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Diana Nemorensis

ANDREW ALFÖLDI

PLATES 31-34

Munusculum Willy Theiler sexagenario oblatum

I

The problem discussed here emerged from an attempt to explore systematically the neglected coin evidence for the history of the later Roman Republic. The denarius illustrated on pls. 31-34, nos. 1-43, with the bust of a goddess in a curious archaic style and the archaic group of three divinities in a sacred grove is not an uncommon one. It was issued in large quantities and has been described again and again, but never closely examined, and therefore its meaning and significance have been misunderstood. A complete catalogue of the specimens preserved in all collections all over the world, based on the sequence of dies, is still to be made. But the 44 denarii assembled here have already enabled us to establish the obvious succession of the main varieties. This sequence shows a trend to a rather quick degeneration, the progress of which can also be pinned down through some die-links, combining the varieties of the reverses with some obverse dies and the changing shapes of the bust represented on them.

The deterioration of the three-figure group took place in the following three stages:

a) There is one specimen in Vienna (pl. 31, 1 and 3) which closely follows the prototype. The goddess in the center puts her right hand on the shoulder of one of her companions, and her left hand on the hip of the other. Under the horizontal bar, mounted behind their necks, the lower parts of the trees of the grove in the background are still clearly distinguished. The goddess on the spectator’s left, with a bow in her right hand, has a chiton not girded under the breasts as have the others; her mantle is fastened on the left shoulder so as to free the right arm for her archery. The goddess who stands on the right side has a poppy-like plant—the identification is not quite certain—in her left hand. As the symmetry of archaic art required, each of the two women standing on the flanks holds an attribute in her outside hand, and lets her inside arm beside the central figure of the composition hang down, grasping her robe. The trees in the background appear on our enlarged photographs to be poplars, but examination of the much smaller actual coins reveals that the leaves are only a schematic rendering of the foliage without an attempt of individualization. In the Italian landscape a grove of cypresses is much more likely than poplars and we think the grove is a cypress grove.

b) This composition was apparently much too complicated for the average die-cutter, especially to the right and left of the goddess in the center, under the horizontal bar, where the trunks of two trees and the arms of the divinity included too much intricate small detail. He therefore simplified his design at these points. First, he simply raised the forearms of the central figure so that they cross those of her neighbors like scissors; between the support to me. My hearty thanks are offered herewith to all those mentioned as well as to Miss Lucy Shoe for improving the English of my manuscript, and to Mrs. Baldwin Smith for its careful preparation for the press.

1 The gallant help of the Bollingen Foundation in New York and of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia enabled me to collect a very large amount of photographs of the Republican denarius from all over the world. The Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique of Switzerland generously gave me an assistant for my research, an especially valuable help for my cataract-stricken eyes. The keepers of public collections and the private owners of the specimens of coins illustrated as well as Dr. H. A. Cahn of Basle lent me their most appreciated help in permitting publication or sending photographs or casts. Dr. A. Alföldi, Jr., of Basle, Mrs. Emma Deé-Alföldi of Berne, Mrs. VI. Clain-Stefanelli of Washington, and Mr. R. W. Johnson of New York supplied the pictures reproduced. The welcome opportunity to discuss details with my friends K. Schefold and F. Gilliam in Princeton was a great

2 The previous literature is listed in the following catalogues: E. Babelon, Description Historique et Chronologique des Monnaies de la République romaine 1 (Paris 1885) 99f., nos. 1-2; M. v. Bahrfeldt, Nachrichten und Berichtigungen zur Münzkunde der römischen Republik 1 (Wien 1897) 4; H. A. Grueber, Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum 1 (London 1910) 569, nos. 4211-14; E. A. Sydenham, The Coinage of the Roman Republic (London 1952) 187, nos. 1148-1148a.

