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Abstract

“Unveiling Baubo” describes how the mythical figure Baubo was constructed in nineteenth-century German. Associated with the act of exposing herself to the goddess Demeter, Baubo came to epitomize questions about concealment and unveiling in the budding fields of archaeology, philology, psychoanalysis and literary theory. As I show in my dissertation, Baubo did not exist as a coherent mythical figure in antiquity. Rather, the nineteenth-century notion of Baubo was mediated through a disparate array of ancient and contemporary sources centered on the notion of sexual vulgarity. Baubo emerged as a modern amalgam of ancient parts, a myth of a myth invested with the question of what modernity can and should know about ancient Greece.

The dissertation centers on the 1989 excavation of the so-called Baubo statuettes, a group of Hellenistic votive figurines discovered at Priene, in modern-day Turkey. The group adheres to a consistent and unique iconography: the face of the female figures is placed directly onto their torso, giving the impression that the vulva and chin merge. Based on the statuettes’ “grotesque-obscene” appearance, archaeologist concluded that they depicted Baubo, the woman who greeted Demeter at Eleusis when the goddess was searching for her abducted daughter Persephone. According to late antique Church Fathers, Demeter refused the locals’ offerings of food and drink until Baubo cheered her up by lifting her skirt, exposing herself to the goddess. Hellenistic inscriptions confirm that the name Baubo was associated with Demeter in antiquity, but there is no evidence of an association between Baubo and any obscene act in the period preceding these Christian writers, whose reception of Baubo is geared clearly towards exemplifying the vulgarity of pagan traditions. Following the excavation, however, Baubo solidified into an obscene ancient figure described as a grotesque personification of the vulva. As
I demonstrate, at the turn to the twentieth century, the name Baubo had taken on connotations beyond the ancient sources that mention the name. The mythical figure that the Priene archaeologists recognized in the statuettes had been influenced by a wide range of sources, including Hellenistic statuettes from Egypt, a *hapax legomenon* from Herondas and Goethe’s *Faust*.

Contemporary scholarship has been focused on the question of whether Baubo is properly Greek. This question is a continuation of the nineteenth-century debates from which Baubo emerged. Defining Greece was particularly charged in Germany in this century, as Ancient Greece came to be held up as a foil for German national identity. As ancient studies came into its own as an academic discipline, German scholars reexamined, and often distanced themselves from the idealizing notion of Ancient Greece prevalent at the turn to the century. This shifting approach to Ancient Greece was both figurative and literal in character, as increased German archaeological activity made the ancient world present in Germany to an unprecedented degree after the 1870s. Baubo was both a result of these changes, as the Baubo statuettes were discovered as a result of new methods in archaeological field work. At the same time, Baubo also developed into a figure that questioned the image of Ancient Greece. Goethe and Nietzsche used Baubo to critique the methods and aims of Ancient Studies in their respective generations, connecting her obscene act of exposure with the indecent investigations of scholars.

“Unveiling Baubo” describes the processes by which facts about the ancient world are produced. That Baubo’s obscenity is still considered an issue that needs to be solved, or that she is held up as a reclaimed figure from an ignored aspect of the ancient past, reveals the continued investments in defining Ancient Greece.
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Introduction

In the fall of 2012, Arena Baubo organized a series of performances and workshops with the aim of “re-thinking representation in performance.” The group’s members are connected to the prestigious art school Konstfack in Stockholm and describe themselves as a “polyphonic arena for performing arts.”¹ Regarding Baubo, the mythical figure who lends the group her name, they write:

… [she is] an old lady who exposed her vagina in an obscene dance provoking the mourning Goddess Demeter to laugh. Baubo is often portrayed with her face placed on top of an enlarged lower body. She is a personified vulva / pig / genius / gorilla/ event / becoming / communism / Robin Hood / 3D rose / financial crisis / fold /movement / map /post-porn star / …²

Baubo stood in the center of the 2012 performances. For example, the event The Art of Flashing – Baubo’s hijacking of Rancière, was described as “Baubo (…) infiltrating the philosopher’s text with her vaginal metamorphosis into the content, form, and texture of its language.”³ During the performance, member Katja Seitajoki read a lecture by the philosopher Jacques Rancière on Gilles Deleuze with her skirt hitched up, leaving vulva partly visible behind the podium. Behind Seitajoki, a video projection showed the hips of a dancing woman, her skirt billowing up to display her naked lower body.

Arena Baubo uses Baubo as part of an artistic exploration of how the female body disturbs and subverts canonical material. They are not alone in this approach. For her 2011 exhibition Life of Baubo, the South African artist Minette Varí produced a series of images of

---

³ Ibid.
female figures with their heads directly attached to their legs. According to the artist’s gallery, these absurd figures subvert narrative “in the profound way that art can make possible.”

Baubo is also part of a 2008 adult marionette theatre, advertised with a quote from a review describing it as: “Entertaining, silly and sexy. (…) [A play] that uses an ancient world view to question what you see and think you understand.”

In a video performance by Susanna Schönberg from the same year, Baubo represents the sexual woman without any function, one of two eternal female principles next to Demeter {Demetra}, the biological-political woman.

The list of examples can be expanded. Baubo is a frequent reference not only in recent art projects; she is also evoked by fashion designers encouraging you to feel like “a cheeky little demon” or belly-dance instructors encouraging women of all sizes to express themselves through dance.

In her prolific modern reception, Baubo has recurrently been situated as a point of departure for exploring the place—or more often the absence—of sexuality and the female genitals in fields as varied as Nietzsche studies, psychoanalysis, and art history. Across these disparate cases, Baubo is marshaled as a medium through which to discuss, depict, question or celebrate the female, obscene, or sexual, or in the words of Arena Baubo: to post/non/mis/re/present. But what is it about Baubo and her myth that makes her such a

---

8 http://www.baubo.co.uk/moon_room.php
9 Kofman (1988) among others, has discussed Baubo in Nietzsche; Gsell (1992) uses Baubo as a starting point for her discussion on representations of the female genitals in art; In Devereux (1981) Baubo is the focal point for a discussion on female sexuality and the vaginal orgasm; Lubell (1994) uses Baubo as the starting point for her exposé on female sexuality.
compelling figure with which to explore these themes? This dissertation approaches Baubo as a cultural construct that crystallized around 1900 out of nineteenth-century debates on Ancient Greece in Germany. There is an irony that Baubo is held up to disturb a patriarchal definition of the past, when in fact the figure emerged from the male-dominated environment of nineteenth-century German ancient studies. As I show in the following chapters, modern responses to Baubo have always been tied to determining the boundaries of Ancient Greece. Whether Baubo is deployed to expand our idea of antiquity, as in the examples above, or, as often in contemporary scholarship, to argue that she is not Greek, Baubo points to modernity’s continued investment in claiming and defining Ancient Greece. These introductory vignettes from Baubo’s afterlife also illustrate one of the main concerns of this dissertation: Baubo’s ambiguous relation to positivist knowledge. Why is Baubo held up as a proof of an ignored aspect of the Ancient Greece by those who reject the methods and conclusion of traditional scholarship, while universalized and generalized by many committed to positivist scholarship? Historians fall back on universalizing claims and literary theorists on empirical evidence. With these issues in mind, Baubo emerges as a figure that not only disturbs the definitions and boundaries of Ancient Greece, but of how Ancient Greece can be known.

The myth of Baubo

The above examples all refer to the same ancient Greek “myth,” in the colloquial meaning of a traditional story connected with a distinct iconography and narrative. This myth can be summarized as follows: Baubo is a woman who greets Demeter when she arrives at Eleusis and makes the mourning goddess laugh by exposing her genitals. She is portrayed as a
female figure with her face placed directly on her torso, her chin and vagina merging.\textsuperscript{11} Besides this story, name and iconography, responses to Baubo have described her as “a forgotten mystery,”\textsuperscript{12} “an obscene gesture,”\textsuperscript{13} a “headless goddess who used to look from the bosom and speak from the vagina,”\textsuperscript{14} a “sacred fool,”\textsuperscript{15} an “ancient belly goddess,”\textsuperscript{16} and “a strategy to deal with the unavoidable.”\textsuperscript{17} Baubo is both a reference to a particular myth from Ancient Greece and a personification or generalization. The artists use Baubo as an example, but more often as a symbol or embodiment of the topics they address: sexuality, the obscene, the place of the female, or simply disruption. Thus, Baubo can be described both as timeless female principle (as Susanna Schönberg does) and a disruptive element (as in \textit{Arena Baubo}). Baubo is both more and less than an ancient mythological figure. More, in that she is made to stand for topics that are considered timeless and not bound to the ancient context from which she is taken. Less, because the myth and history of the figure falls into the background, generalizing her as “the female” \textit{per se} rather than a female figure with her own discrete legacy.

As I show in this dissertation, the myth of Baubo is a modern construct, a myth of a myth that solidified into the form outlined above around 1900. \textit{Unveiling Baubo: The Making of an Ancient Myth} traces how the mythical Baubo was constructed from conversations in literature,

\textsuperscript{11} See for example O’Higgins (2003) 52–53 does not draw any foregone conclusion about the character of Baubo, yet the careful statement that two types of figurines are "linked" to Baubo gives the impression that this link between iconography and name is ancient rather than modern. See also Foley (1994) 229 for whom the Baubo's iconography provide "evidence" for Baubo's association with sexuality in cult.
\textsuperscript{12} “Baubo, Mythos, Revue,” \textit{Melanieforschuetz.de}, accessed June 28, 2015 \url{http://www.melanieforschuetz.de/erwachsenenstuecke/baubo.html}.
\textsuperscript{13} ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} Baubo Belly Dancing, \textit{baubo.co.uk}, accessed July 16, 2015 \url{http://www.baubo.co.uk/index.php}.
\textsuperscript{17} Baubo, Mythos, Revue,” \textit{Melanieforschuetz.de}, accessed June 28, 2015 \url{http://www.melanieforschuetz.de/erwachsenenstuecke/baubo.html}.
archaeology, and philology in nineteenth-century Germany. During this century, Baubo emerged as a figure through which the place of obscenity and sexuality in ancient Greek culture was debated. Associated with the act of lifting her skirt to expose herself to the goddess Demeter, Baubo would come to epitomize questions of concealment and revelation across the burgeoning spheres of psychoanalysis, philology, and continental philosophy, all against the backdrop of radically shifting approaches to archaeological methodology and museological display. Baubo’s obscene character was cemented with the discovery of the so-called Baubo statuettes, a group of Hellenistic votive figurines discovered in the Ionian city of Priene, in modern-day Turkey, in 1898. These statuettes adhere to a consistent and unique iconography, their face is placed directly onto torso legs, merging the head and the legs. After their initial publication in 1904, the ancient religion scholar Martin P. Nilsson held up the Priene-statuettes as further proof that Baubo was, “a grotesque anthropomorphizing of the cunnus.”18 The Priene statuettes were thus both identified with Baubo because of their iconography, while at the same time their iconography was assumed to shed light on the character of Baubo. As I demonstrate, the notion of Baubo as a grotesque personification of the vulva, which emerged in the twentieth century, does not correspond to a consistent mythological figure. Rather, this notion of Baubo had been mediated through a disparate array of sources, both ancient and modern. This dissertation traces how Baubo emerged from this web of sources and associations, what I call the Baubo-complex.

The contemporary responses to Baubo are thus not so much rediscoveries of an obscure ancient figure as continuations of the nineteenth-century debates that produced her. Since the nineteenth century, Baubo’s perceived obscenity has located her on the fringes of what is considered properly Greek and invested her with the question of what we can and should know

18 Nilsson (1941) 110.
about Ancient Greece. These issues were particularly charged in nineteenth-century Germany, where Ancient Greece was held up as a foil for German national identity. This dissertation traces the emergence of Baubo against the background of shifting approaches to Ancient Greece — both figuratively and literally — through literal and material studies. During that century, archaeology and philology emerged as independent academic fields and Berlin’s first public museums opened. As Ancient Studies came into its own as an academic discipline, archaeologists and philologists reexamined, and often distanced themselves from, the idealizing notion of Ancient Greece inherited from the early decades of the century. Radical shifts in the methods employed in archaeological fieldwork and practices of museum display also meant that, beginning in the 1870s, a different ancient Greece was uncovered and displayed. If Classical, democratic Athens had been the focus for J. J. Winckelmann (1717-1761) and the generation that followed him, the Germans of the late nineteenth century instead turned their attention to Hellenistic, monarchic Ionia, as it was uncovered through the famous excavations of cities such as Pergamon, Miletus, and Priene. Baubo emerged as a product of these shifting approaches to Ancient Greece. Literally, as the figurines that gave Baubo a distinctive iconography were discovered as a result of new methods; and figuratively, as Baubo came to figure in discussions of the role of Ancient Greece as a foil for German identity. Baubo was considered an unexpected remnant from ancient Greece, but she was also a product of the fact that the notion of Ancient Greece changing at the end of the nineteenth century. The dissertation looks at four turning points in the making of Baubo, the philological debates on her name and narrative; Goethe’s Baubo in *Faust I* and the relation between this Baubo and the iconography of a group of Hellenistic statuettes also known as Baubo, although very different from the Priene type; the excavation of Priene and the discovery of the Priene Baubos; and Nietzsche’s Baubo in his
Fröhliche Wissenschaft. Each chapter looks at how materials were added to the Baubo-complex, loading the name with more associations. The chapters trace the shifting notion of Ancient Greece in nineteenth-century Germany and shows how Baubo and her obscenity became invested in debates about the methods of knowing Ancient Greece. Recent scholarly responses to Baubo has focused on the question whether or not Baubo is truly a product of Greek culture, often suggesting that she is instead a remnant from a prehistoric past, or a foreign import. These analyses show the other side of the coin to the artists’ discussion, where Baubo is reclaimed as an ignored or suppressed figure from the ancient past. That Baubo is still something that needs to be explained or reclaimed points to modernity’s continued investment in determining what can be considered properly Greek.

Tracing the making of Baubo means that the subject of my dissertation is threefold: a name, a narrative, and an iconography. While all three elements have ancient antecedents, they were only brought together as a coherent mythical figure in the early twentieth century. The narrative of Baubo’s meeting with Demeter and her obscene exposure is conveyed through the late antique Church Fathers Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius and Arnobius, with Clement serving as the source for the two younger writers. All three wrote with the agenda of discrediting pagan traditions and deployed Baubo’s obscene gesture to illustrate the vulgarity of the pagan mysteries. Prior to the Christian sources, the name Baubo is attested in a few Hellenistic inscriptions. These sources associate the name with Demeter, but do not provide enough information to confirm whether the name was associated with anything obscene before the Christians took up the issue. In the older, and more famous, version of Demeter’s arrival at Eleusis, the fifth-century Homeric Hymn to Demeter, it is Iambe, not Baubo, who greets Demeter and makes her laugh, although by means of a joke, not a gesture. Although it is not possible to
confirm what narrative was associated with Baubo’s name in antiquity, scholars have often taken
the Church Fathers literally that they are recounting an older tradition, despite the clear
motivation for their writing. Baubo’s characteristic iconography is based on the group of so-
called Baubo statuettes from Priene, located on the Ionian coast of modern-day Turkey,
excavated by German archaeologists in 1898. The statuettes’ “grotesque-obscene” impression
prompted archaeologists to identify them with Baubo, although the narrative preserved in the
Church Fathers says nothing about the woman’s odd physiognomy. By the time of the
excavation, Baubo’s name had become firmly associated with obscene display, partly through
the impression of a different group of statuettes, which were also called Baubo despite a broad
agreement that they did not depict any ancient figure with that name.

Like a Venn-diagram, name, narrative and iconography each have discrete histories that
have overlapped in various combinations and carried over explanations and characteristics form
one to the other. To make sense of their connections, I propose a Baubo-complex to denote the
web of ancient and modern sources that together informed the notion of Baubo. The aim of this
dissertation is to answer why the elements of the Baubo-complex were produced or discovered
during the nineteenth century and to provide the frame through which they were brought
together. This dissertation does not attempt to explain what Baubo is, but instead asks how the
notion of a figure characterized as a grotesque personification of the vulva and defined by her
obscenity developed. What sources informed this figure, and how was it situated in concerns and
investments about the role of Ancient Greece for modernity?
Mapping the relations between different parts of the Baubo-complex, it becomes clear that meanings and associations have travelled between sources to give rise to entirely new products. For example, a hapax legomenon in Herondas—*baubon*, referring to a leather phallos used as a sex-toy—have been the basis for arguing that Baubo’s name means vulva. This suggestion about Baubo’s name has quickly become a fact, from which it is concluded that Baubo herself is a personified vulva. That Baubo is a personified vulva, in turn, has been taken as a clear indication that there must also have existed a corresponding mythical figure at Eleusis personifying the penis. These sweeping chains of logic carry “facts” from one end of the Baubo-complex to the other. Tracing the processes by which meaning is assigned, this is a project about terminology. It grew out of the impression that certain terms are often used as if they were self-explanatory, when they are not. In the context of ancient studies, this is particularly true for terms connected to sexuality and the body. Fertility, sexuality, obscenity, and apotropaic are all broad terms that have encompassed very different associations in different times, yet are often deployed without regard to whether they describe ancient understandings or modern impressions.

A more critical approach to ancient sources reveals that many of our assumptions about how bodies are described and considered are historically contingent. This statement should not be revelatory after the decades of work on history of sexuality since Michel Foucault’s 1976 *History of Sexuality*. Yet, surprisingly often, Baubo is explained through assumed constants about the symbolic function of bodies. For example, Baubo’s *anasyrma* is repeatedly explained through comparisons to myths from distant cultures—ancient Japan, medieval Europe—or psychoanalytical “facts” to argue that a woman exposing herself has always and everywhere had
the same meaning and consequence.\textsuperscript{19} Similarly, the repeated “fact” that Baubo is a
personification of the vulva is based more on what modern readers have “seen” when Baubo lifts
her skirts than the ancient texts. Clement relays that Baubo exposes her “indecent parts,” τὰ
αἰδοῖα. Guilia Sissa’s reading of myths on the creation of woman shows that ancient Greek texts
describe the belly rather than the genitals as the most characteristic female organ.\textsuperscript{20} This should
give us pause to ask if we know what parts ancient Greeks considered indecent. The assumption
that Baubo not only displays her shameful parts, but is identical with them has dominated
discussion of her. This is true also for the Priene statuettes. Although their genital area is not
pronounced, they are consistently described as personified vulvas. The result prioritizing the
obscene impression that the statuette’s make on their modern audience, obscuring informative
associations from antiquity. While the Priene statuettes are often likened to the British Sheela-na-
gig they are rarely compared to Blemmyes or other Greek figures that were conceptualized with
a similar physiognomy. That Baubo is female becomes not one aspect of her, but her entire
definition.

It is striking that even careful readers such as Sarah Kofman, a student of Jacques
Derrida, fall back on discursively assuming absolute truths about bodies and obscenity when
confronted with Baubo. Kofman both uses Baubo to prove something about the ancient Greeks,
and simultaneously to argue that what Baubo proves is universally viable. This approach to
Baubo is common also within Ancient Studies. For example, Ann Suter ties Baubo to a
discussion on the function of the \textit{anasyrma} in Greek literature, but explains Baubo through
generalizing claims about the different effects of female exposure on men and women, which she

\textsuperscript{19}E.g. Kofman (1988); Suter (2015).
\textsuperscript{20} Sissa (2008).
supports through references to Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi. Suter’s combining of the historically particular and the universal is especially common in discussions on sexuality. There is a contradiction in this type of argument. If the human psyche is can be explained by universalizing claims — if, for example, female exposure has always and everywhere have elicited the same responses — it would undermine the aims of explaining this particular Greek figure and of any project concerned with the particularities of Greek culture. Kofman’s approach represent the other side of these peculiar encounters with Baubo. Why do scholars trained in and committed to a deconstructive tradition need to use Baubo as historical proof of the arguments they make about a text?

This project addresses how Baubo’s obscenity has been approached as a problem that requires an explanation and how these explanations have stretched scholarly methods. Why, when confronted with Baubo, does Kofman’s close reading shift to a wide-ranging cultural comparison and Suter’s historical contextualizing dissolve into arguments about psychological constants of the human mind? In his work on satire, Ralph Rosen has pointed out that when confronted with ancient obscenity, scholars feel a need to explain (from what it stems, what its function is) to an extent that is not comparable to other literary elements. In the case of Baubo, her obscenity is often “explained” either through a generalizing model (it is an example of fertility cults found worldwide for example), or as an import or prehistoric survival. These two conflicting tendencies have in common that they both avoid considering Baubo as an integrated part of Greek culture.

---

This dissertation argues, that even scholars such as Sarah Kofman, trained in a deconstructive tradition, when faced with a figure that has come to be defined as a personification of the female sex, cannot help but defend themselves from this excess of sexuality by relying on positivist formulations of both antiquity and sexuality. My project is thus a critique against essentializing approaches to the body and of sexuality. It is committed to the idea that we work against our understanding of ancient and contemporary debates of gender and sexuality if we deny the historicity of the very concept of the antique and the erotic and assume that bodies have always been described and reacted to in the same manner. In this commitment, it responds to the work of scholars such as Helen King, Ralph Rosen, and Giulia Sissa. As these scholars have shown, ancient studies can productively contribute to gender studies by working from the conviction that terms such as fertility and indecency should be the starting-points for investigations into histories of sexuality and the body, tracing their history, their lineages, and the effects of their etymological and social formation, instead of uncritically deploying them as fixed and final categories.

Methodology and Theoretical Framework
The figure Baubo and the Baubo Complex

The dissertation turns around the 1898 excavation of the so-called Baubo statuettes, when the unique iconography of this group became synonymous with the name Baubo. What was the mythical figure that the archaeologists recognized in these curious figurines? By the turn to the twentieth century, the name Baubo had acquired characteristics that went far beyond the Church Fathers’ narrative. The Church Fathers do not mention anything about Baubo’s odd

---

23 Rosen (2007); King (2013).
physiognomy or being a personification of the vulva, yet their “grotesque-obscene” impression was precisely what identified the group of statuettes as Baubo. How did Baubo develop into a figure defined by grotesque female body? The answer to this question lies in the disparate ancient and modern sources that had become associated with the name Baubo during the nineteenth century, which I call the Baubo-complex.

The Baubo-complex addresses a recurrent problem in the study of ancient mythology. In her study of Scylla, Marianne Hopman discusses the problem inherent in writing about myths: to define your object of study. Recent scholarship demonstrates an increased interest in comprehensive studies centered on mythical figures, as opposed to tropes or authors. Writing about Orpheus instead of Ovid, however, runs the risk of presenting mythical figures as historical individuals with consistent biographies and characteristics rather than the cultural constructs that they are. This problem is clear in studies on Baubo. Maurice Olender, for example, connects the fragment from Asklepiades (preserved in Harpokrates, Jacoby 4) that states that Baubo is the mother of Mise with the Orphic hymn to Mise in which she is described as both male and female, arguing that her child’s bisexuality connects Baubo to anxieties around hermaphroditism and castration. Olender’s reasoning might be appropriate when studying a historical person with a stable biography. “Real” people tend to always be parents to the same children. As the shifting names in the family of authochtonous at Eleusis confirms, however, these names did not represent figures with unchanging biographies and lineages. Mythological names do not correspond to a stable referent; there is no mythological individual that can be pieced together

---

24 Hopman (2012).
26 Continuing his argument, Olender (1990) 101, calls Askalabos Baubo’s grandchild. Askalabos is Mise’s son in Nicander’s Theriaka and Antoninus Liberalis’ Metarmorphoses 24 (in which Mise offers Demeter the kykon).
through various sources, as no such individual exists outside of and independently from those sources.

How would a study of mythological names be conceived to avoid confusing the real and constructed? Hopman proposes to investigate the name rather than the “figure” to which the name is supposed to refer, asking not what Scylla was, but what an ancient audience would have associated with the name. She outlines her project as an investigation of the name Scylla as a symbol, asking whether the cultural constructs evoked by the symbol, the *parole*, has a correspondence in *language*, stable references. Hopman’s approach has the benefit of exploring the cultural associations around a name without relying on the assumption that there is a stable and self-identical figure behind each deployment of it. She maps the set of associations invoked through the name Scylla in antiquity — water, dogs, femininity — and how these categories have been combined and emphasized in various ways. Similarly, my project is concerned precisely with the problematic figure assumed behind the mythical name Baubo. As I show, the cluster of associations attached to Baubo—personified vulva, sexual indecency—have been associated with the name by a modern audience. The sources for these various aspects come are both ancient and modern that are not always connected with the name Baubo. For example, Baubo’s association with obscenity cannot be confirmed in accounts earlier than those of the Church Fathers but have been anachronistically applied to any ancient mention of Baubo.

The problems with Olender’s method are linked to the image he is using. My Baubo-complex is a response to Olender’s Baubo-file, which he proposed in his essay on Baubo from 1985, published in an English version in 1990. Olender’s essay is the most exhaustive

---

28 Olender (1985) proposes a *dossier*, which was translated as "file" in the (shortened) English version of the article, Olender (1990).
examination of Baubo to date, and my project is indebted to his thorough examination of the
ancient sources for the name and the philological discussions on the figure. My own work
extends Olender’s analysis by considering sources outside the traditional limits of ancient
studies, and recognizing the importance of Goethe and Nietzsche in shaping the notion of Baubo.

My project also departs from Olender’s methodologically, as reflected by the difference of a
Baubo-file and a Baubo-complex. Olender’s Baubo-file contains the many ancient associations
of the name Baubo, the myth of Iambe as well as connections made through modern scholarship,
such as Hermann Diels’s argument that the word *baubon*, meaning dildo, is related to Baubo’s
name. Together, these sources shed light on who Baubo is, adding to her file. A “file” implies a
contained body with a flexible perimeter, the content of which can be extended or reorganized.
The analogous image is a filing cabinet or folder that one can add to or extract content from
while keeping its defining label. The file of a historical person might contain letters, photos and,
if the person changed name at some point, documents with different names. These documents
would all shed light on the same person, indicated by the file’s name. A complex, on the other
hand, denotes a flexible set of concepts, images, narratives, and names, held together by their
association rather than by a supposed inherent relation. The complex does not address who
Baubo *is*, but how she comes into being.

Olender’s study analyzes how the history of scholarship have shaped the modern notion
of Baubo, but his discussion does not separate clearly between ancient association and modern
construction. Notably, Olender’s file omits any discussion of Baubo outside the traditional
confines of Ancient Scholarship. As I show, this omission gives a tacit legitimization of the
scholars Olender seems to critique, as he assumes that their work has shed light on Baubo, rather
than constructed her. Further, as I seek to demonstrate, omitting responses outside of scholarship
narrowly defined ignores the mutual influences between artistic and scholarly reconstructions of antiquity and the ways that creative, even mistaken assumptions about antiquity acts as a filter through which the past is reconstructed. Such fluidity is especially apparent during the early nineteenth century, when the lines between scholarship and artistic reception were not as clearly established. Notably, Olender’s file does not dwell on the topic of my second chapter, the two most prevalent occurrences of the name Baubo in the early nineteenth century: the witch Baubo in Goethe’s *Faust I*, and the group of Hellenistic terracotta figurines from Egypt fashioned as women in obscene poses that were—and still are—known as Baubo-figurines. Olender mentions the latter only briefly, observing that they are no longer considered Baubos, while Goethe’s work is not cited. Olender probably excluded these two examples because they do not belong to ancient scholarship. Goethe’s Baubo is a fictional figure and, as Olender notes, the name Baubo for the Egyptian figurines is a mistake: there is no reason to believe that they were called Baubos in antiquity. As I show in Chapter One, the practice of calling this type of figurine Baubo is based on the argument of a certain James Millingen, a self-taught antiquarian and collector, who first suggested in 1843 the name Baubo for a statuette of a nude woman riding side-saddle on a pig. Millingen’s reasoning for this identification is unconvincing, and it is likely that he had in mind Goethe’s Baubo rather than any ancient sources. Olender’s omission of Goethe and Millingen ignores the influence these two sources have had in defining the parameter of his Baubo-file, an influence that they exercised regardless of whether they are correct. Even if one belongs to fiction and the other is mistaken, these two modern deployments ascribed and solidified characteristics to Baubo that were subsumed into the ancient figure, i.e., the figure that

29 Millingen (1843).
Theodor Wiegand’s team recognized in the sculptures from Priene. Goethe and Millingen did not only take up an ancient name; the name took up their modern connotations.

This reciprocal dynamic of modern and ancient ideas is what the Berlin research group *Transformationen der Antike* describes as *allelopoiesis*, a creating of each other. Studying the *allelopoiesis* of Baubo, how the ancient figure was defined by the modern uses of the name, takes us away from a model of one-way development that describes antiquity as being progressively discovered to a larger and more precise extent. Olender’s Baubo-file, while meticulous, assumes such an increased understanding of Baubo. Unlike the file, the complex illustrates why ‘incorrect’ assumptions must also be taken into account if we want to understand not what Baubo *is* (or rather, *was*), but how she came into being: that is, came into being as a figure that can be referenced or debated, but whose independent existence outside of these debates is taken for granted. Understanding the Baubo-complex as emerging in allelopoiesis between modern and ancient deployments acknowledges the influence of creative, forgotten, or mistaken interpretations of antiquity. This also means that Olender’s Baubo-file, combining sources from various periods, is also part of the Baubo-complex.

**Chapters and Sources**

The four chapters trace the development of the Baubo-complex throughout the nineteenth century. Which sources were subsumed into it, and how did they add layers of meaning to the notion of the mythical Baubo? The chapters follow different aspects in the making of Baubo and

---

30 One illustrative example of the use of *allelopoiesis* is Böhme (2011), who discusses on the relation between Freud’s and Aristotle’s interpretation of dreams. Although we can confidently say that Aristotle was not a psychoanalysis, the influence of Freud’s reading has the consequence that we cannot but recognize Aristotle’s description of dreams as related to psychoanalysis.
her relation to ancient studies more broadly. Chapter One considers the philological responses to Baubo’s name and narrative, collecting the earliest attestations of the name and the story of the anasyrma at Eleusis. The name Baubo appears in a few inscriptions beginning in the Hellenistic period, in which Baubo is honored together with Demeter, confirming her connection to the goddess and to the family of autochthonous at Eleusis. But these earliest attestations do not allow us to connect the name to any specific narrative, much less an obscene one. Baubo only becomes connected to the anasyrma in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and Arnobius, who also stress her vulgarity. I argue that Clement’s, who is the source for the other two, frames the narrative of Baubo’s anasyrma to suggest that this act corresponds to a revelation at the culmination of the ancient mysteries. In the nineteenth century, Clement’s account of Baubo was reexamined as a source for the Eleusinian mysteries. When a papyrus with mimes by Herondas was published for the first time in 1892, a hapax legomenon in the sixth mime seemed to shed light on the meaning of Baubo. The word, baubon, referring to a leather phallos used as a sex-toy by two friends, was taken to confirm that Baubo’s name means vulva and, accordingly, that the myth of her anasyrma corresponded to the display of a vulva during the mysteries. Clement had held up Baubo’s act as representative of the indecency of pagan religion generally, and supported his claims about Baubo with a quote from Orpheus, presented as an authority of pagan religion. In the nineteenth-century readings, Baubo’s connections to Orpheus now became central, as the notion of Orphism as a sectarian—and oriental—offshoot from mainstream Greek religion offered a solution to the obscene elements of the Eleusinian mysteries that Baubo represented.

While Chapter One considers the discussions of Baubo’s name within philology, Chapter Two looks at influences on the notion of Baubo from outside Ancient Studies. The starting point is arguably the most famous iteration of Baubo, as the old lady seated on a pig that leads the train
of witches to Walpurgis night in Goethe’s *Faust I*. The chapter looks at the relationship between this Baubo and a statuette in the Berlin antiquities collection in the form of a nude woman riding on a pig, also known as Baubo. While it is often stated that this statuette inspired Goethe, the almost fifty years between the publication of *Faust* and the pig rider’s appearance in Berlin confronts us with the likelihood that, in this case, poetry was not inspired by antiquity, but the other way around.31 Establishing the possibility that Goethe inspired the identification of the Berlin statuette, the chapter describes how the publication of this object began the practice of calling a type of Egyptian female figurines “Baubo.” Since these figurines clearly have no relation to the narrative of the meeting at Eleusis, Baubo became established as an iconographical term defined by its sexually explicit gesture.

The third and central chapter examines with the excavation of the statuettes at Priene by Theodor Wiegand and their subsequent display on the Museum Island in Berlin. The statuettes were unearthed during a time of radical change in archaeological and museological practice in Germany. Wiegand and his mentor Carl Humann considered their work a decisive break with earlier traditions in Ancient Studies. They described their own work both as more objective (*wissenschaftlich*) but also as a rejection of disinterested, bookish scholarship in favor for an active engagement with antiquity. Practically, these aims took the shape of extensive, systematic excavations covering entire ancient cities. Back in Germany, Wiegand took a leading role in reinstalling the displays at the Museum Island. His vision for the new role of Ancient Studies was materialized in the building of the Pergamon Museum. This new museum encouraged the visitor to feel as if they were experiencing the ancient past first-hand and intuitively rather than

31 Graf suggests that Goethe was inspired by the statuette in Berlin in *Brill’s New Pauly*, s.v. “Baubo.”
admiring it from a distance. The statuettes were not displayed in the Pergamon Museum itself, but in the neighboring Neues Museum. This installation was likewise organized geographically rather than thematically. This new priority of a holistic examination and presentation of the ancient city was the prerequisite without which, I argue, the Baubo statuettes would not even have been excavated or exhibited. This goal of understanding antiquity in its entirety was also precisely what Nietzsche deployed Baubo to argue against.

The fourth and final chapter looks at Baubo in Nietzsche’s introduction to *Die Fröhliche Wissenschaft*. This chapter ties Baubo at the end of the nineteenth century with her appearance in Goethe at its beginning. Nietzsche frames his Baubo as an inheritance from Goethe and, like Goethe, deploys her to criticize contemporary scholarship. Baubo is situated as the matrix of the new type of *Wissenschaft* that *Fröhliche Wissenschaft* enacts. An older contemporary of the Priene archaeologists, Nietzsche’s critique of ancient scholarship shares several rhetorical traits with theirs but differs sharply in its assessment of the importance and possibility of knowing the ancient past fully. While the Priene excavation discovered the Baubo statuettes as a result of new methods of examining the past, Nietzsche deploys her in a critique of the attempt at uncovering truth guiding contemporary *Wissenschaft*.

