Some Remarks on Paradigms in the Recent Studies in Orphism

In his paper on *Orphism as a Scientific Paradigm* delivered during the *Colloquia Orphica IV* held at Nieborów in 2012 and published in the fifth issue of *Littera Antiqua*, Przemysław Biernat discussed the rivaling paradigms in modern interpretations of the ancient material labelled as "Orphic." The author focused on the two dominant paradigms in the Orphic studies that have been proposed by the most prominent scholars, namely Alberto Bernabé Pajares (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) and Radcliffe Guest Edmonds III (Bryn Mawr College). Having proceeded to discuss the problem I am going to compare the most important elements in them and, then, to consider whether these two paradigms are so totally different from each other as they seem at first glance or whether they may be convergent in some parts. In my analyses, after briefly presenting the traditional interpretation of Orphism, I will move to Edmonds' proposition, then to Bernabé's reply. Though chronologically it would be more appropriate to begin with Bernabé, beginning with Edmonds' critique seems more appropriate in this article due to the main problem discussed.

Let us summarize the dispute. The central problem is the relevance of the so-called Dionysian myth on the dismemberment of Zagreus, the elder Dionysus, by the Titans. The myth in question is regarded by most scholars as the keystone of both the Orphic doctrines and rituals celebrated in the Orphic circles. Therefore, if someone undermines this myth or exchanges it for a different one, he puts into question the existence of the Orphic communities and even Orphism itself.

The Dionysian myth was to combine cosmogonic and theogonic aspects with anthropogenic and soteriological ones. Interpreted from the Dionysian perspective, Orphism becomes a fundamental antithesis of Homeric anthropology, which implied the temporality, i.e. mortality, of the human soul whose essence was believed to be constituted by man’s power and wealth with no immortality attributed to it except the memory of its famous deeds - a mere substitute for true immortality. The ideology of Orphism, on the contrary, emphasized the immortality of the soul as the essence of the human being and made the faith in eschatological rewards and punishments its axiom.

---

The interpretation in question seems to be prevalent in the study of Orphism since the time of Domenico Comparetti (1910). This does not mean, of course, that there is a general consensus in the scholarly world. For instance, the most influential scholars of the previous centuries, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ivan M. Linforth, and Eric R. Dodds, expressed their skepticism based primarily on a critical evaluation of the source material and its interpretation within the dominant paradigm.

The second half of the twentieth century brought a far-reaching revival of the Orphic studies. A number of new archaeological discoveries, whether it be the golden leaves, bone plates from Olbia (discovered in 1952, published in 1978), or the Derveni papyrus (1962), seemed to throw new light on some questions related to Orphism, greatly enhancing the predominant Dionysian paradigm. Even such skeptical scholars as Martin L. West (b. 1937) accept the antiquity of the Dionysian myth, with some doubts and reservations. The last decade of the twentieth century, however, brought fundamental critique from Radcliffe G. Edmonds III.

I. EDMONDS’ CRITIQUE

To simplify, Edmonds' criticism boils down to a critique of the relevance of the myth on the dismemberment of Dionysus-Zagreus. As regards the interpretation of the golden plates from the perspective of the Dionysian myth, he states:

"Although this myth of Zagreus provides a seductively simple and neat explanation of the cryptic gold tablet, it is unfortunately a modern creation that could not have been known to the 'Orphics' of Timpone Piccolo. Indeed, I shall demonstrate that this Zagreus myth is, in fact, a modern fabrication dependent upon Christian models that reconstruct the fragmentary evidence in terms of a unified 'Orphic' church, an almost Christian religion with dogma based on a central myth – specifically, salvation from original sin through the death and resurrection of the suffering god. If the evidence is viewed without these assumptions, it can be put back together quite differently.”

