
PART TWO

THE LOGIC OF MYSTERY

APPHTA IEPA:

An Inquiry into the Sacred Symbolism
of Ancient Greek Mysteries





PRELIMINARY REMARKS

I propose to investigate thoroughly and in detail the symbolism of the ancient Greek mysteries, and the ritual which is the natural vehicle and physical manifestation of that symbolism, casting on the subject a fresh, unprejudiced, self-effacing and innocent eye, giving rein to feeling no less than mind, with a view to revealing its meaning and general significance in its own context, as organically and functionally embedded in the entire life and spirit of ancient Hellenism. The reason for the necessity of a new beginning in the study of this all-important question, as well as the methodology best adapted to bring light its real nature, intricate structure and adequate solution, will be briefly, and in their general contour, explained in a moment. But before this can be done, we ought to examine the general nature of the problem itself and the essential peculiarities of the situation as we face them; for these are our only guides in the appropriate handling of the matter in question. It is, as always, the nature and characteristics of this content, of the subject-matter, which govern and dictate the type and pattern of the method to be followed in pursuing its properly conducted study: there is no universal methodological panacea, mechanically safeguarding the truth of its results, and blindly transplanted from subject to subject and from problem to problem.

What I shall try to formulate here, in a concise and, necessarily, dogmatic way, is to be seen as providing the general framework in whose context the present inquiry should be read. Evidently the precise nature and full content of such guidelines and principles can emerge and be properly appreciated only when viewed in the light of the investigation itself, on the correctness of whose conclusions the very validity of these general principles partly depends. But this is a *πρότερον - ὕστερον*, I believe; unavoidable, if one wishes to write

neither an introduction to, nor a revelation on, his subject. Accordingly, I am not asking the reader to accept what I am briefly presenting here before proceeding to the inquiry; I am simply presuming that he will bear the former in his mind, while following the latter. At the end, let him judge the whole.

Ritual is the concentrated quintessence of the correct and proper service due to the Godhead. Man is found in the World and before the gods, the one no less than the other. In his normal and natural condition and position he is also aware (in feeling and thought) of the fact - he lives with it and in it. He is in constant encounter with the gods: he honours and praises them, propitiates them, begs for their forgiveness and asks for their gifts, trembles before their actions and is fearful of their powers, atones for his omissions and faults in the face of them, thanks for rewards and successes bestowed on him - all this in a variety of ways and as his heart is inclined to do. In a word, he worships them. This worship must be, in the beginning, spontaneous and, thus, irregular; individual and, to a certain degree, arbitrary. But as time goes on, through constant repetition by the same person on various occasions, and by the several members of a family or social group, by the individual or by the tribe, a certain coagulation takes place; the secondary and the accidental are cleansed out, as it were, by continuous friction; the fundamental and essential emerges in each form of worship, as the universal *typus* appropriate to each of the basic religious attitudes of Man towards God. The result of this crystallization and normalization is ritual in its endless, unchanged repetition, the image of Man's archetypal postures before God.

Of course there is immense variety in the ritual of a natural religion, like the ancient Greek; there is distinction and division within the main types, answering, in its essentials, to the diversity of actual situations. But the procedures have been standardized not in a conventional way, but according to how the tribal, regional or national soul (as the case might be) lives the corresponding attitude towards divinity, how the gesture accompanying and expressing placation or adoration, imploring or glorifying, atonement or abandonment is normally manifested. The Rite is a gesture of cosmic significance. Ritual is the gesture-language of Man to God. Man has put into it all the blood of his soul to make the formalized posture burst with life; all

his energy, in order to present the quintessence of the attitude corresponding to the particular act of worship which he performs.

A mystery, in its religious substance, is a ritual of a particular essential character, of a certain formal type, and with a specific purpose.

The ritual of a mystery is secretive; and this because the participants must satisfy special conditions of purity and preparedness, over and above the normal qualifications required for the involvement in whatever *ἱεραουργία*. To be able to take part in a mystery, one should have an appropriate status of sanctity: the mystery divides people into the holy and the profane. We may say that the mystery ritual is occult. Special consecration is demanded because of the paramount importance of the end to be achieved through the mystery ritual. For in the mysteries, one is not only speaking and meaningfully gesticulating to God, something immensely grand and significant is also effected, realized. This is not the place to enter into further details as to the realized good, the purpose of the mystery; the inquiry, in its various parts, will provide ample and thorough clarification on the matter. I shall only give here the general nature of the intended result, in so far as it is requisite for the present point.

Through the mystery ritual one enters into actual communion with the gods. Not only mystic, secret channels of communication are being opened between man and the Godhead inaccessible to the common gesture-language represented by the ordinary cultus; much more than that, gates are thrown wide open and roads are discovered (or rather actualized) there and then, by and through the performance of the sacred rite, gates and roads leading eventually to beatific existence, whose reality is then promised and whose stamp is already impressed on the initiate, resulting in special protection even throughout his earthly life. I shall briefly indicate this state of affairs by saying that the mystery rite achieves divinisation. I need not warn that the way one should understand this divinisation differs from mystery to mystery; nor that the foregoing short description is geared to the Eleusinian mysteries and Orphic theology. But the main consideration for the purpose at hand is this: a special holy status of a divine order accrues to the initiate as a result of his participation in the mystery rite; he is brought into special connection with the divine order. Hence the

necessity for his special preparation. We referred to this requirement when we called mysteries occult rituals. Here we discover a further appositeness in the appellation: mysteries are occult rituals as they achieve something super-natural and out of the ordinary world-order. Extreme caution must evidently accompany the use of words like occult and, to a far greater extent, supernatural in the treatment of ancient religious ideas and feelings. Occult, we should never forget, signifies the hidden and secret, and is opposed not to the systematic world order, cosmic and divine simultaneously, but only to what is apparent and explicit. As to the supernatural, it must be taken in this connection as almost connoting the unsuspectingly and strangely natural as well as the deeply natural.

Effects can be produced, and results achieved by all types of ritual. In sacrifice, for instance, the honorific and thanksgiving elements are in general unmistakably dominant; and yet the prayer was an essential part of it, in which glorification and solicitation were the two main poles. But the ritual in such cases only makes the request, as it were, known to the god concerned; the actual outcome depends on very many other considerations, and is far from rendered certain by the ritual itself. Quite to the contrary with a mystery ritual: it necessitates and entails the final accomplishment of the purpose associated with it. It has the power to safeguard its results by and through itself; this is its mystic, occult, magical efficacy.

But what then accounts for the difference? Evidently it is the specific nature and essential character of the mystery rite which I shall call symbolic and shall briefly hint at its explanation thus: the principle of all magic consists in the reproduction by the magician of the reality to be affected in a form which he can directly and physically handle, so that by manipulating the surrogate, the real object is accordingly influenced. This surrogate is not a bare simulacrum or any other conventional substitute for the reality whose modification is desired; one cannot inflict change on anything by playing with its mere image. The reality, the substantial essence, itself of the object is made to inhabit, after a fashion, the surrogate; and this is what the magical art really consists of.

To intellectualize magical operations in one way or another is immaterial. Whether because of the Stoic universal *συμπάθεια*, or, more plausibly, by virtue of the serial Neoplatonic structure of reality,

the phenomenon of magic requires this reproduction of the object in its reality at the magician's disposal. And this is what the magic efficacy of the mystery ritual realizes: the mystery safeguards its effect by its sole and mere operation, because it does realize, through its performance, the magic surrogate of the result to be achieved. It actually creates in its performance the very reality of the desired effect.

And this is made possible by its symbolic nature. For the symbol is neither a sign nor an image of, nor a metaphor for, the thing symbolized; it bears neither a conventional, nor a likeness-like, nor a paralleling association with it. It is not at all connected with it through an extrinsic analogy in structure. On the contrary, there exists a natural affiliation, an intrinsic kinship between them, the symbol being the symbolized in a particularly significant manifestation with the significance conditioned by the aspect from which the symbolized is considered in the context in question.

A mystery is thus essentially and fundamentally symbolic in nature. By performing the mystery rite one releases the energy hidden in the symbols utilized therein, one creates the result which is in the nature of the symbols to realize when handled appropriately, a power which resides in them by virtue of their unsuspected, occult, but natural and real, internal affinity to the realities desired.

To perform a mystery ritual is not merely to pose meaningfully before gods, speaking the human gesture-language; it is rather to employ the language of the gods, to speak with them the language, whose names are symbols and not signs, and thus reproduce and contain after a certain fashion the reality named.

To round up this abstract explication: a mystery is a symbolic ritual, of an occult type, presupposing special sanctification, and achieving, through its mere performance, divinisation.

Ritual is the chief aspect, and the sole solid objective foundation of ancient religiosity; it is the matter and the spirit, the vehicle and the life of cultus, of the proper worship of the Godhead. What the believer, the subject, may think of it intellectually, is almost totally immaterial. Ancient religion, in general, is a religion primarily of hieratic Act, not of dogmatic belief.

And yet there is some religious thought to accompany the Act; indeed various kinds of such articulated feeling. For man, at some point of his development, reflects on his religious acts and behaviour.

When their meaning is no longer lived and clearly felt in all its immediacy, he questions himself about their point and significance, he desires to understand them, and this is the dawn of religious thought. In this development we find, I believe, the substance of the idea of a primeval divine revelation which was subsequently forgotten and which left just enough traces in human soul so as to spurn her perennially after its recovery.

The pristine, transparent, absolute, undifferentiated awareness of the ritual in its pregnant life survives later in relative detachment and aloofness as an opaque religious feeling. The common issue from such feeling and questioning is the *ἱεροὶ λόγοι* and the myths, the product of a first reflection on the hieratic act; the gesture language of natural immediacy needs to be translated into human world-language; afterwards, poetic imagination will add its flavour and its anthropomorphism, and, still later, philosophical thought will speculate on it in conceptual terms.

In studies on ancient religion one must endeavour to disentangle the poetic and philosophical element from the religious core, however well the former may occasionally express, after their own fashion, that which is directly revealed in the latter, either in the immediacy of ritual or in the first retrospection of religious feeling articulated as religious thought, as *ἱερὸς λόγος* or original myth.

These spontaneous responses of religious feeling to the primal questioning about the meaning of the ritual will be of immense help to us in our attempt to recreate, in so far as this is possible, the spirit of ancient religiosity if we can separate and isolate them from the poetic and philosophical accretions which encrust them. *ἱεροὶ λόγοι* and myths (as religious thought, and not as poetic embellishment or philosophic intellectualization) cannot be formulated except with reference to divine beings. What was implicit in the ritual becomes explicit now, namely the essence, powers and activities of various gods. They are local, clan or tribal divinities, at first, associated with particular cults or sacred places, and involved in the explication of topical ritual, or rather in the expression in religious language of its point. But the tribes, ethnic groups, and nation as a whole, the populations inhabiting Greece are phyletically and, more importantly culturally kindred as well as closely interrelated geographically. And so general similarity in religious needs, and overall resemblance in the

postures and gestures through which Man speaks to God, must also involve in this case natural affinity in the modes of expressing and typifying religious thought in myth and sacred *λόγος*. There results a network of closely knit correlations, correspondences, analogues, parallelisms and likenesses in the various accounts of religious observances and ritualistic formulaic utterances to be found dispersed all over Greece. This is typically a situation calling for the provision of a unified framework, in whose light and terms the whole bulk of religion can be properly located, arranged and articulated in a coherent system. The instinctive call is, in short, for a naturally emerging national, or rather area, theology that comprehends the entire range of religious practices and narrations.

This natural, spontaneous evolution of a Hellenic theology by the Greek religious consciousness was at first incorporated in hymns and epic poetry; from such crystallizations we possess now Homer, Hesiod and the unequal corpus of Orphic literature. But it is also manifested everywhere in the remains of Greek culture, differently in different parts, and seen from diverse angles in various connections. The task facing us, if we want to reconstruct it, is that of assembling the bits from everywhere and arranging them into a coherent and meaningful picture.

The result of the condensation of an affiliated but multifarious cultus in a national theology involved the development of certain god-types, with individual characters, powers and activities; since the process was on the whole unbiased and spontaneous, these types must be the ones best adapted to serve as the natural points of reference in expressing the theological demands of a variegated cultus in common religious terminology, so to speak. Nonetheless, the various local cults, however similar, were far from being identical; subsisting divergences were bound to survive. Thus some divinities were connected to such ritual and myths that rendered their assimilation or reference to some corresponding god-type smooth and easy; whereas, others were obstinately recalcitrant to such reductions, in which case their worship survived as offered to a daemonic nature, especially when their cult and attributes were of a markedly pre-Olympian order. In between these extremes there lies a great variety of cases that fall under separate headings; from divinities with enough affinity to a national type to necessitate, or facilitate, its assumption under it, but also with enough

peculiarity in personality to qualify the god-typus by a significant cultic epithet; to divinities with resemblances to more than one god-types, resulting in the important phenomenon of multiple ascriptions; and finally to divinities with less than extreme, but strong resistance to definite assimilative reference, in which cases we find the origin of a subordinate national god, or of a major god in daemonic form.

To the nature of such an intricate system of, so to speak, cross-references created in this way, there contributed the simultaneous operation of those forces which led to the transition from a pre-Olympian to an Olympian divine order. And a third dimension of complexity resulted from the existence of the hero cult and that of the dead, and their interaction, in ritual and mythology, with that of the daemonic gods and divinities.

It is in the light of such an intricate network of interrelationships naturally evolved in the way above-circumscribed that we ought to view the numerous apparently baffling elements in our sources, the significant divergences in the accounts of myth and ritual. Far from considering them as blatantly contradictory and thus employing them for their mutual discredit, they should be viewed as what they really are: a natural, meaningful growth. The substance of the case may be put thus: what is apparently one divinity discloses under close scrutiny a structure involving at the proper cultic level more than one divine being; and conversely a seemingly irreducible duality or multiplicity of deities reveals, upon an investigation guided by the aforementioned principles, a certain identity in a particular aspect of divinity. Thus, to mention two characteristic and frequently occurring cases, two cultic epithets of one and the same god, when they are associated with significant peculiarities in the ritual or the myths relating to the god, indicate the existence of two distinct cults addressed to two divinities assimilated to the god in question; and, on the other hand, a significant common cultic epithet ascribed to two gods indicates a double ascription of the divinity involved in the ritual or the myth associated with that epithet or at any rate an identity of the two gods in respect to the function of such a supposed divinity. I shall call distinctions and identifications of such sort aspectual distinctions and identifications. I do not of course pretend to have exhausted here the essence of those relationships among divinities which I try to capture with the notion of aspectual identification and difference. The abstract

framework is here provided concisely in order to be filled by the specific content which the inquiry in its entirety will disclose. I use the non-committal term to suggest regard to aspect rather than to entity; for we must preserve the fabric of ancient religious «thought» as it naturally evolved in life. On the other hand, such aspectual identifications and distinctions may often disclose identities and differences more real, because of greater ritualistic significance, than what is indicated by the ordinary personalised, mainly mythologically orientated, classificatory scheme.

What I said above about common or related religious needs, sentiments and acts resulting in, or rather evolving towards, similar structures of religious «thought», is also applicable (to a lesser extent, and more pronouncedly in analogies of general articulation rather than in developments of detail) to the religions of Eastern Mediterranean as a whole, which do present marked and significant analogies and resemblances. Comparative study of corresponding deities in these affiliated religions (especially in those of Asia Minor and Syria) can therefore throw further valuable light upon their Greek counterparts; provided, of course, one follows carefully the subtleties of multiple correspondences and aspectual identifications, of these cross-relationships between the divinities of this second-order field of religious affiliation. But beyond this field, one need not, and I shall not, go.

This is then how things are in their general structure with regard to ancient Greek religion. The next question is how they are transmitted to us in their variegated specificity, in the richness of their ramifications and the details of their articulations. And here we have ample reason to regret the baleful influence of the passage of time and of human barbarism. For the flesh that would make a living organism out of the bare bone-structure sketched above is preserved in a wretched condition. Especially lamentable is the loss of the vast literature relating to religious and other antiquities. The Greek spirit, essentially conservative or rather traditionalist as it was, and fundamentally turned towards the past in all matters spiritual, even in the midst of its most decisive innovations, devoted its energy to either the intrinsic utilization of its traditions in the production of supreme works in Art and Thought, or the continuous occupation with the study of these traditions, of things as they were happening in the Past,

things great and small alike. The enormous mass of literature belonging to the second type disappeared with only a few exceptions, and its meagre extant shreds are preserved in a dismembered way by the work of lexicographers and grammarians, work which constitutes the third main type of Greek literary activity, and which betrays the same devotion to the past as manifested in its culminating points of achievement. The antiquarian lore collected by the students of the Past was utilised by the grammarians, of whatever kind, in their commentating work on the major products of the Greek mind, and some remnants of this second-level activity are preserved in lexica and the extant (but very unequal) corpus of scholia.

The nature of the subject-matter itself and the conditions under which it becomes known to us, do and should determine the methodological principles according to which a scientifically sound inquiry has to be conducted, if the results are intended to claim in any way an abiding interest and significance. The methodology has to adapt itself to the requirements of the subject; rather than the subject suffer the uncritical imposition of anybody's or any age's domineering methodological preoccupations.

Hence the necessity for a fresh beginning, a virgin look, in inquiries into ancient Greek religion, in which things Greek will be located in their Greek context, and will be elucidated by things Greek. To provide the deepest possible perspective, the broadest horizon is required, the widest use of the sources is necessary. The investigator must let the facts speak for themselves and from their own standpoint: he should only assist them in their self-expression, so to speak, by the proper arrangement of the material. This self-effacement is necessary for the suppression of one's subjectivity. But breadth of learning, on the other hand, should be used as a corrective of one-sidedness, without helping to promote unintelligibility and disintegration in the field of study. To both function positively and also avoid turning the subject-matter into an incoherent mass of disconnected irrelevancies, erudition must go hand in hand with some kind of spiritual empathy towards its object, in which case alone it can lead to real understanding of the object's inner form and intrinsic nature.

How is such comprehensive coherence and multi-faceted unity to be obtained? By following the Platonic Way: taking the transmitted piecemeal information as what it is - the dismembered and disfigured

illustration and description of an once living organism. We should strive to reassemble the pieces so that a meaningful face may emerge on them.

We are entitled to look for such unity in the multiplicity. Firstly, in general, because all things spiritual enjoy the wholeness of organic life; the variety in them (temporal or synchronical) is never the result of a mechanical juxtaposition of pieces; it is the variegated, articulated and structured manifestation (deliberate or spontaneous) of a common vital force. Secondly, in particular for inquiries in religion, because all things religious (and the ritualistic cultus most eminently among them) are practically unchangeable, once settled and formalized; this is of the essence of the ritual and of the religious thought and feeling connected with it; as can be even today seen in the liturgy, dogma and sentiment of the Orthodox Church. Thirdly, in particular for Greek studies, because of the innate traditionalism of the Greek mind in all spiritual matters, its constant orientation towards the past. Fourthly and lastly, because the method I am proposing does work in fact; natural coherence is revealed when one probes deeper and broader. So that I am prepared, by dropping all a priori considerations, to base my final argument on this alternative: on the one hand there is meaningful and naturally fitting unity, comprehending all available evidence critically sifted; on the other, there are either one-sided generalisations presenting a biased view because based on a partial aspect of the entire field; or a disconnected array of mechanically associated dead pieces, the futile attempt to analyse one's object of study according to a method inapplicable and repugnant to it. Even if the choice between these alternatives was an act of faith, which it is not or not only, I presume that we should unhesitatingly opt, with the ancient Greeks, for the former. On what grounds can one possibly object to a procedure which both saves the phenomena, and discloses meaning and unity in them?

Having set, briefly and in abstract terms, the ideal norm, it would be naive, no less than irrelevant, to claim that I have realized it in the following inquiry. But, certainly, the attempt has at least been earnestly made to be intrinsically guided by its spirit. And I cannot but believe that this is the right direction for inquiries of this sort.

One word only will be said here regarding the general nature of my results and views. It will be far from their spirit to construe them as

mainly advocating a sort of sexualism in studies of ancient Greek mystery religion, to be set side by side with the various symbolisms, naturalisms, idealisms or primitivisms (not to mention the various contemporary methodological so-called schools) already besetting these studies with their misleading onesidedness. A new simplification will not do in improving our understanding of ancient Greek religion. For all the above-mentioned aspects, if properly comprehended, do characterise ancient Greek religiosity. Thus the latter is indeed symbolic, idealistic, naturalistic, primitivistic all at once. But the symbol is the magic correlative or surrogate of universal forces permeating and shaking World and Man, of realities multifariously manifested in nature and indelibly impressed upon human awareness, however elementary, in archetypes governing living, feeling, thought and action. Symbols are not the conventional or mechanical signs of some lifeless, merely intellectual abstractions from reality. And again the ideal element or rather dimension in ancient Greek religiosity relates to the ingrained desire for the ultimate of the natural, and is thus felt to be the innermost core of the natural as its absolute reality, power and natural perfection; the ideal is the objectively real sublimation of the natural, not an anaemic, subjective utopia contrasted to it. Further, ancient consciousness conceives of nature not as the dead, inert opposite of mind, but as a living, plastic force replete and pregnant with divine and ideal potencies, and infused with inherent teleology. Finally, the primitive which we encounter in ancient religion is the flesh and body, the material foundation of its naturalness, as well as the survival (even in later times and under elaborate garments) of the primal and elementary, the undifferentiated religious awareness of the potent cosmic forces which weave the fabric of the World; the primitive in Greek religious contexts are not the mere remnant of uncivilised savagery.

To grasp how religion can be simultaneously symbolic, idealistic, naturalistic and primitivistic, depends to a great extent on the correct understanding of the ancient Greek view of nature. The ancient Greek accepts and affirms nature without and within; he builds everything upon this basic acceptance and affirmation. This his positive attitude corresponds to his positive appreciation of what he sees in what he accepts, as conforming to his, so to speak, metaphysical liking. He is, no doubt, well aware of the usual shortcomings attending ordinary

actuality; but he can also feel the irresistible attraction of the natural in its more successful manifestations. He is thus seized by an insatiable love for the perfection of the natural, which perfection he conceives as a real, objective power incessantly operating in the World and moulding it more or less beautifully, as the case may be, thereby also providing the driving force for his aspirations.

Conceive now of nature as a living organism with soul and body, with ultimate perfection as acting force and fleshly matter as earthly root. In a world-view like the one above sketched, nature is never too much separated from (let alone contrasted with) either its soul or its body; the ideal and the primitive are never radically disconnected from the natural or from each other.

To a naturalistic, in this profound sense, stand-point in Greece, there corresponds a naturalistic religion, i.e. one which accepts and affirms the natural in all its unbounded wealth and merit, raising it through its very own perfection and sublimation, instead of rejecting and denouncing it by divine ordinances that imply a fundamentally negative appreciation of it in World and Man. Apply then the above insight into the natural to such a religion, adding the symbolic dimension (which, as delineated previously, is really a further requirement of that threefold unity if it is to become religiously active), and you will possess all the essentials for understanding the wonderful coexistence in ancient Greek religion of those apparently contrasting fundamental characters.

It is in such light that the sexual in religion must be seen, the sexual in its entire natural completeness. Thus, when I emphasize the sexual import of mystery cult, I conceive of the sexual as simultaneously full fleshwise, primeval in its archetypal force and meaning, the flower and perfection of a pregnant power, symbolic also, in its animal manifestations, of cosmic potencies and their all-pervading operations. But I can only intimate, not really condense in advance, what can only be thoroughly understood as emerging from the inquiry itself in its entirety.

A word may be said, in conclusion, concerning the actual form of presentation of this work. My sensitivity to full, elaborate documentation and mathematical rigour in handling and interpreting the evidence will, I hope, be readily acknowledged; one might indeed even think that it sometimes threatens to gain the upper hand over its

necessary counterbalance: empathetic intuition of the spirit of the data, and an eye for spontaneous naturalness in the fitting together of the testimonies. However, as is unavoidable in an inquiry of the present scope, in some places (not many, I believe) a gap may be felt to exist between the extent to which the evidence goes and the implications of my view of it; or the interpretation of some specific piece of the evidence may seem at first sight forced or artificial, adapted to suit the exigencies of the situation according to my theses or preoccupations at that point. In such cases (and the major ones, though very few, are expressly noted as at the end of the first part of the essay), I wish to beg the reader to suspend judgement for the moment, and reserve it for the time when he will have gone through the whole work. For no case will answering to the above descriptions be left deliberately unattended; at an appropriate point during the course of the investigation, additional context will be supplied that is sufficient to bridge the apparent gap between data and explanation, to make the transition from claim to claim or the connection of fact with fact appear -as well as be, natural to the extent it is possible - in short, to exhibit the desired fusion of evidence and interpretation in a single living body, the former confirming and supporting the latter, the latter explaining, filling the accidental lapses and disclosing the spirit and significance of the former.

In fact, to help further in this respect, and in order to combine harmoniously the requirement for maximal provision of meaningful context with the obligation of minimal disruption to the main flow of the development, I utilized the expedience of elaborate notes. They consequently play an organic role in the following study; their relationship to the text is not external but internal: they, musically speaking, provide the harmonic support to the main melodic line figured in the text.



CHAPTER 7

BAUBO AND IACCHUS

Pars obscura cavis celebrabant orgia cistis,
Orgia, quae frustra cupiunt audire profani
Catullus, Carmen LXIV, 259-260

In *The Contest of Horus and Seth for the Nile (Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, ed. J.B. Pritchard, 1969³ pp. 14 sqq.; “the manuscript of the story was written in Thebes in the Twentieth Dynasty [12th centuy B.C.]” Ancient etc. p. 14a)* we find the following incident (I transcribe Wilson’s translation op.cit. p. 15a-b): «Then the All-Lord was angry at Horus, and he said to him: You are weak in your body, so this office is too much for you, you boy, with the taste of his mouth (still) bad! [1]. Then Onuris was angry a million times, and likewise the entire Ennead, that is, the Thirty-life, prosperity, health! And the god Baba drew himself up and he said to the Re-ttar-akhti: your shrine is empty!². Then³ the Re-ttar-akhti was hurt at the retort which has been made to him, and he lay down on his back, and his heart was very wretched. Then the Ennead went out... Then the great god spent a day lying on his back in his arbor, and his heart was very wretched, and he was alone. Now after a long time, then Hat-Hor, the lady of the Southern Sycamore, came, and she stood before her father, the All-Lord, and she uncovered her private parts before his face⁴. Then the great god laughed at her. Then he got up, and he sat down with the Great Ennead, and he said to Horus and Seth: Say your say!».

Thus Egyptian lore has it: merely an incident of refreshing vulgar obscenity, naïvely related⁵. Quite otherwise with the Greek parallel and its elaborate articulation and mystic symbolism, as we shall see.

The same theme occurs in the context of the Orphic-Eleusinian Mysteries (v. Clement, *Protrepticus* II 20, 1 21, 2, pp. 15-16, Stählin, together with Arnobius, *Adversus Nationes* V 24-26, pp. 195-8, Reifferscheid)⁶: the passages can be conveniently consulted in Kern, *Fragmenta Orphicorum*, Fr. 52; Eusebius (*Praeparatio Evangelica* II 3, 30-34) copies Clement. The Kore has been abducted and raped by Pluto; Demeter Deo wanders, sorrowful and lamenting, in search of her. The Great Goddess arrives finally at Eleusis and sits, in extreme grief, by a subsequently sacred well; she is encountered by some aboriginal people there and is especially hospitably entertained by a woman called Baubo⁷. But Baubo tries in vain to cheer and console Deo; the goddess persists obdurately in her grave morosity; she even rejects a specially prepared mixed potion, a *κυκεών*⁸, amicably offered by Baubo. When everything fails (and I here follow Arnobius rather than Clement), Baubo falls upon the last expedient she can conceive of in order to make Demeter recover herself⁹. She prepares her pudenda in a particular way, making them assume the form of a small boy¹⁰, and she then exhibits them naked to Demeter. Her purpose is thereby achieved: the Goddess gladdens, laughs and drinks the potion: ...et quod diu nequivit verecundia Baubonis exprimere, propudiosi facinoris extorsit obscenitas (Arn. *loc. cit.*). There follows the fragment of the Orphic hymn (in a rather free, it appears, and not very metrical Latin rendering), which rather increases the obscenity of the whole affair¹¹.

Two questions have to be asked initially.

Firstly, what, according to Arnobius, Baubo did to her pudendum? Part of the preparation must have been its *ἀποψίλωσις* (stripping off of the hair). This is suggested by Arnobius (...tum longiore ab incuria liberat... V 25 ad fin.), but rendered certain by numerous passages in Aristophanes and the comic poets. Indeed there were various ways of doing it though the commonest and best, to judge from the references in the poets, must have been the *παρατιλμός* (from *παρατίλλειν* = plucking out) by hand and by means of some appropriate application; an alternative way was burning the hair with a lamp. *Ἀποψίλωσις* was considered a sign of being much given to sexual pleasures; it was certainly taken as a great asset in these matters. I shall give a few examples illustrating the above points.

a) Plato Comicus (apud Athenaeus X 441e; *Φάων* Fr. II, Meineke II (2) 674 ff. = Fr. 188.13-15 *Poetae Comici Graeci* (PCG) vol. III p.

511). Some divinity (Aphrodite according to Müller and in conformity with the myth; one might think of Demeter from some of the details mentioned in the fragment)¹² prescribes the votive offering which should be made to various daemons before the inquiring women can have intercourse with Phaon. Among other similar requests we have:

κονισάλω δὲ καὶ παραστάταιν δυοῖν
 μύρτων πινακίσκος χειρὶ παρατετιλμένων· (sc. is to be offered)
 λύχνων γὰρ ὁμάς οὐ φιλοῦσι δαίμονες.

These daemons are personifications of the *πέος* and *ὄρχεις*; cf. Aristophanes Fr. 325; Athenaeus IX p. 395F; Pollux II 174: *μύρτον* is, apart from the myrtle, also the pudendum muliebre¹³.

b) Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 150 ff.: *κὰν τοῖς χιτωνίοισι τοῖς ἀμοργίνοις / γυμναὶ παρίοιμεν, δέλτα* (one more of the infinite variety of names for the *γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον*: *τοιούτων γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα*, says the scholiast!)¹⁴ *παρατετιλμένοι, / στύοιντο δ' ἄνδρες κάπιθυμοῖεν σπλεκοῦν*, where evidently the fact that they were to be *παρατετιλμένοι* powerfully contributes to the *στύσις* of men.

c) Aristoph. *Ranae* 513 ff.: *...καὶ γὰρ ἀλγητρίς τέ σοι / ἤδη ἔνδον ἔσθ' ὠραιοτάτη, κῶρχηστρίδες / ἕτεραι δὺ' ἢ τρεῖς. ΞΑ. πῶς λέγεις; ὄρχηστρίδες; / ΘΕ. ἤβυλλιῶσαι κᾶρτι παρατετιλμένοι¹⁵* (i.e. either very young since only lately there was need to *παρατίλλειν* them - contrast *ἄρτι χνοαζούσας ἀλγητρίδας*, Metagenes *Ἄδραι* Fr. I, Meineke II 2 p. 751 = Fr.4. 3 PCG vol. VII p.6 -; or having their pubic hair freshly plucked out). The Scholiast explains: *Ἡβῶσαι* (i.e. *ἀκμάζουσαι τὴν ἡλικίαν*) *καὶ αἰσχρῶς τίλλουσαι τὸ αἰδοῖον* the latter fact being a sign of the general orgasm due to the former.

For further information concerning this cosmetic practice see the appendix in the present work, *On Depilation: Bodily Cosmetics in Classical Antiquity*.

Secondly, what was the form to be seen in Baubo's pudenda? A puerile form (*nam puerilis ollis vultus erat*), says Arnobius; but he clearly understood this description as euphemistic, or at any rate metaphorical, for he asks rhetorically afterwards: *quinam quaeso spectaculi**, *quid in pudendis fuit rei verendisque** Baubonis, quod feminei sexus deam et consimili formatam membro in admirationem converteret atque visum, quod objectum lumini conspectuique divino*

et oblivionem miseriarum daret et habitum in laetiolem repentina hilaritate traduceret? O qualia, O quanta invidentes potuimus cavillantesque depromere, si non religio nos gentis*** et litterarum prohiberet auctoritas! (Arnobius, V, 27 p. 198, 22 ff. ed.cit.). It is sufficiently clear what Arnobius must have had in mind.

* Vahlen: in specuali cod. : in spectu tali Stewechius Orelli: alii aliter

** Stewechius: reverendis cod.

*** nos gentis editio princeps Fausti Sabaei: noscentis cod.

Clement gives the Orphic fragment as representing the boy Iacchos¹⁶ manipulating with his hand Baubo's pudenda. This is the passage:

ὡς εἰποῦσα πέπλους ἀνεσύρατο,**** δέξέ τε***** πάντα
σώματος οὐδὲ πρόποντα τύπον· παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἴακχος,
χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκε γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις·
ἦ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν εἶδησε θεά, μείδησ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
δέξατο δ' αἰόλον ἄγγος, ἐν ᾧ κυκεῶν ἐνέκειτο.

**** This is Eusebius' codd. reading and evidently correct. One of two supposed main manuscripts of Clement has ἀνεσσύρατο (sic), the addition allegedly by a later hand - the other ἀνεσύρετο.

***** "Lobeck: δὲ codd. " is Stählin's critical note. But Hermann before Lobeck and Gesner before Hermann had already τε.

In the second verse the construction of οὐδὲ πρόποντα τύπον is rather awkward; one would expect an antithesis before οὐδέ. To meet this Hermann proposed οὐ τι for οὐδέ (and Srueve οὐχί). But πάντα may serve as providing an implicit antithesis namely, she shew everything, even things improper; or she disclosed the full mark of her body, which besides was improper¹⁷. Still I think there is deeper trouble, which I have not seen voiced; I mean the question whether, in an Orphic poem, pudenda could expressly and straightforwardly be characterised as unseemly or obscene. This is not in the spirit of the sacred and profound obscenity which pervaded the Mysteries, and which led (all over the World and not only in Eleusis) to the worship of the organs of generation. One should rather expect in the text some reference to, say, the all-powerfulness or absolute sway of the τύπος, the specific power perhaps, wielded by it; or at least to its being hidden

and of mystic, unspeakable power, something not to be revered in open. I should therefore *prima facie* be inclined to emend the text to something like *ἄβρμύοντα*¹⁸ or *εὐρυμέδοντα* or *παντοδάμνοντα*¹⁹. If so, *πάντα* would not mean every one, but all of it; though, I suspect, it may be corrupt too (in which case, there is the excellent proposal of Herwerden: *δείξε δ' ἄφαντον*). We might even try to fit in somehow *ἐρικεύθοντα* (*ἐρικευθές = πυθμήν*, Hesychius) in the place of the suspect *οὐδὲ πρέποντα*. But we shall have another look on this point later on.

Meanwhile, let us concentrate on the third verse, where lies the crucial point on which the interpretation of the whole passage depends. The main question is whether *Ἰακχος* or Baubo is the subject of *ρίπτασκε*. Disregarding for the moment the existence of *χειρὶ* and *μιν* there is no doubt, especially because of the *γελῶν*, that *Ἰακχος* would have been the natural subject of the sentence as it stands. But he was laughingly throwing to and fro - what? *μιν* obviously, but to what does the pronoun refer? *Τύπον* could naturally (from a grammatical point of view) have been the desired reference, but is unsuitable as regards meaning: if the *τύπος* concerned was Baubo's pudenda, it is stationary. There is another difficulty with *ἦεν*. If Iacchos was supposed to be around, and upon Baubo's unusual gesture came and participated in the whole event, then one would expect a verb of movement instead. There is indeed a number of conjectures to this effect: *πρὸς δ' ἦεν Ἰακχος* (Platt)²⁰, *παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἰακχος* (Mullach, *Fr.Phil.Gr.* vol. I, 175). But the principal manuscripts have resolutely *ἦεν* the one (M) and *ἦ. εν* the other (P), where according to Stählin the erased letter was κ. This latter fact must caution us. Perhaps *ἦεν* is significant here; perhaps *Ἰακχος* was meant, ambiguously somehow, as part of the *τύπος* (if not the main part of it). But in such a case *Ἰακχος* begins to look like the thing manipulated rather than the manipulating person, and *μιν* may be taken as referring to him. But who would be the subject of *ρίπτασκε* then?

Continuing for a while with the former way of pursuing the matter (with *Ἰακχος* subject of *ρίπτασκε*), let us consider the attempt to make the three first words of line 3 conform to this notion: Gesner, followed by Mullach, emended it to *χείρά θ' ἔην*²¹. So that, as Mullach edits the text: *Παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἰακχος, / χείρά θ' ἔην ρίπτασκε γελῶν*

Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις, there is perfect sense and naturalness. But I consider the two emendations unjustifiable: it is not a question of the amount of change introduced, mechanically computed; almost any degree of divergence from the transmitted text is justifiable, if justifiable! (There is much to be said in favour of the old, now fashionably disreputed, school of eclectic i.e. spiritual, as opposed to mechanical-textual, criticism). Thus in the last analysis it always is a question of what in the end gives the best result taking everything into consideration. The current notion that editorial technique consists in the mechanical comparison of a number of manuscripts, in the drawing of a stemma on the basis of thin, restricted and impotent evidence collected computationally, as it were, and in the subsequent concentration on some very, very few manuscripts which are pronounced to possess the honour of being independent, and the related idea that textual criticism can be executed without serious involvement in full-blown interpretation in the higher sense of the word, so as (the belief runs) to provide a neutrally achieved platform of sound background on which that higher criticism can be built - that notion and this idea represent but a grossly inadequate and erroneous oversimplification of the real process of construal and understanding with its continual interlacing of weighting of manuscript evidence, textual handling and interpreting. The present case is in fact as good as any that can be found to illustrate the intimate connection between general methodological principles and concrete points. Thus, to come back to our particular matter, my disapproval of the above-mentioned two emendations is not founded on their being drastic; nor is it, after all, that the violence of an emendation can be mechanically measured by the amount of introduced change and its palaeographical justifiability; (thus, in our case, the vigour of the divergence does not consist in the modest change as such, but in the fact that the changes introduced reverse the sense in, grammatically speaking, a smoothly running sentence). On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the emendations give us a much more smooth and natural passage on the whole, both as regards the grammar and flow of the *λόγος* and its immediate sense: Baubo did what she did, and then Iacchos went and played his innocent but indecent games. (Whereas the most natural way to take the text as it stands, even disregarding the difficulty concerning the reference of *μιν*, would be to suppose Iacchos as

revealed, together with Baubo's pudendum, when she *ἀνεσύρατο πέπλους*; which could be possible and, taken in a particular way even probable, as we shall see in a moment). But my real complaint about Mullach's text is that it does not give the required meaning (and the ultimate offences are those against significance), that is, meaning by "required" the sense we should expect here, given our knowledge of all connected matters: in philology as well as in philosophy consonance and organic coherence is the ultimate criterion (even though not the essence) of truth.

I cannot here supply and discuss all the relevant information not even the directly relevant portion of it (I mean that part of it whose relevance is immediately perceptible). But some summary of it must be provided as a justification of my final construal of the Orphic fragment. So, to begin with first-order facts, we have the *κόκκινος βαυβών* in Herondas VI,19, which is what the comic poets call ὄλισσος²² (cf. also the *σκύτινον... ἐρυθρὸν ἐξ ἄκρου παχύ*, Aristophanes *Nubes*, 538-9) and Petronius *scoretum fascinum* (*Satyricon* 138). This was considered to be one of the ladies' accessories (Aristoph. Fr. 309, 13 Dindorf = 330, 13 Blaydes = Fr. 332.13 PCG the fragment is from the *Δεύτεραι Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι*); esp. of those more prone to lewdness, v. *μισηταὶ δὲ γυναικες ὄλισβοισι χρήσονται*, Cratinus, *Fab.Inc.Fr.* 354 PCG; but more importantly for our present purpose, it was worn (in exaggerated dimension) by actors in comedies, as is well known²³: *Εἰσήεσαν γὰρ οἱ κωμικοὶ διεξωσμένοι δερμάτινα αἰδοῖα γελοίου χάριν*, Scholia in *Nubes* 538²⁴. This brings us to the connection with Dionysiac celebrations²⁵. Thus *βαυβών* (the masculine for *βαυβώ*) is an artificial *membrum virile* and we have detected a likely connection of it with the worship of Dionysus. Such a connection of the name and the thing with Dionysiac worship would not, naturally, have been conclusive from the above-mentioned evidence, but for the general fact of the intensely phallic character of Dionysus as well as of at least a certain type of mysteries.

Βαυβώ (cod. *Βανμώ*; but the word series necessitates a change and *Βαυβώ* is a certain correction) *πιθήνη Δήμητρος. σημαίνει δὲ καὶ κοιλίαν ὡς παρ' Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ*. Hesychius s.v. The occurrence of the word, and in such a sense, in Empedocles, who evidently was so sensitive to Mystery cults and teachings, must be significant, as Dieterich correctly noticed (*Die Göttin Mise* , *Philologus* LII N.F. VI

1894 p. 3, n. 8). *Κοιλία* here, no doubt, is ἡ *κάτω* (= abdomen), perhaps an euphemism for the female generative organs (the use of the word for womb is testified in the Hippocratic corpus, cf. e.g. *Γυναικεῖα I*, 38)²⁶. Perhaps *βουβών* is a related word, as Crusius thought, which is defined by Aristotle as the common part of the abdomen and thighs (*Historia Animalium*, 493b9).

Finally, after *βαυβών* and *βαυβώ* we have the verb *βαυβᾶν* signifying the corresponding act. Eusthathius ad Homerum (p. 1761, 27 ed. Romana): λέγει δὲ (sc. Aristophanes Byzantius) καὶ λαπίζειν παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ τὸ συρίζειν (? unless there is a hidden obscene undertone), καὶ βαυβᾶν τὸ κοιμᾶσθαι, οἶον «Ἡ δὲ προῦκαλεῖτό με / βαυβᾶν μετ' αὐτῆς (μεθ' αὐτῆς Nauck, *Tragica Adespota* 165) . Ὅθεν, φησί, καὶ παρὰ Κρατίνῳ τὸ «Λόγος τις ὑπῆλθ' ἡμᾶς ἀμαθῆς σοβαύβαλος²⁷. Κοιμᾶσθαι, to sleep, has both the normal and the indicative sense, as in many modern languages; and *βαυβᾶν* is used, in the few examples that we possess, in the later acceptance of sexual intercourse. (So, correctly, Dieterich, *loc.cit.* p. 4, n. 9, and before him, indirectly, Matthiae)²⁸. Another occurrence of the word that we know of, is in the ancient comic poet Cantharus' work *Μῆδεια*. (Fr. 3 PCGr vol. IV p. 58). We owe the reference to the *Antiatticista* ubi supra (note 28), where he adds: *Κάνθαρος Μηδεία βαυβήσομεν*. The above mentioned word *σοβαύβαλος* is explained by Hesychius as *συῶν ἀυλιστήρια ἢ κοιμητήρια* and by Photius (in his *Lexicon*) as *ἐν οἷς οἱ σῦες εὐνάζονται*²⁹.

In the preceding note we have observed the connection between *βαυβ-* and *βαυκ-*. We meet the same general affinities when we examine words containing the form *βαβ-*. And first of all, it should be noted that even the name of *Βαυβώ* is also found as *Βαβώ*; so *Suda* in: *Βαβοῦς· ὄνομα κύριον* and in *Δημώ*: *ὄνομα κύριον «ἐξένισεν ἢ Βαβὼ τὴν Δημώ»* (where *Δημώ* = *Δήμητρα*; perhaps we should write *Δηώ*, comparing with the passage in *Clement* where we have *ξενίσασα ἢ Βαυβὼ τὴν Δηώ* but then it would be out of the word order). The form *Βαβώ* is also found in *Psellus* (perhaps in connection with *Porphyry*) in a passage to be adduced below (cf. *Kern, Orph. Fr. 53*), and, very importantly, in a *Parian inscription* (*Bechtel, Inschriften Ion. Dial. 65*) where the *υ* has been added *supra lineam*. Besides we know that *υ* and *β* can stand very close phonetically to each other, as is shown e.g. by the fact that they are to

be found as the most likely substitute or trace of an initial *δίγαμμα*. (This close connection is preserved in Modern Greek as identity in certain cases: for instance *Βαυώ* and *Βαβώ* are phonetically equivalent in standard pronunciation). Could it be that something like *βαF-*, or rather *Fa-F(a)-j-* (to be more scientific) lies at the bottom of it all? But of all types of scientific speculation, one of the most dangerous and vain is the etymological one.

Let us then examine the field phenomenologically. *Βάβαξ*, according to the Etym. Magnum, is *λάλος, φλύαρος* (chatterer); *παρὰ τὸ βάζω, βάζω, βάξ, καὶ κατὰ ἀναδιπλασιασμὸν βάβαξ*. This explanation agrees with the Scholiast ad Lycophron, *Alexandra* 472, where *βάβαξ* is explained as: *ρήτωρ, ἀπὸ τοῦ βάζω* an interpretation fitting nicely indeed the Lycophronian context (and yet see the passage from Eustathius given below note 30). However, even *βάζω* (already Homeric), is not straightforward *λέγω* in many cases (for instance Hesychius has *ἔβαξεν· ἔλεγε· καὶ ἐκακόλογει* and *ἔβαξας· ἐλοιδόρησας*). Furthermore, for *βάβαξ* we have to take into account the following facts: 1) Hesychius: *βαβάζειν. τὸ μὴ διηρθρωμένα λέγειν· ἔνιοι δέ, βοᾶν* (cf. idem *Βάβακοι*). This may be seen as the bridge from the more common senses of *βάζω* to the special ones. 2) Hesychius: *βαβάξαι. ὀρχήσασθαι* (and cf. *ἐκβαβάξαι· ἐκσαλεῦσαι* connoting a lewd type of movement, saltation or dance; should we recall here the obscene *ἀπόκινος* of the last note? - *Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀντηγορίδαις*). 3) Again Hesychius s.v. *βάβαξ* and after indicating the sense of chatterer in agreement with the Etym. Magnum (to which it adds an undertone of vanity with *μάταιος*), has: *ἐνθουσιῶν* (in a fit of enthusiasm, possession, frenzy), *ἀναιδῆς* (ruthlessly shameless). This explanation is also given by the Etym. Magnum in a second lemma of the same word: *βάβαξ. μάταιος, ἐνθουσιῶν, ἀναιδῆς*. And it is, I believe, in this sense that we should understand the Archilochian sense quoted in the first lemma of *βάβαξ* in the Etym. Magnum, which after deriving *βάβαξ* from *βάζω* adds *Ἀρχίλοχος· κατ' οἶκον ἐστρωφᾶτο μισητὸς <βάβαξ>*. (In fact the manuscript tradition of the Etymologikon has *Ἀριστοφάνης* instead of *Ἀρχίλοχος* but a) clearly the name of Aristophanes is misplaced where it occurs and should be referred to what follows: *ἔστι καὶ ἐπίρρημα βαβαί, βαβαιάξ, θαυμαστικὸν ἐπίφθεγμα* [see *Pax* 247 and scholia], and b) *Ἀρχίλοχος* is to be substituted from Orion's Lexicon when we

read: *Βάβαξ ὁ λάλος*. *Ἀρχίλοχος*: *κατ' οἶκον ἐστρωφᾶτο δυσμενῆς* (sic) *βάβαξ*, where *δυσμενῆς* should be corrected in its turn from the Etym. Magnum. Of course, it is not impossible that we have in fact two verses, the Aristophanian one imitating, or ridiculing, the Archilochian - a phenomenon far from uncommon in ancient poetry). Here in view of *μισητός* (which of course in a comic poet's or an Archilochian verse is not likely to mean simply hateful, but rather either lewd (*κατωφερῆς*) or impotent - see the examination of this word below), *βάβαξ* should mean shameless madman, so that the sense of the verse probably is: "at home he was roaming (or revolving in his bed?) the lecherous madman". 4) Another gloss by Hesychius is most important: *Βάβακα· τὸν Γάλλον*³⁰ (castrated priest of Magna Mater, effeminate, and usually considered as much given to sexual pleasures, cf. the major subject of ancient eunuchism). This connects us to the circle of obscene religiosity. 5) Again the invaluable Hesychius has: *Βαβάκτης· ὄρχηστής* (and so, simply, Suda s.v.; cf. Hesychius *βαβάξαι* above cited), *ὑμνωδός, μανιώδης* (cf. the *ἐνθουσιῶν* of the *βάβαξ*), *κραύγασος* (so the cod., i.e. brawler, shouter; but from Hesychius *κραύγαρ· ὁ ἰσχυρός*, I would prefer to substitute *κραύγαρ* or *κραύγας*)³¹ *ᾧθεν καὶ Βάκχος*. This connects us with the worship of Dionysus, even to the extent of deriving his appellation *Βάκχος* from the same root and meaning-field. And so Eustathius (p. 1494 in fin, ed. Romana): *καὶ βαβάκτης ἐκ τοῦ βάζειν. ᾧθεν ὁ Βάκχος, ὁ μανιώδης καὶ ἀκρατής* (incontinent, immoderate, intemperate); idem, p. 1431, 49, listing Dionysiac names has: *ὁ καὶ Σάβος, καὶ Σαβάζιος καὶ Βάκχος καὶ Βαβάκτης καὶ Βάβαξ καὶ Ἐμμανῆς καὶ Φλέδων* (babblers, loquacious; loquaciousness goes well with bacchic drunkenness). Further the Etym. Magnum has: *Βαβάκτης· ὄρχηστής, λάλος, μανιώδης, βακχευτής. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ Πάν· Κρατῖνος*:

Χαίρε χρυσόκερω βαβάκτα κήλων / Πάν.

Παρά τὸ βάζω, τὸ λαλῶ, βάζω, βέβαγμαί, βέβακται, βαβάκτης, ὁ πολλὰ λαλῶν, φλύαρος. Cratinus' verses are fully given by Hephaestion, ch. X p. 62 (ed. Gaisford):

*χαίρε χρυσόκερω, βαβάκτα, κήλων
Πάν, Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἐμβατεύων*

(*Fabulae Incertae* Fr. XXII, Meineke, II, 182 = *Fab.Inc.* Fr. 359 PCG vol. IV p. 296). The phallic, aphrodisiac nature of Πάν is known and is emphasized by the occurrence of κήλων (= ὁ ὀχευτῆς ἵππος, Hesychius; ὁ θερμὸς εἰς συνουσίαν, *Etym. Mag.*), a word coming naturally from κήλον both in its general sense as shaft and in its peculiar use (also called κήλων) as swipe or swing-beam for drawing water³²: an enormous erection is compared by Archilochus (fr. 102, ed. Diehl) to the membrum of such a κήλων ass. In such a context, and given on the one hand the nature of Πάν and on the other what has been said above, one cannot, I submit, persist in interpreting βαβάκτα in the verse as simply loquacious unless, indeed, one metaphorically speaks of a converse and intercourse of a different kind³³.

In conclusion, it can now be seen how our world-field is articulated respecting meaning: speak - abuse - babble - shout - be excitedly loquacious - tumultuous, noisome - be enraged, be mad - raving, "hot" - bacchic, lewd, dance - abandon to sexual pleasure and gratification. The core meaning is one of spiritedness and excitedness³⁴. We have then bacchic excitement, soft luxuriating abandon to gratification, obscene dances and practices, pudenda muliebria and intercourse. Everything fits accurately together.