**Contribution**

The project contributes to Comparative Literary Studies, Classics, Gender Studies, and German. It belongs to the growing field of Classical reception, as promoted by scholars such as Lorna Hardwick and Charles Martindale. The crystalizing of Baubo that the four chapter

---

32 See their discussions on the scope and use of receptions studies e.g. in Hardwick (2003); Martindale and Thomas (2006).
delineates shows that a reception approach is often necessary to recognize that much of what we take for granted about the Classical world is modern constructions. Reception studies has grown rapidly in recent years and is increasingly becoming an indispensable part of the Classics curriculum. This growth has not been hampered by the absence of a general agreement on the definition and purpose of Classical Reception. Although I am not advocating that a consensus must be reached, I argue that a discussion of what Classical Reception can entail and aim to achieve is important. This project is meant to be a contribution to this discussion. If Classical Reception methodology relies on the idea that texts can converse across time and cultures, it is more surprising that this is heralded as a new insight. In comparative studies, the practice of bringing various media and periods into conversation is the very premise of the field. If, on the other hand, Classical Reception is used to peel back layers of later influences, from a supposed ancient core, it can be a useful auxiliary tool for Classics, but of little interest to other fields. This dissertation uses Reception Studies in both of the above senses. The chapters describes the accretion of layers of meaning that the name Baubo has taken on in order to point out that much of what we “know” about the ancient past is in fact modern constructs. It also looks at how Baubo has been mobilized intertextuality, for example between Nietzsche and Goethe, or Goethe and the archaeologists, to situate ideas about knowing and the past. This latter approach belongs to what I argue is a third, and most important, contribution that Classical Reception can make, namely to investigate the processes by which the cultural products of ancient Greece and Rome have become known as “Classics.” The importance that Greek and Roman culture has been given as a foil for Western identity gives the project of studying changes in the responses to these periods a particular importance within cultural studies; since it is through the study of the ancient past initiated by J. J. Winckelmann that the very concept of studying culture derives.
Considering the history of Ancient Studies is thus involved in studying the tools and vocabulary with which we describe and discuss culture. This project shows how discussions of Baubo have been situated within concerns about the use of knowing Ancient Greece as such. The chronological bookends of Goethe and Nietzsche frame the emergence of Baubo in the question of how much we should know about the historical Greece, or if it should be recognized as a cultural construct.

By taking apart the modern making of Baubo, this dissertation suggests new connections between ancient sources around the name Baubo and the narrative of the woman at Eleusis. More importantly, it questions the processes by which facts about the ancient world are made. This often occurs through closed loops of information, in which the origin of a fact falls out of view. For example, Fritz Graf’s view that Baubo in *Faust I* is modeled on the Egyptian statuettes ignores the fact that Baubo appears in *Faust* long before the Egyptian type became known as Baubo. Graf’s omission shows our hesitation to see an entangled relationship between antiquity and modernity, rather than a neat line of influence. Examples such as this make clear that reception studies should be considered as more than an appendix or a curiosity, but must be an integrated part of investigating ancient mythology. We cannot go beyond the modern interpretations to get to the ‘real’ ancient Baubo if the Baubo myth itself is a modern construct.

To understand how the Baubo-complex emerged, it is necessary to look at it in the context of German intellectual history and the role Greece played in the nineteenth century as a foil for German national identity. In German literary studies, German images of Greece has been a central topic at least since Eliza Butler’s 1935 *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany*. Recent
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33 Graf in *Brill’s New Pauly*, s.v. “Baubo.”

34 Butler (1935).
monographs have also addressed the role of Greece in German thought more generally and not only for individual thinkers. My project emerges in conversation with these studies, but approaches the question from the angle of antiquity. It explores the role of Ancient Greece for Germany as both an idealized trope of art and literature, and a historical entity with very real influences on the shaping of the modern nation-state. One of the guiding questions of this dissertation is how ancient Greece was shaped through shifting literary and material approaches. As the narrative makes clear, the shifting academic and geopolitical circumstances for investigating Ancient Greece corresponded with a shift in the description of Ancient Greece—when and where it had been. The reception of Baubo with the philologist and archaeologists compared to the reception by Goethe and Nietzsche shows that it was not always important for all thinkers whether Ancient Greece really existed.

Looking at how Baubo was made, it is necessary to trace her development across literature and material studies. In recent years, there have been increased efforts to understand the history of ancient studies in the context of geo-political developments, in particular the emergence of the nation-state, collective identities, and European imperial history. This outlook has been influenced not least by the increasing demands by countries such as Greece, Italy, and Turkey for repatriation of ancient artifacts. Such claims have opened discussions on the modern nation-state’s relation to the ancient past and who is the inheritor of the ancient past. Looking beyond questions of ownership of objects, however, we must also ask if such demands are not only a re-appropriation of artifacts, but an appropriation of the language and hierarchies that legitimized the displacement of these artifacts. Donald Reid has explored one example of
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35 E.g. Williamson (2004); Ferris (2000).
36 E.g. by Hamilakis (2007); Güthenke (2008); Marchand (1996).
such appropriation in his discussion of national museums in former colonies. With Egypt as his main example, he points out that these museums often reiterate the neoclassical architecture associated with European museums. The national museums that are meant to celebrate post-colonial identities do so through the symbolism of imperialism.\textsuperscript{37} With these issues in mind, several recent publications have revisited well-known artifact and described how their afterlives have been shaped by the time period they were discovered.\textsuperscript{38} However, there is still reluctance within art history and archaeology to make these concerns an integrated part of research into lesser-studied objects. My project builds upon this body of scholarship by arguing that the present not only shapes the understanding of ancient artifacts, but in fact determines which artifacts emerge in the first place. The case of Baubo is especially illuminating in this regard, but, I argue, also demands that we acknowledge the role of gender and sexuality in modern receptions of antiquity.

By putting Baubo—rather than the oeuvre of one or several thinkers—at the center of my discussion, I can do justice to the prolific conversations between poets, ancient scholars and philosophers who jointly shaped the notion of ancient Greece in the nineteenth century. My project is hence not so much interdisciplinary, but rather pre-disciplinary. It acknowledges the limiting, and often arbitrary, nature of disciplines when confronted with a particular object or question, and makes the emergence of these disciplines one of its subjects. This approach is especially valid with respect to classics in nineteenth-century Germany. A distinction between, for example, philosophers and classicists not only obscures overlapping themes, but is often also anachronistic, since university disciplines as we know them were only beginning to take shape at

\textsuperscript{37} Reid (202).
\textsuperscript{38} Brilliant (2000); Potts (2000); Prettejohn (2012).
the time. Many of the thinkers now established within the canon of ‘philosophers,’ for example Nietzsche, were trained in and worked on classical philology, or stood in close conversation with scholars from ancient studies.

Read together, scholarly, archeological, and literary responses to Baubo offer a comprehensive mapping of changing notions about ancient Greece—an archeology of archeology. Baubo’s reception within these discourses shows the fascination with the ‘other’ Greece: the obscene, eastern, and sexual. It also reveals that this fascination is nothing new. Baubo has been part of unveiling a different antiquity for about two hundred years. In my dissertation, I look at the conjunction between Baubo’s literary and archaeological reception. Through this approach, my project provides a bridge between literary and material studies, fields that have too often been held firmly apart. I find it especially important to shed more light on the ways in which the emergence of systematic archeology was influenced by, and in turn influenced, literary approaches to antiquity. I argue that museums’ display techniques and collection choices, analyzed together with literary and scholarly reception, offer a productive—and often underestimated—approach to mapping discursive changes. The itinerary of ancient objects exhibited in museums, from their excavations through export, to incorporation into a collection, materializes our engagement with the past and reveals cultural priorities and hierarchies. Furthermore, Baubo in particular shows how we have inherited not only some of our ideas of ancient Greece from the nineteenth century, but also many of their debates. Baubo’s role as the figure unveiled or unveiling true ancient Greece, or Western canon, illustrates how we are still caught in a dilemma of accommodating figures that do not belong to the idealized notion inherited from these generations, but also that determining what can properly be called ancient Greece is still a charged question.
The figure’s trajectory makes clear how, against the backdrop of and imbricated with the formation of German national identity, there was a strong investment in defining whether Baubo was properly “Greek” and, in turn, in defining the place of obscenity and vulgarity in relation to Ancient Greece. In association, the chapters tie Baubo’s emergence to concerns about Ancient Greece that crystalized in the nineteenth century, but that are still reverberating in contemporary scholarship. Baubo’s development within these discourses on what we ought to learn about the past shows how she could be inherited in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, in the artistic responses outlined above and, through Freud, into psychoanalysis as a figure associated with the risks and uses of revealing the past not only in ancient studies, but the personal past.
What do we talk about when we talk about Baubo? Discussions of Baubo are rarely limited to the few ancient sources that mention the name, but instead bring a wide range of literary and material sources into conversation. Baubo is often called a version of Iambe, and the Homeric Hymn to Demeter and other texts that mention Iambe are adduced to shed light on Baubo. Such conflations of the two names would imply that “Baubo” is the vulgar woman at Eleusis, regardless of what she is called. At other times, Baubo is presented as a word rather than a name. The most common explanation of Baubo is that she is not only a character exposing herself, but a personification of that which is exposed; that her name is in fact a word for the female genitals that evolved into the myth of a woman. In G. Devereux or W. M. Lubell, two of the most quoted works on Baubo, Baubo’s function as a thing rather than a figure is taken one step further, as both authors present Baubo as a personification of the vulva and a representation of female sexuality that is detached and independent from any specific cultural-historical context. This use of Baubo as a label for a type rather than a name is also the case for the group of Egyptian figurines that I discuss in Chapter Two, which are known as Baubo although they have no connection to an ancient myth about a woman at Eleusis. In modern responses, Baubo can thus describe a function, an object, a body part, a type (of character or iconography), or an action as well as a name. This chapter collects the ancient references to the name Baubo. It

39 Listing Baubo’s various manifestations, Olender (1990) 84, includes “slave” although the source he refers to, a scholion to Nikander, Alexipharmaka 130, actually calls Iambe a slave and do not mention the name Baubo. For the passage in question see Geymonat (1974) 71–74.; Thorgeirsdottir (2012) 65–73.
41 Lubell (1994).
considers what might have been associated with the name in antiquity and traces the modern arguments by which Baubo transformed from a name to a thing.

While the name Baubo is attested already in Hellenistic inscriptions, it is only in Clement of Alexandria’s *Protreptikos—Exhortation to the Pagans*—from the second century AD that Baubo comes to be connected with the *anasyrma*—the gesture of indecent exposure—at Eleusis. Clement’s story is possibly based on earlier sources, but surely deployed for rhetorical purposes as part of his polemic against pagan cult. Following Clement, Eusebius and Arnobius also centered their polemic against pagan mysteries on Baubo, presenting her as a figure embodying the obscene content at heart of these rituals. Besides providing the only narrative for Baubo, these Christian writers have also been crucial sources for modern scholarship’s reconstruction of the Eleusinian mysteries. As a result, their tale of Baubo’s indecent display at Eleusis has been reiterated along with their argument that this myth corresponded to a sexual display during the initiations. At the time of the Priene excavation in 1989, an etymology of Baubo’s name had emerged that explained that Baubo was not only a figure who displayed her genitals, but herself the embodiment of the genitals. Since the early twentieth century, the notion that the myth of Baubo corresponded to the display of a symbolic vulva during the mysteries has come to be presented as a fact. As I show, this etymology of Baubo’s name is informed by the Church Fathers’ narrative and based on a combination on several ancient words, none of which actually means vulva.

The consequence of this etymology has been not only that the sexual implications that the Church Fathers had ascribed to Baubo’s role in the mysteries seems to be confirmed, but that these implications have been drastically extended. The most important source for the etymology

---

appeared in 1892 with the publication of the mimes of Herondas, which contained a *hapax legomenon*, βαβών, meaning a leather phallos. Hermann Diels connected the word in Herondas with a fragment from Empedocles and, shortly after, with the statuettes discovered in Priene. The close appearance of these three sources coincided with a resurgence of interest in ancient Orphism at the end of the nineteenth century, which was specifically concerned with whether Orphism had been responsible for introducing orgiastic and sexual elements into the Greek mysteries. The newly discovered sources came to be held up as proof for Baubo’s sexual nature as described by the Church Fathers, but also indicators that Baubo could provide a key to understanding Orphic influences on the mysteries.

**Ancient Sources**

**The Inscriptions**

Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius and Arnobius did not invent the name Baubo. Earlier sources confirm that Baubo was associated with Demeter and received cult on the Cycladic islands. The earliest mention of Baubo is an inscription from fourth-century B.C. Naxos and records a dedication to Demeter, Kore, Zeus Eubouleus and Baubo:

\[
[\Theta] \varepsilon\delta\varepsilon\beta\eta\varsigma \kappa\rho\nu\theta\varepsilon\omicron\varsigma \Delta\mu\eta\nu \chi\iota\kappa\iota \\
[\kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\omega\rho\eta \kappa\iota \Delta\iota \varepsilon\upsilon\beta\omega\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota \kappa\iota \vartheta\beta\omicron\omicron]\]

---

43 Diels (1907) 1–14.

44 I will refer to them henceforth as the Christian Apologetics, even though the label is debated for Arnobius. For arguments for counting Arnobius as an apologetic see Edwards (1999). For a different view, see Simmons (1995), who argues that Arnobius did not know his adopted religion well enough to count as an apologetic.

45 Woodhead SEG 16-478; First mentioned by Kontoleon (1950) 280. notes that the inscription's position made it difficult to study. He estimated the date to the third or second century B.C., but SEG has backdated it to the fourth century. Robert and Robert (1953) repeat Kontoleon's date. Graf (1974) 168, following SEG, gives the date as the fourth century B.C.
Baubo’s name is reconstructed from two visible letters, but supported by a similar list of names in an inscription from neighboring Paros from the first century B.C., also found incorporated into a chapel. In the Paros inscription, a female adherent makes a dedication to Demeter Thesmophorai, Kore, Zeus Eubouleus and Baubo:

Ἐρασίππη Ὄρασωνος ἦρη 
Δήμητρι Ἱεσιμοφόρῳ καὶ Κόρῃ καὶ Διὶ Ἐύβουλεῖ καὶ Βαυβοῖ

Babo [sic] is also mentioned in a Hellenistic inscription from Dion in northern Greece. It commemorates that Menekrite, daughter of Theodorus, served as Babo’s priestess. The inscription was discovered within a temenos enclosing several temples honoring Demeter. Within the same sanctuary was also a built-out well, possibly a local imitation of the kallichronon well at Eleusis.

As these inscriptions show, Baubo or Babo received cult at Dion and on Paros and Naxos. In all three places, she appears in association with Demeter. It is tempting also to see references to Eleusis in the well at Dion and the mention of Eubouleus in the Cycladic inscription. This would fit with the Apologetics’ location of Baubo among the autochthonous of the city. These indications, however, must be read with caution. Eubouleus is associated with Eleusis, but the inscriptions address not Eubouleus the swineherd or the son of Orpheus, but

46 First published in Olympos (1876) 15.
47 IG, 12,5, no. 227 (p.63). The ν in Baubo was added after the inscription was completed. The reconstruction of the third word is contested. Kern reads it as an adjective describing Erasippe’s role as a holy woman, while Bloch reads Hera as a byname to Demeter. For a summary see Wide (1907) 264. See also Bechtel (1887) 54, no. 65.
49 Pleket and Stroud SEG 27-280 Other inscriptions found within the same temenos attests worship of Cybele, Artemis, Kourotrophos (possibly an epithet of Demeter) and Eileithya. As Pinigiatoglou (2010) 187, observes, these divinities were all connected to childbirth, possibly an indication of the sanctuary’s role.
50 i.e. the well above Eleusis mention in the Homeric Hymn, 272. Pinigiatoglou (2010) 183 ties the well to the Babo inscription, suggesting that the sanctuary could have been dedicated to the Eleusinian aspect of Demeter.
Zeus Eubouleus. Robert Parker and others have suggested that this byname identified a chthonic version of Zeus as a god of the underworld whom, as opposed to Hades, could be approached through worship.\textsuperscript{51} While the inscriptions confirm that Baubo was honored in association with Demeter, we cannot assume that it was for the same acts as the Apologetics describe.

Two later inscriptions from the eastern parts of the Greek world also associate the name Baubo with cultic activities. A first century AD inscription in Latin from Galatia, in west central Anatolia, mentions a cult of “Babo.”\textsuperscript{52} From the same period stems an inscription from Magnesia, a city not far from Priene and the site of another excavation begun by Carl Humann.\textsuperscript{53} Otto Kern published the Magnesia inscriptions separately from the excavation reports.\textsuperscript{54} The inscription recounts how an envoy was sent from Magnesia to the oracle at Delphi and was told to bring back three maenads from Thebes. The text continues with an account of how the three maenads—Cosco, Théttale, and Baubo—each instituted a thiasos in the city, that they were honored with games after their deaths, and where they are buried.\textsuperscript{55} This is the only epigraphical example where Baubo is not a recipient of cult, but a human leader of cult, although the honors bestowed to her and the importance of her grave recalls the honors rewarded to heroes and founders. Moreover, Baubo institutes cult to Dionysos, not Demeter. At the time of the inscriptions’ publication, Carl Humann had passed away and Wiegand had taken over the work at Priene. Although there is every reason to believe that Wiegand and his team were aware that

\textsuperscript{51} The triad Demeter, Kore, and Zeus Eubouleus is attested elsewhere. On Eubouleus as a bi-name to Zeus and its relation to Eubouleus of Eleusis see: Kern (1891) and Parker (2005) 337–39.
\textsuperscript{52} CIG 4142. This inscription is central for Guthrie (1935) 135-6, who argues that it is an indication that Baubo, Mise and Dysaules were Thracian imports to Greece.
\textsuperscript{53} Kern (1900) 139, no. 215. The inscription itself is from the first century AD, but Kern believes it to be a copy of an older text. It was found before the excavations started, but Kern believes it came from the location of a Dionysos sanctuary. On the discovery of the inscription see Reinach (1890.1).
\textsuperscript{54} Kern (1900) 139, no. 215.
\textsuperscript{55} Kern (1900) 139, no. 215. Reinach (1890.2). Kontoleon (1890) 330ff.
Baubo’s name appeared in a city so close by, they chose not to draw any conclusions from it or to mention the inscription in relation to the Priene statuettes. Kern himself, attentive to modern and ancient references to Baubo, does not make any attempt to link this mention of Baubo with any other literary, epigraphic or material sources.\textsuperscript{56}

Do these inscriptions confirm that Baubo was worshipped over a long time and across a significant distance, and if so, in what capacity? Graf cautions us not to draw conclusions about the nature of Baubo at Eleusis from the latter two inscriptions.\textsuperscript{57} Baubo is a so-called \textit{Lallname}, a name that easily rolls of the tongue, often with repeated syllables that resemble the babble of babies; mama, Gorgo, Lady Gaga are all \textit{Lallwords}. Such names were not uncommon in Anatolia, Graf reminds us.\textsuperscript{58} A search in the \textit{Noms indigènes dans l’Asie-Mineure gréco-romaine} confirms this and that similar-sounding names to Baubo existed also in Ionia in both male and female versions.\textsuperscript{59} This fact, together with the few commonalities between the eastern and western attestations of Baubo and the variations in spelling, confronts us with the possibility of homonyms and when it is appropriate to use one source to shed light on another.

The eastern inscriptions are cited less often than the Cycladic ones, possibly because they are more difficult to fit with the ribald woman at Eleusis that the Christian writers describe. When they are mentioned, it is often to prove Baubo’s eastern connection and, related to this, her sexual character, or to add information to Baubo’s genealogy or biography. In his monumental exposé on Greek religion and mythology from 1906, Otto Gruppe mentions the Galatia

\textsuperscript{56} See chapter two of this dissertation for Kern’s interest in “solving” the appearance of Baubo in Goethe’s \textit{Faust I} and the figurine in the Berlin ancient collection with the same name. Kern more than anyone at the time was interested in understanding the relations between ancient and modern mentions of Baubo. In his edition of the Orphic fragments, Kern (1922) 126, no. 52 includes a reference to the inscription from Paros, but not to the one from Magnesia.

\textsuperscript{57} Graf (1974) 168.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{59} Robert (1963) 367–69.
inscription in a discussion on sexual rituals in Kybele cult. In a footnote, he suggests that Baubo was one of the figures connected with the cult of Kybele that the Orphics introduced into the Eleusinian myth circle. Gruppe’s reference summarizes the idea of Baubo in the early twentieth century as a figure strongly connected with sexual symbolism, Orphism and (connected to these two aspects) the east. Although neither inscription mention anything about sexual rituals, their contexts—stemming from areas where Kybele cult thrived, and the association with Dionysos—enables scholars such as Gruppe to use them to confirm Baubo’s lewd associations. In his own expose, Guthrie builds on Gruppe’s comment and adds that these eastern references to Baubo should compel us to look to Anatolia for the origin of Orphic myth. Herrero connects the Magnesia inscription with the Priene figurines and a quote from Gregory of Nyssa from the fourth century A.D in which Demeter exposes herself instead of Baubo, relating all these instances to “Baubo’s presence in Minor Asia.” Olender cites the Magnesia inscription to state that Baubo “has nurses in her family,” because the Theban maenad described is identified as a descendant of Ino, known to have nursed the young Dionysos. Olender also connects the inscription with a fragment preserved in Harpokration that states that Baubo is the mother of Mise, arguing that Mise and Baubo are both associated with nursing as well as orgiastic eastern rituals.

The above examples illustrate the common practice of reading attestations of mythical names as complimentary rather than comparatively. Underlying them is the assumption that each mention of the name has the same fixed referent and can add to the knowledge of this, as when

---

60 Gruppe (1906) 1437, no. 2.
61 Guthrie (1935) 135.
63 Olender (1990) 99 makes this statement to bring together the Magnesia inscription and the fragment ascribed to Harpocrates that states that Baubo is the mother of Mise as two parts of a discussion on Baubo’s relation to nursing and nurses.
we find a hitherto unknown photo of someone we know well. Olender’s statement about Baubo’s family assumes that Baubo has a consistent lineage and characteristics. This assumption is particularly perilous, given that the Baubo mentioned in the Magnesia inscription shares no characteristics but her name with the Baubo preserved in Hesychius. In the case of Baubo, the practice of allowing several sources to inform the same figure reveals that this figure has been heavily shaped by the Christian deployment of the name. The mere mention of the name invokes connections with sexuality and Orphism. Rather than troubling or extending the notion of Baubo, new evidence is read as confirming what is already known.

**Literary Sources**

Later literary sources also preserve mentions of Baubo, which, if dated correctly, might pre-date the Hellenistic sources noted above. The second century A.D. Alexandrinian grammarian Harpocration has preserved two fragments ascribed to the mythographers Asclepiades of Tragilus and Palaephatos of Abdys respectively. If Harpocration is correct about the fragments’ origin, the quote from Asclepiades would be roughly contemporary with the inscription from Naxos. Asclepiades was a student of Isocrates and would have lived towards the end of the fourth century B.C. The two fragments are similar. Both recall that Dysaules welcomed Demeter to Eleusis. In the fragment ascribed to Palaephatos, Dysaules greets Demeter together with his wife, who is not named, while in the account ascribed to Asclepiades, Dysaules’ wife is called Baubo and they have daughters named Protone and Mise. In Orphic Hymn XLI, Mise is described as a bisexual deity and a female version of Dionysos. Like the inscriptions above, the link between Baubo’s and Mise’s names in Harpocration has generally

---

64 Jacoby (1923) 168, no. 4.
been understood to confirm Baubo’s connection to lascivious sexual rituals imported to Greece from the east. Olender also relates Mise’s bisexuality to the iconography of the Priene statuettes.

If the sources mentioning the name Baubo are read without the assumption that we already know the character to which they refer, an image of pre-Christian associations of the name emerges that overlaps with but also differs from the Christian accounts. Baubo is associated with cult at several places. At Dion and on Naxos and Paros this cult is particularly associated with Demeter and possibly Eleusis, while in Magnesia a Baubo was said to have instituted cult to Dionysos. That the name turns up with different spellings is a reminder that it might not always have the same referent. Also noteworthy is also that the sources are all Hellenistic or later. Although they might be copies of older texts, which seems to be the case with the Magnesia inscription, this act of copying attests an interest in the name in these periods. Baubo’s association with the Eleusinian family of autochthonous makes it plausible that she was receiving honors for her service to Demeter, as were the other members were around the Greek world.

In her study on Iambos, Andrea Rotstein compares the roles of Baubo and Iambe. Rotstein explains that Iambe in the Homeric Hymn is not a cult myth, since it does not reflect the rituals at Eleusis, but is instead an etiological myth that explains the rituals at Thesmophoria. Baubo, on the other hand, is attested in ritual and is hence a cult myth. How Rotstein understands the difference between cult myth and etiological myth is not clear, nor why one must exclude the other. The reasons that she gives for calling Iambe an etiological myth would just as well describe as a cult myth. Rotstein’s argument follows a common trend to describe the

---

difference between Iambe and Baubo as corresponding to talking and gesturing. For Rotstein, this difference corresponds with the fact that Baubo is attested in “ritual,” by which she means the inscriptions, and Iambe only in text. Yet both Clement and Arnobius write that Baubo talks. Further, if the Hellenistic sources honored Baubo because of her help to Demeter, we cannot be certain how this help was imagined. Rotstein, following Kevin Clinton, argues that the inscriptions confirm that Baubo was honored for the gesture described by the Church Fathers. This is a generous reading. Even if Baubo is honored for her help at Demeter’s appearance at Eleusis, we have no indication of what this help was, nor if we should understand her as the jesting lady described by the Apologetics, or as a person in a similar status to Metaneira the queen, as another late fragment seems to suggest. It would be fairer to say that both Iamb and Baubo are names that come up in a flexible constellation of humans honored for their relation to Demeter at Eleusis.

There is also no clear connection between Baubo’s name and obscenities. The name’s Lall-sounds recalls several onomatopoetic words, such as dogs’ barking, βαῦβα. It also recalls a verb for sleeping, βαυβάω, which can also have a sexual connotation, as for example in Eur. Fr. 694. Graf refers to this word to suggest that Baubo’s name associates her with sexuality and the female genitals. The same verb, however, also means “put to sleep,” likely because it recalls sounds made to lull children to sleep. The later meanings could have made it a fitting name for a nurse, a role that Hesychius assigns to Baubo and which might be hinted at in Clement’s mention

---

70 Kern (1922) 119, no. 49.
71 Graf (1974) 68, refers to the Euripidean fragment and Herondas as explaining that the nouns h baubw and o baubwn refer to the sexual organs.
of the boy Iacchos and his interest in Baubo’s breast. Besides the fact that Baubo’s name appears in the east, imagined as a locality where orgiastic cults thrived, there is nothing that confirms that before the Christian writers the Greeks associated the name or figure of Baubo with obscene behavior or objects.

The Church Fathers
Clement of Alexandria (150-215 A.D.)

The description of the Eleusinian mysteries by Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius and Arnobius have had the greatest impact in shaping the notion of Baubo. Clement is the oldest of the three; Eusebius and Arnobius follow his text closely both in form and content. Eusebius’ mention of Baubo is entirely quoted from Clement, while Arnobius’ account is a translation of it with some additions and changes. Their descriptions of Demeter’s arrival at Eleusis are the only accounts of Baubo’s famous anasyrma, the unveiling in front of Demeter, which has come to define the figure.

Born in the middle of the second century A.D., Clement wrote his Protreptikos or Exhortation to the Pagans with the intention of exposing the ridiculous and debased ideas at the heart of Greek pagan religion, while showing that the kernels of truth contained therein have reached their true form in Christianity. Clement is one of modern scholarship’s most important informants on the Eleusinian mysteries. The fact that Clement’s account has been so central in reconstructing the events at the mysteries makes it all the more difficult to determine how reliable his information is. Suggestions of Clement’s familiarity with pagan tradition have ranged widely. Eusebius (PE 2.2.64) claims that he was himself initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries, and was thus speaking from personal experience. Modern scholars, on the other hand, have
suggested that his account is based on the Eleusinian mysteries in Alexandria or that he is drawing from one or more Hellenistic texts.\textsuperscript{72} Whether he was born a pagan or not, Clement displays a solid knowledge of Greek philosophy. While he does not shy away from the harshest condemnation of pagan rituals and myths, he often reads pagan philosophy generously and strives to prove that certain religious ideas are not plain heresies, but misunderstandings.

Clement’s treatment of Orpheus exemplifies this double approach to the pagan tradition, as he sets up Orpheus and the traditions and teachings associated with him both as a forerunner and antithesis to the Christian religion.

Clement opens the \textit{Protreptikos} by addressing Orpheus, introducing him as a foil for Christ. The pagan mythical singer has been replaced by the singer of the new songs. Clement’s Orpheus is one of the principal founders of pagan practices and a theological authority. Clement associates Orpeus with the lewdest and most confused of pagan theories, yet also presents him as a figure who on occasion had a glimpse of true religious understanding. Clement’s text explores both sides of this ambivalence, holding him up to show that conversion must not be a clean break, but a clarification of misunderstanding. As Edmonds has shown, Clement’s ambivalent characterization of Orpheus was repeated by later Apologetics and shaped discussions of Orphism.\textsuperscript{73} The Apologetics would continue to exploit Orpheus as a double figure, both representative of lewd paganism or a precursor to Christianity, playing up one side or the other depending on how strongly they perceived the threat to Christianity.\textsuperscript{74} Herrero has argued that the rhetoric of the Apologetics and especially of Clement contributed to the notion that an Orphic

\textsuperscript{72} Kerényi (1991) 118, On the differences between the Alexandrinian and Attic Eleusinion and the former’s “erotic drama,”119. Gagné and Herrero (2009) 292 suggests that Clement is drawing from a Hellenistic Orphic source for his description of the mysteries.

\textsuperscript{73} Edmonds (2013) 30.

\textsuperscript{74} Edmonds (2013) 30–37.
theology analogous to the Christian existed. \(^75\) Herrero even goes as far as talking about a Christian recreation of Orphism.\(^76\)

The Christian preoccupation with Orpheus was directed both at the character of Orpheus himself as well as the institutions that he represented. Orpheus could easily be compared to Christ, he was also considered a religious founder and his iconography, depicting him as a young man, was very similar to that of Christ. Orpheus was also closely associated with the Eleusinian mysteries, which was another threat that early Christian religion had to address. Eleusis was not only one of the largest and best-known pagan institutions, but also offered promises for the afterlife for the individual initiates—not unlike Christianity itself. Like the Christian myth of salvation, Eleusis also centered on the death and return of a divine child, the mother-daughter relation of Demeter and Kore. The similarities between the Christian and pagan myths made it important to emphasize the differences. Consequently, Clements’s account stresses the pagan gods’ unnatural and incestuous family relations and the indecent females at the center of the myth.

Clement’s account of the mysteries appears at the beginning of the second book of the *Protreptikos*. He combines all the Greek mysteries into one long description. It is therefore difficult to follow which myth Clement ascribes to what mystery. This uncertainty is possibly intentional, as the jumbled account allows Clement to attack the mysteries as one body, showing that they were all ridiculous and obscene. Clement is especially concerned with showing his reader that, at its core, the mysteries commemorated undignified bodily relations, indecent women, incest, castration, fratricide, and cannibalism. Similarly, their symbols are either

\(^75\) Herrero (2010).
\(^76\) Herrero (2010) 265.
obscene, such as Dionysos’ castrated phallos, or meaningless: toys, trinkets, and music instruments. The Baubo episode appears at the end of this account, situated as a culmination of all these undignified themes and supported by the religious authority of Orpheus himself.

Clement tells the story of Baubo’s meeting with Demeter twice, once in his own words and once through a hexameter that he ascribes to Orpheus. Clement explains that Demeter arrived at Eleusis while searching for her lost daughter and was greeted by the local inhabitants (2.20.1). Unlike in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, Clement does not include a court or nobles, only the indigenous farmers. When Demeter refuses their offer of drink and food, Baubo “is deeply hurt, thinking she has been slighted.” As a response to this insult she reveals her “shameful parts,” ῥα αἰδοῖα (2.20.3).77 “These are the secret mysteries of the Athenians!” Cement exclaims (2.21.1). The exclamation marks Baubo’s shameful act as the center of the mysteries. Noting that Orpheus was the founder of the mysteries, Clement continues by quoting a short hexameter so that his readers can confirm this shamelessness in the very words of their originator.

ódh eipouσa pépλous ἀνεσύρατο, δείξε δὲ πάντα
σώματος οὐδὲ πρέποντα τύπον· παῖς δὲ ἦν Ἰακχος,
χειρὶ τὲ μιν ῥίπτασκε γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποι
ἤ δὲ ἐπεὶ οὖν μειώσης θεά, μειῶθ᾽ ἐν τημῷ,
δέξατο δ᾽ αἰόλον ἀγγος, ἐν ὧ κυκεὼν ἐνέκειτο (21.1)

Clement’s quote is the main reason that Baubo has been called an “Orphic” version of the Homeric Hymn: we will return to the significance of this below. Graf notes that the quoted hexameter seems young, at least post-classical.78 The quoted passage departs slightly, but importantly from the paraphrased narrative that precedes it. In the quote, the child Iacchos

77 περιαλγής ἢ Βαυβῷ γενομένη, ὡς ὑπεροφανεία δήθεν, ἀναστέλλεται τὰ αἰδοῖα καὶ ἑπιδεικνύει τῇ θεῶ
arrives as Baubo disrobes. Also noteworthy is also that Baubo in the later version exposes herself after she has said something, this would undermine the difference stated by Rotstein that Baubo, as opposed to Iambe, does not try to coax Demeter into eating by talking.

