

THE THRACIAN DIONYSOS. BOOK THREE:  
NAMING AND FAITH  
Summary

ALEXANDER FOL  
Sofia

In **Years later** I make an attempt to realize how far my four monographs on the problems' sets formulated in 1981 have taken me out – *The Thracian Orphism* (TO, in Bulgarian, with summaries in English and Russian), *Der thrakische Dionysos. Erstes Buch: Zagreus* (TD. 1), *The Thracian Dionysos. Book Two: Sabazios* (TД 2, in Bulgarian, with summary in English) and *The Hymns of Orpheus* (XO, in Bulgarian, with summary in English).

In the matter of expressing my sorriness that the medieval determination – *Graeca* (modern variation *Balcanica*) *sunt, non leguntur*, continues to be in force, and that in consequence of this the writers in *Balcanica* know the state of the studies in certain field of common interest, reading all European languages, while the writers in these languages do not know it, because they do not read the Balkan ones, I would like to make a reconsideration in two points.

The first is that the mark of equation between ancient Greek mythology and ancient Greek religion has to be dropped out, as both *subjects of research* are composed by different *objects* and the process of framing them can not form an integrated matter (entireness). While the so-called myths are literary text, being in action at certain peculiar levels in different social-political and cultural-historical context (cf. Buxton 1994), the Hellenic religion – a term, which does not exist in the thinking in ancient Greek language, – does not correspond to a system, institutionalized on the basis of a doctrine, suchlike are at least the Judaism and Zoroastrism in this period.

The second point I am thinking of in this introduction does come out from the developed by me *Interpraetatio Thracica* (after Fol 1983). *Interpraetatio Thracica* expects the creating of *problem situation* through the chronological and semantical stratigraphy of data coming out from the evidences of each object, the modelling of each object (its description) and

the establishing of its co-relation/interaction with other objects, which are in their turn processed with the same procedures. These correlations/interactions form the *subject of study*, which is to be analyzed interdisciplinary. According to me, this analysis is not a juxtaposition/comparison between literary and material evidences of different origin and kind, but a command over results, obtained from the research into the entire subject with one method, by means of results from the research with other/others methods.

This is an attempt at attaching to the carrier of the spiritedness (of meta-history). The attaching to is the essential difficulty of studies of this spiritedness, which studies usually clarify the point of view of the author-observer and therefore they are as a rule anticipated. The attempt at attaching, which is not anticipated, goes from the oral-traditional or state/political-legal ἔθος/ἥθος of the carrier of Faith passing by his διάνοια to his active παιδεία (lat. *cultura*), i.e. to his attitude of believer. Since the subject of research is *paideia*, it should be conceptually formulated. The formulation of the subject of my research is the *Thracian orphism*.

The Thracian orphism can be studied as *paideia* (= culture, i.e. behaviour/attitude) due to the contacts between Thracians and Hellenes, or, in other words, to the contacts between orality and literariness, between systems of values, modes of thinking and socialities, which are defined by Aristotle as two different social organisations (= ways of life), namely κατὰ ἔθνη and κατὰ πόλεις. Recently, the participation of Thrace into the creation of Hellenic spiritedness is recognized (Karakatsanis 1997; Pavlopoulou 1997; Greenwalt 1997).

Knowing that the people understand each other and gods nothing but by metaphors-messages, the problem of the book does consist of the question whether the metaphor, which the carrier of Thracian orphism sends forth being in his meta-history, will be heard and acknowledged incoming the book.

**Kinds of Time and Space** is an initial step to the hearing/understanding of the metaphor-message, which the carrier of the Thracian orphism sends forth. According to me, at first it would be obligatory to recognize the two modes of thinking in the Antiquity of South-Eastern Europe, suchlike are the literary (= polis) one and the non-literary (= ethnos, but not the ethnic one). These two ways of thinking

come into existence from the mechanisms of the oral historical memory-knowledge and the literary historical memory-knowledge (cf. Fol 1997b, 1997c, 1999).

The literary (written) historical memory-knowledge does state a premise the purposed-sequential, the causal, thinking, which creates the *Linear time* in his variants of Apocalyptic/Finalist/Christian and Newtonian/Physical/Infinite. The Linear time has direct polis' sequence in the *Space of sociopolitical relations*, which sequence can be perceived also as a *language space*. In the Antiquity of South-Eastern Europe this bi-meaningness is of great significance, since herein the transition from the situational application of the words-designations to the verbal text-contextual structures can be traced out. The text-contextual structures, at first voiced orally and then registered literarily (the beginning is put for now in the Linear B script), are this one of the discoveries of the purposed-sequential thinking which is of greatest value for the *paideia* (=culture=behaviour/attitude). Owing to that discovery the *paideia* can function in the drift of the text, whatever is it (written, pictorial, ornamental, formal, achitectural, and s.o.). In fact because of that it is possible to recognize also the resources of the non-literary historical memory-knowledge, which settle the other ways of thinking.

The *monoscentic thinking*, together with the synoptic one (after Sparkes 1991), makes possible *to think-the-thing* in lieu of *to think-of-thing*. In the cultural-historical milieu of the polis-ethnos relations, the non-literary memory-knowledge always *thinks something else* and *thinks it otherwise* and because of that the ways of thinking interweave with themselves. The thoughtful idea, which is the same as the thoughtful image, is sufficient in itself, but provokes the synopsis of the Whole in the *Mythological time* of the *permanent becoming*, which forms the *Space of Faith*.

The *daimonian thinking* – here I keep the connotation of demon as an intellectual mediator between the human being and the god (cf. Méndez Lloret 1993 and XO: 23-27) – produces the *Cyclic time of permanent returning* with his *Space of the commune going through*. The anthropodaimonization – s.c. εὐδαιμονία at doctrinal level – of the Teachers-prophets Orpheus, Zalmoxis and Rhesus is perceived as τύχη, i.e. as a norm of the faith (after XO: 24-25). The daimonian thinking

belongs to the orphics-aristocrats in Thrace. They are understood as εὐδαίμονες in the moment of their death (after **Her.** 5.8.1 Legrand/Feix). The daimonian thinking thinks, therefore, the *Death–New Birth* cycle.

As the Mythological time inevitably interferes with the Cyclic one, so the Cyclic time interferes with the Agonistic one. The *Agonistic time* is a vision of the *elective thinking* and manifests itself in the *Space of aloneness*. In aloneness (not in solitude !) the believer has to endure the suffering of his own purifying. This suffering is, as it is known, ecstatic or enthusiastic, i.e. it is endured as a journey to the enlightened (the so called Apolline) or to the non-enlightened (the so called Dionysiac) side of the divine Knowledge.

Here, the effort is supported by the *epiphanic thinking*, which provokes the appearance-of-the-god in the *Doctrinal time* and disposes it in the *Space of the illumination*. Both kinds of the epiphany of the god (cf. Burkert 1997: 17-20, too) as (ἐν-) θεός (*the god into*) and as *di-/de-* with *-os/-us* (*the god over*) provoke the Dionysos-Zagreus' (the enthusiastic) and, respectively, the Apollo-Sabazios' (ecstatic) mysterial initiation.

The Doctrinal time can be examined in three forms – *heroic*, when the initiated is chosen to be a mediator-protector in his death, *gradual*, when the initiated men are in preparation for Beyond being by the Teacher, and *spiral*. The last form of the Doctrinal time is, as it seems, destined only to Orpheus. The metaphor of *Orpheus* is consisted also in the tearing to pieces of the Teacher, who endures the suffering of his god so to continue to sing in the Beyond-immortal-logos of him.

**The Ethnosness** is a terminological clarification of the essential difference between the *ethnicity/ethnic*, *-ian* in the modern sense of genetically, lingually, socially, politically, culturally and religiously distinguished group (community, nation) and the *ethnosness/ethnos*. According to the Aristotelian typologization ethnos-polis, which is valid also to Hellas itself, ethnosness could be thought as a state of non-literary historical memory-knowledge, which functioning provokes the different kinds of Thinking-Time-Space and their interaction.

From the point of view of ancient Greeks, suchlike ethnosness in South-Eastern Europe is more “Thracian”, than “Illyrian”, “Paeonian”, “Scythian” or “Persian” because the Thracian oralness is the only one which is discerned and examined by the ancient Greek authors in course of

centuries so that its main realias are translated/designated in ancient Greek language.

This *entering into History* of Thrace/Thracians makes possible the recognition of *mythological, legendary* and *historical Thrace* in the written sources from Homer onwards. On the other hand, the Thrace/Thracians have also their Hellas/Hellenes. They borrow directly from them accordingly to their abilities for cultural-verbal contacts, different by intensity and by results in the areas of European (Odrysiens, Getae, Bessi, Edoni, Triballi) and of Microasianic (Bithynians) Thrace during the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC.

The best proof of interactions points between Thracian orphic oralness and Greek literariness present, it seems, three inscriptions. The first is incised on the mouth of a silver jug used for libation from the treasury (165 vessels) found near the village of Rogozen in Northwestern Bulgaria. The Odrysiens king Kotys the First (383-359 BC), declares himself in the inscription as Κότυς Ἀπόλλωνος παῖς, i.e. child and servant (priest) of the Hellenic personification of the Son of the Great Mother-Goddess in his solar hypostasis. Therefore, Kotys is a doctrinally initiated carrier of the faith in the Son (after Fol 1995c).

The other two inscriptions (Φολ 1998<sup>2</sup>: 104; Fol in: Fol and alii 2000: 211; Φ-Φολ 2000a: 43) are incised on the mouths of two silver phialae from 2nd-1st centuries BC with unknown provenance which are in possession today of the Paul Getty Museum under the inv. nos 96.AM.162.3 and 96.AM.162.4 (cf. True-Hamma 1994, C.-D.). They manifest ΚΟΤΕΟΥΣ ΜΗΤΡΟΣ ΟΡΕΑΣ and ΚΟΤΕΟΥΣ ΗΛΙΟΥ (the same reading in Theodosiev 2001 without references on Fol's studies). The form of the anthroponym with variants belongs to the Thracian cultural-historical milieu in Asia Minor, where, evidently, the older identification of the Great Mother-Goddess as mountain and of her Son as Sun is preserved (cf. about him **Soph.** fr. 523 Nauck<sup>2</sup> from the tragedy *Thereus* and ΤΔ 2: № 3, 67-68).