---

2 The first golden leaves were discovered in 1835. Since that time many leaves have been discovered. In recent years, some leaves were found in the tombs in Thessaly and Macedonia.
In the same paper he shows that the Dionysian myth consists of four elements: 1. “the dismemberment of Dionysus”; 2. “the punishment of the Titans”; 3. “the creation of mankind from the Titans”; 4. “the inheritance humans receive from the first three elements – burden of guilt from the Titans’ crime and the divine spark from the remains of Dionysus.”\(^4\) The first three elements are in fact separate motifs, which “live their lives independently” in Greek mythology and literature (Edmonds rigorously analyzed each of them in support of his argument). The fourth element, Edmonds asserts, “is an addition of modern scholars.”\(^5\) Moreover, he argues that the first three elements appear together explicitly for the first time in Olympiodorus (the sixth century AD, c. 495-570), who used them in order to support the conviction that committing suicide should be prohibited, and it is, as Edmonds argues, Olympiodorus’ own interpretation, not the common Orphic version of the dismemberment myth. On the one hand, Edmonds denies the authenticity of Titanic heritage that is the result of "original sin" and the implied duality of human nature; on the other hand, he assumes that the importance ascribed to the myth of the dismemberment of Dionysus in the Orphic context is a product of late antiquity, presumably of Neoplatonic reflection. Thus, in this case it is impossible to speak of the anthropogenic aspect that appears with Olympiodorus' relation. The relevance of the anthropogenic aspect is, after all, overrated by contemporary researchers who have made it the keystone of the alleged "Orphism." To make matters worse, this hypothesis, which recognizes the myth of the dismemberment of Dionysus as the central myth in Orphism, greatly influenced the previous analysis of all ancient texts and archaeological materials. In other words, the researchers were "forced" to look for evidence of the myth in various sources (such as Plato’s dialogues and the golden leaves) and to collect every single piece that would be useful to this interpretation, despite the fact that they [these pieces] can be interpreted just as well, and usually better, in a different context.

Briefly characterized, Edmonds' attitude towards the myth of the dismemberment of Dionysus-Zagreus has far-reaching consequences with regard to the proposed understanding of Orphism and the overall design of the study and reading of passages referred to as "Orphic."

Edmonds rejects the understanding of Orphism both as a centrally-organized religion, and as a dogmatic way of life, in which the myth of the dismemberment of Dionysus and its consequences in the form of the concept of "original sin" and the duality of human nature play a central role. He points out that this view of Orphism results from the imposition of details

\(^4\) Ibidem, p. 37.
\(^5\) Ibidem, p. 38.
that have their source in the Christian concept of religion: a prophet (Orpheus), holy books (the alleged poems of Orpheus), a flaw of human nature that requires redemption through the sacrifice of the son of God (Dionysus), and salvation made available to those who follow the path designated by the prophet. Edmonds suggests a different approach. As stated in the announcement of his recent book, "Rather than looking for a coherent set of sacred texts canonical to people who considered themselves Orphics, texts expressive of doctrines pertaining to sin, salvation, and afterlife, we should look for the products of bricolage, pieced together from widely available traditional material to meet the demand of clients looking for extra-ordinary solutions to their problems. If the texts and rituals are products of bricolage, however, and their creators bricoleurs competing for authority, we cannot expect to find either consistency of texts or doctrines, merely a loose family resemblance between composites of the same traditional elements. A redefinition of ancient Orphism requires a polythetic definition that accommodates the complexities of the ancient contexts rather than the sort of monotheistic definition that identifies Orphism by its scriptures and doctrines."6 In his earlier book, Edmonds writes, regarding the golden leaves, "rather than explaining all the tablets simply as the products of a single (and anachronistic) ‘Orphic’ doctrine of original sin, analyzing the different ways in which these ‘Orphic’ tablets make use of traditional mythic elements to depict the journey to the underworld reveals the various modes of protest they are expressing against the world from which they came."7

II. BERNABÉ’S REPLY

Alberto Bernabé Pajares, in a number of his papers, criticizes Edmonds' viewpoint and arguments to defend the relevance of the myth of Dionysus-Zagreus for the interpretation of Orphism. Above all, he argues that the Dionysian myth is invoked not only by Olympiodorus, but also by other Neoplatonic philosophers such as Proclus (412-485 AD) and Damascius (c. 480-550 AD). He states that "the sequence Damascius presents us with (the death of Dionysus, the punishment of the Titans, the creation of man and dualism of the human soul, φρουρά and metempsychosis) is the same as the one offered to us by Olympiodorus. It also

---

appears in Proclus, who confirms that people came from the Titans" (trans. L. Fretschel). In addition, he presents several allusions to the Dionysian myth made by Aristophanes, Plato, Plutarch, as well as those in the Orphic Argonautics and the Orphic Hymns. To sum up the analysis of the above-mentioned testimonies, he concludes: "All this leads us to the conclusion that the Orphic myth of Dionysus and the Titans is not a nineteenth-century design, mirage, or the result of Christian prejudice, as the critics who deny its existence believe, but that it comes from ancient Greece, albeit from areas a bit religiously marginal, which means no such diffusion as broad as in the case of other myths is seen here. Each of the authors who relay this story, as indeed always happens with myths, select individual elements of the paradigm. But we see that in this case incompatible elements are not added to the narrative (nor the interpretation, but that is another matter entirely). The narrative is also consistent in time. In this way, a long-lasting, long-present religious movement is preserved. We cannot assign it to any other religious movement than to Orphism" (trans. L. Fretschel).

