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 πρῶτερον - ὑστερον, 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 \textit{iepouρyia}. 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 efficacity.

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 unsupposed, 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 ἴεροι 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 ἴερος 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. ἴεροι 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 century 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, naively 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)\textsuperscript{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 Baubo\textsuperscript{7}. 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 κυκεῖον\textsuperscript{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 herself \textsuperscript{9}. She prepares her pudenda in a particular way, making them assume the form of a small boy\textsuperscript{10}, and she then exhibits them naked to Demeter. Her purpose is thereby achieved: the Goddess gladdens, laughs and drinks the potion: \ldots 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 affair\textsuperscript{11}.

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 ἀποφύλωσις (stripping off of the hair). This is suggested by Arnobius (\ldots tum longiore ab incuria liberat\ldots 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. Ἀποφύλωσις 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)\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{quote}
κονισάλω δὲ καὶ παραστάταν δυοῖν
μύρτων πινακίδος χειρί παραστηλμένων· (sc. is to be offered)
λύχνων γὰρ ὁσμᾶς οὗ φιλοῦσι δαίμονες.
\end{quote}

These daemons are personifications of the πέος and ὄρχεις; cf. Aristophanes Fr. 325; Athenaeus IX p. 395F; Pollux II 174: μύρτων is, apart from the myrtle, also the pudendum muliebre\textsuperscript{13}.

b) Aristophanes Lysistrata 150 ff.: κὰν τοῖς χιτωνίσασθαι τοῖς ἀμοργίνοις / γυμνᾷ παρίσμεν, δέλτα (one more of the infinite variety of names for the γυναικείων αἴδιον: τοιοῦτον γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα, says the scholiast!)\textsuperscript{14} παραστηλμέναι, / στῦοντο δὲ ἀνδρὲς κατιθυμοῖεν σπλεκόν ϰresently that they were to be παραστηλμέναι powerfuly contributes to the στύοι of men.

c) Aristoph. Ranae 513 ff.: ...καὶ γὰρ αὐλητρίς τέ σοι / ἣδη ἐνδ που ἐσθ’ ἀραιοτάτη, κώρχηστρίδες / ἔτεραι δι’ ἦ τρεῖς. ΞΛ. πῶς λέγεις; ὀρχηστρίδες; / ΘΕ. ἡβυλλιωσί κάρτι παραστηλμέναι\textsuperscript{15} (i.e. either very young since only lately there was need to παραστηλλέν them - contrast ἀρτι χνοαζουσάς αὐλητρίδισας, Metagenes Αδραι Fr. 1, Meineke II 2 p. 751 = Fr.4. 3 PCG vol. VII p.6 -; or having their pubic hair freshly plucked out). The Scholiast explains: Ἡβυλλιωσί (i.e. ἀκμάζουσα τὴν ἡλικία) καὶ αἰσχρῶς τίλλουσι τὸ αἴδιον 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 conspectuque divino
et oblivionem miseriarum daret et habitum in laetitium repentina 
hilaritate traduceret? O qualia, O quanta invidentes potuimus 
cavillantesque deprimere, si non religio nos gentis*** et litterarum 
prohiberet auctoritas! (Arnobius, V, 27 p. 198, 22 ff. ed.citr.). It is 
sufficiently clear what Arnobius must have had in mind.

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

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

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

In the second verse the construction of ουδε πρεποντα τυπον is 
rather awkward; one would expect an antithesis before ουδε. To meet 
this Hermann proposed ou τι for ουδε (and Sruve ουχι). But παντα 
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 τυπον, 
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 ὀβρυμόντα or εὐρυμένοντα or σαντοδάμνοντα. 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: δεῖξε δ’ ἄφαντον). We might even try to fit in somehow ἐρικεὔθοντα (ἐρικεὔθεσ = πυθῆν, Hesychius) in the place of the suspect υδὲ πρέπονται. 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 Ῥακχος or Baubo is the subject of ῥῆπτασκε. Disregarding for the moment the existence of χειρί and μῦν there is no doubt, especially because of the γελῶν, that Ῥακχος would have been the natural subject of the sentence as it stands. But he was laughingly throwing to and fro - what? μῦν obviously, but to what does the pronoun refer? Τυποῦν 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 ἃεν. 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’ ἃεν Ῥακχος (Platt), παίς δ’ ἃεν Ῥακχος (Mullach, Fr.Phil.Gr. vol. I, 175). But the principal manuscripts have resolutely ἃεν the one (M) and ἃ, ἕν the other (P), where according to Stählin the erased letter was κ. This latter fact must caution us. Perhaps ἃεν is significant here; perhaps Ῥακχος was meant, ambiguously somehow, as part of the τύπος (if not the main part of it). But in such a case Ῥακχος begins to look like the thing manipulated rather than the manipulating person, and μῦν may be taken as referring to him. But who would be the subject of ῥῆπτασκε then?

Continuing for a while with the former way of pursuing the matter (with Ῥακχος subject of ῥῆπτασκε), 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 χειρᾶ δ’ ἃεν. So that, as Mullach edits the text: Παίς δ’ ἃεν Ῥακχος, χειρᾶ δ’ ἃεν ῥῆπτασκε γελῶν.
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 in 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 μῦ, 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 ὄλισβος22 (cf. also the σκότινον... ἐρυθρόν ἕξ ἄκρου παχῷ, Aristophanes Nubes, 538-9) and Petronius scorteum fascinum (Satyrica 138). This was considered to be one of the ladies’ accessories (Aristoph. Fr. 309, 13 Dindorf = 330, 13 Belaydes = Fr. 332.13 PCG the fragment is from the Δεύτεραι Θεσσαλιανίζουσαι); esp. of those more prone to lewdness, ν. μυστηρι ἀν γυναῖκες ὀλισβοί προς ἀρχής, 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: Εἴσηγαν γάρ οἱ κωμικοὶ διεξωσμένοι δερμάτινα ἁίδοια γελοίον 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. Βαυμώ; but the word series necessitates a change and Βαυβώ is a certain correction) τιθήνη Δήμητρος. σημαίνει δὲ καὶ κούλιαν ὡς παρ’ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς. 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). *Koilía* 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. *Γυναι-κεία* I, 38)\(^\text{26}\). Perhaps *βαυβῶν* 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 *βαυβῶν* and *βαυβῶ* we have the verb *βαυβᾶν* signifying the corresponding act. Eustathius 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 κομιάσθαι, οἷον ᾧ δὲ προϊκαλεῖτο μὲν / βαυβᾶν μετ’ αὐτῆς (μεθ’ αὐτῆς Nauck, Tragica Adespota 165). Ὅθεν, φησί, καὶ παρὰ Κρατίνῳ τὸ «Δόγος τις ὑπῆλθ’ ἡμᾶς ἀμαθῆς συνοβαύβαλος»\(^\text{27}\). Κομιάσθαι, 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)\(^\text{28}\). Another occurrence of the word that we know of, is in the ancient comic poet Cantharus’ work *Mήδεια*. (Fr. 3 PCGr vol. IV p. 58). We owe the reference to the Antiatticista ubi supra (note 28), where he adds: *Κάνθαρος Μηδεία βαυβήσωμεν*. The above mentioned word *συνοβαύβαλος* is explained by Hesychius as συών αὐλιστήρια ἡ κομιήτηρια and by Photius (in his Lexicon) as ἐν οἷς οἱ σὺνε εἰνάξονται \(^\text{29}\).

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 *Βαυβῶ* is also found as *Βαβῶ*; so Suda in: *Βαβῶς· ὄνομα κύριον and in *Δημῶ· ὄνομα κύριον «ἐξένισεν ἡ Βαβῶ τὴν Δημῷ» (where *Δημῶ* = Δήμητρα; perhaps we should write *Δημῶ*, comparing with the passage in Clement where we have ἐξενίσασα ἡ Βαβῶ τῆν Δημό but then it would be out of the word order). The form *Βαβῶ* 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, *Inscriptions Ion. Dial.* 65) where the *ν* has been added supra lineae. Besides we know that *ν* 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 δόγμαμα. (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, φιλάρος (chatterer); παρὰ τὸ βάζω, βάξω, βάξ, καὶ κατὰ ἀναδιπλασιασμὸν βάβαξ. This explanation agrees with the Scholiast ad Lycophron, Alexandria 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 ὑπό in many cases (for instance Hesychius has ἐβαζεν· ἔλεγε· καὶ ἐκακολόγει and ἐβαζας· ἐλοιδόρησα). Furthermore, for βάβαξ we have to take into account the following facts: 1) Hesychius: βαβάξεν. τὸ μῆ δισθρωμένα λέγειν· ἔνοι δέ, βοάν (cf. idem Βάβακοι). This may be seen as the bridge from the more common senses of βάζω to the special ones. 2) Hesychius: βαβαξαι. ὀρχήσασθαι (and cf. ἐκβαβάξαι· ἐκσαλεύσαι connoting a lewd type of movement, saltation or dance; should we recall here the obscene ἀπόκινος of the last note? - Σωφρονής ἐν Ἀντιπορίδαις). 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), ἀναιής (ruthlessly shameless). This explanation is also given by the Etym. Magnum in a second lemma of the same word: βάβαξ. μάταιος, ἐνθουσιῶν, ἀναιής. 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 ἐστρωφάτο 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 ἐπίρημα βαβαί, βαβαίαξ, βαβαίαξ, βαβαίαξ, ἑαμαστικὸν ἐπίθεμα [see Pax 247 and scholia], and b) Ἀρχίλοχος is to be substituted from Orion’s Lexicon when we
read: Βάβαξ ὁ λάλος. Ἀρχίλοχος: κατ’ οἴκον ἐστρωφάτο 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 phaenomenon 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 (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· ὀρχηστής (and so, simply, Suda s.v.; cf. Hesychius βαβάξι above cited), ὑμνῳδός, μανιώδης (cf. the ἐνθουσιῶν of the βάβαξ), κραύγασος (so the cod., i.e. brawler, shouter; but from Hesychius κραύγαρ· ὁ ἱγχυρός, I would prefer to substitute κραύγαρ or κραύγασις) ὁθεν 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 βάξεων. ὁθεν ὁ Βάκχος, ὁ μανιώδης καὶ ἀκρατής (incontinent, immoderate, intemperate); idem, p. 1431, 49, listing Dionysiac names has: ὁ καὶ Σάβος, καὶ Σαβάζος καὶ Βάκχος καὶ Βαβάκτης καὶ Βάβαξ καὶ Ἐμμανής καὶ Φλέδων (babbler, loquacious; loquaciousness goes well with bacchic drunkeness). Further the Etym. Magnum has: Βαβάκτης· ὀρχηστής, λάλος, μανιώδης, βακχευτής. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ Πάν· Κρατίνος:

Χαίρε χρυσόκερω βαβάκτα κήλων / Πάν.

Παρὰ τὸ βάξω, τὸ λαλῶ, βάξω, βέβαιμαι, βέβαικτε, βαβάκτης, ὁ πολλὰ λαλῶν, φλύαρος. Cratinus’ verses are fully given by Hephaestion, ch. X p. 62 (ed. Gaisford):

χαίρε χρυσόκερω, βαβάκτα, κήλων
Πάν, Πελασγικὸν Ἀργος ἐμβατεύων
(Fabulae Incertæ 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 δεκατής ἵππος, Hesychius; ὁ θερμὸς εἰς συνοισίαν, 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 water\textsuperscript{32}; 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 kind\textsuperscript{33}.

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 excitedness\textsuperscript{34}. 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 βαυβόν, the βαυβῶ and the βαυβᾶν the latter expressing the characteristic activity of the two other items\textsuperscript{35}. 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 Βαυβῶ 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 Ζεύς Χθόνιος) and, strangely enough, Hera (Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt Inschriften, Die Ionischen Inschriften, ed. F. Bechtel, no. 5441 (65)). Βαυβῶ 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 swine\textsuperscript{36} evidently a reference to our Baubo (v. Cook, Zeus, II, 131 ff. And addenda p. 1119)\textsuperscript{37}.
The connection of Baubo with swine is not only significant because of the reference to the pudenda muliebria by χόρος; 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) 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 καθαρὰ γὰρ καθαρῶς ἐφάπτεσθαι μὴ οὐθεμιτὸν ἂν. 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’ ἀλλω σοφαὶ μικρόμενοι, ὁκοιναν εἰ τις ἐσὶ πηλόν ἐμβάς πηλῷ ἀποθειετο· μαίνεσθαι δ’ ἂν δοκοὶ εἰ τις αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιφάσατο 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 tendency.

But let us revert now to our immediate subject. When Hesychius s.v. Βαυβό explains τιθήνη Δήμητρας, 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) «εξένυσεν ἦ Βαβώ (sic codd.) τὴν Δημώ» and in accordance with the narrations of Clement and Arnobius. The word can be used in extended or metaphorical use. (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) where Demeter fulfills the role of τιθήνη to Baubo’s child, Demophoon (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 Βαυβω 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, Μεσανωνική 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 βαβωτζάκάρας (a kind of spectral apparition, a ghost) and he deduces it from Βαβώ: ενεστι γάρ ποι τοῖς Ὄρφικοις ἔπεα Βαβώ τις ὄνομαζομένη δαίμων νυκτερινή, ἐπιμήκης τὸ σχῆμα καὶ σκιώδης τὴν ὑπάρξειν. 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 Μηλινόθη in Orphic Hymn 71. And yet this need not necessitate the postulation of a different being from our Baubo. 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
This is an ὁσπαδός 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 Δῆμητρι μιχθεὶς ὁ Ζεὺς τεκνὸι Ἐκάτην διαφέρουσαν ἰσχυὶ καὶ μεγέθει τῶν θεῶν, making, thus, her a sister of Persephone 45 (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 Κοσκίω and Θετάλη. 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 gnost of her hidden attributes and mystic symbols. Thus I should venture a suggestion that Κωκίω 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 Θετάλη 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 (ῥόμβος, 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 (calumniatory 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 βαυβῶν? And was not their interplay called βαυβᾶν? 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 feminity, 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 libidinoseness. And further, Dionysus had as one of his names χοιροφάλας; see the Laurentian scholium ad Aeschylus, Persae, 1063: ψάλλε ἀντὶ τοῦ τίλλε· καὶ Διόνυσος χοιροφάλας, ὁ τίλλων τὰ μόρια (= pudenda) τῶν γυναικῶν. For ψάλλεον cf. Hesychius s.v. (and s.vv. ψήλαι, ἀπο-ψάλλεον); also Etym.M. s.v. (cf. Aristophanes, Vespae 1365 and the scholiast to χοιρόθληψ: χοιρόθληψ δὲ ὧ τὸ γυναικεῖον αἴδοῖον ἀποθλί-βων). 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 phaenomena, 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 σώτεραν αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι). And he adds: ἐκ τούτου δὲ τοῦ λόγου καὶ οὐδενὸς άλλου Ἀισχύλος ὁ Εὐφορίωνος ἔρρισε τὸ ἐγώ φράσω, μοῦνος 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 Proclus. The fact is further confirmed by Pausanias in a very important context. Now the same Herodotus, in II, 59-60 describes the celebration of Artemis (that is of her Egyptian equivalence, Βούβαστις according to Herodotus II, 156, 6; and cf. Stephanus Byz. s.v. Βούβαστος· πόλις Αἰγύπτου ἵν Ἡρόδοτος Βούβαστιν φησὶ διὰ τοῦ τ. ... 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 uncontestable 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 here); 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 ἀνασύρατο 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 ἀνασύρατο (corrected from ἀνερύσατο): ἐγώμυσσε, and the same at Suda s.v. Similarly Hesychius s.v. ἀνασύρατο has ἀνω τὰ ἱμάτια ἔσφε; whereas in ἀνασύρα οι explains: ἀποκαλύψας ἡ περιποίησαι, to which Alberti in his erudite edition of this most authoritative lexicographer correctly notes: supple τὸ αἴδιον 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 ἀπεσκύθισται 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 above. As to the former sense, Hesychius, apart from the above quoted lemma s.v. ἀνασύρατο, has: ἀνασύρμενη; ἡ συρόμενον ἱμάτιον ἑπάρονσα καὶ μέρος γυμνόσα (μέρος = μόριον, sc. pudendum, v. e.g. Suda s.v. μόριον). And the same, in the case of men: Theophrastus, Charact. XI, 2: οἷς ἀπαντήσας γυναιξίν ἐλευθέραις, ἀνασυράμενοι δεῖξαι τὸ αἴδιον. This was connected with libidinous attitudes and behaviours; thus Suda gives: ἀνασυρμένην ἀκοσμον, ἀπρεπῆ (disorderly, improper, dissolute). And s.v. Μυσάχην, 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: Εὔβουλος δὲ ὁ κωμικὸς τὸ λαβρίδιον γέννημα καταγελάστως παρθένον ἀνάσυμρα ἐλπ. The clandestine offspring is called παρθένου ἀνάσυμρα, since it is the result of a virgin’s copulation, implied by ἀνάσυμρα in the sense we are studying here. It is interesting here to notice how the ἀνασύρειν is considered as the natural preparation of coition\textsuperscript{53}. 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 ὄργαν οἴκοιν ἐν ταῖς φιδάκκαισιν καὶ γυναρίων καὶ πυργίδων ἔτος ὄγδουν οὐκ ἔλεαιρεσιν, ετc.

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). Φιδάκη is a cask (cf. school. ad loc.); for γυνάριων one of the scholia runs thus: ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἐν φωλεώς καὶ καλαίς καὶ στενῶς χωρίως. Κράτης (the grammarian) δὲ φησίν τι πάσαν στενήν κατάδυσιν οὔτως ὄνωμαζον (cf. Suda s.v. Γυναρίων). We should have Crates’ view when approaching Hesychius’ gloss on Γύπας. He explains: καλῶβας καὶ θαλάμας. οἱ δὲ γυνῶν νεοσσιάς. ἄλλοι + ὀδᾶς εἰς ὀδοὺς (sic cod). οἱ δὲ τὰς κατὰ γῆν οἰκήσεις. οἱ δὲ σπήλαια. καὶ Γυπάρια τὰ αὐτὰ (sc. ταῖς Γύπαις). οἱ δὲ αἵωντος, ἄνασευρμένας (ex ἀνασευρμένα, with Alberti this is the easiest and most natural correction). The signalized 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: Heinse’ s ὄπας καὶ εἰσόδους, omitting perhaps καὶ: ὄπας, εἰσόδους; and Vossius’ στενᾶς εἰσόδους. In any case the sense is clear. But the important element for our purpose is provided by the last gloss. Ἀξωστοῦ remembers 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 breast\textsuperscript{54} - 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 Greeks\textsuperscript{55}. This fits well with that sense of \( \textit{\text{ἀνασεσυμέμενη}} \) 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. \( \textit{\text{μέλαθρον}} \) where one gloss reads: \( \textit{καὶ τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν μύριον} \); not to mention the Greek Septuaginta \( \textit{σπήλαια} \) in Hambakum in the sense of privy parts\textsuperscript{56}.

From these surroundings \( \textit{\text{ἀνασεσυμένος}} \) 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, \textit{Historia Philipp.} I, 6, 14; Plutarch, \textit{Mul. Virt.} 246A; 248B; cf. idem \textit{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, mystic 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, \textit{Abraxas}, pp. 193 sqq.) there is an invocation of a highest power (\( \textit{θεόν Θεὲ}, \) p. 202, 14, \( \textit{μέγας}, \) \( \textit{μέγας Αἰών} \) p. 203, 18 \( \textit{δύναμι} \textit{ἀφθεγκτον} \textit{μεγάλου Θεοῦ} \) 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: ...Δίόνυσε, μάκαρ Εὔις, ...Βαυβῶ,...Ιάω, Σαβαώθ... Ἀδωνάϊ... This highest being (its supreme position indicated by Ὁᾳω (or Σαβαώθ and Ἀδωνάϊ) is the Εὖις (from εὐοὶ, εὔαντ) Διόνυσος as identical (that is, in assimilative conjunction) with Βαυβῶ 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 organs. It is in such a context that the epitheton χοιροψάλας of Dionysius gets its fuller meaning. (For the mysteric Dionysus = Zagreus as supreme god v. already in Alcmaionic Fr. 3 Bernabi: πότνια Γη, Ζαγρεύ τε θεών πανυπέρτατε πάντων).

