The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Archaeology

Arthur Bernard Cook

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 07 / October 1902, pp 365 - 381

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206628, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206628

How to cite this article:

Arthur Bernard Cook (1902). Archaeology. The Classical Review, 16, pp 365-381
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206628

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

books altogether and so jeopardizing the literary element in classical study. The passages set for unseen translation are not all of them taken from classical authors. By setting (among other passages) one which has been specially written for the purpose of the examination, it is possible to provide a really easy piece of Latin, failure to translate which implies ignorance of the very elements of the language; and such passages may moreover be multiplied *ad infinitum*, so that there will be no difficulty in providing easy passages which are 'unseen' in fact as well as in name; whereas, if unseens had always to be taken from classical authors the stock of really easy passages would ultimately become exhausted, as was pointed out in the *Classical Review*. No doubt many scholars object to modern Latin, even though written in a classical style; but they may be willing to waive their objections in view of the positive advantage possessed by passages written or

adapted *ad hoc*—viz. simplicity or just such a degree of difficulty as is desired for the purpose of the examination.

E. A. SONNENSCHN. —

[We gladly insert Professor Sonnenschein's interesting communication. The remarks, however, which are quoted at the beginning of his letter were not intended to be a complete definition of the place of Latin in the matriculation scheme of Birmingham University, for which purpose they were of course inadequate, but to serve as part of a proof that the ancient languages were losing their commanding position of former days.

Since they were written, there have been more signs of the times. Latin is no longer a compulsory subject for cadetships in the Royal Navy, and Oxford is to be asked in the present term to make Greek optional in Responsions.—Ed. C. R.]

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE GOLDEN BOUGH AND THE REX NEMORENSIS.

The Golden Bough. A Study in Magic and Religion. By J. G. FRAZER, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. Vols. I.-III. Macmillan & Co. 1900. 36s. net.

DR. FRAZER'S *Golden Bough* has grown apace. It now extends over three octavo volumes instead of the previous two. Nor is this all; for the thinnest of the new volumes is thicker than either of the old, and they are printed in a slightly smaller type with forty lines to a page instead of thirty-four. The second edition of the book is in fact considerably more than twice the size of the first. It may be worth while to suggest that, if a third edition is needed (and it will be), the long lists of customs and ceremonies on which the author bases his conclusions should be given, say, in brevier while the conclusions themselves are stated, as at present, in small pica. This would be doubly advantageous. It would save space. And it would enable—I will not say, the casual reader to skim the book—but the student, when he re-reads it, to pick out more readily the main lines of the argument.

Again, it is to be hoped that a future edition will be illustrated throughout. Illustrations in any work dealing with anthropological or ethnological questions are of real importance—a fact long since appreciated by the publishers of such periodicals as the *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde* or *L'Anthropologie* or the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*. Nor would it be difficult to get together typical representations of the various customs described in Dr. Frazer's work. Anthropologists and ethnologists rely for the most part on data supplied by ethnographers; and ethnographical books are nowadays almost always illustrated. Besides, folk-lore collections are springing up everywhere: museums, public and private, abound in objects of interest to the student of comparative religion. To give but a single instance—the one nearest to hand—our Cambridge Archaeological Museum possesses an interesting series of corn-mothers and corn-babies, including a beautifully plaited specimen from Greece originally obtained by Mr. W. H. D. Rouse¹ and deposited by the Folk Lore Society in 1898, and a 'harvest-maiden' from Perth presented by Dr.

¹ See Mr. Rouse's remarks in *Folk-Lore* vii. 147 and in his *Gk. Votive Offerings* p. 50, n. 1.

Frazer himself in 1889: several of these might well be photographed to illustrate vol. ii. p. 171 ff. of *The Golden Bough*. Our local collection has also a *corp-chrè* from Islay, Scotland, stuck full of pins, and a lemon and potato from Naples fairly bristling with pins and nails (cp. vol. i. p. 17f.); not to mention various samples of magical knots, etc. (vol. i. p. 392 ff.). As it is, Dr. Frazer has been content with two illustrations—a spray of mistletoe designed for the cover by the late Prof. J. H. Middleton, and the frontispiece, a reproduction of Turner's 'Golden Bough.' Both of these are beautiful¹ rather than useful.

Passing from externals to internals, we note that the main plan of the work remains unaltered. It is still an attempt to account for the ritual of Diana Nemorensis by a thorough-going investigation of those principles, *and those principles only*, that bear upon her cult as conceived by the author. Failure to recognize Dr. Frazer's self-imposed limits has led to a good deal of misunderstanding. It has been widely thought by inattentive readers that tree-worship was here offered as a master-key before which all the manifold chambers of mythology would fly open. Occasionally even an attentive reader has made the same mistake. Mr. Andrew Lang (*Magic and Religion* p. 205f.) remarks: 'Mythology has been of late emancipated from the universal dominion of the sun, but only to fall under that of gods of vegetation, whether of vegetable life at large, or of the corn spirit and the oak spirit in particular.' He enumerates twenty or more gods and demi-gods who have got 'mixed up with plant life' in the *Golden Bough*. But of those that he mentions some are undoubtedly connected with vegetation (*e.g.* Demeter, Dionysus, Jack-in-the-Green) and others have claims that can hardly be denied (*e.g.* Adonis, Attis, Linus, Lityerses, Tammuz). There remain certain cases in which Dr. Frazer may or may not have worked his hypothesis too hard: these require individual criticism, not wholesale condemnation. And if in any instance such criticism should disprove the alleged vegetable affinities, Dr. Frazer would be the first to retract his view. This, at least, is his attitude, if we may judge from his own

¹ Both, to speak the truth, have suffered somewhat in the second edition. The mistletoe was more effective as originally issued, without a framework of horizontal lines. And the autotype of Turner's picture is poor in comparison with the former impression, the plate presumably being worn.

words. In the Preface to his first edition (p. vii.) he wrote: 'Now that the theory, which necessarily presented itself to me at first in outline, has been worked out in detail, I cannot but feel that in some places I may have pushed it too far. If this should prove to have been the case, I will readily acknowledge and retract my error as soon as it is brought home to me. Meantime my essay may serve its purpose as a first attempt to solve a difficult problem, and to bring a variety of scattered facts into some sort of order and system.' But, even if Dr. Frazer *has* in some cases pushed his theory too far (and I shall later on try to show that he has), that is no reason for assigning him to a 'new school of mythology,' still less for speaking contemptuously of his 'Covent Garden' propensities. One would have thought that a sufficient protest had been entered by Dr. Frazer himself, at any rate in the Preface to his second edition, where he says (p. xvii.): 'No one can well be more sensible than I am of the immense variety and complexity of the forces which have gone towards the building up of religion; no one can recognize more frankly the futility and inherent absurdity of any attempt to explain the whole vast organism as the product of any one simple factor. If I have hitherto touched, as I am quite aware, only the fringe of a great subject—fingered only a few of the countless threads that compose the mighty web,—it is merely because neither my time nor my knowledge has hitherto allowed me to do more. Should I live to complete the works for which I have collected and am collecting materials, I dare to think that they will clear me of any suspicion of treating the early history of religion from a single narrow point of view.' After this we have no right to suggest that *der Baumkultus* is to Dr. Frazer what the sun was to Signor de Gubernatis, or allegorical science to Messrs. Fitz Simon, or any other *nostrum* to any other *nos*.

But, while fully recognizing that Dr. Frazer is not a man of one idea, we may be permitted to doubt whether he has hit upon the best method for expressing his views. He takes a particular priesthood as his theme and finds that, in order to solve the problems by which it is beset, he must first discuss certain large and comprehensive questions—the relation between Magic and Religion, Incarnate Gods, Tree-worship, Animal-worship, Taboo, Primitive conceptions of the Soul, &c., &c. This discussion, which occupies ninety-nine per cent. of his pages, enables him ultimately to arrive at a more or

less probable hypothesis with regard to the cult that formed his point of departure. Now there is doubtless something to be said in favour of the method here employed. Like the biographical treatment of history, it enlists our sympathies at the outset in an individual case, and from first to last exhibits the formative influence of general tendencies on a special career. We get a concrete example of abstract principles and are interested accordingly. But the wise historian will not dilate on political and social movements at such a length that we forget the personality of his hero. If he has so much to say on the life of the period he will write a general history, not a biography at all. And, in my opinion, Dr. Frazer would have been well advised to recast his materials in a wider mould, or even to reserve them for that 'general work on primitive superstition and religion,' which, he tells us (Pref. to first ed. p. vii), he has for some time past been preparing. He would thus have avoided the aesthetic error of disproportion. It may be said that science is exempt from artistic criticism. But Dr. Frazer virtually invites it. He is an artist in words as well as a scientist in thought—witness many passages in his great edition of Pausanias—and he does his best to relieve a long and erudite task by stylistic grace, *musaeo contingens cuncta lepore*. But the very beauty of his opening and closing pages heightens our sense of incongruity: we mentally contrast the sympathetic and imaginative paragraphs on Nemi with the dry and voluminous catalogues of fact by which they are separated. For, unlike the author of the book of Job, Dr. Frazer writes his prologue and epilogue in poetry, his intervening scenes in prose.

There is another and a more serious objection to the present form of the *Golden Bough*. Dr. Frazer's explanation of the Arician cult cannot be regarded as certainly correct. At best it is a hypothesis that fits the facts. But if at any time a more convincing hypothesis should be propounded (and the case is quite conceivable), then the collapse of Dr. Frazer's framework might discredit the remainder of his fabric. This would of course be unfair; but it is not in human nature to read the sermon if the preacher misinterprets the text. Since the publication of Dr. Frazer's second edition more than one rival hypothesis has actually been put forward. If these or others like them should find acceptance, many collections of solid facts and not a few brilliant combinations of the same would run the risk of being

neglected. It is surely a pity that real gems should be jeopardised on account of the uncertain value of their setting.

Since, however, Dr. Frazer has deliberately chosen to set forth his views in the form of a commentary on the Arician priesthood, we must follow his order and deal first with the particular cult and then with the larger questions involved in it.