Bernabé consistently criticizes Edmonds' definition of Orphism. While appreciating his analysis of the political dimension of Orphism (in light of Edmonds' studies of the golden leaves), he also states that "the interpretatio politica does not exhaust the scope of these texts." He points out that Edmonds' view of the golden plates as a socio-political protest may raise serious doubts, because, as he puts it, "it is a strange protest, a silent one, because it was destined to be buried. It is likely that political dissatisfaction is an aspect of the interpretation of the texts, but the limitation of the gold tablets to that is a quite reductionist view."

---

8 A. Bernabé, El mito órftico de Dioniso y los Titanes, In: Orfeo y la tradició órfica. Un reencuentro, coordinado por A. Bernabé y F. Casadesús, Madrid 2008, pp. 593–594: "la secuencia que nos presenta Damascio (muerte de Dioniso, castigo de los Titanes, creación de los hombres y dualidad de su alma, φροντίδα y metempsicosis) es la misma que nos ofrece Olimpiodoro. Y aparece también en otros textos de Proclo en que se afirma que los hombres proceden de los Titanes."

9 Ibidem, p. 607: “Todo ello nos lleva a concluir que el mito órftico de Dioniso y los Titanes no es una construcción del siglo XIX, un espejismo, fruto de un prejuicio cristianizante, como creen los críticos que niegan su existencia, sino que procede de la Grecia antigua, si bien de sectores religiosos un tanto marginales, lo que provoca que no encuentre una difusión en las fuentes tan amplia como la de otros mitos. Cada uno de los diversos autores que se refieren a esta historia, como por otra parte ocurre siempre con los mitos, seleccionan elementos sueltos del paradigma. Pero vemos en este caso que nunca añaden en la narración (no en la interpretación, que es otra cosa) elementos incompatibles con el esquema trazado. El esquema se nos muestra tan nítido y tan coherente que podemos reconstruirlo de un modo muy verosímil. Es, además, un esquema muy consecuente a lo largo del tiempo. Responde, por tanto, a un movimiento religioso que tuvo una larga duración, una larga presencia. A ningún otro movimiento religioso podríamos achacar esta persistencia tan duradera, si no es orfismo.”


11 Ibidem, p. 5.
I would now like to refer to the key problems outlined above. Let us start with the fundamental question, namely the Dionysian myth. Before I discuss the credibility of the ancient story on the dismemberment of Zagreus and its possible relation to the so-called Orphic doctrine, I would like to start from its consequence, that is, the tenets of the duality of human nature and "original sin."

Let us look at two passages from Plato's dialogues Cratylus and Gorgias that evoke the formula τὸ σῶμα ἐστὶν ἡμῖν σήμα, attributed to the Orpicians. The quotations go thus:

“For some say that the body is the grave of the soul which may be thought to be buried in our present life; or again the index of the soul, because the soul gives indications to the body; probably the Orphic poets were the inventors of the name, and they were under the impression that the soul is suffering the punishment of sin, and that the body is an enclosure or prison in which the soul is incarcerated, kept safe, as the name soma implies, until the penalty is paid; according to this view, not even a letter of the word need be changed” (Plato, Cratylus, 400c1–9, trans. B. Jowett). ¹²

“But surely life according to your view is an awful thing; and indeed I think that Euripides may have been right in saying, »Who knows if life be not death and death life«; and that we are very likely dead; I have heard a philosopher say that at this moment we are actually dead, and that the part of the soul which is the seat of the desires is liable to be tossed about by words and blown up and down” (Plato, Gorgias, 492e1–493a5, trans. B. Jowett). ¹³

The core of the problem is the provenance of the "body is our tomb" formula. The scholarly literature prefers the view that there is a relation between the Cratylus passage and