Immediately after the Orphic hexameter, Clement quotes the formula of the initiates at Eleusis:

‘ἐνήστευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεῶνα, ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἔργασάμενος ἀπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστην (21.2)

“I fasted; I drank the draught; I took from the chest; having done my task, I placed in the basket and from the basket into the chest.” Clement is the main source for this formula, which seems to relate the epiphany at the pinnacle of the initiation ceremony. The nature of the object that the initiates handle is left unmentioned, but Clement’s rhetoric is suggestive. By placing the myth of Baubo immediately before the reference to the rituals at the mysteries, Clement invites a comparison between the two. By structuring the accounts similarly, his text suggests that the myth is the foundation for the actions. The fasting and drinking of the kykeon by the initiate parallels Demeter’s actions when she meets Baubo. Within this juxtaposition, the “taking from the chest,” alluding to the epiphany at the climax of the initiations, parallels Baubo’s indecent exposure. Clement invites this comparison with the exclamation: “this was the secret rituals of the Athenians!” with which he concludes the narrative on Baubo’s revelation. Clement omits the other autochthonous that he lists from the narrative, nor does he tie this account to the myths of the introduction of agriculture that the Homeric Hymn stresses. In Clement’s account, the myth of Demeter at Eleusis is reduced to the perverted meeting between the goddess and Baubo. By placing Baubo’s story as the last in a muddled account of Greek mystery cults, that seldom differ between specific localities and traditions, Clement further invites his readers to consider Baubo’s act as exemplary of the content of all Greek mysteries.
**Eusebius (263-339 A.D.)**

Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, quotes Clement’s account of the mysteries (2.11.1-23.9) in its entirety in his *Praeparatio Evangelica*. Written about a hundred years after Clement’s *Protreptikos*, the *Praeparatio* is an apology of the Christian faith in response to accusations arising in the third century that Christianity was to blame for Rome’s sufferings. Despite these attacks, Eusebius was writing in a period of Christian establishment and security. Diocletian’s persecutions would follow shortly, but Eusebius’ writing does not reflect a sense that such a threat is looming. Besides Clement, Eusebius quotes extensively from a host of earlier Christian and pagan writers. The extensive quote from Clement follows an equally lengthy passage from Diodorus on pagan theogonies. Eusebius uses these two authorities to demonstrate the ridiculousness of Greek theology and practice respectively. Following Clement, Eusebius draws his reader’s attention to the base content of pagan thought and rituals and point out the rituals that worship the unmentionable body parts of men and women (2.4).

**Arnobius (255-330 A.D.)**

Eusebius’ contemporary Arnobius wrote his *Adversus Nationes* in response to similar concerns, as an apology in the face of growing hostility from non-Christians. The later books of the *AN* have an urgency likely influenced by the edict of Diocletian in 303. Arnobius too draws extensively on Clement for the last books of the *AN*. His treatment of the mysteries appears in book five and follows Clement’s structure. It summarizes several mysteries, points out their lewd and violent content before going into more depth about the mythology and rituals surrounding the Eleusinian mysteries (5.24-26). This section is a free translation into Latin of Clement’s
Greek with some embellishments and changes, including clarifications of Greek terms and geography that might be unfamiliar to Arnobius’ Latin audience. Following Clement, Arnobius too paraphrases the Baubo episode and quotes an Orphic verse to show that this was the myth at the heart of the Eleusinian mysteries.

Arnobius’ summary of the Baubo episode differs slightly but markedly from Clement’s. Baubo does not appear to expose herself out of anger over Demeter’s refusal of her hospitality, but out of concern for her guest. Arnobius extends the passage, describing how Baubo prepares the display by depilation, making her genital area smooth “like a child,” before she returns to the goddess to show her “omnia illa pudoris loca” (5.25), all of that shameful area. Arnobius does not describe a spontaneous gesture of rage, but one carefully considered and prepared. Arnobius’ Orphic quote is also not a direct translation from Clement’s Greek text. The verse does not mention Iacchus; instead, Baubo touches her own body, caressing it and delighting the goddess by making it “boy-like:”

Sic effata simul vestem contraxit ab imo
obiecitque oculis formatas inguinibus res:
quas cava succutiens Baubo manu (nam puerilis
ollis vultus erat) plaudit, contrectat amice.
tum dea defigens augusti luminis orbes
tristias animi paulum mollita repondit:
inde manu poclum sumit risuque sequenti

---

51 Arnobius’ paraphrasing of the meeting: Igitur Baubo illa, quam incolam diximus Eleusinii fuisse pagi, malis multiformibus fatigatam accipit hospitio Cererem, adulatur obsequii mitibus, reficiendi corporis rogat curam ut habeat, sittientis ardori oggerit potionem cinni, cyceonem quam nuncupat Graecia: aversatur et respuit humanitatis officia maerens dea nec eam fortuna perpetitur valetudinis meminisse communis. Rogat illa atque hortatur contra, sicut mos est in huiusmodi casibus, ne fastidium suae humanitatis adsumat: obstinatissime durat Ceres et rigoris indomiti pertinaciam retinet. Quod cum saepius fieret neque ullis quiret obsequii ineluctabile proposittum fatigari, vertit Baubo artes et quam serio non quibat allicere ludibriorum statuit exhilarare miraculis: partem illam corporis, per quam secus femineum et subolem prodere et nomen solet adquirere genericum, longiore ab incuria liberat, facit sumere habitum puriorem et in speciem levigari nondum dari atque histriciuli pusionis. Redit ad deam tristem et inter illa communia quibus moris est frangere ac temperare maerorss retigid se ipsam atque omnia illa pudoris loca revelatis monstrat inguinibus. Atque publi adigit oculos diva et inauditi specie solaminis pascitur: tum diffusior factura per risum aspernatum sumitatque ebiti potionem, et quod diu nequivit verecundia Baubonis exprimere propudiosi facinoris extorsit obscenitas
Arnobius too follows the quote with an exclamation about the indecency of the rituals and quoting the initiates’ formula. Like Clement’s, his version invites the reader to compare the initiations and the myth but Arnobius makes Baubo’s function as an example of pagan rituals more explicit, returning to her name later in the text and comparing her display at Eleusis with the phalli set up to honor Dionysos.

Marcovich has argued that the differences between Arnobius’ and Clement’s accounts are due to the fact that both we and Arnobius have corrupt versions of Clement’s original text. Accordingly, he continues, Arnobius adds nothing new to the Baubo episode, Clement is our only source. Yet, as Marcovich himself shows, Arnobius’ differences have in significant ways influenced the idea of Baubo, with scholars even giving his version priority over Clement’s. Importantly, it was the odd image of Baubo lifting her skirts to display her boy-like body that was on Hermann Diels’s mind when he suggested the name Baubo for the Priene statuettes.

The Christian writers have been central to the idea that Baubo corresponds to the display of a vulva at the mysteries, but what precisely does she display in these texts? Clement writes that Baubo uncovers her αἰδοῖα to the goddess. The word, meaning “shameful things,” is rendered as vulva in almost all modern summaries and translations. In an earlier passage of the Protreptikos, Clement uses the same word for Dionysos’ castrated phallos, which he argues was commemorated in a different mystery (2.19.4). Clement likely envisioned Baubo’s display as a female equivalent. In his Latin translation, Arnobius renders the word as “partem illam corporis, per quam secus femineum et subolem prodere et nomen solet adquirere genetricum,” “that part

---

80 Marcovich (1986).
of the body by which women bear children and obtain the name mothers” (5.25.5). In Clement’s Orphic hexameter, on the other hand, Baubo shows her τόπον, a mark or image. The word is not otherwise used to denote the genitals but Arnobius nevertheless renders it as *formatas inguinibus res*, the parts of the groin (5.25.6). To explain this choice of words and the differences between the two accounts, Marcovich proposes that Clement’s text is corrupt and further, that Arnobius worked from (the same corrupt) text that had been altered by a redactor. Marcovich suggests that Clement’s original quote read τόπον, which can mean the female pudendum (LSJ 1.3). The redactor understood τύπος as referring to παῖς and altered the text accordingly, removing Iacchos. With Iacchos removed, a new subject is required for the action of touching the breast (which the child Iacchos does in Clement). The redactor solved this by making Baubo the subject. The result is the episode in which Baubo displays an image of a boy on her body and manipulates it with her hands herself, whereas it would have been Iacchos touching her in Clement’s original. Arnobius’ rendering has had unforeseen consequences in scholarship, even altering the reading of Clement. Using Arnobius to explain Clement’s text instead of the other way around, Hermann Diels read the name Iacchos in Clement as referring to Baubo’s body, specifically her vulva. Iacchos/Baubo’s vulva thus “appears” when she unveils herself. As Marcovich shows, there is no support for translating Iacchos into a word for a body part. On the other hand, there are several instances in which Iacchos is the name of a small child or infant associated with Demeter at Eleusis. A small child reaching for his mother’s (or nurse’s) breast

---

82 Marcovich (1986) 296.
83 Marcovich (1986) 297.
84 Diels (1907) 1–14.
would not require an explanation. Yet, Diel’s reading of Iacchos as vulva caught on and is still repeated, recently for example by Fritz Graf and Apostolos Athanassakis.86

Summary

Do the Apologetics refer to the same Baubo as the Hellenistic inscriptions and the fragment preserved in Harpocratio? Clement introduces Baubo as the first name in a list of Eleusinian inhabitants, i.e., the same family that the older sources associates Baubo’s name with. Notably, the Apologetics do not mention the function of the other members. The other Eleusinian autochthonous received honors for their role in the Eleusian myth and the Homeric Hymn states that Iambe continued to please Demeter (205). For the Apologetics make sure to situate Baubo in this group of honored culture heroes, but the other members are left aside in favor of Baubo, who becomes the main actor in Demeter’s visit. Even though Baubo might have been associated with this group earlier, even received honors for her role at Eleusis, it is also clear that she was not an indispensable part of it. Palaephatos does not find it paramount to mention the name of Dysaules’ wife, and in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, Iambe appears instead of Baubo. Baubo is also not mentioned in the Orphic hymns associated with Demeter or Mise. If Baubo was honored as part of this group and for the help she offered Demeter, she was not always and everywhere considered the only or most significant member of this group.

Being the only accounts of a narrative connected to Baubo, the Apologetics have come to define Baubo as a figure and the anasyrma have often been retroactively applied to all other mentions of the name. It is also through the Apologetics that Baubo has come to be associated with Orphism. This association has given rise to the notion that there is an Orphic Baubo that is

always tied to the anasyrma. For example, Radcliff Edmonds interpolates this gesture into an “Orphic” papyrus from the first century C.E. (identified as such through the mention of Musaios), which retells the rape of Persephone (P. Berol. 13044; Kern no. 49). The narrative in the papyrus follows that off the Homeric Hymn closely, but breaks of as Demeter arrives at Eleusis. When the text continues, it mentions Baubo handing the child Demophon to Demeter. Edmonds complements the lacuna in the papyrus by interpolating Baubo’s lewd gesture from Clement. There are significant differences between how Baubo is described in the papyrus and in Clement. That Baubo hands the child to Demeter indicates that she is his nurse, or even mother, meaning that she might occupy a role comparable to Metaineira rather than to her servant Iambe in the Homeric Hymn. Edmonds continues his comparison by arguing that the main difference between the Homeric Hymn and the papyrus is Baubo’s gesture, i.e., an episode that is not preserved in the text but which he interpolates. Despite the differences between the papyrus and Clement’s description, Edmonds associates the anasyrma described in Clement so firmly with Baubo that the mention of the name is enough to assume that it must have been part of the narrative.

The anasyrma fits the Apologetics’ rhetoric that draws attention to the indecent bodies and sexual symbolism of the pagan rituals. In later scholarship, however, Baubo’s indecency has become tied specifically to Orphism. Clement uses the Orphic verse to support his argument. This is consistent with his use of Orpheus elsewhere as a voice of authority for pagan beliefs, but particularly important here as Orpheus was considered the founder of the mysteries. For
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87 Edmonds (2013) 175. The papyrus in question is P. Berol. 13044; Kern (1922) 119, no. 49.
Clement, thus, Orpheus is an authority on pagan religion generally and for the mysteries in particular. Similarly, the Baubo story is meant to illustrate what the Athenians, and the larger Greek world, worship at Eleusis. There is not much reason to associate Baubo with a distinct Orphic branch of Greek religion. The Orphic verse that Clement quotes is not preserved elsewhere and Baubo is not mentioned in any of the Orphic hymns, notably also not in those dedicated to Demeter or Mise. Despite this, the Apologetics’ account has been used to argue that Baubo is an Orphic element at Eleusis. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, Baubo and her gesture came to be read as a key to Orphism, begging the question what Orphism is.

The Orphic Baubo

The claim that Baubo is an Orphic is common, yet not clearly defined. Olender notes that in the Orphic tradition, Baubo is a “nocturnal daemon,” paraphrasing a fragment transmitted by the sixteenth-century theologian Allati and attributed to “Psellos.”90 Cook suggests that Baubo was “an orphic goddess of the underworld.”91 Graf summarizes that Baubo’s name belongs to the Orphic tradition where she is a queen.92 Others suggest that Baubo is introduced to the Eleusinian tradition under the influence of Orphism, or indicate that there could exist two Baubos, an Orphic and a pre-Orphic.93 Baubo’s Orphism has been used to draw different conclusions, but there is a prevalent notion that Baubo represents a central principle or ritual

91 Cook (1927) 131-32.
92 Graf (1974) 157, referring to the Berlin Papyrus 13044 discussed above. The papyrus does not mention that Baubo is a queen. This is inferred from her relation to Demophon.
93 Karaghiora-Stathacopoulou (1986) XX, comments that the problem of finding a pre-orphic Baubo at Eleusis or elsewhere is still to be resolved, not mentioning how she considers the Cycladic inscriptions. Lenormant (1873) 683 states that Baubo is an Egyptian element added to the Eleusinian tradition through the Orphics.
object of Orphism; that she is central enough to Orphism that the mention of her name marks a
document as Orphic. The divergence of characteristics associated with Baubo’s Orphism reveals
that the concept itself is not clearly defined. In fact, the modern notions of Orphism and of
Baubo are intertwined. The interpretation of both came to be tied to debates on sexual elements
in Greek religion. At the end of the nineteenth century, Baubo became connected to discussions
about how to evaluate Orphism, a question tied to the problem of how to explain sexual
symbolism in Greek religion.94

Since classical times certain texts and ideas have been grouped together under the label
Orphic. The Classical period only knows the adjective orphic, not a concept of Orphism. These
were texts attributed to the mythical poet Orpheus or one of the thinkers associated with him,
such as his teacher Musaios. The consensus in modern scholarship is that these texts did not form
a canonical or even fixed group.95 In late antiquity, Orphic texts became focal points for both
Christian and Neoplatonist thinkers. The Christian writers looked at Orpheus as a representative
of pagan religion. Their polemic helped shape the modern impression that Orphic texts
corresponded to a coherent theology analogous to Christianity. The fact that the notion of
Orphism was born out of conversations with, and partly as a response to, Christianity has shaped
modern understanding of it. Modern scholarship has dwelt on Orphism’s concerns with purity
and eschatology, making it a direct competitor to the Christian preoccupation with these themes.
However, Edmond notes that these do not seem to have been important or defining themes in
these early debates on Orpheus. The early Christians did not dwell on similarities between
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94 Herter (1941) 256, no.3 argues that Ovid did not use an Orphic source as a model for his Persephone story,
because, among other things, Baubo is not included in his version.
95 Athanassakis and Wolkow (2013) xi.
Orphic and Christian eschatology and teleology even when they compared Orpheus to their own prophet.  

The idea shaped by Christian and Neoplatonist thinkers—that Orphism represented a school of thought—was retained in modernity, although the precise definition of Orphism, what it contained, and how it related to mainstream Greek religion, have fluctuated through the generations. Up to the Renaissance, Orpheus was known above all as a lover and musician. During the Renaissance, the attention shifted to Orpheus’ role as a religious founder who had preserved and transmitted his knowledge in secret mysteries, a notion that reflected the period’s increased interest in secret orders and mysteries. For the Romantics and in the early years of the nineteenth century, these two aspects of Orpheus were brought together and his mythical musical abilities were tied to his role as a transmitter of esoteric knowledge through the mysteries. The origin of the mysteries was often located in Egypt, but there was not yet a prevalent idea that Orpheus had transmitted a “lascivious tradition” from the Orient, as it would be described later in the century.

The shift in defining Orphism was reflected in the changes of which texts were counted as “Orphic.” The first collection of Orphic texts was compiled in 1764 by Johann Mattias Gesner and included the Argonautika and Lithika, the Hymns and references to the Christian Apologetics and other fragments. The Argonautika and Lithika had been considered central Orphic texts since the Middle Ages, but would be banished from collections later in the nineteenth century when interest in Orpheus shifted from his antiquity, proven by his journey on the Argos, to
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97 Dieterich (1893) 3.
eschatological and teleological questions. In their place appeared recent archaeological finds that sometimes did, sometimes did not, mention Orpheus.

Christian August Lobeck’s *Aglaophamus*, published in 1829, marked an important step away from earlier conceptualizations of Orphism. In his seminal work, Lobeck targeted Friedrich Creuzer’s universalizing model of ancient religions, especially the idea that the Greek mysteries could have contained memories of Oriental religious insights. Lobeck countered that the mysteries, in their original form, were expressions of Greek religion. They did not disseminate esoteric knowledge from distant lands or times, but represented the religious traditions prevalent in the Greek community at large. Lobeck drew on a long-standing scholarly tradition that compared the Greek mysteries to ossified Catholic rituals filled with meaningless symbolism. The Orphic priests, he argued, had been the disseminators of these ideas. Lobeck’s work would shape the debates about Orphism in the late nineteenth century, when new archaeological finds reignited interest in Orphism, especially in its theological and eschatological issues. While Lobeck’s concern with whether Orphism was “Protestant” or “Catholic,” there would be no general agreement on this point. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, scholars would variously hold up Orphism as a forerunner for ‘Protestant’ religious sensibilities or blame it for introducing Eastern, lascivious traditions into mainstream Greek religion.

As the debates on Orphism shifted towards its connection to lewd Eastern tradition, Baubo became increasingly presented as an Orphic figure. In the early part of the nineteenth century, even thinkers interested in both Orphism and in the more wild and sexual aspects of Greek religion had not made the connection between these aspects and Orphism. Following this, Baubo had not been considered a particularly Orphic phenomenon. Creuzer discusses Baubo and
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the obscene sexual symbolic of the mysteries. He suggests that the tale preserved in the Christian authors might be an older version of the Baubo episode, but does not make anything out of their mention of Orpheus.\(^{99}\) Nor does Goethe, interested in both Orpheus and Baubo, even call her Orphic.\(^{100}\) Beginning in the twentieth century, however, Baubo’s Orphic identity became a way of explaining her obscenity. Lenormant suggest that the Orphics introduced Baubo to the mysteries, which otherwise had a much more chaste character.\(^{101}\) Nilsson calls Baubo “foreign” to Eleusis and finds that the “milder” Iambe fits better with the mysteries.\(^{102}\) Crusius assigns Baubo to the *Misch-Masch* of the *Winkelmysterien*, confused, non-conformist alternative mysteries.\(^{103}\) His description of their obscene traditions spreading like “evil parasites,” afflicting large parts of the population and flourishing in excessive secret cults, paints a concerned picture of a contained but porous society susceptible to the influences of those less “Greek” elements that Baubo represents.\(^{104}\) Dieterich claims both that Baubo was introduced through the Orphics’ lascivious tradition yet also that these phenomena are *uralt*, pre-historical.\(^{105}\) The Apologetics had used Orpheus to legitimize their claims that Baubo represented the indecent displays at the center of Greek cult. In the early twentieth century, their characterization of Baubo was retained, but instead of being representative of all pagan practice, Baubo’s vulgarity came to be explained as a sectarian or foreign import. Further, while the Apologetics had described a woman who displayed her indecent parts, now Baubo came to be read as herself being the things displayed, a personified vulva. This latter switch was facilitated through the emergence of three sources in

\(^{99}\) Creuzer (1821) 461–62.
\(^{100}\) Kern (1897) 271–73.
\(^{101}\) Lenormant (1873).
\(^{103}\) Crusius (1892) 128.
\(^{104}\) Crusius (1892) 128.
\(^{105}\) Dieterich (1893) 3.
close succession during the final decade of the nineteenth century. The publication of Herondas’ mimes, a fragment from Empedocles, and the discovery of the Priene statuettes were all taken to confirm that the Baubo described by the Apologetics corresponded to a personified vulva.

Herondas

The playwright Herondas likely lived around the third century B.C. in Alexandria. There is no medieval reception history of his work; his mimes are preserved in a single papyrus from the second century AD. The papyrus, housed in the British Museum, was published for the first time by F.G. Kenyon in 1891 and has subsequently been known as the Kenyon Papyrus. The text received much attention when it first appeared and several articles commenting on the find appeared soon after its publication. Otto Crusius would publish the first significant critical commentary already in 1892.

The collection’s sixth mime centers around a κόκκινος βαυβών. Made by a skilled cobbler and discreetly sold to one of the mime’s protagonists, this item is currently circulating among a group of female friends. The word does not appear outside Herondas and its meaning must be determined by the context. Likely it is a leather phallos used by the women as a sex-toy, an object similar to the olisbos in Aristophanes’ Lysistrata (109). Kenyon insisted that the word referred to some “much-admired article of apparel.” This translation makes little sense in the context of the play, particularly given the secrecy of the conversation and the information that the objects gives sweet dreams. In his commentary, Crusius harshly critiques Kenyon and
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106 Kenyon (1891) 1–6.
107 It is made of leather, red, gives women “sweet dreams,” and the friends are careful that their discussion will not be overheard by the servants.
108 Kenyon (1891) 11.
others who, out of prudence, have refused to acknowledge the correct translation of the word. No Dutch interpretation tricks can turn this object into an innocent toiletry article, Crusius writes, referring to an article published by van Leeuwen in Mnemosyne the same year.\footnote{Crusius (1892) 128.} Van Leeuwen had criticized what he considered a common tendency in the field to give any unknown word an obscene meaning.\footnote{van Leeuwen (1892) 97–100. In a later commentary on Herondas, M.S. Buck (1921) 117 summarizes the various prudish attempts at explain the word as something more innocent, commenting that: “This is puris omnia pura with a vengeance. It is to be hoped that these scholars, realizing the grave danger lurking in references of this sort, have long since turned their attention to butterflies and flowers.”} Countering van Leeuwen, Crusius calls for less prudence and stresses the importance to face the indecencies prevalent in Greek culture.

Unfortunately there is no doubt that the vices here discussed had spread through a wide section of the population and even attached themselves — like nasty parasites — to certain debauched secret cults.\footnote{Crusius (1892) 128.}

Having established the meaning of the word, Crusius connects it to the name Baubo. Noting a gloss in Hesychius that explains Baubo as κοιλία, Crusius concludes that Baubo correspond the Middle High German \textit{Wemplinc}, meaning both old lady and belly. “It is clear that Baubo was a unique sort of eponym and deserves to ride the kind of animals that she was given by the old (Longpérier bei Miller. \textit{Mël.} 460) and Goethe (Bd. XIII, 127 Hp)” Crusius concludes.\footnote{Crusius (1892) 129.} In this short tour de force of references, Crusius links the word in Herondas to a different word in Hesychius, the Orphic figure transmitted by the Apologetics, the Egyptian terracotta statuettes of nude females on pigs, and the witch in Goethe’s \textit{Faust I}. Baubo, in Crusius’s summary, is a word and a figure, a character showing her body as well as the body that she shows. “Now we know what was the \textit{formatae inguinibus} of the Orphic Baubo, that caricature of Ιάμβη,”\footnote{Crusius (1892) 128 with reference to Lobeck (1829) 818ff.} he writes. Despite Crusius’s triumphant conclusion, his explanation does
not make entirely clear what the *formatae inguinibus* are: the Herodian *βαυβών*, a female counterpart to it (fake or real), the belly, or the vulva? For Crusius, Baubo becomes a self-explanatory catch-all word for the indecent female body, a meaning that would be reiterated and established as a fact.

With Crusius having established a certain (albeit unclear) etymology for Baubo, his confidence that she was the Orphic symbol would become an established fact. “We know what this creature means, because she herself is originally nothing else than the thing she shows Demeter to enliven her,” Albrecht Dieterich writes shortly after Crusius’s Herondas edition.114 Dieterich continues by explaining that the masculine form of Baubo is *βαυβών* and that “one can easily imagine an old phallic daemon with this name.”115 Dieterich’s suggestions takes Baubo’s etymology full circle. From the masculine noun in Herondas he derives a feminine noun, corresponding to the female genitals. This noun is then assumed to have given rise to the name Baubo. Form the fact that this figure existed a new figure is derived, a male counterpart to the female Baubo corresponding to the masculine counterpart to the feminine noun. This argumentation would be fully explored a generation later by Gilbert Charles-Picard. In a 1927 article, Picard posits Baubo and Baubon as a pair of personifications of the female and male genitals respectively that were part of a primitive cult at Eleusis.116 Despite the convoluted and far-fetched logic of this argument, the idea that Baubo is a personification of the vulva or of a symbolic vulva displayed during the mysteries together with her male counterpart, has come to be repeated and achieved an air of factuality.117
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114 Dieterich (1893) 3.
115 Dieterich (1893) 4.
Baubo at Priene

Crusius notes that his conclusion about the word βαυβών was assisted by his friends in Leipzig, notably Hermann Diels. Crusius had drawn Diels’s attention to the newly published Kenyon Papyrus as Diels was working on his edition of the Pre-Socratics. During his research, Diels had come across a word without any context, baubon. Diels sought an explanation in the sixth-century Alexandrinian lexographer Hesychius and found a gloss on the name Baubo as the nurse of Demeter. This word, Hesychius notes, means κοιλία “as in Empedocles.” In New Testament Greek κοιλία could refer to the womb. Diels would connect this meaning with Crusius’ recent argument and find a fitting correspondence of the word-name Baubo in the excavation at Priene.

It was Diels who first connected the statuettes excavated at Priene with the name Baubo. Around the time that the Priene statuettes were published, Diels wrote to his colleague Hermann Usener that he was considering writing a text on the topic. The indecent themes would require him to write it in Latin, he noted, even though “that is considered philisterhaft these days.” Diels added a note on the Priene finds as a commentary on the fragment from Empedocles: “The name is rendered in the odd terracotta figures found at the Demeter temple at Priene in 1899. The head is missing and the belly is decorated with the female groin and a mouth.” In the same note, he also mentioned Crusius’s Herondas commentary. The Priene archaeologists repeated Diels’s identification in their 1904 publication, albeit with reservations, particularly about Diel’s description of the statuettes as missing a head and having a face on the belly. Is it not it rather the

120 nomen illustratur absonis illis figuris figlinis, quae in templo Ceresi Prienensi 1899 inventae sunt. caput enim eis deest, venter cum inguin muliebri tamquam os ornatur Diels (1901) 166.
case, Schrader asks, that the figures lack a torso and that their head is attached directly onto the 
legs? 121 What Diels recognized in the Priene figurines is Arnobius’ version of the Orphic verse, 
in which Baubo appears with a face on her belly. This also fit with his discovery that Baubo’s 
name meant κοιλία. 122 Although it is often repeated that κοιλία means vagina, it can refer to any 
cavity of the body. It is most often used for the abdomen or the belly and it is not a word 
exclusively connected with female anatomy. As Diels’s identification of the Priene statuettes 
became established, however, the reason behind the identification shifted. Diels had seen the 
word for belly confirmed in the statuettes, but as his identification became established, the 
statuettes’ vulva became the reason for their name. Winter comments on the discovery shortly 
before the official Priene publication, noting that, “as Diels had remarked,” the statuettes recall 
Baubo because of their nudity and the emphasized vulva. 123

As the statuettes become known as Baubo, the ideas that Baubo was a personified vulva 
would be applied to them as well. Perdrizet argues that the Priene statuettes represent the female 
koila that is alive and becomes a living being, a personification of the organ present and essential 
in the goddess’ mysteries. 124 More recently, Fritz Graf has explained that Baubo belongs to the 
aspect of Demeter cult centered on female fertility, as confirmed by the statuettes found at 
Priene. 125 Even when their identity with the mythical figure Baubo is questioned, the fact that the 
Baubo statuettes represent a personification of the female reproductive body is reiterated. 126 In
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121 Wiegand and Schrader (1904) 163.
122 In the 1903 edition of the Pre-Socratic fragments, Diels only glosses the Empedocles fragment with “Baubo – 
Bauch.” Diels and Kranz (1903) 150 no. 153.
123 Winter (1903) LXXIII.
124 Fouquet and Perdrizet (1911) 42; cf. Nilsson (1950) 100 who writes that the Priene figures are an 
antropomorphising of the cunnus.
126 E.g. Karaghiora-Stathacopoulou (1986), who suggests that they represent female sexuality and maternity, 
"analogous to the phallus."
his recent survey of the terracotta figurines from Priene, Rumschied revisits the arguments for and against the Priene statuettes’ identification with Baubo. Most details speak against this identification, he notes, for example the figurines’ nudity and grotesque body. As clues for their meaning, Winter notes that the vulva is emphasized since the incision marking it was added after the statuettes were finished.\textsuperscript{127} Adding details after firing was common practice for small objects, however, since such details would be difficult to render in the mold. Notable for Rumschied’s argument is that the vulva was left unmarked on similar figurines from Samos.\textsuperscript{128} The Priene figurines, with their striking impression of what Olender calls a “short-circuited” body, fit the notion that Diels and Crusius ascribed to the name Baubo, a word meaning groin, belly, vulva, penis, and phallus. With the discovery of the statuettes, the name completed the transformation begun in the discussions of Baubo’s role in Orphism. Baubo no longer denoted a woman or a character, but the female body as a representation of itself.

**Conclusion**

Baubo has no apparent connection to Orpheus before the Apologetics’ accounts. She was also not an indispensable member of the Eleusinian family in antiquity, even though the Apologetics prioritize her over the other autochthonous characters. These two observations have led to the argument that Baubo is an Orphic addition to Eleusis: an argument that only gained ground, however, as Orphism began to be distinguished as a movement responsible for introducing base and sexual traditions into Greek tradition. Baubo’s Orphic character is strongly tied to her *anasyrma* and to her identity as a lewd figure. This identity was corroborated by the

\textsuperscript{127} Rumscheid (2006) 222.
\textsuperscript{128} Rumscheid (206) 222, ft.1357. The statuettes are currently on display in the archaeological museum of Samos.
words from Herondas and Empedocles. When Crusius and Diels made the link to the Apologetics’ Baubo, she emerged as a personified vulva and a central symbol in the mysteries. This understanding of the name carried over to the Priene statuettes that Diels named after her.

Baubo’s Orphic-obscene aspects have been established through a selective reading of ancient sources, including Herondas and Hesychius, and even Goethe, ignoring the earlier inscriptions. When the Priene statuettes were discovered, they were quickly ascribed all the aspects that have become associated with the name Baubo. They too became a personified koilia/cunnus/baubōn. This identification ignores the obvious inconsistencies between the statuettes and Baubo, such as their grotesque bodies and their nudity. The identification also bypasses attempts to understand the statuettes through ancient accounts of similar figures with head directly on their legs; Blemmyes, for example, or Herodotus’ Kynokephaloi (4.191.3) or Strabo’s Sternophalmus (7.3.6). The grotesque body at Priene is seen above all as an expression of Baubo’s offensive gesture. This is mostly because the statuettes elicit the same response in their modern onlooker as reading about the gesture does. What modern readers “see” in the text describing Baubo’s unveiling becomes confirmed through selective reading of older sources.

Baubo’s Orphism begs the question of explaining this “figure,” but the parallel reading of how the sources on Baubo and on Orphism were edited, categorized and combined, reveals them as two categories that separately, and combined, were used to negotiate the limits of the “Greek.”

129 Reinach (1890) and others see a resemblance of a lifted skirt in the statuettes’ hair. Rumschied (2006) 1337 summarizes this line of argumentation.
Chapter Two. Baubo Before Priene

Stimme:
Die alte Baubo kommt allein,
Sie reitet auf einem Mutterschwein

Chor:
So Ehre denn wem Ehre gebührt!
Frau Baubo vor! Und angeführt!
Ein tüchtig Schwein und Mutter drauf,
da folgt der ganze Hexenhauf

(Translate: Walter Kaufmann)

Voice
Old Baubo comes alone right now,
She is riding on a mother sow.

Chorus
Give honor to whom honor’s due!
Dame Baubo, lead our retinue!
A real swine and mother too,
The witches’ crew will follow you.

(Goethe, Faust I, 3962-3967)

I have argued that around 1900 a new ancient myth solidified. The Venn diagram of the Baubo complex gathered into a Baubo myth that combined the name, the narrative of the obscene woman, and the iconography of the Priene figurines into a myth attributed to antiquity but with no exact ancient equivalent. This myth did not emerge ex nihilo. The preceding chapter discussed the Priene archaeologists’ engagement with philological discoveries. The other parts of the Baubo complex, the narrative and iconography, have modern histories of their own that enfolded within and outside of academia. This chapter looks at Baubo’s two most prominent modern iterations before the Priene excavation: a witch leading the way to Walpurgis in Goethe’s Faust, and as the label for a type of Hellenistic terracotta from Egypt. The latter received its name following the publication of a terracotta figurine, today in the Berlin...
Antikensammlung, by James Millingen in 1843 (Fig. 2). Millingen’s article was published in 1843 in Annali dell’Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica, the organ of the Archeological institute in Rome. The institute is the forerunner to the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (DAI), but at the time of Millingen’s publication it was still an international collaboration that included artists, collectors, and scholars. Millingen and Goethe both moved in the circles of its members. Millingen was one of the institute’s founding members, while Goethe followed the young institute with reserved interest. When the institute approached Goethe with the offer of an honorary membership and the invitation to contribute a text, Goethe chose instead to submit an inquiry, keen to differ between his own approach to antiquity and that of the scholars. We will return to this correspondence below, as it offers a clue to Goethe’s interest in Baubo.