Thus far we have, therefore, the βαυβών, the βαυβώ and the βαυβᾶν the latter expressing the characteristic activity of the two other items³⁵. One must now proceed in examining the situation with the Eleusinian Mysteries with respect to these words and things. And, firstly, we begin again with some first-order facts. In a dedication on a marble-fragment in Paros we find Βαυβώ in the company of Demeter Thesmophoros, Kore, Zeus Eubuleus (i.e. Zeus in his function within the orbit of the Eleusinian Mysteries, perhaps Pluto as Zeus Χθόνιος) and, strangely enough, Hera (*Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt Inschriften*, Die Ionischen Inschriften, ed. F. Bechtel, no. 5441 (65)). Βαυβώ is also one of the three daemonic maenads instituting dionysiac rites in Magnesia, according to an inscription found there (v. apud Dieterich *Abraxas*, p. 148, n. 3, and see below). Further there is a terracotta group showing a naked woman with her hand on her pudendum, sitting on a swine³⁶ evidently a reference to our Baubo (v. Cook, *Zeus*, II, 131 ff. And addenda p. 1119)³⁷.

The connection of Baubo with swine is not only significant because of the reference to the pudenda muliebria by *χοῖρος*; it is more important in view of the cardinal role that sacrifices of pigs played in the Eleusinian ritual. This subject has been treated in Chapter One; I shall use here the results achieved there.

Pigs were considered particularly suitable for purifications. Thus for example they were used in the lustrational ritual for homicide, and in the purgation of the Assembly and other public meetings and buildings from evil influence and pollution. The purificational pig, therefore, was a very appropriate victim in the context of the worship of Demeter and Persephone, and especially in the context of the Eleusinian Mysteries, in which *κάθαρσις* (both in its strict sense as a necessary preparation for *μύησις* and *ἐποπτεία*, and also in its broad Orphic signification of deliverance from the bonds of this world and preparation for the beatitude after death)³⁸ was a fundamental theme.

Now religious purification for the ancient Greek mind was based on the principle of Homeopathy: Like acts on like and receives the action of the similar. This was a potent principle with the Greeks, in general, but it was especially prevalent in religious matters: apparent exceptions, when thoroughly examined, reveal an essential consonance with this thesis. To contaminate purity with impurities was to them sacrilege, not purgation: *μὴ καθαρῶ γὰρ καθαροῦ ἐφάπτεσθαι μὴ οὐ θεμιτὸν ἦ*. The approach of pollution to the pure results in the defilement of the pure, not in the purgation of the polluted.

This is not the place to argue in extenso for this view: the subject is analysed in the study in Chapter One entitled *Μίασμα* and *Κάθαρσις*: Purifying Impurity and Polluted Purification. But I believe the fundamental correctness of the thesis, especially in connection with mysteries, will be acknowledged by the competent judge. It may suffice here to recall Heracleitus' protestations in the famous fr. 5 DK: *καθαίρονται δ' ἄλλω αἵματι μαινώμενοι, ὁκοῖον εἴ τις ἐς πηλὸν ἐμβὰς πηλῶ ἀπονίψοιτο· μάλινεσθαι δ' ἂν δοκοίη εἴ τις αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιφράσαιτο οὕτω ποιέοντα* (And cf. fr. 14 DK).

The terracotta group shows to us the right direction: Baubo's exhibition and action is to be seen in the context of presupposed purification like the sacrifice of an impure animal, or the washing out of moral stain by blood. Thus the effect of viewing her behaviour in the religious and cultic framework to which it belongs is twofold: first

cathartic and purificatory; then revelatory of something divine, of an unspeakable power permeating and sustaining the Universal Order. One can see the perspicacious philosophical formulation of this sympathetic understanding of the ancient mystery cultus in Iamblichus' *De Mysteriis*, although the presentation is naturally coloured by the (Neo)Platonic idealizing tendency³⁹.

But let us revert now to our immediate subject. When Hesychius s.v. *Βαυβώ* explains *τιθήνη Δήμητρος*, I suppose he refers, in a somehow stretched signification, to the *ξενισμός* of Demeter by Baubo, as in Suda s.v. *Δημώ* (i.e. *Δήμητρα*) «ἐξένισεν ἡ Βαβὼ (sic codd.) τὴν Δημώ» and in accordance with the narrations of Clement and Arnobius. The word can be used in extended or metaphorical use⁴⁰. (Perhaps, but this is less probable, we could bring the lemma into connection with the narration in the Berlin papyrus tractate (Kern, Fr. 49, VI)⁴¹ where Demeter fulfills the role of *τιθήνη* to Baubo's⁴² child, Demophoon⁴³ (another version of the Metaneira-Demeter story in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter). But in such case we must alter Hesychius' lemma to, say, *τιθήνη· Δήμητρα*, or rather to *Βαυβοῖ· τιθήνη Δήμητρα* which would disrupt the word order).

So far, all mention of Baubo in our sources seems to be connected with, or at any rate to fit well with, the fact reported by Clement and Arnobius, as parts of a coherent story and framework. But there is a passage in Michael Psellus (apud Leon. Allatium, in Sathas, *Μεσαιωνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη* V, 571; v. Kern Fr. 53) where *Βαβώ* (sic) seems to relate to a different train of connections. Psellus wants to explain the Byzantine *βαβουτζικάριος* (a kind of spectral apparition, a ghost) and he deduces it from *Βαβώ*: *ἔνεστι γάρ που τοῖς Ὀρφικοῖς ἔπεσι Βαβώ τις ὀνομαζομένη δαίμων νυκτερινή, ἐπιμήκης τὸ σχῆμα καὶ σκιώδης τὴν ὑπαρξιν. ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ Πορφύριος ὁ φιλόσοφος περὶ τούτων* (and see what follows). Of course the connection with Orphism remains unchallengeable, only Baubo assumes a daemonic character similar to that of *Μηλινόη* in Orphic Hymn 71. And yet this need not necessitate the postulation of a different being from our Baubo⁴⁴. For, firstly, connected with the proper divinities there are in ancient religion various higher beings, not quite gods, or lesser than the main gods at any rate, but related to them in the relevant myths and cults; *δαίμων περὶ τὸν* (or *τὴν*) X is the standard expression (v. e.g. Thesmoph., scholium ad 299: *Καλλιγένεια· δαίμων περὶ τὴν*

Δήμητρα). This is an *ὄπαδός* of the main divinity in the language of the Phaedrus. And then, secondly, it is well known how a daemonic figure (especially of a mystery cult) can become, in a Christian milieu, a malignant ghost of the night. Furthermore, we can point out in this particular case, the intermediate, intervening step in that process of transformation; I refer to the association of the Eleusinian cycle of divinities in general, and of Baubo in particular, with Hecate, the deity par excellence of the magic arts and mysterious influences (evil sometimes because indifferent to restrictedly human concerns), As regards the general connection, the Scholia to Apollonius Rhodius III 467 report as a specifically Orphic view (contrasted to the genealogy of Bacchylides, Mousaios and Pherekydes as well as to the ordinary account) that Dêô gave birth to Hecate (Kern, *Fragmenta Orphicorum*, 41); and Callimachus (apud Scholia in Theocritum, ad II 11/12, p. 272, 18 ff., Wendel) writes: τῇ Δήμητρι μιχθεῖς ὁ Ζεὺς τεκνοῖ Ἑκάτην διαφέρουσαν ἰσχυῖ καὶ μεγέθει τῶν θεῶν, making, thus, her a sister of Persephone⁴⁵ (cf. Kern, *Fr. Orph.* 42). The intimate interconnection and aspectual identification, if I may be permitted to put it thus, of Hecate, Persephone, Moon, Demeter, Artemis, Brimo etc. in a context of infernal magic is abundantly confirmed by the Papyri Magicae. And in the last analysis, it is the fact of such connectedness which is of essential importance, not the variations in the specific treatments and accounts; variations which sometimes betray all too clearly the working of an euhemeristic, naturalistic or, in general, superficially rationalizing mind.

Now as to Baubo in particular. a) In the above-mentioned inscription from Magnesia, she is brought in connection (as co-founder of bacchic rites) with *Κοσκώ* and *Θετᾶλη*. The latter, as Dieterich (*Abraxas*, p. 148, n. 3) says, is "die stereotype Bezeichnung der Zauberinnen"⁴⁶, the former, according to Dieterich's (*loc. cit.*) conjecture, is connected with the mantic *κόσκινον* although I think that the passage to which he refers (Papyri Magicae, vol. I.IV, 2305) bears a wider meaning since the sieve appealed to there is one (cf., v. 2310) of the symbols the invocation of which is meant to constrain Moon Hecate to do what is bidden by the imprecator. The power over the goddess thus rests presumably on the manifestation of the gnosis of her hidden attributes and mystic symbols. Thus I should venture a suggestion that *Κωκώ* might be the true reading, cf. *Anthologia*

Graeca XII, 3. Then *Βαυβώ* and *Κωκώ* would represent the female and male sex organs respectively. Among Thessalian witches, and the witches in general, preoccupation with love affairs is abundantly testified by our sources; hence *Θεττάλη* would fit in nicely, according to our suggestion. In any case the context of the said magical passage is remarkably Orphic and Eleusinian in character, Brimo having been mentioned some lines above (v. 2270) and the mystic dionysiac symbols (*ρόμβος, κύμβαλον, κάτοπτρον*) being referred to almost immediately before the mention of the symbolic *κόσκινον* (Cf. the sieve in *Gorgias*).

b) In the alternative *ἀγωγή διαβολῆς πρὸς Σελήνην* (calumnatory imprecation against somebody to the Moon) in the great *Paris Papyrus Magica* (IV, 2709 ff.), Baubo is explicitly aspectually identified with Moon, Hecate, Kore and Artemis. (I cannot here analyse the notion of aspectual identification; but roughly it signifies an identity of the fundamental core compatible with otherness and even separateness of aspects or further developments; but the core may, in cases, be a nexus of meaning or of symbolism, instead of a single, simple element).

By means of these bridges, then, it can be understood how the Psellus passage (above) does really belong to the context of the Eleusinian mysteries despite its apparent lack of relatedness to it: Baubo is an absolutely Orphic Eleusinian daemonic divinity, and the representation of her bizarre but significant action was the culminating event in the celebration of the (Great) Mysteries, according to the very important relation of Psellus (*Quaenam sunt Graecorum Opiniones de Daemonibus*, 3 ed. Migne = p. 40 Boissonade).

And this brings us back to the point of departure, to the question which initiated the above coverage of the relevant field: in what did Baubo's action consist? The survey was conducted so as to render the answer to this problem natural in its natural context, however bizarre it may sound to modern ears.

For with what could *Βαυβώ* play in her hidden parts but with a *βαυβών*? And was not their interplay called *βαυβάν*? Have we not here the natural right to assume the Greek living equivalent of the Hindoo yoni and lingam in their penetration and union?

In the nexus of the symbolism of femininity, Baubo may be taken to represent the feminine principle in its most material aspect of sexual

distinctness; she is the deification, or rather daemonisation, of the pudendum muliebre as such: her correlative, the necessary complement to the accomplishment of her proper activity, is that which is indirectly hinted at by Arnobius (V, 27 a passage already mentioned above) to have been the additional element seen by Demeter in Baubo's pudenda. Their interaction is the natural symbol of the universal generation.

Everything mentioned in the above survey of relevant facts coheres with, and supports, this hypothesis; and so details fit to the general pattern and the whole explains the facts, just as it ought to happen with any piece of organic, living truth. Indicatively, one such detail may be mentioned: it concerns the fact that Baubo's pudendum is relatively free of hair (as Arnobius indicates, cf. V 25). We have seen that such lack of pubic hair signifies to the ancients libidinousness. And further, Dionysus had as one of his names *χοιροψάλας*; see the Laurentian scholium ad Aeschylus, *Persae*, 1063: *ψάλλε ἀντί τοῦ τίλλε· καὶ Διόνυσος χοιροψάλας, ὁ τίλλων τὰ μόρια (= pudenda) τῶν γυναικῶν*. For *ψάλλειν* cf. Hesychius s.v. (and s.vv. *ψῆλαι, ἀποψάλλειν*); also Etym.M. s.v. (cf. Aristophanes, *Vespae* 1365 and the scholiast to *χοιρόθλιψ*: *χοιρόθλιψ δὲ ὁ τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον ἀποθλίβων*). We should remember in this connection that Iacchus is an aspect of Dionysus; and Iacchus played a prominent part in Baubo's incident according to the Orphic fragment.

In spite of this organic coherence, the scientific justification of the hypothesis (no hypothesis, of course, is ever proved, unless by recourse to a higher hypothesis according to Platonic dialectics) is far from perfect, the reason being the coherence's very incompleteness. Only the exhaustive examination of the entire field of the Orphic-Eleusinian mysteries (especially regarding the essence and role of Iacchus) could ensure the absolute fitness and explaining power of the hypothesis in saving the phenomena, thereby safeguarding its truth in the only possible scientific (as distinct from intuitive) way.

This is not the place to pursue thoroughly the aforementioned justification. But a foundation for that necessary completeness may be attempted.

Firstly, we have already, by way of anticipation, referred to Herodotus II, 156, 6. Herodotus explains there that in Egyptian religion Apollo (i.e. Horus) and Artemis (i.e. Bubastis) are the

offspring of Dionysus (= Osiris) and Demeter (= Isis), Leto being only their nurse and preserver (*τροφὸν καὶ σώτειραν αὐτοῖσι γενέσθαι*). And he adds: *ἐκ τούτου δὲ τοῦ λόγου καὶ οὐδενὸς ἄλλου*⁴⁷ *Αἰσχύλος ὁ Εὐφορίωνος ἤρπασε τὸ ἐγὼ φράσω, μῦθος δὴ ποιητέων τῶν προγενομένων· ἐποίησε γὰρ Ἄρτεμιν εἶναι θυγατέρα Δήμητρος*. The significance of this bringing into connection of Artemis with Demeter cannot be underestimated, but need not here be attended to; it is philosophically elaborated in an important way by Proclus⁴⁸. The fact is further confirmed by Pausanias in a very important context⁴⁹. Now the same Herodotus, in II, 59-60 describes the celebration of Artemis (that is of her Aegyptian equivalence, *Βούβαστις* according to Herodotus⁵⁰ II, 156, 6; and cf. Stephanus Byz. s.v. *Βούβαστος· πόλις Αἰγύπτου ἣν Ἡρόδοτος Βούβαστιν φησὶ διὰ τοῦ ἰ. ... Βούβαστός τε πόλις καὶ ἱερὸν Ἀρτέμιδος* etc.) in the city Boubastis. The proceedings were as follows: people of both sexes, in large numbers, come sailing all together in boats in a state of excitement (castanets are used *κρόταλα* and pipes, there is singing and the continuous clapping of hands. When they approach any town along their journey, they come near the bank, and while some of the women continue to act as before, others verbally abuse the women of the place, some others dance, and still others *ἀνασύρονται ἀνιστάμεναι*, standing up uncover themselves by raising their dress (*ἀνασύρονται*). This is strongly reminiscent of Baubo's action; not, probably, in the fullness of its significant obscenity, but then we have here to do with a public celebration and not with a mystery cult. And though these proceedings are part of Artemis worship yet we have observed the uncontested affiliation of Artemis to the mysteries of Demeter. We see then, everything coheres; the existence of the nexus and its elements are beyond doubt; its precise structure, meaning and interpretation are far more difficult to be discovered in our predicament, of non-extant, incomplete or mutilated sources.

These few comments on the two Herodotean passages I have made not so much in order to demonstrate the aptness of my hypothesis with respect to Baubo's action and in regard to what follows the mere exhibition of her pudenda (for there is no explicit mention of such a continuation here⁵¹); but partly in order to show that pleasing and reassuring consonance in even the minutest detail of the field, even the less directly relevant, which is the prime note of a true hypothesis; and

partly in order to bring into focus the similarity of the Greek and the Egyptian ceremony to the extent that it goes (as I have done already for the respective myths) and so to better facilitate the recognition ultimately of where their difference resides.

We should observe on this occasion that the *ἀνεύρατο* of our Orphic fragment is highly significant, laden as it is with overtones and implications of sexuality. *Ἀνασύρειν* is used either for a woman drawing up her dress so as to reveal her pudenda, usually with erotic intent, or, in the case of men, to signify the laying bare of the *βάλανος*, the glans penis, either temporarily or permanently (circumcision). The connecting bridge for the two senses is provided by the sense of stripping, laying bare, naked. Thus the ancient grammarian in Bekker, *Anecd. Gr.* p. 399, 8 has *ἀνεύρατο* (corrected from *ἀνερύσατο*): *ἐγύμνωσε*, and the same at Suda s.v. Similarly Hesychius s.v. *ἀνεύρατο* has *ἄνω τὰ ἱμάτια ἔσυρεν*; whereas in *ἀνασύραι* explains: *ἀποκαλύψαι ἢ περιποιῆσαι*, to which Alberti in his erudite edition of this most authoritative lexicographer correctly notes: *supple τὸ αἰδοῖον ut in v. ἀνασκολύψας*, where Hesychius explains: *γυμνώσας*; and in order not to leave any doubt as to the matter he gives as one of the idiomatic uses of *γυμνόν* the sense *ἀπεσκυθισμένον ὡς Ἀρχίλοχος* (further explaining *ἀπεσκυθίσται* as *κέκαρται*, has been shorn, cut short; cf. *Anthol. Gr.* XII, 95, 6 for *περισκυθίσαι* in the same sense). However it is not our concern here to follow the examination of the evidence (together with the valuable insight it gives to us of ancient practices, attitudes and sentiments regarding these matters) in relation to the second of the senses noted above⁵². As to the former sense, Hesychius, apart from the above quoted lemma s.v. *ἀνεύρατο*, has: *ἀνασεσυρμένη ἢ συρόμενον ἱμάτιον ἐπαίρουσα καὶ μέρος γυμνοῦσα* (*μέρος* = *μόριον*, sc. pudendum, v. e.g. Suda s.v. *μόριον*). And the same, in the case of men: Theophrastus, *Charact.* XI, 2: *οἶος ἀπαντήσας γυναιξὶν ἐλευθέραις, ἀνασυράμενος δεῖξαι τὸ αἰδοῖον*. This was connected with libidinous attitudes and behaviours; thus Suda gives: *ἀνασεσυρμένην ἄκοσμον, ἀπρεπή* (disorderly, improper, dissolute). And s.v. *Μυσάχνη*, where he enumerates various appellations which had been leveled upon harlots, he mentions *ἀνασυρτόπολις* as one of them *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνασύρεσθαι*. (This was one of Hipponax's preferences). Eustathius gives another form of this word, probably the correct one, namely *ἀνασύρτολις*, in the course of listing words

signifying prostitutes or women ready to satisfy every sexual desire (Comm. p. 1921, 58 ff). Pollux III 21 refers to Eubulus, the comic poet: *Εὐβουλος δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς τὸ λαθρίδιον γέννημα καταγελάστως παρθένου ἀνάσυρμα εἶπε*. The clandestine offspring is called *παρθένου ἀνάσυρμα*, since it is the result of a virgin's copulation, implied by *ἀνάσυρμα* in the sense we are studying here. It is interesting here to notice how the *ἀνασύρειν* is considered as the natural preparation of coition⁵³. Before leaving the grammarians, I would like to refer to another entry in Hesychius, s.v. *Γύπας* (cf. also *Γύπη*). *Γύπη* is a vulture's nest, but in a broader sense it can signify any narrow entrance or descent into a cavity. Thus Aristophanes, *Equites*, 792:

*καὶ πῶς σὺ φιλεῖς, ὅς τοῦτον ὄρων οἰκοῦντ ἐν ταῖς φιδάκναισι
καὶ γυπαρίοις καὶ πυργιδίοις ἔτος ὄγδοον οὐκ ἐλεαίρεις, etc.*

referring to the hardships caused because of lack of space to the people which flocked Athens from the beginning of the Peloponnesian war (cf. Thucydides II, 14; 17; 52; Plutarch *Nicias*, 6; *Pericles*, 34). *Φιδάκνη* is a cask (cf. school. ad loc.); for *γυπάριον* one of the scholia runs thus: *ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἐν φωλεοῖς καὶ καλιαῖς καὶ στενοῖς χωρίοις. Κράτης (the grammarian) δὲ φησὶν τι πᾶσαν στενὴν κατάδυσιν οὕτως ὠνόμαζον* (cf. Suda s.v. *Γυπαρίοις*). We should have Crates' view when approaching Hesychius' gloss on *Γύπας*. He explains: *καλύβας καὶ θαλάμας. οἱ δὲ γυπῶν νεοσσιάς. ἄλλοι + ὁδὰς εἰς ὁδοῦς* (sic cod). *οἱ δὲ τὰς κατὰ γῆν οἰκήσεις. οἱ δὲ σπήλαια. καὶ Γυπάρια τὰ αὐτὰ* (sc. *ταῖς Γύπαις*). *οἱ δὲ ἀζώστους, ἀνασεσυρμένας* (ex *ἀνασεσυρμένα*, with Alberti this is the easiest and most natural correction). The signaled corrupt passage has been restituted differently by different scholars; see the notes ad loc. in Alberti's grand edition of Hesychius. I would mention two as the best: Heinsse's *ὁπὰς καὶ εἰσόδους*, omitting perhaps *καὶ: ὁπὰς, εἰσόδους*; and Vossius' *στενὰς εἰσόδους*. In any case the sense is clear. But the important element for our purpose is provided by the last gloss. *Ἀζώστοι* reminds us of the ungirt Spartan virgins who wore a single, small tunic, open at the sides below, and free-falling, fastened only by two *περόναι* at the shoulders and one *πόρπη* at the breast⁵⁴ - a type of vestment which, together with their easily misapprehensible general demeanour and free intercourse with boys and young men, gave rise to a current of condemnation among

the Greeks⁵⁵. This fits well with that sense of *ἀνασευρμένη* which we saw above applied to women who easily and willingly surrender to lust. And here we find these expressions brought into connection with narrow entrancies into cavities. We should compare Hesychius s.v. *μέλαθρον* where one gloss reads: *καὶ τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν μόριον*; not to mention the Greek Septuaginta *σπήλαια* in Hambakum in the sense of privy parts⁵⁶.

From these surroundings *ἀνασευρμένος* assumed a sense of general indecency, a thoroughly disreputable fellow. Cf. Theophrastus, *Char.* VI, 2.

It should not be imagined, from the analysis above given that the point of pulling up one's dress was indecent obscenity or perverted exhibitionism in the sense defined by the moral attitudes and sentiments of the 19th and 20th centuries. The sexual organ was an object of veneration as well as of desire, and the two attitudes were even interfused with each other. The awe felt before the pudenda muliebria as the source and origin of life is well exemplified in the following passages, all having to do with a defeated army and retreating soldiers who are met by their mothers and wives with their dresses up and their pudenda bare, whereupon they, inspired by the sight, take courage and fight again to win: v. Justinus, *Historia Philipp.* I, 6, 14; Plutarch, *Mul. Virt.* 246A; 248B; cf. idem *Apophth. Lac.* 241B. Of course there was also the funny side of it all: v. Diogenes Laertius VI, 97 and II, 116. But the fundamental aspects of such exhibition for the ancient mind especially in religious contexts, was, on the one hand, the decent obscenity of natural sexuality and, on the other, veneration and awe for the hidden, secret, mysteric womb of life.

But as to our immediate point, namely the adducing of support for the above mentioned account of the action subsequent to Baubo's laying bare her pudenda, I may briefly refer to some passages which acquire their proper meaning in the light of that interpretation.

1) In Moses' apocryphal book about the Great Name (in the Leiden Papyrus Magica 395, v. Dieterich, *Abraxas*, pp. 193 sqq.) there is an invocation of a highest power (*θεῶν Θεέ*, p. 202, 14, *μέγας*, *μέγας Αἰών* p. 203, 18 *ὄνομα ἄφθεγκτον μεγάλου Θεοῦ* p. 203, 22, and cf. p. 203, 8-9) which is called by various names without meaning in the human languages (at any rate in the Greek language; we have

here the very important matter of the magical, barbaric and unmeaning names which purport to express the ultimate name-essence of the being named by them - a matter treated philosophically in Plato's *Cratylus* and Iamblichus' *De Mysteriis*). The formula of invoking this being contains, in the midst of the series of vowels and meaningless words (standardly occurring in various patterns), these human names: ...*Διόνυσε, μάκαρ Εὖιε, ... Βαυβώ, ... Ἰάω, Σαβαώθ... Ἄδωνάϊ...* This highest being (its supreme position indicated by *Ἰάω* (or *Ἰαώ*), *Σαβαώθ* and *Ἄδωνάϊ*) is the *Εὖιος* (from *εὐοί, εὐᾶν*) *Διόνυσος* as identical (that is, in assimilative conjunction) with *Βαυβώ* a hermaphrodite being, or rather bisexuality itself and the *τύπος* (cf. our Orphic passage) as such of the bisexuality of an androgynic being, as illustrating the proximity and juxtaposition of the male and female organs⁵⁷. It is in such a context that the epitheton *χοιροψάλας* of Dionysius gets its fuller meaning. (For the mystic Dionysus = Zagreus as supreme god v. already in Alcmaionic Fr. 3 Bernabi: *πότνια Γῆ, Ζαγρεῦ τε θεῶν πανυπέρτατε πάντων*).

2) In a way similar to the above example, in IV 2200 sqq. (the great Paris Magic Papyrus, ed. Preisendanz vol. I, p. 140), we have an invocation to the Lord of the Universe (*ὁ τῶν ὄλων δεσπότης*) to the *Αἰὼν τῶν Αἰώνων*, which runs thus (omitting the unmeaning words): *σὺ εἶ ὁ κοσμοκράτωρ, Ρᾶ, Πάν, ..., αειμουω* (the series of vowels, a most potent symbol) *Βαυβώ, Βαυβώ, Φόρβα, Φόρβα...* We observe the same significant and sacred bisexuality above noticed. The all-powerful, abominable, horrible aspect of that primeval bisexuality, the source of all origination, is better brought into expression through the fearful invocation in IV 2574-2621, where we note: *καλῶ σε τριπρόσωπον θεάν* (sc. *Ἐκάτην*), *Μήνην, ἐράσμιον Φῶς, Ἐρμῆν τε καὶ Ἐκάτην ὁμοῦ, ἀρσενόθηλυν ἔρνος, μουφωρ* (sic), *Φόρβα, βασιλεια Βριμώ* (i.e. Demeter according to Clement Alexandr. Protrepticus II, 15, 1, but see note⁵⁸ for further articulation), *δεινὴ καὶ θεσμία* (~ Demeter) *καὶ Δαρδανία* (hence in connection with Samothrace), *Πανοπαῖα, δεῦρο ιωιη, Παρθένε, εἰνοδία* (hecatie attribute) *καὶ ταυροδράκαινα σὺ*, etc. The last name, *ταυροδράκαινα*, clearly is connected with the copulation of Zeus (in serpentine form) with Persephone, his daughter by Demeter, and the *ταυρόμορφος παῖς* (sc. the mystic Dionysus) offspring of that *ἀρρη- τουργία* (here = unspeakable copulation), as described by Clement,

Protrepticus II, 16, 1-3⁵⁹, where note the clearly phallic role of the serpent in the Sabaziac mysteries. It is true that in this last passage Baubo is not explicitly mentioned, but *Φόρβα*⁶⁰ is, which name immediately follows upon *Βαυβώ* in the before-mentioned magical passage; besides the assimilative identities *Βαυβώ* - *Ἐκάτη* etc. are sufficiently well-established by passages from the magic papyri already cited (cf. e.g. IV 2714 sqq.). Further, in connection with the *ταυροδράκαινα*, it is to be observed that in the London papyrus XLVI (British Museum) *Ἵρθώ*⁶¹ *Βαυβώ* is called *ἄκρουροβόρος*, i.e. eating the end of (her own) tail: this should be connected with the kind of serpent mentioned by Epiphanius, Panarion, 62D-C (vol. II, pp. 13-14 Dindorf), who relates a very interesting ancient myth concerning it: that in Egypt, in the foundations of every temple, there was the custom of putting in one earthenware vessel a number of asps; the stronger among them, after eating all the others, for lack of food, remained alone, and afterwards, further pressed by hunger presumably, began to eat itself, commencing with the end of its tail: *καὶ οὕτως ἔμεινεν οὐκέτι τελεία, ἀλλ' ἤμισυ ὑπάρχουσα ἔρπετοῦ. Διὸ καὶ ἀσπιδογοργόνα ταύτην ἐκάλεσαν. Οὐροβόρος* is sometimes portrayed as an enormity of a serpent encompassing the world. This epitheton then, *ἄκρουροβόρος*, as applied to Baubo, confirms⁶² the conjunction-in-identity of the male and female, symbolized by Baubo's action according to the proposed interpretation. Another symbol of that conjunction is the bisexuality or hermaphroditism so prominent in these contexts (compare also certain Gnostic especially Ophitic sects). It makes its appearance even in the present connection for Baubo *ἄκρουροβόρος* occurs in the midst of an invocation addressed to Hermes. To return, for a last remark, to *ἄκρουροβόρος*: Photius, in his Lexicon, has: *οὐράν· αἰδοῖον, Σοφοκλῆς* (Sophocles, Fr. 924 Dindorf). And Hesychius s.v. *οὐραί· ἢ κέρκος. καὶ τὸ αἰδοῖον*, the male one of course (cf. also s.v. *κέρκος*). And what clarifies still more the situation, Aristophanes in *Acharnenses* has the following passage (785-7):

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ.

ΜΕΓΑΡΕΥΣ.

Κέρκον οὐκ ἔχει.

Νέα γάρ ἐστιν· ἀλλὰ δελφακουμένα

ἔξεί μεγάλην τε καὶ παχείαν κήρυθράν.

This *μεγάλη* and *παχεία* and *έρυθρά* «*κέρκος*» is of course the *membrum virile* (cf. also *Ecclesiastousai*, 1048: *μεγάλην ἀποδώσω καὶ παχείαν σοι χάριν*) as the scholiast saw: ἄμα δὲ καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ κόρης παίζει, ὅτι ἔξει μεγάλην οὐρὰν τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς πόσθην. And so Hesychius s.v. *σαννίον*: τὸ γὰρ αἰδοῖον ἔσθ' ὅτε οὐρὰν ἔλεγον, ὡς *Εὐπολις*⁶³. It is evident here too, that the male *αἰδοῖον* is meant, since the explanation given by Hesychius applies only to it: *Σαννίον*: τὸ αἰδοῖον, ἀντὶ τοῦ κέρκιον· παρὰ τὸ τῆ κέρκω σαίνειν· τὸ γὰρ αἰδοῖον ἔσθ' ὅτε etc⁶⁴. *Ἀκρουροβόρος* must also, thus, be related to this line of thought; another confirmation of our interpretation. Whether, guided by the etymology of the word, we should connect it with the practice which was said to originate in Lesbos (not the modern Lesbian love) and which was portrayed as exercised upon Zeus by Hera in her temple at Argos, is a possibility I shall leave open here (cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v. *λεσβιάζειν*; *Suda* s.v. *λεσβίσαι*; *Eustathius Comm.* 741, 15; *Aristoph. Vespae* 1385 with the scholia). The practice is finely described in *Aristophanes, Equites* 1285 (cf. further *idem Eccles.* 920 with sch., and sch. ad *Ranae* 1308; *Ausonius Epigr.* 120).

3) From the valuable store of ancient lore, from which even late texts (like perhaps the *Orphic Hymns* in our possession) do preserve the principle and inner spirit of all religious tradition and transmission especially as *Cultus*, being conservative in the extreme⁶⁵, I shall utilize here only the *Orphic hymn* 42, as more directly and evidently bearing on our present point. The hymn, as always in the form of an invocative prayer, is addressed to *Misa*, a divinity related to *Demeter* - *τῶν περὶ τὴν Μητέρα τις* as is put by Hesychius (s.v. *Μισατίς* or *Μίσα τις?*)⁶⁶ in the standard formula denoting, as already remarked, some daemonic figure in close connection with the main deity in a religious cycle and referring or signifying an aspect of the character, function, potency or actions of that principal deity, or a moment in its nature, or an element characteristic or indispensable to the field of its operations and manifestations.

For an adequate comprehension of the matter with regard to hymn 42, we should do for the *Misa* what was done above for *Baubo*. But we shall state here only some results of such an inquiry⁶⁷. Thus a) we conclude from the comic poets, their scholiasts and the ancient lexicographers that *μίσητος* (or *μισητός*), *μισήτη* (or *μισητή*), *μισητία* connote proneness to sexual pleasures, lechery, insatiable intense

desire and perverse (lack of) satisfaction, especially as applied to women⁶⁸. We recognize in this way the same signification of lewdness and lustfulness with Misa⁶⁹ as with Baubo above and the same undertone of pervertedly obscene practices. Then b), *μισήται* (or *μισηταί*) *δὲ γυναιῖκες ὀλίσβοισιν* (the same as *βαυβῶνες*, as above explained) *χρήσονται* the Cratinus fragment (Meineke, vol. II, p. 202-3 = Fr. 354 PCG vol. IV p. 294; apud e.g. Hesychius (see the sources adduced in note 68) makes clear the practices in which such women were disposed to indulge. Finally 3), the accounts of Misa's relatedness to Demeter⁷⁰ exhibit that characteristic uncertainty, or rather ambivalence, so much misunderstood by (or rather simply incomprehensible to) modern critics, which is the outward sign of what I term aspectual identification or assimilative identity or differential coincidence in a fundamental core of signification. We have already noticed the occurrence of the significant formula *τῶν περὶ τὴν Χ τις* in Hesychius. He adds (s.v. *Μισατίς*) *ἦν* (sc. *Μισην*) *καὶ ὀμνύουσι*; whereby, if we may use it as one intermediate link connecting this with his other gloss: *Μίδα θεός· οἱ ὑπὸ Μίδα βασιλευθέντες ἐσέβοντο καὶ ὠμνυον τὴν Μίδα θεόν, ἣν τινες μητέρα αὐτοῦ ἐκτετιμῆσθαι λέγουσιν*, we arrive at a divinity *Μιση* = *Μίδα* *θεός* mother of king Midas⁷¹. But the mother of this Midas is said to have been Cybele or the Great Mother (cf. Hyginus, *Fabula* 191 and 274). But this is not of much consequence: his Phrygian nature and his connection with the worship of the Great Mother there are certain (v. Diodorus III ch. 58 sub fin.; important cultic connection is implied in Pausanias I, 4, 5), as are, on the other hand, his other features: promotion of dionysiac rites and adeptness in Orphic theology and ritual (v. Clement, *Protr.* p. 12 (Potter) and Justinus *Hist. Phil.* XI, 7). The bacchic nature of Midas is evident from Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii Tyanensis*, VI, 27: *μετείχε μὲν γὰρ τοῦ τῶν Σατύρων γένους ὁ Μίδας οὗτος, ὡς ἐδήλουν τὰ ὠτα*⁷²; more completely confirmed by the description of Midas in Philostratus *Imagines* I, XXII: *ὡς ἄβρὸς* (as Dionysus himself is) *ὁ Μίδας, ὡς δὲ ράθυμος μίτρας* (the accessory head dress connected with Cybele, used in Aristophanes, *Thesmoph.* 941, as a sign of effeminacy perhaps) *ἐπιμελείται καὶ βοστρύχου, καὶ θύρσον* (the bacchic thyrsus) *φέρει, καὶ στολὴν ἔγχρυσον· ἰδοὺ καὶ ὠτα μεγάλα, ὕφ ὧν ἡδεῖς οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ δοκοῦντες ὑπνηλοὶ φαίνονται καὶ μεθέλκουσι τὴν*

ἡδονὴν ἐς τὸ νωθρόν; a fine description, these latter phrases, of the soft, passive luxuriousness in sensual sensitivity commonly associated with one aspect of Dionysus. It is especially relevant to our point that Midas, as has been already said, was considered to have been taught by Orpheus about divine and sacred things⁷³. All these circumstances cohere with the view that the Mother of the Gods was aspectually identical with Midas' mother, and thus with the aspectual or differential identification of *Μίδα θεός* with the Great Mother. Naturally, such identification in a common ground or core, is bound to emerge at the surface in apparently contradictory statements, some of unqualified identity, others of special connection in distinctness (*δαίμων περι τὴν Χ, τροφός*, etc.). The important thing is their belonging to the same religious nexus. Plutarch offers a further confirmation in the same direction *Vita Caesaris*, IX: ἔστι δὲ *Ρωμαίους θεός*, ἣν Ἀγαθὴν ὀνομάζουσιν (the Bona Dea), ὡς περ Ἑλληνες *Γυναικείαν*⁷⁴. Καὶ Φρύγες μὲν οἰκειούμενοι *Μίδα μητέρα τοῦ βασιλέως γενέσθαι φασί*, *Ρωμαῖοι δὲ νύμφην Δρυάδα Φαύνω συνοικήσασαν*, Ἑλληνες δὲ τῶν Διονύσου μητέρων τὴν ἄρρητον· ὅθεν ἀμπελίνοις τε τὰς σκηναὶς κλήμασιν ἐορτάζουσι κατερέφουσι καὶ δράκων ἱερὸς παρακαθίδρυται τῇ θεῷ κατὰ τὸν μῦθον. The nexus is unmistakable: the serpent alludes to the mystery of Zeus Sabazius (as explained by Clement) and the unspeakable copulation of Zeus with Persephone, the Maiden par excellence (we are here reminded of the *Μίση Κόρη* of the Pergamon inscription); the unspeakable mother of Dionysus, has the same reference. The Sabazian incident itself is explicitly reproduced (with the necessary change of persons) in Macrobius' account in *Saturnalia* I, 12, 24-27 (and compare his whole report from 21 onwards). There are also further details confirming the evident⁷⁵: the Bona Dea, the very appellation of Ἀγαθὴ θεά⁷⁶ is, I suspect, meant to render prominent, in a quasi-euphemistic, quasi-literal way and sense, a covert reference to the pudenda muliebria. The use of words of good intent to refer to realities which for the modern spirit form the exact opposite of their normal, ordinary signification is a major phenomenon of Ancient Religion: some more words will be said on this below. For the moment I shall simply emphasize the fact that the Greeks referred to Bona Dea as the *γυναικεία θεός* as if this was the goddess especially representing femininity as such and in its sexually proper nature⁷⁷ and peculiarity.

In these circumstances it is not very essential to establish the exact surface-connection of the *Μίδα θεός* with our *Μίσση*⁷⁸, from a grammatical point of view. The pragmatic affinity is undoubtful quite apart from the above noticed minutum concerning the (I take it) significant mention of the taking of oaths in the name of both *Μίσση* or *Μίσα* and *Μίδα θεός* (see the respective Hesychian glosses).

The nature of Misa is thus unambiguously determined: from the signification of *μισήτη* and related forms; from its connection with the Mother of the Gods (Hesychian lemma s.v. *Μισατίς*) whose sexually laden nature is unmistakable in myth and ritual; from its identity with the *Μίδα θεός* and the nature of this latter. Sexual promiscuity, veneration of the female organ and of its unrestrained use and power, often intensified by a preceding holy abstinence and continence, as in the case of the Bona Dea, and a dedication, even an actual offering, of the male pudendum to it for its metaphysical, unsatisfied delectation, are the aspects of the universal World-order which are symbolized by this deity⁷⁹. And so it is that Misa, in the Orphic hymn 42, is associated with the divinities in whose nature, myths and rites the element of orgiastic sexuality is predominant: the Eleusinian Great Goddesses, the Phrygian Great Mother, the Cypriot Aphrodite and the Egyptian Isis. And this Misa is probably connected with the *ξενισμός* of Demeter by Baubo⁸⁰.

This, then, and of such a nature, is the *ἀγνή* and *εὐίερος Μίσση*, the *ἄρρητος* queen as she is termed in Orphic hymn 42, 3. And here I open a parenthesis to note that it is of cardinal importance to form an exact notion about the signification of such terms as *ἀγνός*, *ἅγιος*, *ἱερός* in the nexus of mystery cults. The holiness and sacredness meant do not touch and relate to the nature of the acts performed, and of the speeches and the formulae uttered, as constitutive parts of the unspeakable rites involved in the worship of the relevant deities - do not refer to the character of these acts and words in their human dimension, i.e. as apprehended and evaluated in a purely mundane context; on the contrary, the hallowedness of the mystic *λεγόμενα* and *δρώμενα* resides essentially in their transcendent power and divine efficiaciousness, in their supranatural ability (because of divine origination) to effect holiness in the participants in the sacred orgies. It would be misleading to express this state of affairs by saying that holiness is thought to be achieved through and by unhallowed means:

the means are themselves hallowed by consecration and through divine origination; their ordinary quality (moral and other) is superseded, as it were, by an inner, spiritually divine inhalation, so that there is nothing in common between the rite on the one hand, and the same deeds or words as occurring on a profane level on the other, but an external, physical parallelism. If they were not activated in the sacred context, they would have been of an obscene profanity, as Heraclitus proclaims. I cannot enlarge here on this crucial topic, indispensable though it is for the correct understanding of the ancient mysteries. I add only that, in such contexts, ἄρρητος bears the signification of the unformulable supranaturalness in divine efficaciousness without loosing the connotation of an unspeakable abomination. I shall once again have recourse here to the Heraclitean view as testifying, by such an unimpeachably early testimony, my point: v. Frs. 15, 14, 5, 61 and 88 DK (the last from Iamblichus' *De Mysteriis* I, 11, where see the Iamblichean homoeopathic theory of the mystic obscenities. The subject, particularly in connection with catharsis, is treated in the study in Part One; *Μίασμα* and *Κάθαρσις*: Purifying Impurity and Polluted Purification. For the time being I may simply refer to various compounds like ἄρρητουργία, ἄρρητοποιεῖν etc. Hesychius s.v. ἄρρητον, after giving the usual explanations, adds all-significantly: αἰσχρόν. It is in such dimensions, together with the normal ones, that we should view the ἄρρητος Κόρη as signifying Persephone, so Hesychius s.v. referring to Euripides, *Helena*, 1306, and we have observed the company of the mystic mother of Dionysus above.

Coming back to the Orphic hymn 42, we see that this Misa, whose nature we have analyzed above, is the one who in mystical junction with Dionysus (the much-hailed, many-named sperm of Zeus Eubuleus, v. loc.cit. 1.2) constitutes the bisexual Iacchus:

Θεσμοφόρον καλέω, νερθηκοφόρον Διόνυσον,
σπέρμα πολύμνηστον, πολυώνυμον Εὐβουλῆος,
ἀγνήν, εὐιέρων τε⁸¹ Μίσην ἄρρητον ἄνασσαν,
ἄρσενα καὶ θῆλυν, διφυῆ, λύσειον Ἰακχον.

For «λύσειον» (cf. also *Λύσιος*, *Λυαῖος* as epithet of Dionysus) we can refer (as we have already done) to Gesner's interpretation, apud

Hermann, *Orphica*, p. 476: he very aptly refers to Orphic hymn 50, addressed to *Λύσιος Αθηναίος*, where Bacchus is invoked as *σπέρμα πολύμνηκστον* and as *πολυώνυμος* (just as in hymn 42), he is called *κρυψίγονον μακάρων ιερὸν θάλος*, the holy scion of secret origin⁸², of the blessed immortals, and is hailed as, among other beneficial attributes, *παυσίπονον θνητοῖσι φανείς ἄκος, ιερὸν ἄνθος /χάρμα βροτοῖς φιλάλυπον*, and, finally, as *ἐπάφιος*. This attribute reappears in Hymn 52 together (after two lines) with *ὑποκόλπιε*. (The significance of which we have already explained. This is, besides, in direct connection with our initial Orphic fragment: *Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις*. Cf. the Sabaziac myth and ritual in Clement and Arnobius). Thus, there can be no doubt about its significance. For *ἐπάπτομαι* as signifying sexual coitus we may refer with Hermann to Aeschylus, *Supplices* 44 and 519 (in Hermann's verse numeration) where Zeus is called *ἐφάπτωρ Ἰοῦς* their son being *Ἐπαφος*, their intercourse *Ζητὸς ἔφαιμις*. And so Gesner, loc.cit.: *...ἐπάφιον, a verbo ἐπάπτομαι tagen a tengendo feliciter reddidit Scaliger: simplicior aliquis vocaret contrectatorem . In his versibus, ... , Iacchus sive Bacchus, per id ipsum quod ἐπάφιος est, sit παυσίλυπος et φιλάπονος*. (Clear enough, sexual gratification is involved. Gesner, besides, declares that he has explained the matter *...paucis, et quantum sufficiat τοῖς μεμνημένοις!*). One is reminded in this connection, once more, of the cultic epithet: *Διόνυσος Χοιροψάλας*. One thing must be made clear here. This interpretation should not be viewed as substituting and invalidating the more common ones. Of course *Λύσιος* is connected with the loosening effect of wine, its beneficial activity in removing practical, mundane cares and of delivering the happy mortal to the higher arts of pleasure and entertainment (a real *ψυχαγωγία*); and, obviously, again, the same attribute relates to the divine frenzy, the bacchic orgy which separates the soul from this world as by a sword; and naturally also, the epithet expresses the power of Dionysus, especially in his Orphic form to save and liberate, he the Saviour and the Deliverer. And again he certainly delivers from the specific *μίασμα*, the result of the *ἀθέμιστα* committed by the Titans: the *σπαραγμός* of *Ζαγρεύς* (cf. Olympiodorus, in *Plat. Phaed.* B 1α' (p. 87, 13 sq.) with the Orphic fragment quoted there). The point is that, as in all similar cases, we have not so much to do with real alternation in explication, as with co-ordination. A symbol or a

significant appellation, has many facets, many levels of application: a variety of apparently disconnected and dissimilar circumstances and situations is exhibited symbolically in the unity of its essential core; it plays that role in the religious and mythological sphere, which the abstract conception plays in the realm of intellectual philosophy. And thus here: we must look for the common core of all aspects, not for the dimension which we, moderns, judge as higher. *Διόνυσος Λύσιος* is the Deliverer from a Bond through its positive but religiously transformed acceptance and enjoyment; he releases the energy which lies at the bottom of the Bond, and this is Delivery and Freedom from the Bond as Bond.

There is great need for a complete analysis of the dionysiac theology contained in the valuable collection of the extant Orphic Hymns⁸³. I am deliberately emphasizing its value: this is independent of the precise date of the composition of the hymns in question. Be they as late as one wishes in so far as their formation is concerned - epitheta deorum are not arbitrarily created from one moment to another: on the contrary they preserve, and allude to, in compressed formulaic form, lore of extreme antiquity and ritual of times immemorial.

But I shall here suggest only two more points bearing directly on our proximate subject, Iacchus' bisexuality⁸⁴.

a) In hymn 56 to Adonis enough material is contained to justify an aspectual identification of Adonis with (mystic) Dionysus. Thus he is *πολυώνυμος*, *Εὐβουλεύς* (which brings him into immediate connection with the mystic Dionysus of the Eleusinian cult specifically), *δίκερως* (the dionysiac bull, but also the new Moon), a son of Persephone (*Φερσεφόνης ἐρασιπλοκάμου λέκτροισι λοχευθείς*); he also stays some time in Hades (cf. hymn 53, 3 addressed to chthonius Dionysus). And Cypriot Aphrodite, the *σύνενυρος* of Adonis is described in hymn 55 (in her honour) as *σεμνή Βάκχοιο πάρεδρος* (v. 7). Now if Adonis is aspectually the mystic Dionysus, we gain our point by noticing that he is invoked as *κούρη καὶ κόρη* (Hymn 56, 4)⁸⁵.

b) Trieteric Dionysus (hymn 52) is called *Πρωτόγονος* and *Ἡρικεπαῖος* (v. 6)⁸⁶. Dionysus as *πολύμνηστον σπέρμα* has already been met twice: 42, 2 and 50, 2: as *διφυής*⁸⁷ appears in 30,3, 39,5⁸⁸, 42,4, 58,4⁸⁹; as *ταυρωπός* (30, 4), *ταυρομέτωπος* (45, 1), *ταυρόκερως*

(52,2)⁹⁰. The same names and attributes occur now in hymn 6 addressed to *Πρωτόγονος*; and one can multiply the points of similarity, showing thereby the differential identity of *Φάνης* and *Διόνυσος*⁹¹. But Phanes does clearly possess both sexes as is evident from the above-mentioned hymn itself and from a multiplicity of other testimonies⁹². And this fits extremely well with the womanish aspect of Dionysus in general⁹³ and the intrinsic bisexuality of the mystic Dionysus, of Iacchus, in particular which is our present point. Dionysius, the poet tyrant, called the *χοῖρον*, *ἱακχον* probably playing on the peculiar cry of pigs and *μύσται* (initiates), and on the mystic nature of Iacchus⁹⁴.

We may now come back to our point of departure: the Orphic fragment. Our wanderings (even though incomplete) should enable us to analyse the matter according to its natural connections. Let us, firstly, summarize and recapitulate.

The three crucial verses were standardly edited thus which is, apart from minor changes, what the MSS have (I reproduce the reading from Hermann's variorum edition):

*ὡς εἰπούσα πέπλους ἀνεσύρατο, δείξέ τε πάντα
σώματος οὐ τι* πρέποντα τύπον· παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἴακχος
χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκε γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις.*

*This is Hermann's emendation for the transmitted οὐδὲ.

But we have already sufficiently explained that the passage cannot stand thus: the *ἦεν* cannot be naturally construed in such a reading; and what is, then, the reference of *μιν* and what the subject of *ρίπτασκε*? Gesner, in his edition of Orphica, saw the problem and noted: *χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκε* legunt apud Clementem et Eusebium viri docti, et interpretantur puerum Iacchum a sua matre (i.e. Demeter, presumably the subject of *ρίπτασκε*!) in sinum et complexum Baubus missum: de qua re tamen nihil Arnobius: et quid sibi vult *γελῶν*, masculini generis participium, quod verbo iungendum esse, nemo, puto, dubitat. He thus emends, as I have already mentioned, to: *χειρὰ θ' ἔην ρίπτασκε γελῶν* etc. Which is taken over by Mullach, who completes the meaning intended according to this interpretation changing from *ἦεν* to *ἔην*. So we have: (Mullach)

Ὡς εἰποῦσα πέπλους ἀνεσύρατο, δειξέ τε πάντα
 σώματος οὔτι πρέποντα τύπον· παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἴακχος
 χειρά θ' ἔην ρίπτασκε γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλπους⁹⁵.

I have already confessed that this is neat and elegant and gives a natural sense grammatically and syntactically. And yet, I do not think that this was what stood in the Orphic work. We have here to do with an Orphic-Eleusinian Arcanum not mere laughter-productive, innocent obscenity (indeed this is the major point in the contrasting comparison with the Egyptian parallel of the incident in question). From even what has been so far said, it is abundantly clear that a membrum virile must play a crucial role here: all the lines of investigation pursued above converge in this⁹⁶. This I conceive as the main substantive reason against the Gesner/Mullach construal, however plausibly and smoothly it may run. But all the relevant evidence also supports my contention. In the wanderings of Demeter there is no mention of an actual boy Iacchus accompanying her. As to the boys who in one way or another were connected with Demeter's search for the Kore, they fall into the following groups: 1) The babe Demophon whom Demeter nurses in divine ways and whom she immolates when her proceedings with him are discovered (cf. Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* 219-255; Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* I, 5, 1; Tractatus Pap. Berol. VI (v. 814) apud Kern, *Fr. Orph.* Fr. 49). Of this babe we shall say nothing, as he perished without having achieved the immortality and deification that Demeter intended for him. Her design was thwarted, but her beneficial action succeeded with the next initiate Eubulus. 2) The youth Triptolemus type, the propagator of Demetriad practices and upholder of Eleusinian Mysteries. And 3) The boy who reveals to her the secret of Kore's rape and leads her to Persephone's mystic chambers. This last is the characteristically Orphic aspect, as can be clearly seen from the very important hymn 41 (also Pausanias I, 13, 4; and cf. Schol. Ad Aristides Panathen. 105, 11 p. 53 Dindorf, where *Κελεός* is substituted by *Dysaules* as it often happens⁹⁷). It is most important to bear in mind that the reception and good deeds extended to Demeter when, in search of Kore, she came to Eleusis, were mystic, that is, only to be known by the initiates. We have a very significant passage of Isocrates to this effect. In his *Panegyricus* §28 he writes: *Δήμητρος γὰρ ἀφικομένης εἰς τὴν χώραν*

ὄτ' ἐπλανήθη τῆς Κόρης ἀρπασθείσης, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς προγόνους ἡμῶν εὐμενῶς διατεθείσης ἐκ τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν ἃς οὐχ οἶόν τ' ἄλλοις ἢ τοῖς μεμνημένοις ἀκούειν, καὶ δούσης δωρεὰς διττὰς αἴπερ μέγισται τυγχάνουσιν οὐσαι, τοὺς τε καρπούς, οἳ τοῦ μὴ θηριωδῶς ζῆν ἡμῖν αἴτιοι γεγόνασι, καὶ τὴν τελετήν, ἧς μετασχόντες περὶ τε τῆς τοῦ βίου τελευτῆς καὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος αἰῶνος ἡδίου τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχουσιν. In gratitude for the inhabitants' mystic good deeds towards her, Demeter made two divine gifts, the greatest (*δωρεαί, αἴπερ μέγισται τυγχάνουσιν οὐσαι*) procured by the human race: fruits of the earth and the sacred rites of initiation⁹⁸. The former constituting the major step towards civilisation in this World, the other pertaining to death and beatitude after death.