3 Cf. B. Borghesi, Oeuvres complètes 1 (Paris 1862) 367f.
crossed forearms on the right the foliage of a tree is still marked by hatching (pl. 31, 5, 6 and 7 have this die coupled with two different obverse-dies). Yet this was still too complicated a procedure and the next step was to chisel out all the miscellaneous little details under the horizontal bar on both sides of the central figure, tooling away even the hands of the crossed forearms.

c) Immediately after this awkward solution the crossed, raised forearms were simplified again; they remained held up, but without being crossed, and neatly separated—completely altering the original composition, and transforming the three women to caryatids, supporting the transverse bar. This scheme lasted till the end of the whole issue; the only later change was the gradual transformation of the flower in the hand of the goddess on the right side to a device like the lily of the Bourbons (pl. 33, 24-35; pl. 34, 36-38, 40-43), degenerating in some cases to a meaningless scrawl (pl. 34, 39), or even separated from the hand which should hold it (pl. 32, 17).

It is essential to keep in mind the fact that these three aspects of the degenerative process took place during the use of the first type of the representation of the bust on the obverse (pl. 31, 3-10; pl. 32, 11-17). Whereas the disfigurement of the statue group of the three divinities may be ascribed to the die-engravers, the deliberate and arbitrary change in the hair-style of the bust is a device of a certain supervisor, one of those slaves and freedmen of Caesar who had the technical direction of the coinage in those years, and scandalized the Senate by their important role. The parallels of this device are worth noting. In 44 B.C. the figure of Venus Genetrix, though manifestly referring to Caesar and the cult-image of his newly built temple, has six different garments and attributes, to distinguish each responsible supervisor and also the issues of the four monetales. Also in 44, on the first portraits of Caesar struck by M. Mettius, the hair appears combed downward and forward on the neck; in the following issue, the same hair on the neck is combed upward and backward. The same device was used on the same portrait in 43: the Caesar-heads of Flaminius Chilo have the first type of neck-hair; those of Sempronius Gracchus and Voconius Vitulus the second. In 44, on the next issue of Septunius Macer, the star on the lower end of the scepter of Venus has been covered by a shield, evidently to facilitate the control of dies.

The same procedure, showing little regard for the particular details so essential for an archaeologist, explains the arbitrary alteration of the hair style of the Accoileus denarius. The first type of bust (pl. 31, 3-10; pl. 32, 11-14, 17) has a curious and unusual style, with its double row of knob-like curls bordering the flatly combed hair which clings closely to the skull, and without any tresses on the neck; we shall shortly return to such archaic and partly un-Greek elements of our sculptural group. This strange character of the hair-dressing suggests its derivation from a definite sculptural prototype in the archaic art of ancient Italy.

Then the die-engravers were constrained by their technical supervisor to change the appearance of the hair, simply adding a braid, falling down on the neck (pl. 32, 18-19, from the same obverse-die). This detail, however, was dropped again after a very few dies were engraved with it, giving place to a third headdress which continued in use till the end of the issue.

This third variety of hair-dressing covers the flatly combed crown of hair with a turban-like cloth wrapping (pl. 32, 20-23; pl. 33, 24-35; pl. 34, 36-43).  

II

The date of this monetary issue is 43 B.C. This was established a hundred years ago by C. Cavendoni, who also refuted the erroneous dating of B. Borghesi, based on a hybrid specimen, coupling the Accoileus-obverse with the die of an Augustan coin. His argument, based on observations of the finds, was reaffirmed by Mommsen, accepted by M. v. Bahrfeldt, E. Babelon, and H. Mattingly. Before it had been re-engraved, i.e. provided with the "turban."

Earlier statements of Cavendoni are quoted in B. Borghesi, op.cit. (supra n. 3) 377 n. 1. The opinion of Borghesi was erroneously taken up again by L. Borsari, NSc (1868) 666.  

10 Th. Mommsen, Geschichte des römischen Münzwesens (Leipzig 1860) 417 n. 16 and 658f., n. 561.  

12 NZ Wien 32 (1901) 61.  

18 op.cit. (supra n. 2) 100.