---

¹² καὶ γὰρ σῆμα τινὸς φασιν αὐτὸ εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς τεθαμμένης ἐν τῷ νῦν παρόντι· καὶ διότι αὖ τοῦτο σημαίνει ἡ ἡμέρα οὖν τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ ταύτης "σήμα" ὁρθῶς καλείσθαι· δοκοῦσι μέντοι μοι μάλιστα θέσθαι οἱ ἀμφὶ ὃ Ὀρφεῖον τὸ τὸ ὑδάτιο, ὡς δίκην διδούσης τῆς ψυχῆς ὕψος διὰ ἐνεκὲν διδούσιν, τοῦτον δὲ περιβάλων ἔχειν, ἵνα σωθῆται, δεσμωτήριον εἰκόνα· εἶναι οὖν τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦτο, ὡσπερ αὐτὸ ὄνομαζεται, ἐως ὅτι ἕκτεισθαι τὰ ὀφειλόμενα, [τὸ] "σῶμα", καὶ οὐδὲν δεῖν παραχείν ὑδὸν ἐν γράμμα.

¹³ ἄλλα μὲν δὴ καὶ ὡς γαὶ μὲν γε σὺ λέγεις δεινὸς ὁ βίος, οὐ γὰρ τοῖς θεαμαζομίνι· αὖ, εἰ δυνατὸς ἄλληθ᾽ ἐν τοῖσδε λέγει, λέγων "τίς δ᾽ οἴδειν, εἰ τὸ δὲν μὲν ἐστὶ καθαυείν, τὸ καθαυεῖν δὲ ἔχειν": καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ ὅπως δένονται· ἕδη τοῦ ἔγγοντα ἡτοι ἡ ἕκσονται ἔκοσμα τῶν σοφῶν, ὡς νῦν ἣμεῖς τέθναμεν, καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα ἐστὶν ἡμῖν σήμα, τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς τούτω, ἐν ὦ ἐπιθυμίας εἰσίν, πυρεῖν οὖν οἷον ἀνακεῖθεςθαι καὶ μεταπίπτειν ἀνω κάτω.
the Orphic tenets. Some prominent scholars, however, including Wilamowitz, Linforth, and Dodds, disagree with this opinion. Let us take a closer look at Eric Dodds' arguments. It was assumed by him that Plato contrasted two etymologies of the word σῶμα: one connected with some unspecified τινὲς who derived σῶμα from σήμα or σημαίνω, and the other associated with οἱ ἀμφὶ ὦ Ὀρφέα who derived σῶμα from σώζειν, ὑπα σώζηται. Therefore, Dodds excludes the possibility of identifying τινὲς with οἱ ἀμφὶ ὦ Ὀρφέα.14 Edmonds agrees with Dodds' interpretation. He states as follows:

"The controversy surrounding this passage mostly revolves around the issue of whether οἱ ἀμφὶ ὦ Ὀρφέα also provide the etymology of σῶμα/σήμα, the body as the tomb of the soul, which, on the strength of this passage, has been declared a central tenet of the »Orphic faith« by some modern scholars. I follow Wilamowitz and Linforth 1941, p. 148 in reading the passage as drawing a distinction between the etymology of οἱ ἀμφὶ ὦ Ὀρφέα and the unnamed τινὲς who provide the σῶμα/σήμα derivation . . . nevertheless, the σῶμα/σήμα idea must come from a religious movement very similar to that which supports its ideas with the poems of Orpheus, the 'Orphics' in the strictest sense."15

Bernabé defends the Orphic origin of the formula τὸ σῶμα ἐστὶν ἡμῖν σήμα as well as identifies τινὲς with οἱ ἀμφὶ ὦ Ὀρφέα.16 He argues that the etymological relation between σῶμα and σώζω must be Plato’s own invention:

"Plato, by way of a new etymology suggesting that σῶμα is a name derived from σώζω, reinterprets the role of the body in a positive sense, as a protection of the soul, using the idea of a prison as an intermediary" (trans. L. Fretschel).17

Bernabé’s arguments that are summarized here sound convincing to me.18 However, the matter is controversial and there remain some doubts. In addition to purely linguistic