The inscriptions manifest a spiritual continuum in the Euro-Microasian contact zone of orality which I call *Thracian-Phrygian*. In the depths of the Balkan Peninsula the ethnos' Orphic faith is traced out with most numerous data on the so-called by me *Hyperborean Diagonal*. It is doctrinally marked by both sacred mountains of the European oral

orphism – Pangaeus, where Rhesus prophesizes, and Kogaion, where rezides and teaches Zalmoxis (Fol 1997 and TД 2: 11, 131, 267).

Ever since TO, I found that some communities of Hellas itself (Thessaly, Boeotia, Phocis, but also Macedonia) and regions of Black Sea coasts and Southern Italy belong to the Aegean axis Thrace–Phrygia (“from the gardens of Midas to the city of Midas” according to my expression), as well as to the area of the Hyperborean diagonal. When the criterion is the documented manifestations of the non-literary historical memory-knowledge in an ethnos’ milieu, it is understood that the definition *Thracian* in *Thracian orphism* has purely classificatory function. This term defines South-East European ethnosness – not ethnicity! – of the Orphic doctrine/faith, in other words – its non-polis, non-literary and non-philosophical essence. The Thracian orphism is a tenacity of the Southeastern-European spiritedness.

**There is no Word without Teacher** begins with the specification how the source material clarifies the classificatory term. This becomes possible in the process of the building of the Hellenic paideia (=culture=behaviour/attitude), which is the other name of the *hellenization* from Crete to North. I denote this process as *internal Hellenization*, i.e. cultural-historical mastering of the demo-geographic space. This mastering does pass through the Minoan, Mycenaean and Polis’ epochs. Pelasgians (?) and Thracians are displaced, driven out and hellenized in the motion of the internal Hellenization from the Microasianic coast line along the whole length of Hellespont, the northern Aegean islands Lemnos, Thasos, Samothrace, Naxos, Imbros and the areas of the future continental Hellas (Boiotia, Thessaly, Attica, Phocis).

The internal Hellenization is self-becoming-aware-of, which is well-knitted together with the *external Hellenization*, i.e. by the s.c. Great Greek Colonization, because of the ultimate and persisting recognition and identification of the Other. When the classificatory term *Thracian orphism* is used to define the orality of the genuine atmosphere of the doctrine/faith in the background of both internal and external Hellenization, than it becomes completely clear that Orphism is ethnos’ quality, which is due to the functioning of the kinds of Thinking-Time-Space. The *polis’-ethnos’* dichotomy, obvious even in Athens till the recording of the Homeric poems under Peisistratus and even after that,

was not thought as key of decoding of the Orphism either by Guthrie 1935, or by West 1983, to show only some of the basic studies. After the discovery of the orphic Derveni papyrus however, it became clear that the difference between the initiated and the non-initiated (these who know the sacred logos and these who do not) acquires the context of, firstly – the three well-known passages of **Plat. Phaed.** 69C, 70C and 62B Burnet, where these figures are discerned, and, secondly – also the *logos, which makes rite*, i.e. the *θυηπολία* (recently XO: 15-31).

The transition from unknowing to knowing is going on, as it is notified, by means of *ἐποδή*. The *epodè* is not mumble incantation (popular magic technique for healing), it is being sung (chanted, keened) and even can be a sung theogony (cf. **Her.** 1.132.3 Legrand/Feix, where a Persian sacrifice is described). In **Aesch. Eum.** 649 Mazon, the *epodè* is sacred refrain against the death and, therefore, does possess an enormous power to reincarnate the one who can hear it. If a man is *δαμώνιος*, but also *θείος*, i.e. mastered by a divinity (**Plat. Symp.** 202E Burnet), he can be the Teacher. **Plat. Phaed.** 78A Burnet explains where such man who can sing in accompaniment so to throw away the fear of death can be found out. Socrates replies that Hellas is large and also there are so much Barbarian peoples that surely such enabled man will be found.

The passage lies exactly in the point of intersection between the literary Greek and the oral Thracian orphism. This point is most clearly perceptible in **Plat. Charm.** 150D-157C Burnet, where the (Thracian) healer appears among the disciples of Zalmoxis. The initiated in the doctrine-faith Teacher, who masters *epodè*, “heals”, i.e. he harmonizes the soul and the body. Zalmoxis, who is *daimon* (**Her.** 4.94.1 Legrand/Feix), but also *theòs* in the text of Plato cited above, is the typologized image of the Teacher-Barbarian and is equalized with Orpheus, the “Hyperborean” Olenos and Abaris.

The *oral Thracian orphism* is not an observed Otherness, translated and denoted in ancient Greek. It is discernible as a result of the cultural interaction polisness-orality and not as an examination of the Hellenes-Barbarians antinomy. Its carrier, the believer, is not placed in the usual binary cultural and political opposition, but he is defined as a man wished for *to hear, to see, but also to carry*. The main question – whether some of the heroes of the living Antiquity are aware of the difference between

these three staseis of the spirit, has positive answer – yes, the initiated in the Teaching/Faith.

**Distinction** contains the intention to feel the mechanism of the energetic tension of the one who initiates and of the one who is initiated. Such a task can not emerge directly from the source data, it is sought *above them*, where the *non-pronounced* and the *non-written* does emit its metaphors-messages, which outline the *salvation* and the *alternative*. This perspective is referred mainly to the ancient Greek orphism, which consists of practices (after the analysis of Sabattuci 1982), while the Thracian one is a Teaching, which gives answers to the question *what is the salvation/what is the alternative*.

This essential difference requires a survey of the cultural-historical situation which is being observed in the study. Since I do not see any reasons to give an advantage to the migrational theory about the formation of the Indo-European communities in South-Eastern Europe, I take into consideration the building of the *contact informational space* in the 3rd and in the 2nd millennium BC.

The continuity of the historical process ensures the originating of the cultural-language communities, independently of the internal rearrangements and migrations in the most southern part of Euro-Asia. Their consolidation in their future territories (about the Hellenes especially see Гиндин–Цымбурский 1995: 35) is inseparable from the political structures in the Trojan and Mycenaean koinè. In suchlike circumstances, in the second half of the 2nd millennium BC, among the dynastic families and aristocratic circles it is elaborated the conceptual-terminological language apparatus, which is not parceled imported merchandise of steppe invaders, nor “evolutionary result” of growing wiser peasants.

The heritage of the élite is assimilated during the pre-polis period, when the transition to the literacy (cf. Kullman-Reichel 1990, Burkert 1991 and Lehmann 1991) begins to nourish the literary historical memory-knowledge, in which the power-faith co-relation begins to be discerned more and more clearly. The internal Hellenization makes easier the distinction of the oral Orphism in the rock-cut and megalithic, bullish, wolfish and dragonish ritenesses, in the so-called Delphic reform made by the legendary priests Thrakides (?), in the Samothracian mysteries with



their sacred Thracian or Thracian-Pelasgian (?) language, and in the foundation of the Eleusinian (Eumolpides') mysteries.

The Zagreus' (bullish) riteness, which could be deciphered on the archaeological terrain in Thrace and Greece even today (Райчевски–Фол В. 1993; Фол В.–Нейкова 2000), would be of best service to the discerning of the oral paideia (= culture = behaviour/attitude) from the polis' one. If about the excavated in Thracian area burial it will be determined that the deceased is dismembered, suchlike publications occur oftenly, then this would be a case when the daimonian thinking superimposed him in the lastingness of the Cyclic time. In this time he is believed as anthropodaimon, but he is mono-synoptically thought in the Mythological time, too. Together with this, the dismembered believer is, which put the believer in the Space of the Faith.

This scheme can be made even more complex if some of the extremities of the deceased are exchanged or substituted with limbs of horse, bull, ram, goat, which are sometimes of clay. The problem situation does necessitate the hypothesis that the deceased is thoughtful reincarnating in the Cyclic time, which is more than once, at all events – more than his main stasis of intellectual mediator. The discovering of the sacred things (for example, some of the so-called toys, seven in number, of the “child-Zagreus”) is definite indication of the epiphanic thinking, which put the believer deceased in the Doctrinal time and in its Space of the illumination. Amongst the all sacred things of the Zagreus' riteness, the mirror has the strongest metaphor-message. If the mirror is placed into cenotaph, it is at full the substitute of the dismembered body of god, because he “after following his image, pull himself apart into the Everything” (after TD 1: No.No.9, 17).

This survey as well as the example of the Deer's Artemis from the rite in Patra (Petropoulou 1993) are necessary so to be shown how, during the functioning of the thinking-speech/speech-thinking mechanism in the ethnos' paideia, *one image (one vision)* engenders *many namings* and *one naming – many images (visions)*. This is the technique of the non-literary historical memory-knowledge in kinds of Time/Space and it can be activated by word, motion, product, colour and sound.

This is the landscape *above the sources*, as said previously, which is to be seen in the *Thracian-Phrygian contact zone* of the most southern

part of Euro-Asia. I call this territory *Constantinople's chôra*, also. The last definition seems outside the chronological framework of the study, but it denotes one very important reality – the cultural-historical continuum of the Orphic faith in immortality, which can be traced out also in the data of the Byzantine writers and in the relics of the Bulgarian and Greek folklore (Фол В.–Нейкова 2000).

### **Melinòe: the name is appearing**

**Orpheï Hymni** 71 Quandt (XO: 131-133) offers sufficiently good opportunity for rapprochement with the one image – many namings, one naming – many images hypothesis. The hymn does call the goddess Μηλινόη, -α, “chthonic nymph”, wrapped up in a saffran mantle, borned by Persephone near the mouth of the river Kokytos. Persephone conceived her child in the sacred chambers of Zeus Kronion, but also she was allured by Pluto, so that in her anger she gave birth of child with two bodies.

Melinòe maddens the mortals with phantoms running before their eyes, she does show them her visage in looks that are different and strange. She is visible, but sometimes she is covered by darkness. She dazzles in the night, but she jumps out from the darkness before the face of the mortals with hostile blasts. The hymn ends with a prayer to the goddess, “the queen of the subterrestrials” (= the souls of the deads, according to the commonly accepted interpretation), to send away the furious passion of her soul to the extremities of the earth and to show the initiated her propitious and “conformed to the rite” πρόσωπον.

Melinòe is a theonym, which occurs for the first and last time in this Orphic hymn (the readings in Abel 1885: 95 and Quandt 1955: 49). By means of μείλιον (“that is which calms”) the theonym binds itself with μείλια (offering gifts in Orphic environment) and with μείλιγμα, which is a rite for purification-redemption through libation of mixture of honey, olive and wine. The rite makes the chthonic deity propitious (after Rudhardt 1992<sup>2</sup>: 247 and XO: 132).

