ban on druids, arguing that dating this action to 54 AD based solely on Suetonius is unfounded. The event remains undatable based on the available evidence.

The dissertation also suggests that Mela's references to the ban on human sacrifice likely allude to the same earlier decrees as Strabo's, rather than to Claudius's actions against the druids.

Moreover, the dissertation reinterprets Pliny's account in *Natural History*, rejecting the scholarly notion that he reported an alternative tradition in which druidic teachings originated on the continent and spread to Britain. Instead, Pliny wrote about the spread of magic at that point.

The dissertation supposes that Pliny's source on the druids was likely Sextius Niger, whose name appears in all four books in which druids are mentioned. Finally, the research reexamines Cicero's identification of the Haeduan Diviciacus as a druid, suggesting that he more likely belonged to a different religious group known as *mantis*, *uateis*, or *euhages* in Greek sources. The dissertation also disproves claims that Diviciacus was a *vergovretus* when he went to Rome, and that he ever was a king.