There is abundant evidence regarding the former gift, its supremely beneficial influence on human life in general. The propagator of agricultural cultivation and the founder therefore of the civilised mode of life is Triptolemus, the type (2) boy in the above division. Is it not natural then to assume the existence of a corresponding boy who would play with regard to the *τελετή* the eminent role that Triptolemus played in connection with the *δημητριακοὶ καρποί*? This would be the mystic type (3) boy mentioned above. What was the name of this boy, assuming that there existed one? Pausanias (I, 14) is describing the Temple in Athens, by the Theatre of Dionysus, dedicated to Demeter and Kore and he reports that there was a statue of Triptolemus in it. He goes on to give some information about him on the occasion (omitting, as he says, what is connected with *Δηϊόνην* which I think we should substitute for *Δηϊόπην*; Persephone must be meant, the daughter of *Δηῶ*); but his project is cut short by a prohibition received by him in a dream not to enter into mystic details: *ἃ δὲ ἐς πάντα ὅσιον γράφειν, ἐς ταῦτα ἀποτρέβομαι*, he adds. The Argive⁹⁹ account of Triptolemus makes him the brother of Eubuleus. The Orphic account (Pausanias denies that the verses were written by Orpheus, not their Orphic provenance) concurs: (loc.cit. §3): *Ὀρφέως δέ, οὐδὲ ταῦτα Ὀρφέως ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν ὄντα, Εὐβουλεὶ καὶ Τριπτολέμῳ Δυσάλλην πατέρα εἶναι, μηνύσασι δὲ σφίσι περὶ τῆς παιδὸς δοθῆναι παρὰ Δήμητρος σπέειραι τοὺς καρπούς*.

The boy Eubuleus then must be the hero we want according to the reasoning above. The very name shows that he was connected with the mysteries, the *τελετή*, more directly than Triptolemus; for *Εὐβουλεύς*

is an epithet of Hades, Dionysus and Zeus (especially in his or their daemonic nature), in so far as it belongs to the mysteric and Orphic cultus¹⁰⁰. This special connection of the boy-hero with the mysteries is manifest in the Orphic hymn 41, addressed to Demeter, described as *Μήτηρ Ἀνταία* (the Great Mother, the one whom one unsuspectingly encounters, fearfully trembling before her Terrible and Sacred Majesty, especially when she is wroth). The hymn is very important in a number of ways. Invoking Demeter, it goes on thus:

*ἢ ποτε μαστεύουσα πολυπλάγκτω ἐν ἀνίῃ
νηστείαν κατέπαυσας Ἐλευσίνος ἐν γυάλουσιν,
ἠλθές τ' ἐς Ἀΐδην πρὸς ἀγαυὴν Περσεφόνειαν
δύσαγνος* παῖδ' ἀγνὸν ὀδηγητῆρα λαβοῦσα
μηρυτῆρ' ἀγίων λέκτρων χθονίου Διὸς ἀγνοῦ,
Εὐβουλον τεύξασα θεὸν θνητῆς ἀπ' ἀνάγκης.*

* The question of the soundness or otherwise of this reading will be discussed below.

This is the MSS reading, without the extensive in v. 6 introduced by Hermann and the substitution of ὑπ' for the existing ἀπ' in v. 8, originated by Vossius. I have only mutated *τεύξασα* to *τεύξασα*, made. The meaning of the passage is this: Demeter, wandering in wrath and sorrow, came to Eleusis, where she put an end to her fasting (naturally through Baubo's actions, as we may learn from our Orphic fragment), and, taking a chaste hero-boy as guide, as informer of the sacred marriage-couch of pure Chthonic Zeus (= Pluto), she reached Hades and came to Persephone in recompense making Eubulos a god, and removing him from the cycle of necessity, the bondage of this - wordly mortality. This latter sense is obviously required as providing the prototype of all initiation and *ἐποπτεία* *Εὐβουλος* is the first to become that which all *μύσται* and *ἔφοροι* are to become after death and through death: regenerated as gods, existing in divine beatitude as *μάκαρες* free from the bonds of necessity, from the pain of this world, from mortality, really *ἀπεθανατισμένοι*. This is what the golden ritualistic lamellae tell us in their formulaic expressions:

*ἔρχομαι ἐκ καθαρῶν καθαρὰ (sic), χθονίων βασιλεία
Εὐκλήης Εὐβουλεύς τε καὶ ἀθανάτοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι·
καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὑμῶν γένος ὄλβιον εὐχομαι εἶμεν.*

...
κύκλου δ' ἐξέπταν βαρυπενθέος ἀργαλείο

(this is the Bond of Matter and Necessity, the cycle of endless reincarnations in mortality)

...
«ὄλβιε καὶ μακαριστέ, θεὸς δ' ἔσμι ἀντὶ βροτοῖο».

These are the relevant passages from A1 (I reproduce Zuntz's classification in his *Persephone*, p. 301) = II B1 Pugliese Carratelli, from Thuri. Similarly in A2 where the significant formula is added:

ποιανὸν δ' ἀνταπέτειο' ἔργων ἔνεκα οὐτι δικάϊων· (II A1, II A2
Pugliese Carratelli)

referring to the *προπατορικὸν ἀμάρτημα*, the *ἀθέμιστα* committed by the Titans (from which the human race was originated) on *Ζαγρεύς*, cf. Olympiodorus *In Platonis Phaed.* B 1α', p. 87, 13 Norvin. And this is what Pindar tells us (Fr. 133 Snell), apud Plato, *Meno*, 81b-c: Plato is speaking about a *καλὸς καὶ ἀληθὴς λόγος*, taught by priests, priestesses and those among the poets who are divine, such as Pindar; the *λόγος* is concerned with soul's immortality and the cycles of reincarnation to which she is subjected; then he adds Pindar's passage:

οἷσιν δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποιανὸν παλαιοῦ πένθεος (sc. that caused by the
atrocities of the Titans of old)
δέξεται, εἰς τὸν ὑπερθεὶν ἄλιον κείνων ἐνάτω ἔτεϊ
ἀντιδοῖ ψυχὰς πάλιν,
ἐκ τῶν βασιλῆες ἀγανοὶ
καὶ σθένει κραιπνοὶ σοφία τε μέγιστοι
ἄνδρες αὔξοντ'· εἰς δὲ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἥρωες ἀγοὶ πρὸς
ἀνθρώπων καλεῦνται.

That is, those who made atonement for the misery of old, Persephone subjects to one more incarnation for the benefit of the human race then they become holy heros, exempt from the bonds of body and mortality.

In A4 (= II B2 Pugliese Carratelli), to the initiates it is proclaimed that death is far from a fearful thing: one should rejoice at it:

χαίρε παθῶν τὸ πάθημα τὸ δ' οὐπω πρόσθε ἐπεπόνθεις (that is, in previous deaths, the translation to the place of Beatitude was not forthcoming as the soul was not then initiated and made holy, pure and perfect)

θεὸς ἐγένου ἐξ ἀνθρώπου.

Similarly in B1 (= I A2 PC) the soul proclaims after death:

Γῆς παῖς εἰμι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος·
αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ γένος οὐράνιον· τόδε δ' ἴστε καὶ αὐτοί (sc. οἱ φύλακες of the lake Μνημοσύνη).

Child of Earth and Heaven: I am one of the Titans (cf. the Orphic hymn 37), a god, of heavenly race. The guardians having heard the declaration which implies knowledge (γνώσις, cf. similar Gnostic contexts) let the soul drink from the water of Μνημοσύνη whereupon:

καὶ τότε ἔπειτ' ἄλλοισι μεθ' ἡρώεσσιν ἀνάξεις

having become ἥρωσ as in the Pindaric fragment quoted above. The *θνητῇ ἀνάγκῃ* of the hymn is well illustrated by Proclus, *In Platonis Tim.* 42c-d (III, 296-7 Diehl). For example in 296, 7: *μία σωτηρία τῆς ψυχῆς αὕτη παρὰ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ προτείνεται τοῦ κύκλου τῆς γενέσεως ἀπαλλάττουσα καὶ τῆς πολλῆς πλάνης καὶ τῆς ἀνηνύτου ζωῆς etc.*; and in 297, 7: *... πᾶσαν δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς τὴν εὐδαίμονα περιάγουσα ζωὴν ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὴν γένεσιν πλάνης, ἧς καὶ οἱ παρ' Ὀρφεί τῷ Διονύσῳ καὶ τῇ Κόρῃ* (that is, in the *Μικρὰ Μυστήρια*) *τελούμενοι, τυχεῖν εὐχονται:*

κύκλου τ' ἂν λῆξαι καὶ ἀναπνεῦσαι κακότητος.

Similarly in Simplicius, *In Arist. De Caelo* II, I, 284a14 (p. 377, 12 sqq. Heiberg): *ἐνδεθῆναι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν πᾶσιν ἀφορίζοντος Δημιουργοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ τῆς εἰμαρμένης* (cf. the *ἀνάγκη* of our hymn) *τε καὶ γενέσεως τροχῶ, οὐπερ ἀδύνατον ἀπαλλαγῆναι κατὰ τὸν Ὀρφέα μὴ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐκείνους ἰλεωσάμενον,*

οἷς ἐπέταξεν
ὁ Ζεὺς κύκλου τ' ἀλλήξαι καὶ ἀναψύξαι κακότητος.

Empedocles took over the Orphic (and thus Orphic-Eleusinian) association of this worldly necessity, cyclicity and painful baseness in his powerful *νηστεῦσαι κακότητος* (B144 DK), a purifying abstinence from sordidness.

Eubulus then, is the boy-hero that we required for the Eleusinian *Τελετή*¹⁰¹. He was the first initiate, the archetypal pattern of all initiates. His image may be discoverable in the ἀφ' ἐστίας μούμενος (Apostolius, IV, 61 in *Corpus Paroem. Gr.*; Harpocratio (and Suda) s.v.; Isaeus Fr. 77 ed. Müller), who, according to Porphyry, *De Abstinētia* IV, 5, expiates and atones on behalf of all those undergoing initiation by acting exactly as he is directed, obviously in representation of what happened with Eubulus: ὅπερ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ὁ ἀφ' ἐστίας λεγόμενος παῖς, <ὄς> ἀντὶ πάντων τῶν μνουμένων ἀπομειλίσσεται τὸ θεῖον, ἀκριβῶς δρῶν τὰ προστεταγμένα. This is probably the *ἱερός παῖς* of Himerius XXIII 7, 18.

Confirmation of my view is provided by inscriptional evidence as well. In the Athenian inscription (No 13, Dittenberger1 = I Atticae No. 76 vol. I ed. Minor pp. 39-41) found in Eleusis, written in the old alphabet (and dating perhaps according to Lipsius from 439 BC or, according to Ziehen 423/2 BC), in the midst of instructions relating to the use to be made of the proceeds from fruits of the earth which were sent to Athens from other cities in Greece according to the Pythian Oracle (cf. Isocrates, *Panegy.* §31), we read vv. 36-39: θύεν δὲ ἀπὸ μὲν τῷ πελάνο (cf. Harpocratio s.v.) καθότι ἂν Εὐμολπίδαι ἐκσευ-όνται, τριττοῖαν δὲ βόαρχον χρυσόκερον (cf. lexicographers s. v. *Τριπτύα* or *Τριπτύς*) τοῖν θεοῖν ἑκατέραι (sc. to Demeter and Persephone) ἀπὸ τῶν κριθῶν καὶ τῶν πυρῶν, καὶ τοῖ *Τριπτολέμοι* καὶ τοῖ *Θεοῖ* καὶ τῆι *θεᾷ* (cf. Inscr. Att. III, 1109: *κοσμητῆς ἐφήβων ἱερεὺς θεοῦ καὶ θεᾶς Εἰρηναῖος Παιανιεύς*) καὶ τοῖ *Εὐβόλοι* ἱερεῖον ἐκάστοι τέλεον, καὶ τῆι Ἀθηναίαι βον χρυσόκερον. We find then in the Eleusinian ritual: Demeter, Persephone, Triptolemos, Eubulos, θεός, θεά.

The nature of θεός and θεά will be elucidated in a moment. Meanwhile, it has been established that the only boy-heroes involved

are Triptolemos (for the transmission of the exoteric gift) and Eubulos (for the archetypal initiation). These were the real boys or youths involved. Mention of any other boy must be symbolic; it will pertain to the divine order, not to the divinised one. And this is what we shall see is actually the case.

Having made this analysis, we should be reminded that, further, Arnobius makes it clear that the puerile appearance belonged to Baubo's pudenda, and not to any real child participating in the scene¹⁰².

For the same reasons I also discard the attempt to introduce both a *τύπος* in Baubo's pudenda and an actual child. This, it would appear, was Hermann's intention. For as he edits the fragment (*παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἰακχος, / χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκε γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις*) together with his apparently approving remark *μὲν ad τύπον referendum censuit Dorvilius'*, seem enough reason to him to foster that inadequate construal. It cannot be so: there is no real child around in the affair; the child is symbolic and mythological; the childlike appearance belongs to something in Baubo's fundament¹⁰³.

With the preceding positive and negative preparation, it will perhaps not require much explanation to offer the true solution to the difficulties. For the purpose of the adequate treatment and coverage of a given field is just this, that the solution should emerge naturally and be seen to fit naturally the problem and field in question.

There was some form of a *membrum virile* in Baubo's fundament. This was Iacchus, this was (part at least of) the *τύπος*. Baubo herself was playing and sporting with it. So, first, we have come across the fundamental duality of male and female in juxtaposition and interpenetration; male and female pudenda in copulation; the male and female principles in co-working, and co-generation. This is the symbolism of the all-powerful Phallus and the sacred Womb of Life. This is the *θεός* and the *θεά* mentioned above in the inscription from Eleusis. And then, furthermore, secondly, we see the ultimate identity of the two principles in the aboriginal fusion of a Phallic Womb.

In a clear enumeration of the divinities involved in the Eleusinian mysteries a reference to the male god, to the *Βριμός* of the hierophantic invocation, to Iacchus-Dionysus, is necessary. The hymn sung by the *μύσται* in their procession in Aristophanes *Ranae* is

addressed to Demeter, Persephone et Iacchus. And in Euripides' *Ion* we have the three closely associated: ὁ πολύμυθος θεός (v. 1075), ἡ χρυσοστέφανος κόρη (v. 1085) and ἡ σεμνή μήτηρ (1086). (The occurrence of the bare θεός here to signify the mystic Dionysus is significant in our context). Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* II ch. 24 (§62) sharply distinguishes the Dionysus of Semele from the Dionysus of the Mysteries, in a context which implies the full divinity of the latter: ...hunc dico Liberum Semela natum, not eum, quem nostri majores auguste sancteque [Liberum] cum Cerere et Libera consecraverunt, quod quale sit, ex mysteriis intellegi potest... The distinction of the Semelean Dionysus from the Eleusinian one is forcefully implied by Nonnus *Dionysiaca* XXXI, 66-69, the latter being the Ζαγρεύς begotten from Zeus by Persephone. Demeter, Persephone, Iacchus are the deities involved in the Eleusinian Mysteries. Iacchus is the ἀρχηγέτης τῶν Μυστηρίων τῆς Δήμητρος¹⁰⁴ as Strabo puts it (X, 3, 10, p. 468) distinguishing this δαίμων (i.e. daemonic, pre-Olympian, deity) from Dionysus, who is also called Iacchus. Iacchus is (in aspectual identification with) the Dionysus of the Eleusinian Mysteries, a manifestation of the Orphic-Mystic Zagreus. The statue of Iacchus was brought to Eleusis from the Eleusinion in Athens during the sacred procession on the holiest day, the εἰκὰς Βοηδρομιῶνος (cf. Plutarchus, *Phocion*, 28; *Camillus*, 19; *Alcibiades*, 34; sch. in Aristoph. *Ranae* 323)¹⁰⁵.

Now this Iacchus was thoroughly disreputable in the eyes of the Christian Fathers who knew something about mysteries; Clement, *Protrept.* p. 19 Potter: ἀπόσβesson, ὡ ἱεροφάντα, τὸ πῦρ· αἰδέσθητι δαδούχε τὰς λαμπάδας· ἐλέγχει σου τὸν Ἰακχον τὸ φῶς etc. And this was so because of his sexual nature: Iacchus was the θεός and θεά in conjunction and interpenetration; the Διόνυσος and Μίσση of the Orphic hymn 42; the Phallus and the Womb¹⁰⁶.

It is in this light also that, I think, we should interpret the already adduced inscription from Paros (No 5441 in the *Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, III, 2, 5, *Die Ionischen Inschr.* Ed. Bechtel): Ἐρασίππη Θράσωνος Ἥρη (but HIPH really on the marmble) Δήμητρι θεσμοφόρῳ καὶ Κόρῃ καὶ Διὶ Εὐβουλεὶ καὶ Βαυβοῖ. Ζεὺς Εὐβουλεύς is aspectually identified with Dionysus Zagreus, in the identity of Father and Son¹⁰⁷. And Baubo represents, as we have seen, the female principle in its aboriginal plenipotentiality as the Ur-

Womb in which the Phallus is contained and from which it emerges. We thus discover in various permutations again the *θεός* and *θεά*, the Phallus and the Womb¹⁰⁸.

This must be the substance of the case. But for the complete solution of the problem, there remains to be further determined the nature of the male member concerned. Two real possibilities present themselves: either it was a likeness, an artificial penis (cf. the *κόκκινος βαυβών* or *ὄλισβος* of which we have spoken above); or Baubo was an androgynous being, a female hermaphrodite, so to speak, and hence the male organs were underdeveloped like those of a young child.

In favour of the former alternative would seem to tell:

a) The practices and circumstances narrated and explained previously, as they are mainly gathered from the comic poets;

b) the use of the word *τύπος* if taken to mean the same as *ὁμοίωμα*;

and c) what is implied by the formulaic utterance in the Eleusinian Mysteries, which is brought in immediate and intrinsic connection to the Baubo-incident by both Clement and Arnobius. The formula, as given by Clement (*Protrept.* II, 21, 2) is this¹⁰⁹: *ἐνήστευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεῶνα, ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἐργασάμενος ἀπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστην*. Clearly, the *ἐργασάμενος* must refer in some way to the lewd practices of those using *ὄλισβους*; cf. in a religious context the *θεὸς διὰ κόλπου* in the Sabazic mysteries, Clement, *Protr.* II, 16, 2¹¹⁰.

But, contra:

a') The aforementioned practices and circumstances may indicate rather than reproduce the general nature of the incident, and thus bear a general or partial similarity to it; they may find their exact equivalence in the rites connected with that incident, rites performed in reminiscence and repetition of what happened subsequently and consequently upon that incident, not of the incident itself. (For a clarification of this view see immediately below).

b') *Τύπος* has such a wide spectrum of signification (ranging from impression to archetype and from the mould to the image moulded) that its meaning here should be determined by the required sense of the passage, rather than conditioning that sense.

c') Clearly, the formula refers to what Demeter did and suffered not to Baubo's actions and passions. This point connects us with

remark (a') above. The operations of the initiates instead represent Demeter's activity as subsequent to Baubo's incident. Thus, it is to Demeter's behaviour after she had drunk the cyceon that, I think, St. Gregory Nazianzenus refers in *Oratio* IV (*I contra Julianum*) p. 653 Migne (a passage already referred to above), citing the Orphic verse:

ὥς εἰπούσα θεὰ δαιοὺς ἀνεσύρατο μηρούς,

and adding: ἵνα τελέσῃ τοὺς ἐραστάς· ἃ καὶ νῦν ἔτι τελεῖται τοῖς σχήμασιν (my reading, retaining the transmitted *τελεῖται*; usually, e.g. Lobeck, it is ἵνα τελέσῃ τοὺς ἐραστὰς ἃ καὶ νῦν ἔτι τελεῖ τοῖς σχήμασιν). To which Nonnus Abbas notes *ad loc.* p. 1023 Migne: τοῦ δὲ περὶ τῆς Δήμητρος ἔπος ὁ νοῦς ἔστιν οὗτος: ὅτι ἐπαιρομένη ἢ θεὰ τοὺς ἑαυτῆς μηρούς ἀνεσύρετο λέγει δὲ περὶ τῶν ἱματίων - ἵνα, φησί, τοὺς ἐρώντας αὐτῆς ἀξιώσει τῆς συνουσίας. By τοῖς σχήμασιν St. Gregory means I think: not actual coition, but rather going through the motions, as it were, without really performing the act of. The *σχῆμα* meant here in particular is the position a woman takes when, ready and expectant with bare pudendum, she calls for the performance of the act. St. Gregory's testimony is singularly significant in view of my analysis of the symbolism of the Eleusinian Mysteries to follow. The same St. Gregory seems to divide Demeter's operations into two classes, what she does and what she suffers, both in an obscene context, *Oratio* XXXIX *In sancta Lumina*, p. 337 Migne: οὐδὲ Κόρη τις ἡμῖν ἀρπάζεται, καὶ Δημήτηρ πλανᾶται, καὶ Κελεοῦς τινὰς ἐπεισάγει καὶ Τριπτολέμους καὶ δράκοντας, καὶ τὰ μὲν ποιεῖ, τὰ δὲ πάσχει· αἰσχύνομαι γὰρ ἡμέρα δοῦναι τὴν νυκτὸς τελετὴν οἶδεν Ἐλευσίς ταῦτα καὶ οἱ τῶν σιωπωμένων ἐπόπται. This is repeated, in relation to the Mother of the Gods or Rhea, a few lines before: καὶ ὅσα περὶ τὴν Ρέα ἀνθρωποὶ μαίνονται, τελούντες τῇ μητρὶ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τελούμενοι, ὅσα τῇ μητρὶ τῶν τοιούτων εἰκόσ. This conjugation and bipolarity of action and passion in the mystery context cannot be a mere coincidence or loose formulation; St. Gregory is usually brief but accurate in his references to ancient religious lore: his studies in Athens must have helped him in this respect. The goddess does something and suffers something; the person undergoing initiation suffers something, but also does something¹¹¹.

There was then, in all probability, some kind of *συνουσία* of Demeter (after she had abandoned her grief following Baubo's exhibition), during which she acts and she suffers with somebody, but with whom? One possibility is with Celeus; see the scholiast ad Aristeides, *Panathen.* 105.11 (p. 53 Dindorf): (*Δημήτηρ*) *παρὰ Κελεοῦ καὶ Τριπτολέμου τὸν ἥρπακότα* (sc. *τὴν Περσεφόνην*) *μαθοῦσα, μισθὸν αὐτοῖς ἀποδίδωσι τῆς μνήσεως τὸν σῖτον, πρῶτον ἀθέσμως συγγενομένη Κελεῶ τῷ Τριπτολέμου πατρί, etc.*¹¹². It is significant that the introduction (or confirmation, see the account in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter) of orderly agricultural life is brought here into intimate relation to Demeter's intimacies with Celeus (cf. the similar story with Iasion). The *ἀθέσμως* contrasts to the *θεσμοφόρος*, I suppose, referring to a non-orderly, abnormal, illicit, unlawful copulation. The relevance of *σίτος* in a sexually laden context may be very appositely illustrated by the hymn in Hippolytus, *Elenchus Omnium Haeresium*, V, 9, 8, which is interpreted by Hippolytus Gnostic Ophitic source as signifying in various ways the mystic semen, the Great God, source and life of all existence. (The scansion is a wonderful example of mechanical typolatry; but I lazily here reproduce Wendland's text):

εἴτε Κρόνου, εἴτε Διὸς μάκαρ,
εἴτε Ρέας μεγάλας, χαῖρε <ᾶ> τὸ κατ-
ηφὲς ἄκουσμα Ρέας Ἄττι· σὲ κα-
λοῦσι μὲν Ἀσσύριοι τριπόθητον Ἄ-
δωνι, ...

... καὶ

οἱ Φρύγες ἄλλοτε μὲν Πάπαν, ποτὲ
δὲ <ᾶ> νέκυν ἢ θεὸν ἢ τὸν ἄκαρπον ἢ
αἰπόλον, ἢ χλοερὸν στάχυν ἀμη-
θέντα, ...

Thus semen and corn are but manifestations of the same portentous principle, worshipped in its phallic form. Both are hidden in an *αἰδῆς τόπος*, in the womb of life, in order to reveal their power and produce a new existence. Thus it is that the great and wonderful and perfect mystery of the last epoptic stage of initiation is a newly cut ear of corn which is exhibited there in profound silence (*ibid.* V 8, 39):

Λέγουσι δὲ αὐτόν (sc. the Primal God, the Universal Semen) φησί (sc. the Orphic text which Hippolytus is following), Φρύγες καὶ χλοερὸν στάχυν τεθερισμένον (cf. Attis' emasculation, and Dionysus' membrum in the Corybantic *κίστη* teste Clemente), καὶ μετὰ τοὺς Φρύγας Ἀθηναῖοι μούντες Ἐλευσίνα καὶ ἐπιδεικνύντες τοῖς ἐποπέουσιν τὸ μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν καὶ τελειότατον ἐποπτικὸν ἐκεῖ μυστήριον ἐν σιωπῇ, τεθερισμένον στάχυν. This is further, and most importantly, brought into connection with the *Βριμός* mentioned above and in circumstances which require profound meditation: ὁ δὲ στάχυς οὗτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ παρὰ Ἀθηναίους ὁ παρὰ τοῦ ἀχαρακτηρίστου (sc. the semen productive of everything, not having the form of anything) φωστήρ τέλειος μέγας (cf. Aristophanes *Ranae* 341-2: Ἰακχ ὦ Ἰακχε, / νυκτέρου τελετῆς φωσφόρος ἀστήρ where see the scholia: τὸ μυστηριακὸν πῦρ φωσφόρον λέγουσιν. For the μυστικὸν πῦρ see also Scholiast ad Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 1048 ἢ λαμπάσιν ἀκταῖς. Cf. Sophocles *Antigone* 1147 where Iacchus is χοραγὸς ἄστρων; cf. also Euripides *Ion* 1074 sqq.), καθάπερ αὐτὸς ὁ ἱεροφάντης, οὐκ ἀποκεκομμένος μὲν, ὡς ὁ Ἄττις (and the Γάλλοι, priests of Magna Mater), εὐνουχισμένος δὲ διὰ κωνείου καὶ πᾶσαν ἀπηρητημένος τὴν σαρκικὴν γένεσιν, νυκτὸς ἐν Ἐλευσίνι ὑπὸ πολλῶ πυρὶ τελῶν τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἄρρητα μυστήρια βοᾷ καὶ κέκραγε λέγων: «ἱερὸν ἔτεκε πότνια κοῦρον Βριμὼ Βριμόν», τουτέστι Ἰσχυρά, Ἰσχυρόν. The ἀμηθεὶς στάχυς represents the offering, on a symbolic level, of the male αἰδοῖα to the Sacred Womb, of Attis' pudenda to Cybele. This is why the μούμενος must undergo and suffer something as we saw above: he must loose his manhood, offer it to the Great Female in sacred awe and unquestioning veneration. This is what we saw our Orphic source tells us further down: speaking about the Gates of Heaven and the House of God (and we know that the οἶκος functioned significantly in Orphic-Eleusinian doctrine) ὅπου ὁ ἀγαθὸς θεὸς (we are reminded of the ἀγαθὸς θεός whom Pausanias wanted to identify with Zeus) κατοικεῖ μόνος, εἰς ὃ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται, φησὶν, ἀκάθαρτος οὐδεὶς, οὐ ψυχικός, οὐ σαρκικός, ἀλλὰ τηρεῖται πνευματικοῖς μόνοις, ὅπου δεῖ γενομένους ἀποβαλεῖν (addidi) τὰ ἐνδύματα καὶ πάντας γενέσθαι νυμφίους ἀπηρσενωμένους διὰ τοῦ παρθενικοῦ πνεύματος. The formulation is gnostic but we are able now to see through it^{112a}.

Enough has been said on the symbolism of the ear of corn and its implications for the time being. We can now understand the potency of the symbol and its frequency in representations of divinities associated with the Eleusinian cultus and in particular of Demeter. Nonetheless a confirmation by a grammarian is welcome. Pollux II 168 has: τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ στέρνων ἐπ' αἰδοῖα (sc. μέρος τοῦ σώματος), κατὰ τὸν κενεῶνα, κοιλία καλεῖται καὶ γαστήρ... τὸ δὲ ὑπὸ τῆ γαστρί, στάχυς καλεῖται. What more can we wish for? We begin to appreciate in its deeper meaning the inner, organic connection between the two boons bestowed by Demeter to humanity: agriculture and initiation.

Before proceeding further we should consider a passage from the scholia on Aristophanes, *Ranae* 323: εἰσι γοῦν οἱ φασὶν Περσεφόνης αὐτὸν (sc. the mystic Dionysus, Iacchus) εἶναι· οἱ δὲ τῆ Δήμητρι συγγενέσθαι. I take this to refer to a symbolical, archetypal copulation, consonant with what I argued above about Iacchus not being a real but a symbolical boy, a full blown divine being. He certainly is ὑποκόλπιος, ἐπάφιος καὶ χοιροψάλας, and this is just another instance of the same character. (Compare also what will be said below on his snake-form, and his seeing Demeter naked). Incidentally this would give a surpassing double entendre to the Aristophanic invocation: Ἰακχ', ὦ πολυτιμήτοις (πολυτίμοις Hermann metri causa) ἐν ἔδραις ναίων. (Look also, in the same light, at Sophocles, *Antigone* 1120-1 and see what will be said below on the play on μύρτον). This illustrates how fuller understanding, procured by utilisation of all (including so-called late) sources within the Greek tradition, enhance our chances of comprehending better and more fully and topically even immaculately classical texts and authors.

But even though I do not think that this passage reports an actual copulation (as the one say between Demeter and Celeus), it yet provides the divine archetype of one. The archetype is of the child-husband. (And if, as in certain accounts, Dionysus was Demeter's offspring, we have here the even more potent symbol of the son-husband; it is not very different if we substitute τροφός for mother). In illustration, and leaving aside parallel oriental faiths, I need only refer to Cicero, *De Divinatione*, 41: is est hodie locus septus religiose propter Jovis pueri, qui lactens cum Junone Fortunae in gremio

sedens, mammam adpetens, castissime colitur a matribus. Thus we better understand Suda's lemma: Ἰακχος· Διόνυσος ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῷ. (Compare also Strabo I 470: καὶ ὁ Σαβάζιος δὲ τῶν Φρυγιάκων ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον τινα τῆς μητρὸς τὸ παιδίον, παραδοὺς τὰ τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ αὐτός). It is the archetype of the child-husband, projected also into the sexually and spiritually intense relationship of the passive-active beautiful youth to the active-passive mature woman, of Attis to Cybele ultimately it is the deification of the membrum virile, in all its aspects and conditions through its dedication and consecration to the Great Universal Mother.

In fine, I may refer to an inscription found in Rome CIG 6206:

κείμεαι Ἀνρήλιος Ἀντώνιος ὁ καὶ
 ἱερεὺς τῶν[δ]ε θεῶν πάντων, πρῶτον Βοναδίης (= Bona Dea)
 εἶτα Μητρὸς θεῶν καὶ Διονύσου καὶ Ἑγεμόνος.

We have here gods and goddesses of mystery cults and orgiastic rites (Ἑγεμών may be rightly explained by Dieterich, *Die Göttin Miso* p. 9, as Ἰακχος in connection with Strabo X, 468 where Ἰακχος is described as ἀρχηγέτης τῶν Μυστηρίων τῆς Δήμητρος). We have seen, e.g., what Juvenal testifies about the worship of Bona Dea. And yet this priest is shown by the death inscription to have been a boy of seven years old. In order to illustrate the excellent coherence of our sources in general (and consequently how inapposite is the hypercritical attitude prevailing nowadays in the scholarly handling of our evidences), I shall indicate that the fact of the boy-priest being seven years old is significant. For Hippolytus, *Elenchus*, in the valuable fifth book, has this passage relating to the Ophitic doctrine of their ultimate principle, the Semen: it is about a μακαρία κρυβομένη ὁμοῦ καὶ φανερομένη φύσις (which is, they say, the inhering in man, though searched after, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν), περὶ ἧς διαρρηδην ἐν τῷ κατὰ Θωμᾶν ἐπιγραφόμενῳ Εὐαγγελίῳ (an uncanonical one) παραδιδόασιν λέγοντες οὕτως: «ἐμὲ ὁ ζητῶν εὐρήσει ἐν παιδίῳ ἀπὸ ἐτῶν ἐπτὰ· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ αἰῶνι κρυβόμενος φανεροῦμαι» (take κρυβόμενος with ἐκεῖ, and φανεροῦμαι with ἐν τῷ τεσσαρ. αἰῶνι). Τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶν Χριστοῦ, ἀλλὰ Ἰπποκράτους λέγοντος «ἐπτὰ ἐτῶν παῖς πατρὸς ἡμῶν»· ὅθεν οὗτοι τὴν ἀρχέγονον φύσιν τῶν ὄλων ἐν ἀρχεγόνῳ τιθέμενοι σπέρ-

ματι, τὸ Ἱπποκράτειον ἀκηκοότες, ὅτι ἔστιν ἡμῖν πατρὸς παιδίων ἑπτὰ ἔτων, ἐν τοῖς τέσσαρσι <καὶ δέκα> φασὶν ἔτεσι, κατὰ τὸν Θωμᾶν, εἶναι φανερούμενον. The doctrine is that from the age of seven, semen exists *κρυφίως* in boys; at fourteen, it becomes manifest, thus entitling them really to potential fatherhood. Hence the significance of a seven year old boy as priest of mysteries; the connection of the Ophitic circle of gnosticism with ancient mysteries is manifest in our sources. *Παῖς* according to the Hippocratic division of ages in man's life covers precisely the interval from seven to fourteen years old. *Παῖς* is thus in potential manhood and fatherhood, awaiting for the revelation of the generative principle of life; just as the *μούμενος* is in potential divinity, ready for the revelation of what is au fond the same principle of life and death the *Διόνυσος* - *Ἄιδωνεύς* (= *Ζαγρεύς*) of Heraclitus.

Iacchus provides the archetypal model, the divinity itself of the Semen (to speak with the Ophites) in its offering himself up in dedication and consecration and passivity to the great, engulfing, active Female. The actual encounter is of Demeter with a real boy-hero, the first *τελούμενος* of the sacred, saving mysteries (and not with Celeus and his *ἄθροσμος* concourse) whom we have seen called Eubulus or Eubuleus.

This is the place to return to the Orphic Hymn to *Μήτηρ Ἀνταία* (No 41), who is the Cybele-Demeter, or rather the Cybelic Demeter¹¹³. The passage in question appears in the archetypus, according to Quandt as follows, to reproduce it again:

ἦλθές τ' εἰς Ἄϊδην πρὸς ἀγαυὴν Περσεφόνειαν,
 δύσαγνος παῖδ' ἀγνὸν ὀδηγητῆρα λαβοῦσα,
 μηνυτῆρ' ἀγίων λέκτρων χθονίου Διὸς ἀγνοῦ,
 Εὐβουλον τέξασα θεὸν θνητῆς ἀπ' ἀνάγκης.

In discussing it above, I kept the transmitted text, changing only *τέξασα* to *τεύξασα*. Now *δύσαγνος* is *prima facie* unmetrical (because of *δύσ-*). Nonetheless it was retained by the editors until Hermann. A mystic appositeness was no doubt felt - compare with Scaliger's rendering: *Ipsa ducem offendens purum non pura puellum*. Can then the reading *δύσαγνος* be retained metrically? I think it can, since the syllable *δυσ-* may be considered as *κοινή*¹¹⁴. Retaining it

then, we must ask: Why exactly was Demeter impure? Gesner noted: *propter luctum, puto*. This is not really as outlandish as it may appear at first sight, misery being at rock bottom founded on impurity according to the ancient mind, or at any rate constituting a kind of impurity, a repulsive circumstance to be eschewed, something bespeaking and proceeding from almost impiety and godlessness. However, I do not think that this would be a sufficiently strong and appropriate meaning in our Orphic context. I suspect we must look for something more meaningfully significant in the context of the Mysteries.

And let it be firstly noticed that *δύσαγνος* often implies a state of mind set on things sexual, on unlawful rape and coition. So the Danaides in Aeschylus' *Supplikes* fear the approach of Aegyptus' sons (v. 750 sqq.):

*δουλόφρονες δὲ καὶ δολιομήτιδες, δυσάγνοις φρεσίν,
κόρακες ὥστε, βωμῶν ἀλέγοντες οὐδέν ---*

And the implication is made explicit in one of (the prophet) Alexander's oracles apud Lucianus, *Alexander*, p. 258: *...ἐμίσει (sc. ἐμέ), ὡς τὸ εἶκός, καὶ ἔχθιστον ἠγάειτο, καὶ ποτε περὶ ἐμοῦ ἐρομένῳ τῷ Ρουτιλλιανῶ ἔφη*

Νυκτιπλάνοις ἄροις χαίρει κοίταις τε δυσάγνοις.

Furthermore, we possess a very important testimony in Hesychius s.v. *Ἀχθεία*, which he explains: *ἡ Δημήτηρ, μυστικῶς*. It should not be thought that he refers to Demeter's condition when she was weighed down from sorrow upon the loss of the Kore. This is in fact one of the explanations for her other epithet, *Ἀχαία* (cf. Suda, Hesychius and Etym. Magnum s.v.¹¹⁵; sch. Aristophanes *Acharnenses* 708-9; Herodotus V, 61; Nicander, *Theriaca* 485 where the goddess transforms a boy to a gecko on her visit and reception at Eleusis with the sch.) but there is nothing mystic about it. Therefore *Ἀχθεία* must relate to something not divulged to the uninitiated. Can we guess what that might be? Another Hesychian lemma may help us. *Ἀχθη ἀκαθαρσία. ἀφρὸς θαλάσσης*. The second explanation may somehow relate or point to the *ἀφρός* from which *Ἀφρογένεια*, *Ἀφροδίτη* was

born. The former is connected to the sense which the root of ἄγγω, ἄχ-νυ-μαι, ἄχ-ο-μαι, ἀχ-εύω, ἄχ-ος, ἄχ-θος, ἄχ-θ-ομαι has, according to comparative philology, in Sanskrit (agh-a-m: evil, sin; cf., e.g., Curtius §166a, p. 190). I suggest that Δήμητρα Ἀχθεία is connected to some uncleanness and impurity, she is δύσαγνος. This is further connected, in our hymn, with the boy Eubulus, and contrasted to his purity. The boy's purity, after what has been said above, must consist in his not as yet being ἔφ-ηβος, not having as yet fully manifested the agency of the all-powerful Ophitic God. (Or he has not as yet actually defiled Him, in the contamination and impurity of ordinary, generative intercourse). I propose to interpret Demeter's impurity in an equally sexual sense¹¹⁶. To think that her ἄθεσμος concubitus with Celeus, or some similar story, is being alluded to here, may be also correct, but it is first-level; more probably, Demeter's wishes and designs towards the pure boy may repeat Cybele's attitudes towards Attis and Aphrodite-Astarte's towards Adonis. The pattern is the same: a mature, maternal Power and the young Male hero resplendent in his chaste purity, with their roles as it were reversed. The male qua male is offered up to the Great Female, dedicating to Her impure chastity his untouched, bursting sexuality consecrated and purified in this sacred offering. He becomes thereby ἀπηρσενωμένος (as our Ophitic source put it) and thus spiritually and religiously saved from the filth of worldly generation. By consecrating one's divine spark instead of defiling it in the ἀκάθαρτος μήτρα, one is saved. But this does not imply abstinence. It is, as always in ritual, the performance of the impure acts in a religious context and the symbolical revelation of their innermost core and essence, which ritualistically achieves deliverance from them. This is the great secret of the substance of symbolism: one is not so much indirectly referring to the physical acts by a process of metaphorical (as it were) replacement and substitution; but rather the very acts are enacted in their essential core as the natural symbol of that real, overpowering power transcending human concerns and humanity itself, which is actively but partially manifested in them. By getting to the real symbolic substance of the processes of generation in their marked extremities, one is delivered from their hold and fascination. Changes in the official cultus towards more substitutional imagery and less real natural symbolism, effected through the moral progress of mankind,

do not subtract anything from the validity of that thesis; they on the contrary presuppose it.

The boy-hero is thus offered up and consecrated to Demeter. The *στάχυς*, the ear of corn which she often holds in her hand in representations, is a symbol of that votive offering signifying purity. She absorbs, in a purificatory way, all his potential and future filth; thus she is *Ἀχθεία*¹¹⁷. In this great Mystery she is, as we saw above, both active and passive. She is passive, she the Great Female, the Earth-Womb of the World, as she receives the offering and consecration of the boy's manhood. But she is also active in sacredly desiring him, in sexually desiring the pure as pure, in impurely desiring his chaste sexuality: *δύσαγνος ἄγνον παῖδα* etc.; active further in effecting the purification through her active desire.

It is thus that we should understand the *ποιεῖ* and *πάσχει* of St. Gregory with respect to Demeter; and the *ἀπαρσενώματα* of the Ophitic source; and the Aristotelian dictum that in mysteries one is not so much doing anything (as distinct from acting his role), but rather is disposed to undergo the divine action. It is further thus, to add one more testimony to the already given ones, that one of the epitheta of Demeter was *Ἐνεργίς* (v. Hesychius s.v.; for *ἐνεργεῖν* as *βινεῖν* v. Theocritus IV, 61 with the sch.)¹¹⁸. One is also reminded of the *Δήμητρα Προσύμνη* reported by Pausanias above quoted, which, in the context of the Prosymnus Dionysus story, appears in the light of an almost phallic Demeter.

This is then the context in whose terms the *δύσαγνος* in the hymn may be not only appropriate, but also highly significant¹¹⁹. Of course, my point would have been further strengthened, if I had kept the text in the fourth line of the passage as it is usually edited:

Ἐΰβουλον τέξασα θεὸν θνητῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης.

This then would mean that out of the coition of Demeter with the holy youth (hence the *θνητῆ ἀνάγκη*), she begot a god, Eubulus. I have argued above for a different construal; but if this was after all the correct reading, the sense would be equally consonant with my account of the fundamental symbolism of the mystery. We should then say that the child born was not so much the offspring of an actual parturition, but rather the divinised manhood of the boy, secreted

from him and consecratedly offered to the Great Mother¹²⁰. For in any case the point of the Great Mysteries (in contrast to the lesser ones) was not so much the sacred marriage of the Male and the Female (of Zeus and Demeter or Zeus and Persephone) and the birth of the Son (Dionysus-Zagreus); but rather the transcendence of copulation, and its transformation into consecrative offering of the Phallus to the Womb of Life, the latter engulfing the former actively (not the former forcing his way into the latter according to the symbol of the Serpent-in-the-Womb), the latter actively embracing the former both protectively and purificatorily in chaste, higher delectation of unchaste, unsatisfied desire. In a certain sense, we may say that the sublimely erotic love of the Mother for the Son is here taking precedence (as incorporated into the Great Mysteries) over the subordinate and (metaphysically and religiously) deducible love between Man and Woman (as symbolized in the Small Mysteries). In another, connected respect, we may say that the Androgynic archetype is being offered greater veneration than the separated models of the Male and the Female.

Before proceeding further, a few words remain to be said regarding the meaning of the mysteric formulary: *ἐνήστευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεῶνα, ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἐργασάμενος ἀπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστην*. The two first clauses are self-explanatory (even though their ultimate signification, which coincides with the ultimate meaning of Demeter's *πένθος* and search for the Kore, I shall not discuss here). But the problem of *κίστη* (or *κίστις*) and its contents is formidable. *Κίστη* was ordinarily a covered basket or hamper (usually plaited or twisted hence Hesychius explains it as *ἀγγεῖον πλεκτόν*, from bark or wicker work) suitable, depending on its size¹²¹, for storing food or garments, or as a case in which, e.g. women put their ornaments when going to bed¹²². Sometimes they were employed for special purposes, in which cases they used to bear specific names; thus there existed a *θεωρικὴ κίστη*, and *κοιτίδες* (*κοίτις* being a small *κοίτη* which is equivalent to *κίστη*, v. Hesychius s.v. *κοίτη*)¹²³. They were also used by druggists and apothecaries for their medicines¹²⁴.

In the context of mystery religion, *κίσται*, *λίκνα* (or *κάνητες* v. Pollux VI, 86) and *κάλαθοι* were playing a cardinal role, just as *κανᾶ* were necessary in all sacrifices. It should be emphasized that, evidently, we must clearly distinguish between *κίστη* and *λίκνον*. The former is

a chest, the latter a winnowing-fan or a cradle. Thus the mystica vannus Iacchi of Virgil (*Georg.* I, 166) relates to *μύησις*, just as *κίστη* probably was more prominent in the final *ἐποπτεία*. The use of the latter in religious ceremonies seems more common and widespread (Harpocration s.v. *λικνοφόρος· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Κτησιφῶντος* (*De Corona*, 260, p. 313 ed. Reiske). *Τὸ λίκνον πρὸς πᾶσαν τελετὴν καὶ θυσίαν ἐπιτήδειον ἐστίν· ὁ τοῦτο οὖν φέρων λικνοφόρος λέγεται ἄν*¹²⁵; whereas the *κίστη* was sacred to the two *θεαί* and the mysteric Dionysus (and used in the ritual worship of deities aspectually identified with this triad in one way or another): so Harpocration s.v. *κιττοφόρος* (alluding to the same Demosthenian passage) has: *ἔνιοι μετὰ τοῦ σ γράφουσι*¹²⁶, *κιττοφόρος· τὰς γὰρ λεγομένας κίστας ἱερὰς εἶναι ἔλεγον τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ταῖν θεαῖν* (this is the Dionysus of the mysteries, Zagreus and Iacchus). Plutarch, *Phocia*, 28, mentions these *κίσται* (sacred to the Eleusinian Triad) and calls them *μυστικαὶ κοίται*; around them were wound bands and fillets of a deep purple-red shade which were replaced by others of a sickly, deadly fallow hue during the Great Mysteries: *τότε δὲ περὶ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας* (sc. *τῶν Μεγάλων Μυστηρίων*) *αἱ ταινίαι μὲν, αἷς περιελίττουσι τὰς μυστικὰς κοίτας, βαπτόμεναι θάψινον ἀντὶ φοινικοῦ χρώμα καὶ νεκρῶδες ἀνήνεγκαν*. When Psyche implores Ceres to help her in the search for her divine husband Eros, she invokes her ...per tacita secreta (vel sacra) cistarum ...et cetera quae silentio tegit Eleusis, Atticae sacrarium (Apuleius, *Met.* VI, 111). And Catullus, speaking of Iacchus and his wild train elegantly reproduces the orgiastic atmosphere without failing to mention all the main ritual utensils (Carmen LXIV 256 ff.):

Harum pars tecta quatiebant cuspidē thyrsos,
 pars e divulso iactabant membra iuvenco,
 pars sese tortis serpentibus incingebant,
 pars obscura cavis celebrabant orgia cistis
 orgia, quae frustra cupiunt audire profani, etc.

It is true that this, and the context, have more to do with the Phrygian orgiastic ritual of the Great Mother, and the furious ecstasies of Dionysiac cultus and not with the severely intense profundity of the symbolic Eleusinian mysteries, agricultural in origin, if I may put it

thus¹²⁷. Yet there is a close analogy and parallelism and a common source between the two; the difference lies more in the difference of emphasis relating also to national temper and conditions rather than in discrepancy regarding ultimate meaning. But by their mutual comparative study we can throw light on each other, that we could not, or could not easily, do otherwise¹²⁸.

So *κίσται* were reserved for mystery worship. In them there were the *μυστικά ἱερά*, the sacred and secret objects of initiation (cf. v. 30 in the famous Andanian inscription containing regulations concerning the Mysteries celebrated there, second only to the Eleusinian according to Pausanias (IV, 33, 5), in the name of deities which included the Eleusinian *Μεγάλαι Θεαί*). Similarly, Nonnus (IX, 127) speaking of *Μύστις*, the nurse of Dionysus, finding out (under the influence and inspiration from the divine child) the elements of his orgiastic worship, speaks especially of

καὶ τελετῆς ζαθέης ἐγκύμονα μύστιδα κίστην (sc. ἐνόησε),

which *τελετῆ ζαθέη* must be the analogue of, if not the same as, the Eleusinian *ἀγιώταται τελεται*¹²⁹.

The *κίσται* then were hiding the secret symbols of the mysteries. Clement, *Protrepticus*, II, 20, 4 ff. (p. 19, Potter) reveals them, relishing in his mischievousness: *οἶαι δὲ καὶ αἱ κίσται <αἱ> μυστικάι; δεῖ γὰρ ἀπογυμνῶσαι τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἄρρητα ἐξείπειν. οὐ σησαμαῖ ταῦτα καὶ πυραμίδες καὶ τολύπαι καὶ πόπανα πολυόμφαλα, χόνδρος τε ἁλῶν καὶ δράκων, ὄργιον Διονύσου Βασσάρου; Οὐχὶ δὲ ροιαὶ πρὸς τοῖσδε καὶ καρδίαι (this, or *καρδία*, is the transmitted reading, both here and in Eusebius; *κράδαι* wanted by Morellus and Lobeck) *νάρθηκές τε καὶ κιττοί, πρὸς δὲ καὶ φθοῖς καὶ μήκωνες; ταῦτ' ἐστὶν αὐτῶν τὰ ἅγια. καὶ προσέτι τῆς Θέμιδος τὰ ἀπόρρητα σύμβολα, ὀρίγανον, λύχνος, ξίφος, κτεῖς γυναικείος, <ὄς> ἐστὶν, εὐφήμως καὶ μυστικῶς εἰπεῖν, μόριον γυναικείον.* The mystic cista is full of sacred magic-symbolic food .*

This unique passage will be discussed elsewhere. Here I shall refer only to one dominant aspect of the whole magic and symbolism pertaining to the contents of the mystic cista. A phallic symbol, or even representation, was in it¹³⁰. The aspect was dreadful: Valerius Flaccus *Argonautica* II, 265:

serta patri iuvenisque comam vestesque Lyaei
 induit et medium curru locat aeraque circum
 tympanaque et plenas tacita formidine cistas.