The theonym, which is formed as *named rite*, is one of the names of the chthonic Great Mother-Goddess in the oral Orphic faith. Because of this reason it has no myth, as well as Cybele, Hypta, Bendis, Cotytto, Mysa, Mother of gods, Mother-Mountain, etc. have no myths. The hymn verifies irreproachably both main staseis of the goddess – the *ritual* one, in which she is thought as Mother, who will be made propitious, and the

named one, in which she is changeable and dangerous imageness. The second one is more important for the Faith, because "to change that which is before the eyes" by means of putting on another pròsopon is Orphic technique for changing the essence.

The problems of the non-exactly translated with "mask" pròsopon, extends upward to the interpretative possibilities, given by the vessels with faces of the dead (after Vermeule 1991). They appear in the early Bronze age in Kea, Troy, Kültepe, and in 9<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> century B.C. – in Crete and Rhodes. To this problems belong also the golden masks in the Near East and in South-Eastern Europe from the Mycenaean epoch onwards. Some of these masks occur even in the Early Roman imperial age. In his survey Curtis 1995: 230 takes the view that because of the finds from Mycenae to Kerch peninsula (on the northern coast of Black Sea) it is possible to think for Greek tradition, although according to the author such hypothesis could not be supported. This spreading however is situated in full in the zone of the Hyperborean diagonal from the South-West to the North-East in South-Eastern Europe.

Since my thesis about *Mycenaean Thrace* (recently Fol 1989, 1991 and 1999b) began gradually to be accepted, let me remind that this definition is historical-typological and is referred to ethnos' organisation and oral paideia (= culture = behaviour/attitude) between the middle of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the middle of the 1st millennium BC in diachronia compared to Mycenaean Hellas. In terms of archaeological language, this is the Thracian millennium between the Valchitran golden set from mid 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC (Venedikov 1988) and the necropoleis from the end of 6<sup>th</sup> – beginning of 5<sup>th</sup> century BC in Trebenishte at the lake of Ochrida and Sindos near Thessaloniki (recently Фол В. 1993: 118-130 and Boardman 1994: 184 about the Thracian character of the necropolis at Sindos).

In this diachronic continuum however, the golden pròsopa sometimes occure with golden lamellae for the faces, feet, hands, as well as with bands. The change of the quality of the deceased is made entirely and eliminates all other essences of him at the expense of this one which appears in the epiphanic thinking. He does fall into the heroic Doctrinal time and, therefore, in the Space of illumination, i.e. in Beyond, where he acquires the stasis of anthropodaimon. The Orphic immortality is marked *before the sight of the deceased, but not before this one of the observer,*

with gold, because this metal is an achieved equiponderance between copper, iron, tin (lead) and silver embodying the four cosmic forces.

If the Orphic hymn about Melinòe gives up a registration of *done-named*, it could engender literary myth, but it does not, because simultaneously it does go along the *logos*, which performs *dròmenon*, i.e. θυηπολία (after XO: 25). The marked above Orphic technique can be described now as *done-spoken out-manifested*, which is equal to *action-named reincarnations-initiations*. This is due to the thoughtful simultaneously presence of *one and multiple* in the Orphic tradition (after Rudhardt 1991: 274). The presence of single-plural is another formula to my *one naming – many images / one image – many namings*.

In other words, the theonym Melinòe creates the problem situation of the transition from orality to literariness. This problem situation is set then and there in the very name of Orpheus, which etymologies are quite different one compared to another and controversial (Tomaschek 1980<sup>2</sup>: 130-II, 50-53; OF I, 1-4; Böhme 1981; Theodossiev 1994/1995: 241-243 and 1997: 409-410), because they do not originate from the riteness. In course of distinguishing and recognizing of this riteness of the main Orphic god, conventionally called Dionysos during his mythologizing both in polis' and in ethnos' milieu, the images of Zagreus and of Sabazios appear first of all. If Ζ-αγρεὺς can be spelled out as "nocturnal, mountainous hunter" according to the popular etymology of the bullish riteness, then Σαβάζιος ascends to the Phrygian Sàbas and is reliable rock identification (after TD 1: ΝῶΝῶ 2 and 7; ΤΔ 2: ΝῶΝῶ 1-5 and 37). The chthonic (dark, black) and solar (uranic, white, blue-white) colour antinomy of both images is solved however by the sacrifice (dismemberment) of the god-bull (ram, goat), i.e. by the colour of the blood.

My colour translation-designation of the Orphic riteness of the Son of the Great Mother-Goddess is based on **Plat. Tim.** 67C and 68C Burnet, where is the definition of the colour as flame, which glows from each particular body, and where is mentioned the colour ὄρφνινοῦς as mixture of black, white and red. **Orphei Argon.** 888-1019 Vian describes Orpheus dressed in ὄρφηνα φάρε, i.e. in his own coloured power of *magus* (= master of epodài). He does accomplish complicated chthonic rite before the gates of the fortified precinct where the Dragon keeps the Golden Fleece in order to constraint Artemis of the Doors to let in himself, Medea and

the Argonauts. In fact Orpheus in his complete significance of Naming-Faith makes effort to persuade the Goddess instead not to leave her of free choice. This fundamental difference between Magic and Religion (cf. Graf 1999<sup>2</sup>: 27 with the analysis of Plato's statement) does mark the essential priority of the oral Thracian orphism in front of the Olympian religion.

The hierogamic sacrificial riteness of Dionysos-Zagreus, who dies and is born again by means of his sacred marriage with the Great Mother-Goddess (indraught of the blood in the earth), passes through the *colour staseis of black, red and white* (= Orpheus). These colours are the perfect ones, because they carry all senseful meanings of the Life-Death-Beyond (=Immortality) cycle.

**Staseis of myth** is coming back to the mechanism of remembering of the written historical memory-knowledge in its gradualness of *understanding-knowing-knowledge*. The remembering in such grading is not constant becoming aware of presupposed archetype, neither is reproducing of universalias of the hypothetical common Indo-European mytho-basis. In the deliberate folklore narrative the myth becomes heroic or didactic epos (Homer or Hesiod) in cause of the opposition Dike-Húbris and of the human to the divine justice.

*The epic stasis* of the myth forebodes stormy events since it does draw the energy of form into action and engenders the refinement of the rhythmical speech. The energetic *poetical stasis* of the myth does whirl out the effort to penetrate into the human being-anthropodaimon-god interconnection and opens the floodgates before the dramaturgical stasis (as secondary mythologizing). From here onwards the purposed-sequential thinking in literary milieu easily creates *mythography*, and at last – *mythology*. It is speculative because the theonym, the imagery, the fabula and the episodes begin to act the part of the notional-terminological philosophical instrumentum, especially from neo-Platonists onwards. The literary Orphism will pass directly to the mythography and philosophical mythology.

The Orphism does not distinguish the gods of rite from the gods of myth in such a presupposed way as it is being done in polis' milieu. The mechanism of remembering of the oral historical memory-knowledge leads off to another epistemological gradualness, namely to the *distinction-knowing-naming* of the oral Thracian orphism.

### Who is afraid

In his well-known sentence *Primus in orbe deos fecit timor* (Petron. *Satirarum liber vel Satiricon*, fr. 27 Bücheler-Heraeus) Petronius, this talented, refined, cynical and flexible intellectual, forced to suicide by his benefactor emperor Nero in 56, finds out the genuine root of faith in the feeling of fear before the immense uncertainty of the world. The specialists in the histories of religions think truly that the deification of the natural forces, ill or well-inclined, eliminates the fear. The religion as *fear-propitiating* is referred even today to the so-called primitive tribes. The people of Eastern Mediterranean and of South-Eastern Europe also occur sometimes among them.

The god who dies and is born again, the god who suffers his mission, is not created by cowards. The fear can not give birth to the Son of the Great Mother-Goddess, in whatever is his reincarnation on the Sun-Fire axis. If indeed Petronius has made his efforts, writing in the spirit of Roman stoicism of the slovenly epoch of Nero, then it seems that the used by him *timor* is very near to the *hesitation-apprehension of / before* someone or something. The hesitation, which is experienced in front of the innumerable functions of the divine Energy, and the apprehension not to be failed, therefore not to be called, anyone of them, engender the gods in the world.

With this interpretation I return to TO: 165-166, where the so-called physical polytheism (identification of functions) is knitted together by moral monotheism, i.e. by the unity of the polymony/polymorphicness. From this point of view the Son/Sons of the Great Mother-Goddess do not require from the researcher to clarify their "origin" (about Zagreus it would be "Thracian", "Boiotian", "Mediterranean", and about Sabazios – "Thracian-Phrygian"). The god does not have an ethnic address in the contact zones of syncretism and of synthesis, one of which is the Thracian-Phrygian (the future Constantinople's chôra).

The spirit is free to see the divine Energy in actions in which it dreams of it, in forms in which it sensates it, in sounds and colours in which it hears and catch sight of it, as well as through word-naming, which it gives to it. In the Orphic ethnos' Faith-doctrine all enumerated namings are interchangeable, because the kinds of Thinking-Time-Spaces

are intersected and interinduced one another. The *Thracian orphism* is *Faith of the Named*.

Therefore, fearful is that one, who can not name, and he can not, because he has not enough strong trust so to do it. *The fearlessness of naming* is the true evidence of the Faith.

Nagy 1992<sup>2</sup>: 181-201 gives an exhausted material in support of this position. He makes use of *perkúnas* in Baltic languages with a parallel of the Slavic *perunú*, which has ascended to the Indo-European *\*per(k-) / \*peru-* with derivations signifying stone, rock. In this way he supports his conclusion that “the intrusion of thunder-fire into wood and stone is a sexual and anthropogonic theme”.

The parallel with Baltic languages is well known a long ago (cf. Георгиев 1977: 52, 61, 90), but it is testified for quite more recent epoch and can not serve as a comparable source material about a common Indo-European basis in the second half of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st millennium BC. Even more difficult is the situation of the “Slavic” *perunú*, i.e. Perun, the supreme uranic god, because the theonym is not registered anywhere in the Slavonic totally non-literary antiquity. The “Slavonic” begins to make some comprehensive sense in course of and mainly after 9th century due to the literature created in Bulgaria of king Boris the First and hereupon borrowed by the other Slavic kingdoms.