14 H. Mattingly, Roman Coins (London 1928) 279 (ad pls. 16, 19).
H. A. Grueber\textsuperscript{15} assigned this \textit{denarius} (apparently following a guess of Count de Salis) to the year 41, but this is not supported by the facts; still less so is the date proposed by E. A. Sydenham,\textsuperscript{16} 37 B.C. The correct chronological position of this coin-type can be ascertained by examining the traces of the "handwriting" of the chief die-engraver in the years around the death of Caesar. The hatching of thin vertical lines, indicating the drapery of the female bust of the obverse in the manner of early classical Greek art, with the same row of dots or pears surrounding the neck, appears first on the bust of Victory of the \textit{denarius} of T. Carisius in 46;\textsuperscript{17} then, after our type, again on those of L. Musidius Longus, struck in 42.\textsuperscript{18} This latter copies the split of the chin on the shoulder of the goddess of the Accoleus-obverse, hemmed by oblique hatching on both sides in the same way. This means that the Accoleus-issue came out before 42 and after 46 B.C.; all the moneyers of 46-44 being known, there is room only in 43 for our type. This exact date will help us to understand the career of P. Accoleus after we learn the city from which he came.

III

The question of his origin is not as difficult as it would seem at first glance, because his \textit{nomen} is extremely rare, though it is a time-honored Latin \textit{gentilicium}. In the fifth, ninth, tenth and eleventh volumes of the \textit{Corpus} of Latin inscriptions there is no example of it, nor any of Republican date in Rome itself. Yet, one of the few known names of the \textit{curiae veteres}, where the ritual obligations of the thirty subdivisions of the earliest genteile organization of the Eternal City were carried out, is the \textit{curia Acculeia}, along with the \textit{curia Pinaria}, which bears the name of a clan of the oldest Roman aristocracy, and with some others, which also have gentile names of the old stock. The \textit{gens Accoleia} must consequentially have enjoyed some prominence in the archaic Roman state.\textsuperscript{19} The \textit{L. Accoleius M.f.} of a great marble grave-monument on the Via Appia\textsuperscript{20} has certainly nothing to do with those \textit{Accoleii} of olden days, nor the freedmen \textit{L. Acculeius Abascantus}\textsuperscript{21} and \textit{L. Acculeius Salvius}\textsuperscript{22} living under the Emperors, or a third \textit{libertus}, \textit{P. Acculeius Euhemerus}\textsuperscript{23} from Ostia. They all seem to have been the slaves of a single family of the well-to-do gentry of a Latin \textit{municipium}; I suspect that it was the same as that family whose freedman was \textit{Q. Accoleius} of Aricia.\textsuperscript{24} It seems to me, also, that Aricia must have been the original home of the \textit{Accolei}, because there, in the grove of Diana at the lake of Nemi, were found the votive inscriptions of the local aristocracy, including theirs. One has the name of a \textit{L. Acculeius}\textsuperscript{25} and the other a \textit{M. Accoleius M.f.}, aedile with a \textit{M. Iulius M.f.} Dessau dated the latter inscription—a small base of black marble—at the end of the Republic, because of the lack of \textit{cognomina}; it cannot be later than the Emperor Claudius in any event. Aricia at this time was acquiring some importance through the activity of its local magnates in Roman politics: \textit{hinc multae sellae curules et patrum memoria et nostra, hinc equites Romani lautissimi et plurimi}, wrote Cicero\textsuperscript{27} just a short time before our coins were issued. The orator praises Aricia in his defense of the mother of Octavian, against a contemptuous remark on the boy's \textit{Aricia mater}, made by Mark Antony in his attempt to block Octavian's way to Caesar's political heritage; Cicero scorns Antony\textsuperscript{28} as one \textit{qui Aricinum tanto opere despicit ... municipium}. The Aricians were, in fact, streaming into Rome with the kinsfolk and retinue of Atia. Among them was also \textit{Q. Voconius Vitulus, quaestor designatus}, who supervised the coinage of Octavian after the \textit{coup d'état} of August 43.\textsuperscript{29}

The second part of the obverse-legend of our \textit{denarius} has been read as \textit{Lariscus}. But as only

\textsuperscript{15} op.cit. (cf. n. 2) 1, 569. I wrongly accepted Grueber's date in \textit{Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau} 36 (1954) 23, even if with some hesitation.

