

Orpheus and Orphism: Cosmology and Sacrifice at the Boundary

Liz Locke

An Interdisciplinary Prelude

Knowledge is, in the final analysis, taxonomic, but a taxonomy that is allowed to merge with the object of study—which is reified so that it becomes a datum in its own right—must at best be stultifying. Were this not so, there would have been no intellectual change in human history. Thus, to see the particular reading of an ancient tragedy as refracted through a particular ideological prism, or to spell out the implications of a translator's vocabulary, syntax, and style—these things do not decrease our knowledge; they protect it. (Herzfeld 1983:59)

I am fond of this passage by Michael Herzfeld because it points in so many directions at once. It points toward epistemology in that it asks us to examine the categorical taxonomies that underlie our assumptions about how we know what we think we know. It points toward cosmology in that it suggests that the world which produced ancient tragedy is still available to us as a precursive guide to our own sense of place in the universe. Epistemology, cosmology, and ideology have much in common: they attempt simultaneously to create and explain the bases from which we describe our knowledge of the world, of ourselves, and of the cognitive and social structures through which we circulate in the course of our lifetimes, our histories, and our projected futures.

I am a folklorist because the study of folklore also points in so many directions at once. It recognizes that we cannot hope to understand much about our peculiar place in the universe without eventually taking all such questions into account. One of the great strengths of the discipline is that it does not shy away from the fruits of any field of human inquiry if they carry a potential to illuminate more brightly what it means to be human. Folklore has historically drawn on, and continues to draw on, so many different disciplines—philosophy, art, poetics, science, history, dance, archaeology, literature, architecture, music, and others—that it arouses concern for certain scholars who see it as being in danger of losing its boundaries. My response to folklore's eclecticism is more like jubilation. It allows me to ask questions of any scholar, not just other folklorists.

As folklorists and classicists are aware, one of the primary ways in which we transmit what we know and believe about the origins, and thus the primary nature, of things—space, time, being, power, sex, death, color, music, the sky, animals, gods, humans, etc.—is through stories. Cosmogonic stories detail the origins of the universe. Theogonic ones focus on the origins of the gods. Anthropogonic stories tell of the origins of human beings. Classicists and mythologists use various other such taxonomic terms which may be as or more unfamiliar, but in this article I will blend their vocabularies and styles with those of folklorists.

In the following pages, I engage in a conversation with classicists, historians, archaeologists, an anthropologist, and two philosophers in an attempt to cast light on a question that has arisen repeatedly, mainly in classics, for generations. This conversation assumes familiarity with feminist theory—another inherently interdisciplinary body of knowledge—and concerns a branch of folklore known as mythology, specifically classical Greek mythology, and more specifically, the *Descent Myth of Orpheus and Eurydice*. It begins with a discussion of what have come to be called the Orphic Cosmogonies, winds its way past Martin Heidegger's reading of a fragment of Anaximander, and arrives finally at a theory regarding possible connections between archaic Greek theological misogyny and Christian soteriology.

Myths of Orpheus and Orphism

Orpheus is well known as the singer and lyre player whose music was so enchanting that it would calm wild beasts and move trees, rocks, and rivers to gather about him to listen. The most famous story about him concerns his new bride, Eurydice, in which she is bitten by a snake and dies. In Virgil's account she is fleeing a rapist on her wedding day when she meets her fate.¹ Orpheus' grief-stricken music gains him entrance to the Underworld, ruled by Hades and Persephone, where he begs that his wife be returned to him alive on Earth. Moved to tears, the Queen of the Dead grants his wish, but with a condition, common to the folktale: he must not look upon Eurydice until they are both back in the upper air. Predictably, Orpheus ignores the interdiction and Eurydice slides back through the misty Tainarian Gates.

But there are other stories about this archetypal bard. In one, he is killed and dismembered in Thrace (now Serbia-Bulgaria) by the female followers of Dionysos, the Maenads. In another, he protects the crew of the *Argo* on their quest for the Golden Fleece from the Siren-songs of predatory female birds of prey. The surviving ancient Greek and Latin literature is replete with references to Orpheus. However, on a level entirely different from most magical tales, it is said that he was the founder of an exclusively male religious sect known as Orphism.

“Orphism” is a difficult term to define, as many scholars will attest. Extremely influential in the sixth century B.C.E., it apparently espoused a quasi-Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis (belief that the soul reincarnates in a new body after death), but allowed that eternal, blissful salvation could be the eventual reward of initiates to the Orphic Mysteries. Its practices were more ascetic than was usual for Greek religion, disallowing sexual intercourse with women, blood sacrifice, and, inexplicably, the eating of beans. Since the Hymns of Orpheus, a diffuse collection of writings, taught that Orpheus had received his Mysteries while visiting the Underworld in search of Eurydice,² it is odd that discussions of Orphism in the scholarly literature never involve significant mention of the Descent Myth itself.

From the combined analysis of a great many ancient texts, classicists infer that Orphism (whether or not it ever existed—everything is open to debate) as a dogma, community, priesthood, living religion, or loosely connected set of stories and texts,³ can be said to have had (1) a tendency toward monism,⁴ (2) a belief in the reality of evil,⁵ (3) a belief that the body is separable from the soul,⁶ (4) a belief in metempsychosis, (5) a belief in the immortality of the soul, (6) a belief in heritable guilt for sin, (7) a belief in an afterlife of varying duration with rewards for the initiated and punishments for the uninitiated,⁷ (8) a refusal to participate in blood sacrifice,⁸ and (9) an ascetic worldview.⁹

Is there a connection between the myth of Orpheus’ descent to retrieve his wife and a religious doctrine that refused blood sacrifice and propounded, for the first time in the ancient Western world, that one could survive death by being reborn in a new form? Is there a connection between the Descent Myth and the religious institution of a new, non-pagan form of sacrifice? If we take Herzfeld seriously and read the literature as it is refracted through the modern lens of feminist scholarship, we may arrive at a theory useful for first uncovering, and then protecting, important clues about the value—and the legacies—of epistemology, cosmology, and ideology, i.e., how we arrange the universe in our twentieth century lives.

Modern attempts to collect, compile, and interpret fragments of the ancient Western past, specifically those Greek poems and commentaries, pots and grave goods, mirrors, and murals identified by classicists as “Orphic,” range broadly from the strictly archaeological and philological to the unabashedly fanciful. Walter Burkert, widely recognized as authoritative on most things ancient and Greek, states that for a number of reasons, “the problem of Orphism has become one of the most hotly disputed areas in the history of Greek religion” (1985 [1977]:296). A theosophist writing in the mid-1960s introduces us more emphatically to the difficulties inherent in the quest for meaning in the Orphic materials: “No human being could do full justice to the task, for even the courage of the most stout-hearted German

encyclopaedist would quail before the libraries of volumes dealing directly or indirectly with the general subject” (Mead 1965:10). Much of what is known today of Orphism comes precisely from the tireless efforts of just such a distinguished class of scholars,¹⁰ one in which the names Larry Alderink (1981) and Walter Burkert (1985 [1977]) figure prominently. Through them and their careful translators, we are aware of no fewer than ten different, and occasionally overlapping, poems considered Orphic theogonies.