The registration of realias in the Slavic world, including cultural-historical ones, begins in Bulgaria and later it is reproduced in early Slavic languages in written form. The Grecized Πέρκη, which is very popular denomination of ancient Thrace itself and represent nothing less than the other name of the country, is slaviced in the first records in Bulgarian in names suchlike the oronym Per-in / Pir-in, which are thought as naming of the Son-rock of the Great Mother-Goddess.

The grecization of the Thracian theonym of the Son-rock is best discernible in inscriptions (IGBulg I<sup>2</sup>: 283, 283 bis) which are in full analogous to ones in the Thracian-Phrygian contact zone in the period from 2<sup>nd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> BC till 3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD (Petzl 1994: NoNo 6-7). I put aside the opinion of Brixhe-Panayotou in Bull. Ép. = REG 1990: 698 that Perkos has been from “Greek origin”, since the Hittite-Luvian language milieu of forming of the topo-, oro- and antroponym/theonym is certain as certain is its

passing to the Thracian-Trojan kindred cultural-language community (Цымбурский 1996).

The Homeric Πείρωσ/Πείροος ἦρωσ originates from the Hittite god Pirva, the god of stone and of thunder, and directly identifies the famous Thracian leader in Troy as son of the Son. This is confirmed about the Thracian kings also by the characteristic of Ἀκόμασ, in whose image appears Ares himself in the fight against Diomedes in the narrative of the sixth song of *Iliad*. Since Diomedes injures Ares, who takes back in a cloud to the sky, and later Ajax kills the real Thracian king, Akamas, it has to conclude that Homer, who knows the Thracian native land of Ares, is perfectly punctual here – Akamas is an incarnation of a hostile god and of a hostile leader. The doctrinal position of the Thracian king-priest, son of the Son, is equilized with this one of Ares.

Hence the Thracian Orphic king is Ares. This is reconfirmed in [Ps.]-Eur. *Rhes*. 385 Murray, where Rhesus is θεός, ὦ Τρόια, θεός, αὐτὸς Ἄρης.

Giving also other examples of Thracian grecized names registered through Old-Bulgarian language as a classificatory type of naming, I want to leave off the theme about the linguistic misunderstandings, which result from the processing of names, registered in different epochs due to different reasons, into a provable system, and to return to the theme of the fear.

The fear does destroy the opportunity to be understood the metaphors-messages. The contemporary system scientific quest really experiences fears of the multi-significant. The studied here carrier-believer does see the Great Mother-Goddess—Son poredria as a changeability of its meanings depending on the position, which he occupies in the moment of the confessing of his trust in them. This is a big advantage of the Thracian orphism, which can provoke Faith by means of one naming.

### **Essence and dismembered essence**

The golden Orphic tablets constantly interest the researchers of the ancient Greek orphism (s. OF II 32, Zuntz 1971 and 1976; Janko 1984; Graf 1990 and 1991; Sorel 1995: 112-115; Fol 1999a and 1999c). A little attention however is dedicated to the cultural-historical lieux of these texts, which usually are superimposed upon the chest of the dead. My analysis begins with the Cretan tablets.



Zan/Zeus/Zagreus is the first named Orphic godliness in ancient Greek in the island. It contains definite Egyptian borrowing documented in best way in the prayer of the departed pharaoh to Re, the god-sun, creator and guardian of the world. In the offered prayer the *head* is named *Re*, the *four limbs* – (anonymous) *gods*, the *chest* – *Khepri* (“the one, who comes into the existing”, the morning image of the solar god), and the *phallos* – *Tatenen* (“the raised up land/country”). In the second half of the 2nd millennium BC Tatenen is already anthropomorphic deity with horns of ram and wreath of plumes (after Hornung 1992:173-174). This naming-dismembering is the future vision of Zagreus-the bull, whose seven-partness is united-again mysterially in the vision of the new being-born in the Beyond.

The Egyptian borrowing is situated in the rock-megalithic environment of Crete as long ago as the 2nd millennium BC. The *Rock faith* slightly interests the researchers of the island (for now s. mainly Faure 1964 and 1992; Rutkowski-Nowicki 1996), but despite this the sacred caves and some rock sanctuaries are already observed, drilled and registered. Also, the clay votive figurines as well as separately imposed there clay little heads, torsos, hands and legs from the rock sanctuary at the peak of Petsophas are already published (Rutkowski 1994 with catalogue). The clay figurines and the clay bodily parts substitute (human) sacrifice (after Verbruggen 1981: 117) and support the possibility to read the theonym Zagreus in the Pylian tablet with Linear B writing (cf. Gérard-Rousseau 1968: 52).

The archaeoastronomical observations of Petsophas show that from the peak it is observed the rapprochement of the sun, moon and earth in the beginning and in the end of every eight-year cycle (after Blomberg-Henriksson 1993). This cycle is one of the most ancient thoughtful periods about the king-priest, personified in Crete by Minos, who every ninth year takes himself to his father Zeus so to be advised by him and to begin to arrange his state (**Hom. Od.** 19.178-180 Fuchs with a commentary in **Plat. Leg.** 1.624A-625B and **Plat. Min.** 319B Burnet).

From **Eustath. Ad. Odyss.** 20.390 Stallbaum onwards it is commented upon the question what is the contents of the eight-year period. It is considered that it covers festivities in honour of the Cretan Zeus in the Idaian cave, which are arranged every second year by the nine priests, called Cu-

retes. The priests perform sacrifices of bulls, sheep and goats, which are burnt or "prepared as food", aimed to the initiation of the called into the high stage of the mystery, the epopteia. They contemplate "the subterranean throne of Zeus" in the upper room of the Idaian cave (after Verbruggen 1981: 84-85). The Cretan Zeus/Zan/Zagreus most likely has usurped the throne in the vision of his admirers not until 8th century BC. Then the Son with his new theonym has taken the place of the Great Mother-Goddess as a main deity.

The eight-year cycle, after which Minos, the "confidant" of Zeus has begun to "reign nine-years old", as it is said by the texts, is a certain pre-literary variant of the oral ethnos' Orphism. In the Thracian doctrine it is preserved later in the idea of the tetractys. The tetractys is consisted in the first four phases of the Great Mother-Goddess (cosmic peace, self-conceiving, grávida, giving birth to the Son), but also is consisted in the three phases of the Son (ascension, organization of the Cosmos-Socium, hierogamy) and also in the three phases of the son of the Son (birth of the king, investiture and doctrinal position of anthropodaimon). The formula  $4+3+3=10$  representing the developed tetractys ( $1+2+3+4$ ) is also the Pythagorean formula of the Cosmos.

Six golden tablets are found more than hundred years ago in a grave (graves?) near Elephterna, on the northern slope of Ida (OF II 32b; Zuntz 1971: 362). Liberately translated the verses say: "I am parched with thirst and I die, but I drink/from the never failing source on the right of the cypress/"Who are you? Where from are you?"/I am the son of Earth and of starry Sky".

The six tablets from Elephterna are interpreted usually in the antithesis *Memory-Oblivion*, but after the discovering of the inscriptions of Kotsys, the pais of Apollo, and of Kotes (the pais) of the Mountain Mother and of the Sun, the interpretation of  $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$  in verse 4 of the tablets as soul and of the one who asks the questions – as an anonymous "guardian of the source", has to be dropped out. The formulaic verses contain explicit data about the doctrine of the immortality, the latter of course is profanized during the Hellenistic epoch in written speech. The son of the Son of the Great Mother-Goddess in the pure variant of the Thracian orphism is reduced to the level of the believer orphic. In the point of interaction of

orality with literature the anthropodaimonic position is not doctrinally achievable, it is already only a hope.

The second group of the golden tablets originates from Thessaly. Two lamellae are in the form of ivy leaves, stylised in the form of heart. They are found upon the chest of the skeleton in a marble sarcophagus from the necropoleis near Pelinna-Tetraporos, about ten kilometers on north of Triikka, and are dated to the end of the 4th century BC. The text of both is one and the same except the two last verses which miss in the one of both lamellae (Zuntz 1981: 275-370; Graf 1991a).

In the verses begins to speak the Teacher in the moment of setting down of the deceased. He calls him τρισόλβιος, "three-times blessed", i.e. get into the happy anthropodaimonization, and demands from him to tell Persephone that Bacchos himself deliberated him (verses 1-2). The anthropodaimonization is encoded in verses 3-5 – "bull, you jumped into the milk/quickly you jumped into the milk/ram, you fell into the milk". These verses provoked the creation of enormous literature, of which most closely to the Orphic interpretation is S. Reinach, according to whom the falling down/jumping into the milk is a record of the riteness of the "child Dionysos", i.e. of Zagreus (after TD 1: 64). Dionysos is metaphorically mentioned also in verse 6, where the Teacher said to the initiated deceased that "there is wine", which is his "honour, veneration". He knows that also "under the earth" the sacraments wait for him and that they are the same as the assigned to the "rest of the blessed", i.e. to all who are initiated by the Teacher into the Orphic faith in Dionysos-Zagreus.

One golden tablet originates from Pharsalos, Thessaly. It is dated in the second half of the 4th century BC and has been posed in a big Attic bronze vessel together with other gifts to the incinerated deceased. The text is in nine verses and represents an extended variant of the tetrameter Cretan tablets, but verse 6 is the most important, because in answer of the question of the Teacher, the deceased responds that he is a "παῖς" of Ge and of Uranus. This self-definition fully put together the record with the already clarified Orphic practice of the king-priest, son and servant of the Son of the Great Mother-Goddess according to the Thracian inscriptions.

The name of the deity should express its essence, as it is known from the testified in written form religious doctrines. Every other naming of it dismembers this essence. The universality of the god signifies his limit-

lessness, but the believers in him give him additional names because of their striving for knowing him. Naming part of him, they, being spiritually weak, trust that in this way they become aware of his entirety.

The Orphic riteness and prayingness, partly recorded, authorized, composed and edited in ancient Greek language, manifests itself in polymony and in polymorphness. Outside the esoteric doctrinality and mystery, the namings and the images oftenly are combined. The name of the Teacher is not changed because in it is contained the faith in god. The epiphany, in this case, is also a theophany in the literal sense of the term. The initiated begins to "carry the god" in himself and, therefore, begins to perform a theophory on the road to the Beyond. At the low level of the literacy, suchlike the encoded record in the verses on the tablets, the namings of the essence of the god are encoded, and the Teacher is nameless. Hidden also is the exact quality of Mnemosyne, which is not a personification of the remembering-memory, as it is considered by the analyzers of the tablets. Her quality in the tablets is "carrier of the knowledge", i.e. of the divine Knowledge or of the god, which is one and the same. Only in such a theophoric stasis the deceased becomes immortal, as well as he declares himself.