It could drive somebody mad, the fate that befell the Cecropid maidens when they saw Erichthonius in his cista¹³¹, even though for him who underwent initiation and ἐποπτεία it was a genial serpent which one jovially caresses: see the three stages of initiation on the cinerary urn No 1168 (Cat. Helbig) in the Museo delle Terme, Rome, republished in the collection of mystery representations by Bianchi. What sight exactly the combination of an (actual?) snake¹³² and the other symbols and images contained in the cista presented, is not so material. The important point was that Iacchus' manhood, a membrum virile (cf. Clement, *Protrepticus*, II, 19, 4), raised to the full of its power by the significant, symbolic stimulants, existed in the cista¹³³. One takes it. Operates with it (ἐργασάμενος cf. ὁ διὰ κόλπου θεός with reference to the Sabazian mysteries, Clement *op.cit.* II, 16, 2; serpents were also prominent in the Eleusinian rites as is amply evidenced by reliefs and vase-paintings quite apart from representations of the characteristic Triptolemus snakes; cf. also the golden leaves: δεσποίνης δ' ὑπὸ κόλπον ἔδυν χθονίας βασιλείας loc. supra cit. in Zuntz and Kern = II B1.7 Pugliese Carratelli.) When the mighty symbol is deflowered, and the initiate deflowered too, it is put in a κάλαθος, a basket that traditionally held women's woolen work (it is signaled as especially for wool in Hesychius s.v.; also prominent in processions in honour of Demeter [Callimachus, *Hymn to Demeter*, 1], in connection probably with the wool with which Attis' breast was covered after his self-mutilation, cf. Arnobius, V, 7: virgo sponsa quae fuerat, quam Valerius pontifex iam nomine fuisse conscribit, exanimati pectus lanis mollioribus velat, etc.; also V, 16: quid [sc. sibi vult] lanarum vellera, quibus arboris, [the above-mentioned pine tree; under such a tree Attis in bacchic ecstasy castrated himself and offered his virilia to Agdestis-Cybele] conligatis et circumvoluitis stipitem? nonne illarum repetitio lanarum est, quibus Ia deficientem contextit et teporis aliquid rata est se posse membris conciliare frigentibus? and then there follows a repetition of the above reported incident. See further Zeus' incestuous copulation with Demeter, the latter's rage, and Zeus' singular attempt at reconciliation by a substitute castration; Arnobius V, 21: arietem nobilem bene grandibus cum testiculis deligit

[sc. Zeus], exsecat hos ipse et lanato exuit ex folliculi tegmine etc., and in V, 23, where it is again described how Zeus, with the unusual spoil in his hands, goes to the implacably raging Mother and throws it in her bosom [or rather womb, as in Cicero terra gremio semen accipit] pretending that the organs of virility have been severed from his own body, whilst his demeanour is thus described: diductum pallidum saucium, simultantem doloris cruces et ad fidem facto faciendam arietino sanguine coinquinatum et in mendacia vulneris laneis fasciis linteolisque contactum). Wool is omnipresent in this connection. It was in the mystic *κάλαθος* to cover the phallic symbol.

As to the last clause of the sacred formula, *καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστην* I suggest that it can naturally be taken to signify recovery from exhaustion into power. The symbolic castration of the initiated, the offering up of his generative power to Demeter is concluded. He is now *καθαρός* and *ἄγνός*, sacred and prepared for the beatitude which awaits him in the after-life.

Let us return now to the problem about the true nature of the sight in Baubo's pudendum. I argued that it need not be related to what Demeter did and suffered subsequent to the event, and therefore to what the initiated does and suffers, and thus to the three last clauses of the formulaic expression reported by Clement. The sight provided the insight to it all, the archetypal symbol of what followed then, and follows with each initiation. Having in this way disposed of the apparent necessity of the reasons in favour of the view that an artificial membrum might have been what Baubo played with in her pudenda, the ground is clear for the correct appreciation of the merits of the alternative solution, that of an hermaphroditic Baubo. And firstly, there is the remarkable absence of any hint as to the existence of any extraneous apparatus in Clement' and (which is more significant in view of his detailed narration) Arnobius' relations of the incident in question. Not that this, in itself, would have been conclusive otherwise. But the way having been opened towards accepting the alternative explanation, it cannot fail to be viewed as supporting, or at least nicely fitting, that explanation, especially in view of such Arnobian passages as these: *partem illam corporis, per quam secus femineum et subolem prodere et nomen solet acquirere generi, tum longiore ab incuria liberat (sc. Baubo), facit sumere habitum puriorem et in speciem levigari nondum duri atque hystriculi pusionis*

(Arnobius, V, 25). The pusio seems to be already there; Baubo does nothing but remove the pubic hair which, so to speak, hides him. In fact what might have been ascribed to Arnobius' rhetoric, can now be seen as subtle (or perhaps not so subtle) allusion to Baubo's sexual peculiarity: see, e.g., in V 25 again: ...atque omnia illa pudoris loca revelatis monstrat (sc. Baubo) inguinibus. atque pubi adfigit oculos diva (sc. Demeter) et inauditi specie solaminis pascitur; and the already adduced passage in V, 27: quidnam quaeso spectaculi, quid in pudendis fuit rei verendisque Baubonis, quod feminei sexus deam et consimili formatam membro in admirationem converteret atque risum, quod obiectum lumini conspectuique divino et oblivionem miseriarum daret et habitum in laetiolem repentina hilaritate traduceret? (And Arnobius significantly immediately goes on, after a similar profession of mock hesitancy, to narrate and comment on the ubiquitous presence of phallic Dionysiac symbols): O qualia, o quanta inridentes potuimus cavillantesque depromere, si non religio nos gentis et litterarum prohiberet auctoritas¹³⁴. And it is to the formatas inguinibus res that the puer-like appearance pertains (V, 26, the Orphic passage).

Besides, coming back to the Greek Orphic fragment, and resuming the discussion about the οὐδὲ πρέποντα, it is to be observed that that expression, when seen in the present light, may just mean: not fitting, not appropriate namely to a woman. Τύπος is used here as in Evenus, Epigramm XII = A.P.9.602 = IV.4 (2313) The Garland of Philip, Gow-Page consult it in Jacob's edition of *Anthologia Graeca* (vol. I, p. 96) with the adnotatio¹³⁵.

But, as always, the more ponderous arguments in support of views like these are to be drawn from considerations relating to meaning, signification and overall coherence and adequacy; points of detail, indispensable though they are for the sufficiently articulate delineation of the entire structure, can only, at most, confirm, not determine; only reassure and corroborate, not justify and validate. Thus, in order to appreciate fully and judge competently my hypothesis about a hermaphroditic Baubo, one should conduct a thorough investigation of hermaphroditism in ancient times, examining that idea and phenomenon in all its possible aspects, with a view to establish its religious signification^{135a}.

Already in the course of the present inquiry I had occasion to revert slightly to the extent and depth of the influence and potency of the idea of androgyny, especially in connection with mystery religions. But it should be remembered that the importance (positive or negative) of the phenomenon was universally felt in antiquity. A hermaphrodite was a divine being, even a god¹³⁶; or, then, a monster, an evil omen¹³⁷.

The paramount importance of such beings in the context of mystery-religious and religious thought is a most important topic pertaining also to philosophical speculation concerning the great question of the absolutely first principles. I can only hint here at the main line of signification in that direction. Projecting onto the World at large the principles of organic (especially animal) life, one perceives in the generation of any new being the necessity of two principles accounting for its coming to being, an active and a passive one. Male and Female are thus elevated to the status of two universal principles. But then their distinctness presupposes their coexistence and fusion; for whence did they proceed¹³⁸? They came not from another similar pair, but from their paired unity, from their first manifestation, or appearance in reality, in their primeval fusion, the archetype of their natural subsequent conjunction in copulation. They are the offspring of the Great *Φάνης*, or, if you prefer philosophical formulation, of Absolute undifferentiated, yet differentiable, Being. Religious experience lies above and below any philosophical articulation while conditioning (positively or negatively) it drastically in ancient thought. We must move from intellectual analysis to spiritual insight, and further to religious symbolism, if we are to understand fully that an actual hermaphrodite represents and symbolizes that interpenetration before copulation, that fusion before conjunction¹³⁹. Hence his/her importance; hence such a being, exhibited in its naked singularity, was a fit culmination of the rites revealing the ultimate mysteries of the world¹⁴⁰ - mysteries hidden by nothing save the blindness of the profane.

But even apart from my hypothesis as to Baubo's hermaphroditism¹⁴¹, it is undeniable, as I have argued above, that a membrum virile must play a prominent role in the relevant incident. With this in mind, and in the context of the foregoing partial clarification, we can at last safely turn to the textual questions from

which we began. The negative position, i.e. criticism of various understandings of the three first verses in the Orphic fragment, has been already presented in the course of the process of clarification in text and notes; the positive point can be now dispatched very briefly.

Δείξέ τε πάντα σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον can be kept intact, as I said, if we adopt my hypothesis of Baubo's hermaphroditism. (Otherwise one should emend on the lines indicated at the beginning of this study). *Οὐδὲ πρέποντα* according to the present account is not morally pejorative, but simply signifies natural impropriety or inappropriateness.

Παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἰακχος is also alright: this was the unusual *τύπος* which met Demeter's *augusti luminis orbes*.

But it must be Baubo who handles the boy mirthfully, laughingly¹⁴² thus it must be *γελῶσα*, not *γελῶν*.

But this ruins the metre. In restoring it I can only propose a transposition, making v. 3 read thus:

χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκε γελῶσ' ὑπὸ Βαυβῶ κόλποις.

I confess, I am not fully satisfied with this. Not, of course, because we thus have a spondee in the fifth foot¹⁴³. But there is a certain harshness, perhaps unbearable, in the hyperbata. Still the meaning requires a change, and so let this change serve, until a better is found¹⁴⁴.

In the fourth line the MSS have *μείδησ' ἐνὶ* and, according to Stählin, while one of the two main MSS has *μείδησε θεά*, the other (Parisinus Graecus 451) had an apparently initial *μείδησι* (sic) corrected to *.είδησε*. *Μείδησε* in both places is inelegant and unlikely. Mullach edited (*Fragm.Phil.Gr.* vol. I p. 175) *μείδησε θεά, γήθησ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ* etc.¹⁴⁵. Hermann changed the first *μείδησε* to *ἐνόησε* adopted by Stählin; I do not consider this as particularly happy, though, from the point of view of meaning, it is in the right direction. But in the first occurrence of the word, we should certainly revert to the reading of the older editors especially in view of Parisinus' correction. *Εἶδησε* was written by Gesner, on the authority of Salmasius¹⁴⁶. Lobeck has *εἶδησε* as well, but he comments in the same page (*Aglaophamus*, p. 819): *Wakefieldius barbare εἶδησε*. Does he accept it despite its

barbarity? And why barbarous? The future εἰδήσω is found even in Homer (Odyssey VII, 327); and the aorist in Hippocrates, not to mention Aristotle and Theophrastus (for references see Veitch, *Greek Verbs*, sub εἰδέω)¹⁴⁷. In the second occurrence of μείδησε I am inclined to retain the word¹⁴⁸, though γήθησ' applies more literally to the following ἐνὶ θυμῷ¹⁴⁹.

This then, in fine, is the way the passage should be read:

ᾠς εἰπούσα πέπλους ἀνεσύρατο, δειξέ τε πάντα
 σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον· παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἴακχος
 χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκε γελῶσ' ὑπὸ Βαυβῶ κόλποις.
 Ἥ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν εἶδησε θεά, μείδησ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
 δέξατο δ' αἰόλον ἄγγος, ἐν ᾧ κυκεῶν ἐνέκειτο.¹⁵⁰

To complete the present inquiry, I shall try to give in an anticipatory and condensed way the gist of what I take to be the significance of the symbolism in Baubo's revelation. However it must be born in mind that the following analysis presupposes for its complete substantiation and correct understanding the inquiries conducted elsewhere. There will follow the completion of the investigation into the Eleusinian Mysteries in all their aspects, an attempt to reconstruct, so far as possible, the Eleusinian cult and recapture its spirit in its entirety. It is naturally there that the absolute coherence of the whole and the wonderful adaptation of every part and detail can be seen in their most advantageous light, and be appreciated accordingly.

What the Goddess saw was the revelation of coition, the natural conjunction of malehood and femineity, as a lower manifestation of their primeval and deeper fusion and identity. What she understood, what, amidst her tragic circumstances, made her suddenly and completely change her state and demeanour, what, in effect, reconciled her with the fate of her Kore (for thus should we interpret her smile of acquiescence and her drinking of the cyceon), what she clearly apprehended and grasped at the critical moment of Baubo's singular action was the natural power, in the most profound sense of the words, residing in the sexual organs and releasing in their operations a naturalness and power that proclaimed unmistakably their high origin and noble descent, and promising, if properly used, a

holy and saving vocation. Amidst all rape and debauchery, the Goddess penetrated into the transcendent power, and therefore into the saving potency, the cosmological and soteriological function of eros and sexuality. What befell Persephone was de-moralized in Demeter's mind at that poignant juncture when the mystery of productivity was revealed to her august eyes; sexual activities were viewed no more under the screen of convention and inhibition, but in themselves, in their mighty naturalness and naked attraction. She saw how they could be sported with, as Baubo illustrated, be an innocent plaything, the unmistakable mark of profound naturalness; her own previous experience taught her how they can inflict extreme sorrow when viewed in a certain way; what struck her at that moment, what we may say was revealed then, was the possibility of their serving in another capacity as saving tools, when used in a certain way: hence, Demeter instituted the Eleusinian orgies: the immense power in the base and vile which comes from high and is used to elevate, to cause and effect the return to the source; the means is the ritual. She, the Goddess, taught it: ritualistic lowness, if you wish, when handling naturally potent tools, exalts and elevates. Deification is not achieved by absolutely mortifying and shunning and unqualifiedly condemning the powerful instinct (powerful because archetypal), whatever this may be, but by ritualizing it, i.e. by bringing forth its symbolic nature and signification, which in turn means showing and declaring its derivation from the higher, the divine and the Ideal-Real. In such a context, the worse may well come from the best, and therefore be best adapted to lead us, to raise us to the best. Indeed Heracleitus well formulated the point: one tries, in mysteries, to cleanse himself from mud by mud, and from blood by blood; and, indeed, Dionysus is the same with Hades. The essence of all rite is that it is a gesture of cosmic significance; a gesture pointing to the divine core of the actions utilized during its celebration, indeed reproducing in symbolic substantiation. The acquired lowness and depravity of the (ritual) actions that accrues to them, from the descent, is disentangled and laid down; only their glorious origin is operative and this is what makes them a (mystery) rite. Thus, not the more chaste, but the most powerful activities should be selected as the material basis of the sacrament: for a rite generates sacredness, does not require - precisely here lies the mystery. (Thus, also, in a sense every rite and mystery acts

cathartically as was explicitly observed by Iamblichus in relation to sacramental obscenity).

This was the first level of symbolism: acceptance of, and affiliation with, sexuality in its innocent, profound obscenity and naturalness, and unquestioning belief in its dreadful and glorious liberating and redeeming power under religious form and control¹⁵¹. But a symbol has many dimensions if it is successful, i.e. objective and natural. It plays the role in religious spirituality which the concept plays in abstract thought: it exhibits the essential unity in a field of interconnected multiplicity. At a second level, we encounter the all-powerful cosmic symbol of the Serpent-in-the-Womb, exemplified by the more particular symbols of the Phallus in the female Pudendum and of the seed in mother-earth. Taking a further third step, we understand what is the natural conjunction of the male and female principles (in the World at large, in man and animals, in plants and fruits of the earth) purposing, and resulting in, generation, as offering up of the former to the latter in the hope of salvation; in the place of copulation as token of bondage to this world, we see consecration as promising liberation from the necessity of the cycle, from the mud and filth of endless physical begetting¹⁵². The portentous symbol of the Serpent-in-the-Womb may remain intact; but it is not coition any more, rather hallowed dedication that is signified; and the result is not another begetting in the world, but birth into another, removal from the circle of necessity to the sphere of beatitude. And this new dimension is better symbolized by the newly cut ear of corn (*χλοερὸς στάχυς ἀμηθείς*). And more fully by Baubo's pudenda, i.e. female hermaphroditism. Here the original fusion of the sexes becomes manifest, indeed their identity, and in fact a fusion and identity weighing more on one rather than in the other pole: for it is the masculine female, not the feminine male that stands at the awesome beginning of things, just as finitude comes from infinity and light from darkness in Orphism.

In its turn the new symbol opens to us a fourth level of meaning. Death, we feel it, is intimately bound with Eros and Generation. But we see clearly the connection in the seed of corn: the ear of corn is simultaneously dead and alive; it signalizes the end of its former existence and yet it is ready to begin a new one. In being dead it is full of living power. There is no real death in the World; the dead come

from the living and the living from the dead this is the Orphic-mysteric foundation of Plato's speculations in *Phaedo*¹⁵³.

Nor is this the final step. At a fifth level of symbolism, we can now see and understand the options that open to us between copulation and consecration as we saw them on level three above. The seed can enter once more the womb of life (life as we know it), and then it will live again. This dark, secret Womb of Life is Hades: by dying in the way of the world, one is regenerated in the way of the world. This is so for the fruit of the earth and for man alike, and for all things universally. But if instead of entering the Womb in ignorance and unhallowness, one consecrates oneself to It in epoptic, symbolic knowledge and sacred chastity, then the Death in entering it is not in the way of this world, and, as such, generation out of it is Birth equally not in the way of this world, but birth into divine beatitude and freedom from necessity. One is liberated from Hades if one enters it in the correct way, that is in a state of sacred purity ritualistically achieved. One then is not with the queen of Hades but rather with the Celestial gods; one has indeed moved from the orbit of the Lesser to that of the Great Mysteries: salvation and divinisation are at stake. The newly-cut ear of corn symbolises the frustration of this - wordly power: the ear of corn does not reach its productive maturity. Like the self-castrated Attis and Cybele's Galloi, it devotes its own power to the Great Mother of all, a Mother who in fact incorporates their natural organ in her own complete sex nature. and again Baubo's pudenda is the ultimate symbol of the highest principle. Not for nothing does Psellus ascribe to it the concluding scene of the Great Eleusinian Mysteries.

This, roughly, then, I believe, provides the key to the revelation of the Eleusinian Mystery. And thus, we can appreciate why the symbol of the newly-cut ear of corn (or the sperm as existing out of the womb) and Baubo's pudenda (which in one way or another exhibited the coexistence of male and female but not for generation; or rather in a more subtle and profound way, as I believe, they exhibited the unfruitful (in ordinary terms) though sexual, identity of the male and female principles, and their ultimate unproductive union)¹⁵⁴ were the final acts of the Great Eleusinian Mystery.

The final symbolic insight is better represented on a tangible level by sexual «anomaly» and «perversion», even monstrosity of various

kinds and degrees. We can thus explain the dominance of such features in Orphic traditions, in Mystery cults and mythologies, in practices prevailing among those Gnostic sects which followed the wisdom of ancient «daemonic» religiosity and the otherwise unaccountable existence of the same characteristics in ordinary mythology and ritual. All these factors will be analyzed at further parts of this inquiry; I am, for the time being, simply reminding the reader of their existence and major significance.

These concluding remarks of this part of the inquiry do not, evidently, exhaust the symbolism of the Eleusinian Mysteries, as it is immensely rich in «archetypical-thought». But at least we have perceived the direction in which the study must move if a correct analysis of that symbolism is to become a possibility; and the methodological, ideological and factual foundation has been laid on which a real understanding can be effected - an analysis and an understanding, that is, which will be naturally fitting to the ancient Greek ways of thinking and feeling in general. The whole previous development demonstrates the imperative necessity to move beyond the intellectual preconceptions and emotional atmosphere of one's own age if it is wished that the ancient Greek spirit be caught in its purity, its uncontaminated splendour and eternal, objective validity. This holds, of course, in all fields of inquiry, but becomes naturally more directly evident in religious matters of the sort we were discussing above. The weak, unmanly, unhellenic idealism of a Wilamowitz or a Foucart exemplify very materially the dangers from which one has to guard oneself nowadays in such investigations¹⁵⁵. And the remedy for this malady is not, certainly, to be found in the «mechanical» naturalism or primitivism of a Frazer or a Diels¹⁵⁶.

NOTES

1. «N. Shiah, in *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XXIV (1938), 127 ff. quotes Chinese taunts directed at youths, to the effect that their mouths still have the bad smell of undried mother's milk», *loc.cit.*
2. «Sarcastic for: You are not functioning as a god any more. The name Baba is here determined with an animal sign», *loc.cit.*
3. Underlined words are emphasized in the Egyptian text.

4. Hat-Hor was the goddess of love loc.cit.
5. The translator supposes the whole story to be of a colloquial, almost burlesque kind. I suspect that he is mistaken indeed, if one can go by a priori reasons, that he is gravely mistaken, and this for assignable causes. He maintains that the language, style and treatment of the tale (?) are colloquial; to which, as a stylistic and textual remark I am, of course, absolutely incompetent to form an opinion. (Besides, there is so very little known about the actual language, and in particular the styles, of these ancient middle eastern cultures. Translations are improving as time passes, and much more articulation in all matters is evident in the renderings of their literary relics). But in any case I take exception to his remark that the gods are depicted as petty and childish ; such condescending attitude to the naïve expression of natural, deep-lying, core-forming patterns of perception and behaviour is scientifically unjustifiable. Be that as it may, it will suffice to observe here that the myth, in point of view of matter and plot and general tone, is similar to those of the rest documents translated in the work concerned. The incident I copied could be found in any one of them in fact it is of the same nature as events related in the rest. And besides, what is perhaps more important ultimately, jocularity in religious contexts is a grave and ponderous affair; laughter and mirthfulness in the *εἰκάζειν* of the Eleusinian Mysteries (cf. Aristophanes, *Ranae*) are portentous features: they signify. And think of the divine laughter in Homer at the Ares-Aphrodite incident.
6. Arnobius either follows a different source than Clement, or quotes more in detail from the same source. The common opinion is, I suppose, that he copied from Clement presumably because they relate the same thing and the one precedes the other in time! The facts are as follows: Arnobius provides an enlarged version of the subject (which may well be due to his rhetorical temperament a good example of the African Latin school of Rhetoric and is, in any case, something he habitually does: he dramatizes his narrative more than Clement, certainly); but he also, as we shall see, wants to emphasise that a definite species, a certain pattern of shape, was to be seen in Baubo's pudenda when laid bare. There is no suggestion to this effect in Clemens; but on the other hand, Arnobius might (just possibly, though not at all likely, I believe) have got this idea from the Orphic fragment preserved in Clement, but not explained by Clement in this way, something Clement would not fail to do if he really saw it in the same way. (And if he were to be thought as having seen it thus the fragment needs further emendation in its third line). But if Arnobius misinterpreted the Orphic fragment then, firstly, why did he not mention Iacchos, who is prominent in the fragment as it appears in Clement? Or should we assume a further corruption and demand a new emendation? But, secondly, and much more importantly, why then should

Arnobius misconstrue the fragment as it appears in Clement and not take it (misconstrued or not) from an independent source? In fact, I think that the most natural solution of the whole question is to assume that both Clement and Arnobius had access to the same Orphic work in which the whole incident was related and explained (an *ἱερός λόγος*) and from which both give the same fragment in different ways. But they also may be consulting different sources containing a relevant section of Orphica; which probabilities, on the other hand, do not preclude the possibility that Arnobius had before him Clement as well. In any case the nature of the divergences in the respective accounts is such that makes it certain to the careful observer that Arnobius was not relying exclusively on Clement.

7. Apart from the Egyptian god Baba met above, there was a Mesopotamian female deity by the name of Baba or Bau (v. Pritchard etc. Index sub voce). Very interestingly *Βάαυ* occurs in Philo Byblius' report by Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* I, 10, 7. It is there related that from the wind *Κολπίας* (probably, as Bunsen suggests following Bochart, wind - *ἄνεμος* should here be understood as the living, moving spirit which plays so eminent a part in Semitic cosmogonies) and from *Βάαυ* («*τοῦτο δὲ Νύκτα ἐρμηνεύει*» adds Eusebius about Philo), *Αἰών* and *Πρωτόγονος* were generated (obviously the addition «*θνητοὺς ἄνδρας οὕτω καλουμένους*» is an Euhemeristic reflection in tune with the general trend of Philo's interpretation of the Phoenician sacred texts not to be ascribed to Sanchouniathon). *Κολπίας* is the impregnating wind cf. *κόλπος* in the sense of the entire sinus genitalis as is not unusual in poetic works (e.g. Euripides *Helena* 1144-5: *πτανὸς γὰρ ἐν κόλποις σε Λήδας ἐτέκνωσε πατήρ*; Callimachus, *Hymn to Zeus* 15: *ἔνθα σ' ἐπεὶ μήτηρ μεγάλων ἀπεθήκατο κόλπων* and in *Hymn to Delus* 214: *γείνεο, γείνεο κοῦρε, καὶ ἦπιος ἔξιθι κόλπου*; similarly in *Hymn to Diana* 25); a use which we shall encounter in crucially significant Orphic formulaic expressions; and whose precise anatomical meaning is explained in Pollux II, 222: *τὸ δὲ ἐφεξῆς* (to the *πόρος* of the uterus) *κοίλωμα, γυναικεῖος κόλπος*. The winds as impregnating powers is a common theme in antiquity. We shall see that from Dysaules and Baubo came two children: *Πρωτονόη* (an *Πρωτογόνη*?) καὶ *Μίσση* according to Asclepiades, apud Harpocration s.v. *Δυσαύλης*. But of this affair more will be said below. In anticipation we may note that if *Βάαυ* was correlated to Night, that would fit nicely with my interpretation of Baubo's pudenda as representing the aboriginal Orphic first Principle of Darkness.
8. This has a mystic (that is, not to be divulged) significance in the corresponding mystery which consisted in the performance of the religiously essential parts of the above myth considered as the material receptacle of the revealed meaning. The corresponding *σύνθημα* (i.e. the external sign of the

hidden sense) in the Eleysinian Mysteries (as Clement has it Protrepticus II 21, 2, p. 16, 18 ff. Stählin) runs as follows: «ἐνήστουσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεῶνα, ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἐργασάμενος ἀπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστιν». Further on this will be seen below.

9. What follows is for Arnobius the deliberate design of Baubo, who indeed makes particular preparations in order to achieve her end: when Demeter fails to be cajoled out of her gloomy mood by ordinary attentions vertit Baubo artes et quam serio non quibat allicere ludibriorum statuit exhilarare mioraculis: partem illam corporis etc. . Arnobius V, 25 (p. 196, 22 ff., ed.cit.). Contrariwise, Clement represents Baubo's act as an immediate response to Deo's refusal to drink the *κυκεών*, and proceeding out of resentment for such an offence: τῆς δὲ (sc. Δήμητρος) ἀναινομένης λαβεῖν καὶ πιεῖν οὐκ ἐθελούσης (πενθήρης γὰρ ἦν) περιαλγῆς ἢ Βαυβῶ γενομένη, ὡς ὑπεροραθεῖσα δῆθεν, ἀναστέλλεται τὰ αἰδοῖα etc. Clement, *op.cit.* II, 20, 3 (p. 16, 5 ff., ed.cit.). This is one of the divergences to which I alluded above.
10. ...tum longiore ab incuria liberat (sc. Baubo, the pudenda), facit sumere habitum puriorem et in speciem levigari nondum duri atque hystriculi pusionis (ed.cit. p. 197, 1 ff.). What this pusio was will be seen in a moment. A Latin-Greek gloss (cf. Tertullianus, *de Pallio*, 4p.1041A vol.IIPG) has: hystriculus: δασύπρωκτος (= rough-bottomed, having a densely-haired, shaggy bottom; δασύπυγος in Sch. ad Theocritum V 112/113b, makes the sense clearer, though I think it is not what Theocritus alluded to when he spoke of the δασύκερκος ἀλώπηξ: as the scholiast in 112/113a says: τὰς δασυκέρκως· τὰς πολυτρίχους ἐχούσας οὐράς· κέρκος γὰρ ἢ οὐρά; but κέρκος also is the ἀνδρεῖον αἰδοῖον (cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v.); therefore I think there is a distinction between δασύπυγος and δασύκερκος in that the latter is shaggy and hairy in the pubic region, whereas the former is so in his fundamentum). For durum used in the same, I believe, sexual sense v. Juvenal, VI, 376-8; cf. n. 154.
11. quas (sc. formatas inguinibus res) cava succutiens Baubo manu nam puerilis
ollis vultus erat plaudit, contrectat amice.
tum dea defigens augusti luminis orbes
tristitias animi paulum mollita reponit .
Arnobius *loc.cit.*
12. For instance, the speaking divinity describes herself as *κουροτρόφος*. And Hesychius s.v. *κουροτρόφος*: παιδοτρόφος· ὑφ' ἐτέρων ἢ Δημήτηρ. But in Callimachus, Hymn to Delus, Delus is *κουροτρόφος Ἀπόλλωνος*; and Pausanias I, 22, 3 ἔστι δὲ καὶ Γῆς *κουροτρόφου* καὶ Δήμητρος ἱερὸν Χλόης in Athens, in the road leading to the Acropolis. The Callimachean example

illustrates the loose, poetic use of the word, while Pausanias provides the necessary cultic anchorage, so to speak (though even poetic uses in sacred pieces normally have behind them some cultic - in the strict or the broad sense of the word - justification). For the cult of *Κουροτρόφος* in Athens cf. Aristophanes *Thesmoph.* 295 ff. where one should read *εὔχεσθαι τοὶν θεσμοφόροι* [τῇ Δήμητρι καὶ τῇ Κόρῃ] καὶ τῷ Πλούτῳ καὶ τῇ Καλλιγένειᾳ καὶ τῇ Κουροτρόφῳ [τῇ Γῇ] καὶ τῷ Ἑρμῇ etc. (cf. the scholiast ad.loc.). Clearly the pair *Δήμητρα Κόρη* corresponds exactly to that of *Κουροτρόφος Καλλιγένεια*, and apart from their precise analogy there is affinity as well between them (cf. e.g. the inscription in *Δελτίον Ἀρχαιολ. Ἐφημερίδος* 1889, fasc. 5, 130: *Δήμητρι Χλόῃ καὶ Κόρῃ τὴν Κουροτρόφον Εἰσίδοτος ἀνέθηκε κατ' ὄνειρον*). For *Καλλιγένεια* not as a counterpart but as *Κόρη* herself cf. Photius *Lexicon: Καλλιγένειαν*: Ἀπολλόδωρος μὲν τὴν γῆν (against this Hesychius s.v. but the text is corrupt), οἱ δὲ Διὸς καὶ Δήμητρος θυγατέρα (i.e. *Κόρη*): Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὁ κωμικός, τροφόν. (cf. *Sch. ad Thesm.* 299, *Καλλιγένεια*: δαίμων περὶ τὴν Δήμητραν, ἣν προλογοῖσσαν ἐν ταῖς ἐτέραις Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις ἐποίησεν). The cult of *Κουροτρόφος* in Athens was also associated with *Ἀθηνᾶ Πολιάς* with *Pandrosos* and with *Erichthonios*, cf. CIA II no. 481, 59 *ὁμοίως δὲ* (sc. *ἔθυσαν*) καὶ τὰ ἐξιτήρια ἐν ἀκροπόλει τῇ τε Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ Πολιάδι καὶ τῇ Κουροτρόφῳ καὶ τῇ Πανδρόσῳ, καὶ ἐκαλλιέργησαν; and especially see *Suda* s.v. *Κουροτρόφος*. The cult of *Γῇ Κουροτρόφος* in Athens is testified also by Proclus, *Comm. in Timaeum* vol. III, p. 144, 4 sqq., Diehl οὕτω δὲ καὶ αὕτη δυνάμεις ἔχει ποικίλας (sc. ἡ γῆ), καὶ ὡς μὲν τροφὸς τὴν τελεσιουργὸν μιμείται τάξι, καθ' ἣν καὶ πάτριον Ἀθηναίοις κουροτρόφον αὐτὴν ὑμνεῖν καὶ ἀνησιδύραν, ὡς καὶ ἀνείσαν τὰ φυτὰ καὶ τὰ ζῶα καὶ τρέφουσιν, etc. Whatever one may wish to say regarding Neoplatonic theology, their religion is fully embedded in the traditional Cultus.

Finally, apart from poetic uses, from Hesychius' testimony that *Κουροτρόφος* is *Demeter* and from the cult of *Κουροτρόφος Γῆ* in Athens, we have some passages suggesting that the *Κουροτρόφος* was also *Aphrodite*. There is the Homeric poematium, the prayer to *Κουροτρόφος* (preserved also in *Suda* s.v. *Ὀμηρος* and in *Athenaeus* XIII, 592a) where clearly the wish expressed is of an erotic kind and also rather iambic in nature (cf. the *οὔραι* of the last line). Besides, according to *Athenaeus* this was written by *Sophocles* who *ἰκετεύων οὖν τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, φησὶν* etc. Cf. also the distich by *Nicomedes Smyrnaeus* referred to by Illgen in his edition of the *Homeric Hymns* p. 606, which is all too clear: *Κύπριδι Κουροτρόφῳ δάμαλιν ρέξαντες ἔφηβοι / χαίροντες νύμφας ἐκ θαλάμων ἄγομεν*. This class of testimonies I take to refer to the maternal but erotic fierce female dominant deity of *Asia Minor* (*Suda* makes *Homer* to compose his poematium in *Samos*, on the occasion

of seeing a woman sacrificing to *Κουροτρόφος*); for her similarities with the Paphian Aphrodite and the Syria Dea are unmistakable; furthermore Charon testifies to this apud Photius s.v. *Κύβητος· ὁ κατεχόμενος τῆ μητρὶ τῶν θεῶν· θεοφόρητος. Χάρων δὲ ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ὑπὸ Φρυγῶν καὶ Λυδῶν Κυβήβην (= Κυβέλην) λέγεσθαι. Altogether then we have a chthonic, earthly, erotic female deity for *Κουροτρόφος*, and Demeter as well as Aphrodite are drawn into this circle. That according to Hesiod, Theogony 450, Zeus constitutes Hecate as *Κουροτρόφος* of those who μετ' ἐκείνην ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδοντο φάος πολυδερκέος Ἡοῦς does not refute our conclusion; not because I suspect this as a secularly poetic use, but because, firstly, she is rather a *κουροτρόφος* ἐξ ἀρχῆς (452) which seems to imply a rather general prerogative, one among the many honours that Zeus assigned to her on account of her stand in the Titanic war; secondly because this attribute seems to refer to the lunar influence on the parturition and breeding of children; and finally because there are definite links leading from Hecate to Persephone and from her to the Artemisian form of the Asiatic Great Goddess. All in all, this divine nexus provides an excellent illustration of what I call aspectual identification among divinities. (On the subject of the *Κουροτρόφος* cf. Usener, *Götternamen*, pp. 124 ff.). The offerings and sacrifices asked for by *Κουροτρόφος* in the fragment are all erotic in nature.*

13. For *Κονίσσαλος* v. Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 982 and scholia; also Hesychius s.v. For *Παραστάται* cf. Athenaeus IX, 395F: οἱ καλούμενοι παραστάται... εἰσὶ δ' οἱ ὄρχεις οὕτω καλούμενοι; that is the *παραστάται* to the *πέος*, standing by it. (For the anatomical reasons of this *λέξις* cf. Etym. Magnum s.v. and the passage from Meletius quoted there in Gaisford's edition -: ὑπ' ἐνίων καλοῦνται αἱ γόνιμοι φλέβαι; Meletius: οἱ δὲ παραστάται, οἱ καὶ κρεμαστῆρες λεγόμενοι, ἔκφυσις ἐστὶ τοῦ νωτιαίου μυελοῦ τῆς μήνιγγος, σὺν φλεβῖν ἀρτηριώδεσιν ἐν τοῖς διδύμοις καθήκουσαι, δι' ὧν ἡ τοῦ σπέρματος εἰς τὸ αἰδοῖον γίνεται πρόεσις. For *μύρτον*, cf. the ancient lexicographers (esp. Photius and Pollux II, 174). For the second method of *ἀποψιλῶσις* referred to in the fragment see Aristophanes *Eccles.* 12-13 and *Lysistr.* 825 sqq.: Ἀλλ' ὅμως ἂν οὐκ ἴδοις, / καίπερ οὔσης γραός, ὄντ' αὐ/τὸν κομήτην, ἀλλ' ἀπειψιλωμένον τῷ λύχνῳ, where the talk is about the *σάκανδρος* or as the scholiast explains the *γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον*.
14. Suda also has s.v. *σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον* with reference to precisely this passage. For the following *σπλεκοῦν* (the ancient grammarians seem divided between *σπλεκοῦν* and *πλεκοῦν*) the scholiast correctly says: *συνουσιάζειν, παρὰ τὸ πλέκεσθαι*.
15. Paralleling a sentence from Pherecrates' description of the blessed life in underworld: *κόραι δ' ἐν ἀμπεχόνιοις τριχάπτοις ἀρτίως / ἥβυλλιώσαι καὶ*

τὰ ρόδα κεκαρμέναι Meineke II, 1, p. 300 = *Μεταλλῆς* Fr. 113.28-9 PCG vol. VII p. 159.

16. The horned Dionysus (v. Sophocles Fr. 782 Dindorf, apud Strabo 15 p. 687; Euripides *Bacchae*, 100; and cf., e.g., esp. Orphic hymns 30 and 52) of the Eleusinian mysteries, Zagreus, the son of Zeus and Persephone: cf. Arrian, *Anabasis* II, 16 (the Athenians worship τὸν Διὸς καὶ Κόρης (sc. Διόνυσον), ἄλλον τοῦτον Διόνυσον (from that of Semele)· καὶ ὁ Ἴακχος ὁ μυστικὸς cf. Herodotus 65 τούτῳ τῷ Διόνυσῳ οὐχὶ τῷ Θηβαίῳ, ἐπάδεται); Cicero, *De natura Deorum* III, 58 (but there is superficiality in the lists' accounts of the different homonymous deities in Cicero's source; there must have been such a source, as similar and in many cases identical accounts are preserved in Ampelius, Lydus *De mensibus*, Clement and Arnobius cf. the tables at the end of Mayor's edition); Lydus, *De Mensibus* IV, 51, where we have, on the authority of Terpander the Lesbian melic poet (= fr. 8 Bergk) a very accurate and concise Orphic account; Diodorus, V, 75, 4-5; Euripides, *Orestes* 964-5, where to the νερτέρων *Περσέφασσα καλλίπαις θεά*, one scholiast mentions the correct interpretation: ἢ τὸν Ἴακχον γεννήσασα, ἢ καλλίπαις. (Ἴακχος is the ὠραίος θεός Aristoph. *Ranae* 395); and elsewhere. I mentioned these testimonies in order to show that what is reported about these matters by suspect writers is old and venerable tradition; they were following such traditions in most such cases. Suspect writers (different for different sensitivities) may be: a) Christian writers prone to disclose pagan mysteries in all their apparent obscenity; b) supposedly later Orphic poems; c) allegorizing and philosophically orientated writers. But in the case of the mysteries it is primarily by such suspect sources that we may hope to arrive at the truth; for the simple reason that more orthodox and classical writers are either not bothering about such matters or, if interested, are prohibited from saying anything informative (apart from the well-known, publicly used myths and ceremonies) by virtue of the absolute injunction not to divulge anything pertaining to the mysteries. For the δρώμενα especially, (a) are accounts of unique value, precisely because their authors are free from any religious inhibition. As to the usual counter-argument, that the Christian writers were prejudiced and wanted to present the mysteries in as ugly a light as possible (or not possible), the evident objection is conclusive, namely that they were (particularly in writings like Clement's *Protrepticus*) addressing exactly Pagans (who might have or obtain a complete knowledge on these matters), and not ignorant people like us (cf. characteristically rhetorical turns like the one in op.cit. 11, 15, 3, p. 13, 11 Stählin). As to the purely classical passages, like Sophocles, *Antigone* 1115-1154 or Aristophanes, *Ranae* 316-459, they can be understood as perfectly as the Athenians would have understood them, only by initiates in the Mysteries. Even now some

vague allusions can be seen and comprehended, after we have meticulously collected and put together a sufficiently coherent account of the *λεγόμενα* and *δρώμενα* in the Mysteries and their interpretations out of a careful comparative study of late and suspect sources. And in this way even the general significance and tenor become clearer. Failing that utilization of the later sources, we are reduced to the usual hackneyed and confused platitudes. Classical authors could say nothing but veiled hints at most, both for religious and legal reasons (cf. Aeschylus' persecution). An additional class of unduly underestimated but really invaluable information is the one comprising the two subclasses of lexicographers and the extant Scholia. In these two kinds of source, all the immense antiquarian activity of the ancients has been utilized. The remnants are meagre and mutilated, but they provide the more direct repertory of facts about the contextus or form of life, within which alone we can understand poetry and philosophy.

17. The scholiast to *Nubes* 538 οὐδὲν ἦλθε ραιψαμένη σκύτινον etc., has this note: οὐδὲν ἦλθε· παρέλκει τὸ «δειν»· ὡς καὶ παρ' Ὀμήρω «οὐδὲν ἔτισε»· θέλει δὲ εἰπεῖν, «οὐκ ἦλθε» συνήθως. *Ilias* A 244 and 412: ὅτ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας and ἔτισε. There is of course no problem in these instances, οὐδὲν is adverbial, and in *Nubes* perhaps to be taken with σκύτινον. But if the scholiast's remark was true, we might perhaps justify ourselves by analogy in taking οὐδέ as meaning simply οὐ! Οὐ γὰρ is another possibility. But if a change has to be, οὐ τι enjoys the good credentials of epic diction.
18. This form is found, in so far as I know, in Tzetzes, but is moulded in accordance with a very common pattern. Besides, Tzetzes likely, found it somewhere, a source now probably lost.
19. This word is not mentioned in L and S, but I do not see why it could not exist (and hence, why it does not or did not exist). *Παντοδυναστής* occurs in the Orphic hymns 12, 4 and 45, 2.
20. Both Wakefield (ad Lucretium, IV, 1161) and Vossius (in *Antisymb.* vol. I, p. 52) read παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἰακχος. Cf. Lobeck, *Aglaophemus*, p. 819.
21. Herwerden had proposed χεῖρ' ἰταμήν, which is textually excellent (under the said understanding of the point here) but I believe impossible in view of the strongly depreciatory and disapprobatory sense of ἰταμός. Cf. what I said above for the much milder οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον.
22. See Suda ὄλισβος· αἰδοῖον δερμάτινον. ᾧ ἐχρῶντο αἱ Μιλήσσαι γυναῖκες ὡς τριβάδες καὶ αἰσχροουργοί (feminine onanism)· ἐχρῶντο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ αἱ χῆραι γυναῖκες (the widows)· Ἀριστοφάνης «οὐκ εἶδον οὐδ' ὄλισβον ὀκταδάκτυλον, ὃς ἦν ἂν ἡμῖν σκυτίνη ἐπικουρία», παρὰ τὴν παροιμίαν «σκυτίνη ἐπικουρία» ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενῶν. And Photius ὄλισβος· δερμάτινα αἰδοῖα. The Aristophanian passage is *Lysistr.* 109-10, where see the scholia (in agreement with Suda). The proverb referred to above is extant in the

- Corpus Paroemiographorum vol. II (ed. Leutsch), Macarius VII 83, where see the elaborate annotation by the editor. For Cratinus' famous relevant verse, see below in the discussion about Misa. The σκύτινοι ὄλισβοι (leather simulacra of the penis) are also called φαλλοί and φάλητες. Cf. Hesychius s.v. οἱ φαλλοί, φαληρίς (where we read: καὶ τὸ «φάλης» δερμάτινον αἰδοῖον) and ἐπὶ φαληρίου (where Alcibiades is brought into connection). Strattis' verse apud Athenaeus XII, 551C, (= Ψυχασταί Fr. 57 PCG vol. VII p. 650), seems to require an interpretation distinct both from the proverbial σκύνη ἐπικουρία and the phallic σκυτίνη ἐπικουρία of Aristophanes. And this is the direction to which Hesychius gloss points: σκυτίνη ἐπικουρία· Ἄττικοι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων βοθημάτων (sic; an ἐπὶ τῶν τῶν ἀσθενούντων βοθημάτων?). Σαννυρίων was ridiculed for extreme thinness (see Athenaeus loc.cit.). For various interpretations of Strattis' σκυτίνη ἐπικουρία v. Meineke Fr.Com.Gr. II 785-6 and Corpus Paroem. Gr. II, note ad Macarius VII 83: it is very difficult to decide between them, but I would stick to the authority of Hesychius, (much as I would prefer Bergk's construal, apud Meineke loc.cit.), especially since Strattis was ridiculing Sannyrion for his thinness according to Pollux X, 189 in his comedy Cinesias, though again this is a different comedy from the Ψυχασταί mentioned in the Athenaeus passage. V. Κινησίας Fr.21 PCGr vol. VII p. 634. For his leanness Sannyrion is called κάναβος; this refers to the thin wood roughly shaped around which clay or wax was moulded by the modellers of small figures. Cf. Fr. 70. Dalecampius interpreted therefore the σκυτίνη ἐπικουρία of Fr. 57 as a tight leather corslet worn by Sannyrion to help him keep upright - an attractive way out of the difficulty. In Athenaeus XV 676F one should read Ναρκισσίνους ὄλισβους (pro ὄλίσκους) with Schweighaeuser.
23. For an illustration from a Campanian vessel see Winkelmann, *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*, new ed. 1934, pp. 123-4 and Tafel 8 at the end.
24. Hesychius: Σκυτίνων καθημένων (sc. αἰδοίων; cf. Aristophanes *Nubes* 538) διεξωσμένοι οἱ κωμικοὶ ὑποκριταί, οἱ δὲ αἰδοῖα δερμάτινα τοῦ γελοίου χάριν ἀνωτέρω (pro ἀνωτέρα) τῶν ἰσχύων καὶ τῶν αἰδοίων παρακείμενοι (an παρακείμενα?).
25. And Crusius has proposed that the setting and various details in Heronda's sixth Mime do suggest as a background the worship of the Mother of Gods or Μεγάλη Μήτηρ (*Κυβέλη Δημήτηρ Ρέα*); v. his added note to the end of A. Dieterich's *op.cit.* p. 12. But his reasons are flimsy. Perhaps it is suggestive that Μητρῶ (from Μητέρα τῶν θεῶν) inquires about the ὄλισβος or κόκκινος βαυβών in question.
26. Κάτω κοιλία may also perhaps be used to signify a man's fundamentum as in Aristophanes *Ranae*, 483-5, where one should read:

ΞΑΝΘΙΑΣ: Ἰδοῦ, λαβέ. ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ: προσθοῦ. ΞΑ. ποῦ
 ἴσταν; ὦ χρυσοὶ θεοί,
 ἐνταῦθ' ἔχεις τὴν καρδίαν; ΔΙ. δείσασα γὰρ
 εἰς τὴν κάτω μου κοιλίαν καθείρπυσεν.

The scholiast explains: λαμβάνει ὁ Διόνυσος τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ Ξανθίου καὶ προστίθησιν εἰς τὸν πρῶκτόν (and this is required by the sense of the passage). ὁ δὲ τίθησι τὸν σπόγγον εἰς τὸ αἰδοῖον αὐτοῦ γέλωτος χάριν. The last sentence indicates an extra piece of theatrical business; but the pubic area remains the main signification in these applications of κάτω κοιλία. Cf. also the proverb εἰς τὴν πυγὴν ἐξερρήκε ἢ σοφία. Appendix II, 32, in Corpus Paroem. Gr. vol. I.

27. This sense is confirmed by Hesychius βαυβᾶ· κοιμίζει and βαυβᾶν· καθεύδειν: making somebody sleep and sleeping. It should be noticed though, that the root βαυκ- (about which more will be said below) was used to signify the lullabies and the activity of singing children to sleep, making them sleep by the nurses' lulling. So Athenaus XIV 618E: αἱ δὲ τῶν τιτθεουσῶν ὦδαὶ καταβαυκαλήσεις ὀνομάζονται. And Hesychius s.v. Νύννιον· ἐπὶ τοῖς παιδίοις καταβαυκαλουμένοις φασὶ λέγεσθαι. Idem βαυκαλᾶν· κατακοιμίζειν, τιτηνεῖν, παιδία μετ' ὠδῆς κοιμίζειν (cf. also idem s.v. καταβαύκα· κατεβαυκάλησε, βαυκανιζόντων). The Latin parallel is then lallare (Persius III, 18) and lallus (Ausonius, *Epist.* XVI 91).
28. Cf. Antiatticista (p. 85, 11 Bekker): βαυβᾶν· ἀντὶ τοῦ καθεύδειν. *Εὐριπίδης Συλεῖ*: βαυβῶμεν εἰσελθόντες· ἀπόμορξαι σέθεν / τὰ δάκρυα. Matthiae very plausibly ascribes the speech to Hercules and the addressee should be Xenodice, Syleus daughter. For the Satyric drama *Συλεύς* of Euripides v. *Prolegomena de Comoedia, Scholia in Aristophanem*, ed. Dübner, p. xix 78 sqq. for the Parisian recension (and cf. Dindorf, *Fragmenta Euripidea*, p. 341 [editio quinta] for the Milanese recension as well, where the comments are ascribed to Tzetzes).
29. Perhaps we should further follow the connections of this βαυβάω. For instance, Alexis, the comic poet, used the word βαυβαλίζω. Antiatticista (p. 85, 14 v. Meineke *Fr. Com. Gr.* vol. III, p. 488 IV = *Τίτθαι* Fr. 231 PCG vol. II p. 151) who reports the fact, interprets: ἀντὶ τοῦ βαυκαλίσαι. Now L ... S explain this as to lull to sleep; and it is true that even in modern Greek the verb means (primarily used as middle) to flatter and pacify myself in an easy belief that everything is rosy; yet from the very instances mentioned by L ... S it is clear that the situation is more complicated. Thus in Crates, *Epistle* 33, we have βαυκαλήσεις (from βαυκαλέω which must be another form of βαυκαλίζω) δὲ ἐν ὄστρακίῳ χελώνης (sc. the baby, object); here it could mean what L ... S want it to mean, though Herscher, in *Epistolographi Graeci* p.

215 (Didot) renders in morebis eum etc. But in Lucianus *Lexiphanes* II, it must mean the exact opposite! It is about a young man who tried to hang himself and was saved at just the last moment by somebody who relates the fact: *καὶ εὖ ἴστε, ἀπωλώλει ἄν, εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ ἐπιστὰς ἀπηγγόνισά τε αὐτὸν* (i.e. removed him - ἀπό from the ἀγχόνη) *καὶ παρέλυσα τῆς ἐμβροχῆς, ἐπὶ πολὺ τε ὀκλαῖξ παρακαθήμενος ἐπινύσσω τὸν ἄνθρωπον, βαυκαλῶν καὶ διακωδωνίζων...* τὸ δὲ μάλιστα ὀνήσαν ἐκεῖνο ἦν, ὅτι ἀμφοτέραις κατασχῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἄκρα διεπίεσα. Clearly one cannot lull someone to sleep by pricking and pushing and pulling and beating him. (It may be noted here that Hesychius has *βαυκανήσεται βοήσεται, βοήσει*; see further down). Further *βαύκαλον* in Etym. Mag. is: *μαλακίζόμενον, τρυφερὸν καὶ ὠραϊστόν*, which suggests luxurios softness with its regular attendants. We see the connection *ibid.* s.v. *βαυκίδες: ὑποδήματα Ἰωνικὰ πολυτελῆ. καὶ βαυκίζεσθαι τὸ θρύπτεσθαι. καὶ βαῦ (βαυκαλίζειν Sylburg; καταβαυκαλίζειν Herwerden) τὸ κατακοιμίζειν. «κατεβαυκάλισέ με» φησὶν ὁ κωμικός (Aristophanes? so Dindorf, Fr. 716; Gaisford ad Etym. Mag. s.v. *Βαυκίδες* reports Sturzis' view that Alexis should be the author meant; but the reason adduced is flimsy). In this juxtaposition of enervation, conceit and deceit (which may be lurking in *κατακοιμίζειν*) we have precisely the modern Greek sense. Similarly Aristophanes Fr. 319 Blaydes = Fr. 355 PCG vol. III 2 p. 200, apud Aspasius, ad Aristot. Eth. p. 58A ed. Aldina = CAG XX p. 200 Heyeb.: *Βαυκὸν... τρυφερὸν, ὡς ὁ ποιητῆς Ἄραρος (Aristophanes son) ἐν Καμπυλιῶνι* (Fr. 9 PCG vol. II p. 528): *Βαυκά, μαλακά, τερπνά, τρυφερά. Μετενηγέχθαι δ' ἔοικεν τὸ ὄνομα ἀπὸ τῶν βαυκίδων, ὃ ἐστὶν εἶδος ὑποδημάτων Ἰωνικῶν, οἷς αἱ Ἰάδες χρώνται, οὐ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν ταῖς Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις (sc. ταῖς δευτέραις) μέμνηται.* This general implication of soft lewdness is also confirmed by Fr. IV (Meineke III p. 485 = Fr. 224.9 PCG vol. II p. 148) of Alexis comedy *Ταραντίνοι* (apud Athenaeus IV, 134 A): Athenians nowadays, it is complained, are prone to dance even upon smelling wine, which you can testify by entering a symposium suddenly: *καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἀγενεῖοις ἴσως ἔπεστί τις / χάρις· ἀλλ' ἐπὰν δῆ τὸν γόγητα Θεόδοτον /**

ἢ (καὶ Hirschig, Jacobi) τὸν παραμασύντην (= παραμασή-
την from *μασσῶ*, i.e. parasite) ἴδω τὸν ἀνόσιον
βαυκίζόμενον τὰ λευκά τ' ἀναβάλλονθ' ἄμα

(Jacobs; τὰ λευκὰ τὸν ἄβαλλον θ' sic libri; for the sence v. Pollux II 60 *Κτησίας δέ που φησὶν ἀναβάλλειν τὰ λευκὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὸν Σαρδανάπαλλον*; cf. Athenaeus XII p. 2529 A)

ἦδιστ' ἂν ἀναπήξαιμ' ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου λαβίων. (Dobree;
ἦδιστον ἀναπήξαιμ' ἂν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου λαβίων codd).