In vol. i., pp. 1-6, Dr. Frazer records 'the few facts and legends which have come down to us' with regard to the cult at Nemi. This record is fairly complete: but, considering the length at which the subject is to be treated, we expect it to be exhaustive. Yet some pieces of evidence do not appear till later on in the book, while others are not mentioned at all. As to the former, the important fact that the cult was the common cult of a Latin league only appears at p. 232, and sundry details concerning Hippolytus are relegated to vol. ii. p. 315, n. 2. As to the latter, Dr. Frazer might have traced the worship of Diana Nemorensis further both in space and in time: others, at least, have succeeded in so doing.

Professor G. Wissowa in his *Religion u. Kultus der Römer*, p. 200 f., has recently pointed out that the cult of Diana at Rome in many respects reproduced the cult of Diana at Nemi. Corresponding to the sacred precinct of Diana Nemorensis was the far-famed *aedes Dianae in Aventino*. Each of the two was the religious centre of a Latin federation: the Arician amphiktionon comprised Tusculum, Aricia, Lanuvium, Laurentum, Cora, Tibur, Pometia, and Ardea, as we gather from a fragment of Cato (*ap. Prisc.* iv., p. 129 H., *cp. ibid.* vii., p. 337 H.); the Aventine temple is called by Varro (*de ling. lat.* 5. 43) 'commune Latinorum Dianae templum.' The 'Lucus Dianius' at Nemi was said to have been consecrated by the Latin dictator Egerius Laevius of Tusculum (Cato, *loc. cit.*), or by a Manius Egerius (Fest. p. 145 Müller): the temple of Diana on the Aventine was, according to tradition, founded by Servius Tullius (Liv. 1. 45, Dion. Hal. 4.26, Zonar. 7.9, Aur. Vict. *vir. ill.* 7.9). The festival of Diana at Nemi in all probability fell on the Ides of August (Stat. *silv.* iii. 1. 59 f., Mart. xii. 67. 2.)¹: that of Diana at Rome did so too (see Mommsen

¹ These passages are not quite conclusive, as Dr. Frazer remarks in vol. i. p. 5 n. 2. But they are strongly supported by the fact that at Lanuvium Aug. 13 was the 'natalis Dianae' (*C.I.L.* xiv. 2112 i. 5, ii. 12): see Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 201 n. 1. *Cp.* too Prof. J. Rendel Harris on Aug. 13 as the date of the festival of S. Hippolytus: see below.

in *C.I.L.* i.² p. 325). Through the sacred wood of Diana Nemorensis flowed a stream on whose banks the nymph Egeria was worshipped (Strab. 5. 239): the same divinity had a cult in the grove of the Camenae under the Aventine (Plut. *Num.* 13, Liv. i. 21, 3, Juv. 3. 11 ff.) To Egeria 'sacrificabant praegnantes, quod eam putabant facile conceptam alvum egerere' (Paul. p. 77), and at Nemi Diana was in a special sense a women's goddess (Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 199 f.): similarly at Rome on Aug. 13 women took particular pains to comb their hair neatly and to purify their heads (Plut. *quaestt. Rom.* 100), doubtless in honour of Diana's festival (Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 201), and none but women might enter the chapel of

Diana in the Vicus Patricius (Plut. *quaestt. Rom.* 3). Diana Nemorensis was also a goddess of fertility in general, extending her protection to animals of all sorts; this appears not only from the literary evidence cited by Birt in Roscher *Lex.* i. 1006, 62 ff., but from certain finds made at Nemi itself during the recent excavations and now preserved in the Nottingham Art Museum. They include two bronze hinds found at the entrance of the temple,¹ and several portions of a terra cotta frieze on which the *πόρνια θηρῶν* (*Il.* 21. 470: see Studniczka in Roscher *Lex.* ii. 1750, 52 ff., and P. Paris in Dar.-Sagl. *Dict. Ant.* ii. 152 f.) is represented grasping a lion in either hand, and ending below the waist in wings.² In pre-

TERRA-COTTA FRIEZE FROM THE PRECINCT AT NEMI.

cisely the same way the Aventine Diana was a goddess of fertility who watched over animal life; her cultus-statue was a copy of the Artemis of Marseilles (Strab. 4. 180), and therefore presumably of the well-known Ephesian type (*ib.* 179), while the horns of a fine cow said to have been sacrificed by Servius Tullius were to be seen on her walls (Plut. *quaestt. Rom.* 4, Liv. i. 45, 3 ff.). Undeniably, then, there are strong points of resemblance between the Arician and the Roman cults of Diana—so strong, in fact, that Wissowa regards the Roman cult as a daughter of the Arician (*op. cit.* p. 201). But Varro's statement (*de ling. lat.* 5. 74), that Diana-worship came to Rome from the Sabines and the assertions of Livy (i. 45, 2) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus

(4. 25) that the federal temple on the Aventine was a copy of the Ionian Artemision at Ephesus may be taken to imply that Arician descent was unknown to or disbelieved by these authorities. Probably we should do well to assume parallel development rather than direct borrowing either from Aricia or from elsewhere.

Again, we miss in Dr. Frazer's account of the cult at Nemi a recognition of the fact that it survived into the middle ages and survives today. Professor J. Rendel Harris has pointed out (*The Annotators of the*

¹ G. H. Wallis, *Illustrated Catalogue* of the Nottingham Art Museum, nos. 633-4, p. 35.

² *Id. ib.* nos. 602-4, p. 31, and photographic plate. I am indebted to Mr. G. H. Wallis for the illustration here given.

Codex Bezae, p. 102) that 'according to the Roman Calendar we have—

Aug. 13 SS. *Hippolyti* et Cassiani, Mm.

Aug. 15 *Assumptio B.V.M.*,

where Diana and Hippolytus still live for those who have eyes to see.' The same shrewd observer has detected traces of the old midsummer-ritual in a local *festa*. For on a recent visit to Nemi he and the Rev. K. Lake learned that at a festival held there towards the end of summer the villagers go down to the shore of the lake, which is illuminated for the occasion. When we recall the date of the Arician festival, at 'the hottest time of the year' (*G.B.* i. 5¹), and the 'multitude of torches, whose ruddy glare was reflected by the waters of the lake' (*G.B.* i. 5), we are entitled to ask whether we have not here a survival of the old ritual. The coincidence is at least worth noting.²

Lastly, the archaeological evidence for the cult at Nemi is rather summarily disposed of in the footnotes to pp. 2, 5. We might reasonably look for a more detailed account of the site excavated by Lord Savile in 1885-6. A plan of the remarkable precinct then laid bare with its buttress wall, its ancient paved road, its series of shrines (like those of Olympia), the basement of its temple, the *favissa* full of votive offerings, etc., etc., would serve to control our imagination and could easily be obtained from Mr. Wallis' *Catalogue* above mentioned. Would it have been possible also to trace the 'marble bas-relief, representing the combat between a priest and a candidate for his office...found at the foot of the hill of Aricia'?'³

Having marshalled his facts, Dr. Frazer raises two questions (p. 6): 'first, why had the priest to slay his predecessor? and second, why, before he slew him, had he to pluck the Golden Bough?' Fully to appreciate the author's answer to these questions, we must read his book; for it contains a cumulative argument drawn from analogous

practices among many imperfectly civilised communities, and resting ultimately on the conviction that human nature is the same all the world over. But the various stages of the argument can be fairly represented by the following abstract.

(1) Chapter i. contains, among other things, a survey of folk-customs relating to tree-worship. At the close of it (*G.B.* i. 230 ff.) Dr. Frazer draws certain inferences with regard to the cult at Nemi. (a) Tree-spirits are worshipped in woods, protect birds and beasts, help women in travail, send rain and sunshine, etc. Much the same is said of Diana Nemorensis. It follows that 'the cult of the Arician grove was essentially that of a tree-spirit.' (b) A tree-spirit is often represented by a living person, who is sometimes styled a king. 'May not then the King of the Wood in the Arician grove have been, like the King of May, the Leaf King, the Grass King, and the like, an incarnation of the tree-spirit?' (c) The tree-spirit is at times represented in double, not only by a living person but also by a bough. On the sacred tree in the Arician grove grew the Golden Bough, which had to be plucked by him who would assail the King. We infer 'the representation of the tree-spirit both by the King of the Wood and by the Golden Bough.'

Dr. Frazer next discusses numerous royal and priestly taboos (chapter ii.) and the practice of killing the divine king (chapter iii. § 1). This done, he again (*G.B.* ii. 59 f.) applies his conclusions to the *rex Nemorensis*. (a) His potent and therefore valuable life 'was probably hedged in by a system of elaborate precautions or taboos.' (b) 'The very value attached to the life of the man-god necessitates his violent death as the only means of preserving it from the inevitable decay of age.' The King of the Wood, therefore, 'had to be killed in order that the divine spirit, incarnate in him, might be transferred in unabated vigour to his successor.' (c) At first he may have been put to death 'at the end of a set period.' The rule that he held office till a stronger should slay him looks like a mitigation of this stern custom. Dr. Frazer seeks to strengthen his conjecture by sundry cases from North Europe, where the representative of the tree-spirit, usually 'slain in mimicry,' is allowed a chance for his life by flight. 'Flight,' we are to observe, 'figured conspicuously both in the legend and in the practice of the King of the Wood,' who had to be a runaway slave in memory of the flight of Orestes. (d) 'In Saxony and

¹ Correct the quotation from *Stat. silv.* iii. 1. 52 in *G.B.* i. p. 5 n. 2. Instead of 'tempus erat, caeli cum ardentissimus axis' etc. read 'torrentissimus' for an obvious reason.

² In fairness to Dr. Frazer it must be said that these discoveries of Prof. J. Rendel Harris have been made *since* the appearance of the second edition of the *G.B.*

³ G. H. Wallis *op. cit.* p. 11. Mr. Wallis informs me that the bas-relief in question is not in the Nottingham Museum; 'I have always,' he says, 'understood that the bas-relief was taken to Russia, but so far its whereabouts has not been traced.'

Thüringen the representative of the tree-spirit, after being killed, is brought to life again by a doctor.' So too Hippolytus, restored to life by Asklepios, became Virbius the first King of the Wood.