Orphic Theogonies

Otto Gruppe identified three versions known to Damascius, the last head of the Neoplatonist school of Athens before its closure by Justinian in 529 C.E. (cited in Guthrie 1993 [1935]:74). M. L. West calls these the *Eudemian Theogony* (from Eudemos, a student of Aristotle in the fourth century B.C.E.), the *Hieronyman Theogony* (attributed to “Hieronymos and Hellanikos”), and the *Rhapsodic Theogony* (1983:68–69). In addition to these, there is a poem attributed to Orpheus at the opening of the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodorus (Book I, lines 1–147); West calls this the *Cyclic Theogony*, pointing out that it maintains close parallels with what he calls the *Derveni Theogony*, found in a carbonized papyrus scroll written by an anonymous commentator around 400 B.C.E. and discovered in 1962 at a tomb in northern Greece (Burkert 1977:2).

West shows that the *Derveni Theogony* is itself an abridgment of a larger lost poem, which he refers to as the *Protogonos Theogony*, identifiable by the part played in it by a god called Protogonos (1983:69). Euripides, in a fragment from his *Malanippe*, offers a version of the Orphic origin of the gods in outline; Aristophane’s *Birds* (lines 690–702) provides a radically different, and more fully elaborated, earlier version. Further, in his *Argonautica*, Apollonius Rhodius tells the version in which “Orpheus lifted his lyre in his left hand and made essay to sing” (I.1.1–I.3.6). Alderink supplies the tenth version, represents it in genealogical form only, and attributes it to Alexander of Aphrodisias (1981:39).

It is generally agreed that the *Rhapsodic Theogony*, created sometime in the late Hellenistic period and known as *the* Orphic Theogony by Neoplatonist and subsequent commentators, was itself a compilation, or in W. K. C. Guthrie’s words, “an attempt to put together all earlier strata of Orphic tradition, reconciled as far as possible” (1993 [1935]:77). I will refer to Guthrie’s synopsis of that reconciliation as the basis for retelling in bare outlines a cosmogonic tale told long before it was committed to writing about how the created world came into being (78–83).¹¹

Ancient cosmogonies talk about principles, gods, essences, and forces in ways that call to mind the galaxies, black holes, supernovae, and pulsars of modern-day physical cosmologists. There is a major difference, however, in that descriptions of the principle of generation, life generating new life or forms producing other forms, in the archaic texts are almost exclusively limited to biological, and especially, sexual metaphors. As a result, the elements of the cosmos come into being and are recorded as having done so in stories and lists that read like genealogies. The Orphic theogonies are no exception. But they differ markedly from Hesiod's *Theogony* (considered Homeric because it comes from approximately the same period as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*), the one most widely studied in abridged forms, in which the originating generative principle is Gaia (or Ge), the first Mother, Earth. They have a related, but to us perhaps, much stranger story to tell.

An Orphic Genealogy

The genealogy of the gods was extended backwards: before Ouranos-Kronos-Zeus, there is now Night as an ultimate beginning. Extraordinary and hybrid features are sought for, monstrous figures, incest motifs; Homeric form is lost in cosmic speculation. (Burkert 1985 [1977]:296)

First there was Chronos (Time). Out of Time came Aither (Ether), Chaos (Unorder), and Erebos (Darkness).¹² Time fashioned an Egg inside Aither. The Egg split into two parts and from it emerged Phanes, marvelously beautiful, of both sexes, a figure of shining light with four eyes in a lion's head, and golden wings, who is also called Protogonos, Eriepaios, Metis, Ge, Eros, Kore,¹³ and Dionysos (Guthrie 1993 [1935]:80, 96–97). Phanes bore a daughter, Nyx (Night), with whom s/he mated and to whom s/he gave the gift of prophecy. Nyx gave her oracles in a cave guarded by a goddess called Ananké (Necessity), the first law-giver for the gods. Phanes then gave her/his scepter to Nyx, making her the second ruler of the universe.

Nyx bore Gaia (Earth) and Ouranos (Sky), who together produced the Titans¹⁴—Kronos, Rhea, Okeanos (Ocean), Mnemosyne (Memory), Themis (Sovereignty), and the rest. Gaia bore the Morai (Fates), the Hechatoncheires (Hundred-Handers), and the Cyclops, who fashioned and bestowed the thunderbolts. Nyx passed Phanes' scepter to Ouranos, who was castrated by Kronos (Nyx's favorite grandchild), and from whose semen arose Aphrodite, the essence of sex.¹⁵ The matings of Kronos and Rhea produced the generation of gods known as the Olympians, among whom was Zeus, whose early protection was undertaken by the Kuretes, male nurturers of Mt. Ida on Crete, at the behest of Nyx.

Having been spared by Rhea from Kronos' child-killing spree, and castrating him in the traditional way, Zeus swallowed Phanes-Eros¹⁶-Metis¹⁷-Dionysos,¹⁸ the originator, thereby becoming "the beginning, middle, and end of all."¹⁹ Together with Phanes, all things within Zeus were created again: Aither, Chaos, Erebus, Sky, Ocean, Earth, Tartaros,²⁰ and all the gods and goddesses. The commentator of the *Derveni Papyrus* tells us that the animating principle behind all of this work is Moira (a singular female incarnation of Fate), who, having been swallowed as breath (reason), gives Zeus mastery over Time (Being-in-Time) itself (Calame 1997:73-74). "All that was then in being and all that was to come to pass, all was there, mingled like streams in the belly of Zeus."²¹

Zeus asked his great-grandmother Nyx how he might separate out the Many from himself, the One, and establish his rule. Nyx taught him how to arrange the universe. Athena²² sprang from Zeus' head to become "the accomplisher of his will."²³ Zeus with Rhea (now identified as Demeter²⁴) mated in the bodies of snakes to produce Kore-Persephone. Raped by Hades, she bore the Furies; raped by Zeus, she bore the infant Dionysos, to whom Zeus gave Phanes' throne and scepter, saying to all the generations, "This one have I made your king."²⁵

The Titans, renewed with the rest, got past the Kuretes, stationed again as guards, and attacked the child Dionysos (now called Zagreus), while he played with a mirror and other toys. In attempting to escape them, he became "a youthful Zeus, an aged Kronos, a babe, a youth, a lion, a horse, a horned snake, a tiger, and a bull" (Cook 1965 [1925]:1030, Part II, Appendix G). The Titans killed Zagreus, tore his body into pieces, boiled, roasted, and ate his flesh.²⁶ Zeus sent Apollo²⁷ to collect, arrange, and bury his limbs on Mt. Parnassos at Delphi. Athena rescued his heart, which Zeus pounded into a potion and gave to a mortal woman, his lover Semele, to drink. Semele's body, annihilated at Zeus' *parousia*, was no longer suitable for birthing the god, so he snatched the sacred embryo from her womb and replanted it in his thigh.²⁸ Dionysos was reborn from Zeus. But because some of the Titans had killed and cannibalized the god, Zeus hurled his thunderbolt at them (Atlas and Prometheus, at least, were spared); from their charred remains, there arose a race that had never been seen before, "mortal men" (Guthrie 1993 [1935]:83).²⁹ "So now to Dionysos we make prayer and sacrifice in all the seasons of the year, yearning to be set free from our lawless ancestry."³⁰

The Limitless and the Limited

Obviously drawing heavily upon Hesiod's *Theogony*, but with strikingly peculiar and exotic elements (and seemingly infinite variations), this is the Orphic story, beginning as theogony and cosmogony, ending as

anthropogony. Even more than in Hesiod's story, sexuality plays the inaugural role. Alderink calls attention to the importance of the sexual-reproduction theme in the Orphic cosmogonies in general terms:

Throughout all the Orphic materials, the theme of sexuality is a recurrent and even constant motif. Indeed, one may even say that sexuality was the theme linking the various items which comprise the matrix that is Orphism....To judge from the materials available to us, sexuality signified the power to define without precluding further definition, the power to create and yet allow for death as the possibility for new and renewing creation, the power which propels time from past to future...and result[s] in forms or specific entities which will cease to exist in the process of bringing into existence yet new entities, the power in which thought and creativity inhere....Orphism appears to center attention on creativity—for which the symbolism of sexuality was an adequate language. (1981:94–95)

The first power to emerge from unbounded Aither is the Egg which splits into two parts to reveal Phanes. At first inspection, both the Egg and Phanes would seem to be non-dual in terms of sexuation, but if we look more closely we see that they function as adumbrative metaphors for sexual division before it becomes explicit. Limitless Time (Chronos) is the unsexed primordial origin who brings into Being, through the agency of unsexed Aither's "womb," the Cosmogonic Egg. From this quintessentially female container³¹ emerges the splendidly self-sufficient double-sexed Phanes, a fiery and uniquely Orphic deity, with the capacity to confer the ability to see the past, present, and future on his singular offspring, feminine Night, who becomes an enduring source of wisdom and discrimination for all the generations to come. Night, the primordial mother (102, n. 14), is the first explicitly sexed entity in the universe.

However, there is another shadowy female figure for whom the theology provides no source: Ananké (Necessity). Like Limited Time (Moirá), Necessity has no source, no Coming-into-Being, no Passing-out-of-Being. Alderink calls her "bodyless" and says that she "pervade[s] the entire cosmos" (45). Still the narrative emplaces her and sexes her: what she has is Dwelling, Being-in-Time (in Heidegger's sense), located at the entrance to the cave from which Night conveys seemingly human-oriented information about the nature of Time.

But to whom? Simultaneously dark (by nature) and illuminating (by bisexual if not bilineal inheritance), Nyx-protected-by-Ananké paradoxically *exists as* and *knows* a world that is both unknown and nonexistent (Alderink 1981:44). Later, she will be the power of identification and differentiation (taxonomy) for Zeus, the supreme Sky

god, but in the beginning, in the dark night which is the universe, before there is a separation between a Knower and a Known, the feminine is both Necessary and Obscure: it understands Time.³²

At this point, mated with both/neither male/female Phanes-Eros-Metis-Dionysos, Night “makes a difference,” she produces Gaia and Ouranos, separately sexed as male and female.³³ The separation of Being into two sexes engenders intrinsically hierarchical spatial separation: now there is an Above and a Below. Night chooses the male Sky as the inheritor of her wisdom and her rule. Now there is a Master-Knower (Ouranos) and a Mastered-Known (Gaia).

In Hesiod, as if in rebellion against the newly inaugurated Order which defined her (Diké—Order or Justice—was to the Orphics a goddess who shared Zeus’ throne) (Guthrie 1993 [1935]:222), Gaia lay with Ouranos and produced three classes of confounding, outsized Being-in-Time: the Cyclops (all male), the Hechatoncheires (all male), and most important, the Titans (who in Hesiod simultaneously challenge and certify the coming rule of Zeus). All of these offspring defy the immateriality of Heaven. They energetically confuse and mingle the Above and Below;³⁴ they embody the grotesque, earthy materiality that inspires hatred in the male.³⁵

Returning to the Orphic story, the Titans, first-born of Ouranos and Gaia, are males and females; again Nyx chooses a male, Kronos, as her favorite. Enter Zeus. However, the writers of the *Rhapsodic Theogony* dispense with Hesiod’s Titanomachy³⁶ and empower Ouranos’ successor, not with simple victory and the supremacy it confers, but with the stuff of creation itself: Zeus swallows Phanes *and the universe begins again* in the belly of Zeus. This time the male fully preempts the power of female generativity by becoming generativity itself. But in order to have sway over a created universe he must first learn from the primordial mother how to mother, how to extricate created things out of the belly of creativity. She tells him to perform by the power of his will alone what the last generation could accomplish only by the power of heterosexual sex: inaugurate a taxonomy, set the heavens above the earth.

The Many emerge again from the One. The female accomplisher of the male will, Athena, springs from the head of the Sky-Father³⁷ without the intervention of a womb and monstrous principles (Adikia, Disorder, Injustice) proliferate. Sex becomes associated with brother-sister incest and bestiality (Zeus and Demeter mate as snakes), violence (Persephone, known above ground as Kore, the Maiden, is raped twice), father-daughter incest (at least one of Kore’s rapists, if not both,³⁸ are her father), death (Kore-Persephone’s male offspring, Zagreus, is dismembered and eaten), and retribution (her female offspring are the Furies).

Having existed from the beginning, Dionysos is thrice-generated: Phanes-Dionysos (undifferentiated bisexual Being), Zagreus-Dionysos (the immature male born of forced father-daughter incest), and Dionysos the Resurrected (fully potentiated male born of a male). As the Divine Child Zagreus, he is, contained within himself, the One and the Many, difference simultaneously disallowed and displayed, beginning and end, and wholly male. Older, differentiated, earthy Titanic Being asserts itself and tries to do what Zeus did with Phanes: to swallow, and thereby incorporate, the primordial power of generativity. But now the act of incorporation is *hubris*³⁹ against an established rather than an inchoate Order (*Diké*) and so is susceptible to judgment, the action of *Diké* (Justice). With the advent of the possibility of *hubris* (*Adikia*⁴⁰) and retribution, human life enters the world. In part constituted of Zagreus' sacred remains, in part Titanic, men-born-of-women continue Dionysos' lineage of living incarnation, his Being-in-the-World.

Persephone's Grief and the Orphic Body

By defining tragedy as a reenactment of the suffering of Dionysus, Nietzsche equated divine suffering with human suffering, an equation that obliterates the existential difference between mortals and immortals that forms the basis of the Greek worldview. (Henrichs 1993:27)

The Zagreus myth is often referenced as the central myth of Orphism. But it must be combined with a fragment of Pindar, who was known to have been influenced by Orphic doctrines, to yield its full theological and ideological implications. Pindar's statement comes in one source only, a passage in Plato's *Meno* (81b-c), prefaced by Socrates' reference to a priesthood that performs enigmatic ritual functions and his espousal of the idea that "the soul of man is immortal. At one time it comes to an end—that which is called death—and at another is born again, but is never finally exterminated" (Rose 1943:247). H. J. Rose offers this translation of the passage:

But those at whose hands Persephone accepts atonement for (her) ancient grief, their souls in the ninth year she sends up again to the sun of this world; wherefrom spring proud kings, men of strength and speed, and those chief in wisdom, and for all time to come they are called of men holy heroes. (247)

Rose connected Plato's fragment of Pindar with the Zagreus myth in 1936 by pointing out that the only grief Persephone can suffer at the hands of mortal men, the descendants of the Titans, must have resulted from the Titans' murder of her son; her grief at being raped (by Zeus and/or Hades) can have no connection whatever with mortals. That the fragment alludes to

initiation into secret rites is implied in Socrates' circumlocution about an unnamed and enigmatic priesthood, and is supported by Rose's claim that "Mere Titan-men might well be content if they escape Tartaros, with such an inheritance of guilt; these pardoned sinners were raised to the highest rank on earth and afterwards heroized. The doctrine, then, is Orphic" (1967 [1936]:88). By 1993, Fritz Graf could write: "[Rose's] suggestion has met with nearly universal approval" (1993:244).