For ἀναπήξαιμ' ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου cf. πρὸς τῇ σανίδι δεῖν, Aristophanes, Thesmophoriaz. 940, and scholium ad loc. Perhaps simply: put in stocks. Ἀναβάλλειν τὰ λευκά is aptly interpreted by Hirschig (cf. Meineke V. I p. CCXIV) as a lascivious movement of the eyes (v. references in loc.cit.) and Jacoby well compares Pollux II, 60: Κτησίας δέ φησιν, ἀναβάλλειν τὰ λευκά τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὸν Σαρδανάπαλον (Sardanapalus being very apt company to our Theodotus). As to βαυκιζόμενον, Hesychius explains it as τρυφερόν καὶ ὠραϊστήν; and Pollux IV, 100 has: βαυκισμός, Βαύκου ὄρχηστοῦ κῶμος ἐπώνυμος, ἀβρά τις ὄρχησις καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐξυγραινουσα where ἐξυγραινουσα connotes a lewd, lustful abandon. (As to the dancer Βαῦκος, the likelihood is that he - whether a real or imaginary dancer - was named because of the character of his κῶμος, rather than vice-versa). The nature and character of this dance is significant in our context. It is as Hesychius says, confirming Pollux, Ἰωνικὴ ὄρχησις· καὶ εἶδος ὠδῆς πρὸς ὄρχησιν πεποημένον. The scholiast ad Aristophanes, Equites, 20, commenting on ἀπόκινον explains: ἔστι δὲ καὶ εἶδος ὄρχήσεως φορτικῆς (coarse, vulgar)· οἱ δὲ μέλος (cf. the ὠδῆ of Hesychius)· καὶ ὁ βαυκισμός. Thus our βαυκισμός is connected with ἀπόκινον which is again identified with μακτρισμός in Athenaeus XIV 629E: Τὴν δ' ἀπόκινον καλουμένην ὄρχησιν, ἧς μνημονεύει Κρατῖνος ἐν Νεμέσει (Fr. II, Meineke, vol. II, p. 86 = Fr. 127 PCG vol. IV p. 185), καὶ Κηφισόδωρος ἐν Ἀμαζόσιν (Fr. II, Meineke, vol. II, p. 883 = Fr. 2 PCG vol. IV p. 64), Ἀριστοφάνης τ' ἐν Κενταύρω (Fr. 272 Blaydes = 269 Dindorf Fr. 287 PCG vol. III 2 p. 163) καὶ ἄλλοι πλείονες, ὕστερον μακτρισμὸν ὠνόμασαν· ἦν καὶ πολλαὶ γυναικες ὠρχοῦντο, ὡς καὶ μακτιστρίας (ex μαρκτυπίας) ὀνομαζομένας οἶδα. This was a lascivious and obscene kind of dance, v. Pollux IV 101: βακτριασμός (sic; probably to be connected to μακτρισμός from Athenaeus or rather we should read μακτρισμός) δὲ καὶ ἀπόκινος καὶ ἀπόσεισις ἀσελγῆ εἶδη ὄρχήσεων ἐν τῇ τῆς ὀσφύος περιφορᾷ - in the circular movement of the loins; and this is how we should understand the γελοῖαι = scabrously ludicrous, cf. Athenaeus XIV 629F: καὶ γελοῖαι δ' εἰσιν ὄρχησεις ἴγδις καὶ μακτρισμός, ἀπόκινός τε καὶ σοβάς, ἔτι δὲ etc. For ἴγδις cf. Pollux 104 and Etym. M. s.v., in which latter passage again the λυγισμός of ὀσφύς (bending and twisting of the loins) is mentioned (Bothe's account of this type of saltation apud Blaydes, Fragmenta Aristoph. loc.cit., is simplistic). Finally, it should not be omitted to take account of the passage from the Grammaticus in Bekker's *Anecdota* p. 429, 29: Ἀπόκινος: γένος ὄρχήσεως φορτικῆς· οἱ δὲ μέλος, ἧ ὁ κιναιδογράφων ἱαμβος. To end with two further

glosses from Hesychius: *βαυκά· ἡδέα*. And *βαυκίσματα· τρυφερώματα* (= *mollitia, delicia, daintinesses*).

I may note one more point here: *β* and *κ* are palaeographically very easily interchangeable. (Thus in the above mentioned fragment from Alexis Tarantinos the master-MS of Athenaeus has *βαυκιζόμενον* to judge from Kaibel's silence in his edition) but later MSS must have had *καυκιζόμενον* which was corrected by Casaubon (v. Meineke III, p. 485)). Consequently, one ought perhaps to consider the possibility of there being really a case of *βαυβ-* instead of the transmitted *βαυκ-* in some at least of the above mentioned instances. Or could it even be that when the Antiatticista, in referring to Alexis' use of *βαυκαλίζω*, comments: *ἀντι τοῦ βαυκαλίσαι* (see the beginning of the present note), he simply means to indicate that Alexis used the un-Attic form of one and the same word? However this may stand, I think enough has been said to justify this inference: *βαυβ-* verbal forms connote sleeping in coital copulation; *βαυκ-* verbal forms indicate an act, behaviour or state of soft luxurious lewdness. Perhaps the *μισήτη* (or *μισήτη*) *γυνή* of which we shall speak soon provides the connecting link between those two parts of what is, evidently, one and the same semantic field.

30. Corrected from the *τὸν γάμον* of the MS, already by Sopingius. Cf. Eustathius p. 1494, 61: *Τὰ μέντοι ἐναντία τοῦ ἀβακεῖν* (it is about the *ἀβάκησαν* in Homer *Odyssey* δ, 249), *βάβαξ, ἦτοι λάλος, μαινόμενος, ἄσωτος, γάλλος κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς* (*οὐ* (sc. of the word *βάβαξ*) *χρησῖς καὶ παρὰ Λυκόφρονι* (472)). *ὁ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ βαβάκτης, ἐκ τοῦ βάβειν*.
31. Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos* 164, has *κραυγάζους* according to some MSS, also *κραυγαστάς, κραυγάσους, κραυγαστικούς* according to others.
32. Cf. *Etym.Mag.* s.v. *κῆλον*: *τὸ ἀνανεῦον καὶ κατανεῦον ξύλον, ὃ ξύλινος ἀντλητήρ* whose movement up and down is suggestive in a sexual context. For the shaft or beam-phallus analogy, one may compare the Latin *columna* and *pyramis* of the *Priapea* as well as the *Horatian palus*.
33. Examining the negative words in the same field, we face the same situation. I have already (note 30) reported the Eustathian comment on the *ἀβάκησαν* of δ 249. *Suda*: *ἄβαζος· ἡσυχος, ἡγουν ἐστερημένος τοῦ βάβειν, ὃ ἐστι λέγειν*. See especially the *Etym.M.* s.v. *ἀβάκησαν* and *ἀβακής*. As to the former, the ancient grammarians seem to have been divided as to its meaning between *ἡγνόησαν* and *ἡσύχασαν*; both can be understood and be seen to be connected in terms of our analysis above. In the entry to the second, the *Etymologus* mentions *Sappho's Fr. 108* (Diehl) where *ἀβάκην φρένα* is explained as *ἡσύχιον καὶ πρᾶον* (cf. also *Hesychius* s.v.); *Anacreon's Fr. 7A* (Bergk), where, very significantly, *chthonic* and *tortuous* rhythms are contrasted to those of *ἀβακιζόμενοι*, to the *ἡσύχιοι* and *μὴ θορυβώδεις*;

«καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀβακῆς ἐπίρρημα ἀβακέως· ἀβακέως εὐδοντι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡσύχως». Finally the following gloss should be noted: ἀβακηνοῦς· τοὺς γυναικὶ μὴ ὀμιλήσαντας (Photius). Here, we have both the metaphorical use of ὀμιλία (intercourse) which makes possible the transition from loquaciousness to prodigality and lewdness, and its connection with the field of words under examination.

34. A few remarks may be appended here for completeness. 1) Βάκχος Ἰακχος and Βαβάκτης can be of exactly the same root, as Curtius saw (English tr. vol. I, p. 201). I would put it thus: *Φά-κ-χος*, *Φί-Φα-κ-χος*, *Φα-Φά-κ-της*. However, I repeat, scientific etymology is a kind of modern mythology not a very trustworthy business. 2) More importantly we have, according to Hesychius, that Βαβήρ is ὁ Ἄρης. We find again the spirit of quarrelsomeness and strife and powerful struggle. 3) The same basic story is told by the Laconic idiom βάβαλον for κραύγασον (v. Hesychius v. βάβαλον). 4) But βάβαλον, according to the same Hesychius, is also the αἰδοῖον pudendum (βάμβαλον is the Phrygian variant according to the same, s.v.). And, I believe, the same root and meaning underlie βουβάλιον which is explained as pudendum muliebre, γυναικὸς μόριον: for to the βάβα-λ-ον of the former type, there answers the βου-βά-λ-ιον of the second, the πρόθεμα βου- (from βοῦς) signaling large size. Here the circle has closed: we have come up with the Empedoclean κοιλία once more.
35. Perhaps the suspect entry: Βαρβός· μύστρον, ἐν Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις in Hesychius (Fr. 320 Dindorf; 326 Blaydes = Fr. 354 PCG vol. III 2 p. 199), should be written thus: βαυβός· μύσχον, which latter word is explained by Hesychius as τὸ ἀνδρεῖον καὶ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον. This change would disrupt the word order in Hesychius but in cases the arrangements in B are preserved very defectively. The word need not be Aristophanian as Pearson had observed, the ἐν Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις may be misplaced and really refer to the preceding entry βάρβιτος, a word which does occur in *Thesmoph.* 137. The βαρβός is not testified otherwise, though μύστρον (spoon) is (cf. Pollux VI 87, where it is reported as occurring in Alexander's letter to his mother in default of any other authority, clearly). If the proposed correction was true, it would nicely fit our hypothesis concerning the nature of Baubo's spectacle, as it will appear later. As regards feminine names in ὦ generally, one should compare e.g. the scholiast in *Equites* 1068: *Κερδὸν δὲ ἡ ἀλώπηξ παρὰ τὴν κερδοσύνην, τουτέστι τὴν πανουργίαν, ὡς Εἰδοθέα Εἰδὼ καὶ Ὑψιπύλη Ὑψίῳ*. This form implies familiarity, even a trace of coarseness and vulgarity (augmented in some uses), as of a low nickname.
36. χοῖρος = τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον; v. Sch. ad Aristophanes *Acharnenses* 773, 781 and the ingenious play on both senses in the play itself 773 sqq.; *Thesm.* 538; *ibid.* 289 (where one should read καὶ τὸν θυγατέρος χοῖρον with

- Scaliger, contra Scholiastam; v. Blaydes critical note ad locum); Suda s.v. χοῖρος where the proverb: Ἀκροκορινθία ἔοικας χοιροπωλήσειν (ἀντὶ τοῦ: ἔοικας μισθαρνήσειν ἐν Κορίνθῳ) because of the number of courtesans in Corinth. The proverb is to be found in Corpus Paroem. Plutarchus, Centuria I 92. The multiplicity of names for the pudendum muliebri is mentioned as a well-known fact by Eustathius p. 1539, 33: ὅτι δὲ πολυώνυμον ὄν τὸ γυναικείον αἰδοῖον (ἄμβων τε γὰρ λέγεται καὶ χοῖρος καὶ ἐσχάρα καὶ δέλτα, τὸ αὐτὸ <δὲ> καὶ κέλῃς καλεῖται παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς) οὐκ ἄδηλόν ἐστι. In latin, Varro, *De Re Rustica* II, 4, 10 testifies that porcus was used in exactly the same way: Nostrae mulieres, maxime nutrices, naturam quae feminae sunt in virginibus appellant porcum, et Graeci χοῖρον. Cf. also Hesychius χοιροτροφείον: περιζῶμα γυναικείον (i.e., as Pergerus puts it, zona pudendi mulieribus).
37. See there the description of Rubensohn. Similar statues were numerous in Egypt, but without the significant existence of the swine. Cf. the incident with the Egyptian goddess Baba related above. In this connection one must also remember Herodotus II, 60; but of this, see below.
38. Cf. e.g. Plato, *Phaedo* 76c: Κἀθαρσις δὲ εἶναι ἄρα οὐ τοῦτο ξυμβαίνει, ὅπερ πάλαι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ λέγεται, τὸ χωρίζειν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ ἐθίσει αὐτὴν καθ' αὐτὴν πανταχόθεν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος συναγείρεσθαι τε καὶ ἀθροίζεσθαι, καὶ οἰκεῖν κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν παρόντι καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔπειτα μόνῃ καθ' αὐτὴν, ἐκλυομένην ὥσπερ ἐκ δεσμῶν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος; Olympiodorus commenting on this passage (VII.10; p. 43, 10ff. ed. Norvin) informs us that Plato modeled this passage on the Orphic beliefs; cf. also the anonymous commentator (signalized B by Norvin) Σρκη. Orphic theology, Eleusinian ritual and Platonic ideology go hand on hand.
39. And this is the gist of Iamblichus' reply to those who would object to the ritual elements of the cultus that are apparently unworthy of the divinity. His main answer is given in *De Mysteriis* I, 11, p. 60 des Places: τῶν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐκάστοτε ἐπιτελουμένων, τὰ μὲν ἀπόρρητόν τινα καὶ κρείττονα λόγου τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχει· τὰ δ' ὡς σύμβολα καθιέρωται ἐξ αἰδίου τοῖς κρείττοσι· τὰ δ' εἰκόνα τινα ἄλλην ἀποσώζει, ...τὰ δὲ τιμῆς ἕνεκεν προσάγεται ἢ ἀφομοιώσεως ὅποιασούν ἢ καὶ οἰκειώσεως στοχάζεται· ἕνια δὲ τὸ ἡμῖν χρήσιμον παρασκευάζει ἢ καθαίρει ὅπως καὶ ἀπολύει τὰ ἡμέτερα τῶν ἀνθρώπων πάθη, ἢ ἄλλο τι τῶν ἡμῖν συμβαινόντων δεινῶν ἀποτρέπεται. He then proceeds to further elaborate the point by selecting two such apparently objectionable practices, phallic worship and obscene speech, giving his account of their symbolism, and then commenting on their cathartic function as follows (*op.cit.* p. 61 des Places): Αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων παθημάτων τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν, πάντῃ μὲν εἰργόμεναι καθίστανται

σφοδρότεροι· εἰς ἐνέργειαν δὲ βραχεῖς καὶ ἄχρι τοῦ συμμέτρου προαγόμενοι χαίρουσι μετρίως καὶ ἀποπληροῦνται, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἀποκαθαιρόμενοι πειθοῖ καὶ οὐ πρὸς βίαν ἀναπαύονται. Διὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἔν τε κωμῳδία καὶ τραγωδία ἀλλότρια πάθη θεωροῦντες ἴσταμεν τὰ οἰκεία πάθη καὶ μετρίωτερα ἀπεργαζόμεθα καὶ ἀποκαθαίρομεν (cf. Aristotle's definition of tragedy), ἔν τε τοῖς ἱεροῖς, θεάμασί τισι καὶ ἀκούσματι τῶν αἰσχρῶν, ἀπολούμεθα τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων ἀπ' αὐτῶν συμπιπτούσης βλάβης. Θεραπείας οὖν ἕνεκα τῆς ἐν ἡμῖν ψυχῆς καὶ μετριότητος τῶν διὰ τὴν γένεσιν προσφυσμένων αὐτῇ κακῶν, λύσεώς τε ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμῶν καὶ ἀπαλλαγῆς χάριν τὰ τοιαῦτα προσάγεται· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰκότως αὐτὰ ἄκεα Ἡράκλειτος προσεῖπεν (Fr. 68 DK) ὡς ἐξακούμενα τὰ δεινὰ etc.

40. For instance, the Orphic hymn 63, 15 ff. has:

καὶ ζῶων πάντων, ὅπως ἔν κόλποισι τιθηνεῖ
γαῖα θεὰ μήτηρ καὶ πόντιος εἰνάλιος Ζεὺς (sc. Ποσειδῶν)

"All animals which Earth and Poseidon take care of and breed".

Sophocles, *Oedipus Colon.* 1050-51 οὐδ' (in Eleusis) πότνιαι (Demeter and Persephone) σεμνὰ τιθηνοῦνται τέλη / θνητοῖσιν they take care of, foster preside over the rites for, or for the good of, mortals. And so the scholiast: ἐπιμελοῦνται cf. Simonides Fr. 148, 7 Bergk⁴. As to the metaphorical use of τιθήνη cf. Pindar *Pythion.* I, 20: νιφόεσσ' Αἴτνα, πάνετες χιόνος ὀξείας τιθήνα; and Plato's τιθήνη γενέσεως is famous. Timocles, *Heroes* Fr. II (Meineke III, 599) = Fr. 13 PCG vol. VII p. 765, apud Athenaeus X 445 F, makes a point against those who instead of simply saying τράπεζα, would say, among other things: βίου τιθήνη. This then appears to be condemned, but it is frigidly figurative, whereas we need an extended sense.

41. Kern, op.cit., edits the tractate under the heading *Κάθοδος <τῆς Κόρης>* (sic). But this is a mistake; it must be the *κάθοδος* of Demeter to Hades in search of Persephone, after she had learnt about her daughter's abduction. The papyrus itself ends thus: ὅθεν κάθοδος λέγεται, referring to the reverse of the *ἀνοδος* celebrated in the context of the Thesmophoria (cf. also note 43). V. scholia in *Thesmoph.* ad 80, and ad 185 (though I must say that the scholiast in the second passage seems to interpret the point differently). Cf. also Orphic hymn 41 where Demeter (as *Μήτηρ Ἀνταία*) is descending to Hades (after ceasing her fasting) in search of Persephone. This descent to Hades should be correlated and aspectually identified with Demeter's initiative copulation with the archetypal boy-hero-initiate: Eubulus, who showed Demeter the way to Hades and Persephone.

42. Correcting the manuscript reading from *Βραυβίω* to *Βαυβίω*.

43. This incident must have followed the singular event we are investigating and preceded Demeter's self-revelation as a goddess (v. Papyrus cit. VII) and her descent to Hades under the guidance of Euboulus the son of Dysaules (v. Orphic hymn 41) according to one interpretation of that difficult passage, which is however immaterial for the purpose at hand. See further below in the text V. n. 41.
44. Even quite apart from what I shall adduce below, Baubo's sexual-erotic nature may well be preserved in the above account by Psellus. Spirits were thought to indulge in libidinous lewdness sometimes towards human beings; cf. Iamblichus *Babyloniaca*, apud Photius cod. 94, 3: *καὶ τράγου τι φάσμα ἐρᾷ Σινωνίδος*; also cf. Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* VI, 27: *ἐπεφόιτα δὲ ἄρα τῆ κώμη δέκατον ἡδὴ μῆνα Σατύρου φάσμα λυττῶν ἐπὶ τὰ γύναια* etc.
45. He further mentions that Hecate was sent by her father in search of Persephone. The connection of Hecate with the abduction of Persephone, and Demeter's inquiries about that event, is testified by the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, v. 22ff. It is interesting to note that the scholiast *loc.cit.*, perhaps on Callimachus' authority, further identifies Hecate with Artemis (cf. Pausanias I, 43, 1), and calls her, very significantly, *Δαδοῦχος*. Hecate is also represented as *τροφὸς Περσεφόνης* (scholia in Theocritum *loc.cit.* p. 272, I Wendel). The significance of the identification of Hecate with Artemis will appear in a moment, when brought into relation with Herodotus II, 59ff.
46. And we know the connection of Thessalian witches with Moon Hecate; they even brought her down to earth by means of their spells.
47. Once again, of course, we find the motive of the oriental origin of Greek religious beliefs. Note in particular the forceful *ἤρπασε!* One may also suggest that *οὐδενὸς ἄλλου* is related to the affair concerning the divulgement, on the part of Aeschylus, of mysteric doctrines and his consequent impeachment before the Areopagus. Cf. Aristotle, *Ethica Nicom.* III, 1111a10 (according to whom Aeschylus pleaded *οὐκ εἰδέναι τι ἀπόρητα ἦν, ὡσπερ Αἰσχύλος τὰ μυστικά*; Eustathius, Comm. in Aristotel. *Eth. Nic.* ad loc. - where the plays in which this occurred are mentioned: *Ἰέρεια, Τοξότιδες, Σίσυφος Πετροκυλιστής, Ἰφιγένεια, Οἰδίπους*; all of them probably connected with Artemis; perhaps we ought to excise [*καὶ ἐν Οἰδίποδι*] - Aelianus, *Varia Historia* V, 19; Clement, *Stromata* B, p. 461 (Potter) according to which: *ὡς Αἰσχύλος τὰ μυστήρια ἐπὶ σκηνηῆς ἐξείπων* etc. The reference to *μυστικά* by Aristotle and *μυστήρια* by Clement is to be understood in connection with the Eleusinian mysteries (when accused, Aeschylus claimed not to have been initiated, and, therefore, technically not under the ban of publicising their content, which he must have maintained that he got to know independently and by his own spiritual endeavours). On

the other hand, the plays in which the divulgement is said to have taken place seem to be especially connected with Artemis (with the above-suggested omission of *Οιδίππους* they might even form a tetralogy). Therefore, and in view of the fact that, as we were told, Aeschylus was the first to maintain that the real mother of Artemis was Demeter and that Leto was her nurse, we may propose that Aeschylus (unawares, it would appear) divulged and profaned the mystic relation of Artemis (perhaps as chthonic Hecate) to the Eleusinian divinities, by relating some of the relevant facts, such as the one we are considering, namely that Leto was but nurse to Artemis, her real mother being Demeter. This connection is only to be expected in view of the evidence already adduced above. Artemis-Hecate is there said to be daughter of Demeter, and aspectually identified with Kore. If this suggestion is correct, we may then understand the *οὐδενὸς ἄλλου* of Herodotus as maintaining Aeschylus' innocence: he only got his information from the Egyptian lore, and from nowhere else. The subject was of topical interest to Herodotus.

48. A possible theoretical appreciation and interpretation of this important connection can be found in Proclus (v. e.g. *Theol. Plat.* VI, ch. II, where the *ζωογονική τάξις* is analysed, the second triad of the Assimilative or *Ἡγεμονικοί* gods. The *Κορική τριάς* is then named *Ἄρτεμις - Περσεφόνη - Ἀθηνᾶ* according to Orphic theology and *Ἐκάτη - Ψυχὴ - Ἀρετή* according to the Chaldaean Oracles v. esp. p. 372 ed. Portus). Cf. also op.cit. VI ch. 22 for Artemis, Demeter, Athena, as they occur in the context of the *ἀπόλυτοι θεοί*. See finally the passages from Proclus' *Commentary on Cratylus*, to be adduced below). It does not concern us here to investigate it as such; but I must emphasize a general relevant point of prime methodological importance in our attempt to understand such religious matters. I refer to the trustworthiness or otherwise of late philosophic writers, and in particular and eminently of Neoplatonists, with respect to their reports concerning religious beliefs, myths and rites (the latter class of sacred observances, naturally, do not play a conspicuous role in their extant writings). It is habitual and customary to question and indeed blatantly to deny their reliability in these (as almost in any other) matters in a supercilious, prejudiced and superficial way. But such an attitude is discredited both on a priori considerations (which may not carry weight with some scholarly types) and by the facts (which ought to have been conclusive for all). Such a fact, and a very striking one, such a case where we are by a fortunate accident able to check the statements of later authors is provided by the present occasion. Thus Proclus, in his commentary to the Platonic *Cratylus* (or rather in the excerpts that we possess of it), has an elaborate doctrine of the difference-in-identity (if I may put it thus) between Artemis (identified with Hecate) and Athena in Persephone (v. e.g. p. 106, 5 ff.

Pasquali). The Proclan doctrine is important in itself theologically, i.e. as an attempt to systematize religious belief adequately in a rational structure. But abstracting from the theology, we have, laying at its foundation, some facts upon which the theology is built and in which it possesses its strictly religious core. Thus, to mention only mythological facts strictly relevant to our purpose at hand, *Κόρη* is said to be called Artemis by Orpheus (p. 94, 27); the Hecatic divinity of the Chaldaean Oracles is set on the same footing with Orphic Artemis (p. 105, 26-27); Hecate is called daughter of Leto (thus identified with Artemis) in an Orphic fragment (p. 107, 3-4) cited by Proclus; and this Hecate-Artemis is identified with, or rather assimilated to, *Kore* (*πολλή τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ ἢ πρὸς τὴν ἐγκόσμιον Ἐκάτην ἔνωσις, καὶ ἢ πρὸς τὴν Κόρην*), a fact which is mentioned as something evident to those with even a slight acquaintance with Orphic tradition (*φανερὸν τοῖς καὶ ὀλίγα τῷ Ὀρφεῖ παραβεβληκόσιν* p. 106, 25-27); finally the union (identification, *ἔνωσις*, which is not mere and simple identity but coalescence in unity, unification) of Leto and Demeter is affirmed as part of the sacred, old tradition (*πάτρια*): *διὸ καὶ τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν πάτρια τὴν αὐτὴν Δήμητρά τε καὶ Λητώ θεραπεύουσιν, τὴν ἔνωσιν ἐνδεικνύμενα τῶν θεαινῶν* (p. 103, 24-26; cf. 106, 28 where instead of *περιέχουσα* read *περιέχεται* with Lobeck cf. Kern *Orph. Fr.* 188, apparently independently also suggested by Pasquali, though he leaves in his text the meaningless *περιέχουσα*). *Πάτρια*, in its context, must mean Orphic tradition, Orphic theology being for the Neoplatonists the Hellenic theology par excellence. We see thus Proclus treating the affiliative identity of Persephone and Artemis on the one hand and of Leto and Demeter on the other as part of the Orphic teaching. Now let anyone imagine what the critical school would say as to this piece of information if Herodotus (and, perhaps following him, Pausanias) had not reported Aeschylus' peculiar (or maybe not so very peculiar) view as to the parentage of Artemis in such unambiguous terms. Would there not be a self righteous cry to this effect: this is a typical piece of late eclecticism in religious matters (*θεοκρασία*), indicative of the perversions introduced into the pristine purity of ancient religion by the confusion and nebulosity of the Neoplatonic interpretations: only their fantastic turn of mind could dare to affiliate things as different as a divinity of the Eleusinian Mystery cult and a deity of the Apollonian religion. On the other hand, even our rudimentary investigation discloses that behind late reports lie original facts, that magical formulae as found in Papyri Magicae, Neoplatonic theories and other such outlandish products of the human spirit, rest, all of them, on a solid core of common tradition which is unscientific and impertinent to disrupt by the distempered eruptions of modern fantastic overcriticism.

49. VIII, 37 (the reference to Aeschylus is in §6: *Δήμητρος δὲ Ἄρτεμιν θυγατέρα εἶναι καὶ οὐ Λητοῦς, ὄντα Αἰγυπτίων τὸν λόγον Αἰσχύλος ἐδίδαξε Εὐφορίωνος τοὺς Ἕλληνας*). Pausanias speaks chiefly of *Δέσποινα*, the deity most revered by the Arcadians (*ταύτην μάλιστα θεῶν σέβουσιν οἱ Ἀρκάδες τὴν Δέσποιναν* §9), and it can be deduced from what he says that this *Δέσποινα* is precisely Artemis as daughter of Demeter (consider in conjunction §4, 6 with context, and §9). In any case *Δέσποινα* is explicitly correlated to Persephone, both being the offspring of Demeter the one by Zeus, the other by Poseidon (§9). For the significant way in which the rape of Demeter by Poseidon occurred (similar in its pattern to her rape by Zeus) see Pausanias VIII, 25, 5 sqq. (whence she was worshipped as *Ἐρινύς*; *Βριμώ* she was called because of her similar extreme anger and rage against Zeus). (Zeus is indicated as father of Artemis (= Hecate) by Callimachus (apud Sch. Theocr. II, 11/12 above cited). But it is significant that Pausanias 2, 24, 4 reports that Aeschylus called Poseidon Zeus as well (*Αἰσχύλος δὲ ὁ Εὐφορίωνος καλεῖ Δία καὶ τὸν ἐν θαλάσῃ*) to which Hermann (Fr. 385) very appositely compares Proclus in Plat. Cratylum 148 (p. 83, 28-9 Pasquali): *ὁ δὲ δεύτερος* (sc. *Ζεὺς*) *δυναδικῶς καλεῖται Ζεὺς ἐνάλιος καὶ Ποσειδῶν* (cf. for a general point n. 48); cf. also *Ζεὺς χθόνιος* for Pluto. This Aeschylean fragment Dindorf correctly connects with the former, numbering them 436b and 435a respectively). We have now the (or one) actual passage from the satyric drama *Δικτυουλκοί* Fr. 46a 10 Radt: *ἄναξ Πόσειδον Ζεῦ τ' ἐνά[λιε]*. Cf. Orphic Hymn 63.16 *πόντιος εἰνάλιος Ζεὺς*. And the correspondence of *Δέσποινα* to Kore is intensified by the mystic symbols (*κίστη, κάτοπτρον*, serpents, torch) and the particulars relating to the cult (*τελετή, μέγαρον*) mentioned by Pausanias, and further confirmed by his explicit wish to connect this cult with that of Bacchus and of the Eleusinian deities. Naturally, when he comes to mentioning the mystic name of the *Δέσποινα* Pausanias shrinks back in sacred awe: *τῆς δὲ Δεσποίνης τὸ ὄνομα ἔδεισα εἰς τοὺς ἀτελέστους γράφειν*. The connection of Artemis to Demeter (as her daughter) may be mediated by Hecate, Moon, *Μήνη*.
50. It is of no consequence from our point of view whether Greeks understood correctly or not Aegyptian religion and (proto-rational) theology. (This supposed equivalent of Artemis is the Pasht of Rawlinson or the Bastet of the modern Aegyptologists; v. s.v. Bonnet, *Reallexicon der Aegypt. Religionsgeschichte*). The point is what they did with what they took took properly or improperly is immaterial. (Thus in Bonnet op.cit., loc.cit. sub fin. another affiliative identification is proposed, with Aphrodite this time but in Gnostic sources. This need not disconcert us). The twelve Olympian deities of the Greek Pantheon were nothing more than a poetic-mythological schematization of the existing Cultus. Existing divinities with their particular

rites had either to be subsumed and be aspectually identified with one or another of the Olympians, or be relegated to the order of Daemons or Heroes or marginal (or local) gods. Naturally therefore, affinities in the nature and worship of a specific divinity, with more than one major Olympian, led to multiple subjugations and aspectual identifications. Consequently differing ascriptions of such a kind in our primary sources should be viewed in this context, and ought not to be taken without more ado as signaling their hesitation, mutual-contradiction or ignorance. We should always remember: it is we who possess fundamentally defective knowledge. Now if this was the situation with respect to Greek divinities in the Greek national context, we cannot be surprised at the occurrence of such multiple ascriptions in connection with parallelisms and analogues drawn between different religion-complexes. Far from disregarding such evidence as mutually contradictory and hence mutually-invalidating, we should meticulously combine it in our conception of the nature and cult of the divinity in question. To return to our immediate point it is further significant that in Egypt the Bastet cult was attracted and, up to a degree, assimilated to the Isis-worship, Isis being considered as identical with Demeter.

51. Although, if we remind ourselves of what has been above said about the Arcadian *Δέσποινα*, and if we pay special attention to the *κίστη* lying on her knees (a *κίστη* in which *τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου αἰδοῖον ἀπέκειτο*, Clement, *Protrepticus* II, 19, 4), things emerge again as wonderfully cohering. It might be said that Clement reports the content of the *κίστη* in the context of Corybantic orgies (which he seems to identify with the *Καβειρική τελετή*, through his identification of *Κάβειροι* and *Κορύβαντες* in *loc.cit.* p. 15, 12 Stählin); but Pausanias mentions that Corybantes were sculptured on the basis of the grand group of deities in the temple of *Δέσποινα* near Acacesion in Arcadia (VIII, 37, 6) which housed statues of Demeter, Despoina and Artemis; not only this, but further, when he comes to give some account of their role in the composition he says: *τὰ ἐς τούτους* (sc. *τοὺς Κούρητας καὶ Κορύβαντας* mentioned immediately before) *παρήγημι ἐπιστάμενος*: he would not reveal what he knows about them; they were part of the Mysteries.
52. One may compare in that direction e.g. Hesychius' lemmata on: *ἐσκολυμμένον, ἀνεσκόλυπτεν, ἀποσκόλυπτε, συνεσκολυμμένον, σκολύπτειν, κάβηλος, κάληβος, Λομβούς* (where note the very interesting connection with *Λόμβαι*), *Κίρων*.
53. Another sign of libidinous expectation, perhaps accompanying the drawing up of garments, was lying with legs wide open or unseemly crossed. Cf. Pollux II, 173 (referring to Strattis, Fr. V of *Fabulae Incertae* Meineke II p. 789 = Fr. 65 PCG vol. VII p. 653) and Hesychius s.v. *περιπεπλίχθαι*. Cf. Aristophanes Fr. 205.4 sq. PCG.

54. See Euripides, *Hecuba* 934 ff. (choral part) and the Scholia (ed. Schwartz I p. 74), especially this passage: αἱ Λακεδαιμόνιαι κόραι διημερεύουσιν ἄζωστοι καὶ ἀχίτωνες (without any inner vestment), ἱματίδιον ἔχουσαι πεπορημένον ἐφ' ἑκατέρου τῶν ὤμων. Καὶ Καλλιμάχος (Fr. 225 Bentley = Fr. 620a Pfeiffer):

ἔσκειν τ' ἄζωστος χᾶτερόπορπος ἔτι.

καὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαίαις γραφαῖς (paintings) οὐκ ὀλίγαι (sic M, correctly; sc. γυναικες, κόραι) οὕτως (Cobet's correction from τ') ἔσταλται· καὶ δωριάζειν τὸ γυμνουμένας φαίνεσθαι τὰς γυναικας. Ἄνακρέων (Fr. 59 = Fr. 399 Page)· ἐκδύσα χιτῶνα (κιθῶνα Page) δωριάζειν. Cf. Etym. Magnum, Hesychius s.v. δωριάζειν, and Eustathius, Comm. p. 975, 37 ff. Cf. Euripides, *Andromache* 593 sqq., particularizing his anti-Lacedaemonian sentiment. Cf. Pfeiffer's note *loc.cit.*

55. Cf. Euripides, *Andromache*, *loc.cit.*; Pollux VII, 55; especially Plutarch, *Comparatio Lycurgi and Numa*, 3; and notice the appellation φανομηρίδες (or φανομηρίδες) as applied to them by Ibycus (Fr. 61, Bergk 4 = Fr. 58 Page), cf. Pollux II, 187 and the already-mentioned passage VII, 55. Cf. Scholia in Clement Alexandrinus iv 128 Kletz: (τὰς Λακαίνας) φανομηρίδας ἔλεγον παρὰ τὸ φαίνειν τοὺς μηρούς.
56. Perhaps it is in this connection that we should understand μεγαρικά σφίγγες, v. Suda, Hesychius and Photius s.v. in conjunction. Σφίγγες, just as σφίγγεται (cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v.), from σφίγγω, tighten, compress (for σφιγκτήρ in a particularly relevant sense, signifying the sphincter muscle of the anus, see *Anth. Graeca* XII.7). In this context μεγαρικά then may be connected not so much with Megara (though Megarians had a reputation for πονηρία), but with cavities that tighten at their mouths.
57. I have already referred to the scholium ad Aeschylus, *Persae*, 1063; I may here add Clemens, *Protrept.* 39, 3 (Stählin p. 29.9 sqq.) Διόνυσον δὲ ἤδη σιωπῶ τὸν χοιροψάλαν· Σικυώνιοι τοῦτον προσκυνούσιν ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικείων τάξαντες τὸν Διόνυσον μορίων (literally on them), ἔφορον αἰσχους τὸν ὑβρεως (here in the sense of sexual violation) σεβάζοντες ἀρχηγόν. This passage is particularly clear as to the precise implications of the eponymia. It is also significant to note that the scholium to the Clementine passage, after explaining the χοιροψάλας in the way the Aeschylean scholium does, brings into close connection the membrum virile with the pudendum muliebre by mentioning the following lines from Aristophanes' *Acharnenses*, 800 sq.:

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ. χοῖρε, χοῖρε. ΚΟΡΗ. κοὶ κοί.

ΔΙ. τρώγοις ἂν ἐρεβίνθους

where the scholiast remarks: ἔπαιξε πρὸς τὸ αἰδοῖον τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐρέβινθον αὐτὸ καλοῦσι. And we have already studied the equivalence χοῖρος = γυναικείον αἰδοῖον. This passage in Protrepticus could also perhaps provide the correct explanation for Suda's gloss Ἰακχος ὁ Διόνυσος, qualified after some lines by: Ἰακχος, Διόνυσος ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῷ. (And so Photius s.v. Perhaps we should also correct Hesychius to the same effect, since he mentions twice that Ἰακχος ὁ Διόνυσος, the second time as the opinion of τινές. The former occurrence then should probably run Ἰακχος ἐπὶ μαστῷ). Lobeck (*Aglaophemus* p. 823) takes it as meaning the same with ἐπιμάστιον or ὑπομάζιον and considers ὑποκόλπιος (in the Orphic hymn 52, 11) as signifying the same. But, conversely, it is abundantly clear that ὑποκόλπιος in these contexts means primarily on, or close to, the female pudendum (cf. Kern, *Orphica* 31, 24; 32c, 8; and our *Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις* in the examined Orphic fragment); it is thus probable that we should perhaps correct in the lexicographic lemmata we are discussing ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῷ to: ἐπὶ (or ὑπὸ) τῷ κόλπῳ. But this is of course far from certain; probably we should understand, as intended by the gloss, a small baby or child still lactating. Perhaps it is significant that the pigs sacrificed at the mysteries were suckling pigs. Compare the Spartan *τιθηνίδια* where suckling pigs were offered at the temple of *Κορυθάλλια Ἄρτεμις* on behalf of the little male children by their nurses. Cf. Athenaeus IV p. 139B. The picture of a still lactating little boy is also suggested by the notorious description in Lucretius IV 1161: at tumida (Bernays' accepted correction) et mammosa Ceres est ipsa ab Iaccho. The obese and ὑπερμαζώσα (cf. Synesius *Epistola* IV, p. 644B Herscher) Demeter suckles Iacchus in her function as *Κουροτρόφος* - but as a nurse or as his mother? Diodorus reports a version of the mysteric (non-Semelian) Dionysus according to which he was born from Zeus and Demeter (III 61). But the Orphic and the standard account gave him a parentage from Zeus and Persephone (cf. Diodorus himself IV, 4). In III, 63 Diodorus gives both accounts, ascribing to the Demetrian one secondary status: ...μυθολογοῦσι γενέσθαι Διόνυσον ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Περσεφόνης, ὡς δέ τινες ἐκ Δήμητρος. We cannot count on this deviant tale in an Orphic-Eleusinian connection. Iacchus in his (aspectual at least) identification with Zagreus was borne from Persephone, but as Persephone was *Κόρη* and Queen of the Underworld, for both reasons her child has to be nursed by someone else, by the *Κουροτρόφος* par excellence, and the preeminent divinity of the mysteric circle, Demeter, who, besides, was the alter-ego of Kore. Cornutus may supply another motive for the deviant ascription: after his dismemberment at the hands of the Titans, Dionysus was reassembled and reconstituted by Rhea, the equivalent of the Isis in the Egyptian account and correlated to Demeter: μυθολογείται δ' ὅτι διασπα-

σθεις ὑπὸ Τιτάνων συνετέθη πάλιν ὑπὸ τῆς Πέας (30 p. 62.10-1 Lang). And so Philodemus *de pietate* in two passages, v. Orphica 59F (I) and (II) Bernabi, pp. 66-7.

For the identity of the Orphic Dionysus-Zagreus and the Eleusinian Iacchus v. Arrianus, *Anabasis*, II, 16, 3; Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, II §62; Lucianus, *de Saltatione* 39 (§291): Ἰάκχου σπαραγμόν. Cf. E. Gerhard, *über den Bildenkreis von Eleusis*, I p. 261 and n. 71; pp. 291-2 and Tafel I; II pp. 500-2 with notes, esp. 215 and 220; III pp. 426-8 and Tafel V. Further it is evident that the ἐπάφιος (or ἐφάπτωρ in Hermann's conjecture metri causa) as occurring in Orphic hymn 50, 9 and 52, 9 (where we should correct the MSS (teste Quandt p. 37) ἐπάφριε), must be understood in the same way with the above explained ὑποκόλπιος, as was already seen by Gesner (apud Hermann's Orphica, notes *ad loc.* and p. 476), who also in the latter passage gives an ingenious explication of the other puzzling epithet of Dionysus, λύσιος. Iacchus per id ipsum quod ἐπάφιος est, sit παυσίλυπος et φιλάπονος and thus λύσιος.

58. To the story about the forced copulation of Demeter with Zeus in the form of bull and her subsequent wrath (μῆνις) on account of which she received the appellation Βριμώ, as related by Clement (and in more detail by Arnobius), one must compare the exactly parallel story in Pausanias VIII, 25, 5-7 about the coerced coition of Demeter with Poseidon in the form of a horse and her subsequent anger (ὀργή, θυμός), on account of which she was worshipped as Ἐρινύς in Arcadia by the river Ladon (see also supra note 49); the daughter-offspring of this rape had a mystic name which Pausanias states was not revealed to the uninitiated; from the parallelism with the former passage we must assume that the non-committal name was Δέσποινα. On Βριμώ we have seen that Clement (and Arnobius) state that Demeter was so-called on account of her μῆνις against Zeus; and the sense of wrath and threatening anger is amply testified (cf. Aristophanes, *Equites* 855 where the scholiast has βριμᾶσθαι, τὸ ὀργίζεσθαι καὶ ἀπειλεῖν - ; Xenophon, *Inst. Cyri* IV, 5-9). It could also mean power, extreme potential of energy: cf. *Homeric Hymn to Athena* 9-10:

μέγας δ' ἐλελίξειτ' Ὀλυμπος
δεινὸν ὑπὸ βρίμης γλαυκώπιδος.

And similarly in Apollonius Rhodius IV 1676-7:

Ὡς γε χάλκειος περ ἔων ὑπὸειξε δαμῆναι
Μηδείας βρίμη πολυφαρμάκου

where the scholiast has *βρίμη, τῆ ἰσχύϊ*. The same two naturally-connected senses are testified by Hesychius in various lemmata (cf. also in the *Etym. Magn.* and *Suda*); but he also adds an interesting dimension in this nexus of meaning by giving a Cypriot idiomatic expression: *βριμάζει· ὀργᾶ εἰς συνουσίαν. Κύπριοι*, that is to be in heat, to swell with lust and desire after coition. This must be connected with another gloss on *Βρίμη*, which he explains on the one hand with the more ordinary *ἀπειλή*, and on the other with the more idiomatic *γυναικεία ἀρρητοπούα*, which, given the sense of *ἀρρητοποιεῖν* (and *ἀρρητουργεῖν*) must mean the deviantly induced orgasm in a female; this would naturally point to the *ὄλισβος* and the *σκυτίνη ἐπικουρία* being connected in some way to Demeter. Our Baubo incident may well provide the connecting link. It is in such context of swelling sexual desire, orgasm and wrath and rage of the raped one that we should understand what Hippolytus' Ophitic source gives us in the most important statement about the Eleusinian mysteries V, 8, 39-41 where the following mystic formula and interpretation of the words is included: *καθάπερ αὐτὸς ὁ ἱεροφάντης... νυκτὸς ἐν Ἐλευσίνι ὑπὸ πολλῶ πυρὶ τελῶν τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἀρρητα μυστήρια βοᾷ καὶ κέκραγε λέγων: «ἱερὸν ἔτεκε πότνια κοῦρον Βριμῶ Βριμὸν» τουτέστιν Ἰσχυρὰ Ἰσχυρόν*. This *Βριμῶ* here, it should be noted, probably refers to Persephone, as the mother of the mystic Dionysus. This Terrible One could also be Hecate, but in another connection, or as aspectually identified with Persephone. The main sources are as follows: Lycophron, *Alexandra* 1174-1178 makes it clear that the *Βριμῶ τρίμορφος* meant is Hecate (also Artemis in her Hecatic aspect, for in 1180 she is called *Φεραίη* to which compare Callimachus' *Hymn to Delus* 259, quoted by the scholiast ad loc.). But the scholion ad loc. is instructive; for the scholiast presupposes that Persephone is normally the Terrible One and thus he wishes to combine the normal with the Lycophronian usage: *Βριμῶ ἢ Φερσεφόνη· ἢ δὲ αὐτὴ λέγεται καὶ Ἐκάτη. <καὶ> Ἀπολλώνιος: Βριμῶ νυκτιπόλον χθονίην ἐνέροισιν ἄνασσαν* (Γ, 862) (the same in *Etym. Magn.* s.v.). And the scholion continues: *εἰρησθαι δὲ ὅτι Ἑρμῆν ἐρασθέντα ἐπὶ κυνηγεσίαν ἐξιούση θελῆσαι βιαίως μιγῆναι, ἢ δὲ ἐνεβριμήσατο αὐτῷ· ὁ δὲ φοβηθεὶς ἀπετράπη. Καὶ ἐντεῦθεν Βριμῶ προσηγορεύθη* (also in *Etym. M.*). (Probably it is to this story that Propertius II, 2, 11-12 alludes, and we should keep Brimo there). Finally it is added: *καὶ ἢ Περσεφόνη Βριμῶ λέγεται. Δοκεῖ δὲ ἢ αὐτὴ εἶναι Ἐκάτη καὶ Βριμῶ*. The story about Hermes and Hecate is similar to that related by Clement about Zeus and Demeter; there can be no doubt that the name *Βριμῶ* is connected with frustrated sexuality of one type or another. Apollonius Rhodius in Γ, 861-3 has this passage:

ἐπτάκι δὲ Βριμῶν κουροτρόφον ἀγκαλέσασα
 Βριμῶν νυκτιπόλον, χθονίην, ἐνέροισιν ἄνασσαν
 λυγαίῃ ἐνὶ νυκτὶ etc.

which should refer to Proserpina (ἐνέροισιν ἄνασσαν) but also to Demeter (Κουροτρόφον), or rather to Kore in her Motherly function; whereas in Γ, 1211 he has: Βριμῶν κυκλήσκων Ἑκάτην ἐπαρωγὸν ἀέθλων (in the scholia to the former passage the explanation given (νυκτερινὰ φάσματα, Ἑκατεία, Ἔμπουσα v. Hesychius s.v. Ἔμπουσα) fits Hecate). In the Orphic Argonautica 17-8 by Βριμοῦς εὐδυνάτοιο γονάς, we must understand Dionysus' birth from Persephone, as the ἔργα αἰδήλα Γηγενέων (referring to the διαμελισμός of Ζαγρεύς by the Titans) makes clear. And similarly in v. 427. In Theodoretus, Graecarum Affectionum Curatio p. 10, 18 ff. (ed. Raeder) Βριμῶν is associated with Rhea and Cybele as another name for the same deity. (In Lucianus, Menippus, 20, we can only with certainty deduce that Βριμῶν is a chthonic divinity. Probably it refers to Hecate, since Persephone would be associated to the ἀρχαί). The sense of the word is certain in our religious contexts: Βριμῶν is the Terrible One, full of mad anger and wrath, fearful, full of power and energy, all these normally related to sexual assault or rape. Demeter, Persephone, Hecate are all called Βριμῶν. They are closely related in Mystery religion as we have seen above; and they are here aspectually identified in their Fearfulness and Wrath especially in connection with sexual frustration. There are two elements in this common core. The one comes from the Great Mother of Asia Minor and her wild outbursts; the other relates to the Thracian Maiden, say the Ἄρτεμις Ταυροπόλος or Βένδις, and the compressed energy of a repressed sexuality which she violently releases from time to time. These are the archetypes from which Βριμῶν is made. An important bearing belonging to the noticed parallelism between Βριμῶν and Ἐρινύς, is that Pausanias explicitly states that the affair with Poseidon took place during Demeter's wanderings in search of the Kore, whereas we do not know when the incident with Zeus happened; for it is naïve to say that, since the offspring of the latter copulation was Persephone herself, it should have occurred clearly before the abduction of Kore. To think along such lines is to disregard totally the logic of religious identities and distinctions; one cannot treat gods (or ideas for the matter of that) as if they were physical things. Distinctions in these areas may simply bring into prominence an aspect, feature, character or event of another entity; and identities can very well only point emphatically to the common core shared by different individuals. All of which goes to show how immensely complicated any serious endeavour to really understand ancient religion must be; and how grossly oversimplified all current versions and interpretations of

it necessarily are. Failure to observe these points duly results in the various forms of irrelevancies and worse that bedevil expositions of ancient religions more than anything else, one example of which is the indiscriminate application of the principle of personal difference as it might be called, ending in catalogues of such and such a number of Zeuses, Apollos, Dianas, Demeters and so on (see, e.g., the tables at the end of Mayor's edition of Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*, misplaced so-called rationalism being not, alas, the prerogative of Modern mechanistic thinking alone!). To come back to the material point, if we conclude, by reason of the noticed parallelism, that Demeter's affair with Zeus also happened during her wanderings, we are helped towards the appropriation of cardinal insights that respect the essence of the Eleusinian Mysteries, as well as once more appreciating the correctness of late testimonies: Psellus in his brief delineation of the Eleusinian Liturgy puts the representation of Demeter's *μῆνις* and Zeus' atonement after the *γαμήλιος ἐπὶ τῆς κόρης ὕμναϊος*, (*de Daemonibus*, 3). The insight meant will be very briefly adumbrated in the final conclusion of the main text above; we are helped towards it because we see Demeter suffering in herself as well as for her *Κόρη* (and we should never forget the deliberate ambiguity of *Κόρη*: maiden daughter) by the *ἄ-θεσμος* exploitation of that which is the most eloquent index of our fallen state in *γένεσις*: the point then is that *θεσμοί* must be imposed, and a cathartic outlet instituted. Whether (more logically) before the Rape of the Kore; or (more symbolically) after the event but before her joyful acquiescence in it (i.e. during her turmoil and vexed wanderings), Demeter's forced copulation with Zeus reproduces, and is aspectually identified with Hades' deflowering of Persephone, i.e. the death of Kore. Generation presupposes violence by the male against the female. This violence is institutionalised and becomes orderly and *θέσμια* as copulation and conjugation by virtue of the identity of sexes revealed by Baubo, which opens the way to another form of coition, the dedication of the male to the female in symbolic representation of the aboriginal (female) hermaphroditism of the first principle of Darkness. This grounds both procreative marriage and ritual celibacy; it also safeguards the road to salvation.