A further review of vegetation-cults enables Dr. Frazer to explain the tradition that Hippolytus-Virbius was killed by horses. 'Having found, first, that spirits of vegetation are not infrequently represented in the form of horses; and, second, that the animal which in later legends is said to have injured the god was sometimes originally the god himself, we may conjecture that the horses by which Virbius was said to have been slain were really embodiments of him as a deity of vegetation. The myth that Virbius had been killed by horses was probably invented to explain certain features in his worship, amongst others the custom of excluding horses from his sacred grove' (*G.B.* ii. 313 f.). 'If,' continues Dr. Frazer, 'we knew the ritual of the Arician grove better, we might find that the rule of excluding horses from it...was subject to an annual exception, a horse being once a year taken into the grove and sacrificed as an embodiment of the god Virbius. By the usual misunderstanding the horse thus killed would come in time to be regarded as an enemy offered up in sacrifice to the god whom he had injured' (*G.B.* ii. 315). The conjecture that a horse may have been thus annually sacrificed at Nemi as a representative of the deity of the grove is supported, or at least illustrated, by an account of the October horse.

A discussion of various sacramental customs leads up to an elucidation of the proverb *multi Mani Ariciae* (*G.B.* ii. 343 f.). The tradition that the founder of the grove was a man named Manius, from whom many Manii were descended, is dismissed as an etymological myth devised to explain the word *maniae*. *Maniae* were loaves shaped like men and, if we accept Dr. Frazer's ingenious emendation of a corrupt passage in Festus,¹ were especially made at Aricia. *Mania* was also the Mother or Grandmother of Ghosts, propitiated at the Compitalia. Hence Dr. Frazer suggests that 'in the old days, when the divine King of the Wood was annually slain, loaves were made in his image...and were eaten sacramentally by his worshippers.' 'A dim recollection of the original connexion of these loaves with human sacrifices may perhaps be traced in the story that the effigies

dedicated to Mania at the Compitalia were substitutes for human victims.'

But these are details. The main argument of chapter iii., so far as it bears upon Nemi, is that the *rex Nemorensis* was slain as a representative of the tree-spirit. The objection that such a custom has no analogy in classical antiquity is met by a section on Greek scape-goats and another on the Italian Saturnalia. Dr. Frazer holds that the *φάρμακοί* of Asia Minor, Athens, etc. were 'treated as divine' (*G.B.* iii. 134); and that the mock king of the Saturnalia originally represented Saturn himself and was put to death as the human embodiment of that deity (*G.B.* iii. 140 ff.).

(2) Having disposed of the first question, Why had the Arician priest to slay his predecessor? Dr. Frazer proceeds in chapter iv. to answer the second, Why, before doing so, had he to pluck the Golden Bough? Relying on Servius *ad Verg. Aen.* 6. 136 Dr. Frazer has already identified the branch to be broken from the sacred tree at Nemi with the golden bough mentioned by Virgil. A fresh consideration of Verg. *Aen.* 6. 136 ff., 203 ff., now leads him to infer that the tree was an oak and that the golden bough was mistletoe. If so, it follows from what has been said in chapter iii. that the King of the Wood must have been a personification of the oak-spirit. This permits of a comparison with the Norse god Balder, whom Dr. Frazer regards as a tree-spirit, probably the spirit of the oak, with an 'external soul' residing in the mistletoe (*G.B.* iii. 350). The myth of Balder enables us to understand why the King of the Wood could not be slain till the Golden Bough, *i.e.* the mistletoe, had been plucked. 'As an oak-spirit, his life or death was in the mistletoe on the oak, and so long as the mistletoe remained intact, he, like Balder, could not die. To slay him, therefore, it was necessary to break the mistletoe, and probably, as in the case of Balder, to throw it at him. And to complete the parallel, it is only necessary to suppose that the King of the Wood was formerly burned, dead or alive, at the midsummer fire festival which, as we have seen, was annually celebrated in the Arician grove. The perpetual fire which burned in the grove, like the perpetual fire under the oak at Romove, was probably fed with the sacred oak-wood; and thus it would be in a great fire of oak that the King of the Wood formerly met his end' (*G.B.* iii. 450).

Dr. Frazer ends by explaining why the mistletoe with its green leaves and whitish-

¹ Fest. p. 145 Müller 'et Ariciae genus panni fieri; quod manici appelletur.'

yellow berries is called the Golden Bough (*G.B.* iii. 451 ff.). Here he leans on the analogy of the mythical fern-seed. Fern-seed is supposed to bloom like gold or fire on Midsummer eve and Christmas night, when it empowers its lucky possessor to detect gold hidden in the ground. 'Fern-seed, in fact, would seem to be an emanation of the sun's fire at the two turning-points of its course, the summer and winter solstices.' Mistletoe too is gathered at Midsummer as well as at Christmas, and is used by treasure-seekers for their divining-rods. We must not, however, at once conclude that mistletoe, like fern-seed, is an emanation of the sun's fire. Rather, the sun's fire is an emanation of it. For the ancient Aryan replenished the sun by means of bonfires kindled by the friction of oak-wood; which implies that he looked upon the oak, and (*a fortiori*) the mistletoe, as a sort of solar reservoir. Small wonder, then, that he spoke of the latter as fiery or golden. May he not also have called the former by some name of similar import? Dr. Frazer remarks not only that Virbius was by some identified with the sun, but also that Greeks and Italians alike designated their chief divinity 'the Bright or Shining One' (Zeus, Jove), and that at his most ancient shrines in both countries this god (*Zeus váios, Jupiter feretrius*) was actually represented by an oak. 'The result, then, of our inquiry is to make it probable that, down to the time of the Roman Empire and the beginning of our era, the primitive worship of the Aryans was maintained nearly in its original form in the sacred grove at Nemi, as in the oak woods of Gaul, of Prussia, and of Scandinavia; and that the King of the Wood lived and died as an incarnation of the supreme Aryan god, whose life was in the mistletoe or Golden Bough.'

In estimating the value of Dr. Frazer's view we must bear in mind that from first to last it is very largely hypothetical. It is a conjecture that the Arician priest 'was deemed a living incarnation of the tree-spirit' (*G.B.* i. 232). It is a conjecture based on this conjecture, that 'as such he would be credited with those miraculous powers of sending rain and sunshine' etc. (*G.B.* i. 232). It is a conjecture supported by this conjecture-on-a-conjecture, that 'therefore' he 'had to be killed in order that the divine spirit, incarnate in him, might be transferred in unabated vigour to his successor' (*G.B.* ii. 59). Propped on this in turn are yet other conjectures—that the rule of succession at Nemi 'was a

mitigation of an earlier custom of putting him to death at the end of a set period' (*G.B.* ii. 60), and that he was perhaps 'allowed a chance for his life by flight' (*G.B.* ii. 67). Again, it is a pure conjecture that Virbius was 'a deity of vegetation' (*G.B.* ii. 314). It is a conjecture in the second degree 'that the horses by which Virbius was said to have been slain were really embodiments of him' as such (*G.B.* ii. 314). It is a conjecture in the third degree that there was 'an annual exception' to the rule excluding horses from the Arician grove (*G.B.* ii. 315). It is a conjecture in the fourth degree 'that the sacred grove of Aricia...may have been the scene of a common harvest celebration,' at which this exceptional horse was sacrificed as 'the fructifying spirit both of the tree and of the corn' (*G.B.* ii. 318). Conjectural too is the suggestion that 'when the divine King of the Wood was annually slain, loaves were made in his image...and were eaten sacramentally by his worshippers' (*G.B.* ii. 343 f.). Another series of conjectures is concerned with the mistletoe. It is not certain that the branch at Nemi was Virgil's golden bough. It is not certain that Virgil's golden bough was the mistletoe. Therefore it is doubly uncertain that the branch at Nemi was the mistletoe. Nor have we a right to assume that the tree at Nemi was an oak: for the only evidence that it was an oak is the doubtful identification of the branch at Nemi with Virgil's golden bough, which grew on an oak. Thus it needs a combination of assumptions to hold that Virbius was 'the spirit of the oak on which grew the Golden Bough' (*G.B.* iii. 456) and that 'the King of the Wood must have been a personification of the oak-spirit' (*G.B.* iii. 450). Equally conjectural or more so are the suggestions (*G.B.* iii. 450), that in the mistletoe was contained the external life of the King, that his successor could not slay him without breaking it first and 'probably' throwing it at him, that he 'was formerly burned, dead or alive, at the midsummer fire festival,' that the perpetual fire in the Arician grove 'was probably fed with the sacred oak-wood,' and that the fire in which the King may be supposed to have been burned was 'a great fire of oak.' Finally, it is a conjecture as precarious as any, that the chief deity of the Greeks and Italians was none other than the oak, and that he derived his name 'the Bright or Shining One' from the fact that on certain occasions fires of oak-wood were kindled to replenish by

magical means the flaming sun (*G.B.* iii. 456 f.).

Dr. Frazer's theory is indeed almost wholly hypothetical. But of this in itself we ought not to complain. For, where the facts to build with are so few, we cannot be surprised if the fabric is largely composed of less solid materials. And since Dr. Frazer's restoration follows the pattern of many primitive structures, it is obviously possible that the reader may obtain from his hypotheses a very fair notion of the original. At the same time we are justified in insisting that a reconstruction of this sort will not be satisfactory, (1) if in any points it be inconsistent with itself, and (2) if it base important conclusions on assumptions that are improbable. I confess, I feel that Dr. Frazer is open to criticism on both these grounds, and that the two parts of his discussion suffer accordingly.