2) In a way similar to the above example, in IV 2200 sqq. (the great Paris Magic Papyrus, ed. Preisedanz vol. I, p. 140), we have an invocation to the Lord of the Universe (ὁ τῶν ὀλων δεσπότης) to the Αἰών τῶν Αἰώνων, which runs thus (omitting the un-meaning words): σὺ εἰ ὁ κοσμοκράτωρ, Ρᾶ, Πᾶν, ..., αἰγινω (the series of vowels, a most potent symbol) Βαυβῶ, Βαυβῶ, 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 τριπρώσιστον θεάν (sc. Ἐκάτην), Μήνην, ἑράσιμον Φῶς, Ἐρμήν τε καὶ Ἐκάτην ὁμοῦ, ἀρσενόθηλον ἐρνος, μούφωρ (sic), Φόρβα, βασιλεία Βριμώ (i.e. Demeter according to Clement Alexandr. *Protrepticus* II, 15, 1, but see note for further articulation), δεινή καὶ θεσμία (Δημήτης) καὶ Δαρδανία (hence in connection with Samothrace), Πανοπαία, δεύρο ιων, Παρθένε, εἶνοδία (hecatic attribute) καὶ ταυροδράκαινα σύ, 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 ἀρρητούργια (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 Ἀφρόβα 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 ταυρο-δράκαινα, it is to be observed that in the London papyrus XLVI (British Museum) Ὄρθω Βαυβώ is called ἀκρουροβόρος, 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, ἀλλὰ ἡμιον υπάρχουσα ἔρπετος. Διὸ καὶ ἀσπίδουγορόνα ταύτην ἐκάλεσαν. Ὀυροβόρος is sometimes portrayed as an enormity of a serpent encompassing the world. This epitheton then, ἀκρουροβόρος, as applied to Baubo, confirms 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 ἀκρουροβόρος occurs in the midst of an invocation addressed to Hermes. To return, for a last remark, to ἀκρουροβόρος: Photius, in his Lexicon, has: οὐράνιον αἰδοῖον, Σοφοκλῆς (Sophocles, Fr. 924 Dindorf). And Hesychius s.v. οὐραίος ἡ 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 οὖκ ἔχει.
Νέα γὰρ ἐστιν ἀλλὰ δελφακομένα ἔξεσ μεγάλαν τε καὶ παχέαν κηρυθράν.
This μεγάλη and παχεία and ἔρυθρα «κέρκος» is of course the membrum virile (cf. also Ecclesiazousai, 1048: μεγάλην ἀποδώσω καὶ παχείαν σοι χάριν) as the scholiast saw: ἀμα δὲ καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ κόρης παῖζει, ὡσ ἔξει μεγάλην οὐρὰν τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρός πόσθην. And so Hesychius s.v. σαννίον· τὸ γὰρ ἀιδοῖον ἔσθ’ ὅτε οὐραν ἔλεγον, ὡς Ἐὐσπολος. It is evident here too, that the male ἀιδοῖον is meant, since the explanation given by Hesychius applies only to it: Σαννίον· τὸ ἀιδοῖον, ἀντὶ τοῦ κέρκιον· παρὰ τὸ τῇ κέρκῳ σαίνειν· τὸ γὰρ ἀιδοῖον ἔσθ’ ὅτε ἤτοι ἄκρουροβόρος 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. λεσβάζειν; 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 extreme, 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—σὺ ν ἀπ’ τὴν Μηστέρα τις as is put by Hesychius (s.v. Μίσσατις or Μίσσα τις?) 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 inquiry. Thus a) we conclude from the comic poets, their scholiasts and the ancient lexicographers that μύσητος (οἱ μυσητός), μύσητη (οἱ μυσητή), μύσητια connote proneness to sexual pleasures, lechery, insatiable intense
desire and perverse (lack of) satisfaction, especially as applied to women. We recognize in this way the same signification of lewdness and lustfulness with Misa as with Baubo above and the same undertone of pervertedly obscene practices. Then b), μισήται (or μισηταί) δὲ γυναῖκες ὄλεσθοσίν (the same as βαυβώνες, 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 Demeter 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. Μισάτις) ἦν (sc. Μίσην) καὶ ὄμνυσι; whereby, if we may use it as one intermediate link connecting this with his other gloss: Μίδα θεός· αἱ ὑπὸ Μίδα βασιλευθέντες ἱκτίβοντα καὶ ὄμνυσιν τὴν Μίδα θεόν, ἦν τινες μητέρα αὐτοῦ ἐκτειμήσαντει λέγουσιν, we arrive at a divinity Μίση = Μίδα θεός mother of king Midas. 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 Tyanaensis, VI, 27: μετείχε µὲν γὰρ τοῦ τῶν Σατύρων γένους ὁ Μίδας οὗτος, ὡς ἐκάθεν τὰ ὀντα; more completely confirmed by the description of Midas in Philostratus Imagines I, XXII: ὡς ἀβρός (as Dionysus himself is) ὁ Μίδας, ὡς δὲ ράθυμος µύτρας (the accessory head dress connected with Cybele, used in Aristophanes, Thesmoph. 941, as a sign of effeminacy perhaps) ἐπικολεῖται καὶ βοστρύχου, καὶ θύρου (the bacchic thyrsus) φέρει, καὶ στολὴν ἐγχρυσοῦν ἱδον καὶ ὀτά μεγάλα, ὡς ὅν ἢδε ὦ ὁ φθαλμοὶ δοκοῦντες ὑπνηλοί φαίνονται καὶ μεθέλκουσι τὴν
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 things. 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 \textit{Mída theós} 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 (\deltaαίμων \ περὶ \ τὴν \ Χ, τροφός, etc.). The important thing is their belonging to the same religious nexus. Plutarch offers a further confirmation in the same direction \textit{Vita Caesaris}, IX: ἕστι δὲ \textit{Ρωμαίους theós}, Ἰη οἱ \textit{Αγαθὴν ονομάζουσιν} (the Bona Dea), ὡςπερ \textit{Ἐλλῆνες Γυνακειάν}. Καὶ Φρύγες μὲν οἰκειούμενοι \textit{Mída μητέρα τοῦ βασιλέως γενέσθαι φασί}, \textit{Ρωμαίοι δὲ νύμφην Δράμαδα Φαύνῳ συνυκῆσαν}, \textit{Ἐλλῆνες δὲ τῶν Διονύσου μητέρων τὴν ἄρρητον· οὖθεν ἀμπελίνοις τε τὰς σκηνὰς κλήμασιν ἐφοτάξουσι κατερέφουσι καὶ δράκων ἱερὸς παρακαθόρυσαι τῇ θεῷ κατὰ τὸν μύθον. 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 \textit{Mísa Köρη} 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 \textit{Saturnalia} I, 12, 24-27 (and compare his whole report from 21 onwards). There are also further details confirming the evident: the Bona Dea, the very appellation of \textit{Ἀγαθὴ thea} 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 \textit{γυνακεία theós} as if this was the goddess especially representing femininity as such and in its sexually proper nature and peculiarity.
In these circumstances it is not very essential to establish the exact surface-connection of the *Mîda theós* with our *Mîση* \(^{78}\), 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 *Mîση* or *Mîsã* and *Mîda theós* (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. *Mîσαρίς*) whose sexually laden nature is unmistakeable in myth and ritual; from its identity with the *Mîda theós* 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 deity \(^{79}\). 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 *ζευσμός* of Demeter by Baubo \(^{80}\).

This, then, and of such a nature, is the ἄγνή and εὐέρος *Mîση*, the ἀρρητος 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 ἄγνος, ἄγιος, ἰερός 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 δρόμενα resides essentially in their transcendent power and divine efficaciousness, 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 Heracleitus 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, ἀρρητὸς 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 Heracleitean 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 homoeopathetic 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 ἀρρητοποιεῖν etc. Hesychius s.v. ἀρρητὸς, after giving the usual explanations, adds all-significantly: αἰσχρὸν. It is in such dimensions, together with the normal ones, that we should view the ἀρρήτος 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 humn 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:

Θεσμοφόρος καλέω, ναρθηκοφόρον Δίόνυσον,
σπέρμα πολύμνηστον, πολυώνυμον Εὐβουλής,
ἀγνήν, εὐδερόν τε Ἕλεαν ἄρρητον ἀνασάν,
ἀρσενα καὶ θηλαῖν, δισφύ, λόγειον Ἰακχόν.

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 Δηναίος, where Bacchus is invoked as σπέρμα πολύμνησκότον and as πολυώνυμος (just as in hymn 42), he is called κρυφόγονον μακάρων ἱερὸν θάλος, the holy scion of secret origin82, of the blessed immortals, and is hailed as, among other beneficial attributes, παυσάπτονον θυντοίσι φανείς ἄκος, ἱερὸν 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 κόλπων. Cf. the Sabaziac myth and ritual in Clement and Arnobius).

Thus, there can be no doubt about its significance. For ἐφάπτομαι 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 Ἡταφος, their intercourse Ζηνὸς ἐφαμις. And so Gesner, loc.cit.: ...ἐπάφιον, a verbo ἐφάπτομαι tagen a tengendo feliciter reddidit Scaliger: simplicior aliquis vocaret contractatorem . In his versibus, ..., Ιακχος sive Bacchus, per id ipsum quod ἐπάφιος est, sit παυσίλυτος et φιλάνυον. (Clear enough, sexual gratification is involved. Gesner, besides, declares that he has explained the matter ...paucis, et quantum sufficiat ὑπὸ ἵματος μεμυκμένοις!). One is reminded in this connection, once more, of the cultic epithet: Διόνυσος Χομοβάλας. 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 ἀδέμιςτα committed by the Titans: the σπαραγμός of Ζαγρεύς (cf. Olympiodorus, in *Plat. Phaed.* B 1a (p. 87, 13 sqq.) 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. Δίόνυσος 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 Hymns. 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’ bisexuality.

a) In hymn 56 to Adonis enough material is contained to justify an aspectual identification of Adonis with (mystic) Dionysus. Thus he is πολυώνυμος, Εὐδούλευς (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 ἑρασιπλοκάμου λέκτρουι λοχευθεῖς); he also stays some time in Hades (cf. hymn 53, 3 addressed to chthonius Dionysus). And Cypriot Aphrodite, the σύνεννος 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).

b) Trieteric Dionysus (hymn 52) is called Πρωτόγονος and Ἡρωκεπαῖος (v. 6). Dionysus as πολύμνηστον σπέρμα has already been met twice: 42, 2 and 50, 2; as διφυής appears in 30, 3, 39, 5, 42, 4, 58, 4; as ταυρωτός (30, 4), ταυρομέτωτος (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 testimonies\(^92\). And this fits extremely well with the womanish aspect of Dionysus in general\(^93\) and the intrinsic bisexuality of the mystic Dionysus, of Iacchus, in particular which is our present point. Dionysius, the poet tyrant, called the χοίρον, ἰακχόν probably playing on the peculiar cry of pigs and μῦσται (initiates), and on the mystic nature of Iacchus\(^94\).

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):

\[\text{This is Hermann’ s emendation for the transmitted oδδὲ.}\]

But we have already sufficiently explained that the passage cannot stand thus: the ἧν cannot be naturally construed in such a reading; and what is, then, the reference of μῦν and what the subject of ρῖπτασκε? Gesner, in his edition of Orphica, saw the problem and noted: χειρὶ τὲ μῦν ρῖπτασκε legunt apud Clementem et Eusebium viri docti, et interpretatur puerum Iacchum a sua mater (i.e. Demeter, presumably the subject of ρῖπτασκε!) 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’ ἥν ρῖπτασκε γελῶν etc. Which is taken over by Mullach, who completes the meaning intended according to this interpretation changing from ἧν to ἦν. So we have: (Mullach)
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 this. 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 Demophoon 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 Demetriac 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 happens). 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
In gratitude for the inhabitants' mystic good deeds towards her, Demeter made two divine gifts, the greatest (δωρεαί, αἴτερ μέγισται τυγχάνονσιν οὔσαι, τούς τε καρπούς, οἱ τοῦ μῆνιος θηριώδος ζῆν ἡμῖν αἰτίοι γεγόνοσε, καὶ τὴν τελετήν, ὅς μετασχόντες περὶ τῇ διὸ τοῦ βίου τελευτής καὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος αἰώνος ἡδίον τὰς ἑλπίδας ἔχουσιν. In gratitude for the inhabitants' mystic good deeds towards her, Demeter made two divine gifts, the greatest (δωρεαί, αἴτερ μέγισται τυγχάνονσιν οὔσαι) 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 mysteric 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 Ἀρρενίαν which I think we should substitute for Ἀρρένως; Persephone must be meant, the daughter of Δήμω); but his project is cut short by a prohibition received by him in a dream not to enter into mystic details: ἀ δε ἐς πάντας ὄσιοι γράφειν, ἐς ταῦτα ἀποτρέψομαι, 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): Ὑρφέως δὲ, οὐδὲ ταῦτα Ὑρφέως ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν ὄντα, Εὐβούλει καὶ Τριπτόλεμων Δισαύλην πατέρα εἶναι, μηνύσασι δὲ σφίσι περὶ τῆς παιδὸς δοθῆναι παρὰ Δήμητρος σπέιρα 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 Εὐβούλεις
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 cultus. This special connection of the boy-hero with the mysteries is manifest in the Orphic hymn 41, addressed to Demeter, described as 

This is the MSS reading, without the extensive in v. 6 introduced by Hermann and the substitution of ἂπτ' for the existing ἂπ' in v. 8, originated by Vossius. I have only mutated ἄκαρας to τεῦξασα, 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 - worldly mortality. This latter sense is obviously required as providing the prototype of all initiation and ἔπεθανατισμένοι. This is what the golden ritualistic lamellae tell us in their formulaic expressions:

ἐρχομαι ἐκ καθαρῶν καθαρά (sic), χθονίων βασίλεια
Εὐκλῆς Εὐβουλεύς τε καὶ ἀθανάτοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι·
καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὑμῖν γένος ὀλβίον εὐχόμαι εἶμεν.
κύκλον δ’ ἐξέπταν βαρυπενθέος ἀργαλέοι

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

«ὀλβίε καὶ μακαριστέ, θεός δ’ ἐστι ἀντὶ βροτοῦ».

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

ποινὰν δ’ ἀνταπέτειω ἔργων ἑνεκα οὕτι δυκαῖων’ (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 ἀληθῆς 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:

οἶσιν δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποινὰν παλαιοὶ πένθεος (sc. that caused by the atrocity of the Titans of old)

δέξεται, εἰς τὸν ὑπερθεν ἄλιον κείμων ἐνάτω ἐτεὶ

ἀνδρόδοι θυγαῖς πάλιν,

ἐκ τῶν βασιλῆς ἁγαυοὶ

καὶ σθένοι κρατοῦντι σοφία τε μέγιστοι

ἀνδρέας αὔξεντ’ · εἰς δὲ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἔρωτος ἁγαυοὶ πρὸς

ἀνθρώπων καλεῖνται.

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:

\[ \chi\alpha\iota\rho\varepsilon\ \pi\alpha\\acute{\theta}\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \delta\ \omicron\  \omicron\uilde\upsilon\pi\omicron\ \pi\rho\omicron\\acute{s}\theta\acute{e} \ \acute{e}\pi\acute{t}\acute{e}\omicron\acute{n}\thei\acute{e}s \ (\text{that is, in previous deaths, the translation to the place of Beatitude was not forthcoming as the soul was not then initiated and made holy, pure and perfect}) \]

\[ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{e}\gamma\acute{e}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{e} \ \acute{a}n\theta\acute{r}\acute{r}\omega\acute{p}\omicron\varsigma. \]

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

\[ \Gamma\acute{
\Sigma}\varsigma\ \pi\acute{a}i\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{
\iota}\varsigma\ \kappa\acute{a}i\ \O\acute{
\omicron}\uilde\rho\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu\omicron\ \acute{a}\sigma\tau\acute{e}\omicron\rho\acute{o}\acute{e}n\thei\acute{e}s:\]

\[ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{a}\ \acute{e}m\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{e}n\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\uilde\rho\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\\acute{e}\acute{n}\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\\omicron\\acute{e} \ \delta\ \iota\omicron
\] (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:

\[ \kappa\acute{a}i\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\breve{\tau}\acute{e} \acute{e}\acute{p}e\upsilon\acute{t} \acute{\acute{a}}\acute{l}l\omicron\uilde\omega\omicron\varsigma\ \me\omicron\theta\epsilon\omicron\acute{r}\acute{ώ}\acute{e}s\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{a}n\acute{a}\acute{\acute{x}}\acute{e}i\acute{e}s \]

having become ἡρως as in the Pindaric fragment quoted above. The θυνθητή ἀνάγκη 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 αὐτή παρά τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ προτείνεται τοῦ κύκλου τῆς γενέσεως ἀπαλλάττουσα καὶ τῆς πολλῆς πλάνης καὶ τῆς ἀνηγνώτου ζωῆς etc.; and in 297, 7: … πάσαν δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς τὴν εὐδαιμονία περιάγοντα ζωὴν ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὴν γένεσιν πλάνης, ἦς καὶ οἱ παρ Ὄρφεω τῷ Διονύσῳ καὶ τῇ Κόρῃ (that is, in the Μικρὰ Μυστήρια) τελούμενοι, τυχεῖν εὐχονται:

\[ \kappaύκλου \tau̱ \'Αν \lηξαι καὶ \αναπνεύσασι κακότητος. \]

Similarly in Simplicius, In Arist. De Caelo II, I, 284a14 (p. 377,12 sqq. Heiberg): ἐνδεθήσαι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ τὸ κατ’ ἀξίαν πάσιν ἀφορίζοντος Δημιουργοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ τῆς εἰμαρμένης (cf. the ἀνάγκη of our hymn) τε καὶ γενέσεως τροχῷ, οὐπερ ἀδύνατον ἀπαλλαγῆναι κατὰ τὸν Ὄρφεά μὴ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐκείνους ἰλεωσάμενον,
Empedocles took over the Orphic (and thus Orphic-Eleusinian) association of this worldly necessity, cyclicity and painful baseness in his powerful νηστείωσαι 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 ἄφ’ ἐστίας μυούμενος (Apostolius, IV, 61 in Corpus Paroem. Gr.; Harpocratio (and Suda) s.v.; Isaeus Fr. 77 ed. Müller), who, according to Porphyry, De Abstinentia 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 ἄφ’ ἐστίας λεγόμενος παῖς, <ὁ> ἀντὶ πάντων τῶν μυστηρίων ἀπομειλήσεται τὸ θείον, ἀκριβῶς δρῶν τὰ προστεταγμένα. This is probably the ἱερός παῖς of Himerius XXIII 7, 18.

Confirmation of my view is provided by inscriptive evidence as well. In the Athenian inscription (No 13, Dittemberger1 = 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, Panegyr. §31), we read vv. 36-39: θ’εν δὲ ἀπὸ μὲν τὸ πελάνο (cf. Harpocration s.v.) καθότι ἄν Εὐμολπίδαι ἔκσεῖ-ονται, τριπτολαῖον δὲ βόσαρχον χρυσόκερον (cf. lexicographers s. vv. Τριπτύα οἱ Τριπτύς) τοῖν θεοῖν ἑκατέραι (sc. to Demeter and Persephone) ἀπὸ τῶν κριθῶν καὶ τῶν πυρῶν, καὶ τοῖν Τριπτολέμοι καὶ τοῖ Θεοί καὶ τεῖ θεαί (cf. Inscr. Att. III, 1109: κοσμητής ἐφήβων ἱερεὺς θεοῦ καὶ θεάς Εἰρηναίος Παμανεύς) καὶ τοῖν Εὐβόλοι ἱερεῖον ἐκάστοι τέλεον, καὶ τεὶ Αθεναία 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 scene.

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 (παίς δ’ ἵν \textit{Iakchos}, \textit{χειρὶ τὲ μιν ῥῖπτασκε γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις}) together with his apparently approving remark \textit{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 fundament.

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 \textit{θεός} and the \textit{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 \textit{Bρυμός} of the hierophantic invocation, to Iacchus-Dionysus, is necessary. The hymn sung by the \textit{μύσται} in their procession in Aristophanes Ranae is
addressed to Demeter, Persephone et Iacchus. And in Euripides’ Ion we have the three closely associated: δι πολύξυνης θεός (v. 1075), ἦς χρυσοστέφανος κόρη (v. 1085) and ἦς 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 Δήμητριου 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 εἰκας Βοτρυμοῦνος (cf. Plutarchus, Phocio, 28; Camillus, 19; Alcibiades, 34; sch. in Aristoph. Ranae 323).

Now this Iacchus was thoroughly disreputable in the eyes of the Christian Fathers who knew something about mysteries; Clement, Protrept. p. 19 Potter: ἀπόσβεσον, ὁ ἱεροφάντα, τὸ πῦρ· αἰδέσθητι δοδούχε τὰς λαμπάδας· ἐλέγχει σου τὸν Ἰακχὸν τὸ φῶς etc. And this was so because of his sexual nature: Iacchus was the θεός and θεά in conjunction and interpenetration; the Δίωνυσος and Μίση of the Orphic hymn 42; the Phallus and the Womb. 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): Ἐρασίππης Ὑάλασανος Ἡρη (but HIPH really on the marble) Δήμητρι φθεινοφόρω καὶ Κόρη καὶ Δι Ἐυβουλεὶ καὶ Βαυβοί. Ζεὺς Ἐυβουλεὺς is aspectually identified with Dionysus Zagreus, in the identity of Father and Son. 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 \( \theta \varepsilon \o s \) and \( \theta \varepsilon \a \), the Phallus and the Womb\textsuperscript{108}.

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 \( \kappa \acute{\kappa} \kappa \iota \nu o s \) \( \beta \alpha \mu \beta \o w o s \) or \( \delta \lambda \iota \sigma \beta o s \) 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 \( \tau \upupsilon \upsigma o s \) if taken to mean the same as \( \delta \mu \omicron \omega \mu a \);

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 this\textsuperscript{109}: \( \epsilon \nu \iota \sigma t e \varphi a \), \( \epsilon \pi o n \ t \o n \ k u k e \acute{\epsilon} \o n a \), \( \epsilon \lambda \alpha \beta o n \ \epsilon k \ k \acute{i} \acute{\sigma} \tau \eta \), \( \epsilon r \gamma \alpha \omicron \acute{\alpha} \acute{\mu} \acute{e} n o s \ \alpha \pi \acute{e} \theta \acute{e} \mu \eta \n \epsilon \acute{i} s \ \kappa \acute{a} \lambda \alpha \theta o n \ \kai \ \epsilon k \ \kappa \alpha \lambda \acute{a} \theta o u \ \epsilon \acute{i} s \ \k \acute{a} \sigma t \eta \n \). Clearly, the \( \epsilon r \gamma \alpha \omicron \acute{\alpha} \acute{\mu} \acute{e} n o s \) must refer in some way to the lewd practices of those using \( \delta \lambda \iota \sigma \beta o s \); cf. in a religious context the \( \theta \varepsilon \o s \ \delta i \acute{a} \ \k \acute{o} \lambda \pi o n \) in the Sabazic mysteries, Clement, Protr. II, 16, 2\textsuperscript{110}.