59. Where see the mystic formula: *ταῦρος δράκοντος καὶ πατὴρ ταύρου δράκων* (cf. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, Liturgical Fr. VIII and pp. 155-6, ed. 2), which, probably, also expresses the mystical identity of father (Sabazius) and son (Zagreus), as Dieterich saw, to whose references add Orphic hymn 52, 6 (*θεῶν πάτερ ἦδὲ καὶ υἱέ*, of Dionysus Trieretic), and also the important fact in this connection that, according to Arnobius V, 20, Zeus copulated with Demeter in the form of a bull. For Clement's account of the

- copulation of Zeus with Persephone, compare, in the context of the magical papyri, IV, 1405: *Περσέφασσα... πυριδρακοντόζωνε παῖ*.
60. The feminine of *Φόρβας* (cf. s.v. Hesychius and Harpocration s.v. *Φορβαντεῖον*). He is connected with the mystic *Κουρήτες* and with *Ἐρεχθεύς* (probably as *Ἐριχθόνιος*), whose importance, for our purpose, in the mythological and cultic cycle is clear from its parallelism.
61. To be connected with *Ἄρτεμις Ὀρθία* probably. An epitheton with unmistakable phallic connotations. Cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v. *Ὀρθάνης, Ὀρθαγόρικος* (with the notes in Alberti's edition), and *ὀρθίας*. Cf. further Scholia in Lycophron 538; Photius s.v.; Athenaeus X, 441F; Strabo XIII, 588A; Aristophanes *Lysistr.* 981; *Eccles.* 911 with the sch.; Athenaeus IV, 140B. Perhaps also the cakes *ὀρθοστάδαι* (v. Hesychius s.v.) ought to be connected with this cycle.
62. For Baubo symbolizes the pudendum muliebre as encompassing the virile member, while the snake has an eminently phallic significance. (*Σαύρα*, lizard, is the playful equivalent see the *Musa Puerilis* of Strato, Epigram 3, 207, 242; cf. Martial XIV, 172).
63. Meineke vol. II p. 572 = Fr. 471 PCG vol. V p. 533. Cf. also Photius s.v.
64. The identity of *οὐρά* (in such contexts) with the male organ, is further confirmed by Eustathius p. 1821, 52: *παλαιὰ δὲ χρῆσις οὐρὰν παίζει καὶ τὸ ἀνδρεῖον αἰδοῖον· ὅθεν καὶ γυνὴ μύζουρις* (from *μυζάω + οὐρά*, one practising fellatio) *ἢ αἰσχροποιός* (cf. p. 862, 42). (Cf. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comicorum Anonymorum* CVI, CVII (vol. IV, p. 631) and *Supplementa Addendorum* by Jacobi, vol. VI p. CCCXXXVII).
65. This is confirmed a posteriori from the facts themselves in almost every checkable case and respect.
66. Schneider (apud Hermann, *Ophica*, p. 306) proposed *τῶν περὶ Δημήτερα* but it is wholly unnecessary. The (aspectual) identity of the Great Mother with Demeter is impeccably old: see e.g. the famous chorus in Euripides *Helena*, 1301 sqq. The lemma has as follows: *Μῖσα τις* (vel *Μισατίς*)· *Μῖσα τῶν περὶ τὴν μητέρα τις, ἣν καὶ ὀμνύουσι*. That they even take oaths on her bespeaks her importance. For Hesychius entry *Μίδα θεός* see below in the text.
67. I may recommend in this connection the article already referred by Dieterich, *Die Göttin Misa*, *Philologus* LII (N.F. VI) pp. 1 sqq. Dieterich had the right sense and feeling for these matters (a capacity not perspicuous with the critical school of the last two centuries) but not the philosophical and systematical turn of mind that fits so well with things Greek; and he was able to sense and feel the truth in its general contour and nature, rather than see and understand thoroughly its deeper import and organic structure.

68.V. Hesychius s.v. *μισητήν*: τὴν καταφερῆ (or rather *κατωφερῆ*) λέγουσιν, and the following entry, where, after quoting the Cratinean fragment to be adduced in the text, he adds: τὸν δὲ ἀπλῶς μισητόν, τὸν ἀνίκανον (sc. ad rem veneream) ἢ ἀπληστον τῇ τρυφῇ. (This connection between impotence and insatiability, confirmed also by other grammarians not only regarding food, cf., Photius s.v. *μισητία*: ἢ πρὸς ὀτιοῦν ἄχαρις ἀπληστία are well exemplified s.v. *Κίρων*, and must be significant in their connotation of utter lewdness and sexual depravity. Compare with the case of male youth-deliciae, eunuchs who are castrated at the prime and heat of their manhood so that copulation with them can be protracted, intensely pleasurable and without danger of unwelcome consequences on the part of the Roman matrons: Juvenalis VI, 366 sqq.). For *μισητή* v. also Etym. M. (where it is explained as *πόρνη* and deduced from *μίσγεσθαι*) and especially Suda, s.v. *μισήτη* and *μισητία* (the same lemma in Photius Lexicon). Cf. Eustathius, p. 1650, 64 sqq.: αὐτὸ δὲ γε τὸ μισεῖν, κοινότερον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐχθραίνειν τεθὲν ἢ κωμικῆ σεμνότητος (!) ἐπὶ μίξεων ἔθετο ἀσέμνων. Ἀριστοφάνης γοῦν μισητίαν ἐπὶ κατωφερείας ἔφη, ἤγουν ροπήσ ἀσχέτου τῆς περὶ μίξεις· ἄλλοι δὲ μισήτην βαρυτόνως, πρὸς διαστολὴν τῆς ὀξυτονουμένης, τὴν κοινὴν καὶ ραδίαν (sc. γυνήν) λέγοντες, καὶ χρῆσιν αὐτῆς εἶναι παρὰ Κρατίνω καὶ Σώφρονι. Χρᾶται δ' αὐτῇ καὶ παροιμία ἐν τῷ: περὶ (vel παρὰ) σφυρὸν παχεῖα μισήτη γυνή. The proverb occurs in the Corpus Paroem. Vol. II (ed. Leutsch) Apostolius XIII, 95 where the explanation is: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνικάνων τῇ μισηγία. I take this to refer to impotence from unsatiable desire, just as the *ἄσχετος ροπή* in Eustathius probably implies extreme heat and passion uncheckable and ungovernable. V. further Pollux, VI, 189 and the whole of ch. 32 *περὶ τοῦ ἐπ' ἀφροδισίοις μαινομένου* (where in *ἐρωτομανῶν καὶ ὁ μισέρωσ* we should probably correct to *μισηνέρωσ* with Dindorf or rather *μισήνερωσ*). Cf. Aristophanes *Aves* 1620 with sch., and *Plutus* 989 with sch. (Finally cf. Horatius *Epod.* 8, 9).

69. Dieterich, op.cit. p. 11 mentions the formal difficulty for such a connection of *Μύση* with *μισητία* etc., taking *μισητία* as if from *μισῶ*. But I cannot admit the propriety of a relation of hate to the sense of *μισήτη* here examined. On the contrary, it is explicitly stated in, for example, Suda s.v. *μισήτη*: τὴν κατωφερῆ (the lecherous, lustful woman) *μισήτην* ἔλεγον οὐ παρὰ τὸ μίσος, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸ μίσγεσθαι... οἶονεῖ μισγήτην τινα οὔσαν. And then *μισήτη* could have the first syllable short (cf. *μέμ-χα*). From a cursory inspection of passages like Aristophanes *Plutus* 989, I do not see any metrical reasons contradicting this suggestion. Even quite apart from Suda's etymological suggestion, given that the metre allows it, there is no reason not to take *μισήτη* etc. as having the same kind of first syllable as *Μίση*: why should it be connected to *μισῶ* (totally inapposite here)? And there is no

- need to assume that it was a foreign name or root as Dieterich (*loc.cit.*) suggested.
70. From the monumental evidence, one of the two testimonia reported by Quandt (in his edition of the Orphic hymns, p. 32) consists in an inscription excavated in Demeter's chapel in Pergam: *Μίσση*. The other runs as follows: Ἄνθις ἰέρεια Μίσση Κόρη (*Μίσση Κόρη* Quandt *loc.cit.*) τὸν βωμὸν ἀνέθηκεν; the koric character of Misa must be meant to connect her with Persephone, or, to use Neoplatonic language, with the κορικὴ τάξις. That Misa, with the character that she has could be called κόρη is a wonder only for the modern religious or intellectual consciousness. In a related connection, Demeter was called Ἴερά Παρθένος (*v. Hesychius s.v.*).
71. For the linguistic equivalence, see Dieterich, *op.cit.* pp. 6-7.
72. A few lines below Philostratus adds: δ' οἶμαι, τῆς μητρὸς ἀκηκοῦς... and then follows a way of getting rid of the annoying presence of a Satyr. The οἶμαι shows that Philostratus infers the source of Midas' knowledge of the useful means of subduing a Satyr; Midas' mother then must be thought as especially well-qualified to know such things. Should we write τῆς Μητρὸς ἀκηκοῦς?
73. For further information consult Aelianus, *Variarum Historiarum* III, 18 with Perizonius' notes, and Xenophon, *Expeditio Cyri* I, 2, 13 with Schneider's note. For the statement in the text specifically, cf. e.g. Ovidius, *Metamorphoses*, XI, 92.
74. Cf. Plutarch, *Aetia Romana* 20: Διὰ τί τῇ γυναικεῖα θεῶ, ἣν Ἀγαθὴν καλοῦσιν etc. Cf. Macrobius, *Saturnalia* I, 12, 27.
75. Notice, e.g., the prominent role of myrtle in the ceremonies and myths connected with this goddess. We know that μύρτον = τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον; cf. e.g. Suda s.v.; Pollux II, 174 where it is especially the κλειτορίς.
76. Zeus has also as one of his epithets ἀγαθός: this is, at least, Pausanias' inference (in VIII, 36, §9) from the existence of a temple in Arcadia to Ἀγαθὸς Θεός (the male correlative of Bona Dea). He argues with characteristic rather shallow rationalism, which, in this particular instance, hides, probably unwittingly, a core of important truth: ...ἔστι τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐν ἀριστερᾷ Ἀγαθοῦ Θεοῦ ναός· εἰ δὲ ἀγαθῶν οἱ θεοὶ δοτῆρές εἰσιν ἀνθρώποις, Ζεὺς δὲ ὕπατος θεῶν ἐστίν, ἐπόμενος ἂν τις τῶ λόγῳ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν ταύτην Διὸς τεκμαίροιτο εἶναι.
77. Compare what Macrobius says, on Varro's authority (*Saturnalia* I, 12, 27): haec (sc. Bona Dea) apud Graecos θεὸς γυναικεῖα dicitur, quam Varro Fauni filiam tradit adeo pudicam ut extra γυναικωνίτιν numquam sit egressa, nec nomen eius in publico fuerit auditum, nec virum umquam viderit vel a viro visa sit. There can be no doubt: femineity is here meant in its sexual distinctness, and in its Koric aspect. Cf. Plutarch, *Aetia Romana*, 20; he

considers the question why myrtle is prohibited during the ceremonies in honour of the Bona Dea; he gives (in his rather all too easily idealizing turn) two explanations, which for an adequate understanding of the case must be combined, and of whose the latter runs thus: ἡ πολλῶν μὲν ἀγναί (sc. αἱ γυναικες), μάλιστα δ' ἀφροδισίων τὴν ἱερουργίαν ἐκείνην (an ἐκείνης?) ἐπιτελοῦσιν· οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἐξοικίζουσι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶν ἄρρεν ἐξελαύνουσι τῆς οἰκίας, ὅταν τὰ νενομισμένα τῇ θεῷ ποιῶσι (cf. Pausanias VII, 27, 10: τρίτη δὲ ἡμέρα τῆς ἑορτῆς in honour of Demeter *Μυσιά*; is the epithet from *μυσιά*?! ὑπεξίσαισι οἱ ἄνδρες ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καταλειπόμεναι δὲ αἱ γυναικες δρῶσιν ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ὅποσα νόμος ἐστὶν αὐταῖς. Cf. the Thesmophoria. And Demeter is connected with Bona Dea as Plutarch's passage from the *Vita Caesaris* taught us). What is hidden behind Plutarch's innocuous expressions is easily comprehended when we compare Juvenal VI, 314-345. Arnobius, too considers the rites of Bona Dea as loathsome (V, 18-19).

78. The initially aspirant quality of δ is well-known throughout the field of Greek dialectal variations: cf. R. Meister, *Die Griechischen Dialekte*, vol. I, pp. 262 sqq.; vol. II, pp. 52-54; pp. 253-4: the change from δ to ζ and vice versa is very common. Furthermore, the dental consonants enjoy a particular propensity to substitute, or be substituted by, σ: cf. op.cit. vol. I pp. 260-1; vol. II p. 54; Nachträge zu II p. 257 and p. 222 for the interchangeability of θ with σ. And vol. I, p. 122-24 (which is particularly significant in the present connection as pertaining to the Aeolian dialect); p. 264 (σσ to ττ); p. 265 (στ to ττ and σθ to τθ). I cannot here go into a close investigation of this merely grammatical question, all the more so since I do not consider its settlement (I mean the determination of the precise manner of grammatical interrelation between *Μίδα* and *Μισα*) as of a marked significance for our point in the text. Besides, there are various alternative explanations available at least prima facie. Thus Dieterich (op.cit. p. 6) may be right in his suggestion that *Μίδα* and *Μιση* could represent two alternative Greek renderings of a foreign word (whose sound might have been something like *Μίζα* ζ is δσ or σδ in Attic). But I would favour (though I must emphasize that I have not conducted a sufficiently thorough investigation of the matter) the supposition of a root *μίγ-* as the basis of all these forms. This would be to vindicate the ancient grammarians who connected *μισήτη* etc. with *μίσγω* *μινύω* etc.; cf. the already-mentioned Suda's passage (s.v. *μισήτη*) and also scholia in Aristophanes *Plutus* 989: οὐχ ἔνεκεν *μισητίας*· *πορνείας*, οἰονεὶ *μιογητίας*, παρὰ τὸ *μίσγεσθαι*... *μισητίας*· *μίξεως*, *συναφείας*, ἀπὸ τοῦ *μίσγω* δὲ *μιογητία* καὶ *μισητία*. For the occurrence of the root *μίγ-* in most Indo-European language families, see Curtius, *Greek Etymology* (English Translation) vol. I p. 417 (No 474). It will be seen from the list there that

mis- is already the form which the root assumes in some families; in particular misz- also occurs, and we know the close relatedness of ζ and δ. Besides, dentalism in the case of change from g to δ is well established, see *op.cit.* vol. II pp. 96-99 (where Curtius' reservations do not seem particularly well founded; notice in particular δ± as a Doric by-form for γâ, γη̄ - hence *Δαμάτηρ Δημήτηρ*). A derivation then *μίγ-, μίσγ, μίσ-, μίδ-*, seems on the whole pretty plausible. But as I said, I cannot enter into further details here; I only wished to indicate at least one reasonable line of approach. How much the *μσηγία* in question was really a *μισγ-ηγία*, irrespective of the purely grammatical point, is manifest also in their being found as actual variants in the MSS for certain relevant passages, e.g. in *Plutus* 989.

79. A further verification (although a drop in an ocean) is provided by the context of a literary occurrence of *Μίση*: Herondas, *Mimiambus* I, 56.
80. And Harpocration, s.v. *Δυσαύλης* reports: *Ἀσκληπιάδης δ' ἐν δ' Τραγωδομένων τὸν Δυσαύλην αὐτόχθονα εἶναι φησι, συνοικήσαντα δὲ Βαυβοῖ σχεῖν παῖδας Πρωτογόνην τε καὶ Μίσαν* (codd *Πρωτονόνη τε καὶ Νῆσ(σ)αν* vel *Κνίσαν*, corrected, with respect to *Μίσαν*, by Müller F.H.Gr. II 339, adopted by Dieterich *op.cit.* p. 2 n. 6; the *Πρωτογόνην* instead of *Πρωτονόνην* was suggested by Dieterich loc.cit., with reference to Pausanias I, 31, 4 - should it be also connected with the *Πρωτογένεια* in Pindar, *Olymp.* IX 41?). *Παλαίφατος δ' ἐν θ' Τρωϊκῶν σὺν τῇ γυναικί φησιν αὐτὸν ὑποδέξασθαι τὴν Δήμητρα. Πρωτογόνη* symbolizes, in the present context, the Koric, maiden, virgin aspect of the figure whose lecherous use is typified by Misa, namely of femininity in its sexual distinctness, which again is signified by Baubo, their mother. Unless one should read instead of *Πρωτογόνην*, *Πρωτόγονον*, some manifestations of the primeval *Πρωτόγονος*, about which something more will be said below. *Δυσαύλης*, the Malphallic, is of course highly significant and fitting in the present connection. It represents the Orphic, as against the common, tradition of the Eleusinian reception scene of Demeter.
81. Thus the MSS. Quandt does not put a comma after *ἀγνήν*; Hermann, following Vossius reads *ἀγνήν <τ'> εὐΐερον τε*, no doubt in order to emphasize the addition or conjunction of two beings (one male, one female) in the formation of the bisexual Iacchus. My comma after *ἀγνήν* intends to convey the same point in attenuated form. Dieterich (*op.cit.* p. 1 n. 3) protests against <τ'>: he conceives the invocation as addressed to one and the same being; "das Wesen wird *Διόνυσος, Μίση* und dann auch noch 4 *Λύσειος Ἰακχος* genannt". Apparently following this idea, Quandt has *ἀγνήν εὐΐερόν τε*, taking *τε* to conjoin the two preceding adjectives. The two views are not as incompatible as it may appear at first sight. For if I favour the equation *Διόνυσος + Μίση = Ἰακχος* in the said context, I am well aware

that, from another point of view, the equation Διόνυσος = Ἴακχος holds undoubtedly good. The point is such matters do not belong to the proper field of ordinary arithmetic. Διόνυσος, Μίση and Ἴακχος may well signify the same Wesen, and yet Dionysus may represent its active, male aspect, Μίση its feminine passivity, and Iacchus their interpenetration in nature and activity at all levels. I deliberately use the implausible inter-penetration in the present context; for Dionysus is notoriously somehow womanish, and thereby more precisely symbolizes the passivity of the active element in so far as its malehood desires to be used as active; and Μίση signifies, as our brief survey has shown us, an active attitude and interest regarding her own passivity. Thus Iacchus is a far more potent symbol than the mere conjunction of the male and the female in their simplistic acceptance. There is much more to be said for this idea of two complementary elements, each one having already incorporated the other after its own nature, being further combined in a final act of two-level complementarity. But for the present purpose it is sufficient to note that whatever may be the grammatically correct construal (and I do not see how the question could be decided on purely grammatical reasons apart, that is, from a confessedly slight awkwardness in my acceptance, when considered in itself and torn away from its context) the meaning must be what I briefly hinted at above, the sublation of the apparent difference in the two rival interpretations into, and up to, their original, higher, unity.

82. Alluding to the ἄρρητοι γοναί of Zeus with Persephone: cf. hymn 52, 5: κρύφιον Διὸς ἔρνος. Cf. also 29, 7; 30, 7. Ἄρρητοι also because the Kore remains Kore, the Maiden Virgin.
83. Dieterich's essay *De Hymnis Orphicis capitula quinque* is useful as a Vorarbeit, but is far from systematic.
84. I may mention just one example: outside the corpus of the hymns, Dionysus was invoked as: αἰαῖ, δίκερως δίμορφε, according to Firmicus Maternus, *De Errore Profan.* Relig. XXI, 2. (The reading is really corrupt, as is much Greek in Latin contexts; something like ΕΑΙΑΙΚΕΡΩΣ ΔΙΜΟΡΦΕ). On the other hand διφυής rather than δίμορφος conveys the idea of hermaphroditism: δίμορφος usually refers to monstrous compositions. (But Diodorus, e.g. uses the latter to signify hermaphroditism; see *infra*).
85. In the case of Adonis this does not imply strict physical hermaphroditism, but the passivity of the male see note 93. Cf. Attis.
86. The τελετάρχης in v. 3 reminds one of the ἀρχηγέτις of Demeter's mysteries in Strabo's formulation X, 468.
87. Which in itself indicates possession of both sex organs (or at least intrinsic bisexuality) with Gesner, contra Eschenbach, apud Hermann's *Orphica* pp. 8-9.

88. This refers to the (main) *Κορύβας*; but Clement, *Protrepticus* II, 19, 1-4 brings the Corybantic myth into connection with Dionysus' membrum in particular.
89. This appears in the hymn addressed to Eros; but we shall see the connection when we come to examine hymn 5.
90. Dionysus' connection with the bull is very close and beyond doubt; apart from classical passages like the Euripidean *Bacchae*, one may refer to evidence supplied in former pages (in particular one should keep in mind the ritualistic formula *ἐξ ὄψεως ταῦρος καὶ ἐκ ταύρου ὄφεις* to refer to Dionysus *ἀρρητογονία*), cf. also Plutarchus *Aetia Graeca* 36, and *De Iside et Osiride* 364E-F. It is significant that the last epithet is also applied to the Moon, hymn 9, 2, which is further called *θῆλύς τε καὶ ἄρσην* (subtly differentiating from the *ἄρσην καὶ θῆλυς* "Ιακχος"); we have met with this before, when discussing some passages from the magical papyri. *Μήνη* is the female aspect of *Μήν*, cf. the hymn apud Hippolytus, *Elenchus*, V, 9, 8 (p. 99.16 Wendland), where *Μήν*, additionally, is proclaimed in structural identity with Adonis, Attis, Osiris, Corybas etc., including one of the *γένος* of Zeus (probably Dionysus).
91. It is of course not an identity tout court, but, what I have stated many times, an identity of respect, an identity accompanied by diversity of aspect or relation. It is in this spirit that Macrobius' essay of the identification of Dionysus with Phanes and of almost every god with "Ἥλιος should be seen. In I, 18, 12 he invokes Orpheus' testimony:

τήκων αἰθέρα διον ἀκίνητον πρὶν εἶντα
 ἐξανέφηνε θεοῖσιν + ὄραν + κάλλιστον ἰδέσθαι,
 ὃν δὴ νῦν καλέουσι Φάνητά τε καὶ Διόνυσον
 Εὐβουλῆα τ' ἄνακτα καὶ Ἀνταύγην ἀρίδηλον·
 ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλο καλοῦσιν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων.

(I have put cruces, though the latest Teubner editor prints it as if no cause for worry existed. I am inclined to adopt Gesner's emendation *θεοῖς ὄραν* accepted by Kern as well, Fr. 237 taking it as an accusative of respect as Gesner: *Φάνης ὄραν κάλλιστος*. But this is not fully satisfactory. I suspect (unless one could correct it simply to *θεοῖς θεόν γε*. But could that be corrupted?) that a name is hidden there (cf. *ὃν δὴ νῦν* etc.), and indeed Gesner suggested *ᾠρον* (cf. Diodorus I, 25, 6), but this is definitely non-Orphic. Could it be brought into connection with the possibly corrupt *Φάος ρυέντης* in Hippolytus V, 20, 6-7 (p. 122 Wendland)? The same identity is also maintained in another Orphic verse preserved by Diodorus (I, 11, 3) and Aristocritus Manichaeus (v. Kern, Fr. 237) (where the verse *τοῦνεκά μιν*

καλέουσι Φάνητά τε καὶ Διόνυσον and the context suggest a previously named, or referred to, entity called by further names, in one case Osiris, in the other Helios, which comes to the same thing in view of the identity Osiris = Helios. This circumstance may seem to improve the chances at correctness of Gesner's Ὠρος, but still I doubt the propriety of such an emendation in a genuinely Orphic context. Not that Osiris or Horus could not occur there: but they could only do so as manifestations, not as the manifested, in order to put it in the briefest possible terms. On the whole I would have emended to Ἔρον, the Πρωτόγονος divinity. He was originated by the melting down of Aether, which thus underwent the first change and movement. Who did it (τήκων); Perhaps Χρόνος, if τήκων is genuine. Usually the aether ρήγνυται (ἐρράγη, ρήξαν) in the generation of Phanes. The proper way to understand such identities is the Neoplatonic one: consult, e.g., Proclus, *In Timaeum* 29a, b (I, 336, 6 Diehl): πάλαι γὰρ ὁ Θεολόγος (i.e. the theologian par excellence, Orpheus) ἐν τε τῷ Φάνητι τὴν δημιουργικὴν αἰτίαν (sc. Zeus) ἀνύμνησεν - ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἦν τε καὶ προῆν (ὡς περ ἔφη καὶ αὐτός)· Βρόμιός τε μέγας καὶ Ζεὺς ὁ πανόπτης, ἵνα δὴ τῆς διττῆς δημιουργίας ἔχη τὰς οἰονεὶ πηγὰς (Zeus is the principle of the καθολικὴ δημιουργία, Dionysus of the μεριστὴ δημιουργία)· καὶ ἐν τῷ Διὶ τὴν παραδειγματικὴν (sc. ἀνύμνησεν though the παραδειγματικὴ τάξις, represented by Phanes is above the δημιουργικὴ, signalized by Zeus): Μῆτις γὰρ αὐτὴ καὶ οὐτός ἐστιν, ὡς φησι: καὶ Μῆτις, πρῶτος γενέτωρ, καὶ Ἔρωσ πολυτερπῆς (sc. are in Zeus; cf. Fr. 168, v. 9), αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Διόνυσος καὶ Φάνης καὶ Ἑρικεπαῖος συνεχῶς ὀνομάζεται (although Dionysus is below them in the serial atticulation of divine reality).

92. In the hymn Πρωτόγονος is διφυής, and Πρίαπος. Consult also Proclus *In Pl. Tim.* 30c, d (I, 429, 26 Diehl): καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ (sc. τῷ πρώτῳ προελθόντι ἐκ τοῦ Πρωτογενοῦς ὡοῦ) πρώτῳ τὸ θῆλυ καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν, ὡς ζῶν πρώτῳ·

θῆλυς καὶ γενέτωρ κρατερὸς θεὸς Ἑρικεπαῖος,

φησὶν ὁ θεολόγος (for an attempt to analyse the name Ἑρικεπαῖος, see Gesner apud Hermann pp. 261-2). The reason for the essential bisexuality being given nicely, even if hostilely, by Lactantius *Divinarum Institutionum*. IV, 8, 4: nisi forte existimabimus deum, sicut Orpheus putavit, et marem esse et feminam, quod aliter generare non quiverit nisi haberet vim sexus utriusque, quasi aut ipse secum coierit aut sine coitu non potuerit procreare. I shall give one more testimony, from Nonnus Abbas ad Gregorii Nazianzeni *Orat. In Julianum*, Migne vol. 36, 1028 (taken up partly by Suda s.v. Φάνης): ἐν τοῖς Ὀρφικοῖς ποιήμασιν εἰσηνέχθη τὰ δύο ταῦτα ὀνόματα μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν· ὦν τὸν Φάνητα εἰσφέρει αἰδοῖον (clearly γυναικεῖον) ἔχοντα

ὀπίσω περὶ τὴν πυγὴν. Λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὸν ἔφορον εἶναι τῆς ζυγογόνου δυνάμεως (which is typically referred to the female principle).

93. This is, in truth, not a particularly happy formulation. I am not denying the fact that Dionysus was so presented even by Euripides in his *Bacchae*, and the *θεὸς ἀνδρόγυνος* was a common expression with the Christian Fathers but the description does not give the essence of the situation. The metaphysical foundation of Dionysus' somewhat feminine quality is this: Dionysus is eminently beautiful (when represented as a youth); but beauty, in its intrinsic nature, is enjoyed rather than enjoys; hence a certain pathetic (in all senses of the word) allure cannot fail to be present in every beautiful object as such. And there is another consideration which must be kept firmly in mind: given the high importance of malehood, femineity and coition not only on the animal and human level, but also, and more significantly, in their abstract essence as metaphysical and theological principles affording the only non-mechanical means to understand generation of something out of something given this, it can be no surprise that these factors are studied (especially in religious and religiously orientated philosophical thought) thoroughly in themselves and in all their variety of manifestations and combinations. Thus, from the robust and true, primeval, hermaphroditism of Phanes (where both sexes coexist to the utmost of their pure power without detriment to, but only enhancement of, their respective virtue), we have the pure types in separation as well as their intermixtures in a subtly distinguishable variety of forms. Both actual hermaphroditism and bisexuality of various types are to be traced to the necessary coexistence and coalescence of both sexes in the primal manifestation of divinity. The delicate variation of religious bisexuality must also be observed. To give a rough example: Adonis represents pure male beauty in its perfection, which, as inviting active enjoyment on the part of Aphrodite is tinged by passivity. On the other hand, Attis represents the frustration of such an invitation in its realization, with the purpose of its (vain but real) intensification (the situation being further complicated by the singular condition of Attis' lover, Agdistis who is a hermaphrodite whose male genitalia have been cut off). There is no question of real hermaphroditism in the case of Adonis or Attis; nor is there any suspicion of Dionysus being an hermaphroditus. But his bisexuality (in both directions) is confirmed; consult his adventures as related by Nonnus; and also the story with Prosymnos related by Clement, *Protrepticus* II, 34, 2-4 (cf. Arnobius V, 28-9; and Pausanias II, 37, 5 who does not relate the whole story but speaks, in 37, 1 of a *Δημήτηρ Προσύμνη!*). Clement remarks at the end of the story (p. 26, 5 Stählin): *ὑπόμνημα τοῦ πάθους τούτου μυστικὸν φαλλοὶ κατὰ πόλεις ἀνίστανται Διονύσω*. And there was a proverb: *Φαλλὸς τῷ θεῷ* which Plutarch (*Corpus*

- Paroem. Gr.* ed. Leutsch and Schneidewin, vol. I, p. 329, 10) explains: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπονεμόντων ἐνίοις τὰ οἰκεία πρόσφορα· ἐπεὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ ἴστατο ὁ φαλλός. Also Diogenianus, Centuria VII, 22 (p. 289, 24): ὁ φαλλός τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπονεμόντων ἐνίοις τὰ εἰκότα καὶ πρόσφορα. (The same, Apostolius, Centuria XIII, 81). See further Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 243 sqq. with the scholia, (cf. Herodotus II, 48-9; Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, 16) in connection with the famous φαλληφορίαί. For Διόνυσος Φαλληγός (cf. Φαλλῆς, Aristophanes op.cit. 264) consult Pausanias X, 19, 3 and the story related by Oenomaus Cynicus, apud Eusebii *Praeparatio Evang.* 5, 36. That Dionysus was worshipped as Ἐνόρχης in Lesbos and Samos (scholia in Lycophron *Alexandra* 211 and Hesychius s.v. respectively) implies an emphasis on his active malehood gaining point from the contrast to its reduction or absence, physical or attitudinal; cf. the identification Attis Dionysus in Clement, *Protr.*, II, 19, 4.
94. Athenaeus III, 98d: Ἄθηναι δ' ἐν α' Σικελικῶν τὸν αὐτὸν φησι Διονύσιον (it seems the elder tyrant is meant, the renowned poet) καὶ τὸν βοῦν γαρόταν (i.e. γῆ + ἄρόω) καλεῖν καὶ τὸν χοῖρον ἱακχον (perhaps from ἱα + ἀχῶ, mediating κ having developed*, as in Aristophanes, *Aves* 772 ἱακχον for ἱαχον if that is the true reading [however for a different, preferable derivation v. n. 34]), where they may also lie a covert reference to Iacchus' feminine element (because of the glossematic χοῖρος = pudendum muliebre). I take the opportunity to observe that these are not obsolete words resuscitated by Dionysius as is usually supposed (e.g. L & S consider γαρότας to be Sicilian for a bullock!) but literary inventions, coinages of the learned, as the whole speech of Cynulcus in Athaenaeus from 97a onwards, makes clear.
95. This is Gesner's emendation, again, of κόλποις. It is only an apparent improvement. For although it is true that the dative connotes something stationary, whereas movement is better expressed by the accusative; yet ὑπό + dative signifies strict lying under, while ὑπό + accusative more precisely denotes movement so that (in the end) one lies under. See the examples in Kühner - Gerth, *Satzlehre*, vol. I, p. 524. The emendation began with Heinsius, and was also adopted by Herwerden. ἐνὶ κόλποις could be another possibility, cf. *Athnologia Graeca* V, 165.5; but it is discordant in view of the ἐνὶ in the next verse.
96. I cannot help producing two more instances (out of an ocean) illustrative of the importance of the male αἰδοῖον (as symbol of the productive principle) in Orphic and mystery cults (more on this subject will be said below).
(a) Virgil, *Georgica*, II, 387-8 has:

Et te, Bacche, vocant per carmina laeta, tibi que
oscilla ex alta suspendunt mollia pinu.

Mollia pensilia, explains Servius. But what are those oscilla? The Orphic account is this, as reported by Servius in his commentary ad locum: Alii dicunt oscilla membra esse virilia de floribus facta, quae suspendebantur per intercolumnia: ita ut in ea homines, acceptis clausis personis, impigerent, et ea ore cillerent, id est moverent, ad risum populo commovendum: et hoc in Orpheo lectum est. (We are reminded of the Orphic ἄρσενικοὶ ἔρωτες). One may even go beyond what is mentioned by Servius, towards explaining the occurrence of the pine tree in this connection in Virgil. Thus, Arnobius, V, 5-7, gives a detailed account of the origin of the rites connected with the Great Mother and Attis (in which Liber is also implicated) according to the inquiries of Timotheus, who himself was deeply steeped in the requisite antiquarian lore and acquainted with the relevant mysteries. It is said there that Attis mutilated his manhood under a pine tree (V, 7): furiarum et ipse (sc. Attis) iam plenus, perbacchatus iactatus proicit se tandem et sub pini arbore genitalia sibi desecat dicens: tibi Agdesti haec habe, propter quae motus tantos furialium discriminum concitasti. The pine tree was sacred henceforth to Cybele: inde natum et ortum est nunc etiam sacras velaviet et coronarier pinos (*loc.cit.*). A pine was brought into the sanctuary on fixed days (the sanctuary of the Mother of Gods) V, 16: this, in ritualistic performance of what the Mother of Gods did subsequent to Attis' self-mutilation: tunc arborem pinum, sub qua Attis nomine spoliaverat se viri, in antrum suum defert et sociatis planctibus cum Agdesti tundit et sauciat pectus pausatæ circum arboris robur (V, 7). The parallelism and aspectual identification of Cybele and Demeter on the one hand, and of Attis and Dionysus on the other is certain, and will be analysed in another place; this implies identity of essential core with difference in manifestation.

(b) In case one objects that Demeter's ideal was pure and chaste (and pure and chaste eminently it was only, sacredness and metaphysical and religious holiness can be inculcated by obscene ritual, as the modern mind might classify it in its moralised, denaturalised attitudes), I shall adduce just one corrective here: in Musa Puerilis, *Greek Anthology*, XII, there is an epigramm (225) by Strato, ingenious in its double meaning and metaphor:

οὐδέ ποτ' ἡελίου φάος ὄρθριον ἀντέλλοντος
 μίσησθαι ταύρω χρηὴ φλογόντα κύνα,
 μή ποτε καρπολόχου Δημήτερος ὑγρανθείσης,
 βρέξεις τὴν λασίην Ἡρακλέους ἄλοχον.

On the one hand we have astronomical and agricultural references, on the other obscene sexuality: κύων is the Dog star and the membrum virile (v. Hesychius s.v. κύων, κυνέσπασαν and κύνες; Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, 158

- uses the Pherecratian (Fr. 193 PCG vol. VII pp. 197-8), and then the proverbial expression *κύνα δέρειν δεδαρμένην*, see Apostolius VI 87; X 29; Diogenianus V 85; Suda s.v. *κύνα*; and the scholion to the aristophanic passage. Eustathius, Comm. p. 1821.53 says: *ὡς δὲ καὶ Κύνων ἐπὶ μορίου θήλεος κείται, ἢ εἰρησομένη Κύνειρα δηλοῖ*, which is significant especially in view of the remarkable fact which we notice in these areas, namely the fact of feminine names and things used to signify or allude to the membrum virile and conversely for the pudendum muliebre). *Ταῦρος* on the other hand, may be used in reference to either the male or the female sexual organ (v. Hesychius s.v. *ταῦρος, κένταυροι, Ἀταύρωτος*; Suda s.v. *ταῦρος, Σάραβον*; Photius s.v. *Κένταυρον*; cf. Aeschylus *Agamemnon*, 236 ἀγνὰ δ' ἀταύρωτος etc. and sch., and Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 217-8 with sch; the zodiacal sign Taurus is astrologically feminine); but its proper signification is the region between anus and the scrotum or the vulva (v. Pollux II, 173; cf. Suda s.v. *ὄρρωδία*, and the above adduced references in the light of this explanation). The two last lines of the epigram reproduce the metaphors played with in the second verse. The *Ἡρακλέους ἄλοχος* is, as we know, *Ἥβη* hence here the pubic area as well. And, finally, *καρπολόχος Δημήτηρ ὑγρανθείσα* must relate to the sperm ejaculation implied in *βρέξις* and this illustrates nicely my point. It is important to notice that following this train of thought, *Δημήτηρ* is presented here as almost the male genitalia, that is in a phallic form; we shall see how this fits well with other evidence and expresses her active role and function sexually and religiously. *Καρπολόχοι* from *λοχεύω* beget or bring forth or produce or bear. For Demeter in a lecherous aspect see St. Gregory Nazianzenus *Oratio in Julianum* I (vol. 35, 653 Migne) together with his commentator Nonnus Abbas (vol. 36, 1028, Migne) passages to be discussed below. Usually, St. Gregory is supposed to confuse Demeter with Baubo: « sed hoc memoriae vitio factum » Mullach *Orphica* Fr XVI, ad v. 1; or to lie with the purpose of calumniating the pagan religion: sed aperte iniquus est et calumniator... etc., Gesner apud Hermann p. 476. But Lobeck for once grasped the sense rightly and rejected these untenable suppositions, v. *Aglaophemus* vol. II pp. 823-5.
97. For Ascalabus (the lizard-boy) and Ascalaphus (the owl-boy), cf. e.g. Ovid *Metamorph.* V 438 sqq. and V 538 sqq. Apart from the phallic connotation of meuts (small boyish penis), these cases do not concern us directly here, even though the former belongs to the group of stories relating to the reception of the Demeter pattern.
98. Cicero, de Legibus II, XIV §36 combines the two: nam mihi cum multa eximia divinaque videntur Athenae tuae peperisse atque in vitam hominum attulisse, tum nihil melius illis mysteriis, quibus ex agresti immanique vita excuti ad humanitatem et mitigati sumus, initiaque ut appellantur, ita re vera

principia vitae cognovimus, neque solum cum laetitia vivendi rationem accepimus, sed etiam cum spe meliore moriendi.

99. They are the only ones among Greeks contesting with the Athenians as to antiquity and divine favours we are told loc.cit. More importantly, they maintained that the mysteric worship of Demeter was transplanted to Attica from Argos, and precisely by Trochilos, the hierophant, whose children, from an unnamed Eleusinian woman, were the brothers Eubuleus and Triptolemus.
100. In the ordinary cultus *Εὐβουλεύς* was an epithet of Zeus, He of the Good Counsel. (Cf. Diodorus V, 72; Antiphon VI, 45: *καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ Διὸς Βουλαίου καὶ Ἀθηναῖας Βουλαίας ἱερόν ἐστι, καὶ εἰσιόντες οἱ βουλευταὶ προσεύχονται* etc.). But in a Myconian inscription (No 373 Dittenberger¹) we read: *...ὑπὲρ καρποῦ* (sc. is to be sacrificed) *Δήμητρι ὄν ἐνκύμονα πρωτοτόκον, Κόρη κάπρον τέλειον, Διὶ Βουλεῖ χοῖρον*. This *Ζεὺς Βουλεύς*, who is invoked for the benefit of the fruits of earth, and to whom a pig is sacrificed together with similarly significant sacrifices to Demeter and Persephone, is clearly not a god of the counsel and the Council and the Commons, but one incorporated and affiliated into the mysteric and specifically Eleusinian cycle. Calling Dionysus *Εὐβουλῆα* is characteristically orphic as we explicitly learn from Macrobius I, 18, 17: idem (sc. Liber) versus Orpheici *Εὐβουλῆα* vocantes etc. (going on to show his identity with the Sun, which is Macrobius, or rather his source's (Porphyry's), one-sided preoccupation). Cf. also Orphic Fr. 237 (Kern), apud the same Macrobius I, 18, 12:

*ὄν δὴ νῦν καλέουσι Φάνητά τε καὶ Διόνυσον
Εὐβουλῆα τ' ἀνακτα καὶ Ἀνταύγην ἀρίδηλον.*

The combination of *Εὐβουλεύς* and *ἄναξ* reminds us of the very important passage in Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*, III, ch. 21 (§53), where we read: *Διόσκουροι* etiam apud Graios multis modis nominantur: primi tres, qui appellantur Anactes (or Anaces) Athenis, ex rege Jove antiquissimo (the daemonic Zeus, according to my terminology) et Proserpina nati, Tritopatrus (sic), Eubuleus, Dionysus; etc. Eubuleus is clearly here an aspect of that being which is, in its more common manifestation, Dionysus. The Anactes or *Ἄνακες* were of a Cabeiric nature probably (v. Pausanias X, 38; Orphic hymn 38.20 sqq.; cf. further Aelian, *Varia Historia*, IV, 5 and Plutarch, *Theseus*, 33). The word *ἀνάκτορον* was especially used for shrines of mystic deities where mystic rites took place; it was connected in particular with Demeter (cf. Herodotus IX, 65 and Hesychius s.v.) and also with Samothrace (as the Ophitic source of

Hippolytus tells us in the very important testimony about ancient mysteries contained in Book V of his *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*. Finally Pluto was also called *Εὐβουλεύς, κατ' ἐμφημισμὸν* as very aptly says the scholiast to Nicander's *Alexipharmaca*, 14: ...τόθι χάσμα δυσέκδρομον *Εὐβουλήος*. Hesychius s.v. explains *ὁ Πλούτων. παρὰ δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς ὁ Ζεὺς, ἐν Κυρήνη.* In the Orphic hymns *Εὐβουλεύς* is normally the Dionysus (29.8; 30.6; 52.4) or Adonis who is aspectually identical with the mystic Dionysus (56.3). It is also Pluto (*Εὐβουλος = Ζεὺς Χθόνιος* 18.12) and Zeus (in his capacity as father of Dionysus from Persephone, not from Semele, 42.2; 72.3). The archetypes of the Father, the Son and the Husband coincide in this archetype of malehood, Eubuleus.

101. Thanks to his special connection with pigs he was a *συβώτης* (v. Clement *Protrept.* p. 14 Potter) which fits well with this: firstly because of the pig-symbolism; secondly, on the mythological level, because his pigs had been swallowed down into the yawning chasm in which Persephone disappeared, he knew where she went and could thus offer guidance to Demeter (as is required by Orphic hymn 41); thirdly, because of the ritualistic connection to *Θεσμοφόρια* and *Ἀρρητοφόρια*, in which context see esp. scholia in Lucianum *Dialogi Meretr.* II, 1 (p. 275.22 276.28 Rabe); cf. further Pausanias IX, 8, 1.
102. These points stand in need of further discussion, and in a more general context, but I shall rest here content by raising the crux of the problem: Arnobius in his free rendering of the Orphic passage (for such I believe his version to be), makes no mention of Iacchus at all; and Iacchus does not enter into his relation of the story in detail, anymore than he enters into Clement's; but Clement has his name in the Orphic passage. Now what are we to make out of this singular state of affairs? If it is admitted (and how can one deny it?) that the same orphic passage is referred to by both writers (even if in two distinct forms or recensions of it), then two alternatives present themselves to us: either (a) *Ἴακχος* is corrupt in Clement; or (b) what Arnobius (or his source) saw in the Greek text did not include the word. (What might seem to be a third possibility is not really forthcoming; I mean that Arnobius' verses are corrupt and Iacchus should be introduced directly or indirectly somewhere in them. Attempts in this direction were not lacking: in v. 3 of the Latin version Auratus and also Meursius (followed by Gesner and Hermann) proposed to read:

quas cava succutiens Bacchi manu : nam puerilis

etc. in place of the MS Baubo manu. And then, for consistency, one should take the puerile appearance as referring to Bacchus (or his hand) thus

changing the following *ollis* to *olli* (as is done by Gesner and Hermann), v. 4 being then:

olli vultus erat, plaudit, contrectat amice.

But we have argued that there can be no question of a real child operating with his hand in Baubo's pudenda. Besides, as Lobeck observed (*Aglaophemus* p. 821): *sed de Baccho sive Iaccho nihil legisse Arnobium ostendunt verba eius: partem illam levigat in speciem nondum duri pusionis* referring to the already-mentioned passage V, 25 (p. 197.1 sqq. Reifferscheid); it is indeed evident from the detailed relation of the incident by Arnobius, and his subsequent comments on it that he knew nothing of any distinct boy playing any part in these singular transactions. Given the compressed reference to the event by Clement, and Arnobius' ample description, it is much more probable (if we leave aside for a moment the orphic verses themselves in both our sources) that Clemens did not read anything about Iacchus or that he omitted in his relation to mention him, than that Arnobius failed to implicate him. It is true that v. 3 as it stands in the Latin text (e.g. in Reifferscheid's edition, and Kern Fr. 52) is unmetrical, and thus likely to be corrupt. N. Heinsius conjectured: *quas cava succutiens Baubus manu*, which is all right but will not help us in our present concern. And, in any case, I think that the aforementioned considerations show that even if corrupt, we cannot pretend to read into them a reference to Iacchus or to any other real child for that matter: *ollis* is the correct reading in v. 4, and *puerile* was the appearance of what was to be seen in Baubo's nether parts).

Returning then back to the original double possibility, from a textual point of view, alternatives (a) and (b) coincide practically: the point is to find a Greek text which could either be corrupted to the Iacchus-phrase or be a corruption from it. Thus, working on the Clement's text this time, for the MSS *παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἰακχος*, Leopardus and Herwerden proposed *παῖς νηπίαχος δ' ἦν*, Heinsius *παιδῆϊον ἄνθος* and Ludwig *παῖς δ' ἦεν ἰαλλος*. But such attempts (they will be briefly discussed also below) do not carry much conviction in themselves and in respect to meaning, however possible and acceptable textually they may be. For it is equally incredible that *Ἰακχος*, a mystic divinity, was introduced through a corruption in such a clearly significant if perplexing context, as it is that Arnobius failed to understand or to utilise an existing reference to Iacchus. Besides, most of the correctors labour under the erroneous idea that the *παῖς* is he who does something to Baubo, whereas my point is that Baubo does something to him, or rather plays and sports with him. The natural solution to the crux

seems to me to be this: the Orphic passage did have *παῖς Ἰακχος*. Arnobius renders freely, elaborates and explains the sense of the reference to that mysterious and mystic boy, for the benefit of those unaquainted with the symbolism of the Orphic-Eleusinian mysteries. It is very simple and very natural, as it ought to be. We shall see how nicely does this fit with my view as to Baubo's singular sight in her pudenda. Let me here make one remark about a detail. We have seen above what *hystriculus* must mean in the present context: *δασύκερκος*. *Durus*, in the same spirit, alludes to the *σπύειν* of the *πέος*. Both negations of these attributes refer to the condition of the sexual organs of an *ἄνηβος παῖς*.

103. On the other hand no more than a passing notice is required by the queer notion that what was to be seen when Baubo pulled up her garments was a childlike laughing face painted on Baubo's belly(!). According to such a notion Ludwich must have proposed to change *γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις* to *ἐγέλων Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποι*. And the same must be implied by the punctuation of the fragment, as given for example by Picard in his article "L' épisode de Baubo dans les Mystères d' Eleusis" in *Revue d' Histoire des Religions* XCV, 1927, p. 220 sqq.: ...*παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἰακχος, / (χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκε) γελῶν, Βαυβοῦς: ὑπὸ κόλποις* (*op.cit.* p. 232 where see also the irrelevant fantasies of Perdrizet: Elle y avait dessiné la face de l' enfant Iacchos. Ainsi accomodée, elle avait exécuté la danse du ventre devant Dimiter: à chacune de ses contorsions, la figure peinte semblait rire! There is no need for comment). Picard's article is of little importance: neither full and exhaustive in its references to the relevant sources, nor successful in the handling of the available testimonies; neither systematic and cohesive in the arrangement of the evidence, nor penetrating in the explanations and accounts offered. His only anxiety seems to have been to draw attention (with unscientific subjectivity) to the obscenity of the matter. It would have been a different matter if the very pudenda of a rather elderly woman could be seen (or be made, perhaps with some additional care, to be seen) as a child's laughing face. But this depends on the anatomical configuration of the external part of the pudendum muliebre under certain conditions, which in actual fact is not naturally forthcoming. And besides, even such a unlikelihood would have been inadequate in the final account; it should have been viewed as a quasi-mythological exemplification of the mystic sense intended. See further *infra* note 153.
104. One should not be tempted to connect this expression to the *ὀδηγητήρ, μηνυτήρ* of Orphic hymn 41. In the hymn the point is about Eubulus' specific knowledge of the whereabouts of Persephone, his willingness to inform Demeter (to speak mythologically), and his royal reward -

- divinisation. Demeter takes him as a guide, having pondered on the symbolic meaning of Baubo's Iacchus. See further below.
105. Did this statue belong to the *ἱερά* which were brought from Eleusis to the Eleusinion in Athens on the 14th of Boedromion, in order to participate in the sacred procession of the *εἰκάς* (taking place probably on the evening of the 19th Boedromion)? See inscription No 387.10 ff. Dittenberger¹ and cf. No 347.10 *ibid*. In the Eleusinion, there was no statue of Iacchus to judge by what Pausanias says and his silence at I, 14, 3. The statues mentioned by him (I, 2, 4 and I, 37, 4) are not in the Eleusinion, nor is the former one in the building where the preparations were made for the (Eleusinian?) *πομπαί*.
106. On the phallic nature of Dionysus, and therefore of the male aspect of Iacchus (notice that, as has been said, even the female aspect of Iacchus had a diminished manifestation in the womanish or even eunuchic, teste Clement's character of Dionysus), there is no need to expatiate here: *ὁ φαλλὸς τῷ θεῷ* was proverbial for giving what is proper (Apostolius XIII, 81; Diogenianus VII, 22 in the *Corpus Paroem.* Graec.); and Heracleitus poignantly has described the situation (Fr. 150 DK, apud Clement *Protr.* p. 30 Potter): *εἰ μὴ γὰρ Διονύσῳ πομπὴν ἐποιοῦντο καὶ ὕμνεον ἄσμα αἰδοίοισιν, ἀναιδέστατα εἴργαστ' ἄν*. But there is no need to confirm the obvious evidence which flows from all quarters in corroboration, and some more will be quoted below. Cf. n. 149 and n. 152.
107. Cf. the *θεῶν πάτερ ἡδὲ καὶ νιέ*, Orphic hymn 52 to Trieteric Dionysus who is in v. 4 called *Ἐὐβουλεύς* and in v. 11 *ὑποκόλπιος*, the latter partly in connection with Zeus' mystic copulation with Persephone in the form of a serpent, being the phallus symbolically; one is reminded also of Zeus Sabazius and Dionysus Sabazius. The identity of Zagreus (specifically the son of Zeus and Persephone, cf. Callimachus Fr. 171 Bentley = Fr. 43.117 Pfeiffer, apud Etym. Magnum s.v. *Ζαγρεύς* [the name is there explained as from *ζα* epitatic and *ἀγρεύω*: *ὁ πάνυ ἀγρεύων (ὁ μεγάλως ἀγρεύων* Et. Gud. s. v.) A fitting explanation for the Great Reaper; it is there said that *Ζαγρεύς* is also *Πλούτων*]; also scholia in Lycophron 355) with the third member of the male triad of gods connected with the Eleusinian Mysteries, namely Pluto, is testified by Etym.M. s.v. *Ζαγρεύς*: *τινὲς τὸν αὐτὸν φασὶν εἶναι τῷ Πλούτωνι*. This most significant aspectual identification is also made by Heracleitus Fr. 15 DK cf. also Aeschylus Frs. 5 and 242 Hermann or 229 Dindorf (Frs. 5 and 228 Radt, where consult the notes). That the Great Son is also the Great Father as the Great God is also implied by the author of the Alcmaionid (Fr. 3 Bernabi) apud Etym. Gudanium (578.7 De Stefani); Etym. MS Bibl. Reg. Paris (as quoted by Gaisford in his edition of Etym. Magnum s.v. *Ζαγρεύς*): *Πότνια Γῆ, Ζαγρεῦ τε θεῶν*

πανυπέρτατε πάντων where Ζαγρεύς, the latest god, seems to occupy the position of Οὐρανός the first θεὸς βασιλεύς in various accounts. Zeus Pluto Dionysus coincide here, as we have seen from another angle above, in the divinity of Eubuleus. The male member of the Eleusinian Trias (Demeter, Persephone, Dionysus) has itself a triple manifestation. But this will be properly analysed elsewhere.