(1) Dr. Frazer believes that the Arician priest was the incarnation of a deity resident in an oak. But if we ask—of what deity?—we receive apparently inconsistent replies. (a) Where Dr. Frazer sums up his whole investigation he concludes 'that the King of the Wood lived and died as an incarnation of the supreme Aryan god' (*G.B.* iii. 457). On Italian soil this god was named Jupiter and 'the image of Jupiter on the Capitol at Rome seems to have been originally nothing but a natural oak-tree' (*G.B.* iii. 346). On Dr. Frazer's showing, therefore, the Arician priest ought to be an incarnation of Jupiter. But we look in vain for any trace of a connexion between Jupiter and the Arician grove. The nearest approach to it is an unfinished marble bust of Graeco-Roman work 'probably intended to represent Jupiter' (Wallis *Illustr. Cat.* no. 832), which was found in one of the shrines at Nemi.¹ While speaking of Jupiter, I must add that Dr. Frazer's rejection of the orthodox view ignores much of the available evidence. 'Zeus and Jupiter,' we are told (*G.B.* iii. 457 n. 1), 'have commonly been regarded as sky gods, because their names are etymologically connected with the Sanscrit word for sky. The reason seems insufficient.' Quite so: but it is strongly supported by such phrases as *ὁ δ' ἄρα Ζεὺς | πάννυχος, sub Iove frigido*, by such epithets as *ἀργυρέαννος, ἐρίδοντος, εὐρύσπα, κελαϊνεφής, νεφεληγερέτα, ὑψιβρεμέτης*,

ὑψίλυγος, by such cult titles as *Ἀστροπαῖος, Βροντῶν, Εὐάνεμος, Ἰκαῖος, Κεραύνιος, Νάιος, Ὀμβριος, Οὔριος, Ἰέριος*, by such attributes as the thunderbolt, and by a host of other considerations.

(b) Elsewhere it is Virbius, not Jupiter, who is described as 'the spirit of the oak on which grew the Golden Bough' (*G.B.* iii. 456). That Virbius was 'a deity of vegetation' (*G.B.* ii. 314) at all is, I have said, a pure conjecture devised to account for 'the tradition that Virbius, the first of the divine Kings of the Wood at Aricia, was killed by horses' (*G.B.* ii. 313), for 'the custom of excluding horses from his sacred grove' (*G.B.* ii. 314), and for the fact that 'Virbius came to be confounded with the sun' (*G.B.* i. 6, 231, iii. 456). Prof. Wissowa with equal confidence propounds the view that Virbius was 'wahrscheinlich ein bei der Entbindung hilfreicher Dämon' (*op. cit.* p. 200). Sauer in Roscher *Lex.* i. 2684, following Buttmann *Mythologus* ii. 151 ff., states that Virbius 'als Heilgott und als reiferer Mann dem Asklepios wesensverwandt ist' and conjectures that Hippolytus, like Asklepios, the son of the sun-god Apollo, was originally 'die heilkräftige Sonne.' If it comes to guessing, why not identify Virbius with the stream that flowed through the wood at Nemi? Vib. Sequ. p. 20, 5 Oberl. has the following entry under the head of *flumina*: 'Virbius Laconices, ubi Hippolytum Aesculapius arte medicinae reddidit vitae, unde et Virbius dictus.' Vibius, who wrote circ. 400 A.D., was concerned to give an alphabetical list of the localities mentioned by the most popular poets: his usual sources are Virgil, Ovid *met.* and *fast.*, Lucan (Teuffel-Schwabe § 445, 1). It seems to me probable, therefore, that he had in mind Ov. *fast.* 6. 737 ff., where Aesculapius undertakes to restore Hippolytus to life (*vitam sine vulnere reddam, | et cedent arti tristia fata meae*). If so, Vibius' note may well be based on Ov. *ib.* 756 '*Aricino Virbius ille lacu*'; in which case we should correct the text to 'Virbius lacu Aricino,'² ubi Hippolytum' etc. The corruption into *Laconices* would be easy, since eight lines before stands '*Taygeta Laconices, ubi*' etc. Confusion is one stage more confounded in a second entry under *fontes*: p. 22, 15 Oberl. 'Virvinus Laconices.' That Vibius was acquainted with the Lake of Nemi appears from his *lacus* p. 24, 11 Oberl. 'Triviae lacus Ariciae.' So then this geographer at least took Virbius to be

¹ One wonders that Dr. Frazer did not press into his service the epithet *Dianus* applied to Jupiter in an inscription from Aquileia: *C.I.L.* v. 783 *Iovi Dianō* etc. See Birt in Roscher *Lex.* i. 1003, 49 ff.

² Dr. Postgate suggests *lacu Ariciae*.

the name of a stream, in all probability the stream at Nemi; for a river Virbius in Laconia passes belief, and I have shown how the error may have arisen. Of course Vibius Sequester may have blundered: he blunders elsewhere. But let us assume for the moment that Virbius really was the stream at Nemi. The stream-god would naturally be associated with Diana, who was worshipped on his banks (cp. Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 5. 95 'singula enim numina habent inferiores potestates ministras: ut, Venus Adonim, Diana Virbium,' *id. ib.* 7. 84, 761). When Diana was identified with Artemis, the associate of the former would be identified with the associate of the latter,—Virbius would be regarded as a re-incarnation of Hippolytus. Hippolytus met his fate when driving his team of horses; and this myth was, we know, quoted to explain why horses were not allowed to stray into Diana's *abaton* at Nemi.¹ Lastly, horses were sacrificed by the ancients on the one hand to water-spirits (see Roscher *Lex.* i. 1495, 49 ff., Frazer *Pausanias* iv. 197 f.), on the other hand to the sun (Hdt. 1. 216, Paus. iii. 20. 4, Philostr. *her.* 10. 2)—which would be quite enough to connect a river-god Virbius with the sun. If this possibility be granted, we obtain perhaps an explanation of the marble *stèle* with a double bust of aquatic divinities discovered in the precinct at Nemi. It is figured by Mr. G. H. Wallis *Illustr. Cat.* No. 611 and thus described. It 'consists of the head of a beardless young man, and of an elderly man with a flowing beard. Both have on their foreheads fishes' fins, looking like small wings, aquatic plants cover the neck and chest, and scales cover the cheeks of both heads; the head of the young man has a small fin at each angle of the mouth, the beard of the elder head seems saturated with water and the long damp hair of both heads seems to be blown about in the wind. To judge from the decorative style of sculpture, these heads, which are full of character, are the work of the early Imperial Epoch. The *stèle* is inscribed SACR DIAN'. Have we here the double form of Diana's favourite, Hippolytus-Virbius? In *Ov. met.* 15. 539 f. he tells how the goddess 'addidit aetatem nec cognoscenda reliquit | ora mihi.' This would suit the union of a youthful with an elderly

head and the curious treatment of the faces.² But, whatever may be thought of the identification,³ it is at least as probable that Virbius was a river-god as that he was a tree-spirit: for we have it on the (rather questionable) authority of a geographer that there was a river called Virbius, whereas the arboreal character of this puzzling personage is a matter of mere conjecture. Besides, if the *rex Nemorensis* was really the incarnating priest of Virbius, why should there have been a distinct 'flamen Virbialis' (*G.B.* i. 6, Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 200, n. 4)? It is singular indeed that a priest of Diana should be found incarnating Virbius, while the priest of Virbius had no such part to play.

(c) Earlier in his book Dr. Frazer had implied that the immanent spirit was neither Jupiter nor Virbius, but Diana. For, after remarking (*G.B.* i. 230) that 'the attributes of Diana, the goddess of the Arician grove, are those of a tree-spirit or sylvan deity,' he continued (*G.B.* i. 231)—'May not then the King of the Wood in the Arician grove have been...an incarnation of the tree-spirit or spirit of vegetation?' To which the retort is obvious:⁴ No, for an incarnation of Diana would presumably be a Queen, not a King.

If, then, we start by assuming that the *rex Nemorensis* was the human form of a tree-spirit, we are met by serious difficulties

² The fish forms are not inappropriate to a companion of Artemis. The *xoanon* of Artemis-Eurynome at Phigaleia had a fish tail (Paus. viii. 41. 6). An archaic jar from Thebes, now in the National Museum at Athens, shows a standing female figure with outstretched arms resembling flippers or wings and a robe adorned with a large fish: this peculiar being is probably the Boeotian *πόρνια θηρώς*, and as such would have affinities with Diana Nemorensis (see above). The fish of the fountain Arethusa were sacred to Artemis (Diod. Sic. 5. 3), whose head appears on a Syracusan coin surrounded by fish (Dar.-Sagl. ii. 135, n. 120). In *Anth.-Pal.* vi. 105 a fisherman offers a mullet to Artemis *Ἀρτεμίδι* (cp. Cornut. *N.D.* 34, p. 233). Aphaia, the Aeginetan goddess identified with Artemis (Hesych. s.v. *Ἀφαία*), was brought from Crete to Aegina by a fisherman (Anton. Lib. 40). Diktynna, her prototype in western Crete, was also the divinity of fisher-folk (see Roscher *Lex.* i. 825, 23 ff., Farnell *Cults of the Gr. States* ii. 476 ff.).

³ Mr. G. H. Wallis *Illustr. Cat.* p. 33 regards the herm 'as personification of the lakes of Albano and Nemi.'

⁴ So Mr. Andrew Lang *Magic and Religion* p. 210: 'Given a female tree-spirit, we should rather expect a Queen of the Wood.' In Sen. *Phaedr.* 414 'regina nemorum' is Diana herself. When we recall the theme of Seneca's play and its connexion with the legend of Aricia, it seems possible that the phrase 'regina nemorum' was consciously or unconsciously suggested by the title 'rex Nemorensis.'

¹ Verg. *Aen.* 7. 778 ff. and *Ov. fasti* 3. 263 ff. 'vallis Aricinae silva praecinctus opaca | est lacus, antiqua religione sacer. | hic latet Hippolytus furiis direptus equorum, | unde nemus nullis illud aditur equis.'

whichever way we turn. It might seem at first sight as though a way out of them could be found by the further assumption that Diana was not the first tenant of the Arician grove, but that her cult had been superimposed by the Latins on that of an aboriginal wood-god. This would plausibly account for the fact that in later times the Arician priest was regularly a slave. The god of the conquered population, hypothetically reduced to slavery, would fitly be served by a slave. Note too that Aug. 13, the date of Diana's festival at Rome, was a *servorum dies* (Wissowa, *op. cit.* p. 201), that Servius Tullius who founded the temple on the Aventine was according to the story of servile origin, and that the Manii of Aricia might by a little ingenuity be explained as slaves (cp. *Μάρης*, *Μαρία*, and Petron. 45 iam *Manios* aliquot habet). But unfortunately for such a hypothesis the evidence all goes to show that Diana had been the deity worshipped at Nemi from time immemorial (*G.B.* i. 2 n. 1). There is not a particle of proof that Diana at Nemi was, like Apollo at Delphi, a comparatively late comer. And Dr. Frazer probably does well to refrain from any attempt to make his escape in that direction. He would, I venture to think, have done better still, had he refrained from assuming that the *rex Nemorensis* was the incarnation of any divinity at all.