\textsuperscript{16} op.cit. (supra n. 2) 187 no. 1148.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Schw.Numim.Rundschau} 36 (1954) pl. 27, 5-6.

\textsuperscript{18} ibid. pl. 27, 7; cf. 8.


\textsuperscript{20} \textit{CIL} VI 10481; cf. 35857.

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{CIL} VI 200, col. 3, 9.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{CIL} VI 10482.

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{CIL} XIV 246, v. 1.

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{CIL} XIV 2185.

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{CIL} XIV 4197. Cf. Dessau, \textit{ibid.} ad 4196. L. Morpurgo, \textit{MondAnt} 13 (1903) 334.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{CIL} XIV 4196. Now in the museum of Nottingham in England, as Mr. E. Nash kindly informs me. Cf. Fred. Poulson, \textit{Acta A} 12 (1941) 19ff.

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Phil.} 3.6.16.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{ibid.} 6.15.

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. my remarks in \textit{Netherlands Year-Book for History of Art} 5 (1954) 154ff and \textit{Hermes} 86 (1958) 480ff.
the very first dies of it (pl. 31, 5-6) have L. Ari-
scollvs,20 I assumed a second monetalis instead of the cognomen of the first. The more so, since Arescolus could be easily explained as the diminu-
tive of Arescon from the Greek "Aretkos" pleasing, "obeseous," and since Arescon, Arescius, Arescusa are known as actual names of persons in Italy.21 But the punctuation of this earliest known die must be rejected in face of an inscription22 from the ager Lanuvinus, found re-used as building material, perhaps brought from a neighboring site. This is a dedication to Bellona showing the characteristics of the Augustan age, in the opinion of Borsari, and set up with the permission of two—apparently municipal—magistrates, one C. Sexius/ . . . / and one P. Accoleius Lariscolus. The latter, invested with some function in a place not far from the original home of his ancestors, may be the son or grandson of our Arician monetalis of 43.

Lariscolus has been explained by Eckhel as meaning a laricus colendis, and by Borghesi as a Laribus colendis; but every Roman having been a cultor Lorum, this would not make much sense. Old Latin cognomina were for the most part nicknames with a number of names of strange or unattractive animals among them (Asina, Asello, Sroja, Mus, Trogus; also birds, Todillus, Corvus, Buteo etc.). One may therefore think rather of a larusculus, "little gull," transformed in the daily usage to Lariscolus. Regardless of whether this guess is correct or not, the obverse has no bearing on Lara, Larentia, Larunda; the double row of curls around the face of the bust are the same as on the hair of the three ladies on the reverse: how one could serve on the obverse for the three of the reverse, we shall see presently.

IV

The threefold unity of divinities has been inter-
preted with Borghesi by all modern scholars as the nymphae Querquetulanae, though a note by the editors of his Oeuvres complètes23 revealed that his deductions are based on confused, wrong quotations of Varro. If a more explicit refutation is still needed, we need only read what Festus (p. 314, Lindsay) writes of these divinities: Querquetulanae virae putantur significari nymphae praeidentes querueto virescenti, quod genus silvae iudicantuisse intra portam, quake ab eo dicta sit Querquetu-
laria. They were numina of the oak-trees; yet the grove behind our group is clearly one of cypresses, not poplars (see supra) and certainly not oaks.

The sight of cypresses evoked in every Greek24 and in every Roman25 associations with fear and death: they belonged to the symbolism of burials and to the chthonic divinities, not least among them Hekate, identified, as we shall stress below, with Diana. In the words of Vergil,26 the trees of the grove behind our trinity are not the aereae quercus, silva alta jovis, but coniferae cyprarissi, lucus Dianae. She is everywhere the mistress of dreadfully silent groves: montium domina . . . silvarumque virentium, saluumque reconditorum, amniumque sonantium.27 But the Diana whose realm was quite specially her holy grove was the Diana of Arcia, in whose lucus the dedicatory inscriptions of the Accolei were consecrated. She has been called nemorals28 by the poets, Nemo-
rensis29 on inscriptions.