108. This polarity is, I suspect, also to be found in Harpocratio's lemma on Δυσάυλης. We read there: Ἀσκληπιάδης δ' ἐν δ' Τραγωδομένων (Fr.Gr.H. 12F4 Jacobi) τὸν Δυσάυλην αὐτόχθονα εἶναι φησι, συνοικήσαντα δὲ Βαυβοὶ σχεῖν παῖδας Πρωτονόην (corrected to Πρωτογόνην by Dieterich) τε καὶ Νίσαν (vel Νίσαν; Suda habet Νῆσαν vel Νῆσσαν). Παλαίφατος δ' ἐν πρώτῃ (cod. Primarius: θ' ceteri) Τρωϊκῶν (Fr.Gr.H. 44F1) σὺν τῇ γυναικί φησι αὐτὸν ὑποδέξασθαι τὴν Δήμητρα. We have here all the required elements. Reception of Demeter, Dysaules, Baubo. Müller (Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. II p. 339) proposed to read Μίσα instead of Νῆσα or Νῆσ(σ)α referring to Hesychius s.v. Μισαίς and Orphic Hymn 41. If we accept this should we not then emend Πρωτονόην to Πρωτόγονος? The phallic nature of this being is well attested. Suda has s.v. Νῆσσα ὄνομα κύριον; and s.v. Δυσάυλης οδοτος αὐτόχθων μὲν ἦν, συνύκρησε δὲ Βαυβοὶ καὶ ἔσχε παῖδας Πρωτονόην τε καὶ Νῆσαν. Dieterich read Πρωτογόνην.
109. It is repeated in the same way by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evang.* (c. 129 B Migne), where the whole section is copied from Clement. Arnobius has the same formula but omits the all-important ἐργασάμενος thus: ieiunavi atque ebibi cyceonem: ex cista sumpsi et in calathum misi: accepi rursus, in cistulam transtuli. The omission I take to be accidental, a fault of our single codex.
110. As indicative of the inappropriate ways in which some scholars study ancient Mystery-Religions, I shall mention two emendations proposed for the offending ἐργασάμενος. Lobeck confidently directs us to read ἐγγευσάμενος (*Aglaoph.* p. 25) and so everyone read till Dieterich (*Mithrasliturgie*² p. 125) protested against this habit. But his protestation is rather weak: "Man ändert seit Lobeck das überlieferte ἐργασάμενος in ἐγγευσάμενος. Aber wir haben ganz gewiss kein Recht, einen Text, den wir in seinem eigentlichen Sinne nicht verstehen, am wenigsten den Text einer mystischen Formel, die für uns einstweilen in der Hauptsache dunkel bleibt, zu ändern". But surely we have more positive reasons than these for castigating and condemning Lobeck's change. There is a perfect, adequate and appropriate sense for ἐργασάμενος, as Dieterich himself goes on to remark, namely handling a pudendum. Furthermore, from a more philosophical point of view (which may mean more to Lobeck-type

scholars), either ἐγγευσάμενος would refer to the *κυκεών*, in which case it should precede the ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, or it had to refer to what is supposedly taken from the κίστη, something unknown of which not the slightest hint has been thrown by our sources, and which cannot be eaten up as it is laid down again and transposed to a different place, perhaps repeatedly by the various initiates operating with it. Another emendation is reported by Stählin in his edition, *θεασάμενος* by Reinesius. Scholars should have stronger stomachs and brains than this.

111. The way Nonnus interprets this (c. 1063 Migne) is certainly erroneous: *καὶ τὰ μὲν ποιεῖ, τὰ δὲ πάσχει, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν Δήμητραν παθεῖν εὖ ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι περὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς λῆξαι τῆς πλάνης, καὶ ταύτην δὲ ποιῆσαι εὖ τούτοις, δοῦσα τὰ σπέρματα, καὶ τελέασα τὰ μυστήρια.* Even Lobeck (*Aglaophemus* p. 825) appears to be sensitive to, and aware of, the fact that Gregory Nazianzenus does not seem to have committed a blunder or a crime in relating Demeter's engagements with her host(s), but after giving Gregory's passages and those of Nonnus and the scholiast ad Aristeidem (to be mentioned in the text) he comments: *Apud alios nulla hujus fabulae vestigia reperi, nisi quod in obscurissimo Hymnorum loco Cereris cum uno hospitem suorum concubitus significari videtur.* (By the locus obscurissimus he refers to Orphic hymn 41, vv. 5-8 to be discussed below). But this is the type of statement that will simply do not. Of which fable are there no other vestigia? That Demeter copulated with a number of persons is well known. In the myth of Iasion, her love for that young hero is connected with the gift of agriculture (v. Odyssey V, 125 ff. with scholia; Hesiod, *Theogony* 969 ff.; Scholia ad Lycophron *Alexandra* 29; Conon, *Narrat.* 21; Diodorus, V, 49, 77; differing account by Apollodorus III, 12, 1). And identical deities behaved analogously.
112. Cf. Pausanias I, 14, 3 where *Δυσαύλης* is substituted for Celeus as Triptolemus' father. The evidence points to the same person being differently called in different traditions or accounts. Thus in Pausanias I, 14, 2 the common Athenian account was that Celeus was Triptolemus' father: *Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ καὶ ὅσοι παρὰ τούτοις... <...> ἴσασι Τριπτόλεμον τὸν Κελεοῦ πρῶτον σπείραι καρπὸν ἡμέρον.* Sowing has naturally a sexual meaning as well. *Σπείραι καρπὸν ἡμέρον* may allude both to the transition from the wild, nomadic life to the civilized, agricultural one, and also to the orderly, agreed, accepted, institutionalised (and in this sense lawful) copulation and conjugation. Note the *ἀθέσμως* (in contrast) in the scholiast ad Aristeides Panathenaicus.
- 112a. It is important that the *Μικρὰ Μυστήρια* are related to, if I may put it symbolically, the active aspect of manhood and worldly procreation (Hippolytus, *Elenchos*, V, 8 ad fin.): *μικρά, φησίν, ἐστὶ τὰ μυστήρια τὰ*

τῆς Περσεφόνης κάτω, περὶ ὧν μυστηρίων καὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς ἀγούσης ἐκεῖ οὔσης «πλατείας καὶ εὐρυχώρου» (Matthaeus 7, 13) καὶ φερούσης τοὺς ἀπολλυμένους ἐπὶ τὴν Περσεφόνην (<...>), καὶ ὁ ποιητῆς (I propose Empedocles rather than Parmenides) δέ φησιν:

αὐτὰρ ὑπ' αὐτὴν ἐστὶν ἀταρπιτὸς ὀκρυόεσσα
κοίλη, πηλώδης· ἢ δ' ἠγγήσασθαι ἀρίστη
ἄλσος ἐς ἱμερόεν πολυτιμήτου Ἀφροδίτης.

The works of Aphrodite are constitutive of this World, do not lead to salvation out of it. This is made clear by Hippolytus (source) in the sequel: ταῦτ ἐστὶ, φησί, τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια, τὰ τῆς σαρκικῆς γενέσεως, ἃ μυθθέντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι μικρὰ παύσασθαι ὀφείλουσι, (the additions <πρὶν> here is unnecessary) καὶ μνεῖσθαι τὰ μεγάλα τὰ ἐπουράνια. οἱ γὰρ τοὺς ἐκεῖ, φησί, λαχόντες μόρους μείζονας μοίρας λαμβάνουσι (Heracleitus B25 DK). αὕτη γάρ, φησίν, ἐστὶν ἡ πύλη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ οὗτος <ὁ> “οἶκος θεοῦ” (Genesis 28, 17), ὅπου ὁ ἀγαθὸς θεὸς κατοικεῖ μόνος, εἰς ὃν οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται, φησίν, ἀκάθαρτος οὐδεὶς, οὐ ψυχικός, οὐ σαρκικός, ἀλλὰ τηρεῖται πνευματικοῖς μόνοις, ὅπου δεῖ γενομένους (<ἀπο>) βαλεῖν τὰ ἐνδύματα καὶ πάντας γενέσθαι νυμφίους ἀπηρσενωμένους διὰ τοῦ παρθενικοῦ πνεύματος. αὕτη γάρ ἐστὶν ἡ παρθένος ἢ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα καὶ συλλαμβάνουσα καὶ τίκτουσα υἱόν, οὐ ψυχικόν, οὐ σωματικόν, ἀλλὰ μακάριον αἰῶνα αἰώνων. περὶ τούτων, φησί, διαρρηθὴν εἴρηκεν ὁ Σωτὴρ ὅτι «στενὴ καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς ἢ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωὴν, καὶ ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν οἱ εἰσερχόμενοι εἰς αὐτήν, πλατεία δὲ καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἢ ὁδὸς ἢ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν, καὶ πολλοὶ εἰσὶν οἱ διερχόμενοι δι' αὐτῆς» (Matthew 7, 13-14). A characteristic and ingenious reading of the gospel in terms of Orphic speculation and Mystic eschatology.

113. Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* 1123 ff. refers to the Phrygian Mother of Gods calling her *Μητέρα Δινδυμίνη* (1125), *ἐνναέτην Φρυγίας* (1126), *Μητέρα Ἰδαίην* (1128), *Ρείην* (1139 and 1151) and *Ἄνταίην δαίμονα* (1141). Cf. further Hesychius and Etym. Mag. s.v. That there is an aspectual identification between *Ρέα*, *Κυβέλη* and *Δημήτηρ* is well known. One need simply recall Euripides' famous chorus from *Helena*.
114. Hephaestio, *Enchiridion* I, 3 sub fin. (p. 20 Gaisford2): *τρίτος δὲ ἐστὶ τρόπος* (sc. according to which a short syllable can be common) *ὅταν βραχεῖα συλλαβὴ τελικὴ λέξεως ᾖ, μὴ ἐπιφερομένων τῶν τῆς θέσεως μακρᾶς ποιητικῶν συμφώνων, ἀλλ' ᾗτοι ἑνός, ἢ μηδενός*. If we consider *δύσαγνος* as potentially two words (*δύς* and *ἀγνός*) it can be brought under this type. But this is weak on its own. Fortunately we possess further

relevant evidence. The scholiast ad loc. mentions other ways in which a short syllable becomes common, ways omitted by Hephaestio *ὡς πρὸς εἰσαγομένους τὸν λόγον ποιούμενος*, i.e. because his enchiridion is really an introduction. An additional way effecting the possible lengthening of a short syllable is by it being *ὄξυτονουμένη*: *δευτερος δὲ τρόπος τῶν τὴν βραχεῖαν εἰς μακρὰν ἀναφερόντων, ὃ διὰ τῆς ὄξεϊας. Αὕτη οὖν ἡ ὄξεϊα ἐπικειμένη τινὶ τῶν βραχέων ἢ βραχυνομένων διχρόνων μηκύνει· ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ* (Ilias, M 208):

Τρῶες δ' ἐρρίγησαν ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἰόλον ὄφιν.

Ἴδου ὁ τελευταῖος ποῦς, Πυρρίχιος μὲν ὑπάρχει (υυ), ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὴν ὄξεϊαν ἔχει ἐπικειμένην ἐπὶ τὸ ὄ, ἀντὶ τροπῆς παρείληπται τῆς ὄξεϊας μηκνούσης τὸ ὄ, καὶ οὐκ ἀκαίρως· δοκεῖ γὰρ ἡ ὄξεϊα ἀνατεινομένη τῇ τε φωνῇ καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ θέσει καὶ διατυπώσει τοῦ χαρακτηριστοῦ ἐαυτῆς τὴν βραχεῖαν ἀνακαλεῖσθαι εἰς ἑτέραν τάξιν (p. 159 Gaisford²). And similarly Eustathius, *Comm.* p. 80, commenting on Ilias A 193: *...τὸ δὲ κατὰ τέσσαρας τρόπους κοινῆς συλλαβῆς ἐκ τοῦ ταπεινώματος τῆς βραχεῖας ἀνίσταται μηκνόμενον· καὶ γὰρ καὶ δασύνεται, καὶ τόνον ἔχει ὄξύν, κἂν ἡ συνέπεια βαρύνῃ αὐτό· καὶ εἰς μέρος δὲ λόγου καταπεραιοῖ, etc.* Besides, the asperse spirant on the α of *ἀγνός* can act as a quasi-consonant, which, together with the preceding σ can lengthen the *δυσ*. The sanskrit equivalent of *ἄζ-ομαι*, *ἄγ-ιος*, *ἄγ-νός*, *ἄγ-ος* etc. is *jag'* - (and in Zed *yaz*;- cf. Curtius, *Gr.Etym.* (English tr.) §118, p. 170). Clearly, the *βάγ-ιος* and *βαγ-αῖος* of Hesychius point in the same direction.

115. This last source has: *Ἀχαιά: ἡ Δημήτηρ παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς. Ἀριστοφάνης Ἀχαρνέυσιν* (v. 709):

οὐδ' ἂν (αὐτὴν) τὴν Ἀχαιὴν ραδίως ἠνέσχετ' ἂν.

Εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ ἄχος τῆς Κόρης. Ἡ ὅτι μετὰ κυμβάλων ἠχοῦσα (assimilating and aspectually identifying her thus with Cybele) τὴν Κόρην ἐξήτει. Ἡ ὅτι τοῖς Ταναγραίοις μεταστᾶσιν ἐκ Τανάγρας ἡ Δημήτηρ κατ' ὄναρ φανείσα ἐκέλευσεν αὐτοὺς ἀκολουθεῖν τῷ γενομένῳ ἤχῳ, καὶ ὅπου ἂν παύσῃται ἐκεῖ πόλιν κτίσαι· καὶ ἰδρῦσαντο ἱερὸν Ἀχαιᾶς Δημήτερος. The difference in the accounts indicates that the connection with her sorrow for the Kore is not absolutely central even for *Ἀχαιά*. I think it relates more to the Cybelic nature of Demeter - cf. the famous chorus from Euripides' *Helena*.

116. I wonder whether one should not perhaps understand these impurities in relation to an impure woman, i.e. one quae menstrua non habet. V. e.g.

Lucianus, *Lexiphanes* 19: ...ἄπειμι παρὰ τὸν ἑταῖρον Κλεινίαν, ὅτι πυνθάνομαι χρόνου ἤδη ἀκάθαρτον εἶναι αὐτῷ τὴν γυναικα, καὶ ταύτη νοσεῖν, ὅτι μὴ ρεῖ· ὥστε οὐκέτι οὐδ' ἀναβαίνει αὐτήν, ἀλλ' ἄβατος καὶ ἀνήροτός ἐστι. She was therefore pregnant. A common sacrifice to Demeter was of a pregnant sow. For the ἀκάθαρτος μήτρα, consult the very important Sethian testimony of Hippolytus, v. infra note 130, where it engulfs the ὄφης or καρπός, i.e. simultaneously the virilia and sperm of the father and the foetus of the son. This is the meaning of the archetype of Father-Son as one Being. - Ἀκαθαρσία is joined to ἀσέλγεια by St. Gregory (*Oratio V Contra Julianum* II c. 705 Migne) with reference to Zeus.

117. It is similarly on cathartic grounds that Zeus was described thus by Orphics, apud St. Gregory, *Oratio IV (Contra Julianum* I) c. 653 Migne: Ζεῦ κύδιστε, μέγιστε θεῶν, εἰλυμένε κόπρω. It signifies the seed in manured earth.
118. I wonder whether we should connect this cultic epithet of Demeter with Hesychius' entry s.v. (but out of order) ἐνεργίς· ἢ εἰς γλουτοὺς κάθεισι τῶν χειρῶν. Did this σχῆμα signify a relevant attitude?
119. I do not see the grounds for Hermann's confidence in emending the passage so as to read: ἄγνὸν παῖδα Δυσαύλου ὀδηγητήρα λαχοῦσα - a change accepted by practically everyone afterwards, and lauded by Lobeck as praeclara emendatio (*Aglaophemus* p. 825 n. [k]). Hermann adduces as his reasons the following (ad locum): Vulgata lectio, δύσαγνος παῖδ' ἄγνὸν ὀδηγητήρα λαβοῦσα, et metro repugnat, nec, quo pacto intelligi possit, in promptu est. Quod reposui, ἄγνὸν παῖδα Δυσαύλου ὀδηγητήρα λαβοῦσα, certa nititur auctoritate Pausaniae I, 14 (3) Ὀρφέως δὲ (οὐδὲ ταῦτα Ὀρφέως, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, ὄντα.) Εὐβουλεῖ καὶ Τριπτολέμῳ Δυσαύλην πατέρα εἶναι, μὴνύσασσι δὲ σφισι περὶ τῆς παιδὸς (sc. Περσεφόνης), δοθῆναι παρὰ Δήμητρος σπεῖραι τοὺς καρπούς. Quamquam enim Pausanias non hunc Orphicorum carminum locum respexit, ex illo tamen, quem spectavit, loco, hausisse scriptorem, cuius hic hymnus est, patet. I have given it in toto, in order to exhibit clearly the failures of scholars who are pleased to glorify in being pure, or mere, philologists. For, being agreed for the sake of argument that δύσαγνος is corrupt, why should we not rather enclose it in cruxes, or suggest corrections like δύσθρηνος etc. (all of which, while mending the metrical defect provide in various degrees and directions apposite meanings - and I have not gone thorough enough to select the optimum among these and other possible candidates - also supply a not improbable reason for the corruption δύσαγνος, taken from the following ἄγνόν), instead of adopting Hermann's much more drastic "correction"? But there is the passage of Pausanias, one may say. And so

what? Why should it relate to this hymn in the way indicated by Hermann? Besides, there are other passages presenting a different picture of the relationship between *Δυσαύλης*, *Τριπτόλεμος* and *Εὐβουλος*. Furthermore, and more importantly, the crucial issue is the hidden meaning of these verses regarding any coition on the part of Demeter in the circumstances. (Pure philologists and antisymbolists, it would seem, pay not much attention to the minutiae of their job, in which they take such unjustified a pride). For with or without Hermann's emendation, it is evident that the natural way of interpreting the passage would be to take Demeter's coition as taking place with Dysaules' holy child and not with Dysaules himself. Now in the context of the commoner account which made Celeus the main person of authority encountered by Demeter in Eleusis, there was a tradition that the goddess had intercourse with him following the resolution of her quest for Kore and as the first act of her mighty donations, in particular civilizing agriculture. Scholiast to Aristeides p. 22 Dindorf: *Δημήτηρ παρὰ Κελεοῦ καὶ Τριπτολέμου τὸν ἥρπακῶτα μαθοῦσα, μισθὸν αὐτοῖς ἀποδίδωσι τῆς μηνύσεως τὸν σίτον, πρῶτον ἀθέσμως συγγενομένη Κελεῶ τῷ Τριπτολέμου πατρί*. By analogy, Lobeck (*loc.cit.*) postulates a coition between Demeter and Dysaules, whose offspring was Eubulus! On the other hand, what is particularly significant in this passage, and has not been duly noticed by pure philologists and antisymbolists is the *πρῶτον* and the *ἀθέσμως*. The concubitus must be related to the donum agriculturae. The dead ear of corn sown in the earth lives anew. Similarly with the seed of man in the female womb. But another, higher order offering of the seed to the womb is unproductive and soteriological; and this may be signified by the *ἀθέσμως*, as an intimation of the Great Eschatological Mysteries, as against the Small Procreative Ones. The assumption that there is a copulation indicated in the hymn is strengthened by the change from *ἀπ' ἀνάγκης* to *ὑπ' ἀνάγκης* (a change made in one codex (Leidensis Vossianus 59) and introduced into the vulgate text by Gesner). If this change is accepted then the sense must be what Gesner said, speaking of *Εὐβουλος*: *sed illud θνητῆς ἀπ' ἀνάγκης indicat humano semino conceptum*. But, as I said, the natural way is to take the *ἀγνὸν παῖδα Δυσαύλου* as the author of the said *θνητῆ ἀνάγκη*; when then thus does not cohere. Yet Lobeck (*op.cit.* p. 825, note k) could write: «*Εὐβουλον τέξασα θεὸν θνητῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, ubi si θεά scribatur, intelligi poterit filius Cereris ignotus e Dysaulis concubitu progenitus, quem Hermannus praeclara emendatione huic loco restituit*. There is no need to add anything more on this prime confusion; only to observe that the proposed change to *θεά* is unnecessary even for Lobeck's purposes. So Hermann's change is, far from being praeclara, really

damnata on all accounts. In truth, what is really meant in this context is that Demeter's (unnatural) coition with the young boy divinised him, making him an archetype of the salvation bestowed on the initiates upon undergoing the same experience.

120. That Eubulus was in some traditions considered to be the son of Demeter (v. Diodorus V, 76 sub fin.) is no real problem. For firstly this may simply report the exoteric, more mythological, less cultic and symbolical, tradition. Besides, the information may refer to accounts according to which Dionysus (Eubuleus) was born from Demeter (instead of Persephone) and Zeus (v. Diodorus III, 63 sub in.), in which case it would have no bearing on our point here (cf. *θητηῆ ἀνάγκη*).
121. There were even cistulae or cistae capable of containing a man, cf. e.g. Apuleius, *Metamorph.* IX, 207-8. This must be the sense of Hesychius' second explication of *κίστη*: *κιβωτός*, large chest.
122. Cf. Pollux VI, 13; VII, 79; 160; X, 91 (with reference to Homer, *Odyssey* ζ 76, where see the scholia); 136. (From Pollux X, 138, we see, by implication, that the *κίσται* were probably always covered). Cf. also Suda s.v. *κίστη* (who appropriately begins his entry by *κίστη· ἡ θήκη* a case, chest); Hesychius s.v. *κίστη, κοίτη, κοιτίς*; *Etym.M.* s.v. *κοίτις*.
123. Cf. Hesychius s.v. *Ἀχάνας*; Pollux X, 135 (with reference to Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 108, where see the scholion repeated in Suda s.v.); X, 165.
124. Pollux X, 180: *κίσται δὲ οὐ μόνον ὀμοφόροι, οὐδὲ ἄλλως ἀγγεῖα εἰς ἐσθήτων ἀπόθεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τῶν φαρμακοπωλῶν ἂν καλοῦντο, ὡς ἐν Ἀμφιαράῳ Ἀριστοφάνης* (Fr. 32 Blaydes = 95 Dindorf = Fr. 28 PCG vol. III 2 p. 47):

*καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὄφεις οὐς ἐπιπέμπεις
ἐν κίστη που κατασήμηναι
καὶ παῦσαι φαρμακοπωλῶν·*

(where the mention of serpents in conjunction with the *κίστη* is an ingenious play on the content of the mystic *κίσται*) ὡσπέρ που καὶ θεόπομπος ἐν Ἀλθαίᾳ (Fr. I, Meineke *Fr.Com.Gr.* II, p. 792 = Fr. 3 PCG vol. VII p. 710):

*τὴν οἰκίαν γὰρ ἤδρον εἰσελθὼν ὄλην
κίστης γεγονυῖαν Φαρμακοπῶλου Μεγαρικοῦ.*

Cf. also Theocritus II, 161.

125. What Photius says s.v. *λικνοφόρος* need not be taken as restricted to the Demetriad worship; it may refer to the *οὐλοχύται*, to the sacred barley

required in sacrifices. The entry in Photius is this: *λικνοφόρος· ὁ φέρων τὸν λίκνον* (sic)· *καὶ γὰρ μυστικὸν τι σημεῖον τῆς Δημητρίου τροφῆς* (fruits of earth) *ἐτίθετο ἐπὶ τῶν λίκνων*. Pollux VI, 86 tells us that the *λίκνον* was also called *κάνης*, a form akin to *κανοῦν*.

126. This does not mean that the man bearing the sacred *κίστη* was called either *κιστοφόρος* or *κιττοφόρος*, but that the reading in the Demosthenian passage was considered to be by some *κιττοφόρος* (as the extant MSS have it), by others *κιστοφόρος*. The correct reading must be in fact *κιττοφόρος*, bearer of ivy; Demosthenes did not likely speak disparagingly of something also involved in the sacred ceremonies of Eleusis (the *λικνοφόρος* may have here a special sense). Besides we have an exact parallelism in Plutarch, *Alexander 2*, with reference to wild, Dionysiac-Orphic worship as practised outside the scope of mystery cult. Speaking of Olympias Plutarch remarks that all women of her region are given to *κατάκοροι* and *περίεργοι ἱεροουργίαι* just as the Edonides and the Thracian women, but that Olympias *μᾶλλον ἐτέρων ζηλώσασα τὰς κατοχὰς καὶ τοὺς ἐνθουσιασμοὺς ἐξάγουσα βαρβαρικώτερον ὄφεις μεγάλους χειροθήβεις ἐφέιλκετο τοῖς θιάσοις, οἳ πολλάκις ἐκ τοῦ κιττοῦ καὶ τῶν μυστικῶν λίκνων παραναδύμενοι καὶ περιελιττόμενοι τοῖς θύρσοις τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τοῖς στεφάνοις ἐξέπληττον τοὺς ἄνδρας*. On the other hand, in rites as these described here by Plutarch we have the fiercer and wilder (perhaps even more vulgar) analogue of at least one aspect of the Athenian and Eleusinian mystery worship. The scholia on the Demosthenian passage have: *ὁ φέρων τὰς κοίτας* (obviously for *κιστοφόρος* or *λικνοφόρος*), *ἐστεμμένους κιττῶ* (for *κιττοφόρος*), and *τιμώμενος παρὰ φύλαξιν* or *λικνοφόρος*, probably a misplaced gloss on *Ἄττις, τιμώμενος παρὰ Φρυξίν*.
127. The difference is brought out well by Nonnus XXXI, 66 ff. Hera is asking Persephone to help her against the Semelian Dionysus. She ends her entreaties thus:

*μηδὲ νέον Διόνυσον ἀνυμνήσωσιν Ἀθηναί,
μηδὲ λάχην γέρας ἴσον Ἐλευσινίῳ Διούσῳ,
μὴ τελετὰς προτέρου διαλλάξειεν Ἰάκχου
μὴ τάλαρρον Δήμητρος ἀτιμήσειν ὀπώρῃ (or ὀπώρῃ with
C.F. Hermann).*

Here we find not only the distinction of Iacchus, the Eleusinian Dionysus, from the new Semelean one, but also the contrast of Demeter's *τάλαρον* (used in connection of produce from agriculture v. Hesychius s.v. *τάλαρος*) and the new Dionysus' wine (*ὀπώρῃ* is explained by Hesychius s.v. as: *...κυρίως δὲ ἢ σταφυλή· καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀκροδρύων*).

128. In the light of such parallelism (itself based on valid aspectual identification) we should also see Tibullus I, 7, 48

et levis occultis conscia cista sacris

with reference to Osiris Bacchus as inventor of agriculture and founder of viticulture. And in the great culminating ceremony described by Apuleius in his XI book of *Metamorphoses*, in the splendid procession: ...*ferebatur ab alio cista secretorum capax, penitus celeans operta magnifice religionis* (§246). Further see in Theocritus, the Bacchic Eidyllion XXVI, where (vv. 7-8) Ino, Autonoe and Agave:

ἱερά δ' ἐκ κίστας πεποναμένα χερσὶν ἐλοῖσαι,
εὐφάμως κατέθεντο νεοδρέπτων ἐπὶ βωμῶν.

It is perhaps farfetched, but *πεποναμένα* may allude to the obscene *ἐργασία* intimated by the Eleusinian mystery formula: ...*ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἐργασάμενος ἀπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον...* The sacred thing has been worked up.

Directly connected to Demeter, are the following verses of Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* II, 601 ff:

Quis Cereris ritus ausit vulgare profanis,
magnaue Threicia sacra reperta Samo?

.....

Condita sin non sunt Veneris mysteria cistis
nec cava vesanis ictibus aera sonant; etc.

129. Especially since in the immediately preceding verse, the *φιάλαι* are mentioned, which it was so common to offer to the Eleusinian deities as we know from many inscriptions.
130. A full analysis of the evidence is reserved for another place. A few obvious facts will be mentioned here to provide the necessary perspective. Thus for actual representations, see Scholia ad Lucian, *Dialogi Meretricii* II, I (p. 276, 13 Rabe): *τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ* (sc. with the Thesmophoria and Skirrophoria this identity is significant for the understanding of the worship of Athena *Πολιάς* and Erichthonios) *καὶ ἀρρητοφόρια καλεῖται καὶ ἄγεται, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἔχοντα περὶ τῆς τῶν καρπῶν γενέσεως καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων σπορᾶς* (mark the subtle interchange: *γένεσις* with *καρποί* and *σπορά* with *ἄνθρωποι*!). *ἀναφέρονται δὲ κἀνταῦθα ἄρρητα ἱερά ἐκ στέατος τοῦ σίτου κατεσκευασμένα, μιμήματα δρακόντων καὶ ἀνδρείων*

σχημάτων (i.e. Φαλλῶν). λαμβάνουσι δὲ κώνου θαλλοὺς διὰ τὸ πολύγονον τοῦ φυτοῦ. ἐμβάλλονται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ μέγαρα οὕτω καλούμενα ἄδυστα ἐκεῖνά τε καὶ χοῖροι etc. From Athenaeus XIV 647A, we learn that in the Syracusan Thesmophoria, cakes in the form of female pubes were carried around in honour of Demeter and Persephone: Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Συρακόσιος ἐν τῷ περὶ θεσμῶν, ἐν Συρακούσαις φησὶ τοῖς παντελείοις τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἐκ σπασάμου καὶ μέλιτος κατασκευάζεσθαι ἐφήβια γυναικεῖα, ἃ καλεῖσθαι κατὰ πᾶσαν Σικελίαν μυλλοὺς καὶ περιφέρεισθαι ταῖς θεαῖς. Further the χοῖρῖνοι (from χοῖροι) mentioned by Athenaeus in XIV, 647C in conjunction with πυραμοῦς or πυραμίς - Kaibel is right in adding <οῦ> referring to Hesychius s.v. πυραμοῦς - indicate representations of the female and male pudendum. These πυραμίδες were in the mystic cista whose contents are described by Clement. Clement's πόπανα πολυόμφαλα should be seen in conjunction with Hippolytus V, 20, 5: ...καὶ <ὁ> ὀμφαλὸς ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀνδρεία (i.e. phallus). In fact the entire analysis of Sethian doctrine in Hippolytus (V, 19 ff.) is very important in our context. See e.g. V, 19, 11: σχῆμα δὲ ἔχουσιν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ μήτρα παραπλήσιον τὸν ὀμφαλὸν ἐχούση μέσον, καὶ εἰ, φησὶν (Hippolytus' learned source), ὑπὸ ὄψιν ἀγαγεῖν θέλει τις τὸ σχῆμα τοῦτο, ἔγκουον μήτραν ὁποῖου βούλεται ζῆρου τεχνικῶς ἐρευνήσάτω, καὶ εὐρήσει τὸ ἐκτύπωμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ πάντων ἀπαράλλακτως ὑποκείμενον. That ὀμφαλός in the womb, is the κλειτορίς, whose (pseudo) hermaphroditic enlargement creates the τόπος of Baubo's genitalia, with the little boy's penis encompassed within. In V, 19, 18 we have the archetype of the ἀκάθαρτος μήτρα and the Great Wind (cf. the above noticed impregnating power of the wind; should we understand Δυσαύλης in this context, from the windpipe? But his organ is distorted, the MalPhallic One) or ὄφῖς who enters into the Uterus and generates Man. After the which analysis Hippolytus adds: ἔστι δὲ αὐτοῖς ἡ πᾶσα διδασκαλία τοῦ λόγου ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν θεολόγων, Μουσαίου καὶ Λίνου καὶ τοῦ τὰς τελετὰς μάλιστα καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καταδείξαντος Ὀρφέως· ὁ γὰρ περὶ τῆς μήτρας αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ ὄφως λόγος καὶ <ὁ> ὀμφαλός, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀνδρεία, διαρρήδην οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς Βακχικοῖς τοῦ Ὀρφέως. Τετέλεσται δὲ ταῦτα καὶ παραδέδοται ἀνθρώποις πρὸ τῆς Κελεοῦ καὶ Τριπολέμου καὶ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης καὶ Διονύσου ἐν Ἐλευσίνι τελετῆς, ἐν Φλιούντι τῆς Ἀττικῆς· πρὸ γὰρ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων μυστηρίων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Φλιούντι <τῆς> λεγομένης Μεγάλῃς ὄργια (cf. Pausanias I, 31, 4). ἔστι δὲ παστὰς ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς παστάδος ἐγγέγραπται μέχρι σήμερον ἢ τούτων [emendavi ex τὰ τῶν] πάντων τῶν εἰρημένων λόγων ἰδέα. πολλὰ μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς παστάδος ἐκείνης ἐγγεγραμμένα, περὶ ὧν Πλούταρχος ποιεῖται λόγους ἐν ταῖς πρὸς

Ἐμπεδοκλέα δέκα βίβλοις, etc. For ὀμφαλός v. Etym.M. s.v. It is connected to ἐμπνεῖν and ἀναπνεῖν: δι' οὗ τὸ ἔμβρυον (foetus) ἀναπνεῖ· τὸ γὰρ βρέφος, κατὰ γαστρὸς ὄν, περὶ αὐτὸν εἰλείται καὶ ἀναπνεῖ καὶ τρέφεται· ὅθεν καὶ τὴν Δήμητραν, τροφὸν οὖσαν, ὀμπνίαν ὀνομάζουσι Κυρηναῖοι (ὡς παρὰ Λυκόφρονι (v. 1264)) both as Earth, producer of the fruits of earth, and as the Great Womb. The similarity with phallus is also noted: ἡ παρὰ τὸ φαλλῶ εὐοκένα· ἐκκρεμῆς γάρ ἐστιν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τῆς ἀποτομῆς. Notice the general characterisation of Demeter as nutrix, τροφός, nurse.

131. I have many times commented on the homology and relevance of the Erichthonius affair to the present context. A parallel situation, with an *ιερὸν τῆς μητρὸς Πέας* in a *κίστη*, is related by Apollodorus, *Epitoma*, 6, 16-7 (p. 221 ed. Wagner). Cf. Scholia ad Lycophron, *Alexandra*, 495 (p. 180.35 sqq. ed. Scheer).
132. Cf. also Epiphanius, *Panarion*, p. 229 Petavius, where speaking of the Ophitic sect and the worship of the *ὄφεις*, remarks: *ἔχοντες δὲ φύσει* (= actually) *τὸ ἐρπετὸν ἐν κίστῃ τινι*. From the cista on the coins called *κιστοφόροι*, a snake was shown creeping out.
133. The Erichthonius affair is again very apposite here.
134. In the last sentence, Arnobius seems to bring forward the reason why he does not further elaborate the matter. But there is difficulty here. He says he is prohibited by the *religio gentis* in the first place. But how? True, he writes as a member of the persecuted Church, but this does not prevent him from heaping derision upon derision and insult upon insult on the pagan religion and from ridiculing its myths and rites. Were the Orphic-Eleusinian mysteries under special protection in Latin Africa? And what, in this context, do we make of the second reason adduced by him, the *litterarum auctoritas*? Should we interpret it as the dignity of literature and, keeping the MSS reading *noscentis* for the *nos gentis* of the *editio princeps* (accepted by Reifferscheid), understand *religio noscentis* as respect for the reader? (This is, e.g., the way the passage is taken in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library series, vol. XIX p. 252). But this is rather forced and unsatisfactory. Was it, perhaps, then a mere rhetorical device to suggest that one knows more, when one really does not? I do not believe it. What seems to be more probable is this: divulging mysteries was highly sacrilegious, and therefore strictly punishable by the State. The fearful prospects of an action for impiety, the famous *γραφαι ἀσεβείας*, are well known. The efficacy of this double prohibition, and of the sanctions, both spiritual and civil, connected with it, is highlighted by the fact that even today we do not really know the ritualistic proceedings of the Mystery cults in detail. The imposed secrecy had in particular to do with the actual details of sacred

things and mystic actions, as against hidden allusions and exoteric representations of them. Diodorus, I, 27, 6, speaking about the discrepancies in the accounts relating to the life, death and interment of Isis and Osiris, gives this reason for it: *διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἱερεῖς, ἐν ἀπορρήτοις παρειληφότας τὴν περὶ τούτων ἀκρίβειαν, μὴ βούλεσθαι τὰ ληθῆς ἐκφέρειν εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς, ὡς ἂν καὶ κινδύνων ἐπικειμένων τοῖς ἀπόρρητα περὶ τῶν θεῶν τούτων μὴ γύσασιν εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους*. Of course, he reports the identities Isis = Demeter, Osiris = Dionysus. If one carefully examines what Christians (civilly, if not religiously, bound to silence, even granted that they knew more than what they say) like Clement and Arnobius have to say about those mystery cults, one cannot fail to notice that this includes either transcriptions from what other authors have already related (and is therefore to be presumed as lying outside the banned sphere) as when e.g. Arnobius takes his account of the Attis-affair from Timotheus; or details of the outward aspect of the symbols utilised in the mystic ceremonies, like the toys with which Bacchus was playing just before he was torn to pieces by the Titans, or the *πόπανα* and the pigs in the Eleusinian sacrifices, the torches, the comb, the wool, the pine tree, the myrtle and so on. But all these are mentioned in published texts not least in Orphic poems and accounts. In some cases we may be told the mystical significance of such an isolated symbol; but this is by no means regular and systematic; we do not know the ritual and its import in detail. And even when we, by some happy coincidence, happen to possess some valuable testimony as to the general form of a mystic liturgy (as in Psellus, *De Daemonibus*, 3 Migne), we tend to set it aside or to ignore it out of various prejudices of a pseudo-scientific nature, thereby dispossessing ourselves of this only means available to reach a more exact idea of these things. Furthermore, our lack of precise knowledge is not something strange or accidental. For consider whence such knowledge could be channeled down to us. Initiated pagans would not profane that which ensured their special status, indeed their deification. Christians could never submit themselves deliberately to idolatrous practices just in order to be able to learn finally and in person the carefully kept secret. (Those were times of sincerity and genuine religiousness and earnestness in conviction, not of easy hypocrisy). On the other hand, what was written on the pagan side could only allude to things known to the initiates; and this also covers the Orphic literature at least in so far as we know it. (Thus the *membrum virile* is a *παῖς* in our fragment). To the initiated everything in such religious material pointed to the sacred and unspeakable ceremonies, the blessed *θεάματα* which could alone ensure eternal beatitude; to the *vulgus profanum* it was mysterious indeed, or unmeaning nonsense. This being the case the only possible source of

information respecting these things is twofold: either converted initiates to Christianity; or unwritten tradition (one goes sometimes a step further in speech, when in confidence with his friends and associates, that one is prepared to do in writing). The second is apt to give the broken, piecemeal image that we now have via the utilization of the relevant material by some Christian writers; it runs through all the vicissitudes of unwritten testimonies, the benefits of the Goddess Fame, but also the risks of mere hearsay. The former kind of source, if it existed, has disappeared for us. Perhaps, psychologically it would be extremely difficult even for the most iron-minded convert to play foul with his erstwhile most intimate and cherished hopes and beliefs; one might rather prefer to be silent about them and about the very peculiar rites with which they were associated. Besides, there was much mysteric stuff in common between ancient religiosity and incipient christianity; and much of the older symbolism was appealing to the newer rituals, modelled as these basically were on the ancient patterns of mystery. Such considerations may help to explain an, even initial, scarcity of this type of source. And it is significant that the only detailed information we possess about practices of ritualistic obscenity in connection with gnostic sects comes from someone who confesses to have had immediate and personal knowledge of the matter in his youth v. Epiphanius, *Panarion*, A, XXVI, 17. There is a last question in this connection one should address himself to: why should not some pagan free thinkers and sceptics unveil and expose the mystery-secrets? But they were not likely to undergo initiation in the first place (sometimes initiation was of a pronouncedly repulsive type cf. the *θεὸς διὰ κόλπου* and the *ταυροβόλεια* to give two examples, so that only the believer could muster the strength to suffer it, to give but one reason for the stated improbability); and then we must suppose civil punishment to have been particularly deterrent in these cases. To round off then, the Christians neither had plentiful information respecting these matters, nor must they have been very forward in formally (by publication) disobeying imperial edicts, local laws and public religious customs when their Christian conscience was evidently not implicated. The circumscription in the nature of their evidence which I roughly indicated, and their general reluctance to commit to writing something which cannot be traced back to existing information, confessed on the part of the pagans themselves, may explain both the usefulness and the limitations of their reports. Naturally, what I said above relates to the circumstances of the Struggling Christian faith, not of the Church Triumphant. But in the latter case people had to base their disclosures on earlier sources and unwritten reports.

135. And compare the *ἀνδρεία σχήματα* of the scholiast ad Lucian *Dialogi Meretricii* II, 1 mentioned in explanation of the world *Θεσμοφόρια* above. *Σχῆμα* appears also in Isaias (*Septuagint*) III, 17 where it is a *γυναικεῖον σχῆμα* which is meant. One may also compare in this connection the *εἶδωλα τῆς ἥβης* (*Nubes* 976) which are the traces of the boy's virilia on the sand in the Gymnasia. Closer is: *οὐκ ἄρρενος καὶ θηλείας φύσεως εἰς δίμορφον τύπον δημιουργηθείσης*, Diodorus, *Fragmenta*, vol. X (*Fragm. Libri XXXII*) p. 62 of the Bipontine edition.
- 135a. For a detailed, broad survey, global and diachronic, of hermaphroditism and bisexuality in the cultures of man, see Hermann Baumann, *Das doppelte Geschlecht: studien zur Bisexualität in Ritus und Mythos*, 1955, 1986.
136. Diodorus relates (*Fragmenta*, pp. 519 sqq. Wesseling, from Book XXXII of the *Histories*, vol. X pp. 55 sqq. of the Bipontine edition) that when Alexander Balas consulted the oracle of Apollo Saperdonius in Cilicia, he received as god's answer the warning to be careful of the place which brought fourth the *θεὸν δίμορφον*. He then died in an Arabian town, called *Ἄβαι*, which had seen the birth of an hermaphrodite. See Diodorus narration concerning this hermaphroditus, and the following story about another one in Epidaurus. As to the reason for the divinity of such beings, Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, V, 7, 15: *ἀπεκόπη γάρ, φησίν*, (Hippolytus' source, an Ophitic document), *ὁ Ἄττις, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀπὸ τῶν χοϊκῶν τῆς κτίσεως κάτωθεν μερῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αἰωνίαν ἄνω μετελήλυθεν οὐσίαν, ὅπου, φησίν, οὐκ ἔστιν οὔτε θῆλυ οὔτε ἄρσεν, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις, «καινὸς ἄνθρωπος», ὃ ἔστιν ἀρσενόθηλυς*. For mutations from female to male sex cf. Pliny VII, 4, quoted by Aulus Gellius IX, 14 sub fin. For the myth of Caenis-Caeneus see Ovid, *Metam.* 172 ff. Pliny loc.cit. gives various historical examples and a personal testimony. He starts the report by declaring: *ex feminis mutari in mares non est fabulosum*. Again we notice a certain preponderance of the female sex.
137. See Diodorus, *loc.cit.* pp. 62-3, where it is also reported that the two hermaphroditi, one in Rome, the other in Athens, were burnt alive, the former by order of the Senate, growing superstitious says Diodorus. (Pliny mentions, VII, 4, a less drastic removal: *Invenimus in annalibus Q. Licinio Crasso, C. Cassio Longino Consulibus, Casini puerum factum ex virgine sub parentibus; jussuque haruspicum deportatum in insulam desertam*). Diodorus then goes on to observe that it is impossible that a being can have both kinds of generative organs fully developed, but that what happens is that sometimes by the side of the proper organ of one sex is to be found a formation resembling in all externals (but not in function) the organ of the opposite sex: *ὁμοίως δ' ἐν τῇ Νεαπόλει καὶ κατ' ἄλλους τόπους πλείονας*

ιστοροῦνται γεγονέναι τοιαῦται περιπέτεια, οὐκ ἄρρενος καὶ θηλείας φύσεως εἰς δίμορφον τύπον δημιουργηθείσης (ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοῦτο), ἀλλὰ τῆς φύσεως διὰ τῶν τοῦ σώματος μερῶν ψευδογραφούσης, εἰς ἔκπληξιν καὶ ἀπάτην τῶν ἀνθρώπων (*ibid.* p. 62). He seems to prefigure the modern medical notion of false hermaphroditism. He relates by way of further example what happens with hyaenae, in whose case many μυθολογοῦσιν that they are both male and female, copulating alternatively between themselves yearly; (cf. also Aristotle *De Gen. An.* Γ, 757a2 sq.); and he continues: τῆς ἀληθείας οὐχ οὕτως ἐχούσης· ἑκατέρου γὰρ τοῦ γένους ἀπλήν ἔχοντος καὶ ἀνεπίμικτον τὴν φύσιν, προσώρισται τὸ ψευδογραφοῦν καὶ παρακρουόμενον τοὺς εἰκῆ θεωροῦντας· τῇ μὲν θηλείᾳ πρόσκειται τι κατὰ τὴν φύσιν παρεμφερὲς ἄρρενι μορίῳ (sc. the κλειτορίς), τῷ δὲ ἄρρενι κατὰ τὸ ἐναντίον ἐμφάσεις θηλείας φύσεως. ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν ζώων, γενομένων μὲν πρὸς ἀλήθειαν πολλῶν καὶ παντοδαπῶν τεράτων, μὴ τρεφομένων δέ, καὶ εἰς τελείαν αὔξησιν ἐλθεῖν οὐ δυναμένων. Ταῦτα μὲν εἰρήσθω πρὸς διόρθωσιν δεισιδαιμονίας. Real monsters cannot be fed and develop when they are born. A very scientific position.

For further passages bearing on the subject, consult Wesseling's references.

The same alternation between the divinity and the monstrosity of androgynic beings is also reported by Diodorus IV, 6, 5: τοῦτον (sc. τὸν Ἐρμαφρόδιτον, offspring of Hermes and Aphrodite) δ' οἱ μὲν φασὶν εἶναι θεὸν καὶ κατὰ τινὰς χρόνους φαίνεσθαι παρ' ἀνθρώποις, καὶ γεννᾶσθαι τὴν τοῦ σώματος φύσιν ἔχοντα μεμιγμένην ἐξ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικός· καὶ τὴν μὲν εὐπρέπειαν καὶ μαλακότητα τοῦ σώματος ἔχει γυναικὶ παρεμφερῆ, τὸ δ' ἄρρενωπὸν καὶ δραστικὸν ἀνδρὸς ἔχει, τὰ δὲ φυσικὰ μόρια συγγενᾶσθαι τούτῳ καὶ γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρός· ἔνιοι δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα γένηταις φύσεσιν ἀποφαίνονται τέρατα ὑπάρχειν. Pliny has a significant remark on the hermaphrodites (*loc.cit.*): Gignuntur homines utriusque sexus; quos hermaphroditos vocamus, olim androgynos vocatos et in prodigiis habitos, nunc vero in deliciis. From the field of religious awe the matter has been translated to the area of sexual pleasure.

138. One clearly sees how well Neoplatonism took hold of the peculiarly rationalistic spirit of the Ancient World strongly oriented towards the fundamental, the essential and the ultimate. A question rationalistically framed, requires imperatively an answer, which means in particular that there is no escape, no short-cut to this. Only the impossibility, rationalistically ascertained, of any further question, pacifies the quest by ensuring that the ultimate (the Platonic ἀνυπόθετον) has been reached. Of course rationalism in this sense is misleading; one need simply recollect the enlightened shallowness of the philosophes to be sufficiently warned

against any relevant mistake. Yet I confess I would fain abandon the word if I knew of any other better adapted to express the required meaning.

139. In an hermaphrodite the male organ must coexist with, and in some way in, the female one. Thus it is that, in the two examples related by Diodorus, the subject, even before the full appearance of the virilia, was unable to suffer normal coition with a man, so that she had to copulate *παρὰ φύσιν* i.e. according to the male coition, as it is put by Diodorus: *καὶ κατὰ τὴν γεγεννημένην μετ' ἀνδρὸς συμβίωσιν, τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐπιπλοκῆς ἀντιπραττούσης, δοκεῖν αὐτὴν ταῖς ἀρρενικαῖς συμπεριφοραῖς καθωμιλῆσθαι* (p. 57 ed. Bipontina) for the first case; and for the second: *διετῆ μὲν οὖν χρόνον συνεβίωσε τάνδρῳ, τὴν μὲν γυναικίαν ἐπιπλοκὴν οὐκ ἐπιδεχομένη, τὴν δὲ παρὰ φύσιν ὁμιλίαν ὑπομένειν ἀναγκαζομένη* (p. 60). The male genitalia appear from within the female organs: *ἐβδομαίας δ' οὔσης, ρῆξι ἐπιγενέσθαι τῆς ἐπιφανείας καὶ προπεσεῖν ἐκ τῶν τῆς Ἡραΐδος γυναικείων αἰδοῖον ἀνδρείον ἔχον διδύμους προσκειμένους* (p. 56); and the doctors examining him after the event *γινῶναι, ὅτι κατεκέκρυπτο φύσιν ἀρρενος ἐν ὤρειδῃ τόπῳ φύσεως θηλείας*, etc. (p. 59). And in the first case, the doctors who saw the subject complaining of tumorous inflammations in the pudendum-region, diagnosed the existence of ulcerations on the neck of the uterus, i.e. well inside the generative organ. It is in this context, I think, that the epigramm 105 (Book V of the *Anthologia Graeca*) by Marcus Argentarius should be understood:

Ἄλλος ὁ Μηνοφίλας λέγεται παρὰ μαχλάσι κόσμος,
 ἄλλος, ἐπεὶ πάσης γέεται ἀκρασίης.
 Ἄλλ' ἴτε, Χαλδαῖοι, κείνης πέλας· ἢ γὰρ ὁ ταύτης
 οὐρανὸς ἐντὸς ἔχει καὶ κύνα καὶ διδύμους.