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’\) \( \tau \upupsilon \upsigma o s \) 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 (α’) 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:

\[
\text{ός εἰποῦσα θεὰ δούος ἀνεσύρατο μηροῦς,}
\]

and adding: ἵνα τελέσῃ τοὺς ἐραστάς: ἄ καὶ νῦν ἐτὶ τελεῖται τοῖς σχήμασιν (my reading, retaining the transmitted τελεῖται; usually, e.g. Lobeck, it is ἵνα τελέσῃ τοὺς ἐραστάς ἄ καὶ νῦν ἐτὶ τελεῖ τοῖς σχήμασιν). To which Nonnus Abbas notes ad loc. p. 1023 Migne: τοῦ δὲ περὶ τῆς Δήμητρος ἐποὺς ὦ νοῦς ἐστιν ὁτός: ὅτι ἐπαιρομένη ἡ θεὰ τοὺς ἐαυτῆς μηροὺς ἀνεσύρετο λέγει δὲ περὶ τῶν ἰματίων - ἵνα, φησί, τοὺς ἐρώντας αὐτῆς ἀξιωμή 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 σχήμα 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 ἤμιν ἀρπάζεται, καὶ Δήμητρι πλανᾶται, καὶ Κελευός τινας ἐπεσαγαγε καὶ Τριπτολέμους καὶ δράκοντας, καὶ τὰ μὲν ποιεῖ, τὰ δὲ πάσχει: αἰσχύνομαι γὰρ ἡμέρα δοῦναι τὴν νυκτὸς τελετήν οἴδεν Ἐλευθος ταῦτα καὶ οἱ τῶν συσωμομένων ἐπόπται. This is repeated, in relation to the Mother of the Gods or Rhea, a few lines before: καὶ ὅσα περὶ τὴν Ρέαν ἀνθρωποι 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 something.
There was then, in all probability, some kind of συνονσία 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 Κελεύν καὶ Τριπτολέμου τὸν ἡρπακότα (sc. τὴν Περσεφόνην) μαθοῦσα, μισθὸν αὐτοῖς ἀποδίωσαι τῆς μυήσεως τὸν σῖτον, πρῶτον ἄθεσμως συγχεινομένη Κελεύν τῷ Τριπτολέμου πατρὶ, etc.\textsuperscript{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 ἄθεσμως contrasts to the θεσμοφόρος, I suppose, referring to a non-orderly, abnormal, illicit, unlawful copulation. The relevance of σῖτος 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):

\begin{verbatim}
εἴτε Κρόνου, εἴτε Διὸς μάκαρ,
εἴτε Ρέας μεγάλας, χαίρε ἵκ τὸ κατ-
ηφές ἄκονσιμα Ρέας Ὄτι σε κα-
λοῦσί μὲν Ἀσυρίῳ τριπόθητον Ἄ-
δωνιν, ...

... καὶ
of Φρύγες ἄλλοτε μὲν Πάσαν, ποτὲ
δὲ ἂν νέκων ἢ θεὸν ἢ τὸν ἄκαρτον ἢ
αιπόλον, ἢ χλοερὸν στάχυν ἁμη-
θέντα, ...
\end{verbatim}

Thus semen and corn are but manifestations of the same portentous principle, worshipped in its phallic form. Both are hidden in an ἄϊδης 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 αὐτὸν (sc. the Primal God, the Universal Semen) φησί (sc. the Ophitic text which Hippolytus is following), Φρύγες καὶ χλοερὸν στάχυν τεθερισμένον (cf. Attis' emasculation, and Dionysus' membrum in the Corybantic κόστη τεστε Clemente), καὶ μετὰ τοὺς Φρύγες ᾿Αθηναίου μυοῦντες ᾿Ελευσῖνα καὶ ἐπιδεικνύντες τοὺς ἐποπτεύουσι τὸ μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν καὶ τελείωταν ἐποπτικὸν ἐκεῖ μυστήριον ἐν σωτηρίᾳ, τεθερισμένον στάχυν. This is further, and most importantly, brought into connection with the Βριμός mentioned above and in circumstances which require profound meditation: οὗ δὲ στάχυς οὐδός ἐστι καὶ οὗ παρὰ ᾿Αθηναίων ὁ παρὰ τοῦ ἠχαρακτηρίστου (sc. the semen productive of everything, not having the form of anything) φωστήρ τέλειος μέγας (cf. Aristophanes Ranae 341-2: Ἰακχ ὁ Ἰακχε, / νυκτέριον τελετής φωσφόρος ἀστήρ, where see the scholia: τὸ μυστηριακὸν πῦρ φωσφόρον λέγουσιν. For the μυστικὸν πῦρ see also Scholiast ad Sophocles, Oed. Col. 1048 ἡ λαμπάσιν ἀκταίσις. Cf. Sophocles Antigone 1147 where Iacchus is χοραγὸς ἀστρων; cf. also Euripides Ion 1074 sqq.), καθάπερ αὐτὸς ὁ ἱεροβάντης, οὐκ ἀποκεκομμένος μὲν, ὡς ὁ ᾿Αττις (and the Γάλλοι, priests of Magna Mater), εὖνοισμένος δὲ διὰ κωνεῖου καὶ πάσαν ἀπηρτημένος τὴν σαρκικὴν γένεσιν, νυκτὸς ἐν ᾿Ελευσῖνι ὑπὸ πολλῶν πυρὸ τελῶν τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἄρρητα μυστήρια βοῶ καὶ κέκραγε λέγων: «ἰερὸν ἔτεκε πότνια κούρον Βριμὼ Βριμών», τούτου ᾿Ισχυρᾶ, ᾿Ισχυρίν. The ἀμφθεῖς στάχυς represents the offering, on a symbolic level, of the male αἴδοια to the Sacred Womb, of Attis' pudenda to Cybele. This is why the μυνὸμενος must undergo and suffer something as we saw above: he must lose his manhood, offer it to the Great Female in sacred awe and unquestioning veneration. This is what we saw our Ophitic 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 θεός (we are reminded of the ἀγαθὸς θεός whom Pausanias wanted to identify with Zeus) κατοικεί μόνος, εἰς ὁ ὁ πτερείται, φησίν, ἀκάθαρτος οὐδές, οὐ ψυχικός, οὐ σαρκικός, ἀλλὰ τηρεῖται πνευματικός μόνος, ὅπου δεῖ γενομένους ἀποβαλεῖν (addidi) τὰ ἐνδύματα καὶ πάντας γενέσθαι νυκτόν ἀπηρευμένους διὰ τοῦ παρθενικοῦ πνεύματος. The formulation is gnostic but we are able now to see through it112a.
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 κενεώνα, κοιλία καλεῖται καὶ γαστέρ... τὸ δὲ υπὸ τῇ 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: εἰσὶ γοῦν οἱ φανὶν Περσεφόνης αὐτῶν (sc. the mystic Dionysus, Iacchus) εἶναι οἱ δὲ τῇ Δήμητρι συν-γενέόταται. 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', ὃ πολυτιμῆτος (πολυτίμους Hermann metri causa) ἐν ἔδρας ναῖων. (Look also, in the same light, at Sophocles, Antigone 1120-1 and see what will be said below on the play on μύρ-τον). 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 Ζελεύς), it yet provides the divine archetype of one. The archetype is of the child-husband. (And if, as in certain accounts, Dionyéus 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: "Ιακχος: Δίόνυσος ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῷ. (Compare also Strabo I 470: καὶ ὁ Σαβάζιος δὲ τῶν Φυλλικάκών ἔστι, καὶ τρόπον τινα τῆς μητρός τὸ σαίδιον, 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:

κεῖμαι Αὐρήμος Ἀντώνιος ὁ καὶ ἱερεὺς τῶν βεβελεὼν πάντων, πρῶτον Βοναδίης (= Bona Dea) εἶται Μητρὸς θεῶν καὶ Διονύσου καὶ Ἡγεμόνος.

We have here gods and goddesses of mystery cults and orgiastic rites (‘Ἡγεμῶν may be rightly explained by Dieterich, Die Göttin Mise p. 9, as "Ιακχος in connection with Strabo X, 468 where "Ιακχος is described as ἀρχηγότης 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 κρυβόμενη ὁμοῦ καὶ φανερομένην φύσις (which is, they say, the inhering in man, though searched after, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν), περὶ ᾧ διαρρήδην ἐν τῷ κατὰ Θωμάν ἐπιγραφομένως Ἐναγγελίῳ (an uncanonical one) παραδίδασιν λέγοντες οὕτως: «ἐμέ ο ζητῶν εὑρήσει εν παιδίων ἀπὸ ἑτῶν ἐπτά· ἐκεί γὰρ ἐν τῷ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ αἰῶνι κρυβόμενοι φανεροίμαι» (take κρυβόμενος with ἐκεί, and φανεροίμαι with ἐν τῷ τεσσαρ. αἰῶνι). Τούτο δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν Χριστοῦ, ἀλλὰ Ἰπποκράτους λέγοντος «ἐπτά ἑτῶν πάις πατρὸς ἡμῖν»: ὅθεν οὗτοι τὴν ἄρχεγον φύσιν τῶν ὅλων ἐν ἄρχεγόνῳ τιθέμενοι σπέρ-
The doctrine is that from the age of seven, semen exists 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. Παις according to the Hippocratic division of ages in man’s life covers precisely the interval from seven to fourteen years old. Παις is thus in potential manhood and fatherhood, awaiting for the revelation of the generative principle of life; just as the μονόμενος is in potential divinity, ready for the revelation of what is au fond the same principle of life and death the Δίόνυσος - 'Αιδωνεύς (= Ζαγρεύς) of Heracleitus.

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 ἄθεσμος concourse) whom we have seen called Eubulus or Eubuleus.

This is the place to return to the Orphic Hymn to Μῆτηρ Ἀνταῖα (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:

In discussing it above, I kept the transmitted text, changing only τέξασα to τεῦξασα. Now δύσαγνος is prima facie unmetrical (because of δυς-). 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 κοινή114. 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 ἀσάγνοσ often implies a state of mind set on things sexual, on unlawful rape and coition. So the Danaides in Aeschylus’ Supplices fear the approach of Aegyptus’ sons (v. 750 sqq.):

δουλόφρονες δὲ καὶ δολομήτιδες, ἀσάγνοις φρεσίν,
kóρακες ὡστε, 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 εἰκός, καὶ ἔχθιστον ἥγειτο, καὶ ποτὲ περὶ ἐμοῦ ἐρομένῳ τῷ Ροῦτηλιανῷ ἐφη:

Νυκτιπλάνως δάρων χαίρει κοίτας τε ἀσάγνοις.

Furthermore, we possess a very important testimony in Hesychius s.v. Ἀχθεία, which he explains: ἡ Δημήττῃ, 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. ἀφρός χαλάσσης. The second explanation may somehow relate or point to the ἀφρός from which Ἀφρογένεα, Ἀφροδίτη was
born. The former is connected to the sense which the root of ἂγχ-ω, ἂχ-νυ-μαι, ἂχ-ο-μαι, ἂχ-εύω, ἂχ-οσ, ἂχ-θος, ἂχ-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 Ἀχόθεα 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 ἔφηβος, 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 sense. To think that her άθεσσομος 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 ἀπερσενωμένος (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 ἄκαθαρτος 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 στάχνος, 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 Ἀθέα. 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 πᾶσχει of St. Gregory with respect to Demeter; and the ἀπαρασενόματα 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 Ἐνεργή (v. Hesychius s.v.; for ἔνεργειν as ἔνεργειν 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:

Εὐβουλούν τέξασα θεὸν θυτῆς ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης.

This then would mean that out of the coition of Demeter with the holy youth (hence the θυτῆ τῆς ἀνάγκης), 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 Mother. 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 mystic formulary: ἐνήσπευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεώνα, 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 κύστις) and its contents is formidable. Κίστη was ordinarily a covered basket or hamper (usually plaited or twisted hence Hesychius explains it as ἀγγείον πλεκτόν, from bark or wicker work) suitable, depending on its size, for storing food or garments, or as a case in which, e.g., women put their ornaments when going to bed. 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 κάλαθα were playing a cardinal role, just as κανά 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 κιστή
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 τούτῳ οὖν φέρων
λικνοφόρος λέγουσ’ ἀν’ (whereas the κιστή was sacred to the two
théai and the mystic Dionysus (and used in the ritual worship of
deities aspectually identified with this triad in one way or another): so
Harpocration s.v. κυστοφόρος (alluding to the same Demosthenian
passage) has: ἐνιοί μετὰ τοῦ σ γράφουσι (κυστοφόρος· τὰς γὰρ
λεγομένας κιστας ἱερὰς εἶναι ἔλεγον τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ταῖν θεαῖν)
(this is the Dionysus of the mysteries, Zagreus and Iacchus). Plutarch,
Phocio, 28, mentions these κισταί (sacred to the Eleusinian Triad) and
calls them μυστικαὶ κόιται; around them were wound bands and
fillets of a deep purple-red shade which were replaced by others of a
sickly, deadly sallow hue during the Great Mysteries: τότε δὲ περὶ τὰς
ἡμέρας ἐκεῖνας (ἰερὰς εἰναὶ ἔλεγον τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ταῖν θεαῖν)
(sc. τῶν Μεγάλων Μυστηρίων) ταῖν ταῖν ταῖν μυστικὰς κόιτας, βαπτόμεναι τὰς τραχύς καὶ ταῖν θεαῖν.
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 cuspide 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
Phrygic 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
thus\textsuperscript{127}. 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 otherwise\textsuperscript{128}.

So κίσται were reserved for mystery worship. In them there were the μυστικὰ 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 Eleusinan Μεγάλαι Ἔθεαι). 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 τελετής ζαβής ἐγκύμονα μύστιδα κίστην (sc. ἐνόπησε),

which τελετή ζαβή must be the analogue of, if not the same as, the Eleusinian ἀγιωτάτα τελεταί\textsuperscript{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: οἷοι δὲ καὶ αἱ κίσται ἅντι μυστικαί; δεῖ γὰρ ἀπογυμνωθῆναι τὰ ἁγία αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἀρρήτα ἔξωπείν, οὐ σηχασμαί ταῦτα καὶ πυραμίδες καὶ τολύπαι καὶ πότανα πολυόμφαλα, χόνδροι τε ἄλοι καὶ δράκων, ὄργιοι Διονύσου Βασσάρου; Ὀμηλὶ δὲ ροιαὶ πρὸς ποίδεκα καὶ καρδία (this, or καρδία, is the transmitted reading, both here and in Eusebius; κράδαι wanted by Morellus and Lobeck) νάρϑηκες τε καὶ κυττοῖ, πρὸς δὲ καὶ φθοῖς καὶ μῆκωσες; ταῦτ’ ἐστιν αὐτῶν τὰ ἁγία. καὶ προσέτι τῆς Θέμιδος τὰ ἀπόρρητα σύμβολα, ὄργανον, λύχνος, ξίφος, κτεῖς γυναικεῖος, «οἶς» ἔστιν, εὐφήμως καὶ μυστικῶς εἶπεν, μόριον γυναικεῖον. The mystic cista is full of sacred magico-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 it\textsuperscript{130}. The aspect was dreadful: Valerius Flaccus Argonautica II, 265:
It could drive somebody mad, the fate that befell the Cecropid maidens when they saw Ericthonius in his cista\textsuperscript{131}, even though for him who underwent initiation and \行使 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?) snake\textsuperscript{132} 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, \textit{Protrepticus}, II, 19, 4), raised to the full of its power by the significant, symbolic stimulants, existed in the cista\textsuperscript{133}. One takes it. Operates with it (ἐργασάμενος cf. ὁ διὰ κόλπου θεός with reference to the Sabazian mysteries, Clement \textit{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: δεσποίνας δυτίκος κόλπον ἐδών 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 signalized as especially for wool in Hesychius s.v.; also prominent in processions in honour of Demeter [Callimachus, \textit{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, examinati pectis 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 la deficientem contextet 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, simulantenem doloris cruces et ad fidem facto faciendam arietino sanguine coinquinatum et in mendacia vulneris laneis linteolisque contectum). 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 ἀγνός, 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 memrum 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 feminine et subolem prodere et nomen solet adquirere generi, tum longiore ab incuria liberat (sc. Baubo), facit sumere habitum puriorem et in speciem levigari nondum duri atque hystriculi pusionis
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 conspectuque divino et oblivionem miseriarum daret et habitum in laetiorem 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 auctoritas. 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 adnotatio.

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.
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 god\textsuperscript{136}; or, then, a monster, an evil omen\textsuperscript{137}.

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 proceed\textsuperscript{138}? 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 \textit{Φάνης}, or, if you prefer philosophical formulation, of Absolute undifferentiated, yet differenciable, 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 conjunction\textsuperscript{139}. 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 world\textsuperscript{140} - mysteries hidden by nothing save the blindness of the profane.

But even apart from my hypothesis as to Baubo’s hermaphroditism\textsuperscript{141}, 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.

Δείξει 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’ ἦν Ἰακχος is also alright: this was the unusual τύπος which met Demeter’s augui luminis orbes. But it must be Baubo who handles the boy mirthfully, laughingly142 thus it must be γελώσα, not γελῶν.

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

χειρὶ τέ μν ρίπτασκε γελώσα’ ὑπὸ Βαυβῶ κάλπως.

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 μείδησι’ ἐνὶ and, according to Stählin, while one of the two main MSS has μείδησε θεά, the other (Parisinus Graecus 451) had an apparently initial μείδησις (sic) corrected to εἰδῆσε. Μείδῆσε in both places is inelegant and unlikely. Mullach edited (Fragm.Phil.Gr. vol. I p. 175) μείδησε θεά, γῆθησ’ 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 world, we should certainly revert to the reading of the older editors especially in view of Parisinus’ correction. Εἴδησε was written by Gesner, on the authority of Salmassius146. Lobeck has εἴδησε as well, but he comments in the same page (Agaiofhamus, p. 819): Wakefieldius barbar εἴδησε . 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). In the second occurrence of μείδησε I am inclined to retain the word, though γάθησα' applies more literally to the following ἐνὶ θυμῷ.

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

"Ὡς εἰπόντα πέπλους ἀνεσύρατο, δεῖξέ τε πάντα σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον· παῖς δ' ἦν Ἰακχος χειρί τέ μιν ρίπτασκε γελῶσ' ὑπὸ Βαυβῶ κόλποις. Ἡ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν εἰδήσε θεά, μείδησα' ἐνὶ θυμῷ, δέξατο δ' αὐλόλων ἄγγος, ἐν ὦ κυκελὼν ἑνέκειτο."

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 unmistakeably 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 unmistakeable 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 control\(^{151}\). 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 begetting\(^{152}\). 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 (\(\chiλοεροσ\ \sigmaτ\acute{a}χ\upsilon\ \acute{a}μη\theta\eps\)). 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\textsuperscript{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 - worldly
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)\textsuperscript{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 investigations. And the remedy for this malady is not, certainly, to be found in the «mechanical» naturalism or primitivism of a Frazer or a Diels.