Plato, in a passage from *Cratylus* (400c) on the relationship between the body and the soul, gives additional clues about Orphic thought:

I think this [the meaning of the word *soma*] admits of many explanations, if a little, even very little, change is made; for some say it is the *tomb* of the soul, their notion being that the soul is buried in the present life, and again, because by its means the soul gives any signs which it gives, it is for this reason also properly called "*sign*" (*sema*). But I think that the Orphic poets gave it this name with the idea that the soul is undergoing *punishment* for something; they think it has the body as an enclosure to keep it safe, like a *prison*, and this is, as the name itself denotes, the *safe* (*soma*) for the soul, *until the penalty is paid*, and not even a letter needs to be changed. (Alderink 1981:59–60, emphasis added)⁴¹

The material body is, then, according to the Orphic poets,⁴² epiphenomenal, a sign of the soul, or housing for it, a tomb, a prison, or a safe, until some penalty is paid, some atonement accepted. The soul, on the other hand, is deathless, *athanatos*. As Burkert says, "That the epithet which since Homer had characterized the gods in distinction from men now becomes the essential mark of the human person is indeed a revolution" (1985 [1977]:300).

Archaeologists have given us another treasure to help in our quest for understanding how the Descent Myth might tie in to Orphic religious thought. In 1987 two Greek scholars found two nearly identical gold tablets (*lamellae*) in a grave near ancient Pelinna, dating to the fourth century B.C.E. Like others discovered since 1970, they are regarded as instructions for the entombed bearers on what to say when confronted by Persephone in the Underworld. Graf translates the second line written on the tablets as, "Tell Persephone that Bakkhios⁴³ himself has set you free," and interprets it to mean that the deceased are initiates asking for "release from punishment after death that would otherwise be in store for humankind":

Thus, the combination, in the Pelinna text, of Persephone determining the destiny of a human soul and Dionysus affecting her verdict in a decisive way makes sense when seen in the context of Orphic anthropogony: the Pelinna tablets are the first non-literary, epigraphical attestation for the doctrine. This alone would be important, given the

scarce attestation of it before the Neoplatonists, but there is more to gain: the tablets from Pelinna put it firmly into the context of Bacchic mystery cults and define the *function of this mythology in living religion* (as opposed to pseudoepigraphical and Neoplatonic speculation). (1993:241, 243-44, emphasis added)

It would seem, then, that Orphism comprised not only an eschatology but a soteriology: there is an end to life in the body but with it the possibility of redemption from punishments, and even glorification for the immortal soul. The view differs radically from the earlier Homeric conception of *psyche*; part and parcel as it was with the body, the dead were compared to shadows. If there was any notion of a separable soul, it was *eidolon*, “a phantom image, like the image reflected in a mirror which can be seen, though not always clearly, but cannot be grasped” (Bremmer 1983:195). In the Homeric world,

It is the physical attributes of the soul that have some importance for the Greeks rather than the psychological. The description of the *eidolon* suggests that the Greeks believed the dead soul looked like the living being. And they described the physical actions of the souls of the dead in two opposite ways: they believed both that the dead soul moved and spoke like the living and that the soul of the dead could not move or speak but instead flitted and squeaked. (73)

The notion of a wholly separable soul, immortally dignified rather than behaving like some kind of insect or rodent, not only reversed the focus to concentrate on the psychological, that is, moral, attributes of the dead rather than on their physical Being, it also created a hierarchy, placing a higher value on the disembodied soul than on its physical “housing,” the body. In a sentence famous among Orphism researchers, E. R. Dodds goes so far as to say that “it was here that the new religious pattern made its fateful contribution by crediting man with an occult self of divine origin, and thus setting soul and body at odds, it introduced into European culture a new interpretation of human existence, the interpretation we call puritanical” (1951:139).

The body became less a place of safekeeping for the soul than an obstacle to its eternal redemption and happiness. With this reversal came an accompanying shift in Greek attitudes toward death itself. The cessation of bodily life was no longer seen as “an inescapable evil, part of the life-cycle of the world, of the community, in which the generations succeed each other, and the continuity of the community is contrasted with the discontinuity of the individual,” but as Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood continues:

The new stirrings...some of which are also reflected in the eighth century archaeological evidence, are the first beginnings of a series of developments which will gain momentum in the succeeding, archaic period (c. 700–c. 480) during which we can detect a (partial) shift away from familiar acceptance toward a more individual, and anxious approach toward one's own death. (1981:17)

In a spiritual-philosophical climate marked by “the first known emergence of European individualism,” the continuity of individual Being became more important than that of collective society (17). Departing from an ethos in which the penalty for hubris must be paid while a person was still living on earth, as is necessarily the case in tragedy (Stewart 1905:63), anxiety is here created by the idea that punishments will be exacted from the disembodied soul after the death of the body for crimes committed during embodied Dwelling. This change did not signal an end to traditional concerns about the power of the sacred will of the gods; instead, it heralded a new relationship between gods and men. Having appropriated deathlessness for itself, even if only in a partial and delayed manner, humankind now found itself on a sufficiently level footing to see its way toward the negotiation of a new bargain: ancient rules of reciprocity could be drawn upon to provide passage across the ultimate Great Divide, the one that separates life and death. Heroized immortality could be had for a price by those who paid the penalty.

Anaximander's Penalty

In the cosmos revealed by the physicists, the soul can find no home;
but it redeems itself by its religious consciousness of selfhood.
(Jaeger 1945 [1939]:169)

Anaximander, said to have lived on the Ionian island of Samos from the end of the seventh century B.C.E. to the middle of the sixth (perhaps forty years after Solon) (Havelock 1978:263),⁴⁴ left what is considered to be “the oldest fragment of Western thinking” (Heidegger 1984 [1950]:13), a piece of philosophical speculation on physical cosmology, which turns out to be directly related to the post-Homeric reciprocal arrangements described above. Martin Heidegger's translators render the Anaximander fragment as follows:

But that from which things arise also gives rise to their passing away, according to what is necessary; for things render justice and pay penalty to one another for their injustice, according to the ordinance of time. (20)

Heidegger illuminates the fragment with a searching exploration of the semantic and existential qualities of the concepts involved. What is *that* from which things (*ta onta*, the created universe) arise? What is *necessary* about their passing away? What is the relationship between *justice* (Diké) and the notion of *paying a penalty*? What constitutes *injustice* (Adikia)? And what is its relationship to the *ordinance of time* (Chronos/Moira)? I propose that the questions raised by Anaximander, so fundamental to the ancient northern Mediterranean worldview that was later to express itself through Plato and Aristotle and continue into current Western ontological religious consciousness, are also posed—and in their own way answered—in the strange cosmogonies attributed to Orpheus.