Κύων is the *πέος*, and *δίδυμοι* the testicles, as has been already observed (cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v.) but also *κύων* is the Dog Star and *Δίδυμοι* the zodiacal sign of Gemini. Another play of double-entendre, very common in the epigramms, moving on both the two levels of astronomy and sexology! *Χαλδαῖοι* adds colour to the game, and *οὐρανός* means both heaven and, if I am right, the inner dome in the cavity of her pudenda. We are reminded of Pliny's *delicia*! The common interpretation is less likely, I think; see e.g. Jacobs vol. 9 of his *Anthologia Graeca*, p. 286, who brings the epigramm in relation to Lucianus Epigramm I (vol. III, p. 21) and Nicarchus V (ibid. p. 59) to which consult also his notes, where *οὐρανός* signifies the palate, hence alluding to the practices immortalized by the picture in Argos, which, according to Chrysippus *ἐρωτικά ἐπιστολαί, πρὸς τῷ τοῦ Διὸς αἰδοίῳ (φέρει) τῆς Ἡρας τὸ πρόσωπον* Clementine

Homilies, V, 18 sub fin. a primal archetype for λεσβιάζειν in the ancient sense, i.e. fellatio.

140. As Psellus, *De Daemonibus*, 3 (Migne) relates: ἐφ' οἷς ἡ Βαυβὼ τοὺς μηρῶν ἀνασυρομένη καὶ ὁ γυναικείος κτείς - οὕτω γὰρ ὀνομάζουσι τὴν αἰδῶ αἰσχυνόμενοι. Καὶ οὕτως ἐν αἰσχρῶ τὴν τελετὴν καταλύουσιν, respecting the Eleusinian mysteries. There is, it is true, no specific mention of a membrum virile in this brief statement. But enough, I trust, has been said to make its existence certain, despite such, maybe accidental, and anyway justifiable omissions. Besides, after what has preceded in the τελετή according to Psellus' relation, an exhibition of a mere female pudendum would surely be an anti-climax, especially if presented as the culminating act.
141. We have noticed the insistence in our sources of the fact that what was to be seen in Baubo's pudenda was of a puer-like nature: παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἰακχος in Clement, and in Arnobius (ed.cit. p. 197.1 sqq.): ...tum longiore ab incuria liberat (sc. Baubo, her pudenda), facit sumere habitum puriorem et in speciem levigari nondum duri atque hystriculi pusionis. In note 10 above, it is explained what hystriculus means; as to the durus, it refers to the condition of a hardened, tumescent membrum virile. It bears, I think, the same allusion in Juvenal, VI, 376-8. The question is there about eunuchs castrated relatively late in youth, when their manhood is in full bloom; the result is that matrons can enjoy with them the summa voluptas (368-9) which their condition guarantees, and also without any fear of unwelcome consequences. Juvenal then adds:

Dormiat ille (sc. the previously described eunuch)
cum domina; sed tu iam durum, Postume, iamque
tondendum eunucho Bromium committere noli.

For tondendum some editions read tundendum; I should propose tumendum. In any case the connotation, I think, refers directly or indirectly to the condition of an erect membrum virile whether the immediate denotation is to the specifically appropriate state of a boy who has already reached puberty, or rather in particular to Postumus' membrum (perhaps the name is also significant as paralleling the Greek Πόσθων, from πόσθη). More likely is the second alternative. Postumus' wife is lying with the well-endowed eunuch; but he himself will not commit his already erect and tumescent membrum to the eunuch (i.e. Postumus will not sleep with him), for fear of rather experiencing his wife's part instead in such an encounter with him. But in fact there is no need for the present purpose to choose between these apparent alternatives, because they really coincide in

the end: Bromius, the Dionysus, is the adolescent whose peculiar character as adolescent is the manifestation of the generative power, and whose natural sign is an *ἐντεταμένος φαλλός*. The erect *membrum virile* is either directly or indirectly Dionysus Bromius himself.

The *non dum durum et hystriculum pusio* of Arnobius is then, according to this line of thought, a puer - like male *pudendum*. This fits well with the view (documented in the relevant text and notes) that in cases of hermaphroditism only one at most of the two sets of sexual organs is fully developed or really functional (what is called in medicine *pseudohermaphroditism*). Furthermore it is important to note a possible example of the exactly contrary state of affairs, and in a significant context as well. Phlego, in his *Mirabilia*, reports various cases of androgynic human beings (cap. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10). The last one is about an *ἀνδρόγυνος* being borne in Rome; upon which momentous event the Senate asked the *ἱερομνήμονες* to read and explain the relevant Sibylline Oracles. The Oracles did contain prognosis of such an ominous appearance (p. 76.9-11, BT):

*καί τοί ποτέ φημι γυναῖκα
ἀνδρόγυνον τέξασθαι ἔχοντά περ ἄρσενά πάντα,
νηπίαχαί θ' ὅσα θηλύτεραι φαίνουσι γυναῖκες.*

This *ἀνδρόγυνος* possessed all the male organs, but the marks of the female sex were like the ones of an infant or child. It may, of course, be the case that such a childish aspect refers only to the *ἀνδρόγυνος* being still an infant; but the masculine *ἔχοντα*; the fact that «*ἀνδρόγυνος*» is usually employed with reference to beings who, whether from the beginning or eventually, display a predominance of the male sex; and the occurrence of *νηπίαχοι* after a few lines (p. 77.9) to denote relatively grown up children rather than mere infants; such consideration in particular, and the natural fitness and plausibility of my assumption in general, make me suggest that the implications in our passage are wider and the description as it were *proleptic*. We have here a reverse *Baubo*: a male with infant-like female genitalia. In any case, the Oracles, obviously considering such a birth as a gravely ominous event, went on to enjoin the sacrifices and sacred ceremonies that ought to be conducted on the occasion. The fact that the main *ἱεουργίαι* were addressed to Demeter, Persephone and Pluto (in this order) must be significant as associating hermaphroditism with the Eleusinian Triad. The sacrifices to Apollo (and Hera) subsequently ordained, are set clearly apart (p. 77.24 sqq.):

μη γὰρ ἀπιστόφιλος θυσίαισιω ἀνὴρ παρεπέσθω·

(referring to the sacrifices to Demeter, Persephone and Pluto)

ἔξω δ' ἐνθ' ἀνόμιστον ἐπέπλετο φωτὶ τὰδ' ἔρδειν,
 νοῦπιστοι καταδαιτὸν ἔχειν θυσίαν, κατὰ δ' αὐτῆν
 ὅστις ἂν ἡμετέρων χρησμῶν ἴδρις ἐς τόδ' ἴκηται,
 σεμνὸν Φοῖβον ἄνακτα μετελθέτω ἐν θυσίαισι,
 προφρονέως βωμοῖς ἐπὶ πύονα μηρία καύσας etc.

An exoteric sacrifice, we note, of the heavenly, Olympian type, clearly.

142. This brings Arnobius version nearer to the Greek text of Clement: *plaudit, contrectat amice*, sc. Baubo.
143. This is not rare, even if not common. Cf. e.g. Orphic hymn 42 v. 2.
144. Housman's extreme dictum as to the acceptability of violent emendations if required by the sense of the text is (in)famous. His unharmoniousness in tone and content did him injustice; for his views concerning textual criticism were very healthy, if exaggerated and not always correct.
145. Lobeck already, *op.cit.* p. 820 has mentioned a similar attempt:

τῆ δ' ἐπὶ οὖν μείδησε θεὰ γήθουσ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ

Easy success!

146. It also fits much better with the Latin of Arnobius: *tum dea defigens augusti luminis orbes* etc. Wakefield also adopted it (note on Lucretius, IV 1166).
147. Not to object against the indiscriminate and unscientific application of barbarity to anything untestified in one way or another.
148. It also suits better the Latin version: *inde manu poculum sumit risuque sequenti / perducit totum cyceonis laeta liquorem*.
149. Although we meet the metaphorical association of *μείδησε* with *θυμός* already in Homer, *Odyssey*, v. 301: *μείδησε δὲ θυμῷ / σαρδόνιον μάλα τοῖον*. Cf. for another metaphorical connection π 476: *μείδησεν δ' ἱερῆ ἴς Τηλεμάχου*. An association of smiling with acceptance of a painful but inescapable situation as a result of soothing words addressed to the perturbed subject, occurs again already in Homer (*Ilias*, A, 531 sqq.). In a heavy altercation between Zeus and Hera, the supreme God ends the dispute by sharply threatening his august wife. She, fearing his overarching power and ineluctable decree, submits to his will, gnawing her heart, *ἐπιγνάμψασα φίλον κήρ*. Hephaestus undertakes to console her in her impotent rage. He offers her a cup (*δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον*) to drink nectar. In the end of his persuasive address (595-6):

ὡς φάτο· μείδησεν δὲ θεά, λευκώλενος Ἥρη,
μειδήσασα δὲ παιδὸς ἐδέξατο χειρὶ κύπελλον.

150. D. Heinsius devoted an elaborate note on this Orphic fragment. One may conveniently consult it in Potter's edition of Clement ad loc. He proposed, taking Arnobius as his guide, this version of the passage:

Ὡς εἰποῦσα πέπλους ἀνεσύρατο, δείξε δὲ πάντα
σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον, παιδήϊον ἄνθος,
χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκεν ἔη Βαυβὼ ὑπὸ κόλποις
ἠπίη οὖν μείδησε θεά, μείδησ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ etc.

It is interesting, and it is better than the modern attempts at improvement. In changing *Βαυβοῦς* to *Βαυβὼ* he had a good nose for the problem; but *ἔη* for *γελῶν* is not very attractive. On the whole the account is rather innocent. Of course Baubo removed her pubic hair, but this was not all there was to be seen in her pudendum or it would not have merited the Goddess' change of attitude. Besides, if the *τύπος* was just the *παιδήϊον ἄνθος*, how could Baubo throw it to and fro, toss it about? Not to mention that there is no *χνοῦς*, no dawn, no *ἄνθος* in an *ἄνηβος παῖς*, nor in a *παρατετιλμένον* pubic region: when Nonnus wants to speak of such a boy's condition in his pubes (and it is very appositely Dionysus of whom he speaks), he uses the expression *παιδήϊον ἠβην* (e.g. in IX, 185 and XIII, 90). This much then for Heinsius' honest construal. Still the Greek runs very laboriously in the second (to third) line.

For Ludwig's account (*N. Jahrb. f. class. Philol.* 141, 1890, p. 57):

ὡς εἰποῦσα πέπλους ἀνεσύρατο· δείξε δὲ πάντα
σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον - παῖς δ' ἦεν ἰαλλος -
χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκ'· ἐγέλων Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποι.
ἠ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν μιν ἴδεσκε θεά, μείδησ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ etc.

what shall one say? In such a way we can extract anything from anything: changes have either to be minimal or crucial and singular if drastic and even then they should be of a certain fitting-the-case nature. As to the details: *μιν ἴδεσκε* is easy cleverness without a point; reminiscent of the people who go around making emendations by the rule! Then how can the *παῖς* painted or figured on Baubo's abdomen be *ἰαλλος*, shooting forth, thrusting forth? And if this was the *τύπος* how can anybody *ριπτάζειν* it? And what to say of the continuously interrupted flow of an epic passage? All in all, a failure. For the inappropriateness and lack of point of the queer

notion that a painted, laughing childish face was to be seen in Baubo's belly, see also below.

A couple of words are (barely) needed to dispose of a recent attempt at the fragment. Bernabe (PEG II 1: *Orphicorum et Orphicis Similium Testimonia et Fragmenta* Fr. 395 pp. 325-6) presents this text:

δείξε δὲ πάντα
σώματος οὐδὲ πρόποντα τόπον· παῖς δ' ἦκεν Ἰακχος,
χειρὶ τέμνιν ρίπτασκ' ὀρέγων Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλπους.

All the old sins are collected and aggravated by new ones! *Τόπον* (Marcovich) is absurd in itself and in relation to the rest. What is the improvement over the apposite *τύπος*? And *μιν* can only refer to it and how can one toss a *τόπος*? It should be *ὀρέγων χεῖρα*. And what is wrong with laughter here?

Other proposals I shall pass over in silence.

151. This is very aptly symbolized on the Lovatelli urn when, in the final *ἐποπτεία*, the initiated is depicted as caressing Demeter's snake in front of her and Persephone. (The three pictures of the urn nicely represent the three stages of the initiation: *κάθαρσις μύησις ἐποπτεία*). The snake is the mystic Iacchus (cf. supra); cf. also note 152. The relationship of Iacchus to Demeter is presented in an ambiguous way by Lucretius. In V, 1160 sqq. he ridicules the way in which real defects in women are described in ways which make them appear as points of advantage; and among other instances of such euphemism he gives (v. 1168)

at tumida et mammosa Ceres est ipsa ab Iaccho

The *tumida* (this is Bernays' emendation of the transmitted *iamina* in vulgate changed to *gemina* after Lambinus, though we should also not forget Avancius and Lachmann's *Lamia*; *tumida* is adopted by Munro who refers to Ovid, *Ars Am.* II, 661 and *Rem. Am.* 327) reminding one of the Cratinian *παχεῖαι μισηταὶ γυναικες ὀλίβοισιν χρώνται*, discussed above. Is *mamosa* to be understood in the same spirit, and is then Iacchus Demeter's lover? (This was the interpretation of, e.g., Lambinus and Faber). Or should we connect the *mamosa* with her being *τροφός* or mother of Iacchus (cf. Suda lemma: Ἰακχος· Διόνυσος ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῷ above commented)? So, e.g., Havercamp; the opinions of the older scholars are reproduced in the 19th century, not rarely as if they were new discoveries of the critical spirit. Arnobius, *Adversus Nat.* III, 10, is also capable of both types of interpretation: *habet animus atque ardet*, in

chalcidicis illis magnis atque in palatiis coeli deos deasque conspicerem intectis corporibus atque nudis, ab Iaccho Cererem, musa ut praedicat Lucretia, mammosam, Hellespontiacum Priapum inter deas virgines atque matres circumferentem res illas proeliorum semper in expeditionem paratas. For a resolution of this difficulty cf. supra. The significance of its parallelism in the story of Ἀθηνᾶ Πολιάς and Ἐριχθόνιος will be fully treated elsewhere.

152. It is in such a context that we should consider the Orphic ἀρσενικοὶ ἔρωτες and the mystic γυναικεῖαι ἀρρητουργίαι. Not to mention the practices of certain gnostic sects as reported in detail by Epiphanius, which clearly belong to the same field.
153. This extremely important point will be further discussed and elucidated in another part of the inquiry. But I shall refer here to some passages from classical authors in order to show the widespread awareness of it at an early time.

The idea that we are dead for the dead just as they are for us, certainly appears in *Ranae*. Thus the priest below speaks of Archedemus who (419-20):

νυνὶ δὲ δημαγωγεῖ τ'
ἐν τοῖς ἄνω νεκροῖσι etc.

The scholia completely miss the point, with the exception of one which after condemning (ψυχρὸν γάρ it says, very appropriately) Apollonius' interpretation of the phrase as referring to the κακοπραγία of the Athenians, adds: ἀλλὰ πιθανῶς οἱ κάτω τοὺς ζῶντας ἄνω νεκροὺς φασί (what follows is out of place, probably a variant or an explanation of the preceding sentence: ὅτι διὰ τὴν κακοπραγίαν νεκροὺς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους λέγουσι). On the other hand Aristophanes may well be utilizing a view which he will satyriize in the sequel in order to convey vividly the rotten condition in Athens; and this might have been what Apollonius drew attention to.

In any case the same idea occurs in *Ranae*, 1082:

καὶ φασκούσας οὐ ζῆν τὸ ζῆν

as coming for Euripides; and the scholiast *ad loc.* quotes the following passage, as from *Phrixus*:

τίς δ' οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστι κατθανεῖν,
τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν;

But this creates a problem because, as the scholiast remarks, the incomplete distich comes from a speech by Phrixus himself, whereas Aristophanes makes Aeschylus imply that the notion is expressed by Euripides through the mouth of a woman; *Ranae* 1082: καὶ φασκούσας οὐ ζῆν τὸ ζῆν. On the other hand, Stobaeus (120, 18; Vol. IV, p. 104.3 sqq. ed., Meineke of the *Florilegium*) does preserve a fragment from Euripides' Phrixus, expressing the same idea, though in a slightly different form:

τίς δ' οἶδεν εἰ ζῆν τοῦθ' ὃ κέκληται θανεῖν,
τὸ ζῆν δὲ θνήσκειν ἐστί; πλὴν ὅμως βροτῶν
νοσοῦσιν οἱ βλέποντες, οἱ δ' ὀλωλότες
οὐδὲν νοσοῦσιν οὐδὲ κέκτηνται κακά.

(Fr. 830 Dindorf = 833 Nauck).

But further, we learn from the scholia to Euripides, *Hippolytus*, 191, that in another tragedy, Polyidus, Euripides voiced the same sentiment in the form quoted by the scholia to *Ranae*, 1082: ἐκ τοῦ ὀδυνηροῦ βίου στοχάζεται βελτίονα εἶναι τὰ ἐν Ἄδου τῆς γῆς, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν Πολυίδῳ (Fr. 639 D. = 638 Nauck)

τίς δ' οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστί κατθανεῖν,
τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν.

If we follow the authority of this testimony (but see below for another alternative solution), we may conclude that this was said by a woman and that in the Scholia to *Ranae*, 1082 we have a confusion between two very similar formulations of the same idea from two Euripidean Tragedies. The allegedly Polyidean distich is quoted complete by Diogenes Laertius (IX, 73), and by Sextus Empiricus (p. 175.1); the second verse running thus:

τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν κάτω νομίζεται.

(However, the completed distich is explicitly ascribed to Phrixus by the scholia to Plato, *Gorgias*, 492E; we should accordingly then assume a misascription here, too).

A parody of the distich appears in *Ranae*, 1477-8:

τίς οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστί κατθανεῖν,
τὸ πνεῖν δὲ δειπνεῖν, τὸ δὲ καθεύδειν κώδιον;

To which passage there are two scholia, the one connecting the parody again to Phrixus, the other running thus: *τοῦτο ἐξ Ἴππολύτου* (sic codd.; ἐκ Πολυίδου Bentley and many editors after him) *δράματος*:

*τίς οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστι κατθανεῖν,
τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν,*

ὑπνοῦν δὲ τὸ κατθανεῖν; (this must belong to another passage or another work if it is not an interpolation).
Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ φησι:

τὸ πνεῖν δὲ δειπνεῖν καὶ τὸ καθεύδειν κώδιον.

Πεποίηκε δὲ τοῦτο ἐπειδὴ ὁ Διόνυσος οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἡγάπα ἢ δειπνεῖν καὶ καθεύδειν ἐν μαλακοῖς στρώμασιν, οἷά ἐστιν τὰ ἐκ κωδίων. The addition of the further phrase on the identity of death with sleeping would make the second verse of the Aristophanian parody closer to Euripidean pronouncements. Suda may have had in mind this type of situation, for we find s.v. *τίς δ' οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστι κατθανεῖν, τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν· Εὐριπίδου* (simpliciter, denoting verbatim quotation). *Τὸ πνεῖν δὲ δειπνεῖν, τὸ δὲ καθεύδειν κώδιον· παρὰ τὸ ἐκ Φρίξου Εὐριπίδου* (implying parodying change; he still maintains that it is taken from Phrixus). But we can attain no certainty in this matter. It is yet possible that Euripides expressed in so many words the view in question in Phrixus only, that the scholiast to Euripides' *Hippolytus*, 191 is mistaken in drawing Polyidus into the problem (this is the only *ἀθέτησις* of evidence that the present solution would involve), and that the scholia to Aristophanes *Ranae*, 1478, mention ἐξ Ἴππολύτου through a not improbable error, given that in *Hippolytus*, 190 sqq. a similar sentiment is expressed in different and simpler and nonmysterical terms. (In fact this is maintained by the scholia to *Ranae* 1082). And since in this latter passage it is a woman, and a nurse for that matter, who voices the idea, we may well believe that Aristophanes in *Ranae*, 1082, satirizes simultaneously the Euripidean attitude of putting profound dicta in the mouth of unlikely persons, while at the same time ridiculing the Euripidean transcription of mystic lore without it necessarily following that the two points refer to the same instance. The fact remains, however, that we have two formulations of the idea. The basic one is Fr. 638, which should be ascribed to Phrixus on the overwhelming weight of relevant evidence. The variant Fr. 833 (less apt and weaker), we possess on the sole authority of Stobaeus, maybe a free version of the main text, or it belongs to some other Euripidean work.

However this may be, that Euripides repeatedly expressed the idea was not merely idiosyncratic, despite Aristophanes' scoffing attitude; what Aristophanes jested at was not always repugnant to his mind, even though, in the particular case, we cannot assume any special liking on the part of Aristophanes for mysteric doctrines. Besides, more importantly, Plato, *Gorgias*, 492e sqq., leaves no doubt about the notion's association with religious teaching of a strongly other - worldly character. And I already referred to Plato's arguments in *Phaedo* concerning the continuous cyclic change from the dead to the living and back to the dead. These views are associated by Plato with Orphic and Pythagorean teaching. Lactantius, *De Falsa Sapientia*, III, 19, says that the idea here discussed was ascribed to Silenus, ut majoris sit auctoritatis; the origin is thus considered to be Dionysiac-Bacchic. The relationship between Mysteries and Orphic teaching is a major point.

For the time being, cf. further, on a very similar theme to the one reported here, Sophocles, Fr. 719 Dindorf, apud Plutarch, Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat, 21F. One should also compare Sophocles, *Antigone*, 521 and 1165-7. But as I said, this important topic will occupy us again elsewhere.

154. Unproductive in themselves and for him who has achieved and realized their transcendence; they are simultaneously, and without contradiction, the source of all productivity in their lower manifestations, when they are brought together qua distinct and separated.
155. This is as good a place as any (even though the point in the text is much more general and pervading) to say a few more words about the heavily sexual and obscene nature of ancient religions especially in so far as mystery cults are concerned. (This should also be connected with the repulsiveness of many rites). For the Neoplatonic, Platonizing formulation of the point, compare Hermeias, *Comm. in Phaedrum*, p. 88, 22 sqq. (ed. Couvreur), Πβ, where speaking of ἐνθουσιασμός and the four Platonic μανίαι he says: πρόδηλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἡ ἐρωτικὴ (sc. μανία) πάσαις συμβάλλεται, ὅπου οὐ μόνον ταύταις ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἅπαξ καὶ ἀπλῶς ἀντὶ ἐνθουσιασμῶ· οὐδένα γὰρ ἐνθουσιασμὸν ἄνευ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς ἐπιπνοίας συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι. And he significantly continues to illustrate the point by the case of Orpheus. I shall not document fully the topic, but would rather restrict myself to some characteristic passages, relating to Dionysiac worship, quite apart from the well known Christian array, starting already with the Clementine *Homilies*. (Still, notice the pathetic formulation, meant quite generally, in Eusebius Praeparatio II, 6 (c. 141c Migne): εἰς τοσοῦτον δὲ ἄρα κακῶς ἤλαινον (sc. οἱ παλαιοὶ), ὡς δι' ὑπερβολὴν ἡδυπαθείας ἀκρατοῦς, τὰ ὀκτὰ πρὸς αἰσχροουργίαν μέρη τοῦ σώματος, τὰ τε ἀκόλαστα ἐν

ἀνθρώποις πάθη ταῖς ἰσοθέοις ἐκθειάσαι τιμαῖς). Diodorus I, 22, 6-7 (cf. Plutarchus, *De Iside et Osiride*, 365c) reports how Isis, collecting the pieces into which Osiris had been cut up by Typhon, found all but one: his pudendum was thrown in the Nile and could not be recovered. But Isis instituted for this divine honours similarly to those accorded to all the other parts: ἐν τε γὰρ τοῖς ἱεροῖς εἶδωλον αὐτοῦ κατασκευάσασαν τιμᾶν καταδείξει καὶ κατὰ τὰς τελετὰς καὶ τὰς θυσίας τὰς τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ γινόμενας ἐντιμώτατον ποιῆσαι καὶ πλείστου σεβασμοῦ τυγχάνειν. Διὸ καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἐξ Αἰγύπτου παρεληφότας τὰ περὶ τοὺς ὄργιασμοὺς καὶ τὰς Διονυσιακὰς ἐορτάς, τιμᾶν τοῦτο τὸ μόριον ἐν τε τοῖς μυστηρίοις καὶ ταῖς τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου τελεταῖς τε καὶ θυσίαις, ὀνομάζοντας αὐτὸ Φαλλόν. The μόριον is further worshipped as ἐντεταμένον, IV, 6, 3, in the same context, but with inclusion of Priapus in the cycle Osiris-Isis; in fact τινὲς δέ φασι τὸ αἰδοῖον τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοὺς παλαιοὺς μυθωδῶς ὀνομάζειν βουλομένους Πρίαπον προσαγορεῦσαι, IV, 6, 1. And, of course, Πρίαπος was an attribute of Διόνυσος as well (besides being his son from Aphrodite): τιμᾶται δὲ παρὰ Λαμψακηνοῖς ὁ Πρίηπος ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν τῷ Διονύσῳ, ἐξ ἐπιθέτου καλούμενος οὕτως, ὡς Θρίαμβος καὶ Διθύραμβος. Athenaeus A, 30b. Cf. Herodotus II, 48 sqq. who maintains that the phallic-Dionysiac celebrations were substantially the same in Egypt and Greece, which as a statement respecting ritual is valuable whatever the ancient mythologists, or the modern scientists for that matter, may say for the correctness of the equation Dionysus = Osiris. We must never forget: the basis of ancient religion was the rite, not the poetic myth; the ἱερός λόγος not the philosophical theology. Cf. Lucianus, *De Dea Syria*, 16, especially for (Herodotus loc. cit.) the πηχναῖα ἀγάλματα νευρόσπαστα, τὰ περιφορέουσι κατὰ κώμας γυναικες, νεῦον τὸ αἰδοῖον, οὐ πολλῶν τεω ἔλασσον ἐὼν τοῦ ἄλλου σώματος (cf. Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 365B). Cf. Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 243 and 259 ff. with the scholia; Athenaeus XIV, 622B sqq. where Semos the Delian quotes among other things (and in his work *Περὶ Παιάνων!*) an ithyphallic passage (*Carm. Popul.* 7 Bergk 4):

ἀνάγετε πάντες, ἀνάγετ' εὐρυχωρίαν
 τῷ θεῷ ποιείτε·
 ἐθέλει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὀρθὸς ἐσφυρωμένος (οἱ ἐσφυδομένος
 with Bergk)
 διὰ μέσου βαδίξεν.

For the kind of practices related to ἰθύφαλλοι cf. Demosthenes, In Cononem p. 1261-2 Reiske, esp.: οὗτοι γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ τελοῦντες ἀλλήλους

τῷ ἰθυφάλλῳ καὶ τοιαῦτα ποιοῦντες, ἃ πολλὴν αἰσχύνῃν ἔχει καὶ λέγειν, μὴ τι γὰρ δὴ ποιεῖν, ἀνθρώπους μετρίους. Cf. also the scholia ad αὐτοληκίθους which reproduce Harpocration s.v.; Suda s.v. Σῆμος and Athenaeus XIV 622 connect αὐτοκάβδαλοι with ἰθύφαλλοι and φαλλοφόροι; see also Harpocration s.v. ἰθύφαλλοι, where: ἐλέγετο δὲ κυρίως ἰθύφαλλος τὸ ἐντεταμένον αἰδοῖον, ὡς Κρατῖνος ἐν Ἀρχιλόχοις (Fr. 16 PCG vol. IV p. 130). But passages from the grammarians and lexicographers relating to phallus abound. Note Suda s.v. φαλλικά, φαλλίωνες, φαλλοί. In the second entry to the last-mentioned word he says: φαλλοί· αἰδοῖον σύκινον· ὕστερον δὲ ἐκ δερμάτων ἐρυθρῶν, σχῆμα αἰδοῖου ἔχοντες ἀνδρείου. Καὶ τοῦτο ἑαυτοῖς περιθέμενοι ἐν τε τοῖς τραχήλοις καὶ μέσοις τοῖς μηροῖς ἐξωρχοῦντο, τιμὴν τῷ Διονύσῳ ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίοις ἄγοντες (from Nonnus scholia on St. Gregory). Cf. further Hesychius s.v. φαλλικά, φαλλίκων, εἰθύφαλλος (= τὸ ἐντεταμένον αἰδοῖον... λέγεται δὲ καὶ ποιήματά τινα ἐπὶ τῷ ἰσταμένῳ φαλλῷ ἄδόμενα) and especially s.v. ἰθύφαλλοι (a variant reading of εἰθύφαλλοι) where he notes: οἱ ἔφοροι (cod. ἐπίορκοι obviously corrupt and so Photius; Suda has οἱ ἔφοροι τοῦ Διονύσου, which is probably correct as the ἐπόπτης in the third stage of the mysteries was also called ἔφορος; ἐπίουροι, i.e. φίλακες, suggested by Bernardus may be correct as it is better palaeographically but not as good from the point of view of the meaning) καὶ ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ φαλλῷ, γυναικείαν ἔχοντες στολήν. (which reminds us of the ἀπαρσενωμένοι τετελεσμένοι in the mysteries). λέγεται δέ, ὅτε μὲν τὸ ἐντεταμένον αἰδοῖον, ὅτε δὲ τὸ ποίημα τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ ἰσταμένῳ φαλλῷ ἄδόμενον. Notice the woman's dress (and remember the ἀπαρσενώματα); such ἰθύφαλλοι might nonetheless carry the simulacrum of the ἐντεταμένον αἰδοῖον between their thighs. Suda's second entry on ἰθύφαλλοι runs thus: οἱ εἰς τοὺς μηροὺς μόνον, οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τραχήλοις (contrast s.v. φαλλοί, a passage already mentioned) ἐπ' εὐθείας δεσμούμενοι ἐξ ἐρυθρῶν δερμάτων (cf. Etym.M. s.v. ἰθύφαλλοι where the procedure is explicitly connected to the Prosemmnus story). Hesychius has ἰθῶν· πυγῆ: ...καὶ πρωκτός. It is possible that ἰθύ-φαλλος was also a φαλλός περὶ τὴν πυγὴν in connection to what Nonnus (scholia to St. Gregory c. 1028 Migne) says: ὦν, τὸν Φάνητα εἰσφέρει (sc. ἡ ὀρφικὴ ποίησις) αἰδοῖον ἔχοντα ὀπίσω περὶ τὴν πυγὴν. If so, why should there be a πέος out there? Is this to be connected with the other name of the really πολυώνυμος φαλλός, namely κέρκος or οὐρά?

Phallus was the cardinal *ιερόν* in Dionysiac processions: Plutarchus, *De Cupiditate Divitiarum* 527D: ἡ πάτριος τῶν Διονυσίων ἑορτὴ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐπέμπετο δημοτικῶς καὶ ἰλαρῶς· ἀμφορεὺς οἴνου καὶ κληματαίς, εἶτα τράγον τις εἶλκεν, ἄλλος ἰσχάδων ἄρριχον ἠκολούθει κομίζων,

ἐπὶ πᾶσι δ' ὁ φαλλός. This is not just late testimony; this is the *πάτριος τρόπος*, already mentioned by Heracleitus. For the Dionysus Sabazius, the offspring of Zeus and Persephone, Diodorus, IV, 4, 1 says οὐ (sc. Διονύσου) τὴν τε γένεσιν καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τιμὰς νυκτερινὰς καὶ κρυφίους παρεισάγουσι διὰ τὴν αἰσχύνην τὴν ἐκ τῆς συνουσίας ἐπακολουθοῦσαν which I do not think refers solely to the unspeakable coition of Zeus with Persephone. Finally, Diodorus testifies (IV, 6, 4) that the worship of Priapus Φαλλός was not restricted to ceremonies having only to do with Dionysus: ἔν τε ταῖς τελεταῖς οὐ μόνον ταῖς Διονυσιακαῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις σχεδὸν ἀπάσαις οὗτος ὁ θεὸς τυγχάνει τιμῆς, μετὰ γέλωτος καὶ παιδιᾶς παρεισαγόμενος ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις. Compare Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, V, 7, 27-29 for the everpresence of the phallic image. (For the *παιδιά*, cf. the remarkable *παιδιά ἡδονῶν* in Plato's *Republic*, a passage to be mentioned in a moment). Diodorus, in his down to earth, matter of fact way, presents a glimpse of the true explanation of such widespread adoration: IV, 6, 2: ἐνιοὶ δὲ λέγουσι τὸ γεννητικὸν μόριον, αἴτιον ὑπάρχον τῆς γενέσεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ διαμονῆς εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα, τυχεῖν τῆς ἀθανάτου τιμῆς only this is an inferior, mechanistic, short-sighted formulation. (All these Diodorean passages are reproduced verbatim by Eusebius, *Praeparatio* II, 1 (c. 97B Migne) and II, 2 (c. 108 *ibid.*).

Testimonies can be multiplied indefinitely (cf. e.g. with explicit reference to the Eleusinian mysteries, Scholia in Plato's *Gorgias* 497c: ἐτελεῖτο δὲ ταῦτα (sc. τὰ μυστήρια) καὶ Διοῖ καὶ Κόρη, ὅτι ταύτην μὲν Πλούτων ἀρπάξειε, Διοῖ δὲ μγείη Ζεὺς· ἐν οἷς πολλὰ μὲν ἐπράττετο αἰσχρά, etc.; perhaps the most important collective evidence comes from Book V of Hippolytus *Refutatio*).

Relevant classical passages indirectly referring to the questionable matters gain in point when viewed in the light of our conclusions based also on the study of the later literature. I cannot restrain myself from mentioning an illustration of this most important point. Take the chorus of the initiates in the *Frogs*; they chant: "Ἰακχ', ὦ πολυτίμοις ἐν ἔδραις ἐνθάδε ναίων, / "Ἰακχ' ὦ "Ἰακχε, /.../ πολύκαρπον μὲν τινάσσων /περὶ κρατὶ σῶ βρύοντα / στέφανον μύρτων, ... etc. 323 sqq. Now just have in mind our understanding of Iacchus as was summarily argued above, and remember the double sense of *ἔδρα* field and fundament; also imagine what is likely to be the *κεφαλὴ* of Iacchus and recollect that *μύρτον*, as we have shown, signifies the pudendum muliebre or, more particularly, the *κλειτορίς* (Pollux II, 173); and you will appreciate an exquisite play of double entendre worthy of an Aristophanes! (For the special connection of *μύρτον* with the Eleusinian divinities and cultus cf. *Istrus apud Scholia ad*

Sophoclem *Oed.* Col. 713). For a similar ingenious play cf. *Ranae* 350-2 where one should rather read *χαροποιόν*. Cf. Plato Comicus, *Phaon*, Fr. II, 14 (Meineke II, p. 674) = Fr. 188.13-4 PCGr. vol. VII pp. 510-1, where a *πινακίσκος μύρτων* should be offered to *Κονίσσαλος* and his two *παραστάται* the passage has been explained above; not far from *στέφανος μύρτων* in our passage. It is indeed ó «*διαγόρας*» *Ίταχος* (v. *Ranae* 320 with scholium) that is chanted and yet no mystery is divulged! Notice the remark of Xanthias at the end of that chorus:

ὦ πότνια, πολυτίμητε Δήμητρος κόρη
ὡς ἦδύ μοι προσέπνευσε χοιρείων κρεῶν.

Pigs were sacrificed to the Great Goddesses; and *χοῖρος* was also the *γυναικείον αἰδοῖον*, as we have seen in extenso. All this ingenious play is of course missed if we enjoy the complacent attitude that the Eleusinian Mysteries of the Classical times were something of a family affair.

Almost all mythology turns around sexual matters as the Christian Fathers were not slow to emphasise. Near Eastern texts abundantly testify to the crucial role of the most overt sexuality in religion, long before the pre-classical times; not to mention Tantrism.

No careful and sensitive student of Orphism can fail to perceive a ripple of unspeakable sensuality going continuously down the spine of Orphic religiosity, a very peculiar spirit of intensified, perverted sexuality permeating its Thought and Act, its Myth and Rite; this is of its essence, hence existing from the very beginning (the evidence, properly analysed, supports this contention); transplanted perhaps from the Orient, to be found again there in various Gnostic sects, whose practices are described in detail by Epiphanius. It is the so-called *Μυστήριον τῆς Ἥδονῆς* (and cf. Numenius view that the *φρουρά* in *Phaedo* 62b is ἡδονή. Anonymous comm. in *Phaedo* B b' [85, 22 Norvin]). Classical writers, when they refer to what they can refer to, do confirm the data of the later writers. Cf. Plato, *Republic* II, 364b-e, especially in b: *πείθουσιν ὡς ἔστι παρὰ σφίσι δύναμις ἐκ θεῶν ποριζομένη θυσίαις τε καὶ ἐπωδαῖς, εἴτε τι ἀδίκημά που γέγονεν αὐτοῦ ἢ προγόνων*, (the Titans and relating to the *διαμελισμός* of Dionysus) *ἀκείσθαι μεθ' ἡδονῶν καὶ ἐορτῶν*. And in e: *πείθοντες οὐ μόνον ἰδιώτας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόλεις* (introduction of rites in Plato's time and before), *ὡς ἄρα λύσεις τε καὶ καθαρμοὶ ἀδικημάτων διὰ θυσιῶν καὶ παιδίας ἡδονῶν εἰσὶ μὲν ἔτι ζῶσιν, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ τελευτήσασιν, ἃς δὴ τελετὰς καλοῦσι* etc. Cf. also the details of ceremonies in Demosthenes, *De Corona* 258-260 all the elements that we know of in later writers are already present. And cf. also *Contra Cononem* 39. Studying such passages and

comparing them with what we know about Orphic ritual and belief from late and suspect sources, we can show in detail the absolute coherence and consistency of the Early and the Late. (That Plato or Demosthenes or Aristophanes refer not directly to the Eleusinian Mysteries is very understandable: Aeschylus' fate was a lesson).

Cf. also Herodotus II, 49 ff. as already suggested. And also the old Athenian tradition explaining the initial primeval acceptance of the widespread worship and honour bestowed on the *φαλλός* in scholia on *Acharnenses* 243. Consult further Suda s.v. *φαλλοί* (where the fact that initially the *φαλλοί* were from fig-wood alludes to the story of Prosymnus and Dionysus as related by Clement in Protr.). In another part of this inquiry the phallic nature of chthonic Hermes will be thoroughly studied and analysed. In this note I want to confirm the basically phallic nature of Dionysus, in order to exhibit, in this respect too, the natural appropriateness of the methodology on which I so adamantly insist.

156. A sort of bibliographical note may be appended here. In the course of the above investigation there was occasion to mention and briefly criticize the work of Dieterich and Picard on our topic, and to condemn en passant Wilamowitz's and Foucart's attitudes. In Prümm's *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch für den Raum der Altchristlichen Umwelt*, pp. 221-230, one can find a very serviceable resumé of the various positions vis-à-vis the Eleusinian Mysteries and the Baubo-episode within them. Lobeck treats the incident in *Aglaophemus* pp. 818-827 under the heading: Orphica: Fragmenta Incerta (!). In spite of his undoubted breadth of learning, only the more directly relevant passages are referred to; even so they are treated in what is little more than a discussion of isolated topics without even attempting to see their intimate interconnection: nothing is concluded, nothing emerges out of his handling; there is no objective cohesion in it. Nor is the reason of the shortcoming far to be sought: his sole purpose in writing his *Aglaophemus* was to refute the symbolici, above all Creuzer. His purpose stamped his whole work indelibly with the ugly impress of negativity. He was satisfied to attempt to show that there was no symbolism, no hidden signification in the myths and rites of ancient religion, and especially of the mystery cults. Ipso facto, therefore, his endeavour could not but end in failure. For if Creuzer went astray, he did not err in seeking to find meaning in religious beliefs and observances (in this even the corn-theorists like Frazer do agree), but rather in slavishly reproducing the Neoplatonic accounts and interpretations of those meanings and these in their specific content and matter rather than in their entire spirit. Symbolic significance must be inquired after on a broader basis, steering free and far from both corn-type, gross, mechanical

naturalism and false, weak, romantic idealism, but instead in the spirit of Hellenic speculation and oriental "intimation".

I have not examined closely the archaeological evidence on the matter, and especially the finds of Priene among which are statues with only a human face (in the place of the lower abdomen) and limbs (they can be seen conveniently in H. Diels, *Arcana Cerealia*, p. 11, Fig. 1). In any case, I do not see what could be deduced from such discoveries, against the developments above. I have already (note 103) rejected the notion that a child-like painted face was to be seen on Baubo's belly. Besides what has been said there, how is it supposed that puer-like features were to be discerned in the roughly executed sketch? Not to mention that, to judge at least from the reproductions in Diels' articles, the legs of those figures are of a child, not of a mature woman like Baubo. In general the whole conception possesses a decidedly inferior explanatory power as a hypothesis, is not confirmed by any literary source, and is not necessitated by these statues; more importantly, such an account rather stands in need of further explanation than can be used to explain anything meaningfully, and above all things a religious myth and observance of cultic significance. For such abdomen-faces rather signify and symbolize than are signified and symbolized, in order to express the core of the issue briefly. And it is not difficult to understand what they do symbolize and refer to. For instance, compare Eusebius, *Praeparatio*, V, 36; the incident is also mentioned by Pausanias X, 19, 3 where the κεφαλή of the log found in the sea by the Methymnians, was to be worshipped according to the Apollonian Oracle as φαλληγὸν Διούσιοι κάρηνον; and Theodoretus bursts forth with indignation (*Gr.Aff.Cur.* X, p. 253, 9 sqq. ed. Raeder): καὶ οὐκ ἐρυθρίᾳ τῶν θεῶν ὁ σοφώτατος, ὃν Φοῖβον οἱ ποιηταὶ προσωνόμαζον ὡς δὴ ἄγνὸν καὶ ἀμίαντον, τοῦ Διούσου τὸ ἀκροπόσθιον τιμᾶσθαι χρησιμωδήσας. The ἀκροπόσθιον is the κεφαλή τοῦ πέους and τοῦ Διούσου (cf. in this light the Aristophanian passage adduced in note 155).

More evocative is the figurine of a naked woman, with outstretched legs, sitting on a pig and holding a comb (?); v. A.B. Cook, *Zeus*, II, 1 p. 132, fig. 79. Her pudendum muliebre in full exposure is also symbolically signified by both the χοῖρος and the κτεῖς, symbols of female nature.

A word remains to be said about Diels *Arcana Cerealia* (in *Miscellanea Salinas*, Palermo, 1907, pp. 1-14), which treats of the episode relating to Baubo, and whose main merit is the aptness of the title. Diels (p. 8) proposes the painted-abdomen view, reading the Orphic passage thus:

ὡς εἰποῦσα πέπλους ἀνεσύρατο, δείξε δὲ πάντα
σώματος οὐδὲ πρόποντα τύπον· παῖς δ' ἦεν Ἴακχος

(χειρὶ τέ μιν ρίπτασκε) γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις.
ἡ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐνόησε θεά, μείδησ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ etc.

(The construal and view adopted by Picard, see supra note 102). The already adduced criticisms are equally applicable here: how can one toss around, move to and fro by hand a painted belly? And what is there to such an image capable of inducing a radical change of sentiment in the goddess' sorrowful heart by precipitating a better understanding of the situation (which is clearly, in general terms, the real point which the fourth line requires us to make)? Diels perceives only the surface of the latter difficulty: At quid tandem, inquires, in hac re ludicri? (p. 8). Thus he completely misses the subtle and pregnant insinuations of Arnobius' passage (*Adv. Nat.* V, 27), already quoted, which he also gives: quidnam quaeso in spectu tali, quid in pudendis fuit reverendisq[ue] Baubonis, quod feminei sexus deam et consimili formatam membro in admirationem converteret atque risum, quod obiectum lumini conspectuique divino et oblivionem miseriarum daret et habitum in laetiolem repentina hilaritate traduceret? But one can see only what one can think. Missing the substantial point, Diels comes up with an answer to his problem, patently inadequate and irrelevant to the real situation (pp. 8-9), a monstrous example of what the lack of inner understanding of ancient religiosity on the spiritual level, and the disregard of the natural context of things of the scientific one, can lead to. He appeals to a popular ludus in Switzerland that involved a painted belly of an adolescent in the form of a laughing human face! Worse than the Egyptian prototype! About Diels' use of the statuettes from Priene I need not add more than what I said above. I shall only re-emphasise here that the legs seem to be of a child, not of a mature woman; and that in any case, to give a parallel is not to explain it; it can only serve as a means of illustrating or suggesting an adequate explanation.

Archaeological evidence is mute, to say the least, without help from the literary sources. And to indicate the precedence of the latter over the former, I shall end by providing literary evidence much more promising, I reckon, that the Prienian statuettes. There are three consecutive entries in Hesychius which are given in the codex thus: *Βρυδαλίχα*, *Βρυδακίζειν*, *Βρυλλοχισταί*. The two former are out of the proper word order; the second has been appropriately corrected by Vossius to *βρυλλακίζειν*; for the first one, *Βρυλλαδίχα* has been proposed again by Vossius, but I think *βρυλλαλίχα* must be the correct reading. Beginning the examination with the last and least problematic of them we find: *Βρυλλοχισταί· οἱ αἰσχρὰ προσωπεῖα περιτιθέμενοι γυναικεῖα, καὶ ὕμνους ᾄδοντες*. The *ὕμνους* indicates a religious context. But why *αἰσχρὰ γυναικεῖα προσωπεῖα*?

Perhaps the etymology may help here. *Βρύλλων* is explained as *ὑποπίνων* by Hesychius (and *βρύλλαι· πιεῖν*, according to the same). Thus in Aristophanes, *Equites* 1126: *βρύλλων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*, where the scholiast has: *βρύλλων· ἑξαπατώμενος ὑπὸ τινων καὶ μεθύων. Σύμμαχος δέ, ὑποπίνων ἐκ μιμήσεως τῆς τῶν παίδων φωνῆς* (cf. Suda s.v. *βρύλλων* where the same explanation is offered with reference to the present Aristophanian passage; for the *παίδων φωνή* v. Aristophanes *Nubes* 1382, where the scholiast explains *βρῦν* as *ἄσημος φωνὴ παιδίων, ὅταν πιεῖν ζητῆ*). Clearly this is onomatopoeitic). To *βρύλλω* now a cognate form (with the same meaning of sipping or rather sucking) is *βρύζω*. This word occurs in an important passage in Archilochus Fr. 28 (Diehl) = Fr. 42 West2, apud Athenaeus X, 447B:

ῦ (e.g. <ῆ γ'> Lattimore) ὥσπερ αὐλῶ βρῦτον ἢ θρέϊξ ἀνήρ
ἢ Φρύξ ἔβρυζε· κύβδα δ' ἦν πονεομένη.

Βρῦτος is the *κρίθινος οἶνος*, a kind of beer, as Athenaeus explains there (and cf. Hesychius s.v. *βρῦτον*). We have here a woman practicing fellatio: the *αὐλός* parallels the *πέος*, and the *ἔβρυζεν* refers to the sucking of that *αὐλός*. The *κύβδα* (from *κύπτω*) makes the sense clear: it signifies the characteristic posture of bending forward or stooping down in preparation for sexual intercourse especially for (quick) homosexual practices, or for heterosexual ones modeled on the former according to Hesychius *κυπάται* (*κῦπται* Toup, but in any case from *κύπτω*) are the *μαλακοί* and *κίναιδοι*. (Cf. Lucianus, *Philopseudes* 24; Macho apud Athenaeus p. 580d p. 279.12 Kaibel; Aristophanes, *Equites* 365; *Pax* 897 in a context where, as the scholiast explains, *ἅπαντα ὡς ἐπὶ συνουσίας σχημάτων καὶ θεωρίας; Thesmoph.* 489; *Lysistr.* 17, where see the scholiast who refers to a similar Sophronian verse; Plato *Comicus* apud Athenaeus 441E = Phaedon Fr. 188.5-6 and 20-1 PCG vol. VII p. 509 and 5611; Theocritus V, 116).

We conclude that the Archilochean *ἔβρυζεν* connotes the practices of a *μύζουρις* (already explained above from *μυζάω* and *οὐρά*) that is the ancient *λεσβιάζειν* fellatio whose religious prototype was portrayed in Argos as practiced by Hera on Zeus as we have already seen. Wilamowitz (followed by West) emended *ἔβρυζε* to *ἔμυζε* referring to Hesychius s.v. *ἔμυζεν· ἔστυενεν, ἀπεθήλαζεν*. The sense remains the same (*μυζάω*), but the change is unwarranted. The point is that *βρύζω* has the same meaning. And as Diehl observed: *attamen cui onomatopoeia βρῦτον, Φρύξ* (cf. Bruges), *ἔβρυζε non arripet. Recte. Then could the αἰσχρά* in Hesychius' explanation of *βρυλλοχισταί* refer to some portrayal of that practice, in exaggerated, comic form? We could then understand the second of the

above mentioned Hesychian lemmata (*βρυλλαχίζειν· ἐκτείνειν* or perhaps *ἐντείνειν* sc. τὸ αἰδοῖον) as referring to the *στύσις* of the membrum virile caused by fellatio. We may also then understand along similar lines the first entry, reading, as I suggested, *βρυλλαλίχα* and considering it as compound from *βρύλλω* and *λίχα* related either to *λείχω* (lick) or, less probably to *γλίχομαι* (desire; cf. Hesychius *λιχάζει· ἐπιθυμεί*). The explanation of the last mentioned entry is unfortunately partly corrupt. It runs thus: *πρόσωπον γυναικείον· παρὰ τὸ γελοῖον καὶ αἰσχρὸν + ὄρρ τίθεται* (sic). *ὁ Πίνθων, τὴν ὄρχήστραν καὶ γυναικεῖα ἐνδύματα ἐνδέδεται. ὅθεν καὶ τὰς μαχλάδας βρυλλαλίχας* (from *βρυδαλίχας*) *καλοῦσι Λάκωνες*. The corruption is mended differently by different scholars. The best attempts are Vossius *παρὰ τὸ γελοῖον καὶ αἰσχρὸν ὀρριδιᾶν* (cf. Hesychius s.v. *ὀρριδιᾶν· τὸ ἐπὶ τὰ ἰσχία καὶ τοὺς γλουτοὺς πεσεῖν* probably in the course of some lewd dance); and Kusterus *ὁ Πίνθων τὴν ὄρχήστραν* (i.e. *τὴν ὄρχηστρίδα*) *καὶ <τὸν> γυναικεῖα ἱμάτια ἐνδεδυμένον*. But they are partial and far from final. I would propose *παρὰ τὸ γελοῖον καὶ αἰσχρὸν ὄρρ<σπύγιον> τιθέναι* or *<περι>τιθέναι* (cf. s.v. *Βρυλλοχισταί*) for the first part of the corrupt passage. *Οἱ π. τὸ γ. καὶ αἰσχρὸν <τὸν> ὄρρον <ἐκ>τιθέσθαι, ρικνούμενον <περὶ> τὴν ὄρχήστραν, καὶ γυναικεῖα ἱμάτια ἐνδεδύσθαι*. For *ρικνούσθαι* see Photius and Suda s.v. (also Hesychius s.v. *ρικνοῦσθαι* and *ρικνουσθαι* and Pollux IV, 99) where note especially: *τὸ καμπύλον γίγνεσθαι ἀσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ συνουσίαν καὶ ὄρχησιν κάμπτοντα τὴν ὄσφιν*. Could this *αἰσχρὸν πρόσωπον γυναικείον*, in the said practice be connected to our Baubo plus Iacchus archetype? Mouth and pudendum muliebre are convertible. If yes (but, of course, the whole matter requires closer and broader study, for any definite conclusions to be validly drawn), this would provide a much more relevant illustration of our Orphic fragment, than the innocent (though really suggestive) Prienian statuettes. As we said: the latter require an explanation; they cannot provide one.