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 eikdas 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 ἱερὸς 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 Báau 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 - ἀνεμος should here be understood as the living, moving spirit which plays so eminent a part in Semitic cosmogonies) and from Báau («τοῦτο δὲ Νύκτα ἐρμηνεύει» adds Eusebius about Philo), Αἰών and Πρωτόγονος were generated (obviously the addition «θυντοὺς 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 σὲ Λίθας ἐτέκνωσε πατήρ; Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus 15: ἐνθα’ ἐπει μῆτῃρ μεγάλων ἀπεθήκατο κόλπων and in Hymn to Delus 214: γείνεο, γείνεο κοῦρε, καὶ Ἥπιος ἔξεις 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) κόλωμα, γυναικεῖος κόλπος. The winds as impregnating powers is a common theme in antiquity. We shall see that from Dysaules and Baubo came two children: Πρωτονή (an Πρω-τογόνη?) καὶ Μίση according to Asclepiades, apud Harpocratio s.v. Δυσαύλης. But of this affair more will be said below. In anticipation we may note that if Báau 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: «ἐνήστευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεώνα, ἐλαβὼν ἐκ κύστης, ἐργασάμενος ἀπεθέμυν ἐῖς κάλαθον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου ἐῖς κύστιν». 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 θῆς δὲ (sc. Δήμητρος) ἀναινομένης λαβεῖν καὶ πιεῖν ὦκ ἠθελοῦσις (πενθήρης γὰρ ἐνὶ περιαλγῆς ἡ Βαβὼ γενομένη, ὡς ὑπερφαῦσεσα δήθεν, ἀναστέλλεται τὰ ιδία τα ἰδία 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 pusioin (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; δασύπνοος 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 ἀλώτης: as the scholiast in 112/113a says: τὰς δασύκέρκως· τὰς πολύτριγους ἐχόσας οὐράς· κέρκως γὰρ ἡ οὐρά; but κέρκως also is the ἀνδρεῖοι ἀοίδοιον (cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v.); therefore I think there is a distinction between δασύπνωος 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: σαῦς ποιητής ὁ Γής κουροτρόφος καὶ Δήμητρος ιερὸς 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 εὐχεσθαι τοῖν θεόμοφορον [τῇ Δήμητρι καὶ τῇ Κόρη] καὶ τῷ Πολύτω καὶ τῇ Καλλιγνεῖα καὶ τῇ Κουροτρόφῳ [τῇ Γῇ] καὶ τῷ Ἐρμῆ ἤτοι (cf. the scholiast ad.loc.). Clearly the pair Δήμητρα Κόρη corresponds exactly to that of Κουροτρόφος Καλλιγνεία, and apart from their precise analogy there is affinity as well between them (cf. e.g. the inscription in Δελτίων Ἀρχαίων Έφημερίδος 1889, fasc. 5, 130: Δήμητρι Ἡλκη καὶ Κόρη τῆν Κουροτρόφον Εἰσίθοτος ἀνέθηκε καὶ ὄνειρον). For Καλλιγνεία not as a counterpart but as Κόρη herself cf. Photius Lexicon: Καλλιγνείαν Ἀπολλόδωρος μὲν τὴν γῆν (against this Hesychius s.v. but the text is corrupt), οὗ δὲ Δίως καὶ Δήμητρος θυγατέρα (i.e. Κόρη): Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ὁ κομικός, τροφόν. (cf. Sch. ad Thesm. 299), Καλλιγνεία: δαίμων περὶ τὴν Δήμητραν, ἣν προλογίζουσαν ἐν ταῖς ἑπεραῖς Θεσμοφοριακοῦσας ἑποίησαν). 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. ἰθυσάν) καὶ τὰ ἔξω- τέρα ἐν ἀκροτόλαι τῇ τῇ Αθηνᾶ τῇ Πολιάδι καὶ τῇ Κουροτρόφῳ τῇ Πανδρόσῳ, καὶ ἐκαλλιέργησαν; and especially see Suda s.v. Κουροτρόφος. The cult of Γῆ Κουροτρόφος in Athens is testified also by Proclus, Comm. in Timaeum vol. III, p. 144, 4 sqq., Diehl οὐτω δὴ καὶ αὐτὴ δυνάμεις ἔχει ποικίλας (sc. ἡ γῆ), καὶ ὅσ μὲν τροφός τὴν τελεσιουργὸν μιμεῖται τάξιν, καθ’ ἣν καὶ πάτριον Ἀθηναίως κουροτρόφον αὐτὴν ἰμένην καὶ ἀνθίζον, ὡς καὶ ἀνείσαν τὰ φυτὰ καὶ τὰ ζῷα καὶ τρέφουσαν, 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. Ὄμηρος and in Athenaeus XIII, 592a) where clearly the wish expressed is of an erotic kind and also rather iambic in nature (cf. the ὄραι of the last line). Besides, according to Athenaeus this was written by Sophocles who ὑκετεύων οὖν τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, φησιν 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: Κύπριοι Κουροτρόφος δάμαλην μέσαιτε ἐφήβοι / χαίροντες νύμφας ἐκ θαλάσσων ἀγομεν. 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 poetamium in Samos, on the occasion
of seeing a woman sacrificing to Κουρουτόφος; for her similarities with the Paphian Aphrodite and the Syria Dea are unmistakable; furthermore Charon testifies to this apud Photius s.v. Κοτηθός ὁ κατεχόμενος τῇ μητρί τῶν θεῶν: θεοφόρητος. Χάρων δὲ ὁ Λαμπακινός ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ὑπὸ Φρυγῶν καὶ Λυδῶν Κυβήθην (= Κυβέλην) λέγεσθαι. Altogether then we have a chthonic, earthly, erotic female deity for Κουρουτόφος, and Demeter as well as Aphrodite are drawn into this circle. That according to Hesiod, Theogony 450, Zeus constitutes Hecate as Κουρουτόφος of those who μετ’ ἐκείνην ὀφθαλμοὶ αἰῶντο φάος πολυδερκέος Ἥπειρος does not refute our conclusion; not because I suspect this as a secularly poetic use, but because, firstly, she is rather a κουρουτόφος εἰς ἄρχης (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 Κουρουτόφος cf. Usener, Götternamen, pp. 124 ff.). The offerings and sacrifices asked for by Κουρουτόφος in the fragment are all erotic in nature.

13. For Κονίσταλος v. Aristophanes Lysistrata 982 and scholia; also Hesychius s.v. For Παραστάται cf. Athenaeus IX, 395F: οἱ καλοῦμενοι παραστάται... εἰσὶ δ’ οἱ ὄρχεσι ὡστο καλοῦμενοι; that is the παραστάται to the πέος, standing by it. (For the anatomical reasons of this λέξεις cf. Etym. Magnum s.v. and the passage from Meletius quoted there in Gaisford’s edition -: ὅπ’ ἐνίων καλοῦνται αἱ γόνιμαι φλέβαι; Meletius: οἱ δὲ παραστάται, οἱ καὶ κρεμαστῆρες λεγόμενοι, έκφυσε εἰσί τοῦ νωτίου μυελοῦ τῆς μυεγγοῦ, σὺν φλεβὶν ἀρτηρεώδεσιν ἐν τοῖς δίδῳμις καθήκουσαι, δ’ ἔν ὑπ’ τοῦ σπέρματος εἰς τοῦ αἰδοῖον γίνεται πρόσεις. For μύρτον, cf. the ancient lexicographers (esp. Photius and Pollux II, 174). For the second method of ἀποδῆλωσις referred to in the fragment see Aristophanes Eccles. 12-13 and Lysistr. 825 sqq.: Ἀλλ’ ὅμως ἂν ὧδεις, καὶ καίπερ οὖν τὸ γραός, ὡντ’ ἀυτὸν κομήτην, ἀλλ’ ἀπεψι/λωμένον τῷ λόχῳ, where the talk is about the σάκανδρος or as the scholiast explains the γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον.

14. Suda also has s.v. σημαίνει δε καὶ τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον with reference to precisely this passage. For the following σπλεκόν (the ancient grammarians seem divided between σπλεκόν and πλεκόν) the scholiast correctly says: συνοπσιάειν, παρά τὸ πλέκεσθαι.

15. Paralleling a sentence from Pherecrates’ description of the blessed life in underworld: κόραι δ’ ἐν ἀμπεχόνοις τριχάττος ἀρτίως / ἥβουλισσαι καὶ
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 Διός καὶ Κόρης (sc. Διόνυσον), ἄλλον τοῦτον Διόνυσον (from that of Semele)· καὶ ὁ Ἰακχὸς ὁ μυστικὸς cf. Herodotus 65 τούτῳ τῷ Διονύσῳ οὐχὶ τῷ Θηβαῖῳ, ἐπάθεται); 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 Περσεφασσα καλλιταις θεά, one scholiast mentions the correct interpretation: ἦ τὸν Ἰακχὸν γεννήσασα, ἦ καλλιταις. (‘Ἰακχὸς is the ὀραῖος 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 ἐθέλε ραφαμένη σκότινον etc., has this note: οὐδὲν ἐθέλε: παρέλκει τὸ «δεν» ὡς καὶ τατρ’ Ομήρῳ «οὐδὲν ἑτεε»· θέλει δὲ εἶπεν, «οὐκ ἐθέλε» συνήθεος. Ilias A 244 and 412: ὅτε ἀριστον Ἀχαίων οὐδὲν ἑτεες καὶ ἑτεε. There is of course no problem in these instances, οὐδὲν is adverbial, and in Nubes perhaps to be taken with σκότι

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). Παντοδυνάστης occurs in the Orphic hymns 12, 4 and 45, 2.


21. Herwerden had proposed χεῖρ ἴταμῆν, 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 ἴταμῆς. Cf. what I said above for the much milder οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον.

22. See Suda οὐλισβος· αἴδοιον δερμάτινον. ὁ ἱχρόντο αἱ Μηλήσαι γυναικεῖς ὡς τριβάδες καὶ αἰσχρουργόι (feminine onanism)- ἱχρόντο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ αἱ χεῖραι γυναικεῖς (the widows)- Ἄριστοφάνης «οὐκ εἶδον οὐδ’ ἱλισβον ὁκταδάκτυλον, ὃς ἦν ἄν ἡμῖν σκυτίνη ἐπικουρία», παρὰ τὴν παρομιάν «σκυτίνη ἐπικουρία» ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενῶν. And Photius οὐλισβος· δερμάτινα αἴδοια. 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 σκότνων φλασθεῖν (leather simulacra of the penis) are also called φάλλοι (where we read: καὶ τὸ «φάλης» δερμάτινων αἰδοίων) and ἐπὶ φαλαρίων (where Alcibiades is brought into connection). Strattis’ verse apud Athenaeus XII, 551C, (= Ψυχάσσατι Fr. 57 PCG vol. VII p. 650), seems to require an interpretation distinct both from the proverbial σκουτίνη ἐπικούρια and the phallic σκουτίνη ἐπικούρια of Aristophanes. And this is the direction to which Hesychius gloss points: σκουτίνη ἐπικούρια· Ἀττικοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενοῦντων βοσθημάτων (sic; an ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενοῦντων βοσθημάτων;). Σαννύριον was ridiculed for extreme thinness (see Athenaeus loc.cit.). For various interpretations of Strattis’ σκουτίνη ἐπικούρια 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 Ψυχάσσατι mentioned in the Athenaeus passage. V. Κυνήγιας Fr.21 PCGr vol. VII p. 634. For his leanness Sannyron 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. Dalecampion interpreted therefore the σκουτίνη ἐπικούρια of Fr. 57 as a tight leather corslet worn by Sannyron to help him keep upright - an attractive way out of the difficulty. In Athenaeus XV 676F one should read Ναρκισσίνους δίλισσους (πρὸ διλίσκους) with Schweighaeuser.

23. For an illustration from a Campanian vessel see Winckelmann, Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums, new ed. 1934, pp. 123-4 and Tafel 8 at the end.

24. Hesychius: Σκουτίνων καθημένων (sc. αἰδοίων; cf. Aristophanes Nubes 538) διεξωσμένοι οἱ κωμικοὶ ύποκριται, οἱ δὲ αἰδοία δερμάτινα τοῦ γελοῖον χάριν ἀνωτέρω (πρὸ ἀνωτέρα) τῶν ἁσχίων καὶ τῶν αἰδοίων παρακείμενοι (πρὸ παρακείμεναι?).

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 Μητήρ (Κυβέλη Δημήτρη 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 Μητήρ (from Μητέρα τῶν θεῶν) inquires about the ὀλισβός or κόκκονος βαμβῶν in question.

26. Κάτω κολλά may also perhaps be used to signify a man’s fundamentum as in Aristophanes Ranae, 483-5, where one should read:
The scholiast explains: λαμβάνει ὁ Διόνυσος τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ Ξάνθιαν καὶ προσπίθησιν εἰς τὸν πρωκτόν (and this is required by the sense of the passage). ὁ δὲ τίθησι τὸν σπόγγον εἰς τὸ αἷδον αὐτοῦ γέλωτος χάρων. The last sentence indicates an extra piece of theatrical business; but the pubic area remains the main signification in these applications of κάτω κοιλίαν. Cf. also the proverb εἰς τὴν πυγὴν ἐξερύηκε ἡ σοφία. Appendix II, 32, in Corpus Paroem. Gr. vol. I.

27. This sense is confirmed by Hesychius βαυβάν· κομίζει and βαυβάν· καθεῦδειν: 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 Athenaeus XIV 618E: αἳ δὲ τῶν τιτθεωσάνων ὕδαι καταβακαλῆσαι ὦνομάζονται. And Hesychius s.v. Νύννον· ἐπὶ τοῖς παιδίως καταβακαλουμένας φασὶ λέγεσθαι. Idem βαυκαλάν· κατακομίζειν, τίθησιν, παιδία μετ' ὕδης κομίζειν (cf. also idem s.v. καταβαίκα· κατεβακαλῆσε, βαυκανιζόντων). The Latin parallel is then lallare (Persius III, 18) and lallus (Ausonius, Epist. XVI 91).


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 = Τίτθαν Fr. 231 PCG vol. II p. 151) who reports the fact, interprets: ἀντὶ τοῦ βαυκαλίσασαι. 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 ὀστρακῶν 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 exactl 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:

ηδ άς ϊμ άμ, ἀπ' ἀν, εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ ἔπιστας ἀπηγχώνισα τε αὐτὸν (i.e. removed him - ἀπό from the ἀγχών) καὶ παρέλυσα τής ἐμβροχής, ἐπὶ πολὺ τε ὁκλαξ παρακαθήμενος ἐπινύσσον τὸν ἀνθρωπον, βαυκάλων καὶ διακωδωνίζων... τὸ δὲ μάλιστα ὑνήσαν ἐκεῖνο ἵν, ὅτι ἀμφοτέραις κατα- σχῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀκρα διεπίσα. 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 βαύκαλων in Etym. Mag. is: μαλακιζόμενον, τρυφερόν καὶ ὀραϊ- στόν, which suggests luxurios softness with its regular attendants. We see the connection ibid. s.v. βαύκαδες: ὑποδήματα Ἰωνικά πολυτελή. καὶ βαυκάζε- σθαι τὸ θρήστευθαὶ· καὶ βαῦ (βαυκαλίζειν Syllburg; καταβαυκαλίζειν Herwerden) τὸ κατακομίζειν· «κατεβαυκάλισε με» φησίν ὁ κωμικός (Aristophanes? so Dindorf, Fr. 716; Gaisford ad Etym. Mag. s.v. Βαυκίδες reports Sturzius’ 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 κατακομίζειν) we have precisely the modern Greek sense. Similarly Aristophanes Fr. 319 Blaydes = Fr. 355 PCG vol. III 2 p. 200, apud Aspasius, ad Aristor. Eth. p. 58A ed. Aldina = CAG XX p. 200 Heych.: Βαυκά... τρυφερόν, ὡς ὀ ποιητής Ἀραρῶς (Aristophanes son) ἐν Καμπυλών (Fr. 9 PCG vol. II p. 528): Βαυκά, μαλακά, τερπινά, τρυφερά. Μετενεργέχθαι δ’ έοικεν τὸ ὄνομα ἀπὸ τῶν βαυκίδων, ὃ ἐστὶν εἴδοσ ὑποδη- μάτων Ἰωνικῶν, οἷς αἱ Ίάδες χρύνται, οὐ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν ταῖς Θεσσαλοραξούσαις (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 Τάραντίνοι (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 ἀγενελοῖς ἴσως ἔπεστι τις / χάρις: ἀλλ’ ἐπάν δὴ τὸν γόπτα Θεό- δοτον /

η (καὶ Hirschig, Jacobi) τῶν παραμασώντων (καὶ παραμασή- της from μασσώ, i.e. parasite) ἰδίῳ τῶν ἀνόσιων

βαυκαζόμενον τὰ λευκά τ’ ἀναβάλλονθ’ ἁμα

(Jacobs; τὰ λευκά τῶν ἄβαβλων θ’ sic libri; for the sence v. Pollux II 60 Κτη- σίας δὲ που φήσιν ἀναβάλλειν τὰ λευκά τῶν ὁφθαλμῶν τῶν Σαρδανά- παλλον; cf. Athenaeus XII p. 2529 A)
For ἀναπήξαμι ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου cf. πρὸς τῇ σανίδι δεύν, Aristophanes, Thesmophoriaz. 940, and scholium ad loc. Perhaps simply: put in stocks. Ἀναβάλλει τὰ λευκὰ 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 δὲ φησιν, ἀναβάλλει τὰ λευκὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τῶν Σαρδανάπαλον (Sardanapalus being very apt company to our Theodotus). As to βαυκαζόμενον, Hesychius explains it as τρυφερὸν καὶ ὑπαίστην; and Pollux IV, 100 has: βαυκαζόμενον, Βάικου ὀρχήσταστοι κώμοι ἐπίσώμοι, ἀβρά τε ὀρχήσει καὶ τὸ σώμα ἐξυγραίνουσα, where ἐξυγραίνουσα connotes a lewd, lustful abandon. (As to the dancer Βάικος, the likelihood is that he - whether a real or imaginary dancer - was named because of the character of his κώμος, rather than vice-versa). The nature and character of this dance is significant in our context. It is as Hesychius says, confirming Pollux, Ἰωνικῆς ὀρχήσεις· καὶ εἰδὸς ὑδής πρὸς ὀρχήσεις πεποιημένον. The scholiast ad Aristophanes, Equites, 20, commenting on ἀπόκονον explains: ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ εἰδὸς ὀρχήσεως φορτικῆς (coarse, vulgar)· οἱ δὲ μέλος (cf. the ὑδή of Hesychius)· καὶ ὁ βαυκαζόμενος. Thus our βαυκαζόμενος is connected with ἀπόκονον which is again identified with μακτρισμός in Athenaeus XIV 629E: θὴν δὲ ἀπόκονον καλουμένην ὀρχήσεις, ἡς μηνυμονεύει Κρατῖνος ἐν Ὑμείσαις (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 Κενταύρως (Fr. 272 Blaydes = 269 Dindorf Fr. 287 PCG vol. III 2 p. 163) καὶ ἄλλοι πλείονες, ὥστερον μακτρισμῶν ὁνόμασαν· ἦν καὶ πολλαὶ γυναῖκες ὀφρούστα, ἄς καὶ μακτυριάς (ex maktyripias) ὄνομαζομένας οἴδα. This was a lascivious and obscene kind of dance, v. Pollux IV 101: βακτρισμός (sic; probably to be connected to μακτρισμός from Athenaeus or rather we should read μακτρισμός) δὲ καὶ ἀπόκονος καὶ ἀπόσεις ἀσελγῆς εἰδῆ ὀρχήσεως ἐν τῇ τῆς ὀσφύος περιφορᾷ - in the circular movement of the loins; and this is how we should understand the γελοῖα = scabrously ludicrous, cf. Athenaeus XIV 629F: καὶ γελοῖα δὲ εἶπόν ὀρχήσεως ἐγείς καὶ μακτρισμός, ἀπόκονος τε καὶ σοφάς, ἔτι δὲ etc. For ἐγείς cf. Pollux 104 and Etym. M. s.v., in which latter passage again the λυγασμός of ὀσφύος (bending and twisting of the loins) is mentioned (Bothc’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: Ἀπόκονος: γένος ὀρχήσεως φορτικῆς· οἱ δὲ μέλος, ἃς ὁ κυναιδουράφων ἱμμύσοις. To end with two further
glosses from Hesychius: βαυκά· ἡδέα. And βαυκίζματα· τρυφερόματα (= 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 βαυκιζμενον to judge from Kaibel’s silence in his edition) but later MSS must have had καυκιζμενον 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 βαυκιλίζω, comments: ἀντὶ τοῦ βαυκιλίσαι (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 ἐνάντια τοῦ ἀβάκειν (it is about the ἀβάκησαν in Homer Odyssey δ, 249), βάβαξ, ἤτοι λάλος, μανιόμενος, ἁσω- τος, γάλλος κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς (οὗ (sc. of the word βάβαξ) χρήσις καὶ παρὰ Λυκόφρον (472)); ὁ δ’ αὐτός καὶ βαβάκτης, ἐκ τοῦ βάζεων.

31. Ptolemy, Tetrabiblos 164, has κραυγάζως according to some MSS, also κραυγαστάς, κραυγάσως, κραυγαστικοῦς according to others.

32. Cf. Etym.Mag. s.v. κῆλον: τὸ ἀνανεόν καὶ κατανεόν ξύλον, ὡς ξύλινος ἀνπλητήρ 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: ᾧβαζος· ἱσυχος, ἤγουν ἑστεριμένος τοῦ βάζεων, ὃ ἐστὶ 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 ἕγνοσαν and ἕγοχαν; 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 ἕγοχων καὶ πράδων (cf. also Hesychius s.v.); Anacreon’s Fr. 7A (Bergk), where, very significantly, chthonic and tortuous rythms are contrasted to those of ἀβακιζμένοι, to the ἕγοχιοι and μὴ θεροβζόδεις;
Finally the following gloss should be noted: άβακηνος· τούς γυναίκι μη όμιλήσαντας (Photius). Here, we have both the metaphorical use of ὄμιλια (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: Fά-κ-χος, Fl-Fa-κ-χος, Fa-Fά-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 Ἀρης. We find again the spirit of quarrelsomeness and strife and powerful struggle. 3) The same basic story is told by the Laconic idiom βαβάλων for κραυγάσαν (v. Hesychius ν. βάβαλων). 4) But βάβαλων, according to the same Hesychius, is also the αἰδότων pudendum (βάμβαλων is the Phrygian variant according to the same, s.v.). And, I believe, the same root and meaning underlie βούβάλων which is explained as pudendum muliebre, γυναικὸς μόριον: for to the βα-βα-λ-ον of the former type, there answers the βου-βα-λ-ον of the second, the πρόθεμα Βου- (from βούς) signalizing large size. Here the circle has closed: we have come up with the Empedoclean κολία once more.

35. Perhaps the suspect entry: Βαρβός· μύστρον, ἐν Θεσσαλοραξώσας in Hesychius (Fr. 320 Dindorf; 326 Blydes = Fr. 354 PCG vol. III 2 p. 199), should be written thus: βαυβός· μύσχον, which latter word is explained by Hesychius as τὸ ἀνδρέων καὶ γυναικεῖον αἰδών. 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 Θεσσαλοραξώσας 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 Ὠ generally, one should compare e.g. the scholiast in Equites 1068: Κερδὼ δὲ ἡ ἀλώπης παρὰ τὴν κερδοσύνην, τοῦτοτι τῆν πανωργίαν, ὡς Εἰδοθεὰ Εἰδώ καὶ Υἱπτύλη Ὀψω. This form implies familiarity, even a trace of coarseness and vulgarity (augmented in some uses), as of a low nickname.

36. χοῖρος = τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδών; 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: Ἀκροκορυθῆσα ἔωικας χοροποιώσεως (ἀντί τοῦ: ἔωικας μεθαρπήσειν 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 muliebre is mentioned as a well-known fact by Eustathius p. 1539, 33: ὅτι δὲ πολυώνυμον ἄν τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδών (ἄμβων τε γὰρ λέγεται καὶ χοῖρος καὶ ἑσαχάρα καὶ δέλτα, τὸ αὐτὸ ἢκὲ καὶ κέλης καλεῖται παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς) οὐκ ἄδηλον ἔστι. 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 χοιροτροφεῖον: περίξωμα γυναικείον (i.e., as Pergerus puts it, zona pudendi muliebris).