It has decisive importance for the understanding of our three-figure group, that the Latin Diana was conceived as a threefold unity of the divine hunt-
ress, the moon-goddess and the goddess of the nether world, Hekate. This mixture was not a contamination of late imperial syncretism. The Augustan poets illustrate how deeply rooted this was in Latium, as do their followers in the first century A.D. A few examples help to recall this fact, well-known in general.40 The mighty goddess of the dead is invoked by Vergil41 as tergeminae Hecate, tria virginis ora Dianae. Diana, the montium custos nemorumque virgo, is addressed by Horace42 as diva triformis. Vergil calls Diana48 as well as Hekate44 the Trivia; so does Catullus.45 The um-

---

20 M. v. Bahrfeldt, in Nachträge und Berichtigungen zur Münzkunde der römischen Republik 1 (Wien 1896/97) 4 with pl. 1, 2, noticed such a specimen in the Bignami Collection.
22 L. Borsari, NSc (1898) 66f; EphEp 9 (1910) 38f, no. 599; E. Graog, Prosopogrupp.Rom. 12 (1933) 4, no. 31.
23 B. Borghesi, Oeuvres complètes 1 (Paris 1862) n. 2.
24 Cf. e.g. M. P. Nilsson, Geschichte der griechischen Religion 1 (Munich 1941) 667.
25 Ample illustration is given by Wulff, Theil.I.Lat. 4, 1437, 23ff.
26 Aen. 3.679-81.
27 Catull. 34.9ff.
28 Ovid. Fast. 6.59; Lucan 6.75; Martial 13.10.1 etc. CIL XIV 2213.
30 Aen. 4.511.
31 Carm. 3.22.1ff.
32 Aen. 6.356.9; 10.537.
33 ibid. 7.774; 11.566.836.
34 34.15: tu potens Trivia . . . es dicta.
**Diana Nemorensis**

"brarum ac nemorum incola" is a *Diana triplex* in the language of the inscriptions also.¹⁴ This is true not only in general, but also especially for the Diana of Aricia.¹⁵ The Lago di Nemi is *Triviæ lacus* for Vergil,⁶⁰ *Triviæ nemorosa regina* in Martial.⁶¹ *Arcinum Triviæ nemus* is an expression of Statius.⁶² The same occurs in the references to the festival of the Arician divinity, a little closer to the language of solemn rites than the previous quotations. Propertius asks his mistress:⁶²

*Cur videt accessis dovemat currere taedis
Te nemus et Triviæ lumina ferre deae?*

If the torches carried by the devotees are derived from the ritual of the moon-goddess, the huntress and great mistress of the sorcerers is also emphasized in a famous description of the *dies Triviæ* in Aricia (August 13).⁶³

*lamque dies aderat, profugis cum regibus aptum
Fumat Aricinum Triviæ nemus et face multa
Conscius Hippolyti splendet lacus; ipsa coronat
Emeritos Diana canes et spicula terget
Et tutus sint ire feras omnisque pudicit
Itala terra foci Hecatides excolit idus.*

Again for the interpretation of our sculptural group it is relevant to realize that those three mythical conceptions were already completely interwoven with one another in the religious thinking of classical Greece. This emerges with certainty for the fifth century B.C.,⁶⁴ but it is no less certain that the amalgamation is based on ideas of archaic Greece. The hymn inserted in the *Theogony* (541ff) of Hesiod may be an interpolation, yet it mirrors an archaic conception⁶⁵ of the interrelation of Hekate and Artemis.⁶⁶ Therefore the identification of Diana with Trivia, the Greek Ἐκάρη τριος,⁶⁷ in Latium may also go back to the archaic period.

