

bating the diseases of the harsh summer' (10.392) might take the combinatorial imitation further in pointing the imagistic parallel between the snakes and the plague which are the two principal destructive forces of the second half of *Georgics* 3.¹⁷ Certainly the plague and the cucumber both slither (*serpant*, *G.* 3.475), and exercise their destructive power in summer (*aestiua*, 3.472).

Ultimately, however, Columella's world view, like his cucumber, is a complex mixture of (in crude terms) positive and negative.¹⁸ The summer brings horticultural bounty as well as the blasting Dog Star (10.400–8); the serpentine *cucumis liuidus* may aggravate disease, but the *cucurbita* can be used as a wine-container or a buoyancy aid for children learning to swim (387–8), while the *cucumis candidus* will not only soothe, but actively bring aid to the ill (394–9).¹⁹ Columella certainly identifies the snakiness of Virgil's cucumber and it is more than arguable that his annotative imitation also interprets it, but this is not to say that he asserts a simplistic or reductive interpretation which would diminish the glorious complexity and ambiguity of Virgil's *Georgics*, Columella's *De Cultu Hortorum* and both of their cucumbers.

Balliol College, Oxford

ROBERT COWAN

bob.cowan@balliol.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S00098388090000263

¹⁷ On parallels between Virgil's snakes and plague, see, *inter alios*, D.A. Ross, *Virgil's Elements* (Princeton, 1986), 177–83; R.F. Thomas, *Virgil's Georgics* vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1988), 119, ad 3.414–39.

¹⁸ 'Columella erkennt die Ambivalenz der Natur also durchaus an und huldigt keinem so einseitigen realitätsfernen Optimismus, wie ihm die Forschung vielfach vorgeworfen hat', Diederich (n. 2), 245. On the cucumber, see Henderson quoted in n. 16 above. With different emphasis, P. Toohey, *Epic Lessons* (London, 1996), 176–9, notes a tension in the poem between erotic (and fertile) sensuality and chaste purity. On the associations of cucurbits with the imagery of fertility in literature more broadly, see R. Norrman and J. Haarberg, *Nature and Language: a Semiotic Study of Cucurbits in Literature* (London, 1980), 13–79, esp. 21–3 on classical texts.

¹⁹ I use Columella's own terms to distinguish between the cucurbits, but they are notoriously difficult to identify. For a scientific attempt to do so, see J. Janick, H.S. Paris and D.C. Parrish, 'The cucurbits of Mediterranean antiquity: identification of taxa from ancient images and descriptions', *Annals of Botany* 100 (2007), 1441–57, at 1444–5. Rebecca Armstrong suggests *per litteras* that Columella's observation on the diversity of the cucurbits, *una neque est illis facies* (10.381), might further constitute a correction of Virgil's failure to catalogue the different kinds. I am grateful to her and to CQ's anonymous reader for their helpful suggestions.

THEMIS AT ELEUSIS: CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *PROTREPTICUS* 2.22.5

The present note argues against a tenacious emendation. The textual problem with which it is concerned is located in a particularly sensitive passage, the long attack against the Mysteries of the Hellenes in Clement of Alexandria's *Protrepticus* 2.12–2, one of our most precious sources of information on 'ancient mystery cults'. The manuscripts of the *Protrepticus* are unanimous in reading τῆς Θέμιδος at 2.22.5.¹

¹ All extant manuscripts of the *Protrepticus* derive from the Parisinus Graecus 451 (P), which dates from the tenth century. See O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus. Bd. 1: Protrepticus und Paedagogus* (Leipzig, 1905), xvi–xxiii.

ταὐτ' ἔστιν αὐτῶν τὰ ἄγια. καὶ προσέτι τῆς Θέμιδος τὰ ἀπόρρητα σύμβολα ὀρίγανον, λύχνος, ξίφος, κτεῖς γυναικεῖος, <ὄς> ἔστιν, εὐφήμως καὶ μυστικῶς εἰπεῖν, μόριον γυναικεῖον. ὦ τῆς Ἀμφανοῦς ἀνασχυντίας.