15 Edmonds, Myth of the Underworld..., p. 177, n. 48.
17 Idem, Platón y el orfismo..., p. 136: "Platón, a través de la nueva etimología que propone que σῶμα es un nombre de resultado de σώζω, interpreta el papel del cuerpo en un sentido más positivo, como protección del alma, utilizando como intermedio la idea de la prisión."
analyses, it is interesting that Olympiodorus in his commentary on Plato's *Gorgias* does not imply that the τὸ σῶμα ἐστιν ἡμῖν σῆμα formula is of Orphic origin in identifying the soul-barrel myth as a Pythagorean one. Olympiodorus does not comment directly on the origin of the formula in which we are interested, but he interweaves it with the Pythagorean myth, stating: λέγει γὰρ τάφων τὸ σῆμα, σῆμα δὲ τὸ σῶμα ["For he calls prison a tomb, and the body a prison" - P.Ś]. Is it possible, therefore, that the formula in question is of Pythagorean origin? I do not think that this possibility can be ruled out completely. At the same time, however, there is no doubt that even if the etymology itself does not come from the Orphics (although the problem of the interrelation between Pythagoreanism and Orphism is complicated and impossible to interpret unambiguously), Plato's *testimonium*, as Edmonds rightly points out, indicates the far-reaching relationship between the concept of σῶμα/σήμα and the Orphic view on the relationship between body and soul. What is the essence of this relationship? Let us take a closer look at this question with reference to the story of the soul-barrel from the *Gorgias*.

The fragment from *Cratylus* quoted above indicates that the soul resides in the body as in a kind of prison - to be punished, to be corrected, and, finally, for the sake of justice. There is no doubt that in this sense the tenet implies the dualism of natures in man. But is it true that the concept of "original sin" is necessarily born from this dualism?

The first problem that arises from a question formulated this way concerns the concept of the inheritance of guilt. This inheritance in the context of justice, understood as the inevitability of punishment, known since the times of Homer and Hesiod, and often undertaken in Greek tragedies, appears as emblematic in the political poetry of Solon. In fragment 13, he points out that although there is no escape from the vengeance of Zeus, it happens that children will be punished for the sins of their ancestors. It is in this light, Edmonds suggests, that the problem of the inheritance of guilt which also appears in the golden leaves should be viewed. He states thus:

"Along with the idea of paying for an ancestor’s crimes naturally comes the idea of somehow evading the penalty. [...] the Orpheotelests described in Plato’s *Republic* seem to have promised more complete results from the sacrifices they advised, and, in

---

18 In my opinion, the most important linguistic argument for identifying τυνες with ὁτ ἀμφὶ ’ Ὀρφέα is the difficulty that ensues when μάλιστα is rejected as a word describing τυνες – such a rejection seems groundless.


the *Phaedrus*, Plato mentions Dionysiac purifications as bringing relief to those suffering under the burdens of the crimes of their ancestors. Olympiodorus refers to the role of Dionysos Lusios and his rites in freeing an individual from the penalty of crimes committed by ancestors. But, contrary to Graf’s assertions regarding the Pelinna tablets, the lawless ancestors of these passages need not be the Titans. [...] Dionysos […] role in freeing the initiate, in this life or the next, from the penalties due for the crimes of ancestors is simply an extension of this essential aspect of eschatology.”

Referring to the comments on the σῶμα/σῆμα, the following can be said: the soul in the body is punished for its offenses or for its ancestors’ offenses, but this does not necessarily mean the Titans’ offense as universal human ancestors. This argument, applied to the formula of σῶμα/σῆμα, has a clear weakness. After all, Plato in his *Gorgias* and *Cratylus* speaks of the joining of the soul and the body as such. He does not speak about any misfortunes that result from the human being’s or its ancestors offenses at this point. Incarnation itself, so to speak, is "punishment." This inevitably leads to the question: what was the beginning of this state of affairs? In other words, it leads us to the question of anthropogony. In my opinion, regardless of whether we refer here to the myth of the dismemberment of Dionysius or to other mythical motifs connecting humanity with the Titans, or even leaving this motif completely on the side, the concept of σῶμα/σῆμα only becomes logically consistent when the anthropogonic thread is introduced, resulting in a characteristic of the conditio humana.

The second topic that needs to be analyzed concerns the understanding of dualism arising from the concept of σῶμα/σῆμα or its Orphic equivalent from the perspective of the Dionysian myth. The traditional interpretation sees in the body an aspect of the Titanic heritage, while in the soul - a Dionysian one. There are two reasons, however, why such a view should not be maintained.