A Synthetic Analysis

In the Orphic case there was the awareness of a *body, allied to the universe*, which receives a soul which pre-exists and post-exists that body. Insofar as that soul was destined to survive bodily death, *that soul belonged to a dimension set apart from nature*. We find the beginnings of *a notion of time that is unique to human beings*, a notion made the more firm since the Orphic materials ascribed a soul to humans and to no other created entity. (Alderink 1981:91, emphasis added)

As we have seen, in the Orphic conception of the origin of the cosmos, Phanes-Nyx-Ouranos-Zeus-Dionysos (succession, in this case, equates with identity) is *that* from which created things arise. Necessity (Ananké) guards their Dwelling-in-Time, that is, the dwelling-cave from which obscure Night issues her declarations concerning the specifically human-oriented attributes of Time. Chronos, the progenitor, is that which makes Coming-into-Being (Phanes and the Egg) and Dwelling-in-Time (Nyx and Ananké) possible. It is no leap to think that it is also Chronos (in league with Moira) which brings Dwelling-in-Time to an end, reuniting Being with the *that*, the original *aporia* (Anaximander called it the Unlimited or the Infinite). Immortal Being (soul) then, dwells in a human body for a time, and, if it is purified from the taint of having so dwelt, it is reabsorbed into the limitless, bodyless source of Time itself.

This necessary preamble done, we are left to sort out Diké (Order, Justice), Adikia (Disorder, Injustice), and the penalty that must be paid because of them. Eric Havelock, arguing against the existence of a coherent Greek philosophical mind prior to Plato's, insists that *diké* does not manifest in the early speculations of the Ionian physicists as "a comprehensive cosmic principle of metaphysical proportions" (1978:251), but says that these authors between Hesiod and Plato exploited "'justice' symbolically, though still not conceptually" (14). Werner Jaeger (against whom Havelock's argument is

launched), on the other hand, sees the matter in resonantly Durkheimian terms: Anaximander “transfer[red] the concept of diké from the social life of the city state to the realm of nature, explain[ing] the causal connexion between coming-to-be and passing-away as equivalent to a lawsuit, in which things are compelled by the decision of Time to compensate each other for their unrighteousness” (1945 [1939]:110). Moreover, far from being a mere metaphor for regularity in seasonal change (Havelock 1978:263–64), Jaeger holds that it was Anaximander’s use of diké which gave the first unified, non-mythological concept of a cosmos altogether:

This [fragment] is the origin of the philosophical idea of the *cosmos*: for the word originally signifies the *right order* in a state or other community. The philosopher, by projecting the idea of a political cosmos upon the whole of nature, claims that isonomia and not pleonexia must be the leading principle not only of human life but of the nature of things; and his claim is a striking witness to the fact that in his age the new political ideal of justice and law had become the centre of all thought, the basis of existence, the real source of men’s faith in the purpose and meaning of the world. (1945 [1939]:110)

Like Heidegger, Jaeger feels that Anaximander’s aphorism, ostensibly generated by new ideas about the physical universe, marked a moment in which Greek thinking began to struggle with “the deepest problem of life, the problem of Being itself” (153). I contend that Jaeger’s descriptions of the meaning(s) of diké, combined with Heidegger’s investigations, spin a bright and useful thread connecting Plato, Pindar, and Persephone’s ancient grief not only with the *Rhapsodic Theogony*, but also with the myth of Orpheus’ descent into Hades to retrieve his newly dead bride.

Women and Knowledge

Marcel Detienne thinks of Orphism as a modification to omophagic Dionysiac ritual, a necessarily Apollonian restraining influence on the *orgia* of the Mysteries, turning them from ecstatic celebrations of multiply embodied Being united with a multiply embodied god, into ritual inaugurations of a transcendent “reign of remade unity”:

It had to impose on Dionysos the violence of a split necessitated by its abhorrence of bloodshed as well as the fundamental choice of Orphism in favor of the pure man, by which is meant masculine purity. The enactment of Dionysos’s murder by the Titans was designed to exercise the cannibalistic frenzy that tainted the sacrificial act....The split between Dionysos and Apollo here functions inside another, more

profound, split that Orphism made its own: between woman and man, between *the impure bestiality of one and the pure spirituality promised the other*. Orphism exiles the savage violence of Dionysos into the animal world of women, who is thus, by her very nature, *excluded from Orphic rule*. (1979 [1977]:91–92, emphasis added)

Helene Deutsch, for reasons too complex to pursue here, calls Dionysos “the son who saves [women],” and Apollo, “the son who kills [women]” (see Deutsch 1969). Although both men and women practiced Dionysos’ Mysteries, it was with the understanding that they must participate in his rites, not on the level of intellectualized theory, as was possible with the worship of Apollo, but on the level of the body, or not at all. Women, as far as we can tell from the legends, were disallowed from participating in the Orphic Mysteries.⁴⁵ We have seen how the dissociation of the soul from the body is adumbrated in the Orphic theogonies with the separation of the lofty Knower (Sky) from the lowly Known (Earth). The Knower is male by definition, and knowledge serves as the primary focal point for Orphic doctrine.

Alderink provides another vital strand in the bright thread that winds many seemingly disparate elements cohesively together to provide us with a hardy species of Ariadne’s clue for getting out of the Orphic labyrinth:

Orphic literature is marked by the effort to give knowledge of the world. Where humans were concerned, the emphasis was not on the initiatory procedures through which knowledge was acquired but rather on knowledge of human beings as a species and their composite nature. *Knowledge of the distinction between body and soul was the information which created the distinction between those who can and those who cannot sustain the judgment the gods pass upon humans*. Clearly there was no distinction between cognitive and affective spheres and there was no pursuit of “knowledge for its own sake.” Nor did the knowledge come about as a consequence of transforming rituals; it was the knowledge itself which brought about a change in the person. (1981:89)

We know from the Orphic theogonies that knowledge is not birthed from the bodies of women. The primordial mother, Nyx, bears differentiated Being, but knowledge *about* that differentiation only becomes manifest in the person of Athena, sprung adult and fully armed from the forehead of the supreme male. Obscure, dark Night, like human females, hides something inside herself, something unrelentingly generative even when finally stripped of the legitimating authority that lineage usually confers, the capacity to bestow both necessary powers of differentiation and the death sentence of Being-in-Time. Nyx thus contains within herself, the One, the embodied

world of changeable Multiplicity, unfathomable, unknowable, and so unknown; and because her world is unknown, from the point of view of the Knower, it is nonexistent. What the matrix knows, by virtue of Necessity, she keeps to herself.

Somehow, in order to maintain its status as Knower and yet simultaneously to perpetuate knowledge itself, the human male had to find a way to emulate the perceived-as-primary generative power of the cosmic male. Now that masculine knowledge of the differentiation between body and soul is the only thing worthy of generation, the body through which that knowledge enters the world reverts from the female body—source of tainted, corporeal Being-in-Time—to the “body” of a male priesthood: knowledge can only endure unpolluted if it is passed from generation to generation of males by males. Knowledge itself brings about a change in the person. Mothers may *form*, but fathers *inform*. Pure masculine soul is conceptualized as set apart from nature, whose suffering, ecstatic body continually dies and regenerates itself through sex and the seasons, and placed into non-nature, undifferentiated and cardinal Timelessness—the *aporia*, the incorruptible Infinite, deathless and so filled with bliss.