Now I can present the South-Italic golden tablets. The first, which I shall mention, is this one from Hipponium, near the modern Monteleone in Calabria, dated in the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC. Hipponium is a colony of the Epizephyrian Locri, which is established at its turn by the migrators from the Opuntian Locri. Locris is a territory divided in two parts by Phocis. Its eastern part is situated on the narrow coastal strip of land of the Euboean gulf between Thessaly in north and Boiotia in south. This eastern part of Locris is also divided into northern and southern territory. The southern one is the Opuntian Locris reigned in the mytho-legendary Antiquity by Deucalion and Pyrrha. Their subjects the tradition defines as Pelasgians/Leleges.

I think that it is clear why I single out this tablet as a connection between the Thessalian-Boiotian Orphic orality and the South-Italic documents. In Hipponium, to all appearances, has been venerated the Great Mother-Goddess under the theonym of Persephone. This named personification ascends, because of its chthonism, to the Thracian-Pelasgian roots of the Orphism.

The deceased (hereafter Zuntz 1976) has been held in his left hand a lamp in the grave, in which is found scanty ceramic material. The lamp however is a good sign of the passed initiation, testified by the text of the tablet, put on the chest.

The first verse contains the affirmation that here is the grave of Mnemosyne with an addition – “when he has to die”. The confusion of the analyzers is useless from the point of view of my interpretation, which takes the thesis that the one, who is started on his steps to the immortality, is in the grave-door to the Beyond, where he does not remember anymore, where he knows. The verse 4 introduces the metaphorical death of the “souls”, but this has to be expected in an environment, in which the immortality of the soul replaces the anthropodaimonization of the oral faith. This verse is helpful proof about the interection of orality with literariness. The verse 10 announces the already observed formula that the deceased is a son of Ge and of the showered with stars Uranus. The verse 13 contains the appeal to the “chthonic king”, which also provokes confusion since the literary-philological analysis does not permit such figure in the ancient Greek text. The subterranean king of the Orphism however is Dionysos-Zagreus, to whom the deceased appeals to. This is confirmed explicitly by the last verse 16 where the deceased declares himself as a participant in the μύσται καὶ βάκχοι. Here there is no speaking of thyasos, because the initiation is individual, but of the uniting to the rest of the “thrice-blessed”, “happily-daimonian”.

The golden tablet from Petelia, the modern Strongoli, is dated in the middle of the 4th century BC (4<sup>th</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> century BC according to OF II 32a). It is discovered rolled up in a golden cylindrical container and tied to it by chainlet as an amulet. The text of fourteen verses repeats the Cretan formulae about Mnemosyne, as well as these ones on the tablet from Pharsalos, but is closer to the Thessalian tablet because of the use of παῖς instead of υἱός in the known already response – “pais of Ge and of Uranus”. In this way the verse 6, where is this declaration, carries the vision of the son of the Son from the oral orphism into the record.

In even higher degree this carrying can be perceived in the context of the last big group of documents. In the necropoleis of Thurii, founded in 444/443 BC by Pericles and apoikists from all Hellas on the coast of the gulf of Tarentum, are registered four tumuli. Timpone Grande has been

with a diameter of 28 m and almost 10 m high. The tumulus has contained eight main layers with strata in each of them, which have contained cinder and coals. The deceased has been honoured with sequential sacrifices, from which there have been found ceramic fragments of vessels for libation. It is supposed that the plant-roots in the one of the strata have shown a decoration of flowers. Zuntz 1971: 289, where are all data, thinks that the deceased has been a subject of heroization.

The deceased has been with face to east. Near his chest are found two silver medallions with female heads, his clothes have been decorated with tin golden lamellae, and inside the grave have been put also two wooden boxes, decorated with palmettes. Other gifts have not been found, but closely near the head of the deceased has been placed the golden tablet, rolled up nine times and put in another golden leaf as in an envelope. On both lamellae there are spelled out texts.

Timpone Picolo, situated 265 m to the west of the former tumulus, has been in the beginning of the excavations 5 m high and 52 m in diameter. In Timpone Picolo have been perceived about ten burials. In the lower part of the tumulus have been excavated three graves, but in the archaeological report have been noticed only two of them. They have been identical one to another – one-chambered and 1 and 1.22 m high. The inside facades of the walls were painted in white. Precisely here, but not quite clear in which grave, have been found the three golden tablets.

Zuntz 1971: 292-293 exclaims that the tumuli are not Greek practice, nor also Etruscan, and mentions the big tumuli in Lydia, Phrygia and Southern Russia without knowing that the nearest parallels of the necropoleis of Thurii are the Thracian ones. The author adds that what has happened during the funerals of Patroclus and Hector “must have been very similar to the funeral ceremony at the Timpone Grande”.

This brilliant hellenist and anti-orphic of course can not be blamed that in the 80s and 90s years of the century, the archaeological landscape of *Orphic Thrace* was turned into the only parallel of the tumuli of Thurii, including also the white paint of the “Sabazian sanctuaries”.

The three texts of Timpone Picolo are dated in the 4th century BC (hereafter with the analysis of Zuntz 1971: 299-327). They are published many times and their first verse says that “the pure goes to the chthonic queen”, considered usually as Persephone. She is not Persephone however,

but the unnamed Great Mother-Goddess, who can not receive a name in this first verse because she is the Orphic Cosmos. The second verse does name Eukles Eubouleus and “the other immortal gods”/“the other gods-daimons”/“the other gods, who are ὄσοι daimons”. Independently of the differences in the namings in the three tablets, the equalization – god-daimon/daimon-god, is typically Orphic. It presupposes also the mission of the intellectual mediator as for the gods, as well as for the ones who have received immortality. The adjective ὄσοι signifies these ones, who are suitable to the religious order, according to which the divine force is exercised normally (after Rudhardt 1992<sup>2</sup>: 36).

This divine force is undismemberable. The undismembered essence is also named in the mentioned verse 2, where is Εὐκλῆς Εὐβουλεύς. The formulaic unity of the three variants of the “gods-daimons” corresponds to this theonym, because it is a chthonic personification. The plural of the “gods daimones” encodes the namings of the dismembered essence of the Great Mother-Goddess and of the mentioned theonym. Εὐβουλεύς is Zagreus, and Εὐκλῆς is the kingly initiated, the son of the Son, the anthropodaimonized.

This connection is undisputed as soon as it is moved onward to verse 9 of the tablet A<sub>1</sub> according to the numeration of Zuntz. In this verse the goat fall into the milk, i.e. it is repeated the formulaic hiddenness of the Zagreus’ Death-New birth and is referred to Eubouleus. The verse 4 of the tablet A<sub>4</sub> from Timpone Grande, dated in the middle and in the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, confirms my reconstruction, because it says – θεὸς ἐγένου ἐξ ἀνθρώπου ἔριφος ἐς γάλα ἔπετες. The deceased-initiated has become god “from man”, i.e. he has anthropodaimonized himself, according to his faith in the Death-New birth of Zagreus in the formula “the goat fall into the milk”. Thus the chain reaction has been completed and the son of the Son has made himself immortal.

Also in the circle of the golden tablets are placed already the bone plates from Olbia (see Graf 1991a: 89; Vinogradov 1991). The five bone plates are found in 1951 in the temenos of Olbia, near the temple of Zeus in a stratum from 5<sup>th</sup> century BC (TD 1: No 6).

On the first plate are seen *Life-Death-Life-Truth*, and from below – ΔΙΟΡΦΙΚΟΙ. The arrangement of the codes is absolutely clear and signifies that the life is death, the death – life in the Beyond, i.e. with the

Knowledge. This is the faith of the orphics in ΔΙ-, i.e. in Zeus or Dionysos. The hesitations disappear in the second plate on which it is red *Peace-War-Truth-Lie*, and from below – ΔΙΟΝ-. Even more clear is the encoding in the underneath of the plate, where are incised seven rectangles inscribed in a common one. Near this rectangle is incised the letter Z. The veritable Knowledge, which is already achieved through the death, is Peace, an opposition to the War and to the Lie. This Knowledge is Dionysos, who is heptada, i.e. Zagreus in the phase of the sacrificial sacred marriage.

The plates from Olbia are situated in the Dionysiac faith-riteness of Thracia Pontica (hereafter Fol 1995a, 1997 and Φολ 1998<sup>2</sup>: 45-64). The Pontic Thrace is a part of the Thraco-Phrygian contact zone. It is intersected with the road of dissemination of the Orphic faith from Samothrace to the northernwestern corner of the Pontic basin, where is Olbia. This is the blessed land of the results from the interweaving of the orality with the literariness. In this zone there is no even one god with any mythology. The written on the plates is a record of faith-riteness of an esoteric society.

Owing to the golden tablets and to the bone plates, the oral orphism can be perceived in its innermost sense – the naming of the essence of the divine Knowledge.

**In Thracian way** begins with a coming back to Eliade 1972, after whom the shamans and the shamanism became very popular instead the most correct shaman hood. Shaman is Tungusian word, which is registered in Russian language the first time in 1669, and shamanism is a neologism of the European ethnological schools from the beginning of the 19th century. Instead of the clear terminology, which is referred solely and only to the Arctic realias (s. Diószegi 1968 and Lewis 1971), the structural-anthropological method transmits it to everything touching by. Orpheus also is interpreted as a shaman (Богданов 1991 and Маразов 1994a: 166-173 where there is an explanation of the structural plan of this definition).

Clio, however, has decided one of the singers-Teachers, one of the creators of faith-doctrine, to be called Orpheus. The Mycenaean-Thracian Orpheus is multifunctional suchlike every creator of doctrine has to be. Siebert 1998: 89 is surprised that “the ancient Greek articles from the Scythian steppe” represent images of Scythians in everyday life, hunting and manufactured scenes, while in Thrace such thing can not be observed.



In Scythia there is no doctrinal faith, perhaps indeed it is crowded with shamans there, who have not been observed and listened by the Hellenic masters-craftsmen. Whereas Thrace, the ancient Greek *téchne* meets the essence and the dismembered essence of the Knowledge on the Hyperborean (northern) direction of the Enlightenment-Wisdom in the funeral, initiatic, mysterial and doctrinal riteness.