The relation between these two applications of the name Baubo is as obvious as it is oblique. Goethe’s Baubo leads the way to Walpurgis riding on a sow, and the statuette published by Millingen shows a woman sitting sidesaddle on a pig. Two pig-riding Baubos seem conspicuous enough to assume a relation. The fact that Millingen’s article was published almost fifty years after Goethe wrote the Walpurgis scene, however, denies us a neat explanation of ancient figure inspiring modern literature. Instead, it confronts us with the possibility that, in this case, an ancient figure was inspired by modern poetry instead of the reverse. Commentaries to Faust have explained Baubo with reference to the Demeter myth or as a figure from Greek myth personifying the obscene and sexual. This seems like an uncomplicated explanation for the ancient figure Goethe is adapting but implies that he is taking great liberties with it, since Baubo in Faust has no obvious sexual connotations or reference to Demeter. In fact, these explanations

---

130 Millingen (1843).
describe the Baubo that appears after 1900. We are faced with the conundrum that Goethe seems to precede the ancient figure that he is referencing.

I want to shift attention towards the relation between these many Baubos: the Faust Baubo, the ancient Baubo that the commentaries refer to, and the Berlin terracotta. A closer look at their histories and descriptions will make it clear that the question of which Baubo is inspiring which is not straightforward. Rather than searching for the ancient original of which Goethe is a version, I want to emphasize the interdependence of these various Baubos in defining each other. This necessitates shifting the question away from the ancient original towards how the idea of such an original ancient myth came about.

The Priene team is tacit about the sources on which their identification is based, but their “clearly” lets the reader assume that they have drawn a conclusion from convincing archaeological and philological evidence. Even if we accept this conclusion, their description of the figures as obscene and their choice of name — Baubo instead of Iambe — betray the associations the name had for them: The figures are Baubo because they are obscene, and they are obscene because they are Baubo (and not Iambe). I will argue that obscenity as Baubo’s main identifying trait was largely established through the associations ascribed to Baubo’s name through Goethe and Millingen. Tracing the emerging Baubo complex demonstrates that Wiegand and his team did not discover Baubo at Priene, but responded to an already existing concept of the name. The Priene archaeologists’ discovery was understood by their contemporaries as a correction of Baubo’s iconography that identified these figurines as Baubo based on sound scholarship. I argue that the associations Baubo had already acquired determined the choice of name. Further, by asserting archaeological and philological evidence as more reliable than
literary creation, their identification of the statues was not only a response in a debate on what Baubo is, but on how the ancient past can be known at all.

The Berlin Pig Rider

The terracotta catalogued as TC4875 is today housed in the Berlin Antikensammlung, tucked away in the attic of the Altes Museum. The figurine was bought by the Berlin museums in 1848 and entered into the acquisition ledger as Baubo. As with most objects acquired around the same period, there is no information on provenance or seller. Although she is in storage today, the pig-rider would have spent several years on display at the Royal Museum—today’s Altes Museum. Museums only began to function as storage facilities for antiquities later in the nineteenth century. At the time of Baubo’s acquisition all purchased objects were put on display. In today’s online catalogue she is described as “Baubo auf Schwein sitzend,” “Baubo sitting on pig.”

The is in the form of a nude female seated sidesaddle on a pig with her legs opened wide. The right leg is broken off just below the knee, but was lifted high and supported by her right hand. In her left hand, she holds an object with horizontal slats, resembling a small ladder or a rattle. The figure is mold made with a firing hole on the upper rear. The backside lacks details and the space between the pigs belly and the base is filled in to stabilize the figure. The entry in
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131 Acquisition Ledger, *Inventarium der Terra Cottensammlung der Königlichen Antiquariums, Band I*
133 There has been several and inconclusive suggestions to what this object is. Rubensohn (1929), discussing a similar group, suggests that it is a so called scala, a xylophone-like instrument. The object corresponds in size and shape to the instrument. However, the scala is only known from Apulian vases (it is sometimes called an Apulian sistrum) and the figure is likely to from Egypt.
the museum’s online-collection suggests that although she is called Baubo seated on a pig, “based on recent scholarship,” the figurine is likely a dancer or acrobat, i.e., not the mythical Baubo. The entry does not provide a reference or motivation for this interpretation, leaving the reader to assume that it relies on the observation that spreading your legs shoulder high while riding on a pig must indeed require impressive acrobatic skill (and an unusually large pig). In fact, the Berlin pig rider belongs to a larger group of figures that, like TC4875, are well known despite little being known about them. We have then a Baubo present and displayed in the Berlin antiquities collection already a generation before the Priene excavations. How did this figure arrive there? How did she obtain—and subsequently lose—the name Baubo? And why is she riding a pig?

Ancient figurines consisting of nude or partially nude female riding sidesaddle on pigs are found in museums and collections around the world. They and similar nude, crouching female figures are collective known as Baubo figurines, Baubo types, or simply “Baubos.” The Berlin figure was the first of this type to be published, making it exemplary for this type. Millingen’s explanation of the name makes it clear that he is not relying on an already established iconographical type, but is suggesting a new identity for the figure. By all accounts, his article set the precedent of calling the entire group Baubo. Among her sisters, the Berlin terracotta, and with it Millingen’s article, is also mentioned frequently in early reference literature such as the previously mentioned article in RE and Lenormant’s entry in Daremberg-Saglio Dictionnaire. Lenormant also discusses Millingen’s publication in his Monographie de la voie sacrée, noting that although there are several examples of the type, Millingen’s is the

---

Lenormant (1873).
only one that has thus far been published. I have found nothing to contradict Lenormant’s statement. Following this, it is clear that Millingen’s identification of the statuette established the only known iconography associated with Baubo before the discovery of the Priene statuettes.

It is perhaps ironic that we know so little about the paradigmatic example of this type. The Berlin pig rider was acquired before the Berlin museum kept records on sellers and artifact provenance. At the time of its purchase, the Berlin museums did not yet sponsor their own excavations. Thus, all acquisitions were purchased, either from private collectors or the museum’s own employers. The latter either bought artifacts on directly for the museum, or for themselves with the hope of selling later. There are good reasons to assume that the Berlin pig rider came to Berlin directly from Millingen’s own collection. Millingen was one of the most active sellers of antiquities to European museums in his time: a search in the catalogue of the British Museum reveals that museum still houses 213 objects acquired from him. Millingen moved in the circle of German scholars around the institutio and was well regarded by the museum director Eduard Gerhard; it is very likely that he also sold to the Berlin museums. The Berlin terracotta was acquired a few years after his publication, and all later sources know her as the terracotta published by Millingen and currently in the Berlin collection. There is no evidence of prior ownership and Millingen’s is the only publication that does not mention Berlin. The purchase could have been organized by Millingen himself before his—unexpected—death in 1845, or sold after his death. That Millingen was based in Italy does not mean that the figurine

135 Lenormant (1864) 241.
136 This practice continued after the museum began sponsoring large-scale excavations, as shown by the acquisition records. Wiegand himself would slip easily between his role as private collector and representative for the museums in Constantinople.
137 This does not include the over thousand coins that the museum also bought from Millingen, “Collection Search: Millingen” British Museum, accessed November 27, 2017, http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/search.aspx.
138 Gerhard (1834).
must have been found there and not in Egypt, the source of most figurines of this type. The British Museum acquired a large group of Egyptian artifacts from Millingen’s collection in the 1840s, and the Berlin terracotta might originally have belonged to this cache.

The Berlin terracotta is typical in more ways than one. She is the paradigm for a type, but her modern acquisition history is also exemplary of the time, as is the lack of information about it.

Millingen’s Identification

Millingen’s article “Babao” was published 1843 in the organ of the Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica in Rome, where Millingen was a member. After an introduction on the origins and role of Greek mystery cults, the article turns to the terracotta figure. Millingen does not include any formal description of the figure, such as information on its size, material, or provenance. Instead, he offers an iconographical analysis linked to religious practice.¹³⁹ We do not learn how Millingen came into contact with the object, but the text assumes that this is the first time this or any similar figurine is presented. The figurine is interesting, Millingen argues, since it is the only known depiction of one of the myths connected to the Eleusinian mysteries. In addition, he continues, it provides information on the secret rites held in the festivals of Eleusis and the Thesmophoria.¹⁴⁰ Millingen’s argument relies on the presumption that it is indeed a figure from the context of Eleusis, Baubo. It is by recognizing that the figure is Baubo, Millingen thus argues, that it can be used to identify elements from the mysteries. How does Millingen know that the figure is Baubo and what, in turn, does the figure let him know about the cults to

¹³⁹ Such neglect was not unusual for Millingen, even in his Ancient Unedited Monuments the descriptions are minimal and rarely is anything said of provenance or recent seller history. Later Salomon Reinach would express frustration at this lack of information when working on artifacts published by Millingen Salomon Reinach, “Un deinos oublié,” Revue Archéologique 36 (1900): 322–25.
¹⁴⁰ Millingen (1843) 80.
Demeter? His argument, in both cases, hangs on the vulva and obscenity. These are the traits that reveal the figure as Baubo and which Millingen reveals for his reader in the mysteries.

Millingen connects the figure’s “indecent posture” with Baubo-lambe’s *plaisanteries grossières*.\(^{141}\) But his identification of the figurine as Baubo hinges more importantly on his reading of the object in the figurine’s left hand. There is no satisfying explanation for the object, Millingen writes, yet:

> [There] is no reason to doubt, however, whether the object in question is a symbol employed in the mysteries representing the κτεὶς, or female genitals that was an object of public veneration in the rituals of the Thesmophoria, referencing Iambe, or Baubo’s adventure.\(^{142}\)

*Kτεὶς* is Greek for brush, a word that, like the Latin *pectin*, was sometimes used similarly, as a metaphor for the female genitalia. This was the object, Millingen reveals, that was shown at the most sacred moment in the Eleusinian initiation rituals.\(^{143}\) Similar immoral rituals, he continues, took place everywhere that mysteries to Demeter were established and often in conjunction with those dedicated to Dionysos, where the corresponding symbol was the *phallus* (86-7). By identifying the object as a *kteis*—a symbolic vagina—Millingen fulfills his promises from the article’s beginning, to show that the figure is a unique illustration of the Baubo scene in the Eleusinian myths and that it can give us a clue to what was shown at the mysteries. The *kteis* allows him to link figurine, ritual, and myth: at the mysteries, the symbolic vagina was displayed to recall Baubo’s exposure, which is the same moment that the terracotta figure depicts:

> Le monument publié ici, (planch E, 1843), est plein d'intérêt, car c'est le premier jusqu'à présent connu, qui offre la représentation d'une scène appartenant au culte mystérieux de Déméter. L'importance en est d'autant plus grande qu'il donne la connaissance de rites secrets qui avaient lieu dans les fêtes d'Eleusis et dans les Thesmophories. (…)

\(^{141}\) Millingen (1843) 80.
\(^{142}\) Millingen (1843) 86 (my translation).
\(^{143}\) Millingen (1843) 88ff.
Le sujet a rapporté une scène qui se passa lors de l'arrivée de Déméter à Eleusis, et dont on rappelait le souvenir dans les fêtes de la déesse. Comme ce mythe est peu connu, on croit devoir entrer dans quelques détails à ce sujet.

Le personnage représenté dans une attitude indécente est appelé Iambé par les auteurs les plus anciens; mais ceux d'une époque postérieure lui donnent le nom de Baubo. (Millingen, 80)

There are obvious flaws in Millingen’s argument. Even if a comb were shown at the initiation, the object in the figure’s hand is much too large to be a regular comb and would have to be a hitherto unknown, over life-sized artifact. Following this, Millingen is not only revealing the most hidden moment of the Eleusinian mysteries, but also a completely new object. Furthermore, Millingen bypasses question such as how the figure can be nude if she is meant to show Baubo who lifts her skirt. Or, crucially, why this Baubo apparently greets Demeter riding on a pig. Besides these practical concerns, Millingen’s argument is circular. The figure’s obscenity links it to the Eleusinian mysteries, but is also why he can argue the mysteries’ obscenity in the first place. The name he gives to the figure, and article, works according to the same logic. Millingen identifies Baubo as a version of Iambe, arguing that the later replaced the former in later writers. He uses the two names together or interchangeably, yet settles on Baubo since this, and not Iambe, is the name connected to the indecent version of the myth corresponding to the figure’s obscene gesture. Thus, the figure is Baubo because she is obscene and obscene because she is Baubo. Obscenity proves that the figure is Baubo and that Baubo was an obscene aspect of the Eleusinian initiations.

Millingen (1843) 86, uses the pig in favor for his argument. He reminds the reader that the animal is sacred to Demeter, but does not explain what function it has taken on here.

We should not be surprised at the obscenity of ancient rituals, Millingen reminds us (Ibid. 87-88). At other places he seems keen on ascribing obscene and indecent elements to foreign (specifically Egyptian) influences or post-classical degeneration, arguing that there was nothing in the Classical version of the Eleusis myth that would shock decency.

Millingen (1843) 82, ft. 6. The comment on obscenity in Greek religion comes an argument against the suggestion that the Baubo story is a product of Christian polemicizing, p. 84.
Both Millingen himself and his article have largely faded from discussions of Baubo, probably for good reason. Yet the name Baubo remains as a label for the large group of figures previously mentioned. If not the woman who entertained Demeter with her plaisanteries grossières, what does Baubo denote? As I argue, ignoring Millingen’s argument belies the influence it still exercises. Even if recognized as a misnomer, the name Baubo carries with it the central core of Millingen’s argument, the near identification of the name Baubo with obscene gestures and the vagina. Obscenity is central to Millingen’s argument about and identification of the figurine; even if his article has been forgotten, obscenity and the vagina remains at the core for the Baubo complex. Importantly, it was their obscenity that identified the Priene statuettes as Baubo for the archaeologists.

The Egyptian Baubo type

Since Millingen’s publication, Baubo has become the name of a distinctive iconographical type, separate and different from the statuettes from Priene. This type of “Baubo figurines” has been excavated by the hundreds in the last centuries. While the Priene group has no iconographic relations, Baubo is used for a common type of statuette mostly found in Hellenistic Egypt. There is no exact definition of what constitutes a Baubo, besides a set of recurring characteristics, and while the name occurs frequently as a label it is often with a reservation, such as “so called” or Baubo figurines are written within quotation marks. In excavation reports and museum inventories, Baubo have come to designate figures of nude women spreading their legs apart, sometimes seated on a pig, sometimes not.¹⁴⁷ When their

¹⁴⁷ For discussions on the name and figures see, for example Hornbostel and Laubsscher (1986) 441; Théodora Karaghiora-Stathacopoulou (1986).
provenance is known, and in many cases it is not, they hark from Ptolemaic-Roman Egypt, occasionally southern Italy. 148 The figures generally depict mature women with large round breasts, large bellies and muscular thighs. Some are squatting in a fashion that reveals their genitals, sometimes pointing to them or holding one leg in their hand. Others, especially those on pigs, are simply sitting naked. Several of the pig riders are wearing headdresses and veils, and a few hold an object similar to the Berlin rider’s supposed kteis. 149 They are mostly under twenty centimeters in height; the non-riders can be much smaller. They are mold made and the backs are often unworked or lacking details, revealing that they were quick and easy to produce. Some of the figures preserve traces of paint or the white plaster coating used to prepare figures for paint. Similar figures in glass or faience have also been found. 150 Baubos are still excavated across Egypt. But, most of those housed in today’s museums and private collections—including one

148 Like all small terracottas in Egypt they postdate the founding of Alexandria when Greek artisans introduced the art to Egypt. Many figures have Fayum listed as find spot, but this should not always be taken literally. Hornbostel and Laubsscher point out that since Fayum is a well-known Hellenistic production hub for terracotta many figures have been sold under this name although their actual excavation local is unknown. Hornbostel and Laubsscher, (1986) 425.

149 Including the Berlin Rider, I have found a total of eight published figures of women riding on pigs. None of these has a confirmed provenance and for most the modern purchase history is also uncertain, besides having arrived at European museums during the nineteenth century. For these reasons, and because of their tentative interpretation, they are difficult to search for in catalogues and collections. Still, there is every reason to assume that many more have existed and do exist. The British museum knows of a rear mold for a similar figure groups from Alexandria. This is an important clue, both for the figures provenance in Hellenistic Egypt and that there has existed many more than the handful I have located. Besides the Berlin pig rider the following figures have been published: A woman on pig, naked apart from kalathos and veil, holding a similar object to the Berlin terracotta: “Figure,” British Museum, accessed March 7, 2016, The same catalogue entry also mention the rear mold; A woman naked apart from kalathos and veil sitting on a pig at the Victoria Museum, Uppsala: Bergmann (1974); Woman on pig wearing kalathos and veil in a private collection in Cairo: Rubensohn (1939). Bergman also discusses this group, adding that its whereabouts are now unknown. Michailidis (1962) has published two women on pigs without mentioning provenance or whereabouts. One wears a kalathos and has her left leg bent, the other is completely naked, sitting with her legs down. Vogt (1924) 43, includes a picture of a pig rider from the Lawrence collection with kalathos and veil, her hand is obscured by the veil but seems to support the kalathos in a similar fashion as the British Museum figure. A terracotta of a woman on a boar wearing a Phrygian cap and veil has turned up at an auction: “Rare Egyptian Terracotta Nude Baubo Seated Atop a Boar,” accessed 12 March, 2016, http://www.artemisgallery.com/Rare-Egyptian-Terracotta-Nude-Baubo-Seated-Atop-a-Boar.html.

owned by Freud—ound their way there in the mid nineteenth century. As a result, the finds spot of most of these figures, their find spot is not known. They were found in unofficial excavations and made their way to Europe through the hands of private sellers who did not know, or did not want to reveal, their provenance. In the cases where there is more information—e.g. from recent excavations—distribution and context correspond to similarly produced Egyptian terracottas, which means that they were widely produced and distributed and turn up in highly varied find contexts.\textsuperscript{151} Their find spots are either unknown or too general to allow conclusive or general arguments about their function: living spaces, rubbish heaps, and occasionally graves.\textsuperscript{152} The figures that are not riding on pigs have a wider geographical distribution and more stylistic variety; it is sensible to ask whether they should indeed be considered a type, or if images of naked women with legs apart could possibly appear synchronically but independently.\textsuperscript{153} That despite their name these figurines do not, in fact, depict Baubo, was recognized early.\textsuperscript{154} The same arguments levied against Millingen’s identification are true for all the figures. Baubo cannot be naked if she is also lifting her clothes to expose herself, and although pigs are iconographically and ritually connected to Demeter, there is nothing in the myths around Eleusis about riding on one. Beyond this association through the pigs, there is nothing in the find context of these figures that implies a connection to Demeter (as there is for the Priene figurines).

Despite this, the label Baubo still lives a stable yet ambivalent existence in scholarship, not as a reference to a myth, but to an iconographical type. Many catalogues and articles use

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{151} Hornbostel and Laubsscher (1986).
\textsuperscript{152} Hornbostel and Laubsscher (1986).
\textsuperscript{154} One of the earliest and most thorough critiques comes from Fouquet and Perdrizet (1911).
\end{flushleft}
quotation marks or reservations such as “so-called Baubo.” This type of labeling recognizes that the name is a misnomer, yet retains it to mark that these objects belong to one group. As indicated above, the group exhibits a wide diversity. To the variants mentioned above can be added examples where the woman is held by a Silenos/satyr, is seated on an eye, or in the same squatting pose but clothed. In her entry on Baubo in LIMC, Karaghiorga-Stathacopoulou identifies “two or three” types of figures known as Baubo (although she reminds the reader that there is in fact no ancient image that depicts Baubo for certain). Besides the Priene group, she lists the Egyptian terracottas of nude women as one group with those on pigs as a possible third group. As Karaghiorga-Stathacopoulou’s entry exemplifies, the label is well established yet not exactly defined. Even a formal iconographical definition for Baubos is hard to pinpoint (do they ride on pig? Are they spreading their legs, or merely sitting naked?). In fact, it is impossible to give even the smallest common denominator for determining what is a Baubo type.

Considering this, it is prudent to ask how and why Baubo is used to denote an iconographical type, indeed what constitutes an iconographical type at all. In the case of the Egyptian Baubo, where the label does not denote a shared motif nor a determined iconography, I argue that Baubo denotes a shared iconography, but implies a common interpretation. Baubo came to be used for figures interpreted as obscene, a meaning that was facilitated through the name’s appearance in Goethe and Millingen: two sources outside the traditional confines of Ancient Studies.

This common interpretation of the Egyptian Baubo statuettes is based on an association between fertility, female sex, and apotropaic functions—a connection, however, which is not as

---


solid as most scholars assume it to be. Karaghiorga-Stathacopoulou follows the dominant understanding with her suggestion that the squatting, nude females are “grotesque prophylactics, boasting female fecundity.”¹⁵⁷ The figures’ association with protection and female reproductive health goes back at least to Perdrizet’s 1911 critique of Millingen. “The obscenity of the pose should be sufficient,” Perdrizet writes, “to prove that they are prophylactics against evil, since the force emanating from her koila is as comical as irresistible ‘just like evil.’”¹⁵⁸ He adds that they were seemingly useful for all occasions, but were likely given to women close to giving birth. For Perdrizet, the association of obscenity and humor with protection and female fertility is obvious and needs no further clarification.¹⁵⁹ Most scholars seem to agree, and apotropaic and fertility have become the dominant terms in explanations of the Baubo figures. Weber calls them apotropaic amulets.¹⁶⁰ Hornbostel and Laubsscher agree on this function and add that they are probably fertility idols (although they also explain that the figurines do not show women giving birth).¹⁶¹ Dunand suggest various interpretations, all related to apotropaic or fertility functions.¹⁶² When considered separately from the squatting females, the pig riders have been similarly interpreted. Hornbostel and Laubsscher suggest that they too are connected to fertility.¹⁶³ Bergman argues a connection with pregnancy through the sow’s supposed analogy with the female hippopotamus in Egyptian religion, transferring the latter’s connection with pregnancy

¹⁵⁷ Karaghiorga-Stathacopoulou (1986) 90.
¹⁵⁸ Fouquet and Perdrizet (1911) 43.
¹⁵⁹ Nilsson (1950) 110 discusses the common scholarly association between fertility rituals and sexual symbols in the context of Eleusis and the Thesmophoria. While he recognizes that there is no evidence that any genital symbols were displayed at the mysteries, he notes that there was a clear association between sexuality and fertility in Greek religion. His main support for this, however, is the Baubo-lambe episode.
¹⁶⁰ Weber (1914) 165.
¹⁶¹ Hornbostel and Laubsscher (1986).
¹⁶³ Hornbostel and Laubsscher (1986), 438.
and parturition to the former.\textsuperscript{164} It is noteworthy that these and other examples consistently describe the pig as a sow—in Hornbostel and Laubsscher even a pregnant sow—although in all cases the bottom of the pig is molded together with the group’s base and visual inspection reveals no primary or secondary sexual characteristics can be identified. It would seem that Bergman’s description of an analogy between sow and hippo describes his own analogy between women and sows. Like Karaghiorga-Stathacopoulou and Perdrizet, others also argue these functions based on the figures’ grotesque poses and obscenity. Bergman suggests that the pig riders should be divided into two groups, those completely naked and those wearing a \textit{kalathos}, the cylindrical basket headdress, and veil, arguing that the complete nudity of the former must mean that they had a different function.\textsuperscript{165} Similarly, Rubensohn argues that although both types are connected to fertility, the figures that are partially dressed are not “grotesque-obscene” and should therefore be treated as a separate group.\textsuperscript{166} Weber and Dunand also divide the pig-riders into obscene and not obscene.\textsuperscript{167} This division is not solely iconographic, but also guides their interpretations. Often, apotropaic and fertility functions are not argued but rather presented, as with Perdrizet, as having an inherent relation with obscenity. The Baubo type, thus, does not denote a group of figures that are occasionally found in obscene poses, it is a label defined by obscenity. Why this association? There are traces in antiquity for connecting obscenity with fertility, for example in the rituals around the Thesmophoria. The above examples do not cite to these occasions however; instead, the connection between female nakedness, the apotropaic, and fertility is presented as a constant feature of all cultures.

\textsuperscript{165} Bergmann (1974) 85. Karaghiorga-Stathacopoulou’s division in LIMC is based on a similar notion.
\textsuperscript{166} Rubensohn (1929) 199.
\textsuperscript{167} Dunand (1979) 100; Weber (1914) 165.
When the apotropaic function is explicated, it is often through reference to an object in Perdrizet’s catalog. This figurine, part of a lamp handle, shows a Baubo sitting on an eye and points to her vagina. Perdrizet presents it as a proof *pars pro toto* that the group were used as apotropaic amulets to ward against the evil eye.\textsuperscript{168} This figure is evidently warding of the evil eye, Perdrizet argues, and by extension all similar figures are as well: after all, the obscene and comical gesture is a prophylactic against evil. The figure, along with Perdrizet’s self-evident connection between evil-eye protection, and the comical and obscene, is often cited. While apotropaic is a convenient and common explanation, however, the term itself is rarely explained. The underlying premise is that if the figures are obscene, which anyone can see that they are, they must also be apotropaic. That they are protections for women seem to follow from the fact that they show women. Renate Schlesier, among other places in her entry “Apotropäisch” in *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlichen Grundbegriffe*, has taken aim at the careless use in scholarship of the term *apotropaic*.\textsuperscript{169} That the term is derived from ancient Greek, she argues, gives a false impression that it describes an ancient phenomenon.\textsuperscript{170} In fact, Schlesier emphasizes, “apotropaic” in the meaning of a protective object or figure that wards off evil, especially the evil eye, is a neologism. As such it has its own distinct modern etymology, which she traces back to Otto Jahn. The term was further established, especially the connection to the evil eye, under Albert Dietrich and his followers.\textsuperscript{171} The term’s modern history, she points out, is thus closely intertwined with nineteenth-century models that envisioned an evolution of religion that retained certain aspects from a primitive past, such as the apotropaic. From its

\textsuperscript{168} Ibid. 43.
\textsuperscript{169} Schlesier (1990) 41-44.
\textsuperscript{170} Schlesier (1990) 42.
\textsuperscript{171} Schlesier (1990) 42-43.
conceptualization as a residue of “primitive” religion follows the *apotropaic*’s predominant connection with genitals, the obscene and comical. Thus, the connection between the obscene and *apotropaic* that is so obvious for Perdrizet in fact has a highly specific modern legacy. The term *apotropaic* has proliferated since the nineteenth century, but has little or nothing to do with the Greek term *apotrópai theoi*, Schlesier argues.¹⁷² The ancient term could be ascribed to any divinity and described them both as the ones averting danger as well as the danger to be averted. Furthermore, there is no evidence that it was particularly connected to the obscene, sexual, or misshapen.¹⁷³ In conclusion, the Baubo on the eye that Perdrizet points out fits neatly into the nineteenth-century idea of an apotropaic figure warding off the evil eye, but such an idea is itself an anachronism that does not describe the ancient world from which it is taken. Suggestions that the Egyptian Baubos are all apotropaic fertility symbols are hence not inferences from the archaeological context or ancient concepts. It is an interpretation based on the scholar’s impression of their iconography. In other words, fertility or *apotropaic* describes what modern interpreters think would be a reason to produce a figure showing her vagina. Or, as Schlesier puts it:

> The tendency so common in Otto Jahn and other older historians of religion to identify images with sexual emphasis as apotropaic seems rather to confirm the defense mechanisms [Abwehrmechanismen] of modern scholars than of ancient audiences and actors (Schlesier, 44, my translation)

Instead of interpreting the figures based on the impression they give, a more rigorous approach must also consider the figures’ paraphernalia, their clothing and the objects they hold, as well as iconographically related figurines. Lázló Török attempts just this, noting that the many

---

¹⁷² Schlesier (1990) 41.
¹⁷³ Schlesier (1990) 43.
variants in this group should dissuade a homogenous explanation. While he sees no reason for a connection to the Eleusinian Baubo, Török suggests that the attributes such as the veiled *stephane* (wreath), the coiffeur and lotus buds, could be associated with Harpokration, Dionysos, possibly even the Alexandrinian Eleusinia. Another informative parallel is a number of dice-shaped molds from Roman Egypt, published by Georges Nachtergaele in his article “*Un sacrifice en l’honneur de ‘Baubo.’*” Each side of these molds shows one or a small group of figures. The iconography is thematically consistent: from the Roman era, the molds show sacrificial animals, a divinity to whom the sacrifice is apparently directed and sometimes also attributes, such as an altar or knife. The most common “divine figure” is a seated Baubo figure, a nude female with her legs spread open. Nachtergaele thinks it likely that the molds were used to produce metal plates that, when assembled, would show a sacrificial scene. As Nachtergaele implies with the title of his article, this scene would show this Baubo as the divine recipient of the sacrifice. Both Török’s and Nachtergaele’s suggestions are useful comparisons to the terracottas, not least because they imply that these figures could depict objects of worship rather than—or in addition to—figures meant to be identified with, as implied in the interpretation of pregnant figures meant for pregnant women. Neither Török nor Nachtergaele attempts to present a new identity for the Baubo type, but their approaches move beyond a categorization and explanation based solely on the figure’s obscenity. Their observations also make it possible to discuss the Baubos’ place among similar figures, such as squatting dressed women, squatting naked women praying—which Weber and following him Dunand call orans—or male figures,
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177 E.g. Karaghiorga-Stathacopoulou (1986) 89.
either squatting in a Baubo-pose or riding on animals.\textsuperscript{178} These figures, although sharing many characteristics, are almost never mentioned in comparisons with the Baubo type. Since they are not obscene they are treated as unrelated.

The main problem with explaining all the Baubo type in terms of obscenity, and following it apotropaic, and fertility, is the question whether explanations centered on these categories reflect ancient mindsets. Would the producers and owners of these figures agree that they could be categorized according to details that determined their meaning and function? Both Dunand and Török warn against homogenous explanations for terracottas, since it is unlikely that such a vast group had the same meaning for everyone who handled them.\textsuperscript{179} As we have seen, the interpretation of the Baubo figures relies on an initial division into discrete groups for which Baubo’s obscenity becomes her defining trait and the key to her explanation. That fertility and apotropaic functions follow from obscenity becomes so self-evident that Dunand even argues that the figures are fertility symbols when the figures are found in graves where they would seem to do little good.\textsuperscript{180}

Schlesier’s remark that modern scholars project their defense mechanisms onto antiquity should also remind us to examine the ways in which we project our own practice and bias onto ancient material, for example the modern scholarly practice to group and categorize onto non-dogmatic and multivalent pagan religions. Despite the general agreement that they are not representations of Baubo, the group is still approached and explained precisely as a group, with the loose common denominator that they are all naked women in poses that seem to draw

\textsuperscript{178} The later have been found mainly in southern Italy, the riders being young boys, sometimes wearing flower wreaths, resembling erotes or young bacchants, but there are also many examples from Egypt of Harpocrates figures riding on anything from roosters to dogs and sheep. Examples in Dunand, (1979) 227-236; Millingen (1843) 86 knew of at least one such figure of a boy on a pig, which he interpreted as an unusual child initiate. Millingen.


\textsuperscript{180} Dunand (1979) 7.
attention to their vaginas. Indeed, following the interpretation of the above discussed types “Baubo” is often generalized as a term for all female fertility figures. See for example: Murray (1934) 93–100. Gupta (1936) 183–84; Lubell, (1994).

One group with one label seems to require one explanation. For these Baubos this has been the obscene and apotropaic. Schlesier’s critique of the careless use of apotropaic illustrates the risk of allowing a single term be the final and entire explanation of an object. As I have hoped to show, *apotropaic* opens as many questions as it answers and does in fact not clarify how or why these objects were used and understood. *Apotropaic* is used in lieu of an explanation. I argue that the same can be said for “Baubo” as a term. Millingen’s mistaken conclusion obscures the fact that his argument is still rehearsed. Although Baubo has become a label—a figurine can be called “a Baubo” instead of a name, “Baubo,” as in Millingen’s one-word title—the label carries Millingen’s original associations. As a label instead of a name, Baubo’s obscenity is not only a trait, it is her definition.

Millingen initiated a transition in the use of the name Baubo, away from a name and towards a label. Used as a label instead of a name, the definition of what could be called “Baubo” shifted away from a connection with Eleusis and Greek myth towards the modern impressions of obscenity and indecent display. As the term was already well established for these figurines at the time of the Priene excavation, I argue that these associations played into Wiegand’s understanding of the Priene figurines. Although iconographically they have nothing in common with the pig riders or other Egyptian Baubos, they are named Baubo because of their association with obscenity.
Baubo in *Faust*

Some fifty years before Millingen identified a naked woman on a pig as Baubo, another (or the same?) Baubo, also riding on a sow, leads the train of witches to the Walpurgis festivities in Goethe’s *Faust I*. Towards the end of the first part of *Faust*, Faust and Mephistopheles exit the regular comings and doings — and time and space — of humans to take part in the *Walpurgisnacht*, the annual gathering of witches to dance with the devil at the Blocksberg, the tallest mountain in the Harz. On their way to the mountain, Faust and Mephistopheles are overtaken by a storm of witches gathering. Out of the seeming chaos of voices and movement, Baubo’s entrance is announced and she is called to lead the procession to the mountain.

**Mephistopheles:**

(...)

Hörst du Stimmen in der Höhe?
In der Ferne, in der Nähe?
Ja, den ganzen Berg entlang
Strömt ein wütender Zaubergesang!

**Hexen (im Chor):**

Die Hexen zu dem Brocken ziehn,
Die Stoppel ist gelb, die Saat ist grün.
Dort sammelt sich der große Hauf,
Herr Urian sitzt oben auf.
So geht es über Stein und Stock,
Es färzt die Hexe, es stinkt der Bock.