The passage is cited by Eusebius with the exact same words.² The emendation proposed by Wilamowitz in 1880, however, 'correcting' the τῆς Θέμιδος of the passage into Γῆς Θέμιδος, has met with almost unanimous approval.³ It has been used by

² Eusebius transcribes this section of the *Protrepticus* (2.11.1–23.9) in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* 2.3.40; K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke. Praeparatio Evangelica*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1954²), 86. Although Wilamowitz writes *corruptela autorem etiam Eusebii exemplum obsedit*, the manuscript reading τῆς was retained by Mras in his 1954 edition of the *Praeparatio Evangelica*. All MSS of Eusebius' *PE*, together with P, are unanimous in reading τῆς, and even Wilamowitz concedes that this is what Eusebius also read (from a corrupted copy, in his opinion). Eus. BONV, together with Clem. P, all agree in reading θέμιδος after τῆς. Eus. H provides the only discordant reading: θέμιτος (M. Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus* [Leiden, 1995], 32). Arnobius makes a free translation of Clement's passage in *Adv. Nat.* 5.19.26, but without any echo of the lines on Themis.

³ U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Commentariolum Grammaticum*, vol. 2 (Göttingen, 1880), 11 = U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Kleine Schriften IV: Lese Früchte und Verwandtes*, ed. K. Latte (Berlin, 1962), 608–9. Until recently, Clement's discussion of the mysteries in the *Protrepticus* was widely seen as an aggregate of information from various teletic cults, arranged without much order, and the case for seeking an appropriate divinity from any other mystery cult to make sense of the passage seemed perfectly legitimate. In 1880 there was no indication that Themis might have had an established presence in the Eleusinian cult, or that she played a part in teletic rites more generally. Lobeck, for instance, already suggested the correction θερμοθέτιδος (C.A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus, sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum censui libri tres* [Königsberg, 1829], 703). Mras conjectures θέμιτος on the basis of the θέμιτος of Eus. H. Themis did not seem to fit a context of *teletai*, and *Ge Themis* was a brilliant choice for an emendation. The idea of Themis as the expression of a primordial earth-goddess has had long currency; see e.g. L.R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, vol. 3 (Chicago, 1971), 3, 13; K. Latte, 'Themis', *RE*² 5.2 (1934), 1626–7; K. Reinhardt, 'Personifikation und Allegorie', *Vermächtnis der Antike: gesammelte Essays zur Philosophie und Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. K. Becher (Göttingen, 1966²), 26; K. Clinton, 'IG² 5, the Eleusinia, and the Eleusinians', *AJP* 100 (1979), 7; R.F. Healey, *Eleusinian Sacrifices in the Athenian Law Code* (New York, 1990), 75–9; 219–24. An equivalence between Ge and Themis is made by Aeschylus, *PV* 210–2, for instance (cf. A.J. Podlecki, *Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound* [Oxford, 2005] ad loc.); she is associated with Earth at Delphi (E. Stafford, *Worshipping Virtues: Personification and the Divine in Ancient Greece* [London, 2000], 52–6); the inscription of a seat in the theatre of Dionysus at Athens (IG² 5130) reads *ἐπὶ τῆς Θέμιδος* (cf. also IG² 5098: 'two *hersephoroi* of *Chloe Themis*'); Paus. 5.14.10 sets the altar of Themis in the mouth of the oracle of Ge, and locates a sanctuary of Themis next to a sanctuary of Ge on the south slope of the Acropolis (1.22.1–3; cf. 8.25.7). The understanding of Themis as the personification of an 'original' deity of fertility and social order belongs to a distinct moment in the history of religions, of course. Stafford, 45–73, the most recent scholarly discussion of Themis as a figure of cult, rightly warns against continuing to privilege the 'early and primitive' association of Themis with earth and fertility. As all divinities of polytheistic Greek religion, Themis is linked to many other gods through rich ties of equivalence, complementarities and proximity, and there is no valid reason to privilege the tenuous connection of Themis with Ge in archaic and classical (mostly) literary sources to the detriment of all other associations (see e.g. Delphi inv. 4286; H.A. Shapiro, *Personifications in Greek Art: The Representation of Abstract Concepts 600–400 BC* [Zurich, 1993], no. 144). Not only is the cult association between Ge and Themis not 'original', but it is hardly attested. No actual cult association between Themis and Ge is attested before the mid-third century B.C.E., as Stafford observes, and even there the few documents adduced are far from decisive (67: 'nowhere have we seen evidence to support the theory that Themis originated as an epithet of earth'). Price (T.H. Price, *Kouroutrophos. Cults and Representations of the Greek Nursing Deities* [Leiden, 1978], 101–32), for instance, has argued that the inscription which was thought to mention a 'priestess of Ge Themis' (IG² 5130) might actually be referring to a priestess of Ge and Themis instead, or even to two distinct priestesses, one of Ge and one of Themis (see also Stafford, 63–4). This late imperial text is in fact our only