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: Ἐίδε μὲν ἄρα οὐ τούτο ξυμβαίνει, οὔτε πάθαι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ λέγεται, το χωρίζειν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἐθίσαι αὐτὴν καθ’ αὐτήν πανταχοῦ ἣ τοῦ σώματος συναγείρεσθαι τε καὶ ἀθροίζεσθαι, καὶ οἶκεῖν κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ νόπ παρώντι καὶ ἐν τῷ ἑπείτα μόνῃ καθ’ αὐτήν, ἐκλυομένην ὡσπερ ἣ δεσμῶν ἢ 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) § Ἴρκη. 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 ἐπιτελούμενων, τὰ μὲν ἀπόρρητῶν τινα καὶ κρείττων λόγου τῆς αἰτίαν ἔχει: τὰ δὲ ὡς σύμβολα καθιέρωται ἐξ ἁδίου τοῖς κρείττων: τὰ δὲ ἐκόνα τινα ἅλλην ἀποσώζει, ...τὰ δὲ τιμήν ἐκεῖν προσάγεται ἢ ἀφομοίωσεις ὑποισοῦν ἢ καὶ οἰκείωσεις στοχάζεται: ἐνα δὲ τὸ ἡμῖν χρήσιμον παρασκευάζῃ ἢ καθαίρει ὡποῖοι καὶ ἀπολύει τὰ ἡμέτερα τῶν ἀνθρώπων πάθη, ἢ ἄλλο τοῖς 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 δύναμεις τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων παθημάτων τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν, πάντη μὲν εἰρήμονε καθιστανται
σφοδρότεραι· εἰς ἐνέργειαν δὲ βραχεῖς καὶ ἄχρι τοῦ συμμέτρου προαγόμενα χαῖρονσι μετρῶς καὶ ἀποπληροῦνται, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἀποκαθαρόμενα πειθοὶ καὶ οὐ πρὸς βλαν ἀναπαύονται. Διὰ δὴ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ κομῳδίᾳ καὶ τραγῳδίᾳ ἀλλότρια πάθη θεωροῦντες ἱσταμέν τά ὀικεῖα πάθη καὶ μετρώτερα ἀπεργαζόμεθα καὶ ἀποκαθαρόμεν (cf. Aristotle’s definition of tragedy), ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς, θέμασι ταῖς καὶ ἀκούσας τῶν αἰσχρῶν, ἀπολυόμεθα τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων ἀπ’ αὐτῶν συμπεπτοσύνης βλάβης. Θεραπείας οὖν ἕνεκα τῆς ἐν ἴμῳ ὑψηλῆς καὶ μετρότητος τῶν διὰ τὴν γένεσιν προσφυμομένων αὐτῆς κακῶν, λύσεώς τε ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμῶν καὶ ἀπαλλαγῆς χάριν τὰ τοιαῦτα προσαγεται· καὶ ἀν τὸ τοῦτο ἐικότως αὐτὰ ἄκεα ὶῬακλεῖος προσέπετον (Fr. 68 DK) ὡς ἐξακούμενα τὰ δεινά etc.

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

καὶ ξώνων πάντων, ὁπόσ’ ἐν κόλπῳσιν τιθηνεὶ
γαῖα θεὰ μήτηρ καὶ πόντιος εἶναίος Ζεὺς (sc. Ποσειδῶν)

“All animals which Earth and Poseidon take care of and breed”.

Sophocles, Oedipus Colon. 1050-51 οὗ (in Eleusis) πόντιαι (Demeter and Persephone) σεμάντηονται τελή/θντοσίν 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 Bergk. As to the metaphorical use of τιθήνη cf. Pindar Python. I, 20: νῦφέσα’ Αἴτνα, πάνετες χύνον δόειας 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: βλού 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 ἄνωδος 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 Ἀνταλα) 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 Βραυβῶι to Βαυβῶ. 
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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 Euboulos 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 licentiousness sometimes towards human beings; cf. Iamblichus Babylonica, apud Photius cod. 94, 3: καὶ τράγου τι φάσμα ἐρᾷ Σινωνίδος; also cf. Philostratus, Vita Apollonii VI, 27: ἐπεφοίτα δὲ ἀρά τῇ κόμη δέκατον ἥδη μὴνα Σατύρου φάσμα λυττών ἐπὶ τὰ γυναῖκα ετσ.

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 Συνιάστης (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 ἡμνασμένος! One may also suggest that οὐδενὸς ἀλλος is related to the affair concerning the divulgement, on the part of Aeschylus, of mystic doctrines and his consequent impeachment before the Areopagus. Cf. Aristotle, Ethica Nicom. III, 1111a10 (according to whom Aeschylus pleaded οὐκ εἶδεν τι ἀπόρρητα ἕν, ὡς περ Αἰσχύλος τὰ μυστικά; Eustathius, Comm. in Aristotel. Eth. Nic. ad loc. - where the plays in which this occurred are mentioned: Ἰέρεια, Τοξότιδες, Σίνουφος Πετροκυλιστής, Ἰφιγένεια, Οἰδίπους; all of them probably connected with Artemis; perhaps we ought to excise [καὶ ἐν ὸιδίποδι] - Aelianus, Varia Historia V, 19; Clement, Stromata B, p. 461 (Potter) according to which: ὡς Αἰσχύλος τὰ μυστήρια ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἐξετῆσιν εἶπόν ετς 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 Οὐδὲνος 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, andaspectually identified with Kore. If this suggestion is correct, we may then understand the οὐδὲνος ἄλλον 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 ζωογονικὴ τάξις is analysed, the second triad of the Assimilative or Ηγεμονικοί gods. The Κορικὴ τριάς is then named Ἀρτέμις - Περσεφόνη - Ἀθηνᾶ according to Orphic theology and Ἐκάτη - Ψυχή - 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 θεοὶ. See finally the passages from Proclus' Commentary on Cratylus, to be adduced below). It does no 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 (πολλὴ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὴν ἕγκοσμον Ἐκάτην ἕνωσις, καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὴν Κόρην), a fact which is mentioned as something evident to those with even a slight acquaintance with Orphic tradition (φανερὸν τοῖς καὶ ὀλγα τῷ Ὀρφεί παραβεβληκόσων p. 106, 25-27); finally the union (identification, ἕνωσις, 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᾽ ἧμιν πάτρια τὴν αὐτὴν Δήμητρα τε καὶ Λητῷ θεραπεύουσιν, τὴν ἕνωσιν ἐνδεικνύμενα τῶν θεανῶν (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 nebulousness 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 Ἀρτεμιν θυγατέρα εἶναι καὶ ὁ Δητῶς, ὡς τοῦ Ἀιγυπτίων τὸν λόγον Ἀισχύλος ἐδόθη Ἐσθηρίων τοὺς Ἑλλήνας). Pausanias speaks chiefly of Δέσποινα, the deity most revered by the Arcadians (παύτην μάλιστα θεῶν σέβοντι οἱ Ἀρκαδές 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 Ἐρενώς; Βρομώ 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 (Ἀίσχυλος δὲ ὁ Ἐσθηρίων καλεὶ Δία καὶ τὸν ἐν θαλάσσῃ) to which Hermann (Fr. 385) very appositely compares Proclus in Plat. Cratylum 148 (p. 83, 28-9 Pasquali): ὁ δὲ δεύτερος (sc. Ζεὺς) δυνάμεως καλεῖται Ζεὺς ἐνάλλος καὶ Ποσείδων (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 satyr play Δικτυνακόλο Fr. 46a 10 Radt: ἀνὰξ Πόσειδον Ζεῦ τ’ ἐνάβλιε. Cf. Orphic Hymn 63.16 πόντιος εὐάλλος Ζεῦς. And the correspondence of Δέσποινα to Kore is intensified by the mystic symbols (κάστη, 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 Δεσποῖνης τὸ ὄνομα ἐδέω εἰς τοὺς ἀτελέστοις 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 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 disconcern 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 αἰδοίον 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 Καβειρικὴ 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 ἔτούτως (sc. τοὺς Κοῦρης καὶ Κορύβαντας mentioned immediately before) παρίσημο 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, ἀνεσκολυπτεῖν, ἀποσκολυπτεῖν, συνεσκολυμμένον, σκολύπτειν, κάβηλος, κάληβος, Λομβδών (where note the very interesting connection with Λόμβατι, Κύρων).

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. περιπεπληθαί. 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 Λακεδαιμόνια κόραι δεσμευόμοναν άξιοστοι καὶ ἄχιστοις (without any inner vestment), ἵπποι δὲ θ' ἐκατέρον τῶν ὀμοιοι. Καὶ Καλλίμαχος (Fr. 225 Bentley = Fr. 620a Pfeiffer):

εἰκεν τ' ἄξιοστος χάτερόπορπος ἐτι.

καὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαίαις γραφαίς (paintings) οὐκ ὀλίγαι (sic M, correctly; sc. γυναῖκες, κόραι) οὖτως (Cobet’s correction from τ') ἔσταλται· καὶ δωριάζειν τὸ γυμνουμένας φαίνεσθαι τὰς γυναῖκας. Ἀνακρέων (Fr. 59 = Fr. 399 Page) ἐκδόσα χιτώνα (καθώνa Page) δωριάζειν. Cf. Etym. Megnum, 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 φαινομηνίδες (or φαινομηνίδες) 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) φαινομηνίδας ἔλεγον παρὰ τὸ φαίνειν τῶν μηρών.

56. Perhaps it is in this connection that we should understand μεγαρικαῖς σφιγγαῖς, v. Suda, Hesychius and Photius s.v. in conjunction. Σφιγγαῖ, just as σφιγκταί (cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v.), from σφίγγῳ, tighten, compress (for σφιγκτήριον, tightly in a particularly relevant sense, signifying the sphincter muscle of the anus, see Anth. Graecca XII.7). In this context μεγαρικαῖ, then may be connected not so much with Megara (though Megarians had a reputation for σκαλπίζειν), 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 τὴν σιωπὴν τῶν χαρωφάλας· Σικούνιοι τοῦτον προσκυνοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικείων τάξεις τὸν Διόνυσον μορίων (literally on them), ἐφορον αἰσχοὺς τοῦ ὑβρεῖς (here in the sense of sexual violation) σεβάζομεν ἄρχηγόν. This passage is particularly clear as to the precise implications of the etymology. It is also significant to note that the scholium to the Clementine passage, after explaining the χαρωφάλας, 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.:

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΙΙΣ. χοίρε, χοίρε. ΚΟΡΗ. κοί κοί. ΔΙ. τρύγοις ἄν ἐρεβάνθους.
where the scholiast remarks: ἐπαίξε ἐν ἄμα, ἐπικαὶ ἐν ἄμα, ἐπικαὶ ἐν ἄμα. And we have already studied the equivalence χοίρος = γυναικείων ἄμα. 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 ἐν ἄμα τινικόλπιος (in the Orphic hymn 52, 11) as signifying the same. But, conversely, it is abundantly clear that ἐν ἄμα τινικόλπιος in these contexts means primarily on, or close to, the female pudendum (cf. Kern, Ophica 31, 24; 32c, 8; and our Βαυβόδις ὑπὸ κόλπος 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 (ο 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 ταβινίδα where suckling pigs were offered at the temple of Κορυβάλλα ὁ Ἀρτέμις 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 mystic (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: …μισθολογία γενέσθαι Διόνυσον ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Περσεφόνης, ὦς δὲ 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 mystic 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: μισθολογείται δ’ ὦτι διασπαρ-
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) ἐπάφρε), 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 παυσίλωτος et φιλάσινος 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 *Βρωμὼ*, 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 *Ερυνός* 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 unitiated; from the parallelism with the former passage we must assume that the non-committal name was Δέσποινα. On *Βρωμὼ* 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 ἄργιζωσθαι, τὸ ὀργίζωσθαι καὶ ἀσπελεῖν - ; Xenophon, *Inst. Cyri* IV, 5-9). It could also mean power, extreme potential of energy: cf. *Homeric Hymn to Athena* 9-10:

μέγας δ’ ἔλελίξετ' Ὀλυμπός
deinóν ὑπὸ βρίμης γλαυκώπιδος.

And similarly in Apollonius Rhodius IV 1676-7:

"Ως γε χάλκειος περ ἑών ὑπόειξε δαμήναι
Μηδείας βρήμη πολυφαρμάκου"
where the scholiast has βρίμη, τῇ ἵσχύ. 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· ὑγξε ἐissorsυνοσίαν. Κύπρου, 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 γυναικεῖα ἀρρητοποιία, which, given the sense of ἀρρητοποιεῖν (and ἀρρητορυγεῖν) must mean the deviantly induced orgasm in a female; this would naturally point to the ὀλοσβος and the σκωτίνη 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 mystical formula and interpretation of the words is included: καθάπερ αὐτῶς ὁ ἱεροφάντης... νυκτὸς ἐν Ἑλευσίνι ὑπὸ πολλῶν πυρὶ τελῶν τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἀρρητα μνητήρια βοᾶ καὶ κέκραγε λέγων: «ἰερὸν ἔτεκε πότια κούρον Βριμῶ Βριμῶ» τουτόστων 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 Demeter. 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 Φεραῖή 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 ἡ Φεραῖήν...<br>...η ὅ ἀυτῇ λέγεται καὶ 'Εκάτη. <καὶ> Ἀπολλώνιος: Βριμῶ νυκτιπόλον χθονίνον ἐνέρωσαν ἀνασαν (Γ, 862) (the same in Etym. Magn. s.v.). And the scholion continues: εἶρησαν δὲ ὅτι Ερμὴν ἐφασθέντα ἐπὶ κυνησιάν ἐξουσίας κυνησίας βιαίως μεγήναι, ἢ ἐνεβριμήσατο αὐτῶν ὅ ὂ δομοθεῖς ἀπετράπῃ. Καὶ ἐνεῦθεν 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 ἡ Περσεφόνη Βριμῶ λέγεται. Διόκει δὲ ἡ αὐτῇ 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:
which should refer to Proserpina (ἐνέρωσιν ἀνασαν) but also to Demeter (Ḳουρωτρόφον), or rather to Kore in her Motherly function; whereas in Γ, 1211 he has: Βρμω νυκτιπόλοι, χθονίην, ἐνέρωσιν ἀνασαν ἔνας ἐν νυκτί etc.

which should refer to Proserpina (ἐνέρωσιν ἀνασαν) but also to Demeter (Ḳουρωτρόφον), or rather to Kore in her Motherly function; whereas in Γ, 1211 he has: Βρμω νυκτιπόλοι ἐκάττων ἐπαρωγόν ἀέθλουν (in the scholia to the former passage the explanation given (νυκτερινά φάσματα, Ἐκατεία, Ἐμπουσα v. Hesychius s.v. Ἐμπουσα) fits Hecate). In the Orphic Argonautica 17-8 by Βρῳοφ εὐδυνάτοιο γονάς, we must understand Dionysus’ birth from Persephone, as the ἐργα ἄδηλα Γηγενέων (referring to the διαμελαιμός of Ζαγρεύς by the Titans) makes clear. And similarly in v. 427. In Theodoretus, Graecarum Affectionum Curatio p. 10, 18 ff. (ed. Raeder) Βρμω is associated with Rhea and Cybele as another name for the same deity. (In Lucianus, Menippus, 20, we can only with certainty deduce that Βρμω is a chthonic divinity. Probably it refers to Hecate, since Persephone would be associated to the ἅρχαι). The sense of the word is certain in our religious contexts: Βρμω 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 Βρμω. 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 Ἀρτεμις Ταυροπόλος or Βένος, and the compressed energy of a repressed sexuality which she violently releases from time to time. These are the archetypes from which Βρμω is made. An important bearing belonging to the noticed parallelism between Βρμω and Ἐρινός, 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 μήνις and Zeus’ atonement after the γαμηλίως ἐπὶ τῇ κόρῃ ὑμεναῖος, (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 θέσμοι exploitation of that which is the most eloquent index of our fallen state in γένεσις: the point then is that θέσμοι 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 θέσμα 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: ταύρος δράκοντος καὶ πατήρ ταύρου δρα-κων (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 (θεόν πάτερ ἡδὲ καὶ νέοι, 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: Περσεφάσασα... πυρδρακοντόξων παῖ.

60. The feminine of Φόρβας (cf. s.v. Hesychius and Harpocration s.v. Φορβαντέιον). He is connected with the mystic Κουρήτες and with Ερωταίος (probably as Ερωτέων), whose importance, for our purpose, in the mythological and cultic cycle is clear from its parallelism.

61. To be connected with Ἀρτεμίς Ορβία probably. An epitheton with unmistakable phallic connotations. Cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v. Ὀρβάνης, Ὀρβαγόρκος (with the notes in Alberti’s edition), and Ὄρβας. 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).


64. The identity of οὖρά (in such contexts) with the male organ, is further confirmed by Eustathius p. 1821, 52: παλαιὰ δὲ χρήσις οὐρὰν παῖζε καὶ τὸ ἀνδρεῖον αἴδοιον ὀθεν καὶ γυνὴ μύξουρις (from μυξάω + οὐρά, one practising fellatio) ἢ αἰσχροτωπώς (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, Orphica, 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: Μία τις (vel Μισαῖς); Μία τῶν περὶ τὴν μητέρα τις, ἦν καὶ ὁμόνοοι. That they even take oaths on her bespeaks her importance. For Hesychius entry Μία θεός see below in the text.

67. I may recommend in this connection the article already referred by Dieterich, Die Göttin Mise, 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. μησήτης· τὴν καταφερὴ (or rather κατωφερὴ) λέγουσιν, and the following entry, where, after quoting the Cratinean fragment to be adduced in the text, he adds: τὸν δὲ ἀπλῶς μυσητὸν, τὸν ἀνίκανον (sc. ad rem veneream) ἥ ἀπληστον τῇ τρυφῇ. (This connection between impotence and insatiability, confirmed also by other grammarians not only regarding food, cf., Photius s.v. μυσήτα· ἥ πρὸς ὅτι οὖν ἄχαρες ἀπληστία are well exemplified s.v. Κύρων, 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 μησήτη v. also Etym. M. (where it is explained as πόρνη and deduced from μίσεσθαι) and especially Suda, s.v. μισήτη and μισητία (the same lemma in Photius Lexicon). Cf. Eustathius, p. 1650, 64 sqq.: αὐτὸ δὲ γε τὸ μυσεῖν, κοινότερον ἐπὶ τὸν ἔχθρανεν τεθεῖν ἡ κωμικὴ σεμνότης (!) ἐπὶ μίξεων ἔθετο ἀνέμνων. Ἀριστοφάνης γοῦν μυσητάν ἐπὶ κατωφερείαν ἔφη, ἦγον ροπὴς ἀσχέτω τῆς περὶ μίξεως· ἄλλοι δὲ μισήτη· τὴν βαρυτύνου, πρὸς διαστολὴν τῆς ὀξυτονομῆνης, τὴν κοινὴν καὶ ραβδίαν (sc. γυνὴν) λέγοντες, καὶ χρῆσαν αὐτῆς εἶλαι παρὰ Κρατίκω καὶ Σώφρονι. Χρᾶται δ’ αὐτῇ καὶ παρομία ἐν τῷ περὶ (vel παρὰ) σφυρὸν σαχέα μισήτη γυνή. The proverb occurs in the Corpus Paroem. Vol. II (ed. Leutsch) Apostolius XIII, 95 where the explanation is: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνακάνων τῇ μισητία. I take this to refer to impotence from unsatiable desire, just as the ἀσχέτες ροπὴ 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’ ἀφροδισίαις μαινομένου (where in ἐρωτομανῶν καὶ ὁ μισέρως we should probably correct to μισηφέρωs with Dindorf or rather μισήφερωs). 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 μίσο. 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 κατωφερὴ (the lecherous, lustful woman) μισητὴν ἔλεγον οὐ παρὰ τὸ μῖσος, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸ μίσησθαι... οἶονε μυσήτην τίνα ὁδησαν. 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 Μύση: why should it be connected to μισῆ (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: Μήσῃ. The other runs as follows: Ἀνθίς ζέρεω Μήσῃ Κόρῃ (Μήσῃ Κόρῃ 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 Ἱερὰ 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’ οὐκαὶ, τῆς μητρὸς ἀκηκοώς... and then follows a way of getting rid of the annoying presence of a Satyr. The οὐκαὶ 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 ἀκηκοώς?

73. For further information consult Aelianus, Variae Historiae 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.


75. Notice, e.g., the prominent role of myrtle in the ceremonies and myths connected with this goddess. We know that μύρτων = τὸ γυναικεῖον αἶδοιον; cf. e.g. Suda s.v.; Pollux II, 174 where it is especially the κλειτορίς.

76. Zeus has also as one of his epithets ἄγαθος: 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: ...ἐστι τῆς ὀδὸς ἐν ἀριστερᾷ Ἀγαθοῦ Θεοῦ ναός· εἰ δὲ ἀγαθῶν οἱ θεοὶ δοτηρέσ εἶσιν ἀνθρώποις, Ζεὺς δὲ ὑπάτος θεῶν ἐστὶν, ἐπόμενος ἓν τις τῶν λόγω τῆς ἐπίκλησιν ταῦτιν Διὸς τεκμαίροντο εἶναι.