With the spiritual background clear, there is no difficulty in the evaluation of archaeological facts brought to light in the *nemus* of Aricia, nor in the interpretation of the artistic symbolism and structure of that *Diana triplex*. The finds made in the grove⁶⁸ do not go back beyond the fourth century B.C., nor does the temple of Diana, in spite of its archaistic Etruscan appearance noted by Vitruvius.⁶⁹ A. E. Gordon⁷⁰ has observed correctly that the comparatively late date of the excavated remains of the sanctuary does not preclude the dedication of the grove at the end of the sixth century. The archaic inscription copied by Cato, to which we shall return, speaks not of a temple, but of a grove, the *lucus Dianius* which alone was of importance in that early epoch and rather primitive environment. The Latins of that time had ideas on divinity rather similar to those held later by the Teutonic peoples of Tacitus (Germ. 93): *ceterum nec cohibere parietibus deos neque in allum humani oris speciem adsimulare . . . arbitrantur: lucos ac nemora consecrant deorumque nominibus appellant secretum illud, quod sola reverentia vident.* Before the temple of Diana in Aricia was built, a cult image stood in her sacred grove. Our coins attest that this archaic statue still stood in 43 B.C. in the *nemus*; the temple did not replace this venerable relic.

The existence of such a time-honored image of the *Diana Nemorensis* was in all probability the starting point of mythological speculation on its origin. The cruel character of that divinity and the barbarous fight of fugitives for the privileges of the *rex Nemorensis* seem to have suggested the equation of the Arician goddess with the Scythica Diana; the story was invented that her image had been brought and her cult instituted by Orestes and Iphigenia on their flight from Tauris.⁶¹ The attempt to take this account rather literally⁶² has already been justly rebuked,⁶³ and our coin-type completely eliminates the possibility of any real relationship with the Crimene Artemis.

Our reproduction of the old *Diana triplex* cannot

---

⁴⁷ 2.8.4. Cf. AA (1912) 295ff, fig. 15. The work of Lucy Shoe on the moldings will soon shed more light on this general topic.
⁴⁹ M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 1 (München 1941) 684ff with the previous literature.
⁵⁰ O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* 2 (München 1906) 1289 n. 2 with the details.
⁵¹ W. H. Roscher in his *Myth. Lex.* 1, 1890ff; O. Weinreich, *ibid.* 5, 1212ff; W. Ehlers, *RE* 7, 471ff, give the bibliography and details.
conceal, of course, the hand of an artist of the last century of the Roman Republic. The rendering of the grove reflects the same taste as do the charming garden-scenes of the Prima Porta villa of Livia with its vertically accented row of trees. Further, the deeply cut vertical folds, to the right and left of which oblique hatchings mark the drapery on the legs of the three goddesses, are a favorite device of the archaic art of late Hellenism; the much too elongated slim bodies also remind us of Neo-Attic archaic taste. The inept alterations of the hairdress of the bust also belong to this stylistic period. On the other hand, the vertical folds in the center of female drapery on the lower part of the body occur commonly in archaic art, e.g. in terracotta groups of three women, and constitute the iconographic basis for the Arician trinity. More significant is the horizontal bar in the neck of Diana-Hekate-Selene, stressing their threefold unity in a simple way, like the δοκαία of Sparta, two upright parallel bars connected by horizontal ones at their upper and lower ends, symbolizing the fraternal relationship of the Dioscuri.

The iconographical basis of our three-figure group cannot differ from the idea behind it: i.e. the three bodies of Hekate joined together with a bar express the unity of the threefold manifestation of her divine power, discussed above. It is true that we do not know any archaic Greek Hekate with three bodies. Pausanias was informed that the Hekate of Myron had only one body and that it was Alkamenes who created the threefold type. But what Alkamenes achieved, was to make the monstrous treble daemon aesthetically acceptable by composing the three bodies in the round. Among the archaic terracotta figures with three female divinities lined up one beside the other, there are none yet known with the attributes of Hekate, but eventually some such Hekataion may be found. Alkamenes may have transformed such clumsy products of rustic art; it is difficult to believe that he created his new type ex nihilo. On the other hand, the Latin city of Diana in all probability adopted the Hekate-Artemis-Selene triplets along with their ready-made artistic expression, both at once, from the same Greek source; Greek antecedents are therefore to be postulated. Also Greek are the attributes of our group: the bow of Artemis and the poppy of Selene.