some to dissociate the passage entirely from Clement's description of Eleusis.⁴ Others have seen it as pointing towards an equivalence between Demeter and Themis, as yet another generic type of earth-mother goddess, whether located in Eleusis or not.⁵ Although this emendation has been convincingly refuted by Pierre Boyancé in 1936, it continues to be generally accepted in editions of the text and discussions of the passage, when it is recognized as an emendation.⁶ As the strong case for the $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$ of the manuscripts has all but been ignored in the past 70 years, and as our understanding of Clement's sources on mystery cults has significantly increased during that time, we believe that the question needs to be revisited. This is a textbook example of a hermeneutic house of cards: layers of interpretation built on the single (virtual) stroke of one letter.⁷

Our passage culminates with an assault on the Mysteries *par excellence*, the Eleusinian rites (2.20–2).⁸ After 'revealing' and 'exposing' a number of other mysteries (Aphrodite, Deo, Dionysus, Corybantes), Clement moves on to attack the

independent attestation for the putative figure of 'Ge-Themis' (C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Myth as history: the previous owners of the Delphic Oracle', in J.N. Bremmer [ed.], *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* [Oxford, 1987], 240, n. 62; Stafford, 68).

⁴ See e.g. A. Körte, 'Zu den eleusinischen Mysterien', *ArchRW* 18 (1915), 115–25; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin, 1932), 82; U. Pestalozza, *Religione mediterranea* (Milan, 1951), 229–33; G. Casadio, *Vie gnostiche all'immortalità* (Brescia, 1997), 19–66. Most scholars who have written on the question do not mention that $\Gamma\eta\varsigma$ $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$ is an emendation.

⁵ Körte (n. 4), for instance, argues that the *kteis gunaikeios* was shown to the initiand as a symbol of rebirth. He writes that Clement called Demeter Ge-Themis as 'er nur der Abwechslung halber die eleusinische Erdmutter mit einem anderen, wesengleichen Namen benennt'. Pestalozza (n. 4), 231 makes Ge-Themis an equivalent of Demeter-Kore. Cf. also V. Ehrenberg, *Die Rechtsidee im Frühen Griechentum* (Darmstadt, 1966), 33; Farnell (n. 3), 13–14.

⁶ P. Boyancé, *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs* (Paris, 1936), 36, 53; P. Boyancé, 'Sur les mystères d'Eleusis', *REG* 75 (1962), 460–82. The editions of O. Stählin (n. 1), G.W. Butterworth, *The Exhortation to the Greeks, The Rich Man's Salvation, and the Fragment of an Address Entitled To the Newly Baptized by Clement of Alexandria* (Harvard, 1919), Q. Cataudella, *Clemente Alessandrino. Protreptico ai Greci* (Turin, 1940²), and M. Marcovich (n. 2), the most recent one, all follow Wilamowitz's opinion. C. Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Le Protreptique* (Paris, 1949), is alone in accepting the $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$ of the manuscripts. Roberts also argues against the emendation of Wilamowitz, on the basis that 'Clement almost never hyphenates the name of a god or goddess' (L. Roberts, 'The unutterable symbols of ($\Gamma\eta$)- $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\varsigma$ ', *HTHR* 68 [1975], 79). His discussion is an example of the force of scholarly tradition, as it continues to presuppose the association of Themis with Ge in the passage. See e.g. p. 79: 'the Alexandrian procession may have included three different sets of mysteries. This does not discount the possibility that Clement may have combined the two goddesses in his thought. For scholars now recognize that the ancient goddess $\Gamma\eta$ remained important through Hellenistic times'. The persistent presence of 'Ge-Themis' in discussions of the passage, even when the emendation of Wilamowitz is not accepted, is striking. Like Roberts, for instance, Stafford (n. 3), 45–73 accepts the manuscript reading $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$, but explicitly reads the passage in reference to 'Ge-Themis'. Although A. Bernabé, *Orphicorum et Orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta. Poetae epici graeci. Pars II*, 3 vols (Leipzig, 2004–7), rightly edits $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$ in *OF* 532 II, he locates the fragment in the section devoted to 'Phlya et Lycomidae'; he is following Casadio (n. 4), who actually bases this link with Phlya on the reading $\Gamma\eta\varsigma$ $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$.