Male Knowledge and the Descent Myth

It was possible to create these “descent groups” because agnation was cultic rather than physiological. Sacrificing, not birth or begetting, maintained agnatic continuity...Physical paternity was not entirely irrelevant: an adulterous woman, a terrible threat to agnatic purity, was excluded from sacrifices of every kind, under threat of terrible punishment from any and every hand. (Jay 1992:45)

Orpheus is a powerful and enduring mythological figure precisely because he is so inextricably caught up in this new negotiation of radically dichotomous categories—soul and body, life and death, Apollo and Dionysos, male and female. He is called a priest and the initiator of “the Orphic brotherhoods,” priests of the sect that L. R. Farnell calls “perhaps the strongest religious influence in the Hellenic world” (1912:137–39). And what does a priest do? He sacrifices. Here I call upon the work of the late feminist anthropologist Nancy Jay:

Sacrifice joins people together in community, and, conversely, it separates them from defilement, disease, and other dangers. This opposition of joining and separating is so widespread that *one of the clearest indications that a ritual killing is properly sacrifice is that it is part of a religious system of this kind.* (1992:17, emphasis added)

Orpheus is remembered as the archetypal poet-musician, but he is also a sacrificer. As Jay's remarkable book amply demonstrates, "It is a common feature of unrelated traditions that only adult males—fathers, real and metaphorical—may perform sacrifice" (xxiii). Guthrie, citing Apollonius Rhodius, Diodoros, and other ancient writers, enumerates the instances in which the Thracian bard, the putative father of a priestly lineage, acts in this capacity for the crew of the Argo:

[In the Orphic version of the *Argonautica*] we find him performing the inaugural sacrifice before the start, persuading the Argonauts to become initiated at Samothrace...sacrificing after the accidental killing of King Kyzikos, performing the purificatory rites at Malea on the return journey...and finally, his last act before returning to his home in Thrace, staying behind alone to offer sacrifice at Tainaron (believed to be one of the entrances to Hades) to the rulers of the world below. (1993 [1935]:28)

In short, Orpheus' pre-descent legends are characterized by sacrifice, literally from beginning to end. And at the end, he performs his priestly function alone at the very Tainarian Gate which will close upon him forever after his famous—if failed—adventure in Persephone's realm, undertaken in the guise of a bereft lover. I submit that it was upon this very threshold, the one that separates the living from the dead, that another revolutionary concept—now soteriological rather than eschatological—came to be expressed in the mythic narrative of Orpheus' descent for Eurydiké.

Who Pays the Penalty?

Probably Orpheus himself was the hero of the Orphic poem on the Descent into Hades, but it is very difficult to find a connexion between the myth and Orphic belief. (Nilsson 1935:212)⁴⁶

Eurydiké is not so named when we first encounter the story of Orpheus' bride. She is instead called Agriope, "Wild-Eyed" or "Wild-Voiced" (Nilsson 1935:30).⁴⁷ However appropriate the name for a Thracian nymph in the wild retinue of Dionysos, it stands in diametrical contrast to Orpheus himself, who through music and Muse-inspired poetry tames and civilizes what is wild. He knows that the wild (Adikia, Disorder) must be brought under control, made human, useful. One of the most outstanding and time-tested ways to bring the uncontrollable under control is by means of sacrifice. Control, by definition, requires the eradication of wildness, or at least its transformation into Order (Diké). Through sacrifice, wildness is expunged, but so too is the Being who embodies it. "The victim has indeed been brought under a kind of analytic control, but in the process it has been killed" (Jay 1992:xxvi).

Classics scholars and poets, as well as comparative mythologists and other folklorists, have made a virtual industry of guessing at why Orpheus disobeys the injunction not to turn, not to look back. But his function as a sacrificer has never been brought to bear on the issue. What if the killing of Agriope, literally accomplished in the eyes of a priest, is the act that transforms wildness (*adikia*) into justice (*diké*)? What if, at the moment before Orpheus acts on Persephone's tearful good will and robs her of the penalty that all men must pay, he stops at the threshold, frozen in the insight that he might pay the penalty of ancient guilt not with his own life on earth as was always demanded before his own religious doctrine delayed the requisite payment until after death, *but with the life of another*? And that with his turning to sacrifice Eurydiké, whose name means "Wide Justice," he could thereby win redemption for all those sacrificers (fathers and sons) who would come after him?

There are two kinds of humans: those who pay the penalty of the ancient grief and those who do not. The first group is comprised of beings eligible for immortality and bliss; the second will spend eternity in the dark recesses of the Underworld, never to be raised again into the sun, never to be heroized by men. Additionally, there are two kinds of humans: males and females. And only males are in a position to pay the penalty (*diké*) because they are the only variety of human to whom initiation in the rites of atonement are available. But with what might the penalty be paid? Why not with something of essential, but profoundly ambiguous, value: Being-in-Time personified, that is, the body of a woman. With *Diké*, or better yet, with Eurydiké, "Wide Justice," All Justice once and for all, all the justice and atonement that Persephone could ever demand from men. Given that her "body" is already that of a bloodless wraith (and hence would not implicate the forbidden practice of blood sacrifice) why not administer to it the sacrificial look that kills?

Bewailing the loss of Bion (a bard in the lineage of Orpheus), the inheritor of his musical prowess, Moschus, identifies Orpheus' wife for the first time as Eurydiké (Lang 1932 [1880]:169). The section of the poem that carries her new name begins: "But justice hath overtaken them all." It goes on: "Not unrewarded will the singing be; and as once to Orpheus's sweet minstrelsy she gave Eurydice to return with him, even so will she send thee too, Bion, to the hills" (202). Persephone will send Bion, as she did Orpheus after his death at the hands of the Maenads, to the hills, otherwise known as the Isles of the Blessed. He takes Eurydiké with him only in the sense that now all men take her with them when they die—as ransom. As it was later understood in the cases of Jesus and Custer, the sacrifice of the one came to be understood as redemption, as payment of the penalty for the many.

Is this why Orpheus is dismembered by the female followers of the original One, the god Dionysos? Is Orpheus' payment-by-proxy understood by the Maenads as the ultimate betrayal of the pact made with Persephone by Orpheus himself in his own doctrine of atonement to the Queen of Death, Phanes-Kore herself, the mother of Zagreus-Dionysos? Did he carry the valuation of the male over the female, Timelessness over Being-in-Time, one step too far? Did his innovative act of sacrificial justice change forever the concept of death and redemption for the generations of humans to follow?

Now, long after all the Orphic poets who knew the secret rites of initiation have gained immortality in the Western Lands, subsequent Western religious consciousness seems to have passed its own judgment on this trick played by human men against the gods: it accepted it wholeheartedly as correct. It adopted this essential function of sacrificial mythology into its living religion. All of this means to suggest that Eurydiké may hold a more important place in the history of religious thought than was previously suspected. Rather than merely bidding her time as a sign-woman (a female whose role is always to signify something beyond herself) in Hades, she may have eventually been replaced with another, more enduring sign, that of a male redeemer; the Styx with another, a brighter river; the Isles of the Blessed with a new home for those who can sustain the judgment of death, that is, the redeemed, the conquerors of Being-in-Time, the cosmic enemy without which no redemption is possible, or indeed, required.

Allow for a moment the possibility that the best of all possible worlds, for all varieties of human Being, is not a world without women—without whom Being-in-Time is unthinkable and unknowable—think of Eurydiké, and in the spirit of the eighteenth century American hymn “Free Grace,” sing:

Hallelujah to the man who purchased our pardon.
We'll praise him again when we pass over Jordan.