---


22 An even wider context for the interpretation is possible, as in Neoplatonic philosophy from the perspective of the problem of the one-many relationships throughout the cosmos. The anthropological aspect would then be only a specific application of the general concept. See for example: Olympiodorus, *In Platonis "Phaedonem" commentaria*, 1, 4, 4-5, 14, ed. Westerink, L. G., Amsterdam 1976, and Proclus, *In Platonis "Timaeum" commentaria*, I, 314, 4-10, ed. Diehl, E., Leipzig 1903.

Firstly, it would mean that the soul is in the body due to the offense that Dionysus committed. However, nothing in the myth quoted by Olympiodorus admits such a possibility. What is more, it sounds almost absurd to bear the guilt of the one who is then "liberator" and "savior." It is difficult even to propose a reasonable hypothesis of what Dionysus' offense would be. The only thing that comes to mind is the fact that he was a descendant of Zeus out of wedlock - after all, Hera had persuaded the Titans to dismember Dionysus. Therefore, Dionysus would inherit the guilt of his father.

Secondly, it is difficult to understand how only the body is of Titanic heritage. After all, the Titans did not offend by their "flesh" but by envy and lust of power, which resulted in a revolt against the order of things. These features (i.e. envy and lust of power) can be considered "bodily" from the perspective of Homeric anthropology, but from this perspective, all "spiritual" characteristics are "bodily." Certainly, however, from the perspective of the Platonic theory of soul, these features are "spiritual." Therefore, to avoid ambiguity, the meaning of "Titanic" should be clarified. In reference to the aforementioned Platonic concept of soul, I think that it would be the most appropriate to identify the Titanic element of soul with the appetitive part.

As a result, the soul must be understood as a combination of two parts: the Dionysian part and the Titanic, or appetitive part, which can also be understood as the sum of the appetitive and passionate parts, that is, as the emotional part. But how should the Dionysian aspect of the soul be understood? In terms of both Platonic and Neoplatonic philosophy, only one possibility emerges: it is none other than rationality. The interpretation implied in the Gorgias seems to confirm such a point of view. Two types of life: the orderly life (ὁ κόσμιος βίος) and the disorderly life (ὁ ἀκόλαστος βίος) correspond, respectively, to the dominance of the rational and appetitive parts of the soul. Where does the body fit into such a structure? Without a doubt, it needs to promote the dominance of the appetitive part. I would even risk saying that the body, not being an autonomous part of the human being, is in fact the source of all movement of the appetitive part, since it is the basis of all its desires and aspirations.

It seems that the above interpretation agrees both with the Platonic passages (Cratylus, 400c1–9; Gorgias, 492e1–493a5) and the Dionysian myth, without direct reference to that myth. In the case of the Dionysian myth, it is enough to give up the symbols of Dionysus and

---

24 This includes, of course, not only the myth of the dismemberment of Dionysus, but also the Titanomachy.
the Titans. Either way, it seems likely that the concept of σῶμα/σῆμα, as its Orphic equivalent, leads to the concept of two opposite factors by which a man is driven: the rational part and the appetitive part. Thus, the human being becomes a kind of arena for the clash of two seemingly contradictory natures.

Now, the question arises whether the abovementioned two natures can be characterized as good and evil. The problem is very complex. It is difficult to conduct an in-depth analysis with reference only to the texts referred to as Orphic. Therefore, I propose taking a look at the Pythagorean table of opposites.

At this point, I will only present the conclusions, as the analysis of the status of good and evil in Pythagorean philosophy may be the subject of a separate paper. From the perspective of Pythagoreanism, it is impossible to speak of "evil" at the level of principles, that is, of absolute "evil." This means that Pythagorean dualism is not absolute, but is merely an expression of the human perception of reality. People know that the cosmos is a unity, albeit they can see and understand its unity only through the duality of opposites. The cosmos, synonymous with being, is good, but people see the good in a close relationship with evil, which is not "real," but is only the "weaker good," something that manifests itself at the level of phenomenal. It is in fact only a deficiency of the good, a deficiency of determination-unification, a violation of the right proportions.

It is certainly debatable whether these complex and subtle distinctions and conclusions most likely made by the Pythagoreans and their commentators can be used to reconstruct the alleged Orphic anthropology. Surely, we should be very careful and remember that we are dealing only with a hypothesis. However, I think that in light of our knowledge of the importance of the problem of the unity of opposites in Pre-Socratic philosophy and of how this problem appears in the Derveni Papyrus, the hypothesis that the above interpretation on the unity of good and evil in Pythagorean philosophy may also be related to the duality of natures in Orphism is acceptable. In consequence of the acceptance of this hypothesis, a reading that indicates duality can easily trigger off the anachronism of "original sin."