⁷ The difference between Γ and T is of course minimal in uncial scripts, and a mistake readily made.

⁸ On Clement's view of Eleusis, see for instance F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Berlin, 1974), 194–9; W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, trans. P. Bing (Berkeley, 1983), 251, 269–71. Wilamowitz had a generally low opinion of Clement's value as 'witness for the Eleusinian cult': U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1932), 374.

mysteries of Pherephatta.⁹ Throughout the passage, Clement systematically relates the myth of each mystery cult which is being exposed, and proceeds to reveal its *synthēmata*, *hagia*, and/or *symbola*. The section on the *Cabiri*, for instance, ends with a description of the shameful *symbolon* of the cult's mystic *kistē*: the castrated *aidoion* of Dionysus (2.19.1–4).¹⁰ In disclosing the myths and rites of Eleusis as so many empty errors and shocking obscenities, the attack against the mysteries of Pherephatta follows the same pattern deployed against other *teletai* in the passage. It also follows the same order of material presentation. It tells the myth of Demeter's search for her daughter in the version of a hymn attributed to Orpheus (2.20), quotes some verses from Orpheus which illustrate the shamelessness of the cult (2.21.1), discloses the σύνθημα Ἐλευσινίων μυστηρίων (2.21.2), and reveals the ἅγια of the mystic *kistai* (2.22.4). Immediately after this, Clement proceeds to unveil the σύμβολα of the cult (2.22.5).

Wilamowitz's emendation was based on internal and external considerations. The passage of Clement was thought to have little order in its arrangement of the material, something which justified looking beyond Attic Eleusis for fitting parallels;¹¹ moreover, no independent evidence for Themis and the mysteries was thought to exist, something which justified changing the received text.¹² Both considerations have now been disproved. First, the sentence which mentions the 'unutterable symbols' of Themis clearly belongs to Clement's discussion of Eleusis. Recent research shows that the arrangement of the material we find in this section follows the pattern used for the other cults, as we have seen.¹³ The mention of the *symbola* at 2.22.5 belongs squarely in the section of the passage concerned with Eleusis.¹⁴ The reference to the Hierophant, the Dadouch, and Iakchos right after the '*aporrhēta symbola* of Themis' are

⁹ The systematic alphabetical order adopted in the passage makes it clear that Clement is following a written source, a Hellenistic treatise on the mysteries which gives mythical and ritual accounts of diverse *teletai* using as main source one (or several) 'Orphic' poem(s); see C. Riedweg, *Mysterienterminologie bei Plato, Philo und Klemens von Alexandrien* (Berlin, 1987); N. Robertson, 'New Light on Demeter's Mysteries: The Festival Proerosia', *GRBS* 37 (1996), 365–75; M. Herrero, 'Las fuentes de Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2.12–22: un tratado sobre los misterios y una teogonía órfica', *Emerita* 75 (2007), 37–50. This contradicts the obviously interested information of Eusebius (*PE* 2.2.64) that Clement had direct knowledge of the mysteries because he had been initiated, something which is still widely repeated. While with Pherephatta Clement designates Kore, the poetic *epiklēsis* Deo is used to refer to both Rhea and Demeter. The alphabetical treatise used by Clement probably relies on 'Orphic' poetic traditions in which these equations of feminine goddesses were typical (e.g. *P. Derveni*, col. XXII.7 [*OF* 398 Bernabé]).

¹⁰ On the meaning of *kistē* in the passage, see Roberts (n. 6), 77–9.

¹¹ Roberts (n. 6) 73, for instance, still sees the passage concerning the *symbola* of Themis as an 'afterthought' of Clement's general discussion of the mysteries.

¹² Neither P.F. Foucart, *Les mystères d'Éleusis* (Paris, 1914), G. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton, 1961), K. Kerényi, *Eleusis: Archetypal Image of Mother and Daughter*, trans. R. Manheim (New York, 1967), K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Philadelphia, 1974), nor K. Clinton, *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Stockholm, 1992), for instance, discuss the presence of Themis at Eleusis. Healey (n. 3), 75–83, explicitly describes Themis as a divinity who does not belong to the 'Eleusinian pantheon'.