**Stimme:**

Die alte Baubo kommt allein,
Sie reitet auf einem Mutterschwein

**Chor:**

So Ehre denn wem Ehre gebührt!
Frau Baubo vor! Und angeführt!
Ein tüchtig Schwein und Mutter drauf,
da folgt der ganze Hexenhauf.\(^{182}\)

---

\(^{182}\) Do you hear voices up high?
“Old Baubo” on her pig has the honor of leading the witches’ train. Baubo riding on a pig reads as if it were a description of the Berlin terracotta or her Egyptian namesakes. The similarity caught the attention of Otto Kern (1863-1942). At the turn of the twentieth century, Kern was one of the foremost experts on Greek mystery cults and would collect and published what would remain the standard edition of orphic fragments for almost a century.\textsuperscript{183} His work on the mystery cults and Orphic fragments would have introduced Kern to the ancient Baubo myths. Kern was also interested in the history of ancient scholarship and the reception of Greek myth. Despite his expertise, Kern could not find a satisfactory explanation for how the character in Goethe and the ancient terracotta figurine published by Millingen were related. Although his work on mystery cults and history of classical scholarship would have made him the best informed to take on this question, still he could reach no definitive solution; he suggesting on different occasions that Goethe might have seen the Berlin pig rider before it arrived in Berlin, or that Millingen was

---

\textsuperscript{183} Otto Kern, \textit{Orphicorum Fragmenta}.

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Witches’ Chorus}
The witches ride to Blocksberg’s top,
The stubble is yellow, and green the crop.
They gather on the mountainside,
Sir Urian comes to preside.
We are riding over crag and bring,
The witches fart, the billy goat stinks

\textbf{Voice}
Old Baubo comes alone right now,
She is riding on a mother sow.

\textbf{Chorus}
Give honor to whom honor’s due!
Dame Baubo, lead our retinue!
A real swine and mother too,
The witches’ crew will follow you.
\end{quote}
influenced by Goethe’s *Faust* for his identification.\(^{184}\) Since neither Goethe nor Millingen mentions the other Baubo, however, either direction of influence remains speculative. In fact, old Baubo’s presence in the Germanic forest of *Faust* is a more complicated question than who influenced whom. As with the naming of the Egyptian Baubo, I will attempt to untangle the processes by which Baubo acquired the associations that defined the notion of an ancient original that both Millingen and Goethe refer.

Trying to make sense of the relation between the two Baubos, Kern remarks that the riddle has received little attention. In fact, he continues, the very problem that the passage poses for him seems to have eluded other Goethe scholars.\(^{185}\) The statement remains largely true also for subsequent scholarship. Baubo and her pig have flown under the radar as one of the many ancient Greek figures that Goethe invokes in his oeuvre. Commentaries explain that she is the lewd woman at Eleusis, or gloss her as a personification or goddess of the vulva.\(^{186}\) Perhaps it would require an expert on the Orphic tradition such as Kern to notice that Baubo—a minor character associated with a lewd joke—is unusual among the otherwise illustrious ancient figures that interested the Classicists. Further, the Orphic fragments and Church Fathers that are the main sources for Baubo were hardly required reading even for an avid layman as Goethe. More importantly, however, explaining who Baubo is begs the question why she is included in *Faust* at all. The main problem for Kern is why Baubo is included in the scene at the Blocksberg.\(^{187}\) Until the appearance of Helen, *Faust* takes place in a world of early modern Germanic legends.

---

184 Kern (1897.2); Kern (1897.2) 150-152.
185 Kern (1897.2) 271.
187 Kern (1897.2) 271.
Walpurgisnacht is the culmination and celebration of this world. So who invited Baubo to these festivities, all the way from ancient Greece and as a VIP guest, no less? As Kern observes, Baubo’s appearance in the German forest at Walpurgis should give us pause: not only because of her prominent role in the procession, but because of her very participation.

The most common explanation to Old Baubo’s visit, for example by Schöne and Gaier, is that she is a guest of honor from the ancient past. Although these commentators do not use the term, their suggestion allows us to picture Baubo as a form of theoros, the sacred envoy that Greek poleis would send as official observers to their neighbors’ festivals. For Schöne and Gaier, Baubo’s visit thus corresponds to Mephistopheles’s at the classical Walpurgis in Faust II. This neat correspondence between the two parts fails to satisfy completely. Baubo’s brief mention at Walpurgis hardly compares to Mephistopheles’ importance in the classical festival. Moreover, Baubo is a curious envoy of choice. The short glimpse we are allowed does not give the impression of an ancient figure matching neo-classical ideas of antiquity. She is old (whether in age or historically) and the alternate phrasing of mother-pig and mother on pig evokes an unflattering analogy between woman and sow. She is hardly representative of a Greek ideal, nor a household name among Goethe’s readership. If a Greek figure associated with sexuality or debauchery was needed, Pan or Dionysos would be more obvious choices. Upon a closer inspection, Kern’s problem with Baubo at the Blocksberg turns out to be twofold. Why is Baubo part of the Walpurgis scene in Faust, and how did she become part of Goethe’s ancient vocabulary? We can also ask: how and why did this figure arrive in Germany from Greece, whether on the back of a pig or through literary references and scholarship?

---

Goethe published the first *Faust* fragments after his return from Italy, and after an eight-year hiatus he began on the project again. Several new scenes, among them the Walpurgis night, was added during this period of work starting in 1797.\(^{189}\) In its first iteration, the scene was longer and the sexual themes more outspoken. In this rendering, the sexual ceremonies on the Blocksberg together with the appearance of Mammon were more clearly juxtaposed with the themes of sex and money in the Gretchen tragedy enveloping the scene. Goethe anticipated that the scene, especially its unabashed sexual content, would elicit strong reactions. When it did, he decided to self-censor to accommodate his contemporaries’ *sittliches Gefühl*.\(^{190}\) Goethe banished the most obscene parts to a *Walpurgissack*, remarking that he hoped the Germans would not abandon him when the sack’s stygian demons were eventually let loose.\(^{191}\) This would not happen until 1905, when the full, unedited scene was published by Witkowski.\(^{192}\)

**Witches Sabbath**

Goethe’s *Walpurgissack* contains no further references to Baubo, but the longer original scene sheds light on her connotations and inspirations. The scene at the Blocksberg draws from traditional narratives of the Witches’ Sabbath, a legendary meeting of witches and the devil on the last day of April. The witches’ Walpurgis has countless references in images and text. Witkowski, whose 1923 commentary on Faust was the standard for decades, turned attention to

\(^{189}\) Witkowski (1894).

\(^{190}\) Witkowski (1894) 12. See also Goethe and Schöne (1994) 344. Schöne dismisses suggestions that Goethe shortened the scene for dramaturgical reasons or due to lack of time.

\(^{191}\) Goethe and Schöne (1994).

the lewder part of Goethe’s *Faust*. In his 1894 book, he compiled an overview of books that Goethe had consulted on the subject. He reminds the reader that this legend was so well known that we shouldn’t assume that Goethe followed one particular model. Most likely, Witkowski argues, Goethe composed the scene based on his knowledge of traditional tales and only borrowed details from this or that account.\(^{193}\) It is not hard to spot the parallels between Goethe’s Walpurgisnacht scene and early modern illustrations and narrations of the Witches’ Sabbath, whether they were direct influences or not. The most famous Walpurgis depiction is Michael Herr’s *Hexensabbath auf dem Brocken* (1650). Herr’s etching includes almost all the details from Goethe’s scene, so that it almost appears as if it could be a visual source. The image is often compared with the scene in *Faust*, even though it cannot be proven that Goethe had seen it.\(^{194}\) In Herr’s image, witches ride towards the mountain at the center of the picture. There, women are dancing with the devil, performing rituals or kissing the behind of a goat. This last detail, a grotesque inversion of the communion rite, was one of the elements Goethe initially included but subsequently censored from his first Walpurgis draft. In the upper left corner of Herr’s etching a woman rides through the air on a goat, a sister with tastes similar to Goethe’s pig-riding Baubo. The frontispiece to Johannes Praetorius’s *Blockes-Berges Verrichtung* from 1668—a seminal descriptions of the Walpurgis ritual—also features a woman flying to the mountain on a goat in the upper left corner, while another woman is falling from her flying goat in the upper right. These two examples are not unique. Along with brooms and dough-troughs, goats were popular as flying vehicles for early modern witches.\(^{195}\) The goat made a fitting companion because of its

\(^{193}\) Witkowski (1894) 121.

\(^{194}\) Witkowski (1894) 35. See also Goethe and Schöne (1994) 121. Schöne also argue that it cannot be proven that Goethe knew the image. Elsewhere Schöne claims that Goethe did consult the picture, but appears to confuse it with the – very similar – frontispiece to Praetorius: Schöne (1993) 342.

\(^{195}\) Other prominent examples include Dürer’s *The Witch* from around 1500 in which the witch is riding back to front on one. Hans Baldung incorporated goats as riding animals or companions for many of his witches.
prominent role in accounts of witches’ Sabbaths and its connection with the devil and uncontrolled sexuality.\textsuperscript{196} Pigs, on the other hand, rarely occur, flying or otherwise. Perhaps Goethe found the early modern associations with the goat better expressed through a pig, or perhaps he thought the pig a better-suited animal for the ancient Baubo. Goethe’s scene reads as a version of these early modern accounts. Nothing obviously anachronistic is added and even Baubo and her pig do not seem out of place.

The overt sexual theme in the original Walpurgis scene seems to confirm the explanations by Witkowski and others that Goethe included Baubo at Walpurgis as a figure of licentiousness and sexuality.\textsuperscript{197} Still, as the comparison with early modern descriptions show, Baubo appears in \textit{Faust} as much as a full-fledged witch as an ancient figure. Appearing as if she had flown right out of Michael Herr’s image, she seems more at home at the Blocksberg than Mephistopheles at the classical Walpurgis. Baubo is fully assimilated among the German witches apart from the few traits she has kept from antiquity: her name, and possibly also her pig. Rather than reading Baubo as an ancient figure that appears in the Germanic world, we can also describe her as a witch that has taken on certain ancient attributes, including her name.

\textit{Ancient Sources}

While Baubo appears as an early modern witch (what Kern calls a nightly demon), her name separates her from being completely one of that company.\textsuperscript{198} What is this name supposed to conjure? If it is sexuality and licentiousness, can these traits be described more precisely or located in a particular source?

\textsuperscript{196} Witkowski (1894) 19. 
\textsuperscript{197} Witkowski (1894) 41. Düntzer (1889) 288–301. 
\textsuperscript{198} Kern (1897.2) 272.
Goethe mentions Baubo in two places besides *Faust*. In the *Italian Journey*, he is reminded of her during the debauchery of Roman Carnival in 1800.

Wenn uns während des Laufs dieser Torheiten der rohe Pulcinelle ungebührlich an die Freude der Liebe erinnert, denen wir unser Dasein zu denken haben, wenn eine Baubo auf öffentlichem Platze die Geheimnisse der Gebärerin entweiht, wenn so viele nächtlich angezündete Kerzen uns an die letzte Feierlichkeiten erinnern, so werden wir mitten unter dem Unsinne auf die wichtigsten Szenen unsers Lebens aufmerksam gemacht.¹⁹⁹

Later, Goethe would also incorporate Baubo in an essay on natural science titled: “*Verstäubung, Verdunstung, Vertropfung.*” The title words, neologisms for disintegration into dust, vapor, and drops respectively, are Goethe’s suggestion for an alternative to the dominant view that all destruction and regeneration in nature happens through sexual reproduction.

(…) und so ließen sich auch Naturforscher manchmal betreten, daß sie, der guten Mutter einige Blößen abmerkend, an ihr als der alten Baubo höchst zweideutige Belustigung fanden. Ja wir erinnern uns Arabesken gesehen zu haben, wo die Sexual-Verhältnisse innerhalb der Blumenkelche, auf antiker Weise, höchst anschaulich vorgestellt waren²⁰⁰

The two references confirm that Goethe was aware of the tradition of Baubo as the woman at Eleusis who exposes herself to make Demeter laugh.²⁰¹ The engagement with the myths around Eleusis might also have led Goethe to provide Baubo with a pig. He became familiar with the pig’s connection to Demeter cult when inquiring about two figures of women holding pigs that were part of his collection. When Goethe was made an honorary member at the institutio in Rome, his first contribution was an open inquiry to the institute’s members about these figurines.²⁰² *Faust*-Baubo’s pig should then be attributed to the pig’s association with Demeter

---

²⁰¹ Kern (1897.2) 272. On Goethe’s interest in Orphism see also Trevelyan (1981) 62.
²⁰² Goethe inquired about the statues in letters to Hofrath Meyer: Dönike (2013) 43. That Goethe does not mention any figures sitting on pig in this correspondence, in fact he writes that he does not know of any similar figures, should be proof enough that he had never encountered the Berlin pig rider or any figure like it.
and Demeter’s with Baubo, not the direct association Baubo-pig as Lubell suggests for example.203 Hans Arens has suggested another association for the pig, remarking that in Bavarian popular belief the storm appeared riding on a pig.204 This suggestion would mean that the pig too belongs to the Germanic world Baubo is visiting. Either explanation would solve one of Kern’s riddles: Baubo’s pig does not need to be brought from Greece through a figurine of Baubo.

That Goethe was aware of the Orphic tradition of Baubo must not mean that he had studied the Orphic fragments first hand. There are several possible intermediary channels. Both Hamann and Herder, two influences on Goethe’s concept of Greek myth, mention Baubo.205 In “Versuch einer Sibylle über die Ehe,” an exposé on conjugal sex,206 Hamann juxtaposes “the hag Baubo” with a sacred vestal virgin, writing that he would not want to shy away from the topic as the latter, nor reveal too much, like the former. Like Hamann, Goethe stresses Baubo’s sexual indecency first and foremost, rather than any connection to the mysteries at Eleusis. Goethe’s use of Baubo fits with that of his interlocutors for whom Baubo is less of a specific mythical reference than a general term for a shameless woman.207

While the focus on Baubo’s licentiousness supports the argument that Baubo appears in Faust because of her associations with sexuality, it is especially the revealing of the sexual that interested Goethe in these texts. In both the Italian Journey and Verstäubung, Verdunstung, Vertropfung, Goethe mentions Baubo’s gesture, but not its positive outcome. Her exposure is an independent act of indecency done for the sheer pleasure of it. Moreover, the act is not simply a revelation of something indecent but exemplifies how revelation in itself can be indecent.

204 Arens (1982) 386.
205 Schadewaldt (1989) 93.
206 Hamann (1951) 197–203.
207 Arens also remarks that Hamann and Herder’s Baubo is a general figure of an indecent female rather than denoting a specific person. Arens (1982) 386.
Looking back on the celebrations during Ash Wednesday, Goethe meditates that the carnival’s profane scenes might remind the participants of the most important stages of human life. In *Verstäubung, Verdunstung, Vertropfung*, the act of exposing of sexuality in the context of science becomes an unfitting act, as when the scientist reveals too much in the sexual aspects of his object of study. In these examples, Baubo does not simply reveal what should not be known: she reveals what is known but must not be revealed at all times. In Italy, it is the female sexual organs. In *Verstäubung, Verdunstung, Vertropfung* it is the sexual reproduction of plants but also, in a twist, the Baubo myth itself. While at the carnival such revelation can be part of a celebration of sexuality and life, the same preoccupation with sex in science and scholarship becomes a perverse preoccupation with titillating subjects.

**Goethe and Altertumswissenschaften**

In *Verstäubung, Verdunstung, Vertropfung* Goethe develops a critique of scientists’ obsession with sexual reproduction. Like some philologists, he writes, natural scientists tend to become unduly engrossed with any cruder aspect of their subject. Perhaps, he notes, this is simply a way of alleviating the dryness of their study. *Verstäubung, Verdunstung, Vertropfung* is exemplary of a recurring critique of Enlightenment studies in Goethe’s work. He described this type of scholarship as simply concerned with taking nature apart to find the truth behind her.

Fitting with the Baubo myth, Goethe often voiced his critique through images of unveiling. Thus for example in the beginning of *Faust* where he lets Faust proclaim his tools:

```
Ich stand am Tor, ihr solltet Schlüssel sein:
Zwar euer Bart ist Kraus, doch hebt ihr nicht die Riegel.
Geheimnisvoll am lichten Tag
Läßt sich Natur des Schleiers nicht berauben,
Und was sie deinem Geist nicht offenbaren mag,
```
Das zwingst du ihr nicht ab mit Hebeln und Riegel.

*(Faust I, 665-73)*

To seek for truth inside or beyond nature’s veil is for Goethe to miss the point. Nature does not hide truth behind a veil of appearances; she is the appearance itself. Or, as he phrased it in the sixth of his *Zahme Xenien*

*Isis seigt sich ohne Schleier*  
*Doch der Mensch, er hat den Star*  

The *Unwilliger Aufruf*, written at the same time as *Verstäubung, Verdunstung, Vertropfung*, repeats a similar sentiment.

*(…)  
Natur hat weder Kern  
Noch Schale,  
Alles ist sie mit einemmale:  
Dich prüfe du nur allermöst  
Ob du Kern oder Schale seist?*

The only obscuring veils are those the scientist himself pulls in front of knowledge.

Goethe’s critique of the natural sciences extended to ancient studies as well. Despite the influence Goethe exercised on ancient scholarship and the notion of antiquity more broadly, he never called himself an ancient scholar. This was not only due to a lack of patience for details, for which he famously could refer to his “living encyclopedias,” but part of a conviction about why modern man should engage with antiquity at all. Influenced by Herder, Goethe developed

---

208 The sexualized language in this debate is not by chance and I have elsewhere discussed the gendered nature and the larger debate that unveiling the goddess had in Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment discourse on natural science. Frederika Tevebring, “Unveiling the Goddess. Artemis of Ephesus as a Symbol of Nature at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century” *Lychnos* (2012): 153–66.

209 *Isis* shows herself without veils  
But man has cataracts


211 A comments by Müller quoted in Dönike, 18.
an antagonism for the type of ancient studies reduced to unearthing facts. Such a search for “mere truth” was not only tedious, but in direct conflict with all the benefits that an artistic or literary engagement with the ancient past could bring. According to Goethe, when ancient and natural studies hunt for truth beneath a surface, they forget the beauty of engaging with the surface itself. The sixth of his *Zahme Xenien*, quoted above, continues with an attack on the myth theory of Friedrich Creuzer followed by one on Newton’s color theory. Both, Goethe argues, tear their subject apart in a perverse attempt to find truth in its pieces. The *Verstäubung, Verdunstung, Vertropfung* essay similarly combines a critique against misdirected efforts in philology and natural sciences. Here it is particularly the focus on sexual reproduction that is Goethe’s target. In this argument, Baubo appears in a double role: she is the sexual figure with whom the scholar becomes unduly fascinated, but she is also a parallel to the scholar himself as a figure who reveals what ought better remain hidden.

Baubo, in Goethe’s examples, is both more and less than a reference to a Greek myth. Following Herder and Hamann, Goethe uses Baubo as a reference to licentious behavior without reference to specific mythical context. In this understanding she can be tied to a discussion of appropriate and inappropriate revealing that is not limited to bodily decency. That Goethe’s Baubo is connected to the themes of indecency in the *Walpurgisnacht* is therefore correct, at least on the surface. From Baubo’s connection with the indecent, however, does not follow an identity with it. Goethe is interested in Baubo as a figure exposing the sexual, but she cannot be said to be, as most commentators suggest, a personification or representation of these exposed things.

---

212 Dönike. 18.
213 Friedrich Creuzer’s (1771-1858) *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker* (Leipzig: Heyer and Leske, 1819-23) had caused a big controversy in the German ancient studies community. Goethe sided with Gottfried Hermann in the critique against the work. On Goethe’s poem see Pierre Hadot, “Isis Has No Veils,” *Common Knowledge* 12, no. 3 (Fall 2006): 349–53.
Goethe uses Baubo to explore not only indecent exposure, but the indecency of exposure. She is a figure that can be part of the celebrations of sexuality, as at the Carnival, but also a figure that represents the indecency of scholars who are more interested in explaining than doing.

Goethe’s Baubo borrows from antiquity and early modern iconography, but she is ultimately a figure in tune and up to date with contemporary debates, specifically on the limits and intentions of scholarly inquiry. Explanations that try to pinpoint precisely when Goethe encountered Baubo and brought her back to Germany, figuratively or literally, ignores Goethe’s creative act.214 The associations that Goethe choses to invoke through Baubo make her a fit herald for the witches’ train at Walpurgis. Her sexual connotation fits the scene’s explicit sexual theme, but perhaps more importantly, her connection with imprudent revelation of that which should be hidden connects her with the larger Faust work’s preoccupation with the limits of scientific inquiry. Further, Baubo is not an uncomplicated loan from antiquity. Like Goethe himself, she travels from the Mediterranean to Germany where she links Germanic and Greek tradition, but in a way that shifts and disturbs how the categories “German” and “Greek” have been understood.

Baubos before Priene

When the Priene figurines were excavated at the end of the nineteenth century, the name Baubo had two well-known and established references: Baubo was the name of an indecent pig-riding witch in Faust, and a term for describing Egyptian terracottas in obscene poses drawing attention to their genitals. Both uses were sufficiently well established that the name could be re-

---

214 I have already discussed Kern’s suggestion that Goethe could have seen the Berlin terracotta in Italy, which Lubell asserts with even more conviction. Wilpert (1998) similarly, seems to suggest that Goethe finds Baubo at the carnival in Rome.
deployed with the assumption that these references would be known. In archaeological reports, Baubo was used as a designation without further description. For example, the British excavators of Naukratis published their finds of Baubo figures in 1898, the same year the Priene figurines were found. Goethe’s Baubo also enjoyed a life beyond Faust, in parodies and playful references. In Willhelm Hauff’s Mitteilungen der Memoiren des Satans from 1826, the Faust Walpurgis scene is retold as an outing of the Frankfurter Bürgertum. Baubo is still called a witch, but she has exchanged her sow for a carriage and recognizes the devil (her guardian’s guitar teacher) with a courteous nod. The two Baubos have also been assimilated with or made to refer to one and other, as we have seen above in the examples of Lubell and Kern.

Kern’s suggestion that Goethe’s Baubo could have influenced Millingen is not entirely impossible. If so, commentaries that illuminate Goethe’s Faust Baubo through references to the Berlin pig rider are actually using an ancient figure defined by a modern account to illuminate this same account. In fact, the same problem occurs even if Goethe was not the direct influence on Millingen. Both Millingen and Goethe ascribed associations to Baubo that reflected back onto the ancient figure. Both in her use as an iconographical label as well as in Goethe’s oeuvre, Baubo is condensed into concepts that are not directly tied to the narrative of Eleusis. In both cases, the most important of these is her connection to sexuality, conceptualized as so strong that she in fact becomes identified with the female sex and obscenity. As becomes clear from the scholarship on the Egyptian Baubos, their defining trait is the attention they direct towards the vagina. Similarly, Goethe uses Baubo as synonymous with indecency but without reference to

---

215 Murray (1934)
216 Hogarth, Edgar, and Gutch (1898), 85.
217 Hauff (1830).
218 See above, note 55.
the myth around Eleusis. These characteristics, in turn, have been ascribed onto the ancient figure that the terracottas and Goethe are supposed to reference. The ancient Baubo explained in the Goethe commentaries is shaped by the connotations that these two modern versions have attached to her. It is notably that this *allelopoiesis* happens with full awareness of the fact that the Baubo of *Faust* and the Egyptian terracotta is not a direct reference to the ancient myth.\textsuperscript{219}

**Millingen and Goethe as scholars**

The idea that Baubo is a stable, definable ancient figure is tied to a particular notion of how the past can be known. If Millingen and Goethe are not part of the history of the study of Baubo, it is because they don’t fit with a narrative of scholarship that reveals figures from the past, expanding the knowledge of them to a greater degree and with more precision. At least for mythological figures, who per se do not have a substance beyond their iterations in art, literature or oral tradition, I believe we should be cautious towards this pattern of logic. This does not mean that there are no differences between a modern and ancient idea of a figure. It means we should take care when describing what a figure *is* precisely so as not to get these ancient and modern iterations confused. The relationships outlined above are a case in point. Goethe’s and Millingen’s Baubo’s are thought to reference an original in a creative or mistaken fashion, when in fact they took part in shaping modern understandings of this original from which they are said to deviate.

\textsuperscript{219} Although the relationship between the Egyptian terracottas that are merely called so, theories of Baubos origin in Egypt and the fact of the mysteries of Eleusis is often confused so that one piece of information feed the other Murray (1935).
As discussed above, Goethe’s distance from scholarship was based not only on personal vocation, but on a conviction of how antiquity should be approached at all. Such an outspoken ideology cannot be found in Millingen. If Millingen is excluded from histories of ancient scholarship it is not by his own volition, but because he exemplified a form of engagement with antiquity that only in later generations appears to fall on the side of scholarship.

Millingen was of Dutch and English heritage but had grown up in France, where he was briefly imprisoned as a British subject.\textsuperscript{220} After his release, the young Millingen continued his career in banking, eventually working for the French mint. Possibly this was a reluctant compromise between his family’s ambitions and his own interest in numismatics, which he had been encouraged to study by the family friend Clayton Mordaunt Cracherode. When the banking house in which he was a partner filed for bankruptcy in 1820, Millingen relocated to Italy. The move had the double benefits of reliving his asthma and allowing him to commit more time to his interest in ancient artifacts.\textsuperscript{221} In the following years, Millingen maintained a base in Florence, but moved between Rome and Naples and did excursions to Paris and London. He became part of the circle of European scholars and intellectuals studying antiquity in Rome. Besides the \textit{Institutio di corrispondenza archeologica}, he was as an honorary member of the Royal Society of Literature, a fellow of the Societies of Antiquaries of London and of France, and a correspondent of the Institute of France. His publications on coins, vases, and other ancient artifacts were well received, and Millingen was considered an authority on these topics. Goethe


\textsuperscript{221} Dönike (2013), 57.
himself had his friend and collaborator, the artist Heinrich Meyer, write a review of Millingen’s *Ancient Unedited Monuments* for his journal *Über Kunst und Altertum* in the 1820s.222

If Goethe has been firmly situated in the canon of literature and philosophy, Millingen is harder to pinpoint in today’s academic vocabulary. Was he a scholar, archaeologist, collector, or layman? Perhaps one reason that Millingen is rarely mentioned as an ancient scholar, despite being well regarded by his contemporaries, is the embarrassment that followed when it was revealed that one of the British Museum’s most famous acquisitions from Millingen, a bust of Caesar, was a forgery. The bust has since been removed from exhibition; the embarrassment made larger by the fact that this was the most copied bust of Caesar in the nineteenth century.223

Such stories seem to locate Millingen in the cliché of clueless or careless collectors, harvesting Italian antiquities without consideration for their historical context. Yet, Millingen represents a common, even typical engagement with antiquity from the early part of the nineteenth century, in which Goethe also took part, straddling collecting and scholarship, following private as well as public interests and in conversation with an international community including antiquarians, poets, and philologists. Millingen’s double practice of publishing and selling antiquities has not disappeared. It is still common among private collectors today to publish artifacts, or lend them to museums, in order to bolster their legitimacy and market price. Today this practice is morally ambiguous and frowned upon from the side of ancient scholarship (consider, for example, the controversies around the generous Levy-White donations, said to implicitly give academic and institutional consent to buying antiquities from dubious sources).224 In the 1840s, however, such

222 Dönike (2013) 156.
223 Bagnani (1960) 228–44. It is however worth considering Bagnani’s suggestion that the bust is not a “fake” but a masterful art-work carefully executed according to the patron’s taste and if anything is to blame it is not the sculptor or commissioner, but rather the taste that searches exclusively for ancient originals of any kind but rejects medieval or renaissance pieces. Ibid. 230. Millingen was a child of his time and delivered to his customers what they required.
a practice was not merely common, but often carried out by the same person. There is no reason to think Millingen’s habit of publishing the artifacts he had acquired before selling them was considered anything but responsible scholarly behavior. Hence, it is not so much that Millingen operated outside of scholarship, but that the definition of scholarship has shifted.

Millingen and Goethe both contributed to the growing importance of ancient studies for nineteenth-century Germany. The generation of Humboldt, Schiller, and Gerhard established Ancient Studies as the foundation and focus for what would become the German Bildungsbürgertum, but the question of how antiquity should be studied was not self-evident. The disciplinary divisions that orient our approach to antiquity today were only beginning to take shape, and divisions between studying, enjoying and creating antiquity were not as sharply defined. The Rome instituto where both Goethe and Millingen were members is a case in point. The list of honorary members of the instituto reveals that not only scholars in the conventional meaning were considered part of this endeavor. The Deutsches archäologisches Institut is often presented as an heir to the instituto but in fact represents more a shift of direction. The DAI’s focus on national interests as opposed to the instituto’s international interests and the shift from private actors to state-sponsored projects, are only some indications for the new paths Ancient Studies took in the later nineteenth century. The circles in which Goethe and Millingen moved lay the administrative and ideological foundation for the importance of ancient Greece for the following generations, but the same efforts resulted in the disciplinary specializations that would obscure their roots. Goethe and Millingen provide the material and literary references to
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225 Marchand (1996) esp. 37 ff. discusses the ideological foundations of institutional approaches to the ancient world in Germany.
antiquity that would fuel the development of ancient studies, but later generations are more likely to consider their contributions as footnotes rather than foundations.

Baubo and Altertumswissenschaften

Through Goethe and Millingen, Baubo obtained some of her most salient characteristics, associated with obscenity and the vulva to the extent that the name could be used analogously for these traits. These emerged in a context of debating the studies of antiquity. In the case of Goethe, Baubo was deliberately deployed in a discussion of knowing and studying. In the case of Millingen, his identification and the iconographic type it occasioned, she was part of this debate indirectly through the discussions on how to identify and analyze the group. The two uses of the name solidified Baubo’s identity not only as part of a narrative but as a very personification of the obscene and female sexuality.

The Priene team did not find Baubo at Priene. They chose a name for a figure partly because of the name’s associations (grotesque-obscene). Their choice of the name should be understood as part of an ongoing discussion of not only what Baubo is, but also of who can name and define. Even if they lay claim (and are given the right by later scholarship) to more scientific grounds for their identification of the figurines, their motivations (grotesque-obscene) are taken from these divergent versions.

The Priene figures entered into a modern world that already knew a Baubo, or several. Even though the archaeologists based their identification on ancient material and philological facts, the name — and it is fair to ask if they would have gotten this name at all before Faust — confirmed the characteristics previously assigned to the name Baubo. Baubo was identified on
scientific, objective grounds, but the ancient Baubo they referred to was one established by non-
scientific precursors. In short, the ancient image at Priene took on the personality of her modern
forerunners.
Chapter Three. Discovering Baubo

There is nothing remarkable about how the Baubo figurines are displayed today. During the twentieth century, the Priene finds were moved several times, reflecting Berlin’s tumultuous modern history. They were evacuated from Berlin’s Museum Island during the Second World War and, following the war, exhibited in a temporary display in West Berlin. Following the Berlin’s reunification, they were united with the rest of the city’s antiquities collection. Since 1995, they are back where they were originally displayed in 1905, in the Altes Museum on the Museum Island in the center of the city.

Today, you will find the Baubo figurines towards the end of the museum’s first floor gallery. Compared to the spectacular monumentality of the Pergamon Museum and the innovative renovations and reinstallation of the Neues Museum, the displays in the Altes Museum seem unremarkable. The finds from Priene are collected in a section dedicated to the ancient city. A model of Priene in the Hellenistic period, together with leaflets, offer the visitor historical context for the surrounding objects. The terracotta figurines from the Demeter sanctuary are assembled in a large vitrine. There are figures of women, children, pigs, and also the eight Baubo figurines (fig. 2). As a whole, the display is engaging and informative, if perhaps a little old-fashioned. In fact, the presentation of the Baubo figurines is remarkably like their original display in the early twentieth century. Then, too, they were shown together with the other finds from the Demeter sanctuary in a section dedicated to Priene, presenting the find in a historical-geographical context. What is remarkable is how far removed this display is from the
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227 Today, the display signs identify them as “Daemons (‘Baubo’).”
original intentions of the building and, considering this, that the Baubo statuettes were even given a home there in the first place.

The following pages contrast the context of the Baubo statuettes’ display in Berlin with the original intentions for the Altes Museum. Excavated in 1898, and presented in the Altes Museum in the early twentieth century, the Baubo figurines’ emergence come at a time of radical transformation in archaeological techniques and museum display in Germany. Their excavation and presentation reflect not only a shift in museological trends, but a reconsideration of the *raison d’être* for the museum and the role of ancient Greece for the nation. Chapters One and Two examined the sources and modern interpretations for the narrative and the name of Baubo. I argued that the meaning of the name Baubo was negotiated through responses to a wide range of ancient and modern sources mostly unrelated to the Church Fathers’ narrative. Here, I discuss the discovery of the figurines that gave the Baubo complex its characteristic iconography, describing the scholarly and political conditions that allowed them to be excavated and displayed: conditions, I argue, without which the figurines would not have emerged at all. Tracing their trajectory from Priene to the Berlin museum shows the emergence of the figurines as the product of a late nineteenth-century critique and reconsideration of what ancient Greece had meant for the earlier generations.

**The First Museum, A Temple of Art**

From its inception, the project of the public museum has been invested with the question of how it can serve the public and the state that it represents, while functioning as a vehicle to
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228 This argument is in part a response to the term *allelopoiesis*, initiated by the Berlin-based research group *Transformationen der Antike*. The term illustrates how modern readings change the ancient texts. I extend this argument to include also material artifacts. Böhme and Stefan, “Die Antike ‘nach’ Freud.”
improve both. There has often been a tension between these two tasks of both representing and improving. The Altes Museum was opened to the public in 1830, but discussions about the need for a public museum in Berlin began much earlier, towards the end of the eighteenth century. A museum was considered crucial, both to improve the aesthetic sensibilities of the public and for Berlin to present itself as Prussia’s cultivated capital. Berlin had long been considered small and uncultivated, and the city had nothing that compared with the art collections in Dresden, Vienna, and Munich. A museum would not only showcase Prussia’s cultured ambitions, but also its political status. The project began in earnest after the 1814/15 return of the artworks taken from Berlin by Napoleon, which had been on display in the new public museum there. With these concerns regarding the status of Preussen in Germany and internationally in mind, King Friedrich Wilhelm III founded the Prussian Ministry of Culture and Public Education and installed Wilhelm von Humboldt as its head. Von Humboldt moved in the circles of the Weimar classicists and the international community of scholars and artists in Rome. His concept for the university and the museum translated the ideas of the romantics to improving society through aesthetic education.