The adaptation of such a Greek scheme in the Latium of the sixth century, dominated thoroughly by the Etruscans and under their overwhelming cultural influence, must not be thought of as a purely Latin affair. We have already noted the un-Greek appearance of the head-dress of Diana in its first form on these coins (pl. 31, 3-10; pl. 32, 11-14, 17); short hair is frequent on female figures in the ripe archaic art of Etruria and in the transition to classical forms; the curls surrounding the short hair occur, so far as I see, in a rather late phase of the evolution, around 500 B.C. Besides this, the most original profiles of the Diana-bust (pl. 31, 5-6; pl. 32, 27, 30) have rather an Etruscan than a Greek appearance. The artist who made the cult-image of Diana in the generation of the famous Vulca was an Etruscan or at least had been trained in the artistic language of the Etruscans.

V

In the latest research on Roman religion two contrasting views have been advanced on the origin of Diana. First, there was an attempt to prove, against the traditional view, her foreign descent, the foundation of which could not stand a serious test; therefore its rejection involved, as the obvious consequence, the assumption that she is a genuine

66 R. Tekale-F. W. Winter, Die antiyen Terrakotten 3 (Berlin-Stuttgart 1953) 57, fig. 10.
67 P. Plut. De fraterno amore 1, of which K. Schefold reminded me.
68 Pausan. 2.30.2 and the brilliant paper of E. Petersen, AEM 4 (1880) 140ff; 5 (1881) 1ff, 13f, 193ff; W. H. Roscher in his Myth.Lex. 1, 190ff; Heckenbach, RE 7, 278ff etc.
69 See supra n. 66.
71 E.g.: G. G. Giglioli, L'arte etrusca (Milan 1935) pl. 139, 1-3; pl. 153, 2-4; pl. 158, 4; pl. 201: pl. 204, 2; pl. 306, 3. M. Pallottino, Art of the Etruscans (New York 1955) fig. 47 etc.
72 E.g.: G. G. Giglioli, op.cit. (supra n. 71) pl. 235 = M. Pallottino, op.cit. (supra n. 71) fig. 94.
74 A. E. Gordon, TransPhilAd 63 (1932) 177ff. Cf. also his previous work (supra n. 40).
Italic goddess, hellenized only in the course of the fifth century. We need not list again the opinions on the original nature of the Latin Diana, whether she was primarily a goddess of the wild life of Nature or of the moonlight, or was the heavenly protector of female life. These aspects appear intermingled, from the Middle Republic on, in the archaeological evidence and the literary sources, e.g. in the hymn of Catullus:

\[
O \text{ Latonia maximi / magna progenies Iovis / quam mater prope Deliam/ deposuit olivam, / montium domina ut fores, / silvarumque virientium / saltuamque reconditorum / amniumque sonantium. / Tu Lucina dolentibus / Iuno dicta puerperis, / tu potens Trivia et notho / es / dicta lumine Luna. / Tu cursu, dea, menstruo / metiens iter annuum / rustica agricultae bonis / tecta frugibus exples.}
\]

Now that we have recovered the original cult statue of the Old Latin deity haunting the Arician forest, this intricate question can be answered on a firmer ground than hitherto. That image reveals to us that the Latins of the sixth century were already acquainted with the combination of Hekate with Artemis and Selene and appropriated it through the medium of Etruscan art to their own purposes. The image attests the reception of the interpretatio Graeca, above all for the sculptural type, the need of which was felt after a long period of veneration of such spirits without an image. Yet we shall see that the imported form of the deity could not have meant a sudden Hellenization of the cult: I suspect, rather, that it provided the Latins with crutches for anthropomorphic representation, and to walk with crutches is a slow and awkward business. The final proof of complete Hellenization is the building of the temple beside the nemus. The finds, indeed, illustrate this rather copiously. Wissowa, in his classical work, regarded the Latin Diana—mainly on the ground of the votive offerings found in the grove, but also in view of the later developments testified to by the literary evidence—as the divine patroness of women and their great helper in the needs of their sex, and this emphatically from the beginning.