(2) Another assumption that has made mischief in Dr. Frazer's mind is that the branch at Nemi was mistletoe and the tree an oak. The basis of this assumption is Servius' note on Verg. *Aen.* 6. 136, which—as it is important to the argument—I transcribe below.¹ Servius here records a

¹ Serv. in *Aen.* 6. 136 *Thilo latet arbore opaca aureus licet de hoc ramo hi qui de sacris Proserpinae scripsisse dicuntur, quiddam esse mysticum adfirmant, publica tamen opinio hoc habet. Orestes post occisum regem Thoantem in regione Taurica cum sorore Iphigenia, ut supra <ii 116> diximus, fugit et Dianae simulacrum inde sublatum haud longe ab Aricia collocavit. in huius templo post mutatum ritum sacrificiorum fuit arbor quaedam, de qua infringi ramum non licebat. dabatur autem fugitivis potestas, ut si quis exinde ramum potuisset auferre, monomachia cum fugitivo templi sacerdote dimicaret: nam fugitivus illic erat sacerdos ad priscae imaginem fugae. dimicandi autem dabatur facultas quasi ad pristini sacrificii reparationem. nunc ergo istum inde sumpsit colorem. ramus enim necesse erat ut et unius causa esset interitus: unde et statim mortem subiungit Miseni: et ad sacra Proserpinae accedere nisi sublato ramo non poterat. inferos autem subire hoc dicit, sacra celebrare Proserpinae. de reditu autem animae hoc est: novimus Pythagoram Samium vitam humanam divisisse in modum Y litterae, scilicet quod prima aetas incerta sit, quippe quae adhuc se nec vitii nec*

whole series of comments and explanations that had been offered by others with regard to the Virgilian incident of the Golden Bough.

(i) 'Public opinion' connected it with the following tale. Orestes, having killed Thoas king of Taurica, fled with Iphigenia to Italy and established the statue of Diana, which he had carried off, not far from Aricia—presumably at Nemi. 'After the rite of sacrifice had been changed,' i.e. when the translated Diana had become a reformed human character, who no longer demanded human victims, there still grew in her sacred precinct a certain tree, from which in ordinary circumstances it was not lawful to break a branch. But, if a runaway slave could manage to do so, he might challenge the priest of the temple, himself a runaway slave, to a duel. The priest was a runaway slave in memory of Orestes' legendary flight. The duel in a sense made up to the goddess for the old human sacrifices that she missed. All this, as Mr. Andrew Lang has observed (*The Fortnightly Review* 1901 p. 236 = *Magic and Religion* p. 209), is a good example of an aetiological myth. Orestes and the Tauric Artemis were brought in to explain certain features in the primitive cult of Diana Nemorensis. But, whatever may be said for or against the parallel between Taurica and Nemi, one thing at least it does not explain, and that is the Golden Bough. Servius implies (he does not directly state it) that 'public opinion' identified the golden bough plucked by Aeneas with the bough plucked by the would-be *rex* at Aricia. But this identification, as Mr. Lang remarks, is dubious in the extreme. For the bough of Aeneas was definitely and distinctively golden, whereas we are not told that such was the case with the bough at Nemi: indeed Servius' words (*arbor quaedam de qua infringi ramum non licebat*) would naturally be taken to refer to any bough of the tree, as though all its boughs were of equal worth. The dedication of the Virgilian bough to 'Iuno inferna,' its supernatural toughness in unhallowed hands, its willingness to go with the man ordained

virtutibus dedit: bivium autem Y litterae a iuventute incipere, quo tempore homines aut vitia, id est partem sinistram, aut virtutes, id est dexteram partem sequuntur: unde ait Persius <v 35> *traducit trepidas ramosa in compita mentes*. ergo per ramum virtutes dicit esse sectandas, qui est Y litterae imitatio: quem ideo in silvis dicit latere, quia re vera in huius vitae confusione et maiore parte vitiorum virtus et integritas latet. alii dicunt ideo ramo aureo inferos peti, quod divitiis facile mortales intereunt. Tiberianus *aureum, quo pretio reserantur limina Ditis*.

by fate, are all important characteristics which, so far as we know, have nothing whatever to correspond to them at Nemi. It is clear, then, that, if 'public opinion' explained the Golden Bough by means of the Arician tree, it was founding its explanation on a very questionable analogy. And Dr. Frazer is building on sand when he assumes, as he does throughout his book, the trustworthiness of that explanation.

(ii) But Servius has another view of the matter, this time literary, not traditional. Dr. Frazer does not, I think, mention it; but it deserves a passing notice. 'Those who are said to have written about the rites of Proserpina' held that there was 'something mystic' about the Golden Bough and brought it into connexion with the ordinary ritual of Proserpina. Their explanation was as follows. Aeneas was about to enter the Underworld. His entry was tantamount to an initiation into Proserpina's rites. None might draw near to those rites without bearing a branch. Hence Virgil had to provide Aeneas with a branch. The reference to branch-bearing in the rites of Proserpina is sufficiently explained by what M. Lenormant says of the Eleusinian initiates (Dar.-Sagl. ii. 570): 'Les mystes s'y présentaient couronnés de myrte et tenant à la main un bâton de forme particulière, sorte de thyrses très courts. . . Ce pouvait être aussi un simple rameau, et c'est ainsi que sur le célèbre vase à reliefs de Cumes (fig. 2639) Céléus ou Eubouleus porte, en guise de *bacchos*, un rameau d'arbre.' But that Virgil had the Eleusinian rite in view is not very likely: we have no reason to believe that the Eleusinian branches were golden, or that they were taken from the *ilex* (*Aen.* 6. 209), or that they corresponded in any other way to the Virgilian branch. However, this second view contains at least a germ of truth. Virgil's branch was 'Iunoni infernae dictus sacer' (*Aen.* 6. 138) and the Sibyl said of it (*ib.* 142 f.)—'hoc sibi pulchra suum ferri Proserpina munus | instituit.' In short, its chthonian character is well established. But can we go further? I think we can, thanks to Servius' garrulity: he has other *ἔνδοξα* in store.

(iii) A marginal gloss in cod. T says: 'quidam accipiunt ramum pro scientia mistice et aureum pro claritate sapientiae et sic quisque inferos ingreditur id est secreta scientiae perscrutatur.' This allegorical interpretation of the Golden Bough is set out at greater length by Servius himself. Pythagoras took the letter Y as an object lesson in ethics, its 'ramosa compita' indicating

respectively virtue and vice. Virgil's 'ramus' hidden in the wood is a similar parable of human life, where true teaching is often overlaid by a tangle of error. (iv) Others, adds Servius, say that the Bough is Golden because mortals meet their death through riches—witness the poet Tiberianus, who wrote on the pernicious effects of gold and began his poem thus (Bährens *unedierte lat. Gedichte* Lps. 1877 = *P.L.M.* iii. 265):

Aurum, quod nigri manes, quod turbida
uersant

flumina, quod duris extorsit poena metallis!
Aurum, quo pretio reserantur limina Ditis,
quo Stygii regina poli Proserpina gaudet!

and towards the close of it wrote:

Te celent semper uada turbida, te luta
nigra,
te tellus mersum premat infera, te sibi
nasci

Tartareus cupiat Phlegethon Stygiaeque
paludes!

Now it is possible that comments iii and iv, though they obviously explain nothing about the Arician cult, may help to throw some light on the equally obscure subject of Virgil's Golden Bough. Its chthonian character is, we have seen, certain; and the whole Virgilian episode shows that it was a kind of passport to the Underworld. But why a bough? and why golden? and why compared to the mistletoe? Because divining-rods were used for the discovery of treasure and might be of mistletoe. Prof. E. B. Tylor (*Man.* 1902, p. 49 f. no. 40) shows that 'the European divining rod was used to find not only water but mineral veins, stolen treasure, and even the thief who stole it.' And Dr. Frazer (*G.B.* iii. 454) mentions 'divining-rods of mistletoe' used in Sweden by treasure-seekers. Aeneas before entering the realm of Πλούτων might well be furnished with such a rod: it would enable him 'telluris operta subire,' and its power of self-movement is perhaps hinted at in the words 'ipse volens facilisque sequetur.' One further point: the usual shape of the divining rod is that of the letter Y. Now Prof. J. Burnet (*Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 84 ff.) has proved 'the close relation between Pythagorean and savage modes of thought' (*ib.* p. 105). Is it not possible that the importance attached to the letter Y was due to one of Pythagoras' 'primitive usages' (*ib.* p. 84)? I mean, he as a 'wonder-worker' (*ib.* p. 90) and a 'medicine-man' (*ib.* p. 91), who was identified with Apollo

Hyperboreios the god of divination (Aristot. *frag.* 186)¹, used a divining fork and expounded its virtues in allegorical fashion: the famous Y is but the symbol of his fork.² However that may be, I do not doubt that Virgil's Golden Bough is the mythical counterpart of the dowser's mistletoe rod used for the discovery of underground secrets. It is intelligible on its own merits; and we do but darken counsel if we try to connect it with Nemi. To support weighty conclusions on that fancied connexion is indeed a perilous procedure.

Dr. Frazer in his second Preface (p. xv.) refers to hypotheses as 'necessary but often temporary bridges built to connect isolated facts.' This particular bridge must, I fear, be abandoned as unsound. But if so, what have we to offer in its stead? Is there no ascertainable link between the Arician priesthood and the rest of Italian religion? I believe that there is, and that it is a good deal simpler than Dr. Frazer supposes. We need not go so far afield as 'the mouth of the Congo' (*G.B.* i. 163) or 'the backwoods of Cambodia' (*G.B.* i. 164) to find a parallel to the *rex Nemorensis*. Not twenty miles away, along the Appian Road, lived another priestly king, the *rex sacrorum* of Rome. And it will be at least worth while to enquire whether the known facts with regard to the latter may not provide us with a satisfactory explanation of the former.