Cosmological myths are not without consequences. Ask a woman.

Notes

¹ See Book Four of *The Georgics*, Virgil 1988 [1982].

² For a recent translation see Apostolos N. Athanassakis 1977.

³ Alderink, who wrote *Creation and Salvation in Ancient Orphism* mainly with the intention of sorting out a definition for Orphism, calls it “a climate of opinion,” “a structure of thought,” “a mood,” and “a spirit” (1981:4–5).

⁴“To those who had advanced to a monotheistic stage of belief, Zeus was the name of the one god, the beginning and end of all things; in mystic, pantheistic philosophy he becomes a mere abstraction, as in the Orphic poems” (Whibley 1905:303).

⁵“[The materials] relate the problem of evil to the body-mind distinction” (Alderink 1981:89).

⁶“[The materials] assert that the destiny of the soul is related to the activity of the soul during its habitation of the body” (Alderink 1981:89).

⁷ Jaeger points out that this doctrine also made its way easily into Platonic thought. In the *Protagoras*, Socrates “reminds his hearers of the Orphic imagery which called the unintelligent ‘the uninitiate,’ which made a sieve the symbol of the soul of the insatiable lover of pleasure, and taught that in the next world he was punished by pouring water forever into a leaky cask” (Jaeger 1943:142).

⁸ See Alderink’s Foreword to Guthrie (1993 [1935]:xxii).

⁹ Writing on the “new upwelling of spiritual forces” that was attested by “the Orphic movement,” Jaeger states: “Any creed which lays down that the soul comes from God and does not perish, naturally teaches that it must be kept pure during its earthly existence; and a believer in such a creed feels himself responsible for all his conduct during this life” (1945 [1939]:166). The Orphics are known to have practiced abstinence from meat and sexual activity in addition to eschewing, like the Pythagoreans, beans and burial in woolen cloth.

¹⁰The most important work includes: E. Abel 1885, C. A. Lobeck 1829, Otto Gruppe 1887, Salomon Reinach 1933 [1909], Otto Kern 1953 [1922], Erwin Rohde 1966 [1925], H. Diels 1879, Lewis Richard Farnell 1921, James George Frazer 1898, Arthur Bernard Cook 1914 and 1965 [1925], Jane Harrison 1980 [1903], H. J. Rose 1959 [1930], W. K. C. Guthrie 1993 [1935], M. P. Nilsson 1925, Ivan M. Linforth 1941, M. L. West 1983.

¹¹ There is a general consensus that the poems refer to stories in oral circulation as long ago as the late seventh or early sixth century B.C.E., between Hesiod and the Pre-Socratics. West writes, “The discovery of the Derveni text now allows us to see for certain that more of [the stories] go back to the classical period than we had the right to assume. It is a discovery that has thrown an unexpected and indeed sensational light on early Orphic theology” (1983:69).

¹² Guthrie writes: “Aither and a great yawning gulf, and darkness over all” (1993 [1935]:80).

¹³ Kore literally means “maiden” or “unmarried woman.” It is the name frequently used to identify Demeter’s daughter, the Earth goddess Persephone, before she was abducted by Hades and condemned to become Queen of the Dead.

¹⁴ The Titans are old gods, male and female, associated with pure power.

¹⁵ The *Derveni Papyrus* tells us in column 17, lines 5–7, that “Heavenly Aphrodite” and “Zeus” and “making love” and “mating” are fixed names for the same god (Alderink 1981:118).

¹⁶ Eros (Desire) is, loosely speaking, Aphrodite’s male counterpart, and in some theogonies, her son.

¹⁷ Metis is the goddess who embodies Cunning Intelligence.

¹⁸ Dionysos is a complex male divinity who figures largely in the ancient mystery cults, and is often associated with emotion, as opposed to reason.

¹⁹ Alderink (1981:82), Kern’s fragments 21 and 168.

²⁰ Tartaros is the lowest level of the Underworld.

²¹ Alderink (1981:81), Kern’s fragment 167.

²² Athena is a female goddess who has no mother and no children.

²³ Alderink (1981:82), Kern’s fragment 176.

²⁴ Gaia, Rhea, Demeter, and Kore embody the Earth principle in succeeding generations.

²⁵ Alderink (1981:82), Kern’s fragment 208.

²⁶ See Detienne 1981 [1972] for a theory of “sacrificial/alimentary codes” and its expansion in Detienne and Vernant 1989 [1979].

²⁷ A complex male divinity often associated with reason, as opposed to emotion.

²⁸ The thigh or lap is generally a euphemism for the genitals. Thanks to Steven Olbrys for pointing out the paradoxically oppositional structure of Zeus’ anatomy which allows for two indexically diverse birthings: Athena-head-mentality-maleness; Dionysos-genitals-physicality-femaleness.

²⁹ It is unclear whether Guthrie includes women in his reading. It is possible he does not, as Semele is usually considered a human woman, a daughter of the royal line of Thebes. Her name, however, may also refer to an ancient Thracian Earth goddess.

³⁰ Guthrie (1993 [1935]:83), Kern’s fragment 232. Lawless ancestry refers to the Titans who slew and ate Dionysos-Zagreus.

³¹ According to Irene Elia, an anthropological biologist, "Although parthenogenesis is extremely rare as a vertebrate mode of reproduction...it points out a distinction between the sexes that is obvious but profound. In sexually reproducing species, no new life develops without an egg. No sperm that we know of has ever been able to create a new life without an egg" (1988:27).

³² As Jaeger notes, Plato (*Rep.* 617c) identified the Morai as "the daughters of Necessity, Ananké" (1943:431, n. 64).

³³ As Gregory Bateson points out, information is any difference that makes a difference. Night's wisdom may now manifest as information.

³⁴ The male Cyclops are called Brontes (thunder), Steropes (lightning), and Arges (shining) (Alderink 1981:46). Thunderstorms require an energetic relationship between sky and earth. They blend darkness with light, dry with wet, static with kinetic, and up with down. We know today that lightning does not "shoot from the sky" as it appears to do, but "rises from the earth."

³⁵ In R. M. Frazer's translation, Hesiod tells us that the Titan Kronos was "most to be feared" and "hated his vigorous father" (*Theogony*, line 138). He also tells us that the misshapen Hundred-Handers, Kotto (the name suggests Rancor), Briareos (The Strong One), and Gyges (Frazer suggests Limbs) being the most fearsome of children, their father was driven to hate them (*Theogony*, line 155). It was Ouranos' act of putting each one back into Gaia and out of the light that prompted her to devise the plan to have Kronos castrate him. Hatred of the bright male for the bright male, whether father toward son or son toward father, is what provokes the dark female, who has contained each male within her own body at one time or another, to plan the first murder.

³⁶ The cosmic war fought between the old Titans and the younger Olympians for universal supremacy.

³⁷ "The Derveni papyrus indicates that Zeus created 'from above' or 'in the sky' and...Aristotle...found the soul to enter the body 'from the winds.' In both cases there is an upward location for the source of life" (Alderink 1981:58).

³⁸ Zeus was often identified with Hades and called Zeus Chthonios (Guthrie 1993 [1935]:7).

³⁹ Hubris, commonly thought to mean a crime born of pride, more precisely means "an act which seeks to establish a dominant position for [an] attacker in the eyes of the community" (Mason 1984:23).