But would the Latin League, at that time as we shall see a confederation above all for military purposes, really accept the special tutelary divinity of women as a warrant of their unity, just because she was the most popular celestial being in the politically most prominent Latin city? Both in this same environment and among other peoples of the same ethnic group, we know of female divinities who originally presided over warlike societies, but afterwards, their power over the menfolk having been exhausted, they were transformed into divine nurses. Iuno, who in the Latium of the imperial epoch was so closely connected with female life, was once a furious daemon leading the host, as is attested by the archaic battle gear of Iuno Sospita, by the connection of Iuno Curitis with the spear, and by other such mythical figures which remind one more of Hekate than of Lucina. The Matronae of the Gauls and Germans, peaceful helpers of mothers and their offspring on so many votive inscriptions of the Empire, had shortly before that been martial powers; they were—just like the early Latin Diana—certainly not chosen to be the official defenders of the national troops of the Roman army as nutrices or counterparts of Lucina. In another study I wish to demonstrate that the three Matronae ruled over tripartite social organizations, just as the three horses or three crests of the helmet of Pallas Athene hint of the three phyloi she led in war and protected in peacetime. As the Latin confederation was once composed of thirty units and corresponding tripartite subdivisions, there is at least some probability that the Diana triplex was appropriated as suitable for a corresponding role.

VI

By a rare piece of luck, we know the dedicatory inscription of our triple Diana-group, copied in the grove of Aricia by the elder Cato and transmitted to us—whether completely or not will not be discussed here—by the grammarian Priscianus in the following form:

\[\text{Lucum Dianium in nemore Aricino Egerius Baebius Tuscalanus dedicavit dictator Latinus. hi populi committer: Tuscalanus, Aricinus, Lanuvinus, Laurensis, Coranus, Tiburtis,}\]

\[\text{L. Morpurgo, MonAnt 13 (1903) 346ff.}\]

\[\text{I shall show elsewhere that the Campstres were not the deities of the drill-ground (the Campus Martius of the civilians) but of the battlefield (the campus of combatants).}\]

\[\text{4. p. 129 and 7, p. 337 Hertz.}\]
Pometinus, Ardeatis Rutulus.81 This highly important political act can now be confidently dated at the end of the sixth century on the ground of our stylistic analysis; this gives an opportunity for checking again some facts of early Roman history. An original fragment of the Cumaean chronicle, inserted in the seventh book of Dionysios of Halikarnassos (a most important source, independent of the Roman annalists), allows us to connect this Latin alliance with the occupation of Rome by Porsenna and with the end of the rule of the Tarquins. Furthermore, G. Wissowa realized that the federal cult of Diana on the Aventine copied that of Aricia; he therefore regarded the Aventine cult as a "Filiale" of the Arician one. This might be quite true if the cult of the Aventine goddess were a local, municipal affair, with the same solemnities on August 13 as had the federal cult. But the rituals of a federal cult cannot have been celebrated by the same federal authorities and delegates in two cities on the same day. The Aventine cult can only be an attempt by Rome to replace the Arician one after the victory of Lake Regillus—i.e., of course, not under Servius Tullius, in whose time the League of Aricia did not yet exist.

The Aventine cult—presumably first an altar in a grove as in Aricia—being dedicated extra pomerium by the Latin cities, had originally nothing to do with the plebs, which established itself on this hill only in 456, with the so-called lex Icilia de Aventino publicando. The first center of the plebs on the Aventine was the grove of Diana; Ceres came still later, and not in 496 B.C. as the Annalists imagined. The Aventine remained extra pomerium, beyond the sphere of the rights of the patrician magistrates, who would not have legally tolerated this revolutionary organization, an illicita coitio, inside the sacred boundary of the city.

We hope to return very soon in a more extensive study of all these implications of the identification of the original cult-image dedicated by the actual head of the Arician League of the Latins.

81 Cf. Fest. p. 128, 15 Lindsay: Manius Egerius Iucum Nemorensem Dianae consecravit, a quo multi et clari viri orti sunt.