This ancient rule holds true in respect to all Humanities, because of the double position of Man in them: *s/he is subject and object of his/her own study*. In History and in historical disciplines the double position of Man is much more disturbing as, for instance, in Pedagogy, despite the popular fallacy that the Past is an outlived segment of Linear time left to the classical archeologists for antiquarian accounts. In this part of the world, in the so called Balkans, the Past is an intellectually and spiritually living substance even today. If someone doesn't understand this, the best thing s/he could do is stay at home, in his/her prestigious off-lying institute or university and collect information for his/her research by electronic way instead of becoming a member of occasional survey's teams or archaeological expeditions in more or less exotic Balkan lands, which are waiting to be discovered.

*Everyone can see what s/he knows* remains a largely applied principle of the studies on non-literary ancient Euro-Asian societies, wrongly identified with illiterate primitive communities, described nowadays by anthropologists/ethnologists in Africa or somewhere else. This kind of *watching with an expert's eye*, armed most frequently with prejudiced parallels, decides not only the starting point, but usually anticipates the final result or conclusion. The latter is easily proved by the great number of opinions on sites, finds, constructions, functions, events, images and pictures offered by the Thracian archaeological material and by the written sources for Thrace and the Thracians.

However, the case of Thrace and of the Thracians, generally speaking, could not be exhausted by the means of an experts' eye armed with positivistic concepts on primitive/peripheral/archaic populations at a certain degree of ethnicity, which is most probably the situation in Eastern, Northern and Central Europe for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> mill. BC. before the Roman expansion.

Making use of this concept on the Antiquity outside Hellas, some investigations on Thrace declared it as “Ort der Begegnung” of the Celts with the Iranian metal-work in the role of “Drehscheibe” (Luschey 1983) or as a meeting place of three cultures, the local, the Achaemenid and the Greek one (Pfrommer 1993). Within the framework of this old interpretative strategy going back to Venedikov–Gerassimov 1979, Amandry 1959 and even to Filow 1934, Ebbinghaus 1999: 405 concludes that “... the Panagurishte rhyta may be seen as the final manifestation of typically Thracian tradition of combining Persian forms and Greek style in the creation of precious metal plate...”.

Fortunately, Thracian toreutics research is more advanced than “Ort” and “Drehscheibe” thanks mostly to Marasov’s studies on different types of metal vessels, workshops, style features, iconography, pictorial language and regional specifics in the Thracian area (s. his complete bibliography in Marasov (Gen. Ed.) 1998). Other new studies, especially on Borovo set and on the Thracian rhyta (lastly Стоянов 1998 with bibliography in page 65, n. 1; Ebbinghaus 1999) introduce a more detailed map of places of production of the vessels in one and the same so called treasure. I noticed that an attempt for distinction appears in Ebbinghaus’s study, which I proposed long time ago, namely – objects produced *in Thrace, for* the Thracians and *by* the Thracians (Fol 1997d). This distinction does not concern metal work only!

But the essential problem is still standing up even till now – why exactly this kind of works *in Thrace, for* and *by* the Thracians has being produced and not another one? Why even war booty, foreign “royal gifts” and imported objects become an integral part of the Thracian culture? Because, *like us*, the people of the “Ort – Drehscheibe” see what they know, but, *in difference to us*, know that what they see is a particular sign/expression of their own global understanding of the divine invisibility, i.e. a part/level of the Whole.

This basic difference between their and our manner of looking at the things must be taken into account in order to put the problem in a completely unexpected way – the aim of the study should be *what they* (aristocrats and, in some cases, the rest of the Thracians) *do think* producing/looking at/commissioning/using/acquiring/gaining a site/construction/

object. What we think about could be only a home exercise in learnedness, because we are observers of the Thracian history, not its makers.

How can we bring ourselves nearer to them?

In difference to Eastern, Northern and Central Europe the South-Eastern area of the continent, closely connected with Indo-Iranian space, was composed and is composed even today by *contact zones*, as already said. The exchange of ideas, skills and speechless languages in this Indo-Iranian/Indo-European world determines the *Thracian Paideia*, i. e. the Thracian *culture-behaviour-attitude*. The special feature of this paideia-behaviour-attitude is situated at the cross-points of its Orality with the Literariness of the Greek intellectuals, in the same way as the Greek Orality in the poleis and in the regions outside them crosses itself with the high Greek Literariness. In other words, South-Eastern Europe proposes a picture of internal permanent *διάνοια* interactions between Ethnos-Poleis structures from the very beginning of the written history to the Late Antiquity and even till Byzantine Times.

The functioning of the ethnos' non-literary historical memory-knowledge could be understood if the sites/constructions/ objects are considered as a production of *τέχνη*, not of art, as they are wrongly considered. Even in Polis Greece all forms of the so called by modern scholars artistic creation should be seen first of all as an expression of the *τέχνη* i. e., of the *ἔθος/ἥθος* (oral/written ethics) of the traditional/state *νόμοι*.

The *τέχνη production in Thrace* is presented mainly by built/painted monuments (fortified settlements, residences, sanctuaries, tombs), by ceramics and eventually by some metal works. Most of them are manufactured in Early or Late Hellenistic style. The *τέχνη production for Thrace/Thracians* could be seen in imported objects, coming predominantly from Marmara Sea-Hellespontic, Black Sea and Aegean bicultural spaces. Their workshops (ateliers) provided with pottery and metal wares the inner Thracian market and, especially the Thracian aristocracy most probably to a considerable extent. Some of them are made by order, but the rest have been delivered as tributes/presents or have been plundered.

*In/for τέχνη production* does reflect predominantly the Greek, but mix-Hellenic – in Thucydides' term – vision on historical, legendary and mythological Thrace by the means of interactive speechless languages, as to be expected. The best, because relatively proved example of this vision,

i. e. of this image/idea – idea/image on the interaction of the Three-Thracian realia, does represent the famous mug from Apollonia Pontica (Museum Sozopol, inv. № 261) with the Thracian Horseman basileus (?) and two infantry men, which is co-related to the chous of Apollonia Pontica (Museum Sozopol, inv. № 266) with the Muses and the letter “A” (Apollo?). They form two special commissions made by the Eretria Painter for Apollonia Pontica” about 425 BC in Athens (Lezzi-Hafter 1997).

While the *infor τέχνη production* could be more or less analyzed by means of classical disciplines adjusted to the Thracian oral ethnos’ paideia-behaviour-attitude in their quality of “translations-designations” of local significances into Greek, the *by τέχνη production* does require other methodological instruments for decoding the images/ideas – ideas/images. In the culture-historical cross-points between oralness and literariness it will be more conform:

- to abandon the use of the terms cult, mythology and religion (Frost 1996 even for Greece) and to replace them with *rite, parable, faith/teaching* (Fol 1998);

- to distinguish the *everyday practical function* from the *ritual* and – most important! – from the *thought doctrinal function* of the site/construction/object/set/κειμέλιον (= πιτύη in Thracian);

- to compare not the images, but their hidden connotations;

- to put in concordance all their languages – the language of the form, of the material, of the function, picture, iconography, ornament, colour and technology;

- to give the object in the hands of the right person at the right time and at the right place, i.e. to situate it in everyday life/ritual/doctrine and, consequently, in different kind of Thinking–Time–Space;

- to put in concordance all speechless languages with the context of the translations–designations of the Thracian spiritual reality reported into Greek/Latin;

- to consider “influences”, loans, adopted ideas/images – images/ideas and skills as a possible supplement to these two groups of languages;

- and, finally, to form the Whole of the non-literary historical memory-knowledge as system of all components in correlation expressed by the paideia-behaviour-attitude;

Thus, the risk of *everyone can see what s/he knows* could be reduced.

It will be a gambling game to take advantage of all this languages, including the technological one, if the access to the Whole, i. e. to the Knowledge as a system has not its own *key of decoding*. The key of decoding could be found neither at the level of the so called *excavated reality*, i. e. in the site/construction/object itself and in its environment, nor at that of the so called *archaeological reality*, i. e. within the framework of the classical approach to the “Barbarians” based on the formula “local (if seen by “s/he who knows”) – acquired” (in any case), but mostly applied only to the everyday practical function. For example the already well-known question why the Thracian aristocratic élite does develop a taste for rhyta frequently receives the banal answer, because of the Thracian drinking habits and under the influence of the Achaemenid royal palace/diplomatic practice.

The key of decoding of the Whole could be chosen at the level of *culture-historical reality*, where the ritual and the thought doctrinal function of the site/construction/object put in motion the paideia-behaviour-attitude of its bearers.

The level of the Thracian culture-historical non-literary ethnos reality could be gained by means of the Indo-European/Indo-Iranian parallels and named identifications of realia. This approach is elaborated by Dumézil–Eliade technique of panoramic generalizations of societies, mythologies and religions from the Sanscrit epic poems eastwards, used most frequently into disputable translations into modern languages, to the “people Gaullois” and the brave ancient Germans westwards. The panoramic technique makes the paideia-behaviour-attitude of all members of the Indo-European/Indo-Iranian family equal but in different spaces, different segments of Linear time and even in different kinds of time (Cyclic, Mythological, Agonistic and Doctrinal), and in this manner goes back to the structural anthropology. The lands of the structural anthropology are inhabited by one and the same figures, who are living not in History, but in Terminology, as Orpheus, the Shaman.

Another way to gain the Thracian culture-historical non-literary ethnos reality comes out from the classical disciplines with their old theoretical concept on the so called periphery, barbarian, of course, which has to be “acculturated”, if not – so much the worse for it. This concept was

fruitless even during its fashionable period after the Second World War and is completely exhausted nowadays in spite of some standard attempts to be re-enacted. My own opinion mentioned above and often expressed, that the Hellenization of the Thracians makes them enter into History, does define the cross-points interactions in the contact zones but not the effects of the “influences” imported as wares.

Why the ritual and the thought doctrinal function of the site/construction/object put in motion the paideia-behaviour-attitude of its ethnos bearers and not the economic or political reasons? Because the ethnos economy is not other but “royal”, i.e. monopolized/centralized, and because the active kernel of the ethnos political structure depends on the position of the king – the South-East European–Asia Minor anax/basileus/monarchos/dynastes/tyrannos/paradynastes, etc. One might say that this king’s position is sacral, but this assertion goes without saying even for Peisistratus in Athens, who came to the city under the protection of Athena played by the beautiful Phýê from the deme of Paiania (**Her.** 1.60 Legrand/Feix).