The university and the museum were hence two means to the same end: the education of the citizens (or at least the Bürger class that formed the administrative backbone of the state) as a

\[229\] Before there was a new museum to make this the old one, the Altes Museum, was known as the Royal Museum, Königliches Museum or the New Museum, Neues Museum. To avoid the obvious risk of confusion I will forthwith refer to the museum with its current name, Altes Museum. Much has been written about the foundation of the museum and the philosophical and conceptual ideas behind it Wezel (2001) gives offers a discussion of the philosophical discussions that informed the museums. Spiero (1934) 41–86 presents the sources for the earliest discussion of the museum, both architecturally and conceptually. Fendt, (2012) offers a discussion on the handling and display of the ancient sculptures in. This project appears as part of the Berlin research group Transformationen der Antike, which includes a sub-group dedicated to the history of display. Plagemann (1967) offers a comparison of all the German public art museums, putting the Berlin museums in context of Prussian discussion with and in competition with the larger German speaking world .

\[230\] Fendt (2012) 69. When the Altes Museum opened, it included a statue of Napoleon among the statues of Roman emperors, perhaps as a reminder of the victory that had made the museum possible. Wezel (2001) 105.
path to build a better society. Partly as a response to disappointment at the violence following the French Revolution, Schiller wrote his 1794 *Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man*, which asked how to develop a society that could live up to the initial ambitions of the revolution. As the title indicates, the answer for Schiller, Goethe, Herder and others lay in aesthetic education. Confronting citizens with the highest achievements of art—i.e., the works of the Greeks—would refine and sensitize the individual, and inspire to production of works of the same caliber. Discussions of the benefits of the museum were imbued with religious language. Goethe suggested that the museum should be a “Menagerie of fine arts, religion and poetry.”\(^{231}\) The poet and writer Ludwig Tieck, who would be part of the museum’s committee, anonymously published a collection of essays with his friend Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder, in which the latter compared contemplating art to prayer, explaining that

> Galleries are treated as fair grounds … when really they should be temples. Places where one can approach the great artists in awe-inspiring solitude and quietly and humbly admire them as the highest among the living.\(^{232}\)

Such religiously imbued language was not just hyperbole, but expressed the ambition to shape institutions that could, like the church, be the moral guidance for the state by encouraging active creativity. These ideas of the museum as a place for undisturbed meditation of the artwork guided both the appearance and the organization of the museum.

The architect commissioned to fulfill these ambitions was Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781-1841), whose neo-classical style was commissioned for so many buildings that he was almost single-handedly responsible for Berlin’s nickname as “Athens on the Spree.” Schinkel’s building effectively translated the ideas of a place for religious contemplation intended to engage the city.

\(^{231}\) Plagemann (1967) 25.

\(^{232}\) Wackenroder and Tieck (201) 60.
The façade of the museum unmistakably reminded visitors of an ancient Greek temple (fig. 3). The building is centered around the rotunda, modeled after the Roman Pantheon, where some of the museum’s finest ancient statues were displayed. Visible from the rotunda, the statue known as “Praying Boy”—in the same place it occupies today—was meant not only to pull the visitor into the sculpture hall, but also offered, through his gesture of prayer, a guide in how to contemplate the objects. An interior portico opened up to the adjacent park Lustgarten, creating a fluid and permeating transition between the museum building and the city (fig. 4). The museum presented itself as a modern take on an ancient religious building in synthesis with the city.

Inside, the museum housed paintings as well as the antiquities collection. While the paintings were hung according to schools and origin, the antiquities were organized thematically and with consideration of their size and style.\textsuperscript{233} This arrangement was partly owed to a practical matter. The Prussian antiquities’ collection was limited, and if the museum were to present examples from all epochs of ancient art, the original works would have to be complemented with plaster casts or drawings. Such practice was not unusual at the time, but went against the museum’s aim of conveying the aura of the ancient artworks. The diplomat von Bunsen addressed the matter in a memorandum to the king. As the collection expanded, he concluded, the museum would have to choose if it wanted to collect originals for a thematic display or copies for an archaeological/ art-historical display. However, Bunsen emphasized, he did not advise the latter, since such copies could not “adequately convey ancient grandiosity.”\textsuperscript{234} An organization according to style and subject, it was decided, was the most favorable way to showcase the objects’ aesthetic excellence.\textsuperscript{235} The museum’s interior was built accordingly.

\textsuperscript{233} Humboldt (1830) in Schinkel and Wolzogen (1863) 313.
\textsuperscript{234} Bunsen (1828) in Schinkel and Wolzogen (1863) 288.
\textsuperscript{235} Schinkel and Wolzogen (1863) 310.
Humboldt proudly showed the king the many innovative ways by which Schinkel’s design allowed an undisturbed admiration of the ancient statues. Against common contemporary practice, the walls were kept undecorated so as not to draw attention from the pieces. Further, instead of the conventional display of statues lined along the walls, they were placed on columns and positioned so that the visitor could observe them from all sides.\footnote{Humboldt did believe that the museum should not edit the antiquities collection, but present it in its entirety, since “even the objects that are not excellent or beautiful are informative for the ancient past.” In reality, however, the accumulating of the collection was a selection itself, since all objects were acquired through purchase as the museums were not yet sponsoring excavations. Humboldt (1830) Schinkel and Wolzogen (1863) 302–13.} These techniques all furthered what Schinkel considered the museum’s principal objective, “to awaken in the public the sense that art is the most important branch of human culture.”\footnote{Schinkel and Waagen, “Die Aufgabe der Berliner Galerie (1828)” in Kratz-Kessemeyer (2010), 26.} Historical interest, Schinkel continues, takes second place to this aim.\footnote{Kratz-Kessemeyer (2010) 28. This priority was not without conflict, and was the cause of Alois Hirt, who had been active in the first drafts of the museums, to be excluded from the committee. Fendt (2012) 69-71 ascribes the differences to a generational shift, Hirt’s enlightenment ideas clashing with Schinkel’s romantic. On the earliest ideas for the museum and Hirt’s contribution see Seidel (1928).} From its architecture to the presentation of the artifacts, the museum represented an idea of education, \textit{Bildung}, that emphasized individual and religious contemplation of artworks rather than lexical or historical information.\footnote{Fendt (2012) 69-71 has pointed out that the make-up of the committee that decided on the museum’s organization is telling. The committee was led by Humboldt and included, besides Schinkel himself, Waagen, the future director of the \textit{Gemäldegalerie}, and several artists such as the sculptor Christian Daniel Rauch and the poet Ludwig Tieck. This assembly of artists, architects and art historians, rather than historians or archaeologists, ensured that the art works were presented as timeless master pieces rather than historical artifacts.}

\textbf{Greece in Germany, Germany in Greece}

\textbf{German Absence}

Throughout the planning and design of the museum, one weak point was clear to everyone involved: Berlin had very few ancient original pieces to display. “That the new museum cannot compare its collections of Roman art to the Vatican, or of Greek to the British Museum (...) is, considering the nature of things, so obvious that no one would try pretend
otherwise,” is how the Prussian diplomat Bunsen begins a letter to the king about how to increase the collection. What allowed the British and French collections to outshine the Prussian was, primarily, their colonial activity. Colonial expansion and archaeological interests had long gone hand in hand. The Musée Napoleon had exhibited artifacts amassed through Napoleon Bonaparte’s campaigns. The British Museum’s collections too, were largely amassed through the empire’s diplomats. The pediment over the entrance echoed the Parthenon frieze inside, only it celebrated British innovation and enterprise instead of Athen’s. The largest museums were enabled by imperial and colonial expansion and were presented as a celebration of the same.

The lack of an empire did not impede the progress of the museum project in Berlin. After all, this museum would have a different objective. If the museum in Paris was a celebration of war, this would be one of peace, directed towards the building of a better future society rather than celebrating the power of the present one. While the Berlin museum project was certainly fueled by competition with Paris and London, it expressed and cultivated a distinctly German relation to the ancient world, imagined by its initiators as being concerned with the future rather than contemporary exploits.

Ancient Greece had been an important foil for German national identity since the late eighteenth century, but its importance was more as a principle than a historical reality. German literature and philosophy were unusually invested in the ancient Mediterranean world, while unusually absent from the Mediterranean. Germany’s colonial endeavor came late and never rivaled France and Great Britain. Before Ludwig of Bavaria’s son assumed the Greek throne as
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240 Nubsel (1828) in Schinkel und Wolzogen (1863) 288.  
Otho I in 1832, there were few notable German ventures in the Mediterranean beyond Italy. Meanwhile, France and England were represented by diplomats and archaeologists—frequently combined in the same person—throughout the Mediterranean and the Middle East. Even Greece, then considered an uncultured fringe of the Ottoman Empire, had already been breached at the end of the eighteenth century, when the English Society of Dilettanti sponsored the architects James Stuart and Nicholas Revett’s 1751-53 travels to draw the ancient monuments of Athens. But in the same era that Stuart and Revett braved the untraveled roads of Greece in the interest of science—or at least in the interest of finding models to inspire garden houses in stately homes, their publication’s main use—German classicism produced several beautiful accounts of travels through Greece, based purely on classical literature and imagination.\footnote{Said, \textit{Orientalism} (2014) 19, notes that “Goethe's \textit{Westöstlicher Diwan} and Friedrich Schlegel's \textit{Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier}, were based respectively on a Rhine journey and on hours spent in Paris libraries.”}

This discrepancy between the proliferation of German descriptions of the East and the lack of German eyewitnesses prompted Edward Said to conclude that German orientalism was of a different kind than its Anglo-French counterpart.\footnote{In the context of historical imagination of the early nineteenth century, I believe there is good reason to talk about Greece and the Orient together. Greece was under Ottoman rule until it gained independence and was considered more Eastern than it is today. Further, both Greece and the Orient functioned as an ‘other’ for German identity. Cf. Dastur (2000) 156-73.} Although Said recognizes the nation’s contribution to scholarship, Germany was largely left out of Said’s landmark book on Orientalism a decision he explained with the remark:

\begin{quote}
(...) at no time in German scholarship during the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century could a close partnership have developed between Orientalism and a protracted, sustained \textit{national} interest in the Orient. There was nothing in Germany to correspond to the Anglo-French presence in India, the Levant, and North Africa. Moreover, the German Orient was almost exclusively of a scholarly, or at least a classical, Orient: it was made the subject of lyrics, fantasies, and even novels, but it was never actual.\footnote{Said (2014) 19. His Emphasis.} \end{quote}
Said’s verdict that Germany’s relation to the Orient was not “actual” has been suggested also for German studies of ancient Greece. In the case of Greece, the question has the added urgency that the rhetoric of idealizing the Greek people recalls twentieth-century fascist ideology.

Eliza Butler, a British Germanist, tackled precisely this connection in her 1935 book *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany*. Appalled by the rise of national socialism in Germany, she wrote her book, which traces a direct legacy from German idealism and romanticism to national socialist ideology. Butler’s work opens with a vignette in which she compares the nations of the world, to children living on an island. While some children explore the island and even build boats and venture out to sea, one group of children is content simply to stand motionless and stare out over the sea. These introverted, inactive children are, of course, the Germans. These children have poor posture and weak physiques and seem generally unfit for the island world but “as long as they are occupied with their dreams they will remain unnoticed.” The danger arises when they put their dreams into action. Butler considers the Germans to be unique in their ardor for putting their idealized ideas of the absolute into action. Common to Butler’s description of German relation to ancient Greece and Said’s verdict on German Orientalism is that both are characterized by the lack of an active, physical presence. Compared with the French and the British, this relation was more introverted and historical, less actual, and potentially more dangerous. Nineteenth century Germany, they conclude, was a land of thinkers rather than doers.

245 Butler (1935).
246 Butler (1935) 3.
247 Butler (1935) 3.
248 The relation between ideology and materiality that Said and Butler sketch for Germany has been contested. Marchand (2010) expose on German Orientalism from 2010 argues that German scholarship on the east had very real ideological as well as geo-political results and that there is a relation between early nineteenth scholarship and German imperial ambitions later in the century. Güthenke (2008) 3, has demonstrated how important the idea of an actual Greek nation state was for Romantic and Idealist thinking about ancient Greece. In this context, Güthenke
From our historical vantage point, it is difficult to un-see the link between the celebration of one people as “better” than any other and twentieth-century fascist ideology. In his introduction to Olender’s *The Languages of Paradise*, Vernant remarks that behind the efforts of nineteenth-century scholarship we cannot but help see “the dark silhouette of the camps and the rising smoke of the ovens.” Yet, the intention of the Altes Museum was the exact opposite of what Butler witnessed in the 1930s: to celebrate peace and refine culture. Against Said, the *Bildungsreform* and the museum project show that even a classicizing and scholarly approach to ancient Greece had very “actual” consequences for the nation. It is true that the Romantics generally did perceive Greece, at least in its ancient guise, as irretrievably distant. In fact, this was the central tenet that guaranteed that contemplating the artwork would inspire better culture. This distance was closing in, however, as Germany became increasingly involved with the materiality of the ancient world. In Germany, too, the earlier generation’s distance and idealizing would be pitted against material actuality.

**German Presence**

Over the course of the nineteenth century, much changed on the Berlin Museum Island. The Baubo figurines were moved into the Altes Museum after it had been refigured in 1905 to house only antiquities. At this time, Germans could no longer be described as dreamy children lost in the contemplation of the horizon. At the turn of the century, Germany was an active archaeological actor in the Mediterranean, and the ancient world was materially present in Berlin.
on an unprecedented scale. Between 1870 to 1918, the Museum Island’s collection of antiquities grew on a scale incomparable to the purchases encouraged under Schinkel and Humboldt.

The Altes Museum was joined by a second museum for antiquities, the Neues Museum, in 1855. This museum was designed by Schinkel’s student Friedrich August Stüler, who, however, did not follow his teacher’s example in the presentation of antiquities. The museum was organized instead to present the historical development of ancient art. This was achieved precisely by the means that had been rejected for the Altes Museum, namely, with plaster casts and thematic décor. The collection of plaster casts formed the focus of the museum core, and walls and ceilings were painted in the style of the culture on display: Egyptian patterns as wall decorations in the Egypt section, for example.251 The quiet contemplation of the original art works was dismissed in favor of historical information. The museum was historical, but decidedly art historical. It presented an ancient world out of the textbooks on art history, with plaster casts guaranteeing that each period was illustrated with its most representative work.

The radical transformation of the Museum Island, however, began when Richard Schöne arrived at the Ministry of Education in 1872. Schöne, then only thirty-two, already had a career as an artist in Rome and a Habilitation in archaeology behind him as he began his reform of the Academy of Arts and the museums. Schöne aimed to clear out the nepotism and antiquarianism that had set the tone of German ancient studies and further archaeological expertise. Under Schöne, the number of sub-departments in the museums increased from six to seventeen and the collections of antiquities also grew, as did the staff.252 While the Museum Island had been shaped by art historians and artists, Schöne’s reform raised the importance of archaeologists.

251 On the planning and realization of the Neues Museum, including an interesting discussion on whether the art history it presented drew more from Hegel or Schelling, see Wezel (2001).
Schöne threw his support behind several large-scale German excavations, above all in Asia Minor. The new support for archaeology at home and abroad transformed the museums. They were no longer temples of art or illustrations of art history, but vehicles for continuous exploration of the ancient past. The new excavations provided the museums with objects that would require the entire museum concept to be reconsidered.

Between 1880 and the First World War, the Ishtar Gate, the Pergamon Altar, and the Market Gate of Miletus were excavated and brought to Berlin. The arrival of all three monuments depended on the person of Theodor Wiegand, who had taken over the leadership of the Priene excavation following Carl Humann’s death in 1896. He later led several other large-scale excavations at, among other places, Miletus. Between his roles as excavator, scientific attaché to the German embassy in the Ottoman Empire, museum director, and head of the Berlin antiquities collection, Wiegand personally oversaw the transportation and installation of the several monumental ancient structures that are still the most famous on the Museum Island. Transporting these monuments from the Ottoman Empire to Berlin was a feat of engineering, ingenuity, will power, charm, and a willingness to resort to smuggling, if needed.\footnote{His correspondence to Berlin often mentions “discrete” shipments.} Even after securing excavation permits from the Ottoman authorities and in competition with the French archaeologists, there was still the problem of transporting the monuments to Berlin. The railroad had only been extended through Ionia a few years before Wiegand’s arrival, and was not always of much help.\footnote{“The railroad is lauded, but a poor work. At least it leads people to trust in his abilities, which is practical.” Georg Siemens writes to Wiegand in 1899. Quoted in Wiegand and Wiegand (1970) 29.} The monuments often had to be transported down from steep slopes using oxen and donkeys, a task so difficult that the locals determined that the entire Priene excavation was
cursed and refused to work on it, causing Wiegand further headaches.\(^{255}\) As his biographers continuously stressed, the fact that Wiegand managed to secure the monuments for the Berlin Museum Island was a testimony of his abilities and character. Martin Schede, Wiegand’s close collaborator and friend, in his obituary for Wiegand, calls him “victorious conqueror,” whose projects were always on the grandest scale and only possible to achieve with a fighting spirit like his.\(^{256}\) Wiegand was hardly one of Eliza Butler’s daydreaming children, but represented the new scale and rhetoric of German archaeology at the turn of the century.

**Großarchäologie**

As was his intention, Schede’s characterization of Wiegand captured the tone of the period in German archaeology that Wiegand was crucial in shaping. Archaeology was no longer the topic of silent contemplation, but of fighting power and strength. Not only were there more antiquities in Berlin, but they were of such a size that their excavation, transportation, and installation required a large bureaucratic and financial apparatus. The new German state, with its center in Berlin, offered the organization and support for such large-scale projects. This also meant, however, that as Germany expanded its archaeological activity, that activity had to be presented as distinctly German. The transformation of the central German archaeological institution, the DAI, was a case in point. Many of the actors connected with the first museum, such as Humboldt himself, had been part of the IfAK, *Institut für archäologisches Korrespondenz* in Rome. This group had started in the late eighteenth century as a loose, international association of expats in Rome. As it grew and came to oversee more excavations, it
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\(^{256}\) Schede (1937) 109–11.
changed its name, and in 1872 it became the DAI, *Deutsches Archäologisches Institut*. The change of name reflected a change of character. As the DAI, the organization could oversee large excavations and publications with the help of state support, but had to argue that these endeavors were done in the interest of the German state and in German spirit. Arguing the benefits of the new organization, Curtius wrote, “…can one imagine what could be achieved if our available energies could be harnessed together in the right way: the steam power of the navy, the technical know-how of the General Staff, the expertise of archaeologists and architects!”  

257 Theodor Mommsen, Berlin’s leading ancient historian, recognized this development as the beginning of a *Großwissenschaft*, a big (or great) science. 258 The neologism likens science to the *Großstadt*, big city, and the *Großindustrie*, big industry, two other central terms in Wilhelminian Berlin. As with the latter two, Mommsen explained, *Großwissenschaft* could not rely on the expertise of one person alone, but required the cooperation of several actors. The success of the projects, again like big industry, relied on access to capital and top down administration. 259 Archaeology was growing alongside with the German state. 260

Berlin had grown to a *Großstadt* rapidly, tripling its population between 1840 and 1880. This growth was viewed with a mix of excitement and apprehension. The Wilhelminian period produced a large body of literature and film that investigated the *Großstadt* as simultaneously promise and threat. Most often, these works present the big city as an agent or organism over which the population is never in complete control. 261 The same ambiguity can be detected in the growth of scholarship. State sponsorship and cooperation between experts made possible large,
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257 Curtius (1872) Quoted in Marchand (1996) 92.
258 German *Wissenschaft* refers both to humanist scholarship as well as to the ”hard” sciences.
260 Marchand (1996) esp. 36-73, outlines the details of the growth of national institutions for archaeology.
261 This idea was expressed in many literary works and films, and was theorized by Georg Simmel in his essay *Die Großstädte und das Geistesleben*, from 1903.
encompassing endeavors, such as *Pauly Wissowa’s Realencyclopädie*, the monumental German encyclopedia of ancient studies. On the other hand, while *Großwissenschaft* opened new possibilities, it also changed the role of the academic. Instead of the *Gelehrte*, the learned man who cultivated his personal expertise, he now had to be an administrator and leader. Mommsen recognized this new role with regret as a necessary, but unfortunate development of the time.262

*Großwissenschaft* was the opposite of the Humboldtian idea of *Bildung*, which saw education as personal growth.263 On the other hand, Humboldt’s *Bildung* had never been meant for everybody, but had centered on the class of the *Bildungsbürgertum*. The Romantics had called for Germans to become modern Greeks, but for neither Humboldt nor Schiller did this suggest that *everyone* should see themselves as Greek. It was quite enough that a few souls were born with Greek spirit to propel the rest of the nation to a better era. The development from individual *Bildung* to state-sponsored *Großwissenschaft* also had practical consequences. The IfAk had been international, but never had ambitions of being inclusive beyond a small elite of self-supporting scholars, and its project relied on the members’ personal funds. The concept of the *groß*-projects, on the other hand, promised inclusivity for everyone identifying with the German state. Beyond these concerns, as was clear in the language of Wiegand, projects of greatness and size started to be heralded not only — as Mommsen had reluctantly expressed it — as a necessary premise for scholarship, but also as a source of pride in their own right.264

262. “It is something we must accept, but it will not be easy,” Mommsen (1905) 223.
Humann and Wiegand at Priene

The two leaders of the Priene excavation, Carl Humann and Theodor Wiegand, both had close ties to Groβindustrie and arguably embodied the new big science. Both were also proud to admit that they were not the bookish scholars of the old guard. Richard Schöne praised Humann by saying that he was not a Gelehrte but a man serving the Wissenschaft, i.e., not a scholar in the sense shaped by Humboldtian Bildung, who worked following his own interest and with the paramount aim of his own intellectual improvement, but a man working for the type of scholarship now promoting objective, big-scale, collaborative scholarship.  

Humann did not arrive in Ionia as a scholar of antiquity, but as an engineer working on the Ottoman railroad. Before opening the excavation at Priene, Humann had already led several German excavations in Ionia and was celebrated as the “discoverer of Pergamon.”  

He was proud of being the opposite of a bookish academic and remarked that it was easy to recognize a philologist: he is the man with two left hands who falls over when he visits the site. Humann presented himself as a man of action, a leader, who could relate to his workers but had little patience for academic niceties. Ernst Curtius, excavator of Olympia, described him as “a pasha, always commandeering around some dozen people and horses.”  

As Eduard Wiegand, Theodor Wiegand’s son, explains it, it was Wiegand’s equally practical nature that prompted Humann to choose him as assistant and successor.  

By his own account, Wiegand was never promising scholarly material. As with Humann, his talents lay in action, persuasion, and inspiring leadership. Having been threatened with

265 Schuchhard and Wiegand (1931) 3.
266 Richard Schöne, in Schuchhard and Wiegand (1931) 3.
268 Curtius (2013) 616.
269 Wiegand and Wiegand (1970) 22.
expulsion from school, Wiegand eventually continued in academia and managed to finish his
dissertation even though he later admitted that he was poorly suited to the task.\textsuperscript{270} Wiegand’s
talents came to the fore when he traveled to Greece in 1894 and began his career as a field
archaeologist. In Athens, he worked with Wilhelm Dörpfeld on the Acropolis and was soon
introduced to Carl Humann. This meeting would be a crucial turning point in Wiegand’s career.
Humann, who led some of the largest German excavations, took a liking to the young
archaeologist and brought him to Ionia to be his assistant at the newly started excavation at
Priene. Humann’s health quickly deteriorated after the excavation started, leading Wiegand to
take over the leadership. When Humann died, Wiegand succeeded him as excavation leader and
German cultural representative in the Ottoman empire.\textsuperscript{271} At only thirty-two, he was appointed
museum director of the Berlin Smyrna department. Wiegand continued his career with the
excavations in Miletus and the export of the Miletus market gate to Berlin, and as the academic
attaché at the German embassy in Constantinople. In these positions, he oversaw German
archaeological interests in the Ottoman Empire, including the export of the Ishtar Gate from
Babylon during tightening restrictions on cultural exports. These feats, and his role in expanding
the Pergamon Museum in Berlin, made him a well known and influential name in German
cultural affairs. When offered the leadership of the DAI in 1932 he accepted, even though his age
and many bouts with malaria had made him fit for retirement. He used his position and fame to

\textsuperscript{270} Wiegand and Wiegand (1970).
\textsuperscript{271} In a letter from 1899, Wiegand explains that as Humann’s successor he was also expected to live up to his social
and friendly reputation. At his first official appearance in Istanbul he had therefore felt obliged to drink 12 halfs of
beer, making him sick for two days. Letter from Humann to Geheimrat {Schöne?}, Altes Museum Archive,
9.1.1899, I/AS 10 (Pr. 107) Ausgrabungen in Priene 1897-1898.
influence German scholarship during the Nazi regime, particularly trying to curb the influence of party interest in ancient scholarship and protect his own employees.\textsuperscript{272}

Unlike Humann, Wiegand did have a classical education, even though he claimed that he found academic work difficult and not a good fit.\textsuperscript{273} His ties to big industry were almost as close as Humann’s. He married Marie Siemens, whose father, Georg Siemens, was the head of the Deutsche Bank and the main investor in the Ottoman railroad expansion.\textsuperscript{274} Both Humann and Wiegand belonged to a new generation of German archaeologists who came to archaeology not through philology or art history, but through technical professions, such as engineering and architecture. The professional expertise of these fields was carried over to archaeology, where measurement, drawing, stratigraphy, and surveying ensured a more systematic approach to fieldwork than had been standard in earlier generations. These new techniques too, and not just their results, were declared feats. Theodor Wiegand explains the recent developments in archaeology in the introduction to a book on Priene intended for to school teachers:

> Excavation techniques had long studied the proud quarters of the ruling class and the great sanctuaries before we finally dared to take on entire cities. Employing the careful, meticulous and tedious work it required, we have been able to lay bare these places in their entirety.\textsuperscript{275}

The new field techniques were presented not only as a more complete or careful investigation of the past, but also as an antidote for earlier, ideologically shaded reconstructions.

\textsuperscript{272} During the Nazi regime, Wiegand worked hard to safeguard the DAI from party influence, besides protecting his employees. However, his position was delicate and required him to be on good standing with the regime. His son does not mention, for example, Wiegand’s support for Hitler by signing the letter \textit{Deutsche Wissenschaftler hinter Adolf Hitler}, published in Völkischen Beobachter 1934. Wiegand and Wiegand (1970) 17–19.

\textsuperscript{273} Wiegand and Wiegand (1970) 15.

\textsuperscript{274} Earlier generations of German ancient scholars had married each other’s daughters and sisters to an astonishing degree. This seemed to also be expected from Wiegand. In a letter from 1898 he reveals in confidence that the Ottoman cultural minister, Osman Hamdi Bey, had expressed disappointment when he didn’t marry Carl Humann’s daughter. Letter from Wiegand 9.1.1898, Altes Museum Archive I/AS 10 (Pr. 107) Ausgrabungen in Priene 1897-1898.

\textsuperscript{275} Wiegand (1910) 3.
Wiegand continues, “[the following work presents Priene] not as an archaeological imagination, but as a drawing, produced through careful consideration of all the scientific information.”

Wiegand and his contemporaries saw their work not simply as a continuation or intensification of previous generations’ interest in Greece, but as a shift. Greece was now being investigated through objective methods, which would result in a more correct and complete presentation of the past.

The result of this shift was that the ancient Greece produced excavations and presented in museums looked different from what had been the subject of Humboldt and Schinkel’s historical imagination in the previous century. Perhaps their professed disinterest in books made Humann’s and Wiegand’s search for Greece less shaped by what they assumed Greece should look like.

Neither Humann nor Wiegand published extensively outside of excavation reports, and even in these works ancient Greece is curiously absent. The ruins are presented without much theorizing about the spirit of the people who constructed them, and the description focuses on the contemporary landscape and the people populating it, scattered with anecdotes and phrases in Turkish or Greek to show the writers’ familiarity with the present land. The Greece being excavated in late nineteenth-century Ionia had a stronger link with the present land: both with the people living there as well as with contemporary German economic interests.

The old-school perspective that Humann, Wiegand, and their ilk were opposing still lived on but would lose out, not only because of Wiegand’s élan and influence, but also because of shifting geo-political circumstances. The policies implemented in Ionia can be contrasted with Ernst Curtius’ work at Olympia in Greece. Curtius was as a philologist who had studied under Karl Otfried Müller, among others. His approach to archaeology was informed by the German

---

Wiegand (1910) 3.
Sachphilologie, the philology of things, which Müller had promoted. Sachphilologie encouraged the study of objects with the same diligence as texts, but never doubted the primacy of text over material artifacts. Curtius had published an extensive history of Greece, which made clear his approach to Olympia. His Greek history centered on the achievements of the Classical era as the finest expression of art, and the work of Phidias as its highest expression. Phidias was said to have produced some of his finest work at Olympia, and the hope of recovering remains there motivated Curtius to fight for the excavation rights over many years. In the end, Curtius’ excavation did not fill the Berlin museums with classical sculpture as he had hoped, although this was due to circumstances beyond his control, namely the ban of export of antiquities that the young Greek state had issued. Curtius, too, was set on applying state-of-the-art methods in the field, but Phidias had not left behind much to find. Instead of the Phidian marbles that Curtius envisioned, the excavation yielded a disappointing number of “useless bronzes.”

Moreover, over the twenty years that it took for Curtius to obtain his excavation permit, the young Greek nation-state had considerably restricted the export of antiquities. As a result, Curtius was not able to bring many of the finds home to Germany. He still argued for the importance of the excavation, for scholarship and German pride, but in the age of state-sponsored archeology, scientific interest alone did not impress as much.

Instead of Classical Olympia, it was Hellenistic Ionia that came to dominate the image of Greece on the Museum Island. Humann and Wiegand were not led by concerns to find the finest Greece, but rather one that they could conceivably explore and exploit. The policies of the Ottoman Empire and the archaeologists’ good standing with its senior authorities also made the process of obtaining permits for excavation and export easier, at least relatively. Curiously,

Wiegand chose to open the 1904 Priene report with a detailed description of the entire process, from Humann’s application to the Ottoman issuance of the firman granting the excavation permit.\textsuperscript{278} The entire process, from application to the beginning of excavation, took less than a year. Perhaps Wiegand wanted to invite his reader to compare this administrative feat with the drawn-out process that Curtius had endured in Greece. Shifting circumstances at home and abroad meant that the adherents of Großarchaeologie came to continue and expand the legacy of the Museum Island. As a result, Berlin came to be filled with Hellenistic sculpture that had nothing of the solemn grandeur that Winckelmann had characterized as the pinnacle of Greek art. The lively composition of the Hellenistic Pergamon Altar caused something short of a scandal when arriving in Berlin and occasioned a heated debate on the merits of this ‘baroque’ antiquity.\textsuperscript{279} This initial response did not stop it from becoming a point of pride for the city as well as for Humann, its “discoverer,” and Wiegand, who oversaw the building of the museum that would house it.\textsuperscript{280} That Berlin’s collections had been comparatively small had been painfully obvious from the museum’s inception. This monument, finally, would make the Berlin displays as grand as those in London and Paris, even though it responded to needs different from the ideas behind the original antiquities collection.

The Greece produced by Humann and Wiegand not only looked different: its display also invited the visitor to relate to it in a new way. Humboldt had stressed the distance from which we must admire Greece. This notion was translated both into education and into the display style of the first museum, where Greek sculpture were presented as timeless masterpieces rather than historical artifacts. In contrast, Wiegand wished to present the ancient cities as “an image from

\textsuperscript{278} Wiegand and Schrader (1904) 3–4.
\textsuperscript{280} Schuchhard and Wiegand (1931).
the lively and sunny real Greek community.” Conversely, the exhibitions not only furnished the historical context, but allowed the visitors the sense of being present in this “real Greek community.” The Pergamon Altar offered—and still does—the visitor the peculiar sensation of being inside an ancient monument: peculiar, since for most visitors it is still unclear with what kind of architectural structure they are confronted.

The experience of identifying with the ancient city was also produced outside the museum. The Pergamon Altar quickly became identified as a symbol of German pride. The Ionian kingdom that had warded of the Gauls, imagined as a form of proto-French nationals, offered a convenient parallel for the Prussian Empire. The celebration of the jubilee of the Royal Academy of Arts included a reconstructed temple that combined elements of the Pergamon Altar and the Zeus Temple at Olympia. This curious amalgam of styles represented all and no Greek period and, as Lionel Gossman has said, “made sense only as a celebration of German archaeological triumphs.” The same celebrations also included a panorama of ancient Pergamon, allowing visitors the sensation of gazing down on the ancient city (fig. 4). Official celebrations and museum visits gave citizens the opportunity to see themselves in the Greek world and transpose to the ancient city their own experience as citizens.

From 1880 to the First World War, ancient Greece became more real, more physically present in Berlin. While displays moved away from distanced idealizing, the importance of Greece became its very presence, in the German capital here and now, conflating the experience of ancient people and modern citizens.

---

281 Wiegand (1910) 3.
282 Bilsel (2012) has discussed the problems that this impression of “authenticity” carries with it, then and now.
Winckelmann and Humboldt had encouraged their compatriots to aim to become the Greeks of modernity, spirits reborn from antiquity but adapted to this time and climate. This goal would be achieved by admiring the Greeks in their highest forms at a distance. That the museum in fact had little to exhibit from this era was hopefully to be corrected in the future. When this future arrived and the island was filled with Greek antiquities, however, not from the period that Winckelmann and the generation that followed him had held as the pinnacle, but from what they considered the decline of the ancient world. The same political and scholarly circumstances that increased the presence of Greek antiquities in Berlin also brought with them changes in the ways that Greece was explored and engaged with.

Greece was presented not as in the original museum—as a distant past to be admired—but as a real living society. Großarchäologie and the empirical methods it applied allowed cities to be excavated in their entirety. A new generation of archaeologists, less concerned with hierarchical art-historical canons, insisted on also displaying finds that did not conform to idealizing ideas of Greek art. Finally, state sponsorship presented German archaeological achievements as a point of pride for the citizens at home. Without these changes, it is doubtful that the Baubo statuettes would have emerged or put on display. But, it was Wiegand’s goal to present the cities as lived places, in all their idiosyncrasies.