77. Compare what Macrobius says, on Varro’s authority (Saturnalia I, 12, 27): haec (sc. Bona Dea) apud Graccos θεὸς γυναικεία dicitur, quam Varro Fauni filiam tradit adeo pudicam ut extra γυναικείων 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, Actia 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: ὑπολόγισεν ἢ σκέτωμα ἢ ἀφροδίσιον τὴν ἑρωργίαν ἐκείνην (ἄκειν; τις ἐκείνης; ἐπιτελοῦσαν· οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἐξοικήζουσα τοὺς ἀνδρας ἀλλὰ καί πάν ἄρρεν ἐξελάνυσε τῆς οἰκίας, ὡσπερ τὰ νενομισμένα τῇ βοῶθο ποιώσαι (cf. Pausanias VII, 27, 10: τρίτη δὲ ἡμέρα τῆς ἑορτῆς in honour of Demeter Μυσία; is the epithet from μυσιάω; ὑπέξεισαν οἱ ἄνδρες ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καταλειπόμεναι δὲ αἱ γυναικεὶς δρώσιν 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, ο: 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 (σο 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 Μίσα) 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 Μίση could represent two alternative Greek renderings of a foreign word (whose sound might have been something like Μίζα ζ is δα 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 μῦγ- as the basis of all these forms. This would be to vindicate the ancient grammarians who connected μυσήτη etc. with μύσω μεγνώς etc.; cf. the already-mentioned Suda's passage (s.v. μυσήτη) and also scholia in Aristophanes Plutus 989: οὐχ ἔνεκεν μυσήτη- σορφώνεια, οἴονε μυσήτης, πάρα τὸ μύσωσθαι... μυσήτη- μύεως, συναφείς, απὸ τοῦ μύσιγγο τὸ μῦγγητα καὶ μυσήτη. For the occurrence of the root μῦγ- 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 δε as a Doric by-form for γα, γη - hence Δαμάτρη Δημήτρη). A derivation then μιγ-, 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 μισητία in question was really a μιση-ητία, 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. Δυσαώλησ reports: Ἄσκληπιαδὰς δ’ ἐν δ’ Τραγωδομένων τόν Δυσαώλην αὐτόχθωνα εἶναι φησίν, συνοικήσαντα δὲ Βαυδοί σχεῖν παῖδας Πρωτογόνην τε καὶ Μίσαν (codd Πρωτογόνην τε καὶ Νῖσαν vel Κύλαν, corrected, with respect to Μίσαν, by Müller E.H.Gr. II 339, adopted by Dieterich op.cit. p. 2 n. 6; the Πρωτογόνη instead of Πρωτογόνη was suggested by Dieterich loc.cit., with reference to Pausianias I, 31, 4 - should it be also connected with the Πρωτογόνεια in Pindar, Olymp. IX 41?). Παλαίφατος δ’ ἐν θ’ Τρωίκών σύν τῇ γυναίκι φησίν αὐτῶν ὑποδέξασθαι τῇ Δήμητρᾳ. Πρωτογόνη symbolizes, in the present context, the Koric, maiden, virgin aspect of the figure whose lecherous use is typified by Misa, namely of femineity in its sexual distinctness, which again is signified by Baubo, their mother. Unless one should read instead of Πρωτογόνη, Πρωτόγονον, some manifestations of the primeval Πρωτόγονος, about which something more will be said below. Δυσαώλης, 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 ἄγνην; Hermann, following Vossius reads ἄγνην τ’ εἰδερόν 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 ἄγνην 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 Λύσεισ Ἰακχός genannt”. Apparently following this idea, Quandt has ἄγνην εἰδερόν 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 = Ἰακχός in the said context, I am well aware
that, from another point of view, the equation $\Delta \delta$ holds undoubtedly good. The point is such matters do not belong to the proper field of ordinary arithmetic. $\Delta \delta$, $\delta$ and $\iota$ may well signify the same Wesen, and yet Dionysus may represent its active, male aspect, $\delta$ 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 $\delta$ 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 acceptation. 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 acceptation, 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 $\iota$ of Zeus with Persephone: cf. hymn 52, 5: $\kappa \rho \upsilon \iota$. Cf. also 29, 7; 30, 7. $\iota$ 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: $\alpha i \alpha i$, $\delta \iota \kappa e\rho \omega \zeta$ $\delta \iota \mu \omicron \phi \omega$, according to Firmicus Maternus, De Errore Profan. Relig. XXI, 2. (The reading is really corrupt, as is much Greek in Latin contexts; something like $\varepsilon \alpha \iota \alpha \iota \kappa e \rho \omega \zeta \Delta \iota \omicron \omicron \omicron \phi \omicron \epsilon \varphi$). On the other hand $\delta \varepsilon \phi \nu \iota\varsigma$ rather than $\delta \iota \mu \omicron \rho \omicron \phi \omega$ conveys the idea of hermaphroditism: $\delta \iota \mu \omicron \rho \omicron \phi \omega$ 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 $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \acute{a} \rho \chi \acute{e} \tau \varsigma$ in v. 3 reminds one of the $\acute{a} \rho \chi \gamma \acute{e} \tau \varsigma$ 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) *Koríbas*; but Clement, *Protrepticus* II, 19, 1-4 brings the Corybantic myth into connection with Dionysus’ membra 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 εξ ὀφεώς ταῦρος καὶ ἐκ ταῦρου ὀφις 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 θηλύς τε καὶ ἄρσην (subtly differentiating from the ἄρσην καὶ θήλος "Iakchos"); we have met with this before, when discussing some passages from the magical papyri. *Μήν* is the female aspect of *Μή*, cf. the hymn apud Hippolytus, *Elenci* Graeca, 9, 8 (p. 99.16 Wendland), where *Μή*, 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 Ἡλιος should be seen. In I, 18, 12 he invokes Orpheus’ testimony:

\[
\text{τήκων αθέρα διον ἄκινητον πρὸν ἔντα
εξανέφηνε θεὸν + ὅραν + κάλλιστον ἵδεσθαι,
ὅν δὴ νῦν καλέωσι Φάνητα τε καὶ Διόνυσον
Εὔβουλῆτα τ’ ἀνακτα καὶ Ἀνταύγην ἀρίδηλον·
ἀλλ’ ἄλλο καλοῦσιν ἐπιχειρόνων ἀνθρώπων.}
\]

(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 θεὸς ὦραν accepted by Kern as well, Fr. 237 taking it as an accusative of respect as Gesner: Φάνης ὦραν κάλλιστος. But this is not fully satisfactory. I suspect (unless one could correct it simply to θεὸς θεόν γέ. But could that be corrupted?) that a name is hidden there (cf. δὴ νῦν etc.), and indeed Gesner suggested ὦρων (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 μυν
...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 Ωρος, 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 Έρως, the Πρωτόγονος divinity. He was originated by the melting down of Aether, which thus underwent the first change and movement. Who did it (τῆκων); Perhaps Χρόνος, if τῆκων is genuine. Usually the aether πρόγνυται (ἐφφάγη, ρήξαν) in the generation of Phanes. The proper way to understand such identities is the Neoplatonic one: consult, e.g., Proclus, In Timeaeum 29a, b (I, 336, 6 Diehl): πάλαι γὰρ ὁ Θεολόγος (i.e. the theologian par excellence, Orpheus) ἐν τῷ Φάννητι τὴν δημιουργικὴν αἰτίαν (sc. Ζεὺς) ἀνύμνησεν - ἐκεί γὰρ ἦν τε καὶ προῆν (ἀντέρ ἀφῃ καὶ αὐτός): Ἀρχίμος τε μέγας καὶ Ζεῦς ὁ πανόπτης, ἦν δὲ τῆς διπτῆς δημιουργίας ἔχῃ τὰς οἰονεὶ πηγὰς (Zeus is the principle of the καθολικὴ δημιουργία, Dionysus of the μεριστή δημιουργία): καὶ ἐν τῷ Δᾶ τὴν παραδειγματικὴν (sc. ἀνύμνησεν though the παραδειγματική τάξις, represented by Phanes is above the δημιουργική, signaled by Zeus): Μήτης γὰρ αὐτὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστιν, ὡς φησί: καὶ Μήτης, πρῶτος γενέτωρ, καὶ Ἀρώς πολυτερῆς (sc. are in Zeus; cf. Fr. 168, v. 9), αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Διόνυσος καὶ Φάνης καὶ Ἡρωκεπάοις συνεχῶς ὄνομαζεται (although Dionysus is below them in the serial articulation of divine reality).

92. In the hymn Πρωτόγονος is δεφυης, and Πρᾶπος. Consult also Proclus In Pl. Tim. 30c, d (I, 429, 26 Diehl): καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ (sc. τῷ πρώτῳ προελθόντι ἐκ τοῦ Πρωτογενοῦς φόδο) πρῶτῳ τὸ θῆλυ καὶ τὸ ἄρρης, ὡς ζῷῳ πρῶτῳ: θῆλυ καὶ γενέτωρ κρατερὸς θεὸς Ἡρωκεπάοις,

φησιν ο θεολόγος (for an attempt to analyse the name Ἡρωκεπάοις, see Gesner apud Hermann pp. 261-2). The reason for the essential bisexuality being given nicely, even if hostily, 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 Ὁρφυκοῖς ποιήμασιν εἰσηνέχθη τὰ δύο ταῦτα ὄνοματα μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν· ὄν τὸν Φάνητα εἰσφέρει αἰδὸιον (clearly γυναικεῖον) ἔχοντα...
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 θεός 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, femininity 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 μυστικόν φαλλοῦ κατὰ πάλιες ἀνίστασαι Διονύσῳ. 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· ἐπὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ ἱστατο 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 φαλληφορίαν. For Διόνυσος Φαλληφόρος (cf. Φαλῆς, 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 Ἔνόρχης 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: "Ἀθάνας ὅ ἐν α’ Σικελικῶν τὸν αὐτὸν φησί Διονύσιον (it seems the elder tyrant is meant, the renowned poet) καὶ τὸν βοῦν γαρόταν (i.e. γῆ + ἀρόω) καλεῖ καὶ τὸν χοῖρον ἵαχον (perhaps from ἵα + ἀχόω, mediating κ having developed", as in Aristophanes, Aves 772 ἵαχον for ἵαν 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. ἐν κόλποις could be another possibility, cf. Athnologia Graeca V, 165.5; but it is discordant in view of the ἐν in the next verse.

96. I cannot help producing two more instances (out of an ocean) illustrative of the importance of the male αἷδου (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, tibique 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 dicit 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 Orphee lectum est. (We are reminded of the Orphic ἄρσενικοι 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 aquainted 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 velavier 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 plantibus cum Agdesti tundit et sauciat pectus pausatae 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:

οὔδέποτε ἡμέλιον φάος ὀρθριὸν ἀντέλλοντος
μύσγεσθαι ταύρων χρή φλογόντα κόνα,
μη ποτε καρπολόχου Δημήτερος ὑγρανθείσης,
βρέξης τὴν λασίνην Ἦρακλέως ἄλοχον.

On the one hand we have astronomical and agricultural references, on the other obscene sexuality: κῶνω is the Dog star and the membrum virile (v. Hesychius s.v. κῶνω, κανέσπασαν and κόνες; Aristophanes, Lysistrata, 158
uses the Pherecratian (Fr. 193 PCG vol. VII pp. 197-8), and then the proverbial expression ἡ ἐπὶ μορίου θῆλεος κεῖται, 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, κένταυρος, Ἄταυρωτος; Suda s.v. ταῦρος, Σάραβων; Photius s.v. Κένταυρον; cf. Aeschylus Agamemnon, 236 ἀγνᾶ δ’ ἄταυρωτος 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. ὄφρωδα, and the above adduced references in the light of this explanation). The two last lines of the epigramm reproduce the metaphors played with in the second verse. The Ηρακλέως ἀλοχος is, as we know, ὑβη hence here the pubic area as well. And, finally, καρπολόχος Δημήτηρ ἡγανωθεία must relate to the sperm ejaculation implied in βρέξεις 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 accepi mus, 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 mystic 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 Εὔβουλεύς was an epithet of Zeus, He of the Good Counsel. (Cf. Diodorus V, 72; Antiphon VI, 45: καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ Δῶς Βουλαίου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς Βουλαίας ἵερόν ἐστι, καὶ εἰσίν τε οἱ βουλευταὶ προσεύχονται etc.). But in a Myconian inscription (No 373 Dittenberger1) we read: ...ὑπὲρ καρποῦ (sc. is to be sacrificed) Δήμητρι ποι ἐν ἐνυφώμα τηρωτόκον, Κόρη κάρτρον τέλευιν, Δί Βουλέ χοίρον. This Ζεὸς 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 mystic and specifically Eleusinian cycle. Calling Dionysus Εὔβουλη is characteristically orphic as we explicitly learn from Macrobius I, 18, 17: idem (sc. Liber) versus Orpheici Εὔβουλη 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:


The combination of Εὔβουλεύς and ἀναξ 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, Tritopatreus (sic), Eubuleus, Dionysus; etc. Eubuleus is clearly here an aspect of that being which is, in its more common manifestation, Dionysus. The Anactes or Ἄνακτες 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 Omnimium Haeresium*. Finally Pluto was also called Ἐὔβουλεύς, καὶ εὐφημησιμὸν as very aptly says the scholiast to Nicander’s *Alexipharmaca*, 14: …τοῦ χάσμα δυσέκδρομον Ἐὐβουλήσ. Hesychius s.v. explains ὁ Πλούτων. παρὰ δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς ὁ Ζεὺς, ἐν Κυρήνῃ. In the Orphic hymns Ἐὖβουλεύς 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 (Ἑῷβουλος = Ζεὺς Χθόνος 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 Θεσμοφορία and Ἄρρητοφορία, 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 is 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) Ἰακχὸς 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

e tc. 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:

\[ \text{ollis vultus erat, plaudit, contractat amice.} \]

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 (\textit{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. Heisius 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 \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\delta\'\varsigma\nu\epsilon\nu\) \(\iota\alpha\kappa\chi\omega\sigma\), Leopardus and Herwerden proposed \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\nu\eta\pi\iota\alpha\chi\omega\varsigma\delta\'\varsigma\nu\), Heinsius \(\pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\iota\iota\nu\varsigma\alpha\nu\delta\varsigma\) and Ludwig \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\delta\'\varsigma\nu\epsilon\nu\ \iota\alpha\lambda\lambda\varsigma\). 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 \(\iota\alpha\kappa\chi\omega\sigma\), 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 \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\) 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 Ἰακχός. 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 hystericulus must mean in the present context: δασύκερκος. Durus, in the same spirit, alludes to the στύεων of the πέος. Both negations of these attributes refer to the condition of the sexual organs of an ἀνήβος 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 κόλπως to ἐγέλων Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλπους. 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’ ἕν Ἰακχός, / (χειρὶ τέ μιν ρήτασακε) γελῶν, Βαυβοῦς: ὑπὸ κόλπους (op.cit. p. 232 where see also the irrelevant fantasies of Perdrizet: Elle y avait dessini la face de l’enfant Iacchos. Ainsi accomodie, 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 δονηγητήρ, μετυρή 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 ἅγεα 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?) σομπσαί.

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, testē Clement’s character of Dionysus), there is no need to expatiate here: ὁ φαλ- λὸς τῶ θεῶ 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 σομππήν ἐποιοῦτο καὶ ἰμενεν ἀσμα αἰδοίουσιν, ἀναιδέστατα εἰργαστ’ 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 ἱδὲ καὶ νιέ, Orphic hymn 52 to Trieretic Dionysus who is in v. 4 called Ἑβδουλεύς 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 ἔπατετικ and ἁγρεύς: ὁ πάν τὸ ἀγρεύνων (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: τινὴς τὸν αὐτὸν φασιν εἶναι τῷ Πλούτῳν. 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 Alcaimonid (Fr. 3 Bernabi) apud Etym. Gudianum (578.7 De Stefani); Etym. MS Bibli. Reg. Paris (as quoted by Gaisford in his edition of Etym. Magnum s.v. Ζαγρεύς): Πότνια Γῆ, Ζαγρεύ τε θεῶν
παντερτατε παντων where Ζαγρεις, the latest god, seems to occupy the position of Οδρανος the first θεος βασιλευς 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 Δυσαύλης. We read there: ‘Ασκληπιάδης δ’ ἐν δ’ Τραγῳδομένων (Fr.Gr.H. 12F4 Jacobi) τὸν Δυσαύλην αὐτόχθονα εἶναι φήσει, συνοικήσαντα δὲ Βαυβοὶ σχεῖν παῖδας Πρωτονόην (corrected to Πρωτόσφηνι by Dieterich) τε καὶ Νήσαν (vel Νήσαν; Suda habet Νήσαν vel Νῆσαν). Παλαιότερος δ’ ἐν πρώτῃ (cod. Primarius: δ’ ceteri) Τροικών (Fr.Gr.H. 44F1) σὺν τῇ γυναικική φήσι αὐτὸν ὑποδέχασθαι τὴν Δήμητρα. We have here all the required elements. Reception of Demeter, Dysaules, Baubo. Müllér (Fragm. Hist. Gr. vol. II p. 339) proposed to read Μίσα instead of Νήσα or Νήσα (σα) referring to Hesychius s.v. Μίσατις and Orphic Hymn 41. If we accept this should we not then emend Πρωτονόην to Πρωτόσφηνι? The phallic nature of this being is well attested. Suda has s.v. Νήσαςιν ὁνομα κύριον; and s.v. Δυσαύλης οὕτως αὐτόχθων μὲν ἦν, συνωσίτες δὲ Βαυβοὶ καὶ ἐσχε παῖδας Πρωτονόην τε καὶ Νήσαν. Dieterich read Πρωτοσφήνι.

109. It is repeated in the same way by Eusebius, Præparatio 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 ἐγγενεσάμενος (Aglaoph. p. 25) and so everyone read till Dieterich (Mithrasliturgie p. 125) protested against this habit. But his protestation is rather weak: “Man ändert seit Lobeck das überlieferte ἐργασάμενος in ἐγγενεσάμενος. 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 ἐλαβον 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 σάσχει, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν Δήμητραν παθεῖν εὖ ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι περὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς λήσαι τῆς πλάνης, καὶ ταύτῃ δὲ ποιήσαι εὖ τούτοις, δοῦσα τὰ σπέρματα, καὶ τελέσασα 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 Aristideim (to be mentioned in the text) he comments: Apud alios nulla hujus fabulae vestigia reperi, nisi quod in obscurissimo Hymnorum loco Cereris cum uno hospitum 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 ὅσι παρὰ τῶν τῶν Κελειδο πρῶτον σπείρα κερπὸν ἀρεφον. Sowing has naturally a sexual meaning as well. Σπείρα κερπὸν ἀρεφον 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 ἄθέσμος (in contrast) in the scholiast ad Aristeides Panathenaiicus.

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.): μικρὰ, φησίν, ἐστὶ τὰ μυστήρια τὰ
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: 

"... and this World shall not bring salvation, but leads to destruction. This is made clear by Hippolytus ('source) in the sequel:"

(Pages 361-362)
relevant evidence. The scholiast ad loc. mentions other ways in which a short syllable becomes common, ways omitted by Hephaestio ὡς πρὸς εἰσαγωγέων τὸν λόγον ποιούμενος, i.e. because his enchiridon is really an introduction. An additional way effecting the possible lengthening of a short syllable is by it being ὄξυτονουμένη: δεύτερος δὲ τρίτος τῶν τῷν βραχείαν εἰς μακρὰν ἀναφερόντων, ὁ διὰ τῆς ὁξείας. Αὐτὴ οὖν ἡ ὁξεία ἐπικειμένη τινὶ τῶν βραχείων ἡ βραχυνύμενῶν διχρόνῳ μηκόνει ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ (Ilias, M 208):

Τρῳς δ’ ἔφρηγεναν ἐπεὶ ἤδον αἰῶλον ὄφιν.

'Ἰδοὺ ὁ τελευταῖος ποὺς, Πυρρίχιος μὲν ὑπάρχει (ὡς), ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὴν ὁξείαν ἔχει ἐπικειμένην ἐπὶ τὸ ὁ, ἀντὶ τροπῆς παρελήφθαι τῆς ὁξείας μηκυνυσθῆς τὸ ὁ, καὶ οὐκ αὐτίκως· δοκεῖ γὰρ ἡ ὁξεία ἀνατενομένη τῇ τῇ φωνῇ καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ θεσί καὶ διατυπώσει τοῦ χαρακτήρος ἐαυτῆς τὴν βραχείαν ἀνακαλεσθαι εἰς ἐτέραν τάξιν (p. 159 Gaisford). And similarly Eustathius, Comm. p. 80, commenting on Ilias A 193: ...τὸ δὲ κατὰ τέσσαρα τρόπους κοινῆς συλλαβῆς ἐκ τοῦ ταπεινώματος τῆς βραχείας ἀνιστατεῖ μηκυνύμενον· καὶ γὰρ καὶ διαστένει, καὶ τόνον ἔχει ὁξέν, καὶ ἡ συνετεῖα βαρύνη αὐτῷ· καὶ εἰς μέρος δὲ λόγον καταπεραιοῖ, etc. Besides, the asperse spirant on the α of ἄγνος can act as a quasi-consonant, which, together with the preceding σ can lengthen the δως. The sanskrit equivalent of आ-ओम, आ-वोस, आ-वहस्त, आ-व हस्त etc. is Jag - (and in Zed yaz-; cf. Curtius, Gr.Etym. (English tr.) §118, p. 170). Clearly, the ब-व-अ-व-अ-व of Hesychius point in the same direction.

115. This last source has: Ἀχαία: ἡ Δημήτηρ παρὰ Ἀττικῶς. Ἀριστοφάνης Ἀχαρνεύσιν (v. 709):

οὐδ’ ἄν (αὐτὴν) τὴν Ἀχαιάν ροδίως ἰδέοτα ἄν.