¹³ See n. 9.

¹⁴ The fact that Clement breaks his unveiling of Eleusis with two rhetorical interruptions (2.22.1–2 and 2.22.3, based on Heraclitus and Philo, respectively), and that he has also anticipated some attacks on Eleusis in 2.12.2 and 2.17.1, does not affect the validity of this statement. The important point is that we expect to find *symbola* at the end of the section. A new lemma with Themis would also be uncharacteristic in both having no myth and breaking the alphabetical order.

mentioned should be sufficient to confirm the matter.¹⁵ Second, the external considerations which were valid in 1880 have changed since then. It is no longer true to say, with Wilamowitz, that *ignoramus Themidis mysticum cultum*.¹⁶ The publication of column III from the 'Nichomachean sacrificial calendar' in 1935 confirmed the presence of Themis in the rituals of Eleusis once and for all.¹⁷ Whereas Themis was nowhere associated with the Eleusinian cult of Demeter and Korê before this text was found, the sacrificial calendar of the Agora now gives her pride of place in the rituals of the mysteries at the end of the fifth century B.C.E. The nineteen sacrifices mentioned in the upper part of column III are to be performed by the Eumolpids in the Eleusinia festival.¹⁸ The very first sacrifice mentioned is a ewe of twelve drachmas for Themis.¹⁹

The presence of Themis in the cult of Eleusis is independently and prominently attested. There is no valid reason to continue defending the emendation of Wilamowitz against the unanimous reading of the manuscripts and of Eusebius. The lemma of the *Protrepticus* (and of its source) on the mysteries of Eleusis mentions and describes the ἀπόρρητα σύμβολα of Themis.²⁰ Whatever value one gives to this testimony, it is a significant element of the great Eleusinian puzzle. It can no longer be replaced by a virtual text.

McGill University

RENAUD GAGNÉ
renaud.gagne@mcgill.ca

Università di Bologna

MIGUEL HERRERO
miguelhdj@yahoo.es
doi:10.1017/S00098388090000275

¹⁵ The rhetorical invocation which follows our passage has been thoroughly analysed in C. Riedweg, 'Die Mysterien von Eleusis in rhetorisch geprägten Texten des 2/3. Jahrhunderts nach Christus', *Ill. Class. Stud.* 13.1 (1988), 127–33.

¹⁶ Wilamowitz (n. 3), 11 = 608–9.

¹⁷ F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément* (Paris, 1962), n. 10, l. 60, first published in J.H. Oliver, S. Dow, 'Greek Inscriptions', *Hesperia* 4 (1935), 21–9. See now S. Lambert, 'The sacrificial calendar of Athens', *ABSA* 97 (2002), 353–99. Boyancé (n. 6, 1936), 26 and 53 and (n. 6, 1962), 480–2, was the first to see the importance of this inscription for the passage of the *Protrepticus*. He, however, improbably connects the Eleusinian Themis with the μέγιστη θεά of Proclus, *In rempubl.* 1.125.20 Kr. Healey (n. 3), 75–83, discusses the presence of Themis in the inscription at length. His contention that the sacrifice of Themis mentioned in this public inscription belongs to the gentilitial cult of the Eumolpidae, based on the understanding of 'la thémis ancestrale' as the 'symbol of clan justice' proposed by G. Glotz, *La solidarité de la famille dans le droit criminel en Grèce* (Paris, 1904), and his many followers long ago, no longer carries conviction.

¹⁸ For the identification of this list as referring to the Eumolpid sacrifices of the Eleusinia festival, and not the Mysteries themselves, see Lambert (n. 17), contra Oliver (n. 17), 26–9 and Sokolowski (n. 17) ad loc.

¹⁹ Lambert (n. 17), l. 60: ΔΙΙ Θέμιδι οἷς. The price is wrongly indicated in Sokolowski. For discussion of sacrificial prices in the inscription, see Lambert (n. 17), 396–7.

²⁰ Marjoram, a lamp, a sword and a woman's comb are mentioned, probably objects to be placed in a sacred basket, as Stafford (n. 3), 62–5 suggests, in reference to the *hersephoroi* of *IG* 2² 5098. This short discussion on the emendation of Wilamowitz is not the place to speculate on the significance of this group of objects.