The exploration and presentation of ancient Greece had always been closely intertwined with the exploration of what was German, and as Germany evolved and changed, so did the ancient Greece it looked to as a foil for its own identity. In the nineteenth century, ancient Greece was not stable in time and space, but instead moved from the classical, democratic Athens of the neo-classicists to the Hellenistic, monarchical Ionia of the German Empire. Its
character changed too: from the naïve, idealized childhood of man, to the *bürgerlich* cities of the Ionian coast. The changing representation of Greece also reflected a change about why Greece should be presented at all. The original idea of the museum was to present an idealized Greece, admired from a distance to inspire a better future. In the 1880s, after the founding of the German nation, this future seemed to have already arrived, although perhaps not in the form that the Romantics would have hoped. Greece was now presented as a place not in an unattainable past, but a present to step into and identify with.
Towards the end of the introduction to the second edition of Die fröhliche Wissenschaft, Nietzsche suggests that: “Perhaps truth is a woman (...). Perhaps, if we were to speak Greek, her name would be Baubo.” The suggestion is surprising and wrapped in contradictions. Earlier in the introduction, Nietzsche states that truth is no longer truth when her veils are removed. To learn, following this, that truth might have a name, and that this might be Baubo raises more questions than it answers. Among figures from Greek myth, Baubo is not illustrious or well known. Nietzsche’s contemporaries might have associated her with the scene of obscene exposure at Eleusis, or as the witch riding to Walpurgis in Goethe’s Faust I. This indecent female would seem a curious name for truth, traditionally pictured as a solemn goddess. What did the name Baubo represent for Nietzsche, and what does it mean that truth can perhaps be called thus?

Recent feminist readings, most of them influenced by Sarah Kofman’s article “Baubo: Theological Perversion and Fetishism,” often read Baubo as a positive figure of female sexuality in Nietzsche. Kofman refers to unsupported archaeological and philological “evidence” to argue that Baubo is a personification of the vulva. Others have followed her in referring to ancient sources that explains the character of Baubo—occasionally even pointing to the Priene statuettes, of which Nietzsche was unaware. It is striking that scholars such as Kofman, who recognize

284 “Vielleicht ist die Wahrheit ein Weib (...)? Vielleicht ist ihr Name, griechisch zu reden, Baubo?” KGA V,2: 20.
286 Kofman’s main source for the claim that Baubo means vulva is the hapax legomenon “babon” from Herondas that refers to a dildo. I have outlined in Chapter Two how this word gave rise to an etymology that explained Baubo’s name as vulva and the figure itself as a personified vulva. Kofman supports this reading with comparisons to Japanese mythology as well as with unsupported claims, for example that the vulva was celebrated at Eleusis.
287 See Chapter Three of this dissertation for a discussion on how these statuettes were found and came to be known as Baubo. Thorgeirsdottir (2012) 70, for example, states that “paintings and sculptures of Baubo often depict her
Nietzsche’s arguments on the contingency of truth, fall back on universalizing or unsupported “evidence” to explain Baubo. Kofman, for example, refers to Japanese myths to show that all stories of women exposing themselves have meant the same thing. Moreover, despite their wide range, these explanations omit Nietzsche’s discussions of the Eleusinian mysteries, the context in which ancient sources place Baubo. More importantly, explaining Nietzsche’s text through ancient evidence of what Baubo is ignores the critique of positivist scholarship within which Nietzsche’s Baubo is embedded. This chapter unravels Nietzsche’s associations with and sources for Baubo. It situates Baubo within Nietzsche’s critique of knowledge production and shows that she was a figure internal to Nietzsche situating himself within nineteenth-century debates on truth and knowing.

I do not propose a new reading of truth or of the woman in Nietzsche, rather, it looks at how Nietzsche deployed Baubo in the context of reconsidering the role of German scholarship at the end of the nineteenth century. Nietzsche’s critique of Wissenschaft was echoed in ancient scholarship at the end of the nineteenth century, particularly in the rhetoric of the Priene archaeologists. Like Nietzsche, scholars such as Wiegand and Humann (who excavated Priene) defined their work as a rejection of the historicism and positivism that had characterized the mid-nineteenth century and described their own scholarly project as one concerned with life instead of the dead. Apart from rhetoric, however, their understanding of the role of history in modern society differs sharply from Nietzsche’s. Nietzsche and the Priene archaeologists offered two different responses to the question of what place scholarship should hold for their era. Nietzsche reclaimed Goethe’s legacy partly in response to nationalist interests coopting Goethe as a poet of

with her skirt held up, displaying her belly, and at times with a baby coming out of her womb,” it is not clear what artworks she is referring to, especially since no paintings associated with Baubo have survived from antiquity.
the German spirit that had been realized in the German nation, a project in which Wiegand’s excavation and museum work was deeply invested.

Nietzsche used the figure of Baubo to express his critique of the empirical Wissenschaft to which Wiegand would devote his work. While the name Baubo might not have been familiar to Nietzsche’s readers, the context that he places her within would have been. In Die fröhliche Wissenschaft, Nietzsche lets Baubo take the place of the goddess of nature in a pastiche on the motif of unveiling truth or nature in the guise of an ancient goddess. This motif had been a common allegory for man’s relation to nature and truth since the Renaissance, both in natural sciences and poetry. Referring to the image allows Nietzsche to situate himself in this tradition and to mark his legacy from Goethe, who used this image to state that nature itself is the veil, not what is underneath it. Baubo’s surprising appearance in the Fröhliche Wissenschaft alerts us to the different relation to truth that Nietzsche’s Fröhliche—joyful—Wissenschaft enacts.

By putting Baubo in the place of the goddess, Nietzsche makes her the matrix of a creative, Dionysian form of Wissen. Baubo points to the contingency of truth and the possibility of a Wissenschaft that rejects the aims and methods of what is considered vernünftig, reasonable. Nietzsche’s underlining of his copy of Franz Anton von Besnard’s edition of Arnobius Against the Pagans testifies to Nietzsche’s interest in Arnobius’ description of the mysteries. Besnard’s edition offers a link between Fröhliche Wissenschaft and Nietzsche’s reflection on the mysteries in Geburt der Tragödie and on Baubo’s role within both projects. She emerges as a figure that reveals as much as she hides, or rather points to an absence, giving her and the Fröhliche Wissenschaft a particularly Dionysian relationship to truth.
The usefulness of truth and knowledge had been an issue in Nietzsche’s earliest writings but came to a head after his controversy with the German academic establishment. *Fröhliche Wissenschaft* was first published in 1882, shortly after Nietzsche’s deteriorating health had forced him to resign from his position at the University of Basel. His career in the academy had been short-lived. The scandal that his first book, *Die Geburt der Tragödie*, caused within the philological establishment had effectively ended any hopes of an academic career in Germany. Thus, instead of a first step towards a career in German philology, Basel became Nietzsche’s first and only permanent position. Despite the young scholar’s infamy and dwindling numbers of students, however, the university continued to support him and provided him with a pension when he eventually became too ill to teach.288

Nietzsche was taken aback by the German backlash to his first book, but although the critique was unexpected, it was not unrelated to his own ideas of scholarship and his place in academia. The attacks were spearheaded by the young Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, a fellow graduate from the prestigious Schulpforta. The future careers of the two budding scholars reflect what was at stake in their conflict. Wilamowitz would go on to become Berlin’s leading philologist, following in the footsteps of his mentor and later father-in-law, Theodor Mommsen. Meanwhile, Nietzsche’s continued work was marked by his distance from the academic establishment as he explored what a different kind of *Wissenschaft* would entail and aspire to.

The charge that Wilamowitz put forward most forcibly was that Nietzsche’s work was...

---

288 Gossman (2002) offers an insightful portrait of Basel around the time when Nietzsche arrived presents an image of the city that due to its economic situation after the canton wars were willing to take a chance on young untested and even provoking talents while cultivating a reactionary academic climate opposing the liberal tendencies of the Berlin University. See especially Chapter Four, on Nietzsche’s and Overbeck, 413ff.
unscholarly, unwissenschaftlich. If anything, he argued, it belonged to philosophy, not philology. Nietzsche did indeed ask to be transferred to the philosophy department at Basel (a request that was turned down), but more importantly, Wilamowitz’s accusation that Nietzsche’s work was not Wissenschaft did not necessarily contradict Nietzsche’s own standpoint. Nietzsche not only distanced himself from the kind of positivist scholarship represented by Wilamowitz, but questioned the very place of Wissenschaft in contemporary life. In his Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen, published shortly after the controversy around Geburt, Nietzsche attacked historicism’s failure to contribute to life. In the essay “Von Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben” Nietzsche argues that the current age is suffering from a historical fever, a hunger for facts that begs the question whether they are in any way useful for life today. This fever for facts produces intellectuals that resemble a snake after eating too big a prey, stuffed with “inner life” but incapable of action, dictionaries filled with knowledge inside but with unassuming exteriors. The problem, Nietzsche asserts, goes back to the mistake of including history in a narrow definition of Wissenschaft, that is, to consider the only valid engagement with the past to be a conventional, academic approach that aims to uncover the truth. This restricted definition of what it means to know the past forecloses other ways of knowing, including creative, inspired, Dionysian modes. The aim to lay bare the past in all its details never adds to life, Nietzsche argued, never contributes to making life greater. Rather, it perpetuates the idea of life and humanity as static, unable to develop. Life and action, Nietzsche concludes, depends on

---

289 Gründer (1969) has collected the texts responding to the controversy, such as Moellendorff’s Zukunftsp hilologie! and the texts published in defence by Nietzsche’s friend and colleague Erwin Rohde.
291 KGA, III, 1:10.
forgetting more than knowing. *Fröhliche Wissenschaft* continues this critique and attempts to enact its opposite, a *Wissenschaft* that creates rather than uncovers.

As Nietzsche wrote to his friend Erwin Rohde, *Fröhliche Wissenschaft*’s title refers to the Provençal expression for the art of the troubadours.292 He expands this idea in *Ecce Homo*, explaining that the concept of *gaya scienza* stands for the unity of singer, knight and free spirit.293 Taking on the role of troubadour, Nietzsche uses this work to write a philosophy that is closer to art than positivist *Wissenschaft*. Nietzsche anticipated the cool response that the book would receive among his friends and colleagues. The book’s aphorisms and poems are often light and humorous, concerned with the body and material life, and the tone was a far cry from his debut *Geburt der Tragödie*. Rohde as well as Nietzsche’s esteemed senior colleague, Jacob Burckhardt, both responded unenthusiastically. Nietzsche did not abandon the project, however. For the 1887 edition of the work, he added a fifth book, an appendix of songs and an introduction that expressed even more clearly this unconventional form of joyful *Wissenschaft* and its contrast to conventional reason.

**Baubo replacing the Goddess**

Baubo appears in the introduction that Nietzsche added to the second edition of *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft*. He would later quote the passage at the end of *Nietzsche contra Wagner*. Towards the end of the introduction, Nietzsche suggests: “Perhaps truth is a woman who has grounds not to show her grounds. Perhaps her name, if we are speaking Greek, is Baubo.”294

---

293 KGA VI, 3:331-2.
Baubo’s punctuation of the passage on truth is surprising, especially for the many who are unfamiliar with the name or have never associated it with truth. This surprise — even provocation, given Baubo’s obscene associations — was no doubt Nietzsche’s intention. The suggestion that truth might be called Baubo follows a reference to the veiled goddess, calling to mind this figure’s prevalence in German tradition, for example in Novalis and Schiller. At the place where we would expect a goddess of nature, or in a Nietzschean context perhaps Dionysos, Nietzsche instead puts Baubo. Often imagined as an old woman, Baubo is decidedly not a goddess; moreover, she is associated with the obscene act of unveiling herself to Demeter, yet here Nietzsche invokes her as someone who does not show. Further surprising is that before revealing that the name of truth might be Baubo, Nietzsche states that “we no longer believe that truth remains truth when you pull off her veil.”

Naming truth Baubo, Nietzsche forces his reader to ask whether this is really true and if Baubo indeed is truth, what grounds she is still not showing.

If truth is no longer truth when we pull off her veil it follows that any proclamations about what truth is must be false, or at least hypocritical. Nietzsche’s statement, however, is less an assertion than a suggestion with several reservations. Maybe truth is a woman and if so, and if we were to speak Greek, maybe we would call her Baubo. Baubo is not truth, but a name attached to truth if one is speaking Greek. What Baubo reveals is not what truth is, but that truth is not a fixed concept.

The suggestion that truth might be called Baubo is unexpected because we have learned to call truth by a different name, because we have not been speaking Greek. Before introducing Baubo, Nietzsche reminds his reader about the German-language tradition of truth. The Baubo-vignette in *Fröhliche Wissenschaft* is a pastiche on a well-known allegory of man’s inquiry into nature, the unveiling of an ancient goddess. Nietzsche signals this tradition by prefacing Baubo’s appearance with a reference to the temple at Sais.

You will hardly find us back on the path of those Egyptian youths who make the temple unsafe at night, embracing statues and who, in general, attempts to unveil, uncover and place in the harsh light everything that for good reasons have been kept under cover.

The motif of the goddess’ veiled statue goes back to Plutarch’s description of the temple at Sais in Egypt in *Moralia* V. Plutarch reports an inscription on the base of the statue of Isis—whom he identifies with Athena—that reads “I am all that has been, and is, and shall be, and my robe no mortal has yet uncovered.” Plutarch’s quote from Sais recalls an aphorism from Heraclitus stating that “nature loves to hide.” Beginning in the Renaissance, both two quotes became connected to the image of the veiled goddess of nature. The use of this motif has had two main strands, which are not always separate. On the one hand, the unveiled goddess was used to illustrate progress in the natural sciences. On the other, it was picked up in mystical, pantheistic and Spinozist circles, where the goddess that cannot be unveiled was read as a statement of an all-encompassing divinity. In the German-speaking world, Kant’s discussion of Johann Andreas

---

296 For a history of the image of a personified nature and its deployment in discourses on man’s relation to nature from antiquity see Hadot (2006) Hadot discusses Nietzsche and nature in 200ff.

297 KGA, V,2:20.


299 Φύσις κρύπτεσθαι φιλεῖ (B123) Graham has pointed out that the quote ought rather to be read as “it is part of nature’s characteristics to hide,” Graham (2003). Hadot (2006) structures his book around the responses to Heraclitus’ fragment.
von Segner’s frontispiece to *Einleitung in die Naturlehre* fueled the importance of the motif among the Romantics and beyond, tying it to discussions of what is possible to know about nature through science viz. other approaches.

Although the goddess, when she was named, was mostly identified as Isis, modern illustrations of the scene often depicted her as the iconography of the multi-breasted Ephesian Artemis.\(^{300}\) Beginning in the seventeenth century, images of the unveiled goddess became popular in frontispieces to scientific treatises. These images mostly display an unambiguously positive take on man’s control over nature. For example, Blasius’s frontispiece to his 1681 *Anatome Animalium* shows a multi-breasted goddess unveiled by personified Knowledge (fig. 6). Surrounding the two figures are symbols of subdued nature, such as an elephant gaping in awe and a pacified lion kept on a leash. Anton van Leeuwenhoek, pioneer of microbiology and inventor of the microscope, used a similar image of the unveiled nature for several of his self-published works between 1685 and 1719 (fig. 7). In this image, the goddess lifts her veil to present her body for inspection. Two older men behind her and two female personifications flanking her direct the viewer’s attention to her lower torso, from which toads and insects swarm out of a cornucopia.\(^{301}\) About these early modern examples of the unveiling-motif, Hadot writes that they did not “imply any metaphysical affirmation regarding nature. Isis simply represented natural phenomena, and her unveiling symbolized the progress of a science.”\(^{302}\) Hadot’s claim is a simplification. Early on the image became a tool for debating man’s relationship to nature and

---

\(^{300}\) The syncretism of Isis and Ephesian Artemis goes back to antiquity. The iconography of Artemis Ephesia is easily recognizable by her many chest protuberances. These were likely meant as a depiction of ornament hung on the cult statue, but were misunderstood as breast from late antiquity onwards. Isis, but not Artemis, was associated with veils, while the image of the multi-breasted goddess fitted with a tradition connecting breasts with nature since the middle ages and so, since the renaissance, the notion of the multi-breasted Isis as a goddess of nature spread. On the reception of the many breasted goddess see, Tevebring (2012) and Hadot (1982).

\(^{301}\) For a summary of the modern reception of the Ephesian Artemis see Tevebring (2012).

his prerogative to investigate her. Carl von Linnaeus, for example, chose the multi-breasted
goddess to introduce his *Systema Naturae*, in which he made the controversial claim that humans
are a part of the animal kingdom, specifically the class mammals, “animals of the breast.” The
veiled goddess would also illustrate the limits of knowing nature. In Segner’s 1770 frontispiece,
two putti are examining the footsteps of nature, shown as a veiled female with her back turned to
the viewer but identified as Egyptian Isis by her sistrum—an ancient Egyptian instrument (fig.8).
Underneath the image is written “Qua licet,” in so far as it is permitted, signaling that
investigating nature is a question of decency, not just skill.

Immanuel Kant discusses Segner’s frontispiece in a footnote to *Kritik der Urteilskraft*,
connecting the image to Plutarch’s quote from the temple at Sais. Kant explains that Isis is
“mother nature” and notes that Segner prefaces his introduction to the natural sciences with an
image that cautions against believing that it is possible to know everything about nature.

Following Kant’s reference, the image would have a prolific afterlife in German poetry and
literature after 1800. These responses were also influenced by French and Italian traditions,
where the veiled goddess had been used as an allegory for hermeneutical processes—for
example, on the frontispiece of the *Encyclopédie*, where the veiled truth is depicted surrounded
by allegories for the arts and sciences. In the German-speaking world, Freemasonry and
pantheistic influences had brought new attention to the themes of initiation and revelation, and

---

303 Schiebinger (1993) 382–411. See also Steigerwald (2006) 54–82, on notions of gender in the composition of
Alexander von Humboldt’s frontispiece. The use of the unveiling motif within gendered discussions of natural
sciences is a rich topic too vast to discuss here, where I note only Leeuwenhoek’s important contribution to the
knowledge of human reproductive systems and Linnaeus’s advocacy against wet-nurses and for the importance for
mother to breastfeed their children themselves.

304 Cf. Segner’s use with the grave stele of the Danish naturalist Otto Friedrich Müller, shows death pulling aside the
curtain and revealing a temple. The inscription reads: “guided by experience he stepped into the temple of nature,
after removing her veil, he saw the Goddess’s face.” Discussed in Nielsen (2009) 477.

305 Kant (1902) V: 316.

306 On the response to the image in France, see Zorach (2005) 123.
with it the question of who should or can know truth. These joint influences gave rise to the imagery of veiled nature as a symbol of universal divinity and hence truth, loading with new significance the question of who was allowed to look under her veil. In its afterlife in German literature, the image was often deployed to question who could approach nature through which methods. These visual debates addressed the sexual dynamic and implicit violence of a woman being disrobed—in almost all cases—by a man. Alternative ways to engage with nature were illustrated by respectful, consensual interactions with the female nature. This reading of the motif continued the discussions that the image had been tied to in the natural sciences, although the continuity was not always recognized as such. Instead poets often used the image to contrast a poetic approach to nature with that of the sciences, which they characterized in similar terms as Hadot, namely as mechanistic and uncomplicated.

Schiller and Novalis

The goddess of nature had mostly been depicted as a statue unveiled by another female personification—science or knowledge—or a male scientist. Starting around 1800, nature was increasingly depicted and described as a woman with her own opinion about who may undress her. Different approaches to nature were compared to the difference between seducing a woman and violently robbing her of her veil, making the question of how to know nature an issue of respect and decorum. Schiller based his 1795 poem “Das verschleierte Bild zu Sais” on the quote from Plutarch. The poem tells of a young novice at Sais who ventures to unveil the goddess’ statue, despite the warnings from an aged hierophant that the goddess does not tolerate being

---

unveiled by those who are not appropriately prepared. What he sees leaves him dumbstruck and depressed, unable ever to recount his experience. Novalis responded with a different take on the motif in a story embedded in the novel *Die Lehrlinge zu Sais*, posthumously published in 1802. Here, Hyacinthus leaves his lover Rosenblütchen to travel the world in pursuit of knowledge only to face her again when he lifts the veil at Sais. In the same work, Novalis compares the ways scientists and poets approach nature, noting that while the poet seduces nature, the scientist can only dissect her dead body. Novalis’ seduction of nature recalls Schiller’s addition to Plutarch: that no mortal can look under the veil “until she removes it herself.” Both poets use the sexual tension in the motif to illustrate the differences in pursuing nature.

*Goethe*

Schiller and Novalis describe characters that are driven by the urge to unveil nature, whether this is actually possible or not. Meanwhile, Goethe used the veiled goddess to suggest that the very thought of looking under the veil is to misunderstand what nature is. Returning several times to the image, Goethe used it to argue that there is nothing underneath the veil, but that nature is the veil. In the 1826 poem *Genius die Büste der Natur enthüllend*, truth can be found in every direction, except behind the veil.

Laß den Augen nicht gelüsten!
Sphinx-Natur, ein Ungeheuer,
Schreckt sie dich mit hundert Brüsten.

Suche nicht verborgne Weihe!
Unter‘m Schleier laß das Starre!
Willst du leben, guter Narre,
Sieh nur hinter dich in's Freie.

Ansgaun, wenn es dir gelingt,
Daß es erst in's Innre dringt,
Dann nach außen wiederkehrt,
Bist am herrlichsten belehrt.\(^{308}\)

As the figure of the Sphinx—nature shows, trying to penetrate nature is not only foolish, but also dangerous. It is not possible to discover a permanent core of nature; instead nature is change and flux, often through violence, decay, and death.

The image of the unveiled goddess had been deployed in celebrations of science’s investigation of nature or to question whether there are other, better, ways to approach truth. Goethe turns the image into a critique of truth-seeking itself as practiced in historical *Wissenschaft* as well as in natural sciences. In the sixth of his *Zahme Xenien* Goethe puts his critique bluntly: “*Isis zeigt sich ohne Schleier; Doch der Mensch, er hat den Star.*”\(^{309}\) Those who insist on finding truth have themselves created a veil that hinders them from seeing. The essence of nature lies not beyond or underneath, nor in any of its parts, but in its entirety as it appears to us. Goethe’s critique of searching for truth in the parts extended beyond natural sciences. The poem continues by attacking Isaac Newton and Friedrich Creuzer. Goethe saw an analogy between Newton’s experiments with breaking light and Creuzer’s analysis of ancient myths,

---

\(^{308}\) Respect the mystery;
Let not your eyes give way to lust.
Nature the Sphinx, a monstrous thing,
Will terrify you with her innumerable breasts.

Seek no secret initiation
Beneath the veil; leave alone what is fixed.
If you want to live, poor fool,
Look only behind you, toward empty space.

If you succeed in making your intuition
First penetrate within,
Then return toward the outside,
Then you will be instructed in the best way


\(^{309}\) Isis shows herself without veils
But man has cataracts
Goethe (1902).
which sought to explain the meaning of myths through the etymologies of the names they contained. For Goethe, both Creuzer and Newton used methods that violated their subject matter without adding anything to the appreciation of it. Any “meaning” of a myth or of nature lies in the impression it makes, not in details that only an expert could illuminate. As I discussed in Chapter Two, Goethe’s Baubo is connected to the indecency of this kind of scholarship. In the essay “Verstäubung, Verdunstung, Vertropfung,” Baubo links the ancient scholars and natural scientists that are both too keen on finding intimate truths. It is this Baubo that Nietzsche inherits and involves in his own project of rethinking Wissenschaft. Nietzsche plays up the sexual tension inherent in the unveiling motif but follows Goethe in connecting Baubo’s indecency to unseemly attempts to learn the intimate details of history or nature.

*Jenseits von Gut und Böse*—Supposing that truth is a woman...

Introducing *Fröhliche Wissenschaft* with the Goethean Baubo, Nietzsche makes a joke of the earnest truth-seeking that the veiled goddess had been connected to. We will return to the importance of joking below when discussing the legacy of Goethe’s image of nature as constant and violent change. This was not the only time Nietzsche addressed the notion of approaching nature/truth as a woman. The second, reworked, edition of *Fröhliche Wissenschaft* appeared during Nietzsche’s extraordinarily productive period in the 1880s, following *Also sprach Zarathustra*. As he was completing the preface to *Fröhliche Wissenschaft* in 1886, *Jenseits von Gut und Böse* was published with an introduction that also recalled the motif of truth as a woman.

The first sentence of *Jenseit’s* introduction echoes the question in *Fröhliche Wissenschaft*: “Vorausgesetzt, dass die Wahrheit ein Weib ist —, wie?” As in *Fröhliche Wissenschaft*
Wissenschaft, this is a conditional statement: “Supposing truth is a woman —, what then?”

Nietzsche claims no more that truth is woman than that she is Baubo. To suppose that truth is a woman is a perspective, just as calling her Baubo is. The question is what is gained through looking at truth in this way, as has been done in the long tradition of describing truth as a veiled goddess? For Nietzsche, the answer is clear:


310 Would’t we have good cause to say that all philosophers, at least insofar as they were dogmatics, understood women poorly? That the terrified earnestness and awkward insistence with which they have approached truth is an inept and indeed indecent way to win a lady? KSA, V:9.
311 “und jede Art von Dogmatik steht heute mit betrübter und muthloser Haltung da. Wenn sie überhaupt noch steht!” KGA VI,2:3.
312 Friedrich Nietzsche, Götzen-Dämmerung, KGA. VI, 3:69.
Nietzsche’s notion of truth changes through his work, but is always tied to the question of what the aim of truth might be.\textsuperscript{313} To judge something as true is to judge its usefulness for life, not to recognize any inherent truth value beyond life.\textsuperscript{314} Wissenschaft, like truth, is a means to an end; it is a judgement or, as Kofman points out, a perspective.\textsuperscript{315} Since we must always look from at least one perspective, there is no standpoint from which truth can be determined without a relation to life and the material world. While this would mean that there is no perspective on truth that is per se wrong, there is a perversity in denying any perspective at all, of claiming to find truth as such.

If the will to truth is about its usefulness, might there not be a different use for untruths? Vernunft, reason, is concerned with truths that are useful to conserve immediate life according to conventional morals and reasoning. Those who use their Vernunft value as true the things that serve to retain their immediate, individual life. If, however, we recognize a different aim for life beyond the life of the individual, would this not be tied to a different truth? What can we achieve if we instead follow a queer reason, Quervernunft, or even foolishness, Unvernunft? Nietzsche repeatedly reminds his readers that forgetting and thinking against reason is a means of supporting life that is greater than the life of the individual. The introduction of Jenseits ends with a reference to those who do not look at truth as a woman, the free thinkers of Europe. With Fröhliche Wissenschaft, especially in its second iteration, Nietzsche continues his critique and presents his readers with a text that seeks to realizes this foolish perspective on truth.

\textsuperscript{313} Nietzsche often ties truth to woman. Kofman (1988) has outlined the development of Nietzsche’s truth-woman figure, noting that the later Nietzsche increasingly sees truth as feminine, a weapon yielded by the weak against the strong.

\textsuperscript{314} Cf. KGA VIII, 2: 29-32, Fragments 9{60}.

\textsuperscript{315} Kofman (1988) 190. Cf. Nietzsche’s argument in Geburt, that Dionysos was resent in Greek tragedy through the audience’s act of putting him there through their imagination, Vorstellung. KSG III: #8.
In its conventional nineteenth-century German-European guise, Wissenschaft is hostile to life because it insists on the perversion, or indecency to attempt uncover truth as such. Refusing to recognize the creative, productive relation to truth, it can only perpetuate what is already known, making life stagnant, only able to wait for death. Fröhliche Wissenschaft explores this antithesis between life and knowledge and what it means to create new truth that makes life greater beyond death. In the second edition, the juxtaposition between life and knowledge is laid out from the first sentence. Nietzsche asks whether those who have not experienced the same (erlebt) will understand the book any better by prefixes (Vorreden). That Nietzsche continues by calling the book an Erlebnis (an experience)—something lived—marks its different premise than other books, it is life rather than knowledge. Experience and prefix, life and words: these oppositions are repeated in Nietzsche’s Baubo. Nietzsche states that Baubo has reasons not to show her reasons, she is (perhaps) “…ein Weib, das Gründe hat, ihre Gründe nicht sehen zu lassen.” The German Gründe relates reasons to foundations. To begründen is to give a basis for arguments, to make them firm and stable. For Nietzsche, Gründe is the characteristic of dialectics, the form of philosophical argument that prioritizes reasoning over action and that has dominated since Socrates. Before Socrates, the Greeks were wary towards those who presented their grounds and would caution their children against dialectics. Anything that needs the support of truth is not worth much, Nietzsche concludes. Gründe belongs to the static, uncreative knowledge that cannot enhance life. Arguing from Gründe is to pretend that

317 KGA VI,3: 63-4.
318 Ibid. 64. Cf. Fröhliche Wissenschaft, Young powder kegs ready for action will not be convinced by Gründe, KGA, V,2: 80.
knowledge has a foundation, an ultimate beginning and goal instead of being continuously created. Baubo rejects *Gründe* and instead points us to a Greek truth. The Greeks were artists, Nietzsche argues, because they knew how to remain on the surface, at the appearance of things. They are superficial “out of profundity,” he continues. Remaining on the surface means to have the courage to engage with and shape the world, through philosophy, creative arts or religion, rather than to search for a “truth” beyond appearance or a foundation underneath your argument.

What does staying on the surface entail for a *Wissenschaft*? Why does it require courage and humor? Refusing *Gründe*, Baubo appears as a joking fool unconcerned by reason and logic. Her very appearance is a joke that Nietzsche plays on his reader, as he replaces the desirable goddess with a foolish old woman. This embrace of the unattractive is as emblematic for Nietzsche’s new *Wissenschaft* as is the gaiety. Nietzsche plays on the motif of nature-truth as a desirable woman, connecting the sexual thematic to productivity. But to the sexual he adds something painful and repulsive, like the caress of a fur filled with prigs. The introduction mentions another woman, an unfaithful one that we love although we do not trust her. Nietzsche’s nature is not the generous, laughing nature that Novalis flirts with, but the sphinx-nature of Goethe that has no care or meaning for human life. Life is painful. To live though this pain and to learn to love it takes courage. Loving pain goes against *Vernunft*, however, meaning that not only Baubo-truth, but those who seek her, are foolish. Dialectics, morals and religion offer reasons, *Gründe*, for life’s pain which is why they are a support and comfort for the weak.

---

319 Cf. KGA V,2:16.
320 KGA, V,2:20.
322 Cf. KGA, VI:3 "Endlich die Liebe, die in die Natur zurückübersetzte Liebe! Nicht die Liebe einer "höheren Jungfrau"! Keine Senta-Sentimentalität! Sonden die Liebe als Fatum, als Fatalität, cynisch, unschuldig, grausam - und eben darin Natur!".
Baubo rejects *Gründe*, she does not offer the grieving Demeter consolation; instead, she responds to the goddess’s pain with a joke. It is this combination of gayety, *Heiterkeit*, and violence, and the apparent foolishness of seeking it out that makes Baubo’s truth specifically Greek and ties her to that central Nietzschean figure, Dionysos.

**Tragedy and Mystery in Franz Anton von Besnard**

In 1884 Nietzsche wrote his mother asking her to bring him from his library a translation by Franz Anton von Besnard of Arnobius’ *Against the Pagans*.\(^{323}\) Besnard’s translation was published in 1842 and Nietzsche had likely already acquired it already as a student. The edition includes an extensive commentary which sometimes strays far from Arnobius’ text. Besnard’s notes on Demeter’s mourning and arrival at Eleusis evolve into an exposé on the Greek mysteries that only tangentially returns to the words of Arnobius. Nietzsche’s enthusiastic underlining of his copy testifies his interest in these pages (fig. 9). In *Götzen-Dämmerung*, Nietzsche would paraphrase and even quote from Besnard’s text. A comparison with Nietzsche’s description of the mysteries in *Geburt der Tragödie* confirms that Besnard was an influence already for this text.\(^{324}\) The close similarities between the two accounts shed light on how Nietzsche imagined Baubo’s role at the mysteries and her relation to Dionysos.

*Geburt der Tragödie* contains Nietzsche’s most thorough discussion of the Eleusinian mysteries, the home of Baubo. Nietzsche explores the parallels between the tragedies and the mysteries as two places where the Dionysian spirit of the Greeks was expressed. The climax of

---

\(^{323}\) Besides the book, he also asked his mother to bring him some warmer socks. Letter from Friedrich Nietzsche to Franziska Nietzsche, September 20, 1884, KSA, III: 536.

\(^{324}\) Nietzsche’s copy has been digitalized and is available through the Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek Arnobius and Besnard (1842), klassik-stiftung.de September 28, 2017. [http://haab-digital.klassik-stiftung.de/viewer/image/1236105648/1/LOG_0000/](http://haab-digital.klassik-stiftung.de/viewer/image/1236105648/1/LOG_0000/).
the initiations at Eleusis was mirrored, according to Nietzsche, in the myth of Demeter’s smile when she is told she may “give birth to Dionysos once again.”325 Dionysos’ appearance in Geburt, much like Baubo’s in Fröhliche Wissenschaft, is surprising. Ancient sources do not associate Dionysos with Eleusis, nor identify as Demeter’s son. In ancient accounts, such as the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, the child that Demeter mourns when she arrives at Eleusis is her daughter Kore/Persephone and it is she who eventually returns to her mother together with the fertility of the lands. Nietzsche’s claim, however, appears in a different light when we recognize Besnard’s influence on Nietzsche’s understanding of the mysteries and the importance that Besnard attributes to Dionysos.