⁴⁰ Jaeger states that "Diké and hubris are opposites in Greek" (1945 [1939]:442, n. 18).

⁴¹The translation is from Harold Fowler (1953:63).

⁴²J. A. Stewart had no difficulties with the idea that Plato's own belief system was, at least in part, derived from Orphism: "Orphic doctrine, refined by poetic genius for philosophic use, is the material of which Plato weaves his Eschatological Myths. And he seems almost to go out of his way to tell us this....But, after all, the most convincing evidence for the great influence exercised by Orphic doctrine over Plato is to be found in the way in which he loves to describe Philosophy itself in terms borrowed from the Orphic cult and the Mysteries" (1905:68–69).

⁴³An alternative name for Bacchus or Dionysos, Persephone's murdered son.

⁴⁴Solon was one of the Western world's first codifiers of a formal legal system.

⁴⁵See Guthrie, who gives almost a full page to what he calls "the misogynistic element in the Orpheus-legend" and "the personal antagonism of Orpheus to women" (1993 [1935]:49–50, 62).

⁴⁶No such connection has been forged, to my knowledge, since Nilsson's writing.

⁴⁷The name is given by the Alexandrine poet Hermesianax.

References Cited

- Abel, E. 1885. *Orphica*. Leipzig.
- Alderink, Larry J. 1981. *Creation and Salvation in Ancient Orphism*, American Classical Studies, No. 8. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
- Apollodorus. 1921. *Bibliotheca*, trans. J. G. Frazer. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Apollonius Rhodius. 1988 [1912]. *Argonautica*, trans. R. C. Seaton. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Aristophanes. 1961. *The Birds*, trans. William Arrowsmith. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Athanassakis, Apostolos N. 1977. *The Orphic Hymns*. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
- Bremmer, Jan. 1983. *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Burkert, Walter. 1985 [1977]. *Greek Religion*, trans. John Raffan. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1977. *Orphism and Bacchic Mysteries: New Evidence and Old Problems of Interpretation*, ed. W. Wuellner. Protocol of the 28th Colloquy. Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenic and Modern Culture.
- Calame, Claude. 1997. Figures of Sexuality and Initiatory Transition in the Derveni Theogony and its Commentary. In *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, eds. Andr Laks and Glenn W. Most, pp. 65–80. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cook, Arthur Bernard. 1914. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion. Vol. I: Zeus, God of the Bright Sky*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1965 [1925]. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion. Vol. II: Zeus, God of the Dark Sky (Thunder and Lightning)*. New York: Biblo and Tannen.
- Detienne, Marcel. 1981 [1972]. Between Beasts and Gods. In *Myth, Religion and Society: Structuralist Essays by M. Detienne, L. Gernet, J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet*, ed. R. L. Gordon, pp. 215–28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1979 [1977]. *Dionysos Slain*, trans. Mireille Muellner and Leonard Muellner. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Detienne, Marcel and Jean-Pierre Vernant. 1989 [1979]. *The Cuisine of Sacrifice Among the Greeks*, trans. Paula Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Deutsch, Helene. 1969. *A Psychoanalytic Study of the Myth of Dionysos and Apollo: Two Variants of the Son-Mother Relationship*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Diels, H. 1879. *Doxographi Graeci*. Berlin.
- Dodds, E. R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Elia, Irene. 1988. *The Female Animal*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Euripides. 1995. *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays*, trans. C. Collard, M. J. Cropp, and K. H. Lee. Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips.
- Farnell, Lewis Richard. 1921. *Greek Hero-Cults and Ideas of Immortality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1912. *The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

- Fowler, Harold, trans. 1953. *Plato: Cratylus, Parmenides, Greater Hippias, Lesser Hippias*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Frazer, James George. 1898. *Pausanias*. New York.
- Graf, Fritz. 1993. Dionysian and Orphic Eschatology: New Texts and Old Questions. In *Masks of Dionysus*, eds. Thomas H. Carpenter and Christopher A. Faraone, pp. 239–58. Ithaca, New York and London: Cornell University Press.
- Gruppe, Otto. 1887. *Die Griechischen Culte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den Orientalischen Religionen*. Leipzig.
- Guthrie, William Keith Chambers. 1993 [1935]. *Orpheus and Greek Religion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Harrison, Jane. 1980 [1903]. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. London: Merlin Press.
- Havelock, Eric A. 1978. *The Greek Concept of Justice: From its Shadow in Homer to its Substance in Plato*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1984 [1950]. *Early Greek Thinking: The Dawn of Western Philosophy*, trans. David Farrell Krell and Frank A. Capuzzi. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Henrichs, Albert. 1993. He Has a God in Him: Human and Divine in the Modern Perception of Dionysus. In *Masks of Dionysus*, eds. Thomas H. Carpenter and Christopher A. Faraone, pp. 13–43. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 1983. The Excavation of Concepts: Commentary on Peradotto and Nagy. *Arethusa* 16(1.2):57–68.
- Hesiod. 1983. *The Poems of Hesiod*, trans. R. M. Frazer. Norman, Oklahoma and London: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Jaeger, Werner. 1945 [1939]. *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, Vol. I: Archaic Greece, The Mind of Athens*, trans. Gilbert Highet. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1943. *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, Vol. II: In Search of the Divine Centre*, trans. Gilbert Highet. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jay, Nancy. 1992. *Throughout Your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion, and Paternity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Kern, Otto. 1953 [1922]. *Orphicorum Fragmenta*. Berlin.
- Lang, Andrew. 1932 [1880]. *Theocritus, Bion and Moschus*. London: Macmillan & Co.
- Linforth, Ivan M. 1941. *The Arts of Orpheus*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Lobeck, C. A. 1829. *Aglaophamus: Sive de Theologiae Mysticae Graecorum Causis*. Leipzig.
- Mason, Peter. 1984. *The City of Men: Ideology, Sexual Politics and the Social Formation*. Monographica 4. Gottingen: Edition Herodot.
- Mead, G. R. S. 1965. *Orpheus*. New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Nilsson, Martin P. 1952 [1925]. *A History of Greek Religion*, trans. F. J. Fielden. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1935. Early Orphism and Kindred Religious Movements. *Harvard Theological Review* 28(3):181–230.
- Plato. 1963. *The Collected Dialogues of Plato*, eds. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Reinach, Salomon. 1933 [1909]. *Orpheus: A General History of Religions*, trans. Florence Simmonds. New York: Putnam.
- Rohde, Erwin. 1966 [1925]. *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality Among the Greeks*, trans. W. B. Hills. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rose, Herbert J. 1967 [1936]. The Ancient Grief. In *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on His Seventieth Birthday, January 2, 1936*, Oxford Essay Index Reprint Series, pp. 79–96. Freeport, New York: Books For Libraries Press.
- _____. 1959 [1930]. *A Handbook of Greek Mythology*. New York: Dutton.
- _____. 1943. The Grief of Persephone. *Harvard Theological Review* 36:247–50.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. 1981. To Die and Enter the House of Hades: Homer, Before and After. In *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death*, ed. Joachim Whaley. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Stewart, J. A. 1905. *The Myths of Plato*. New York: Macmillan & Co.
- Virgil. 1988 [1982]. *The Georgics*, trans. L. P. Wilkinson. London: Penguin Books.

West, Martin Litchfield. 1983. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Whibley, Leonard. 1905. *A Companion to Greek Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.