Εἰρήτησαν παρὰ τὸ ἄχος τῆς Κόρης. "Ἡ ὅτι μετὰ κυμβάλων ἤχουσα (asimilating and aspectually identifying her thus with Cybele) τὴν Κόρην ἔξητε. "Ἡ ὅτι τοῖς Ταναγραίοις μεταστάσει ἐκ Τανάγρας ἡ Δημήτηρ κατ’ ὄναρ φανείσα ἐκέλευεν αὐτῶς ἀκολουθῆσαι τῷ γενομένῳ ἤχῳ, καὶ ὅπου ἄν παύσηται ἐκεῖ πόλιν κτίσαι· καὶ ἱδρύσαντο ἱερὸν Ἀχαιάς Δημήτερος. The difference in the accounts indicates that the connection with her sorrow for the Kore is not absolutely central even for Ἀχαία. 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: "...ἀπεμι παρὰ τὸν ἑταῖρον Κλεινίαν, ὅτι πυνθάνομαι χρόνου ἡδὴ ἀκάθαρτον εἶναι αὐτῷ τὴν γυναίκα, καὶ ταύτη νοσεῖν, ὅτι μὴ ἔστε ὄσκετε οὐδέ ἀναβαίνει αὐτὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀβατος καὶ ἀνήρτος ἐστί. She was therefore pregnant. A common sacrifice to Demeter was of a pregnant sow. For the ἀκάθαρτος μέτρα, consult the very important Sethian testimony of Hippolytus, v. infra note 130, where it engulfs the ὄψες οτ καρπώς, i.e. simultaneously the virilia and sperm of the father and the focus of the son. This is the meaning of the archetype of Father-Son as one Being. - Ἁκαθαρσία 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: Ζεὸ κύσατε, μέγιστε θεῶν, εἰλιμένε 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 γλυοτοὺς κάθεσις 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: ἁγνὸν παιδὰ Δυσαύλου ὀδηγητῆρα λαβοῦσα - a change accepted by practically everyone afterwards, and lauded by Lobeck as praeclara emendatio (Aglaoaphenum p. 825 n. [k]). Hermann adduces as his reasons the following (ad locum): Vulgata lectio, δύσαγνος παίδ' ἁγνὸν ὀδηγητῆρα λαβοῦσα, et metro repugnat, nec, quo pacto intelligi possit, in promptu est. Quod reposui, ἁγνὸν παιδὰ Δυσαύλου ὀδηγητῆρα λαβοῦσα, certa nititur auctoritate Pausaniae I, 14 (3) Ὡρφέως δὲ (οὐδὲ ταῦτα Ὡρφέως, ἔμοι δοκεῖν, ὄντα) Εἰβδομεὶ καὶ Τριπτολέω Δυσαύλην πατέρα εἶναι, μηνύσαςι δὲ εφίσι περὶ τῆς παιδός (sc. Περσεφόνης), δοθήμαι παρὰ Δήμητρος σπείραι τοὺς καρποὺς. 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 δύσθημος 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 ἁγνὸν), 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 Εὐβουλός. 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 Κέλεω καὶ Τριπτόλεμο τῶν ἁρπακότα μαθοῦσα, μαθὸν αὐτοὺς ἀποδίωσα τῆς μηνύσεως τῶν σιτῶν, πρῶτον ἄβεσμως συγγενομένη Κέλεω τῷ Τριπτόλεμον πατρὶ. 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 ἄνάγκης and the ἄναγκης. 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 ἄβεσμως, 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 ἂντ’ ἄναγκης to ὑπ’ ἄναγκης (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 Εὐβουλός: sed illud ἄναγκης ἂντ’ ἄναγκης indicat humano semino conceptum. But, as I said, the natural way is to take the ἄγνων παῖδα Δυσαύλου as the author of the said ἄναγκης when then thus does not cohere. Yet Lobeck (op.cit. p. 825, note k) could write: «Εὐβουλόν τέξασα θεῶν ἄναγκης ὑπ’ ἄναγκης, ubi si θεά scribatur, intelligi poterit filius Cereis 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. θητή 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: κυβωτός, 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: ή θήκη a case, chest); Hesychius s.v. κίστης, κάτη, κοίτης; Etym.M. s.v. κώτις.

123. Cf. Hesychius s.v. Αχάνας; 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 οὖ μόνον ὠμοφόροι, οὐδὲ ἄλλοι ἀγγεῖα εἰς ἐσθή- των ἀπόθεσιν, ἄλλα καὶ αἱ τῶν φαρμακοπωλῶν ἄν καλοῦντο, ὡς ἐν Ἀμφιαράῳ Ἀριστοφάνης (Fr. 32 Blaydes = 95 Dindorf = Fr. 28 PCG vol. III 2 p. 47):

καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὁφεὶς οὖς ἐπιπέμπεις
ἐν κίστη που καταστήμηνα
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 θεόπο- μπος ἐν Ἀλθαίᾳ (Fr. I, Meineke Fr.Com.Gr. II, p. 792 = Fr. 3 PCG vol. VII p. 710):

τὴν οἰκίαν γὰρ ἠφόρον εἰσελθὼν ὀλην
κίστης γεγονών Φαρμακοπώλου Μεγαρικοῦ.

Cf. also Theocritus II, 161.

125. What Photius says s.v. λυκνοφόρος need not be taken as restricted to the Demetriac worship; it may refer to the οὐλοχύται, to the sacred barley
required in sacrifices. The entry in Photius is this: Λικνοφόρος· οἱ θέρων
tῶν λύκων (sic); καὶ γὰρ μνημονίων τῆς Δημητρίου τροφῆς
(fruits of earth) ἐτίθετο ἐπὶ τῶν λύκων. Pollux VI, 86 tells us that the
λύκων was also called κάνης, a form akin to κανοῖν.

126. This does not mean that the man bearing the sacred καστή was called either
καστοφόρος or κυττοφόρος, but that the reading in the Demostenian
passage was considered to be by some καστοφόρος (as the extant MSS have
it), by others κυττοφόρος. The correct reading must be in fact καστοφόρος,
bearer of ivy; Demosthenes did not likely speak disparagingly of something
also involved in the sacred ceremonies of Eleusis (the λυκνοφόρος 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 κατάκορος and περιέργοι ιερον-
γίας just as the Edonides and the Thracian women, but that Olympias
μᾶλλον ἐτέρων ξηλωσάμα τὰς καστοχὰς καὶ τῶν ἐνθυσιασμῶν ἐξ－
γουσα βαρβαρικότερον ὄφεις μεγάλους χειρόθεις ἐφείλκετο τοῖς θά－
σοις, οἱ πολλάκις ἐκ τοῦ κυττοῦ καὶ τῶν μνηστικῶν λύκων παραναὐδο－
μενοι καὶ περιελπτόμενοι τοῖς θυρίσεως τῶν γνωακῶν καὶ τοῖς στεφά－
νοις ἔξπληττον τοῖς ἀνδραίσ. 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 Demostenian passage have: ὃ θέρων
τὰς κοίτας (obviously for καστοφόρος or λυκνοφόρος), ἐστεμμένος καττῷ
(for κυττοφόρος), and τιμώμενος παρὰ φιλαξί on λυκνοφόρος, probably a
misplaced gloss on Ἀττίς, τιμώμενοι παρὰ Φρειύν.

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 Ἀθήναι,
μηδὲ λάχει γέρας Ἰσον Ἑλευσινίω Διονύσεω,
μὴ τελετάσ προτέρω διαλλάξειν Ἰάκχου
μὴ τάλαρον Δήμητρος ἀτιμήσει σπώρῃ (οἱ σπώρῃ with
C.F. Hermann).

Here we find not only the distinction of Iacchus, the Eleusinian Dionysus,
from the new Semean 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 (σπώρῃ is explained by Hesychius s.v. as:
...κυρίως δὲ ἡ σταφυλῆ· καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλλων ἀκρο－
δρῶν).
128. In the light of such parallelism (itself based on valid aspectual identification) we should also see Tibullus I, 7, 48

\[ \text{et levis occultis conscia cista sacris} \]

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: ...\[ \text{...erebatur ab alio cista secretorum capax, penitus celeans operta magnificè religionis (§246). Further see in Theocritus, the Bacchic Eidyllion XXVI, where (vv. 7-8) Ino, Autonoe and Agave:} \]

\[ \text{îĖÚa \̷ ' âΩΛÛÙ·¬ ÂÔӷ̤ӷ ¯ÂÚÛdÓ ëÏÔÖÛ·È,} \]
\[ \text{Ăéʿ̈˜ η٤ıÂÓÙÔ ÓÂÔ‰Ú¤ÙˆÓ âd 'ˆÌáÓ.} \]

It is perhaps farfetched, but πεπονάμένα may allude to the obscene ἔργα-σία intimated by the Eleusinian mystery formula: ...\[ \text{...ἐλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἔργασάμενος ἀπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον... The sacred thing has been worked up.} \]

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

\[ \text{Quis Cereris ritus ausit vulgare profanis,} \]
\[ \text{magnaque Threicia sacra reperta Samo?} \]
\[ \text{.................................} \]
\[ \text{Condita sin non sunt Veneris mysteria cistis} \]
\[ \text{nec cava vesanis ictibus aera sonant; etc.} \]

129. Especially since in the immediately preceding verse, the \[ \text{φιάλαι are mentioned, which it was so common to offer to the Eleusinian deities as we know from many inscriptions.} \]

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): \[ \text{...τὰ \dè αὐτὰ (sc. with the Thesmophoria and Skirrophoria this identity is significant for the understanding of the worship of Athena Poliás and Erichthonios) καὶ ᾧρητοφόρια καλεῖται καὶ ᾧγεται, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἔχοντα περὶ τῆς τῶν καρπῶν γενέσεως καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων σπορᾶs (mark the subtle interchange: γένεσις with καρπός and σπορά with ἀνθρώποι!). ἀναφέρονται \dè κάνταθα ᾧρητα ίερὰ \dè στέατος τοῦ σίτου κατεσκευασμένα, μμήματα δρακόντων καὶ ἀνθρώπων} \]
σχημάτων (i.e. Φαλλών). λαμβάνουσι δὲ κόνων θαλλούς διὰ τὸ πολύγονον τοῦ φυτοῦ. ἐμβάλλονται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ μέγαρα οὐτῶν καλούμενα ἄδυτα ἐκείνα τε καὶ χοίροι etc. From Athenaeus XIV 647A, we learn that in the Syracusian Thesmophoria, cakes in the form of female pubes were carried around in honour of Demeter and Persephone: Ἡράκλειδης ὁ Συρακούσιος ἐν τῷ περὶ θειμῶν, ἐν Συρακούσιας φησί τοῖς παντελείοις τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἐκ σησάμου καὶ μέλιτος κατασκευάζονται ἐφήβων γυναικεῖα, ἃ καλεῖσθαι κατὰ πάσαν Σικελίαν μυλλοὺς καὶ περιφέρεσθαι ταῖς θεαίς. Further the χοιρίνα (from χοίροι) mentioned by Athenaeus in XIV, 647C in conjunction with πυραμόδοι οτι πυραμίδες - Kaibel is right in adding <σν> referring to Hesychius s.v. πυραμίδα - 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 ὡπερ ἐστιν ἀνδρεῖα (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 ἦχουσιν ὁ ωρανός καὶ η γῆ μήτρα παραπλήσιον τὸν ὀμφαλὸν ἔχοσι μέσον, καὶ εἰ, φησιν (Hippolytus' learned source), ὕπο ὄλων ἀγαγεῖν θέλει τις τὸ σχῆμα τούτο, ἔγκυον μήτραν ὅτοπον βούλεται ὄρους τεχνικῶς ἐφυγνωστάν, καὶ εὐρήσει τὸ ἐκτύρωμα τοῦ ωρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν μέσω πάντων ἀπε- ραλλάκτων ὑποκείμενον. That ὀμφαλὸς in the womb, is the κλειτόρις, 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 Δυσσάλησ in this context, from the windpipe? But his organ is distorted, the MalPhallic One) or ὄμφις who enters into the Uterus and generates Man. After the which analysis Hippolytus adds: ἔστι δὲ αὐτοὶ ἡ πάσα διδασκαλία τοῦ λόγου ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν θεόλογων, Μουσαίου καὶ Λέων καὶ τοῦ τάς τελετάς μάλιστα καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καταδείξατος Ὁρφέως: ὁ γὰρ περὶ τῆς μήτρας αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ ὀφεὼς λόγος καὶ ὁ ὀμφαλὸς, ὡπερ ἐστιν ἀνδρεία, διαρρήθην οὕτως ἐστίν ἐν τοῖς Βασικικῶς τοῦ Ὁρφέως. Τετέλεσται δὲ ταῦτα καὶ παραδεδομα ἀνθρώπως πρὸ τῆς Κελεοῦ καὶ Τριπτόλεμου καὶ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης καὶ Διονύσου ἐν Ἑλευσίνι τελετής, ἐν Φιλοῦτι τῆς Ἀττικῆς· πρὸ γὰρ τῶν Ἑλευσινιών μυστηρίων ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Φιλοῦτι τῆς· λεγομένης Μεγάλης ὄργα (cf. Pausanias I, 31, 4). ἔστι δὲ παστάς ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς παστάδος ἐγγεγραστα μέχρι σήμερον η τούτων [emendavi ex tā tōn] πάντων τῶν εἰρημένων λόγων ἱδέα. πολλὰ μὲν οὖν ἔστι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς παστάδος ἐκείνης ἐγγεγραμμένα, περὶ ὧν Πλούταρχος ποιεῖται λόγους ἐν ταῖς πρὸς
 ὑμπεδοκλέα δέκα βιβλίας, etc. For ὄμφαλός v. Etym.Μ. s.v. It is connected to ὑμπνεῖν and ἀναπνεῖν: δέ ὁ τὸ ἱμβροῦν (focust) ἀναπνεῖν· τὸ γὰρ βρέφος, κατὰ γαστρός ὄν, περὶ αὐτὸν εἰλείται καὶ ἀναπνεῖ καὶ τρέφεται: ἦθεν καὶ τὴν Δήμητραν, τροφὸν ὁσίαν, ὀμπνήαι ἰνομάζονι Κυρηναίου (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 φαλλῷ ἐωκέναι· ἑκκρημῆς γὰρ ἔστιν 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 ἱερὸν τῆς μητρὸς Πέλας 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 ὃψ, remarks: ἔξωντες δὲ φόσι (= actually) τὸ ἔρπετον ἐν κίστῃ τινι. From the cista on the coins called κυστοφόρου, 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 γραφαὶ 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 τοῦτων ἀκρίβειαν, μὴ βούλεσθαι τάληθες ἐκφερὲν εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς, ὡς ἄν καὶ κανὴν ἑπικεκμένων τοῖς τὰπόρρητα περὶ τῶν θεῶν τοῦτων μνημόσυνα 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 πόταμα 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 θέαματα 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
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 mystic 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 ταυροβόλον 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 άνδρεία σχήματα of the scholiast ad Lucian Dialogi Meretricii II, 1 mentioned in explanation of the world Θεαμοφόρια above. Σχήμα appears also in Isaias (Septuagint) III, 17 where it is a γυναικείον σχήμα which is meant. One may also compare in this connection the εἴδωλα τῆς ἡβής (Nubes 976) which are the traces of the boy’s virilia on the sand in the Gymnasia. Closer is: οὐκ ἄρενος καὶ θηλείας φύσεως εἰς δύμορφον τόπον 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 δύμορφον. He then died in an Arabian town, called Αβαί, 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: ἀπεκόσμη γάρ, φησίν, (Hippolytus’ source, an Ophitic document), ὁ Ἀττίς, τοῦτ’ ἔστω ἀπὸ τῶν χοίκων τῆς κτίσεως κάτωθι μερών, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αἰωνίαν ἄνω μετελήθηθεν οὐσίαν, ὅπου, φησίν, οὐκ ἔστω οὕτε θῆλυ οὕτε ἄρσεν, ἀλλὰ καυχή κτίσεις, «κανόνος ἀνθρώπων» ὥστε ἄρσενόθηλον. 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 puere 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: ὁμοιός δ’ ἐν τῇ Νεαπόλει καὶ κατ’ ἄλλους τόπους πλείονας
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 ñÈâ¬¬Èû-ò¬Ý¬Èû that they are both male and female, copulating alternatively between themselves yearly; (cf. also Aristotle De Gen. An. I, 757a2 sqq.); and he continues: τῆς ἀλήθειας οὐχ οὕτως ἔχουσης· ἐκατέρω γὰρ τοῦ γένους ἀπλῆν ἔχοντος καὶ ἀνεπίμικτον τὴν φύσιν, προσώρισαι τὸ ψευδογοφοῦν καὶ παρακρονούμενον τοὺς εἰκῆ θεωροῦντας· τῇ μὲν θηλείᾳ πρόσκειται τι κατὰ τὴν φύσιν παρεμφερές ἄρρεν μορίῳ (sc. the kleito-
ría), τῷ δὲ ἄρρενι κατὰ τὸ ἐναντίον ἐμφάσεις θηλείας φύσεως. ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ ἐπί πάντων τῶν ξύφων, γενομένων μὲν πρὸς ἀλήθειαν πολλῶν καὶ παντοδαπῶν τεράτων, μὴ τρεφομένων δὲ, καὶ εἰς τελείαν αἰσθήτων ἐλθεῖν οὐ δυναμένων. Τάυτα μὲν εἰρήθησον πρὸς διώρθωσιν δεισ-
daimonías. 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 androgyne 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’ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ γεννᾶσθαι τὴν τοῦ σώματος φύσιν ἔχοντα μεμιγμένην ἐξ ἄνδρος καὶ γυναικός· καὶ τὴν μὲν εὐπρέπειαν καὶ μαλακότητα τοῦ σώματος ἔχειν γυναικικό παρεμφερῆ, τὸ δ’ ἄρρενπολόν καὶ δραστικὸν ἄνδρος ἔχειν, τὰ δὲ φυσικὰ μόρια συγγενεσθαι τούτῳ καὶ γυναικί καὶ ἄνδρος· ἐνιοὶ δὲ τὰ ταὐτά γενῆ ταῖς 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 para φύσιν i.e. according to the male coition, as it is put by Diodorus: καὶ κατὰ τὴν γεγενημένην μετ’ ἀνδρὸς συμβίωσιν, τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐπιπλοκῆς ἀντιπραττούσης, δοκεῖν αὐτὴν ταῖς ἀρρενικαῖς συμπεριφοραῖς καθωμιλήσας (p. 57 ed. Bipontina) for the first case; and for the second: διετή μὲν οὖν χρόνων συνεβίωσε τάνδρι, τὴν μὲν γυναικείαν ἐπιπλοκὴν οὐκ ἐπιδεχομένη, τὴν δὲ para φύσιν ὀμμαλὰ ὑπομένειν ἀναγκαζόμενη (p. 60). The male genitalia appear from within the female organs: ἐβδομαίας ὑ υφά, ρήξιν ἑπιγενέσθαι τῆς ἐπιφάνειας καὶ προσεῖν ἐκ τῶν τῆς Ἡραῖδος γυναικείων αἰδοίον ἄνδρειόν ἔχον διδύμους προσκεμένους (p. 56); and the doctors examining him after the event γνώναι, ὅτι κατεκρυπτῷ φύσις ἄρρενεν ἐν ὕφειδε 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:

"Ἀλλος ὁ Μηνοφίλας λέγεται para μαχλάσι κόσμος, ἄλλος ἐπεὶ πάσης γενεται ἀκρασίας. Ἔκεῖ ὁ Χαλδαῖος, κεῖσης πέλας, ὅ γαρ ὁ παύτης οὐρανός εὔτος ἔχει καὶ κόμα καὶ διδύμους.

Κόων is the πέος, and δίδυμοι the testicles, as has been already observed (cf. e.g. Hesychius s.v.) but also κόων is the Dog Star and Δίδυμοι the zodiacal sign of Gemini. Another play of double-entendre, very common in the epigrams, 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 ἐρωτικαὶ ἐπιστολαί, πρὸς τῷ τῶν Διὸς αἰδοίων (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 Βαυβώ τῶν μηρῶν ἀνασυρμένη καὶ ὁ γυναικεῖς κτεῖς - οὕτω γὰρ ὄνομάζοντι τὴν ἀνδρὸν οἰσχυρόνομον. Καὶ οὕτως ἐν αἰσχρῷ τῇ τελετῇ 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 τελετῇ 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’ ἦν Ἰακχός 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 nondum durum et hystriculum pusio of Arnobius is then, according to this line of thought, a puér - 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 androgyne 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):

καὶ τοῖ ποτὲ φημὶ γυναῖκα ἀνδρόγυνον τέξασθαι ἔχοντά περ ἄρσενα πάντα, νηπίαχαι θ' ὡς 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 νηπίαχος 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 ἱερουργίας 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.):

μὴ γὰρ ἀπιστόφιλος θυσίασιν ἀνὴρ παρεπέσθων.
(referring to the sacrifices to Demeter, Persephone and Pluto)

\[\text{ἐξω δ’ ἐνθ’ ἀνόμιστον ἐπέπλετο φωτὶ τάδ’ ἔρδεν, νοῦστοι καταδαίτων ἔχεω θυσίαν, κατὰ δ’ αὐτὴν ὀστὶς ἄν ἡμετέρων χρησμῶν ἔδρας ἐς τόδ’ ἱκται, σεμνὸν Φοῖβον ἄνακτα μετελθέτω ἐν θυσίαις, προφρονέως βαμοῖς ἐπὶ πίονα μηρία καύσας etc.}\]

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

142. This brings Arnobius version nearer to the Greek text of Clement: plaudit, contrsectat 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 unjustice; 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:

\[\text{τῇ δ’ ἐπὶ οὖν μείδησε θεὰ γύμφου ἐνι θυμῷ}\]

Easy success!

146. It also fits much better with the Latin of Arnobius: tum dea defigens augsti 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 θυμῶ / σαρδόνων μᾶλα τοῖον. Cf. for another metaphorical connection π 476: μείδησεν δ’ ἵερη ἵς 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 alteration 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, ἐπι-γνάμψασα φίλον κήρ. Hephaestus undertakes to console her in her impotent rage. He offers her a cup (δέπας ἀμφικύππελλον) to drink nectar. In the end of his persuasive address (595-6):
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:

"Ως εἴποῦσα πέπλος ἀνεσύρατο, δείξε δὲ πάντα σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον, παιδήριον ἄνθος,
χειρὶ τέ μιν ῥιπτασκεν ἐʿ Βαυβῳ ύπὸ κόλπους ὁπιτὶ οὖν μείδησε θεά, μείδησ’ εἰν θυμῷ ετ.