Moreover, I will venture to propose the hypothesis that the logical consequence of this kind of (alleged) Orphic anthropology is a complete reversal of Christian soteriology: through the "release" of his soul, through participation in the mysteries, and through a just life in accordance with his Dionysian part (that is, the reasoning part of soul according to Neoplatonic philosophy), a man becomes the real savior of the world.

---

Therefore, I propose keeping the concept of duality in the interpretation of Orphism, as well as rejecting reading this concept in the context of "original sin." At this point, I agree with Edmonds’ opinion that the concept of "original sin" is marked by Christian anachronism. In addition, as I tried to demonstrate above, I believe it to be contrary to the logic of the Dionysian myth, or, to generalize, the concept of duality of natures. I also suggest a certain restraint in relation to the Dionysus myth. On the other hand, I am not convinced that it is "a curious concoction"; rather, I admit the possibility of the myth's authenticity. At the same time, however, it seems more likely to me that it is a late version, perhaps developed over centuries, which nonetheless remains essential to Orphic anthropology and perhaps Orphic anthropogony. If we assume Olympiodorus' version to be the ancient one, it is difficult to understand why for centuries no detail of it has penetrated to a wider audience. On the other hand, the Stoic understanding of man as composed of an animal and of a god (Epictetus) suggests that this idea could have been known previously, though not necessarily in connection with the myth of the dismemberment of Dionysus, the burning of the Titans, and the creation of man from the soot of Titans.

One final question remains. Edmonds emphasizes the importance of political protest, of the counter-cultural dimension in the interpretation of the "Orphic" gold leaves. Bernabé, not agreeing to reduce the golden leaves only to the political dimension, appreciates the inclusion of this motif. I think that herein lies the path to reconciling these two paradigms. Why?

First of all, because it is hard to imagine the ancient Greek concept of man, the concept of the good life, without reference to the community, to the polis. At the same time, however, any such concept of community or polis was inscribed in a kind of theory of the world, according to the concept of macrocosmos-cosmos-microcosmos (world-state-man). Without a doubt, it is difficult to indicate pure Orphic materials (if such materials exist), on which one could conduct a separate study. However, considering Euripides’ Hippolytus and Antiope, the works of Aristophanes, and finally the golden leaves, the image of a countercultural, theologically and anthropologically legitimate lifestyle and resulting proper relation to the political community emerge. Firstly, I think, that every anthropology and

---

28 Every community that rejects the dominant culture and its norms (attitude, preferences) indicates by the very fact of its existence other norms which are acknowledged by this community and its members as better than the rejected dominant norms.
every political attitude needs its own "cosmogony" and "theogony" (philosophically speaking, they need ontologies). Secondly, every cosmogony and theogony is connected with a certain anthropogony and anthropology, which serves as the foundation for political beliefs and political attitudes.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

I think that in the light of the above analysis, which takes into account both paradigms, we can formulate a working definition of Orphism: an intellectually multiform mystic religious trend varied over time and space, of an unknown degree of formalization, legitimating itself by referring to Orpheus and attached to his cosmogony, theogony and anthroponogy, based on the duality of the world and, consequently, on the duality of human nature, expressed, among others, in a countercultural protest against the socio-political and religious orders that predominated over the Greek poleis and were based on the recognition of power, fame, and material wealth as the highest values.

In addition, I am very critically disposed towards the "critical rationalism" of K. R. Popper, who defines the development of science as falsificationism. On the other hand, the theories of Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend, along with the fine adjustment provided by Imre Lakatos, are far closer to me. I am convinced by the argument put forward by Feyerabend in his Against Method, whereby theoretical anarchism is more conducive to the development of science than alternative concepts. From this point of view, I see the two examined paradigms as complementary. The on-going debate between them, probably never possible to solve, can bring immense benefits to humanities research in general and to studies in Orphism in particular. On the basis of Lakatos’ theory of benefits for the development of the discipline, however, I think that keeping the idea of the two human natures (not necessarily referring to the relation of Olympiodorus and necessarily rejecting the idea of


"original sin") is a necessity, because otherwise we lose the landmark that is needed by every science. In the meantime, it is difficult to find an alternative.