The dependence of the Whole, i.e. of the ethnos culture–historical reality on the king’s position does require the question *who is the ruler*, i.e. which is the image/idea – idea/image of him in his own faith and in that of his subjects. In other words the problem is what kind of ethnos–state ideology has to be discerned in rites, sacred logoi, incantations, pictorial or constructive formalizations and thought visions not only in esoteric aristocratic circles but in popular faith. The latter must be connected in any case with the royal “hidden” components of ethnos–state ideology in a way that the society is not disintegrated. The connection High–Low was observed and noted by **Her.** 5.7.1 Legrand/Feix, who testifies that all the Thracians *σέβονται* Ares, Dionysos, Artemis, whereas the kings “separately from the rest of *πολιητέων*” – Hermes, and swear by him as their (dynastic) progenitor.

Roshava Chouka is a tumulus nearby the village of Alexandrovo, Haskovo district, South-East Bulgaria (15 m. height, 60-70 m. diam.) The dromos to the tomb is about 10 meters of length, 1.17 m. wide and almost the same height. The entrance to the first chamber is 0.70 m. wide in its lower part and 0.65 wide in its upper part, the height only 1.11 m. The chamber is rectangular (1.2 m N – S x 1.85 m E – W). The walls are verti-

cal up to 1.22 m., where the trapezoidal roof begins and reaches up to 2.20 m. The entrance to the second round chamber is 1.09 m. high and 0.70 wide. The chamber itself has a diameter of 3.30 m. and a height of 3.40 m. A retreating foot soldier aiming a spear and a horseman attacking him are depicted at the western end of the northern corridor's wall. On the Southern wall, a standing soldier with a head in profile to the right can be recognized as once being painted, it now being badly damaged. The decoration of the rectangular room is better preserved. Several bands are depicted (gray-white, white, black, red). Above the entrance to the round chamber a horseman is painted, riding to the right and there is a human figure in front of him.

The wall paintings in the main round chamber are best preserved. They form few horizontal bands (coloured in brick red, red, Pompeian red). The scene on the Southern wall under the central frieze is probably the most important in this part. It contains two figures under which two unclear humans are seated. The one seems to be holding a trapezoidal scepter with seven rays, radiating from the marked center.

The central figural frieze has a width of 0.38 m. It consists of four scenes, which the discoverer G. Kitov (Kitov 2001) calls "hunting" ones. The "hunters" are royal horsemen and foot-soldiers, two of the scenes being with an attacked stag and deer, two other two being with an attacked wild boar.

The situation-analysis of this extraordinary monument of the Thracian *tèchne*-painting shows that the tomb is a sanctuary of Orphic mystical initiations. The two sitting figures under the central frieze are the Great Goddess-Mother and her Son-Sabazios as Sun, translated-designated at the Heptad with his seven rays. On the central frieze an anthropodemonized Thracian king is being depicted as horseman and foot-soldier (according to the Orphic principle of the Single in the Plurality). He kills the main enemy of the Great Mother-Goddess, the wild boar, which is bearer of the chaos against the Cosmic order. In the other two scenes the king causes the suffering of the Sun-Son, who is in the Stag-Deer-image (the sacrificial rite of the hierogamic Heptad).

In spite of this explicit "translation-designation" (according to my terminology) of the hidden and unhidden doctrinal components of the oral

teaching, modern authors do continue to think that in Thrace some *cults* (?), which have been *practices* (?) become some *beliefs* (Archibald 1999).

The terms “cults” and “beliefs” – in difference from the tribes discovered by anthropological and ethnological missions in the jungle – haven’t got any culture–historical meaning for the Balkan Peninsula contact zone/s of orality–literariness, as well as the terms “myth” and “religion”. The so called Thracian mythology is written by the Greeks and put on the Thracian stage within the framework of the old binary concept of the North as Wisdom (Knowledge, Enlightenment) – Non-wisdom (Cruelty, Ferocity). The so called Thracian religion remains devoid of any sense, because of the lack of institutionalized and codified hierarchic relations between God – “religion-makers” – “religious people”. The king’s/ethnos–state ideology of the Odrysians, Bessi, Triballi, Getae, Edoni, Bithynians and of the correlated with them Phrygians, does function as a *Whole of drômena–legômena*, i.e. as *Thracian orphism* (TO).

In Archibald’s 1998 and 1999 opinion, the term is a pure misunderstanding because, going from “practices to beliefs”, Orphism couldn’t be, so to say, reached in Thrace, especially in the Odrysian kingdom, where, as she writes, Orpheus is “unmasked”. Z. Archibald is right that Orpheus has been “masked” long before her own visit to Thrace, but – and this is the crucial point! – by the Greeks. The Greek and later the Latin authors, the Athenian and Apulian vase-painters and the philosophers from the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC to 6<sup>th</sup> c. AD do attribute Orpheus “masked” by themselves to the Thracian culture–historical reality. Why and why not to the Scythian, Illyrian, Persian and Phrygian culture–historical reality?

Attribution doesn’t mean origin. “Orpheus” couldn’t be found in Thrace, because *he is not there*, and, consequently, his “mask” can not be “taken off” during archaeological surveys/excavations and by reading books. *Orpheus is the Greek key of decoding of the Thracian paideia-behaviour-attitude in its binary concept Wisdom – Non-wisdom.*

*Thracian Orphism* is a term for ethnos/oral culture–historical reality in South-Eastern Europe. It covers the space from Phocis–Thessaly to the North–Eastern Thrace – the Hyperborean diagonal, as I say – and from the Midas’ gardens in Ancient Macedonia to the Midas’ city in Phrygia (Fol 1997). *Thracian* related to Orphism is the most appropriate designation for the ethnos/oral *teaching–faith in immortality*, because of the dense con-



centration of written sources, images/ideas–ideas/images and connotations of the different speechless languages of the archaeological material in the Thracian lands. A most significant feature in this respect offer the two clearly distinctive levels of esoteric and exoteric (aristocratic and popular) Thracian mysterial drômena–legômena and their continuity in the Balkan peninsula during the times of the Early Christianity, Late Antiquity, Byzantine Middle Ages until the relics in the folklore, registered in 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The teaching–faith in immortality and its pre-Greek East Mediterranean–Egyptian proto-history does essentially discern from the teaching–faith in immortality of the soul and in the metempsychosis. It is obvious that these statements couldn't be accepted easily by classical archaeologists, historians and philologists. Some of them, according to the traditional positivistic manner of thinking do imagine the “Thracian Orphists” as connoisseurs of their own philosophy like the Platonists, Freudists or Marxists.

The Thracian Orphism is a teaching–faith in *immortality of the intellectual energy*, which is visualized and thought in cosmogonic doctrinal meaning by the sacred marriage of the Great Mother-Goddess with her Son–Sun/Fire, and – in sociogonic doctrinal meaning – with the son of the Son, i.e. with the Orphic king, who is priest, prophet and teacher of his own position. The Orphic esoteric mysteries realized by purification demand that this position should be thought as *ékstasis* (raising up) *to the Son*. The Orphic exoteric (Orphic–Bacchic) mysteries demand that the followers should be thought in *enthiasmós* (introducing in) *of the Son*.

These two doctrinal ways to the immortality could be found/coded in sites/constructions/objects made *by the Thracians*, and – in some cases – in those made *for the Thracians* and *in Thrace*. The Thracian orphism represents nowadays the working hypothesis for *explanation the Whole*, i.e. the paideia-behaviour-attitude of its ethnos bearers. This is the reason why it should be taken into consideration as interpretative strategy of the Thracian oral culture-historical reality until a new key of decoding of speechless languages could be defined.

Here, I shall be interested in the representations of Orpheus in the Attic vase-painting, so to emphasize the ancient Greek point of view, i.e. the ancient Greek interpretation of the Teacher, presented in artefacts,

which are not produced in Thrace or to be of Thracian use (hereafter mainly after Desbals 1997: vol. II №№ 1-92 – with my gratitude to the author for the possibility to use her dissertation).

Twelve scenes represent Orpheus playing in lyre in front of Thracian aristocrats. They are dressed in zeira (a mantle decorated with horizontal strips), alopekis (fox-skin cap), sometimes are in boots. Some of them stand aside their horses, but as a rule all of them carry or lean against two spears. These kingly men listen for the song/hymn of Orpheus, which he offers up, as it is known, to Helios, according to the paradigmatic scene on the Berlin crater of the “painter of Orpheus” dated to the middle of the 5th century BC (ARV<sup>2</sup>: 1103, 1; 1683; Para 451; Add.<sup>2</sup>: 329). This is the moment, in which the Teacher initiates his disciples into the Faith in the Sun-Sun.

Three Thracian initiated aristocrats are represented in this scene with naked bodies under their mantles. Bearing in mind that all “Barbarians” (Persians, Amazons, Scythians, Orientals) are represented always dressed, in opposition to the Hellenic nakedness which is a mark of heroism, the images of Thracians designate something unusual. It is consisted in the circumstance that “Orpheus, the Thracian” has invented the Orphism which is not only Thracian, but also Hellenic.

Six scenes on the Attic vessels represent Orpheus attacked by Thracian women in the presence of initiated aristocrats. These vessels are from the middle and the second half of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, and even in this early epoch the Thracian women are armed with spits/pokers, sickles, double axes, spears, bow and sword. This group brings into mind purely doctrinal associations, because the Teacher still is not killed, but he will die like his god. He is thought by the initiated in the vision of the dismemberment of Zagreus, unambiguously stressed by the pokers and the sickles. Orpheus is thought however, also in the vision of Helios-Sabazios, which is suggested by the double axes and the spears in their quality characteristic of royal insignia.

Twenty nine scenes on Attic depicted vases show Orpheus in the absence of initiated aristocrats attacked by Thracian women, is injured or killed by them. The Thracian women are armed with pokers, double axes, spears, sickles. Some of them are depicted holding stones and pieces of rock. At least in fifteen scenes the women are tattooed. Now, explicitly, it

is seen that the scenes are not doctrinal, but mystical, and they represent the death of the Teacher in the pathos of his god. The dismembering of Dionysos-Zagreus is equalized with the sacrifice of the subject of the main rite, of the king-priest himself, which rite is performed once annually.

Almost all tattooed women from the scenes on the Attic ceramic belong to the iconography of Orpheus. Outside them there are enumerated eight cases of women tattooed on the neck, hands, legs and body. The tattoos are usually parallel horizontal and vertical lines, sometimes single, which are wavy, straight, zigzag, filled with rosettes of dots, stars and, seldom – of animals which are discernible with difficulties. The participants in the attack and murder of Orpheus evidently are distinguished from the “marked women”, who are wet-nurses or slave-women. Here it is necessary to mention the explicitly reported evidence about the tattoo as a noble distinctive mark for the Thracians (**Her.** 5.6 Legrand/Feix). **Stob.** 64.14.25-26 Wachsmuth-Hense cites Phanokles that the Thracians tattoo his women with blue marks on the skin so that the detestable murder of Orpheus might not be forgotten. This evidence is repeated by other ancient authors in its explanatory part.