I begin by noting that in connexion with both these priestly kings was a cult of Vesta. At Nemi Diana herself bore the title Vesta (inscr. Orelli 1455 = Wilmanns 1767), and Dr. Frazer observes (*G.B.* i. 5) that this 'points almost certainly to the maintenance of a perpetual holy fire in her sanctuary.' He might also have observed that Lord Savile discovered the base of a small circular shrine at the back of her temple. And none know better than Dr. Frazer what that circular form signifies. His brilliant essay in the *J. of Ph.* xiv. 145 ff. proved conclusively that

¹ In proof of his claim to be Apollo he exhibited his golden thigh and took from Abaris *ὃν εἶχε χρυσοῦν οἰστόν, ὃν ἄνευ οὐχ ὁλός τ' ἦν τὰς ὁδοὺς ἐξευρίσκειν* (Iamb. *vit. Pyth.* 140 f.). 'The golden arrow which showed the way can hardly be other than the arrow with which Apollo is represented as divining on the coins of Syria (e.g. *Head Coins of the Ancients*, pl. 38). At Ixiai in Rhodes Apollo was worshipped as Ἴξιος: the place itself was so called ἀπὸ ἱξῶ (Steph. *Byz.* s.v. Ἴξια), and the title of the god may have some relation to his character as a diviner.

² Since writing the above I find that Miss A. W. Buckland, *Anthropological Studies*, p. 146, cites from Tyndale's *Sardinia* the suggestion that the Pythagorean Y 'might perhaps also be considered an analogous character' to 'the bifurcated stick.'

the primitive circular hut with a hearth inside was perpetuated in the circular temples of Vesta. In short, this circular base must be the stylobate of Vesta's hearth.³ Further, among the terracotta figures found in the precinct at Nemi was one that is catalogued as 'Head of a Vestal Virgin' (*Illustr. Cat.* no. 600). Undeniably, then, there was at Nemi a cult of Vesta in close connexion with the grove over which the sacerdotal king kept guard. At Rome too the Vestal Virgins were intimately associated with the *rex sacrorum*—an association on which Dr. Frazer in the aforesaid essay and Mr. Warde Fowler in his *Roman Festivals* (pp. 213, 282, 288, 334) justly lay stress. Moreover, Servius in commenting on Verg. *Aen.* 10. 228 says: 'virgines Vestales certa die ibant ad regem sacrorum et dicebant: *vigilans rex? vigila.*' So that the priestly king at Rome, as at Aricia, had a sacred vigil to keep. Similarly on Greek soil the βασιλεύς stood in a special relation to the κοινὴ ἐστία, as is clear from the evidence collected by Dr. Frazer *loc. cit.* p. 146, n. 5, by G. Gilbert *Griech. Staatsalterth.* ii. 271 n. 2, 324 n. 1 and by v. Schoeffer in Pauly-Wissowa s.v. 'Basileus.'⁴ In some parts of the world analogous practices are still observed. To the cases cited by Dr. Frazer *ib.* p. 159 ff. add one more. The Rev. J. Roscoe informs me that 'the temporal king of Uganda is at the same time the head of all the priests in the country. He is also the guardian of a sacred fire, which is kept burning at the main entrance to the royal enclosure. When the king travels, the fire goes with him. When the king dies, the fire is extinguished.'⁵ It would appear, then, that the connexion between a priestly king and a sacred hearth

³ Lord Savile himself oddly took it to be 'a circular sacrificial altar, with a gutter for carrying away the blood' (*Illustr. Cat.*, p. 9). But the base (of which a photo-mezzotype is given *ib.* p. 10) is obviously a stylobate, consisting of three concentric steps and 'showing traces of having been paved in mosaic.' The gutter is nothing more gruesome than a rain-water drain. The position of the supposed altar, 'at the N.E. angle of the rear of the Temple, and not in front of it' (*ib.* p. 9) would alone suffice to prove that it was not, as the excavators imagined, 'the external altar of the Artemision.'

⁴ Aristotle *Pol.* H (Z) 8. 1322b 28 mentions certain magistrates who ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς ἐστίας ἔχουσι τὴν τιμὴν καλοῦσι δὲ οἱ μὲν ἀρχοντας τοῦτους οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις. This is best illustrated by an inscription from Mytilene: Cauer² 431, 45 ff. τὰς δ' ἀναγγελίας τῶν στεφάνων (ὃς πῶς γένηται, ἐπιμελήθη τοῖς βασιλεῦσι καὶ πρυτάνευσιν, καλέσαι δὲ ἐπὶ ξένια) τοῖς δικασταῖς καὶ τῶν γραμματέων ἐς τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐπὶ τῇ κοινῇ ἐστίᾳ.

⁵ See also the Rev. J. Roscoe, *Further Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda*, p. 51.

traceable both at Nemi and at Rome, belongs to that primitive state of society in which the king as head of the household with the help of his unmarried daughters watches over the family fire. This encourages us to believe that the known origin of the *rex sacrorum* may serve to elucidate the unknown origin of the *rex Nemorensis*. The *rex sacrorum*, as is well known, discharged those sacerdotal functions that the king of Rome had to the last retained in his hands; he was the religious ghost of the former monarch. Assume that the same is true of the *rex Nemorensis*, and much of the mystery that surrounds him will vanish. He was at one time the dictator of a league of Latin communities, whose religious centre was Aricia. As such he had under his especial charge the Arician cult, the cult of Diana. When the Latin league that he

represented ceased to have political importance, its *rex* survived as a religious functionary, precisely as did the *rex sacrorum* at Rome or the βασιλεύς and the φυλοβασίλης at Athens.

Looked at from this point of view, the various problems concerned with him cease to present any serious difficulty. (a) 'A candidate for the priesthood,' says Dr. Frazer (*G.B.* (i. 2) 'could only succeed to office by slaying the priest, and having slain him, he retained office till he was himself slain by a stronger or a craftier.' This rule of succession has been rightly explained by Mr. Andrew Lang as 'a mere rude form of superannuation' (*Magic and Religion*, pp. 94-100, 216). Whenever the infirmities of age began to increase upon the *rex*, he was no longer fit to act as *Fidei Defensor* and must therefore make way for a more vigorous successor.

MARBLE FRAGMENTS FROM THE PRECINCT AT NEMI.
(Parts of gnarled tree-trunks, one attached to portion of human figure.)

But, since he might deny his unfitness or conceal the signs of incipient old age, primitive justice demanded that he should hold himself ready to meet in single combat all who challenged him. If he repelled their attack, well and good; he had proved himself the better man. If he were worsted, again well and good; the better man took his place. Dr. Frazer himself cites many examples of kings who are killed or are forced to kill themselves as soon as they contract any bodily defects (*G.B.* ii. 5-13), others in which all danger of royal senility is averted by fixing a limit to the king's reign (*G.B.* ii. 14), and one which furnishes a parallel to the Arician challenge (*G.B.* ii. 14 f.). But, as Mr. Andrew Lang insists, none of these kings is shown to be an embodiment of a divinity. Hence the *monomachia* of Nemi can be satisfactorily explained as an early form

of superannuation without recourse to any doctrine of incarnate gods.¹

(b) Again, the *rex Nemorensis* had to mount guard over a particular tree in the grove of Diana,—probably because Diana herself was thought to reside in the tree. Diana was normally worshipped in a *lucus* (Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 199, n. 1 and p. 401), indeed every *lucus* was her sanctuary (Serv.

¹ In the honour attaching to the *spolia opima* we may perhaps trace another relic of the same principle. Romulus, when he had slain the king of the Caeninenses with his own hand in battle, deposited his spoils 'ad quercum pastoribus sacram' and there marked out the bounds of a temple to Jupiter Feretrius (Liv. i. 10. 5). The circumstances suggest comparison with Nemi. A further vestige of the same barbaric custom may, as Dr. Frazer surmises (*G.B.* ii. 67), underlie the annual *regifugium* at Rome (Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverw.* iii.² 323 f.); though again there is no need to assume any inherent divinity in the *rex*.

on Verg. *georg.* 3. 332, quoted by Frazer. *G.B.* i. 230, n. 1). But she may have been especially connected with one sacred tree, just as Artemis Κεδρεῖντις had a wooden image in a great cedar at Orchomenos (Paus. viii. 13. 2).¹ If this was so at Nemi, it might serve to explain the two marble fragments found in the course of the excavations 'representing a tree attached to a statue' (*Illustr. Cat.*, no. 790).² What more reasonable than that a religious *rex*, the successor of a temporal *dictator*, should be expected to keep watch and ward over the very home of the goddess?

(c) But why should the Arician *rex* be a runaway slave, whereas the Roman *rex* was always a patrician? The discrepancy is perhaps to be accounted for by the peculiar terms of succession that obtained at Nemi. In primitive times the obligation to fight all comers would not be considered much of a drawback: consequently the office was held by distinguished persons. 'Legend had it that...Diana, for the love she bore Hippolytus, carried him away to Italy...where he reigned a forest king under the name of Virbius' (*G.B.* i. 6). History had it that Egerius Laevius the Latin dictator, or according to others Manius Egerius, dedicated the grove to Diana. This latter version suggests an explanation of the proverb *multi Mani Ariciae*, which on the face of it referred to an old and famous pedigree but was sometimes connected with *Mania*, a 'bugbear to frighten children' (*G.B.* i. 6). If we suppose that the Manii of Aricia were the old kingly dynasty of the place, this curious change of meaning becomes intelligible.³ The temporal *rex*, recognised head of the Latin league, was a personage of distinction: the religious *rex*, who 'at any time of the day, and probably far into the night' (*G.B.* i. 2) prowled about the sacred grove, 'sword in hand, might well be taken as a bogey-man. One thing at least is clear: it cannot be shown that in early days any servile character attached to the *regnum*.