Besnard rejects the prevalent notion that the mysteries amounted to a celebration of agriculture. While this was certainly one element, he argues, it does not reflect the festival’s complexity. He especially targets Christian Lobeck’s view, put forward in Aglaophamus, that the mysteries did not transmit a religious knowledge different from other Greek rituals. Besnard thus took the side of Lobeck’s opponent, Friedrich Creuzer, whom he quotes extensively in support of his own description. Lobeck’s work had largely been a response to Creuzer’s claim that the mysteries taught religious knowledge inherited from Eastern religions. Lobeck rejected this view and any explanation of the mysteries that included esoteric or foreign knowledge. In his commentary, Besnard ridicules Lobeck’s attempt to explain the significance of the mysteries, paraphrasing the wording from Aglaophamus; was all that was conveyed at the mysteries really that man occasionally lives from fruits, that wine makes one happy, and that plants grow in the spring and die in the fall?326 This paraphrasing of Lobeck by Besnard reappears word for word in

---

325 KSG III,1: 67-69.
326 Arnobius and Besnard (1842) 557. Christian August Lobeck (1829), 180.
Nietzsche’s own ridicule of Lobeck in *Götzen-Dämmerung*.\footnote{KGA, VI, 3: 152.} Nietzsche continues his critique with a quote from Lobeck in German in which Lobeck explains that the mysteries originated from the fact that the Greeks, when they had nothing better to do, “ran around, raging, laughing or, since man occasionally also feels this way, they sat down and cried.”\footnote{Arnobius and Besnard (1842) 564, cf. KGA, VI,3: 152-4. Quoted from Lobeck (1829) I, 672.} This quote also comes from Besnard’s commentary and borrows Besnard’s translation into German from Lobeck’s Latin original. Although Nietzsche never mentions Besnard, his critique of Lobeck is a continuation of Besnard’s and relies on the same examples to illustrate it. These are the only two passages from Lobeck that Nietzsche cites and both appear to be lifted from Besnard.\footnote{This has also been noted by Ebanoidse (2012) 552-56, who, however, does not follow this further.}

Besnard’s influence on Nietzsche is clear not only from Nietzsche’s critique of Lobeck, but in the characterization of the mysteries in *Geburt*. Besnard’s description of the mysteries anticipated many of the central themes and scenes in Nietzsche. The mysteries were concerned with larger themes than the annual harvest, Besnard argues; they were a celebration of “the one and eternal, living, animated nature,” and the continuation of life beyond the death of the individual.\footnote{Arnobius and Besnard (1842) 559.} This knowledge was conveyed in myths and symbols of sexuality, the gods’ suffering and death, incest—underlined twice by Nietzsche—and ecstasy. This complex acknowledgement of life as well as death has been hard to stomach for “the enemies of positive religion,” Besnard argues, but is essential to understanding the character of the mysteries.\footnote{Ibid.} The Greeks did not celebrate the fact that this year, too, plants will grow, but the awe-inspiring realization that life and nature continue despite continuous death. This notion was conveyed most forcefully in the myth of Dionysos’ rebirth as lacchos after his slaughter. The reenactment of this
myth, according to Besnard, was the culmination the combined celebrations of the Eleusinia and the Thesmophoria.\textsuperscript{332}

Placing Iacchos at the center of the mysteries requires some conjecture on Besnard’s part. The name Iacchos does play an important role at Eleusis, but the figure that the name refers to is elusive. The Eleusinian initiations were preceded by a procession in which the initiates, shouting \textit{iacchos}, were led to Eleusis by the \textit{iakchagōgós}, who carried Iacchos’ statue.\textsuperscript{333} That Iacchos had a statue and sanctuary indicates that Iacchos was the name of a divine figure, not only the initiates’ shout. Classical sources associate Iacchos with Dionysos, especially in his role as leader in ecstatic rituals. In Sophocles’ \textit{Antigone} (1115-1125), Iacchos is one of Dionysos’ many names. Similarly, in Euripides’ \textit{Bacchai} 275, Iacchos is identified with Bromios, another name for Dionysos. Two black-figure lekythoi from around 500 B.C. show Dionysos, identified as Dionysos Iacchos.\textsuperscript{334} In the Roman period, Iacchos became firmly established as a double of the similar sounding Bacchus, Dionysos in his Latin guise, and the two names were used interchangeably.\textsuperscript{335} This is not the case in the Greek sources, where Iacchos and Dionysos, although connected, always are always separated in cult.\textsuperscript{336} While it is often repeated in secondary literature that Iacchos is the son of Demeter, the sources for this statement are late and tentative. It is a conjecture based the fact that Iacchos is called a child in a few late ancient texts, most importantly Nonnos, writing in the fourth or fifth century A.D..\textsuperscript{337} These statements have

\begin{footnotes}
\item[332] Arnobius and Besnard (1842) 558.
\item[333] Graf (1974) 51-58, has summarized the sources for Iacchos. See also Jimenez san Cristobal (2012).
\item[335] Graf (1974) 52.
\item[336] Graf (1974) 54. See also Strabo, 10.3.30, who explains that Iacchos is the god addressed by the initiates at Eleusis.
\item[337] No iconographic evidence can be linked to Iacchos with certainty. Mylonas (1961) 208-13, reads a group of vase paintings showing Demeter receiving a child as references to a myth about the child Iacchos at the initiations.
\end{footnotes}
been read in conjunction with hints of a child at the mysteries. Vases from the fourth century B.C. onwards show Demeter with a child on her lap, and Diodorus Siculus (first ct. B.C.) writes that that Dionysos Zagreus is reborn from Persephone or Demeter (3.64.1.), suggesting that Iacchos appeared as a sacred child at the initiations. The most important sources for claims about Iacchos the child are the Church Fathers Clement, Eusebius, and Arnobius, whose accounts have been influential in reconstructing the events at the mysteries. Read together, these sources could indicate a late antique or Christian idea of Iacchos as a sacred child at the mysteries; there is, however, little that confirms that Classical sources also imagined Iacchos as a child.

Besnard draws on the above sources—Classical as well as Roman and Christian—to argue that Iacchos is a new guise of Dionysos and that he embodies the character of the mysteries. Besnard describes Iacchos as the son of Persephone and Zeus and as the adopted son of the god of the underworld. Iacchos’ mixed parentage from deities connected to life and death makes him the “lord of death” (underlined by Nietzsche, fig. 10). Importantly, this notion of Iacchos helps Besnard explain Arnobius’ cryptic wording of the meeting between Baubo and Demeter. Arnobius’ account of Demeter’s arrival in Eleusis follows Clement closely and might be a translation of it, apart from a few significant differences. Like Clement, Arnobius supports his summary of the Eleusinian myth with an Orphic quote. Whereas Clement’s quote mentions the child Iacchos arriving during Baubo’s exposure, however, Arnobius’ quote does not mention Iacchos, but suggest instead that Baubo’s display looks “boy-like.”

---

338 There is no iconographic evidence that can be linked to Iacchos with certainty. Mylonas reads a group of vase paintings showing Demeter receiving a child as references to a myth about the child Iacchos at the initiations. Mylonas (1961) 208-213.
339 Arnobius and Besnard (1842) 558.
340 I discuss the sources and the relation between Arnobius’ and Clement’s texts in Chapter One of this dissertation.
341 Arnobius, V:26,1: Baubo manu - nam puerilis ollis vultus erat - plaudit, contrectat amice.
version of the meeting between Baubo and Demeter at which Baubo appears to display a child when she exposes herself. Besnard’s commentary unpacks this scene and the significance of the unnamed boy whom Baubo appears to conjure from her body, identifying him with the boy Iacchos that Clement mentions. Having explained the significance of Iacchos, Besnard connects Baubo’s mythical display to the pivotal moment during the initiation. According to Besnard, what Baubo reveals to Demeter is the sexuality that warrants rebirth. By showing Iacchos, the reborn Dionysos, she reveals a promise of new life after destruction. Further, according to Besnard, Iacchos’ relation to Dionysos and his presence at the mysteries establish him as a link between Demeter and Dionysos: two deities that he argues are otherwise connected through the character of their festivals. The mysteries and tragedies grew out of the same sensation, Besnard concludes, anticipating Nietzsche’s connection of the mysteries and tragedy and the importance he too placed on Iacchos-Dionysos.

Nietzsche’s characterization of the mysteries in Geburt follows Besnard’s closely, both in its main themes and in many details. Like Besnard, Nietzsche argues that the suffering of the gods is the main theme of the mysteries. Seeing the gods suffering in their life justifies life for humans. Nietzsche also repeats that the rebirth of Dionysos is the culmination of the festival, and that Demeter’s smile is the mythical correspondent to this event:


342 Arnobius and Besnard (1842) 565.
343 KSG III,1: 67-69.
Besnard had described the same scene through a quote from Creuzer’s *Symbolik*. The wording is close to Nietzsche’s description in *Geburt*, including Demeter’s smile, which in Creuzer-Besnard is immediately connected to Baubo’s appearance (fig. 9):

> Ein heiterer Blick fährt durch das Verborgene und das schöpferische Vermögen, das Zeugende will sich offenbaren in seiner Eigenheit. Mann und Weib treten in diesem Ahnen und Suchen einander scharf gegenüber. Das Verschiedene erkennt sich in seiner Verschiedenheit. Baubo enthüllt sich und der schöpferischer Iacchos tut sein Mannheit kund. Wie zu Samothrake über der werdenden Welt der heitere Scherzredner Hermes steht, so verräht das Lächeln, sodann das Lachen der sehenden, suchenden, trauernden Demeter neben der scherzenden Iambe das mehr und mehr aus dem dunklen Schooße der Erde und Mutter zum Lichte hinausstrebende neue Leben. (Creuzer IV, 461)

If Nietzsche looked to Arnobius as a source for the mysteries, it is less surprising that he foregrounds Dionysos. Nietzsche repeats the scene described by Besnard, but substitutes the name Dionysos for Iacchos. Although Nietzsche does not mention her, Baubo also hovers over the scene also in *Geburt*. The pivotal moment when Demeter’s sorrow turns to laughter is the result of Baubo’s revelation of Iacchos as a new Dionysos, a culmination of the themes of sexuality and death characterizing the mysteries. Like Russian nesting dolls, Baubo, Iacchos and Dionysos contain and reveal each other. Baubo is Dionysian in that she gives form and name to something that must be continuously destroyed and regenerated: Dionysos himself. This giving of form through joy and despite pain is Baubo’s role also in *Fröhliche Wissenschaft*.

*Dionysian Wissenschaft*

Bubo reminds Demeter that she will give birth to Dionysos once more, a painful-joyful process analogous to the philosopher’s pain as he continuously gives birth to new thoughts. It is thus not enough, as Kofman and others have done, to conclude that Baubo appears in
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Nietzsche as a personification of the vulva. Baubo does embody the sexual prerequisite for life, but she reminds Demeter that this new life will have a different form; it will not be merely a continuation of the same. Dionysos is reborn, but as Iacchos. As a personified vulva, however, Baubo could only represent the continuation of life, but for Nietzsche and Besnard, Baubo’s sexuality is tied to the enhancement of life. Just as Iacchos is not a repetition but a different Dionysos, it is important that the process of giving a new form to life is represented by the myth of the woman Baubo, not by a symbolic vulva. Baubo is herself a form, a veil of a veil.\textsuperscript{346} Her story adds something to the process instead of reducing it to a symbol. This is what life-affirming means in Nietzsche; it is not to reduce the pain in an individual life, but to face this pain in order to make life something else, something “more interesting.”

As in the mysteries, Baubo appears in the \textit{Fröhliche Wissenschaft} to convey the contingency of nature and truth. Nature is not something separate that can be approached, discovered or seduced. It is continuous change through violent destruction and rebirth in a new form. Baubo shows that this principle can be brought to bear also on \textit{Wissenschaft}. Any claim about truth, including truth derived from \textit{Wissenschaft}, is a creative act of giving form to nature:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

The problem with conventional \textit{Wissenschaft} is that it insists that it uncovers truth rather than creating it. Since truth is only relevant as an aim for life, not as an absolute concept outside of it,
the only thing that is captured and rendered immobile by such a *Wissenschaft* is man. It is not, as Novalis proposes, nature that dies when the scientist dissects her, it is we.

Ist es den “die Wahrheit”, welche allmählich durch die Wissenschaft festgestellt wird? Ist es nicht vielmehr der Mensch, welcher sich festellt (...) die Wissenschaft führt den ungeheuren Prozeß nur weiter, der mit dem ersten organischen Wesen begann, sie ist eine schaffende bildende konstitutive Gewalt und kein Gegensatz zur schaffenden bildenden konstitutiven Gewalt (*FW*, KGA, V,2:544-4)

Dionysos stands for this continuous, joyful, and painful process of putting into form. Thus Nietzsche responds to the claim that Dionysos was not there at the tragedies, but only “imagined.” The difference between *feststellen*—conclude, make firm—and *vorstellen*—imagine, put up — is that the latter acknowledges our own creative agency. While *vorstellen* is life affirming, *feststellen*, unveiling, revealing, make firm, is life-hampering. In *Fröhliche Wissenschaft*, Baubo is the matrix of a *Wissenschaft* that embraces *Vorstellung* rather than *Feststellung*. Giving form to nature can be a creative, life-affirming process if we recognize our agency in producing these forms.

**Rethinking Ancient Studies at the end of the nineteenth century**

In Chapter Three I have argued that the discovery of the Baubo statuettes was facilitated through shifts in German approaches to ancient Greece that took place from the 1870s onwards. The generation of archaeologists to which Wiegand and Humann belonged continually emphasized that their work was guided by science, *Wissenschaft*, as opposed to idealizing fantasies. Practically, their work altered how antiquity was approached, both in the field and in
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the museums in Germany. The large-scale excavations initiated after 1870 systematically excavated entire cities, not only temples and palaces where marble statues were most likely to be found. In Berlin, new museum displays organized the finds geographically and chronologically rather than thematically, giving the visitor a comprehensive look at the ancient city. The aim was to make the ancient Greek city accessible in its entirety, showcasing the everyday, bürgerliche aspects of ancient life for the Bürgers of Germany. This comprehensive, immersive display of the ancient world reached its pinnacle in Wiegand’s organization of the building of the Pergamon Museum. As Can Bilsel has discussed, this museum introduced a new emphasis on the authentic experience of ancient architecture, or, in short, the impression of being in the presence of antiquity.348

Humann and Wiegand often described their work as a departure from previous generations’ methods of investigating the ancient past. They shared this ambition, as well as much of their rhetoric, with Nietzsche. Both Nietzsche and the archaeologists contrasted their work with a tradition of pursuing knowledge for knowledge’s sake and urged that any relation to the past should benefit contemporary life. For both, a distanced, objective approach was opposed to a life-affirming relation to the past. Nietzsche had ridiculed Kant’s description of aesthetic enjoyment “without interest,” arguing instead that there is no pure art beyond the form and materiality in which it is expressed.349 Art “for its own sake” without relation to lived experience would be meaningless. Within the field of Ancient Studies, scholars were also coming to terms with the field’s legacy of disinterested scholarship. This approach had been promoted since the early years of the nineteenth century, especially by the Homerist Friedrich August Wolf. For

348 Bilsel (2012).
349 KGA, VI, 2.
Wolf, disinterested meant non-utilitarian, not to pursue knowledge as a means to an end, but for its own sake. Marchand has argued that while the disinterested approach was originally promoted to further positive engagement with texts—as opposed to studying only to pass exams—it quickly became the reasoning behind the grammar drills endured by students on the track to administrative jobs. Perhaps it was this transformation that made disinterested scholarship so unpalatable to the generation of archaeologists around 1870 who had been shaped through the Bildung system. Although he continuously stressed his commitment to Wissenschaft, Wiegand’s museum promoted a display of antiquity that did not rely on Bildung to be accessible to its audience. The past, in this presentation, was something that could be understood intuitively. This was part of Wiegand’s response to a living engagement with the past. Nietzsche, on the other hand, questioned what this life to be promoted entailed. For both, the question circled around the issue of what we can know about the past and, more importantly, why we should know it. While the Priene Baubos were discovered because of methods that promoted a more comprehensive knowledge of ancient Greece, Nietzsche’s Baubo embodied a Wissenschaft that embraced forgetting.

Nietzsche and Ancient Studies

Nietzsche’s sources for Baubo overlapped with, but were not identical to those of the Priene archaeologists. Nietzsche was not familiar with the 1891 publication of Herondas’ mimes—discussed in Chapter One—that produced an etymology for Baubo’s name, claiming it referred to the vulva. Nor is there any indication that Nietzsche was interested in, or familiar

\[351\] Ibid.
with the Egyptian statuettes that in archeological reports became known as Baubo figurines. As I have shown, Nietzsche’s notion of Baubo was above all shaped by his reading of Arnobius through Besnard, which allowed Nietzsche to connect Baubo to the Dionysian themes of death and rebirth, and to Goethe. Through these sources, Nietzsche associated Baubo with obscene exposure and sexuality, but not, as the archaeologist often claimed, as a personified vulva. Nietzsche’s understanding of Baubo’s exposure is noteworthy. Like Goethe, Nietzsche associated Baubo’s obscenity with the indecency of scholars insisting on finding the truth about the past, while he associated her exposure with a productive Wissen that continuously unveils itself.

Despite Nietzsche’s increasing popularity at the end of the century, Fröhliche Wissenschaft would not initiate a new form of Wissenschaft. As Nietzsche himself slipped into oblivion and away from active engagement with the world, his ideas were disseminated to a wide audience, although often distorted from their original meaning or summarized as easily misunderstood buzzwords. The influence of Nietzsche’s rhetoric can be also noted with the Priene archaeologists, even though they do not discuss Nietzsche directly. Then again, Humann as well as Wiegand rarely discussed their readings, even priding themselves for not being bookish types. In this claim, as in others, their rhetoric resembles Nietzsche’s. Whether this was a direct response to Nietzsche’s ideas, we cannot say, but Wiegand’s critique of knowledge without function shows the wide influence of Nietzsche’s ideas, or at least his rhetoric, in the late nineteenth century.

As Can Bilsel has demonstrated, Wiegand’s Pergamon Museum presented antiquity in a drastically different way than had the older museums on the Museum Island. This was the first architectural museum. The enormous displays allowed for an immersive encounter with
antiquity, a feeling of seeing it “as it really was.” The aura of the artifact became a direct link between the past and the present.\textsuperscript{352} Wiegand meant the museum to be accessible to a broad audience, it was a museum for the \textit{Volk}. For him, this meant making the audience aware of their own presence in the encounter with the past. A newspaper quoted Wiegand explaining that the Pergamon Museum was a museum neither for dead architecture nor for past cultures, but a “living museum for the people.”\textsuperscript{353} He was supported in this view from several sides. Wilhelm Waetzold, the general director of the museums, praised the “elementary form of the \textit{Pergamon Altar’s} art work,”\textsuperscript{354} and the Prussian minister of culture and education, Hermann von Oppeln-Bronikowski, considered the altar a means to connect with and engage the uneducated masses.\textsuperscript{355} The museum was conceived as anti-elitist. Its display made it intuitively understandable, according to its promoters, without relying on mediation through \textit{Bildung}. This was a decisive distancing from the intention of the first public museum. The first museum on the Museum Island was built under the auspices of Wilhelm von Humboldt as part of his educational reforms. Although it was a public museum, it was far from a democratic project, but aimed instead at refining the tastes of the bourgeois middle class. The architecture of the first museum had gestured towards a temple, meant to recall the sacredness of art. At the end of the nineteenth century, Wiegand compared it instead to a mausoleum, a repository for the dead past.\textsuperscript{356} Wiegand’s new museum project not only diverged from the earliest museum, but also from the historical positivism that had informed the New Museum that followed it. If historicism taught that the past could be accessed through careful, impassionate engagement with the sources, the
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Pergamon Museum allowed visitors to imagine themselves as firsthand witnesses of the past. Wiegand’s new museum was directed towards a new audience and a new raison d’être of the museum in society.

Bilsel describes Wiegand’s speech for the DAI centennial in 1929 as “Nietzschean.” In his presentation, Wiegand stressed that the altar offered a picture of the entirety of antiquity that was not lost in particularities. The altar represented the “triumph of light over unbridled barbarism,” and could be the inspiration for uniting the people under a single mind. Nietzsche would hardly have accepted this. Nietzsche’s Wissenschaft was never a democratic project, and the education of the masses was a bigger threat than any barbarism, not because it would give them access to Wissen, but because it promotes an idea of Wissen as static. Nietzsche, too, critiqued the concern with petty details of the past, but he did this from the conviction that life and action requires forgetting. Wiegand’s project, although concerned with life, was not about forgetting, but rather the notion that the past could be found and displayed in its entirety, that the mere presence of it would mean that it is understandable. For Nietzsche, what we could learn from the Greeks is not their history, but their relationship to history. Nietzsche’s aestheticizing of the past independent of history was not the same as Wiegand’s trust in the aura of history.

The main differences between them, however, lay in the aim of history. Wiegand’s archaeological and museological work was always framed as a contribution to the nation. Nietzsche took up Goethe and his Baubo in an attempt to recuperate the “pagan poet” as he was being incorporated in the German nation-building project as a forefather of the German spirit that had been realized in the German Reich. For Nietzsche, the very project of a German Reich was
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the antithesis of Goethe’s work. The Reich stood for stagnation and fossilization and the empowerment of the weak, rather the insistent display of power and strength that for Nietzsche is the hallmark of weakness. Nietzsche had incorporated Baubo into a critique of conventional *Wissenschaft*. The Priene statuettes that have given Baubo her characteristic iconography and interpretation, on the other hand, were discovered as a result of this *Wissenschaft* and have, in a twist, or rather circle of irony, come to influence the reading of Baubo in Nietzsche.
Conclusion

One of the aims of this project was to trace a double, and sometimes contradictory, role of Ancient Greece in nineteenth-century German thought. The narrative mapped out in this dissertation illustrated the double role of Ancient Greece for Germany, acting as an idealized state existing in poetic imagination, and as a historical entity on which to model the nascent German state. Although the importance of the former grew out of the latter, there was a discrepancy between them that led to confrontations throughout the century, within the field of Ancient Studies and between scholarship and poetry. The idealized image of Ancient Greece that was inherited from Winckelmann and the generation around the turn of the nineteenth century remained an important foil for budding German national identity into the following century and motivated the central role of Classics in German Bildung. As Ancient Studies came into its own as an academic discipline, German scholars reexamined, and often distanced themselves from, the idealizing notion of Ancient Greece prevalent at the turn of the century. As this dissertation shows, the narrative of Greece in nineteenth-century Germany was not one in which Greece moves from poetic ideal to historical reality. Rather, the rise of the academic disciplines gave rise to questions about why ancient Greece should be studied and whether knowing facts about Ancient Greece should be worth striving for.

As I have shown, Baubo’s relationship with an idealized Greece amounts not only to troubling this notion Baubo was a figure through which the importance of Ancient Greece for Germany could be debated. This project was born out of a curiosity about figures that fitted poorly into idealized notions of Ancient Greece [Good]. Karl Friedrich Schinkel’s now lost painting *Blick in Griechenlands Blüte* from 1825 illustrates the fantastic view of Greece in
Germany in the first half of the nineteenth century. The image depicts an imagined Greek locale with a homosocial world of strong, white, naked men building a temple together. The odd perspective, together with the impossible architecture—the temple seems to be built inside out—with the vague local and anachronistic features decisively distance this image from any historical model. Baubo was and is associated with the opposite of these perceived virtues, the female, the excessively sexual, the obscene, and the Oriental, so much so that she came to personify these characteristics, being described as a personification of the vulva imported to the Greek by eastern influences.

When I first began to conceptualize this project, it was easy to describe the German relation to Ancient Greece as one that proceeded from the Winckelmannian idealization to an increased acceptance of the sides of Greek culture that Baubo represents. As my work progressed, I found this to be less and less true. There was no time in which the obscenity or irrationality of the Greeks was not acknowledged. Moreover, these sides of the ancient Greeks were often held up by poets and rejected by scholars. In 1951, Eric Dodds famously argued against the dominant notion of the rational Greeks, yet, this notion had not always dominated views about the Greeks.\(^{358}\) The premise of Dodd’s argument was that an idealized image of Ancient Greece could be counteracted through scholarship. But a closer look at the early history of Ancient Scholarship shows how the academy disseminated the notion of the rational Greeks (or Greek rationalism) by actively distancing itself from creative and intuitive approaches—rejected as Schwärmerei—that dwelled on the other side of the Greeks.

The development of Ancient Studies into an academic field, and the legacy of the nineteenth century for the field today, form the background for my project on Baubo. The

\(^{358}\) Dodds (2004).
nineteenth-century debates within the field revealed that the methods of studying ancient Greece became closely tied to the evaluation of it. The concern with *Wissenschaftlichkeit*, proving itself as an objective, scientific field, often motivated a purging of comparative and relativizing approaches. The so-called *Symbolikstreit*, the controversy following the publication of Friedrich Creuzer’s *Symbolik und Mythology der alten Völker* (1810-42), illustrate the concerns within the field. Creuzer’s comparative methods, which connected Greek and Indian traditions, were rejected as catholic *Schwärmerei*. The result of this was that the field increasingly favored a view of the Greek past as exclusive and discrete in world history. I argue that through these processes, the field developed a history of its own legacy that was passed down into the next century.

Dodd’s work reflects a twentieth-century view of Ancient Studies as a field that has never been concerned with the irrational side of the Greeks. This is not wholly true, revealing a twentieth-century view as it looks back on the field at the end of the nineteenth century. As a result, studies such as Dodd’s or Martin Bernal’s have been described as radical turns within the field. However, the comparisons with Eastern cultures and the preoccupation with the “dark” side of the Greeks had been prevalent as Ancient Studies began to take shape as an academic discipline. That this has been forgotten, I argue, is due to the practice of applying modern, often anachronistic labels to older thinkers, retroactively deciding who was an Ancient Scholar, a philosopher or poet, or a mere collector or layman.

The emergence of Baubo in the nineteenth century was not so much tied to whether the Greeks were obscene or not, but whether we should pay attention to the obscenity. Strikingly, Baubo’s obscenity is now juxtaposed most strongly with her Greek identity, exemplified by Fritz Graf’s stance and his reluctance to reconsolidate this lewd figure with Greek sensibilities. While
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the definition and delineation of Greece has been a central concern in responses to Baubo from the outset, these four chapters have traced a narrative of the nineteenth century in which the central question was not so much *what* Greece is, but rather what and why modernity should *know* about Greece. Consequently, the narrative I describe juxtaposes thinkers that, from today’s perspective, would be assigned to different fields—Goethe and Millingen, Nietzsche and the Priene archaeologists. This reflects the multiple modes of *knowing* Ancient Greece that were in conversation throughout the century and would eventually fragment into different fields with divergent investments.

Narrative Arch

Baubo’s position in the imagination of Ancient Greece was partly a response to the sources that shaped her as a figure, the Christian Apologetics. Chapter One opens the project by establishing that Baubo, although a classical figure, has always been a composite one, constructed to reflect on ancient Greece rather than to reclaim it. The first chapter collects the ancient sources on the name Baubo and establishes that there is no evidence to confirm that Baubo was associated with a lewd gesture before the Christian accounts of the encounter at Eleusis. The Apologetics provided Baubo with the narrative without which she could not have been a figure at all, only a collection of stray references. Given this importance, this Chapter argued that the context in which the Apologetics invoked Baubo is significant. As the only sources on Baubo’s encounter with Demeter, the Apologetics have not only shaped the understanding of this figure, but also the interpretation of it. That the etymology, derived from the *hapax legomenon* in Herondas, that identified Baubo’s name with the vulva, came to dominate the definition of Baubo’s name was, I argue, only possible through a relying on the
Christian sources’ claim that the mythical Baubo corresponded to vulgar pagan practices.

Already in these earliest occurrences, thus, Baubo was invoked as a figure through which the pagan legacy was debated.

Situated at the chronological bookends of the post-ancient developments that I describe are Goethe and Nietzsche. Both used Baubo to critique the methods and aims of Ancient Studies in their respective generations. Rather than describing it as an obscene revelation from the past, they connected Baubo’s act of exposure with scholars’ indecent urge to reveal the details of the past. Their responses to Baubo were tied with concerns about academic studies being prioritized as a way of approaching the past in favor of poetic and creative modes. Chapter Two situates Goethe as an interlocutor for the emerging field of Ancient Studies.

This chapter shows how the name Baubo could be detached from a particular Greek figure or myth and instead be used as a label to convey a set of associations, in this case centering on sexual vulgarity. It outlines the curious relationship between Goethe’s mention of Baubo in *Faust I* and the statuette of a woman riding on a pig, also known as Baubo, in the Berlin *Antikensammlung*. The relationship between these two occurrences of Baubo is ultimately inconclusive, but this inconclusiveness illustrates the entangled legacies of creative and academic approaches to the past. The descriptions of Baubo in the *Faust* critical apparatuses seem to describe an ancient figure that Goethe borrowed, when in fact he was involved in shaping this figure.

Chapter Three ties together the developments described in Chapters One and Two. Centering on Theodor Wiegand’s 1898 excavation of the statuettes at Priene, it shows that these statuettes were identified as Baubo because they seemed to correspond to the characteristics that the name Baubo had come to be associated with, most importantly sexual exposure and an
excessively female body. The discovery of the statuettes at Priene provided Baubo with a distinctive iconography that has featured prominently in later reception. The chapter argues that their discovery was only possible because of the radical methodological and theoretical shift within Ancient Studies around 1870, in which Wiegand played a seminal part. Wiegand belonged to a generation of Ancient Scholars with a strong commitment to Wissenschaft and trust in the possibilities of positivist scholarship to reveal the details of the ancient past. This confidence in fact had the effect of obscuring the influences on how Baubo was imagined that stemmed from non-wissenschaftliche sources. For example, the Priene statuettes were held up as being a more accurate depiction of Baubo than the Egyptian statuettes, but the logic behind this was that the former displayed an extreme version of what characterized the latter — vulgar exposure.

Chapter Four closes the project’s narrative arch by presenting Nietzsche as an alternative view to his contemporaries, the Priene archaeologists, reflecting on what Ancient Studies could and should aim towards. In light of the increased stress on positivist scholarship, Nietzsche questioned the urge of uncovering and revealing details of the past. Nietzsche’s use of Baubo in Fröhliche Wissenschaft is the matrix of this critique and of the possibility of other modes of knowing. Closing the dissertation with Nietzsche also emphasizes how the developments of the late nineteenth century came to shape and solidify the idea of what Ancient Studies can do. That discussions about what belongs and does not belong to Ancient Studies from this period still affect the framing and understanding of the field today is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that Nietzsche is now rarely considered within Ancient Scholarship.
The singularity of Baubo has prompted interpretations that stretch the methods of the scholars who approach her. Even relying on the Apologetics’ account of the *anasyrma*, what Baubo exposes when she lifts her skirts in front of Demeter is not obvious. Clement’s τὰ αἰδοῖα and Arnobius’ omnia illa pudoris loca, leaves open for interpretation what exactly these writers considered to be a woman’s “shameful” parts. Yet modern readers have determinedly “seen” Baubo’s vulva in the texts describing her unveiling.

The chapters show how Baubo was deployed within both positivist and creative responses to Ancient Greece in the nineteenth century. Associated with the act of unveiling herself, Baubo has come to epitomize questions of concealment and revelation and the relation between what is hidden and its cover. Baubo’s nineteenth-century history established her as a figure connected to the revelation of surprising or shocking aspects of the ancient past. In the twentieth century, Baubo was received and repositioned both within and beyond Ancient Studies as a figure associated with unveiling the forgotten or ignored past. The project’s title, Unveiling Baubo thus have referred to several of Baubo’s connotations. Goethe and Nietzsche both invoke Baubo by playing on the trope of unveiling a goddess as an allegory for hermeneutics. By replacing the goddess with Baubo, they question the underlying assumptions and priorities of this image. For the archaeologists that discovered Baubo, the systematic excavation and unearthing of the material past presented an objective method of knowing the past. In her more recent iterations, Baubo has been held up as a figure that reveals the ignored or suppressed aspects of the past.

Baubo, I have claimed repeatedly in this project, is a modern construct. This statement must not be controversial. Myths are always cultural constructs and all mythical figures change
throughout their reception. Even the earliest attestations of mythical names or images are the products of accrued layers of meaning in iterations that are lost to us. This project is not about pointing out that any receptions of Baubo are wrong. Artists and creative writers have no obligation to adhere to a historical original that does not exist and I have been delighted to take part in the new layers and contexts in which Baubo is continuously becoming involved. What differs about Baubo from other myths, though, is that her function as a myth that can be consciously reinvented has been rejected. Instead, Baubo is repeatedly situated as a figure through which the past is bared of its secrets. She has been presented as a tool, a key, or even the result, of probing into secrets of the past.

I am convinced that Baubo does provide an important and singular figure through which to explore ancient as well as modern investments and concerns about the vulgar and the appropriate, what should be hidden and what revealed. For such investigations to be productive, however, Baubo must be approached as the starting point for these discussions, not the solution to them.
Figure 1. Baubo auf Schwein sitzend. Unknown provenance. Terracotta; 11.8*8.5*3.5 cm. Berlin, Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, TC4875. Photo: Johannes Laurentius.
Figure. 2. The modern-day display of the Baubo figurines. Berlin, Altes Museum. Photo: Tevebring.
Figure 3. Schinkel’s Altes Museum. Etching after drawing by Karl Friedrich Thiele, 1853. Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett SAE 1858, 037. Image: Staatliche Museen Berlin.
Fig. 4. The Staircase of the Altes Museum. Etching after Karl Friedrich Schinkel, 1858. Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett SAE 1858, 043. Image: Staatliche Museen Berlin.
Fig. 5. Detail from the Pergamon Panorama installed as part of the Jubilee for the Royal Academy of Arts in 1886. Berlin, Stiftung Preußische Kulturbesitz, AV 899. Photo: Antikensammlug, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin.
Fig. 6. Frontispiece to Gerardus Blasius, *Anatome Animalium*, 1681.
Fig. 7. Frontispiece to Antony van Leeuwenhoek, *Levende Dierkens*, 1686
Fig. 8. From the frontispiece to Johann Andreas Segner, *Einleitung in die Naturlehre*, 1770.
Fig. 9. Pages 546-547 of Nietzsche’s copy of Besnard’s Arnobius edition. At the top of the left page, Nietzsche has underlined Besnard’s quote from Friedrich Creuzer. Klassik Stiftung Weimar, http://haab-digital.klassik-stiftung.de/ Nov. 2, 2017.
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