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 ἐ 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 παιδήριον 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 ἄνημβος 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 παιδήριον ἡβην (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 Ludwich’s account (N. Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 141, 1890, p. 57):

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: μὲν ὑδάσκε is easy cleverness without a point; reminiscent of the people who go around making emendations by the rule! Then how can the ἡβην painted or figured on Baubo’s abdomen be ἔγέλων, shooting forth, thrusting forth? And if this was the τύπος how can anybody ριπτάζειν ἐν ετ. 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{δείξε} & \text{ δὲ πάντα} \\
\text{σώματος οὖνδὲ πρέποντα τόπον: παῖς δ’ ἦκεν Ἰακχὸς,} \\
\text{χειρὶ τέμνων ῥίπτασκ’ ὀρέγων Βαυβῶς ὑπὸ κόλπους.}
\end{align*}
\]

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 μῦν can only refer to it and how can one toss a τόπος? It should be ὀρέγων χέιρα. 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 ἐποπτεῖα, 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: κάθαρος μύησις ἐποπτεῖα). 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)

\[
\text{at tumida et mammosa Ceres est ipsa ab Iaccho}
\]

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 παχείαι μυσταί γυναῖκες ὄλσβοισιν χρῶνται, discussed above. Is mammosa 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 mammosa with her being τρόφῳ or mother of Iacchus (cf. Suda lemma: Ἰακχὸς· Ῥόγοις ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῶ 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: havet animus atque ardet, in
chalcidicis illis magnis atque in palatiis coeli deos deasque conspicere
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 ἄρσενικὸς ἐρω-
tes 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):

νῦν δὲ δημαγωγεῖ τ’
ἐν τοῖς ἀνω νεκροῖς 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 ζωντας ἀνω νεκροὺς φασι
(what follows is out of place, probably a variant or an explanation of the
preceding sentence: δὴ διὰ τὴν κακοπραγίαν νεκροὺς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους
λέγουσι). On the other hand Aristophanes may well be utilizing a view
which he will satyrize 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 εἶ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστὶ κατθάνειν,
τὸ κατθάνειν 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τίς δ’ οἶδεν εἰ ζῆν τοῦθ’ ὁ κέκληται θανεῖν,} \\
\text{τὸ ζῆν δὲ θυνήσειν ἑστὶ; πλῆν ὅμως βροτῶν} \\
\text{νοσοῦσιν οἱ βλέποντες, οἱ δ’ ὀλῳδότες} \\
\text{οὐδὲν νοσοῦσιν οἰδὲ κέκτηται κακά.}
\end{align*}
\] (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 ὀδύνηρου βίου στοχά-
ζεται βελτίων ἐλναι τὰ ἐν Ἀδου τῆς γῆς, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν Πολυίδῳ (Fr.
639 D. = 638 Nauck)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τίς δ’ οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστὶ καθθανεῖν,} \\
\text{τὸ καθθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν.}
\end{align*}
\]

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:

\[
\text{τὸ καθθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν κάτω νομίζεται.}
\]

(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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τίς οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστὶ καθθανεῖν,} \\
\text{τὸ πνεῦν δὲ δειπνεῖν, τὸ δὲ καθεκύδειν κώδιον;}
\end{align*}
\]
To which passage there are two scholia, the one connecting the parody again to Phrixus, the other running thus: τότο εξ Ἰππολύτου (sic codd.; ἐκ Πολυδου Bentley and many editors after him) δράματος:

τὸς οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζήν μὲν ἐστὶ κατθανεῖν,
τὸ καθανεῖν δὲ ζήν,

ὑπνοῦν δὲ τὸ καθανεῖν; (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 κόμιδων.

Πεποίηκε δὲ τοῦτο ἐπειδὴ ὁ Δίονυσος οἰδὲν ἐτερον ἡγάτα ἢ δειπνεῖν καὶ καθεύδειν ἐν μαλακὸς στρώμασιν, οἶμαι ἐστὶν 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. τὶς δ’ οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζήν μὲν ἐστὶ κατθανεῖν, τὸ καθανεῖν δὲ ζήν: Ἐὐριπίδου (simpliciter, denoting verbatim quotation). Τὸ πνεῖν δὲ δειπνεῖν, τὸ δὲ καθεύδειν κόμιδων παρὰ τὸ ἐκ Φρίξου Ἐὐριπίδου (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 Polydus into the problem (this is the only ἄθετησις of evidence that the present solution would involve), and that the scholia to Aristophanes Ranae, 1478, mention εξ Ἰππολύτου through a not improbable error, given that in Hippolytus, 190 sqq. a similar sentiment is expressed in different and simpler and nonmysteric 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 Phrixos 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 mystic 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), IIβ, where speaking of ἐνθουσιασμός and the four Platonic μανία he says: πρόσηλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἡ ἐρωτική (sc. μανία) πάσας συμβᾶλλει, ὅποι οὐ μόνον ταύταις ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀπαξ καὶ ἀπλῶς ἀντὶ ἐνθουσιασμῷ ὀδένα γὰρ ἐνθουσιασμὸν ἀνευ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς ἐπιπαύει συμβᾶει 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 ἠλιοῦν (sc. οἱ παλαιοί), ὡς δὲ ὑπερβολὴν ὑδραπαιδίας ἄκρατος, τὰ οἷκα πρὸς αἰσχρουργίαν μέρη τοῦ σώματος, τὰ τε ἀκόλαστα ἐν
and from 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 τῇ γὰρ τοῖς ἱεροῖς εἴδωλοι αὐτὸν κατασκεύασαν τῷ καταδείξαι καὶ κατὰ τὰς τελετὰς καὶ τὰς θυσίας τὰς τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ γυνομένας ἐντιμήσατον ποιῆσαι καὶ πλείστου σεβασμοῦ τυγχάνειν. 

And, of course, Πρίασος was an attribute of Διόνυσος as well (besides being his son from Ἀφροδίτη): τιμᾶται δὲ παρὰ Λαμψικηνοὶ ὁ Πρίασος ὁ αὐτὸς ὤν τῷ Διονύσῳ, εἰς ἐπιθέτου καλομένου ὑπόσω, ὡς Θράμβος 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 πηχυαῖα ἀγάλματα νευρόπασσα, τὰ περιφέροντα κατὰ κῶμας γυναῖκες, νεῶν τὸ αἰδώς, οὐ πολλῷ τε ἔλασσον ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ 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):

<κάναγετε σάντες, κάναγετε εὑρωφρίαν τῷ θεῶ ποιεῖτε·>
<ἐθέλει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὀρθὸς ἐσφυρωμένος (οὐ ἐσφυρωμένος>
<with Bergk)
<διὰ μέσου βαδίζειν.>

For the kind of practices related to ἰθύφαλλον cf. Demosthenes, *In Cononem* p. 1261-2 Reiske, esp.: ὁστοί γὰρ εἰσίν οἱ τελεύτες ἀλλήλους
τῷ ἰθυφάλλῳ καὶ τοιαῦτα ποιοῦντες, ἂ πολλὴν αἰσχύνην ἔχει καὶ λέγειν, μή τι γε δὴ ποιεῖν, ἀνθρώπους μετρίους. Cf. also the scholia ad αὐτολεγκόθεν which reproduce Harpocratio s.v.; Suda s.v. Σήμος and Athenaeus XIV 622 connect αὐτοκάβαλοι with ἰθύφαλλοι and φαλλοφόροι; see also Harpocratio s.v. ἰθύφαλλοι, where: ἐλέγετο δὲ κυρίως ἰθύφαλλος τὸ ἐντεσάμενον αἰδοῖον, ὥς Κρατίνος ἐν Ἀρχιλόχους (Fr. 16 PCG vol. IV p. 130). But passages from the grammarians and lexicographers relating to phallus abound. Note Suda s.v. φαλλικά, φαλ-λίωνες, φαλλοί. In the second entry to the last-mentioned word he says: φαλλοί· αἰδοῖον σύκινον· ὑστερον δὲ ἐκ δερμάτων ἐρυθρῶν, σχῆμα αἰδοῖον ἔχοντες ἀνδρέους. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐκαύσει περιβήμενοι ἐν τε τοῖς τραχήλοις καὶ μέτοικος τοῖς μηρῶις ἑξωρχοῦντο, τιμὴν τῷ Διονύσῳ ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίους ἔγινε (from Nonnus scholia on St. Gregory). Cf. further Hesychius s.v. φαλλικά, φαλλικοί, εἰθύφαλλος (= τὸ ἐντεσάμενον αἰδοῖον... λέγεται δὲ καὶ ποιήματα ταύτα ἐπὶ τῷ ἱσταμένῳ φαλλῷ ἀδόμενα) and especially s.v. ἰθύφαλλοι (a variant reading of εἰθύφαλλοι) where he notes: οἱ ἔφοροι (cod. ἐπίρροκον 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 ἔφοροι; ἐπίουροι, i.e. φύλακες, 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, γυναικεῖαι ἰσχύοντες στολήν. (which reminds us of the ἀπηρσενιμένοι τετελεσάμενοι in the mysteries). λέγεται δὲ, ὅτε μὲν τὸ ἐντεσάμενον αἰδοῖον, ὅτε δὲ τὸ ποίημα τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ ἱσταμένῳ φαλλῷ ἀδόμενον. Notice the woman’s dress (and remember the στεφάνιον); such ἰθύφαλλοι might nonetheless carry the simulacrum of the ἐντεσάμενον αἰδοῖον between their thighs. Suda’s second entry on ἰθύφαλλοι runs thus: οἱ εἰς τοὺς μηρῶς μύονον, οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τραχήλοις (contrast s.v. φαλ-λοί, a passage already mentioned) ἐπ’ ἐθέλεσι δεσμούμενοι εἴς ἐρυθρῶν δερμάτων (cf. Etym.M. s.v. ἰθύφαλλοι where the procedure is explicitly connected to the Prosemnus story). Hesychius has ἰδὼν· πυγή· ...καὶ προ-κτός. It is possible that ἰθῦ-φαλλος was also a φαλλὸς περὶ τὴν πυγήν in connection to what Nonnus (scholia to St. Gregory c. 1028 Migne) says: ὅν, τόν Φάντατα εἰσφέρει (sc. ἡ ὀρθικὴ πόιησις) αἰδοῖον ἔχοντα ὀπίσω περὶ τὴν πυγήν. 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 ἱερὸν in Dionysiac processions: Plutarchus, De Cupiditate Divitiarum 527D: ἡ πάτριος τῶν Διονυσίων ἐορτῇ τὸ πολυάτων ἐπέμπετο δημοσικῶς καὶ ἱερῶς· ἀμφοτέρων ὀνομα τὶς κλήμα-τις, εἶτα πρόκειν τῶν ἑλληνικῶν ἄρρητον ἴκελοῦθει κομίζων,
This is not just late testimony; this is the πάτριος τρόπος, already mentioned by Heraclitus. For the Dionysus Sabazius, the offspring of Zeus and Persephone, Diodorus, IV, 4, 1 says οὗ Ἔλσον τὴν τε γένεσιν καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τιμὰς νυκτερινὰς καὶ κρυφώς παρεισάγουσι διὰ τὴν άισχόνην τὴν ἐκ τῆς συνωσίας 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: ἐν τε ταῖς τελεταῖς οὗ μόνον ταῖς Διονυσιακαῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις σχεδὸν ἀπάσαις οὗτος ὁ θεὸς τυχάναι πνεος τιμῆς, μετά γέλωτος καὶ παιδαῖς παρεισαγόμενοι ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις. Compare Hippolytus, Refutatio, V, 7, 27-29 for the everpresence of the phallic image. (For the παιδιὰ, cf. the remarkable παιδιὰ ἦδονῶν 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: ἐνοι δὲ λέγωντι τὸ γεννητικὸν μόριον, αὕτων ὑπάρχου τῆς γεννήσεως τῶν ἀνδρώτων καὶ διαμονῆς εἰς ἀπάντα τὸν αἰώνα, τυχεῖν τῆς ἄθανατου τιμῆς only this is an inferior, mechanistic, shortsighted 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: ἄτελεῖτο δὲ ταύτα (sc. τὰ μυστήρια) καὶ Δηοὶ καὶ Κόρη, ὥστε ταύτῃ μὲν Πλοῦτων ἀρταξεῖε, Δηοὶ δὲ μυγαί Ζεὺς· ἐν οἷς πολλὰ μὲν ἐπάρτετο αἰσχρὰ, 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: Ἱακῆ, ὁ πολυτίμων ἐν ἐδραῖς ἐνθάδε ναϊν, / Ἱακῆ ὁ Ἱακῆ, /.../ πολύκαρπον μὲν τινάσσον / περὶ κρατῇ ἐὼ βρύοντα / στέφανον μῦρτων, ... etc. 323 sqq. Now just have in mind our understanding of Iacchus as was summarily argued above, and remember the double sense of ἐδρα field and fundament; also imagine what is likely to be the κεφαλὴ of Iacchus and recollect that μῦρτον, as we have shown, signifies the pudendum muliebre or, more particularly, the κλειστορίς (Pollux II, 173); and you will appreciate an exquisite play of double entendre worthy of an Aristophanes! (For the special connection of μῦρτον 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 χαραποτιών. Cf. Plato Comicus, Phaon, Fr. II, 14 (Meineke II, p. 67) = Fr. 188.13-4 PCGr. vol. VII pp. 510-1, where a πυκκισκος μύρτων should be offered to Κονίσαλος and his two παραστάται the passage has been explained above; not far from στέφανος μύρτων in our passage. It is indeed ὁ «διαγόρας» Ιακχός (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:

 долгий мотив, полутымный Δήμητρος крьп
и́дь́ мьр пре́сёне́съ чорёи́въ крее́в.

Pigs were sacrificed to the Great Goddesses; and χαῖρος was also the γυναικείον αἴδοιον, 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 Μοστήρον τῆς Ἡδονῆς (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: ψείδουσιν ὡς ἐστι παρὰ σφισὶ δῶναμις ἐκ θεῶν ποροξομένη θυσίαις τε καὶ ἐπῳδαίς, εἴτε τι ἀδικημάτι ποὺ γέγονεν αὐτῶν ἡ προγόνων, (the Titans and relating to the ἦδον_redirect οἱ ἰδέα καὶ ἐφοτέρων. And in e: ψείδουσεν οὐ μόνον ἰδώτας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόλεις (introduction of rites in Plato’s time and before), ὥς ἀρὰ λύσεις τε καὶ καθαρμοι ἀδικημάτων διὰ θυσίων καὶ παυδας ἰδέων εἰς μὲν ἐτι ζωσιν, εἰς δε καὶ τελευτήσασιν, ὡς δὴ τελετάς 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 Alchristlichen 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 kephali of the log found in the sea by the Methymnians, was to be worshipped according to the Apollonian Oracle as falhron Διονύσου κάρπου; and Theodoretus bursts forth with indignation (Gr.Aff.Cur. X, p. 253, 9 sqq. ed. Raeder): καὶ οὐκ ἔνθερᾳ τῶν θεῶν ὁ σοφότατος, δὲν Φαῖβον οἱ ποιηταὶ προσωνόμαζον ὡς δή ἀγνὸν καὶ ἀμάντον, τὸῦ Διονύσου τὸ ἄκροπόσθιον τιμᾶσθαι χρησμῳδήσας. The ἄκροπόσθιον is the kephali τοῦ πέος and τοῦ Διονύσου (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 χαῖρος and the κτείς, symbols of female nature.

A word remains to be said about Diels Arcana Cerealia (in Miscallanea 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:

ως εἶπον άπλους ἄνεισύρατο, δείξε δὲ πάντα
σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον: παῖς δ’ ἦν "Ιακχος
(χειρί τε μν ρίπτασκε) γελών Βαυβοΐς ύπό κόλπους. ή δ’ ἐπεί οὐν ἐνόησε θεά, μείδησ᾿ ἐνι 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, inquies, in hac re ludici? (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 quaesum in spectu tali, quid in pudendis fuit reverendisque Baubonis, quod feminei sexus deam et consimili formatam membro in admirationem converteret atque risum, quod objectum lumini conspectuque divino et oblivionem miseriarum daret et habitum in laetiorem 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: \(\text{βρυδαλίχα, βρυδακίζειν, βρυλλοχιστάι.}\) The two former are out of the proper word order; the second has been appropriately corrected by Vossius to \(\text{βρυδακίζειν; }\) for the first one, \(\text{βρυλλαδίχα}\) has been proposed again by Vossius, but I think \(\text{βρυλλαδίχα}\) must be the correct reading. Beginning the examination with the last and least problematic of them we find: \(\text{βρυλλοχιστάι: οἱ αὐσχρὰ προσωπεία περιτιθέμενοι γυναικεῖα, καὶ ύμνους ἅδοντες.} \) The ύμνους indicates a religious context. But why αὐσχρὰ γυναικεῖα προσωπεία?
Perhaps the etymology may help here. Βρύλλων is explained as υποστίνων by Hesychius (and βρύλλαν: πιέν, according to the same). Thus in Aristophanes, Equites 1126: βρύλλων τὸ καθ’ ἤμεραν, where the scholast has: βρύλλων· ἐξαπατώμενος υπὸ τινων καὶ μεθύσων. Σύμμαχος δὲ, υποστίνων ἐκ μιμήσεως τῆς τῶν παιδῶν φωνῆς (cf. Suda s.v. βρύλλων where the same explanation is offered with reference to the present Aristophanic passage; for the παιδῶν φωνή v. Aristophanes Nubes 1382, where the scholast explains βρύναν ἡς ἡμικός φωνῆ παιδίων, ὅταν πιέν ζητή. Clearly this is onomatopoetic). To βρύλλω now a cognate form (with the same meaning of sipping or rather sucking) is βρῷζω. This word occurs in an important passage in Archilochus Fr. 28 (Diehl) = Fr. 42 West2, apud Athenaeus X, 447B:

Βροῦζω is the κρίθωνος ὁῖνος, a kind of beer, as Athenaeus explains there (and cf. Hesychius s.v. βροῦτον). We have here a woman practicing fellatio: the αὐλός parallels the πῖος, and the ἐβρῳζεν refers to the sucking of that αὐλός. The κόβδα (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 (κύπται Toup, but in any case from κύπτω) are the μαλακοὶ καὶ κάναιδοι. (Cf. Lucianus, Philopseudes 24; Macho apud Athenaeus p. 580d p. 279.12 Kaibel; Aristophanes, Equites 365; Pax 897 in a context where, as the scholast explains, ἀπαντά ὡς ἐπὶ συννοικίας σχημάτων καὶ θεωρίας; Thesmoph. 489; Lysistr. 17, where see the scholast who refers to a similar Sophronian verse; Plato Comicus apud Athenaeus 441E = Phaon Fr. 188.5-6 and 20-1 PCG vol. VII p. 509 and 5611; Theocritus V, 116). We conclude that the Archilochean ἐβρῳζεν connotes the practices of a μῦζωρις (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 ἐβρῳζε to ἐμῳζε referring to Hesychius s.v. ἐμῳζεν· ἐστεεν, ἀπεθήλαζεν. The sense remains the same (μυζάω), but the change is unwarranted. The point is that βρῷζω has the same meaning. And as Diehl observed: attamen cui onomatopoëeia βροῦτον, Φρῦς (cf. Bruges), ἐβρῳζε non arriet. Recte. Then could the αἰσχρὰ in Hesychius’ explanation of βρυλλοχισταῖ refer to some portrayal of that practice, in exaggerated, comic form? We could then understand the second of the
above mentioned Hesychian lemmata (βρυλλαξίζειν· ἐκτείνειν or perhaps ἐντείνειν sc. το αἰδοῖον) as referring to the στύος of the membrum virile caused by fellatio. We may also then understand along similar lines the first entry, reading, as I suggested, βρυλλαξία and considering it as a compound from βρύλλος and λήξα related either to λείχω (lick) or, less probably to γλήξομαι (desire; cf. Hesychius λιχάζει· ἐπιθυμεῖ). The explanation of the last mentioned entry is unfortunately partly corrupt. It runs thus: πρόσωπον γυναικείον· παρὰ τὸ γελοῖον καὶ αἰσχρὸν + ὑπερ τίθεται (sic). ὃ Ρήθων, τὴν ὀρχήστραν καὶ γυναικεία ἐνδύματα ἐνδέδυται. θεῖν καὶ τὰς μαχλάδας βρυλλαξίας (from βρυδαξίας) καλοῦσι Δάκωνες. The corruption is mended differently by different scholars. The best attempts are Vossius παρὰ τὸ γελοῖον καὶ αἰσχρὸν ὀρριδάν (cf. Hesychius s.v. ὀρριδάν· τὸ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱσχία καὶ τοὺς γλουτοὺς πεσεῖν probably in the course of some lewd dance); and Kusterus ὃ Ρήθων τὴν ὀρχήστραν (i.e. τὴν ὀρχήστριὰ) καὶ «τὸν» γυναικεῖα ἰμάτια ἐνδεδυμένον. But they are partial and far from final. I would propose παρὰ τὸ γελοῖον καὶ αἰσχρὸν ὀρροπούγων· τιθέναι οὐ περετιθέναι (cf. s.v. Βρυλλοκασταί) for the first part of the corrupt passage. Or π. τὸ γ. καὶ αἰσχρὸν τὸν ὀρρόν ἐκτιθέσθαι, μεκανομένον «περὰ» τὴν ὀρχήστραν, καὶ γυναικεία ἰμάτια ἐνδεδύσθαι. For μεκανοῦσθαι see Photius and Suda s.v. (also Hesychius s.v. μεκανοῦσθαι and μεκανοῦσθαι and Pollux IV, 99) where note especially: τὸ καμπύλον γέγεν-σθαι ἀναχμονῶς καὶ κατὰ συνουσίαν καὶ ὀρχηστάν κάμπτουτα τὴν ὀσφύν. Could this αἰσχρὸν πρόσωπον γυναικείοι, 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.