But, as time went on and Latin society gradually emerged from its barbaric condition, a kingship with no temporal power and tenable on these precarious terms became less and less sought after. At last only men 'tam abiectae condicionis tamque extremae sortis' (Suet. *Cal.* 35) could be found willing to take their lives in their hands and become candidates for the post. The restriction to runaway slaves may have been helped out by a popular play on words. Runaway slaves were called with grim humour *cervi*, not *servi*; and Diana, who had under her protection the stags of the woodland, would also shelter the human quarry in her sanctuary: cp. Festus p. 343 Müller 'servorum dies festus vulgo existimatur Idus Aug., quod eo die Ser. Tullius, natus servus, aedem Dianae dedicaverit in Aventino, cuius tutelae sint cervi, a quo celeritate fugitivos vocent cervos.' Similarly any man who entered the grove of Zeus Lukaïos in Arcadia was dubbed *ἔλαφος* (Plut. *quaest. Gr.* 39), perhaps as being the natural prey of the fierce wolf-god (see *J.H.S.* xiv. 137). However that may be, the deterrent effect of the sword-of-Damocles at Nemi is illustrated by the vacant throne of Ngoïo in West Africa (*G.B.* ii. 26). One can quite understand that none but a desperado would in imperial, or even late republican, times have become a claimant for the Arician kingship. On the other hand, the *rex sacrorum* at Rome had to submit to nothing more dangerous or degrading than the annual *regifugium* above mentioned; his office remained compatible with patrician dignity.

(d) Those who undertook the risk at Nemi had first to break off a bough from the sacred tree. Why? According to Dr. Frazer, because the life of the oak-spirit resided in the mistletoe; the incarnating priest could not, therefore, be slain until the mistletoe had been cut (*G.B.* iii. 450). According to Mr. Andrew Lang, 'the bough was broken...as a taunt, a challenge, and a warning. "You can't keep your old tree, make room for a better man!" That is the spirit of the business' (*Magic and Religion*, p. 221). I should prefer to steer a middle course between the subtlety of Dr. Frazer's explanation and the outspoken verve of Mr. Lang's. It is doubtful whether the tree was an oak⁴ and still more doubtful whether

¹ Dr. Postgate reminds me of Stat. *Theb.* 4. 425 ff. 'nec caret umbra deo; nemori Latonia cultrix | additur. hanc piceae cedrique et robore in omni | effictam sanctis occultat silva tenebris.'

² Mr. G. H. Wallis kindly supplied me with the photograph from which the above illustration of these fragments was made.

³ The 'Manius heres' of Pers. 6. 56 is, as Conington says, 'one of the aristocracy of Aricia'—a beggar. Persius probably chose this phrase deliberately to suit its context, the passage about pedigrees. Manius was a name which had come down in the world: it was common in the gens Aemilia and the gens Sergia (Egbert *Lat. Inscr.* p. 85), but had come to be used even of slaves (Cato *de re rust.* 141).

⁴ Prof. Furtwängler *die antiken Gemmen* iii. 231 holds that we have a representation of Diana Nemorensis in a series of gems, which exhibit a draped female figure standing by an altar with a branch in one hand and a cup (sometimes full of

any mistletoe grew on it; but after all it was a sacred tree, and the branch—I take it—was broken in order that the challenger might put himself directly under the protection of Diana. The very fact that he had been able¹ to break off the branch raised a presumption that he was the chosen champion of the goddess, and—wearing her favour, so to speak,²—he did battle with the former champion.

If, then, we start from the simple hypothesis that the *rex Nemorensis* is comparable with the *rex sacrorum*, the various details of the Arician priesthood fall into place without difficulty and we arrive at a satisfactory theory of the whole cult. Indeed so obvious is the path that we ask in amazement, How came Dr. Frazer to miss it? The fact is, he did not miss it, but deliberately rejected it. In vol. i. p. 162 he raises the question 'May not the King of the Wood have had an origin like that which a probable tradition assigns to the Sacrificial King of Rome and the titular King of Athens? In other words, may not his predecessors in office have been a line of kings whom a republican revolution stripped of their political power, leaving them only their religious functions and the shadow of a crown?' 'There are,' Dr. Frazer continues, 'at least two reasons for answering this question in the negative. One reason is drawn from the abode of the priest of Nemi; the other from his title, the King of the Wood. If his predecessors had been kings in the ordinary sense, he would surely have been found residing, like the fallen kings of Rome and Athens, in the city of which the sceptre had passed from him. This city must have been Aricia, for there was none nearer. But Aricia, as we have seen, was three miles off from his forest sanctuary by the lake shore. If he reigned, it was not in the city, but in the greenwood. Again his title, King of the Wood, hardly allows us to suppose that he had ever been a king in the common sense of the word. More likely he was a king of nature, and of a special side of nature, namely, the woods from which he took his title.'

fruit) in the other; near her is placed a stag (*ib.* pl. xx. 66, xxii. 18, 26, 30, 32). A similarly posed male figure holding a sacrificial knife (*ib.* pl. xxii. 19) is regarded by him as Virbius. If these identifications were certain, we could be sure that the sacred tree at Nemi was not an oak: for in pl. xxii. 18 at least the branch has round fruit on it, probably apples.

¹ Cp. Serv. on *Aen.* 6. 136 'dabatur autem fugitivis potestas, ut si quis exinde ramum potuisset auferre,' etc.

² Cp. the θαλλοφόροι at the Panathenaic festival.

These two objections are the lions that frightened Dr. Frazer from finding his way to the Interpreter's house. But closer inspection shows that the lions are chained.

(1) If, argues Dr. Frazer, the *rex Nemorensis* had been in truth the religious successor of a line of temporal monarchs, he would have been found residing where his predecessors resided—at Aricia. As it is, we find him three miles off in a forest sanctuary. Therefore he had no such secular origin. This argument strikes me as a singularly weak one. It assumes as beyond question that an Arician monarch would reside at Aricia. But, if an important part of the duties of an early *rex* was to look after the public ritual of his domain (Dr. Frazer has just proved it: *G.B.* i. 161 f.), and if the chief cult of Aricia went on at Nemi (Dr. Frazer would readily admit it: *G.B.* i. 2), why in the name of all that is reasonable should not the Arician king have lived at Nemi? That he actually did so is rendered highly probable, if not absolutely certain, by the associated cult of Vesta. What is the meaning of a Vesta-shrine, *alias* a public hearth, at Nemi except that the king had his residence there? Aricia was not unique in having its principal religious seat at a distance from the town: the Artemision at Ephesus, for example, was almost a mile from the city,³ and its sacred kings the Essenes⁴ very probably resided within the *temenos*. Religious obligations, then, provide a sufficient reason for the choice of the Arician king's abode. (2) Again, Dr. Frazer urges: 'his title, King of the Wood, hardly allows us to suppose that he had ever been a king in the common sense of the word.' This argument is misleading. The English phrase 'King of the Wood' does more or less suggest a departmental king of nature; but only because we do not use the word 'wood' as a separate place-name: 'King of the Black Forest' or 'King of the Bush' would not be similarly suggestive. Now the Latin phrase *rex Nemorensis* means, not 'king of *nemora* in general,' but 'king of the *Nemus* in parti-

³ J. T. Wood, *Discoveries at Ephesus*, p. 9.

⁴ *Etyim. mag.* 383, 30 'Ἐσσηνὶ δὲ βασιλεὺς κατὰ Ἐφεσίους. See *J.H.S.* xv. 12 and Herwerden *Lex. Gr. suppl.*, s.v. Ἐσσην. Strabo xiv. 1. 3 (633c) states on the authority of Pherekydes that the descendants of Androklos, founder of Ephesus, ἐτι νῦν...ὀνομάζονται βασιλεῖς, ἔχοντες τινὰς τιμὰς, προεδρίαν τε ἐν ἀγῶσι καὶ πορφύραν ἐπίσημον τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους, σκίπτων ἀντὶ σκήπτρου, καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς Ἐλευσινίας Δήμητρος. But, as Dittenberger has pointed out (*Syll.*² i. 279, no. 175, 4 n.), it is doubtful whether these βασιλεῖς or βασιλῖδαι (*Suid.* s.v. Πυθαγόρας Ἐφεσίους) can be identified with the Ἐσσηνες.

cular,' i.e. king of a certain definite wood, which in virtue of its importance had come to be known as the wood *kar' ἐξοχήν*,¹ 'Nemi, imbedded in wood,' as Clough calls it in his *Amours de Voyage*. And 'king of Nemi,' as it is best translated, no more points to a departmental deity than 'king of Rome.' Had the Latins wished to imply 'king of all woodlands,' they would probably have said 'rex silvanus' rather than 'rex Nemorensis'; for the latter adjective has a distinctively local termination.²

These were the main objections that deterred Dr. Frazer from following up the analogy offered by the *rex sacrorum*, and they have broken down. We need not hesitate, then, to press that analogy and to conclude that the *rex Nemorensis* was in fact the religious successor of one who had been also a temporal king.³

¹ Wissowa *op. cit.* p. 199, n. 3 well observes: 'Auch die um das Heiligtum sich gruppierende Niederlassung heisst mit Eigennamen Nemus (Nέμος Strab. v. 239, App. b.c. v. 24), heute Nemi, ebenso wie sich aus dem *lucus Angitia* im Marserlande. . . die Gemeinde der Lucenses, heute Luco, entwickelte (Mommson *C.I.L.* ix. p. 367).' Similarly at Teutheia in Achaia Artemis bore the cult-title of Νεμῖδια (Strab. viii. 3. 11, 342 c.), which was presumably derived from a neighbouring *νέμος*. Thus Artemis Νεμῖδια would be an exact parallel to Diana *Nemorensis*.

² Roby *Lat. Gram.* i. 300, section 815, Stolz *Hist. Gram. d. Lat. Spr.* i. 540 f.

³ If the *rex sacrorum* was thus strictly parallel to the *rex Nemorensis*, it is tempting to ask whether certain points in the story of the early kings of Rome do not gain a fresh significance. Servius Tullius was born a slave (Dion. Hal. 4. 1). And the singular legend about his birth preserved by Plut. *de fort. Rom.* 10 and Dion. Hal. 4. 1-2 implies a close, indeed a vital, connexion between him and the royal hearth. Again, he was in a sense the champion of Diana: we have seen that he established her cult on the Aventine, and sacrificed a phenomenal cow in her honour. He lived near an ancient *Dianium* on the *Virbius clivus* (Liv. i. 48. 6, Solin. i. 25), a hill leading up to the Fagutal of the Esquiline (Kiepert-Hülsemann, map i. Ko). Finally, he was attacked in person by his successor L. Tarquinius, the son of *Egerius* (Dion. Hal. 4. 64), and put to the sword by his orders (Dion. Hal. 4. 39, Liv. i. 48. 4). Is this conjuncture of circumstances (slave yet king, connected with hearth, devoted to Diana, murdered by successor) and names (*Dianium*, *Virbius*, *Egerius*) purely accidental, or have we here scattered hints of a state of affairs really corresponding to the situation at Nemi? In view of variants on the reading *Virbium* in Liv. i. 48. 6 and Solin. i. 25 it would be rash to insist on the latter possibility. In Liv. i. 48. 6 *Virbium clivum* is the reading of the libri recentiores: *Urbium* is supported by codd. A C H I Voss. II.; *uerbium* stands in Lips., *uibium* in the frag. Flammersheimense. In Solin. i. 25 too the best attested reading is *clivum Urbium*: cod. Sangallensis has *orbium*, and cod. Angelomontanus *olbium*. Nevertheless it is quite possible that the slope of the Esquiline was originally called 'clivus Virbius,' like the hill at Aricia (Pers. 6. 56 *clivumque ad Virbi*).

How does this conclusion affect our estimate of the *Golden Bough*? It certainly invalidates what I have called the framework of the book. If I am right, not only is the 'Golden Bough' a misnomer, but the whole explanation of the Arician cult given by Dr. Frazer falls to the ground. Yet (and I would lay stress on the fact) Dr. Frazer's work is much more than an attempted explanation of a single cult. He has undertaken—

*omne aeuom tribus explicare chartis
doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis,*

and we have still to examine the inferences here drawn from a vast array of facts relating to other cults and other climes. Unless I am much mistaken, the real value of the book will be found to lie not in the particular Arician hypothesis—that is wrong—but in the generalisations with regard to magic and early religion, many of which are undoubtedly right.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

Numismatische Zeitschrift. Vol. xxxiii. (for 1901) 1902.

Imhoof-Blumer. 'Zur syrischen Münzkunde.' Rare or unpublished coins of Apamea on the Orontes, Karne, Ptolemais, Nikopolis, Emmaus, &c. The cultus-statue of Zeus Heliopolites seen between two oxen on the coins of Nikopolis is discussed.—J. Scholz. 'Griechische Münzen aus meiner Sammlung.'—A. Markl. 'Das Provinzialcourant unter Kaiser Claudius II. Gothicus.' On the coinage of Alexandria in Egypt.—O. Voetter. 'Die Münzen des Kaisers Gallienus und seiner Familie.' Continued from Vol. 32. With atlas of plates.—J. Maurice. 'L'atelier monétaire de Thessalonica pendant la période Constantinienne.'—O. Voetter. 'Herculi und Jovi. Rathselhafte Abkürzungen auf gleichzeitigen Münzen des Constantinus in Lugdunum und des Licinius in Antiochia.'

Revue belge de Numismatique. Part 2, 1902.

A. Blanchet. 'Une émission de monnaies en Gaule sous Gallien en 262.'—Coins with reverses inscribed 'Deo Volcano,' 'Deo Marti,' and 'Deae Segetiae,' probably struck at Lyons at the time when

For, when the neighbouring *Dianium* disappeared (Liv. i. 48. 6 *ubi Dianium nuper fuit*), the name 'Virbius' would almost inevitably suffer corruption. It would naturally pass into 'Verbius' (in Pers. *loc. cit.* cod. C has *verbi*, and in Verg. *Aen.* 7. 762 cod. R has *Verbius*), or 'Urbius' from 'Urbs' = Rome, or 'Vibius' from the well-known gens, or 'Orbius' ('*Opbios* cod. Vat. in Dion. Hal. 4. 39) to suit the tradition that Tullia there drove her chariot-wheels ('*orbes*') over her father's corpse (Fest. p. 182 Müller suggests derivation from the 'flexuosi orbes' of the hill), or 'Olbius' to form a contrast with the later name of the road, 'Vicus Sceleratus' (Dion. Hal. 4. 39 *οὗτος ὁ στενωπός, ὁλβιος καλούμενος πρότερον, ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ δεινοῦ καὶ μυσταροῦ πάθους ἀτεβής... καλεῖται*).

the Empire was scourged by pestilence.—*Review.* Macdonald's *Catal. of Greek Coins*, Hunter Coll., vol. ii.

Rivista italiana di Numismatica. Vol. xv. Parts 1 and 2, 1902.

F. Gnecchi. 'Appunti di numismatica Romana.' On some rare coins (*aes grave* &c.) from recent excavations in Rome.—G. Dattari. 'Appunti di numismatica Alessandrina.' On the classification of the Alexandrian coins of Saloninus and Valerianus junior.—J. Maurice. 'L'atelier monétaire d'Ostia pendant la période Constantinienne.'—A. Sambon. 'La cronologia delle monete di Neapolis.'—M.

Rostowzew. 'Tessere di piombo inedite e notevoli della collezione Francesco Gnecchi a Milano.'—R. Mowat. 'Le monnayage de Clodius Macer et les deniers de Galba marqués des lettres S. C.' A full descriptive list with illustrations of the coins of Macer, *propraetor in Africa*.—'Il Ripostoglio di Karnak.' A short notice of the recent remarkable find of Roman coins at Karnak near Luxor. The coins are Roman aurei, in perfect preservation, of the period from Hadrian to Diadumenian. They were contained in two terracotta jars, one of which held 1000, the other 180 specimens.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xxii, 4. Whole No. 88. 1901.

A further collection of *Latin Proverbs*, M. C. Sutphen. *The Torch-Race*, J. R. S. Sterrett. *The Pomerium and Roma Quadrata*, S. B. Platner. *Etymologies*, G. Hemphill. *Zarathustra and the Logos*, L. H. Mills. *Cicero's Judgment of Lucretius*, G. L. Hendrickson. *Cicero ad Atticum*, Louise Dodge. MAMATPAI, J. S. Speyer. The books noticed are Harper's *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters* (C. Johnston), Cumont's *Textes et Monuments Figurés Relatifs aux Mystères de Mithra* (G. Showerman), Osiander's *Hannibalweg* (E. B. Lease).

Vol. xxiii. No. 1. 1902.

Problems in Greek Syntax, Basil L. Gildersleeve. The editor defines his position as regards the aesthetics of syntax. *The Annals of Varro*, H. A. Sanders. *Word-Accent in Early Latin Verse*, J. J. Schlicher. A rehabilitation of the pitch accent in Latin. *A martyrological Fragment from Jerusalem*, E. J. Godspeed. *Plato's Testimony to Quantity and Accent*, A. N. Jannaris. *Note on the collation of Parisinus 7900A (of Horace)* M. S. Slaughter. Review, Reports, Brief Mention, etc.

Hermes. Vol. 37, 1. 1902.

W. Dittenberger, *die Familie des Alcibiades*. Proves that the pedigree-tree of Alcibiades as we have it shows that a generation has fallen out. He exhibits it as follows—Alcib. I. contemporary of Cleisthenes, his sons Kleinias I. trierarch at Salamis and Alcib. II. called *δωδακός* in Plat. *Euthyd.* 275A. The sons of the latter were Kleinias II., who was father of the celebrated Alcibiades and fell at Coronea in 448, and Axiochus. F. Leo, *Vergil und die Ciris*. Combats the view of Skutsch that Cornelius Gallus is the author of *Ciris*. L. concludes that the verses common to Vergil and the author of *Ciris* are borrowed by the latter, who published the poem after the *Aeneid*. A. Brieger, *Demokrits angebliche Leugnung der Sinneswahrheit*. Shows abundantly that D. believed the testimony of the senses. He only required that sense-perception should be completed and corrected by the understanding. U. Wilcken, *ein neuer Brief Hadrians*. Dates a letter in the Berlin Museum (No. 140), which he had previously ascribed to Trajan, in the year 119, and now ascribes it to Hadrian. W. K. Prentice, *die Bauinschriften des Heiligtums auf dem Djebel Shékéh Berekdé*. Gives an account of an

expedition to this mountain N.W. of Aleppo. The inscriptions on the remains of a wall show that there was here a temple to Zeus Madbachos and Selamanes. We also have information given on the builder and the architect, the cost and the time of building. F. Hiller von Gaertringen und C. Robert, *Relief von dem Grabmal eines rhodischen Schulmeisters*. Description of this relief found in the neighbourhood of old Ialysus and now in Hiller's possession. It was probably the upper part of a door-entrance. The *Ταῖοι*, to whose family the deceased belonged, probably were of the town Phoenix and are not the inhabitants of the Lycian town Tlos. M. Ihm, *eine lateinische Babriosübersetzung*. This is from the second vol. of the Amherst Papyri and is a translation of two fables of Babrios and part of a third in extremely bad Latin. W. Crönert, *Ormela*. On some linguistic peculiarities of inscriptions from Ormela which was a place on the borders of Pisidia and Phrygia. O. Seeck, *Zur Chronologie Constantins*. Opposes Mommsen's opinion as to the date of Constantine's becoming sole emperor and also Th. Preger's on the date of the foundation of Constantinople. Mommsen replies that Seeck's argument is consistent with his own opinion. G. Wissowa, *monatliche Geburtsstagsfeier*. Refers *Verg. Ecl.* 1. 7 and 42 not to a Roman but to a Greek and oriental custom of celebrating the birthday of the monarch with monthly sacrifices. M. Ihm, *zur römischen Prosopographie*. Refers to some tile-inscriptions.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Vol. 57, 1. 1902.

Ueber eine besondere Bedeutung von γὰρ, J. M. Stahl. In *Thuc.* iii. 40. 4 and 43. 4 γὰρ neither gives a reason nor an explanation, but is rather concessive = 'it is true.' Other exx. of this meaning are given which accords with the derivation γὰρ ἀπα. *Ueber den Verfasser der X libri de architectura*, H. Degering. Maintains against Ussing the authorship of Vitruvius and discusses the relationship of the work to Pliny. To be continued. *Zwei alte Terenzprobleme*, F. Schoell. On (1) the prologue to the *Heautontimorumenos* and (2) the narrative in the *Andria*. *Zu Achilles Tatius*, F. Wilhelm. Discusses the erotic literature of the ancients on the question as to whether the love of women or of boys is superior, and refers to Achilles Tatius. *Kaiser Marcus Salvius Otho*, L. Paul. An apology for Otho. His suicide is attributed to a desire to guard the Romans from civil war, also to want of confidence in himself as a