Why the iconography of Orpheus represents only tattooed Thracian women outside the slaves? They are usually characterized as maenads/bacchantes, and their maenadism is considered as irrational (after Dodds 1940; 1951). Fortunately, it was noticed that the historical maenads “offered sacrifices as civilized substitutes” (Obbink 1990: 71-72), so to be understood even by the graecists that the bacchantes of Euripides are not Greek housewives but are pulled out from the Thracian Zagreus’ riteness. The real maenads are in the rite, and the vision of them – in the ancient Greek literature.

Then who are the ritual maenads, who doctrinally sacrifice the son of the Son and mysterially dismember the Son himself (in his image of bull)? They are the priestesses of the Great Mother-Goddess. This role of them, of priestesses-tattooed noblewomen, can not be perceived by the ancient Greek observers. In the myth the positions of the reason and the sequence are exchanged, so to be obtained an acceptable explanation in ancient Greek language – the murder of Orpheus provokes the practice of the punitive tattooing, instead of that the tattooing gives the right to the Thracian women to kill Orpheus. This right of them springs out from their statute of

enforcers of the will of the Great Mother-Goddess, who solely has the right over the doctrinal death of her Son and over the mystical death of his son.

The position of the tattooed women is confirmed also by the circumstance that some of them are armed with stones or pieces of rock. This weapon is not for maenads. The “weapon” is connected in its genesis with the archaic materialized image of the Great Mother-Goddess, who is Mountain/Rock.

Three scenes represent the giving oracles head of Orpheus. The most famous among them is depicted on a black-figured vase from about 420 BC. A young man records on a tablet the oracular words, pronounced by the head of the singer. The recording man sit on a rock, and from the right of the head Apollo stretches his right arm to him while holding a laurel twig in his left hand.

The scene is, taken in itself, so clear that it requires perhaps only one explanation. Orpheus is in his Death. In his death however, he is the carrier of the divine Knowledge. Orpheus is in the immortality of the anthropodaimon, who predicts and instructs, gives advises and is a leader of his followers. This is the doctrinal position of the son of the Son and of every one who has believed in him, who names himself or is named as *orphic*, according to the analysis of the golden tablets. In the scene however, is presented also the Son himself in his hypostasis of Apollo, i.e. in his solar image. His stretched to the recording man right arm is the sign that this is his, of the God, revelation.

On the instant I have to remind that the Attic vase-painting does not know the so-called Orpheus' katabasis, but only Orpheus-the Teacher, and, therefore, is nearest to the image-idea of the Thracian Faith-Doctrine.

The iconography of the Apulian vases includes the theme about the playing of Orpheus in front of the Thracian initiated aristocrats, his combat with the tattooed priestesses of the Great Mother-Goddess, but most numerous are the scenes of Orpheus in Hades. Besides in front of Hades, Orpheus plays in front of Persephone, Hekate and other deities. Because the figures are oftenly provided with inscriptions, their distinguishment could be made easily. Eurydice is also among them.

I do not resume here what is known about the South-Italic ceramic with the iconography of Orpheus dated in the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, so to remind

it, but to oppose it to the Attic scenes. The South-Italic Hellenic orality has fabulated the immortality of Orpheus independently of his Attic iconography. The South-Italic orphism from Pythagoras onwards is connected with the Thessalian one, as it became clear from the commentary on the golden tablets, whereas in Athens this vision is impossible, because there “immortality” with certainty means human *hùbris*.

Unlike Orpheus, the anthropodaimonized Teacher, and unlike Rhesus, the anthropodaimonized interpreter of the will of Dionysos, Zalmoxis is qualified as deity. In ancient Greek language however, the Herodotus’ characteristic, “daimon”, is equivalent to the Plato’s “theos”, which means “taking possession of/obsessed by” divinity. The literary orphism of Plato equalizes the anthropodaimon terminologically with the god and this practice is preserved in consequence by the all commentators of the Orphic verses.

That Zalmoxis is in position of Teacher is quite clear because of **Her.** 4.94.1 Legrand/Feix, where the Getae “think” that they become immortal because of their ritual practice which persuade them to trust that the dead goes to “the daimon Zalmoxis”. This is pure faith which is possible because of the naming of the Teacher. How is this faith achieved? **Plat. Charm.** 156D-157C Burnet responds – through ἐπωδή. This is the known sing-song/song sung over, which contains “good words” so that the state of intelligibility to be achieved, according to Plato. It means immortality in translation in Orphic language.

The Ionian substantive/verb Threskéie/Threskéyein (see TD 1: 173-235; Fol 1995b) is mentioned at the earliest by **Her.** 2.18.2, 2.37.3, 2.64.1, 2.65.1 Legrand/Feix. The context of Herodotus’ choice is clarified by the author himself. **Her.** 2. 81.2 Legrand/Feix announces the similarity of the “Orphic-Bacchic” to the “Egyptian-Pythagorean” *hosia*. Threskéie/Threskéia (in koiné)/Threskéyein has been probably acquired and Hellenized during the internal and external Hellenization. These words, which have no Thracian origin in the sense of a gloss, do express Greek ethno-cultural meaning. In the Orphic fragments the words appear as Greek designation of Thracian Dionysian initiation and mysteries introduced by Orpheus himself.

Threskéyein is the verbe used by **Plut.** Vita Alex. 2.7-8 Ziegler as “greek” translation-designation of the rites performed by the Macedonian

Bacchantes (Klodonos and Mimallonos) who have been followers of the women of the Edonians and of the Thracians in Haemus Mountain. My old definition of Threskéie/Threskéia/Threskéyein as Orphic-bacchic mysteries (TO: 53-54, 70-71, 79; Fol 1995b) was brilliantly argued by Lamagna 1999 who does differ the Thracian (orphy) τὸ μυεῖν (= mystical initiation) from the Thracian (orphy) τὸ θρησκεύειν (= mystical obsession) on the basis of **Greg. Nazian.** Contra Julianem imperatorem 1 (= 4) MPG/Bernardi 1983 (cf. Grégoire 1948 with the lit. before the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War).

I clarified already thyepolia as the logos which does the rite. It initiates into a visual sacrament. Θρησκεία might not be logos, but in **Orphei Argon.** 21-24 Abel (cf. other reading by Vian) it is read the following: θρησκείαν τε Ζηνός ... ὄρεσιδρόμου τε λατρείην/μητρός, ἃ τ' ἐν Κυβέλοις ὄρεσιν μετίσατο κούρην/Φερσεφόνην περὶ πατρὸς ἁμαιμακέτου Κρονίωνος/ῥαιομένου τε Ζαγρηῶς περίφημον ἄμυξιν.

The passage is not used, the more so as a conjecture in Abel introduces the reading "threskeia". The text reveals the ritual vision about the nocturnal tearing to pieces of Zagreus and about the baccheuo-ing of the women, followers of Dionysos. In the record of the legendary *Argonautica*, therefore, threskeia is made equal to thyepolia. This is a very excited step ahead because it means that logos, a *written down verbalization*, provokes as the state of ecstasis as well as that one of enthusiasmos.

I daresay that this sentence is not an intellectual game. While the religion is an observing of prescribednesses and norms, the Faith is a suffered redemption. Then, in both cases, *the Faith in the named, which is voiced, is an initiation into*, in which the logos is equal in value to the ritual agon. The initiation is consisted of that to learn whom, what, when and how to name, so that this learning can become the bow-string which the believer can draw to the Knowledge. If the Zagreus' faith goes through the suffering, the Sabazios' one goes through the purification. Both form the oral orphism as a trust in the Immortality.

Orpheus achieves the same suggestion by means of his lyre in tetrachord, which is the other name of the Pythagorean principle of the tetractys. The tetrachord is the sounding of the four cosmogonic elements in the tone "re" (the earth), "mi" (the air), "fa" (the water) and "sol" (the fire). According to the ten-phasic rhythmically created model of the Cosmos at

“la” the born Son will ascend in orbit, i.e. the Sun, to reach the seventh phase of the hierogamy.

The tetrachord-tetractys remains in itself the common universal principle of the building of the Orphic-Pythagorean ritually and doctrinally, energetically vocalised space. The Mother-Son paterfamilias receives its full equalization with the Whole/Entireness of the Cosmos-Socium after the birth of the son of the Son.

The answer of the question why the oral orphics believe in the immortality becomes in a challenging manner easy – because they believe in the Whole/Entireness, which they will know.

### **Tetractys**

The Tetractys is formed because of the conception of the four cosmogonic primary elements. This seems natural, but only at first glance, for the inner energetic source of the Tetractys is the Fire. In the presence of this obvious asymmetry, the Fire will be multifunctional or, to say in the language of the book –polynamed.

Putting aside in this summary the expected parallels with the Sanscrit Agni and with the Zoroastrism, as well as with the Mythraism, I go now to my conclusion that the Tetractys becomes being of the Faith because of the Son-Fire/Sun.

The Samothracian Tetractys, which is named Axiokersa-Axieros-Axiokersos-Kasmilos/Kadmilos (Hermes), is in full correspondence with the Herodotus' Tetractys of Thracians, reported as Artemis-Dionysos-Ares-Hermes (venerated only by the kings). In both arrangements (about them s. in detail TD 1: 216-224), composed of ancient Greek translations-designations, the *self-conceiving-hierogamy* imagery of the initiation is suggested by the ithyphallic Hermes. He binds in the Great Mother-Goddess with the self-conceived by her Son as a presence of the abstract male principle, and them both – with the born of the sacred marriage son of the Son (= King, Teacher).

The royal or the Orphic initiatory level in the Herodotus' narrative is explained by means of through the oath, taken by the Thracian kings in the name of Hermes, and is analogous to the oath of the Samothracian epoptes. The oath introduces the ithyphallic principle, i.e. the visualised hierogamy, as a deepest-in-heart sacrament, and not simply as a presence of the god. The deepest-in-heart sacrament consists in the presumption that

the orphic-king himself can enter into the hierogamy with the Great Mother-Goddess so to complete the formation of the Cosmos-Socium. This should lead to the conclusion that the sacred marriage can be visualized in his two staseis. The one is mythological, i.e. the stasis of the Son, the other is doctrinal, i.e. the stasis of the son of the Son (the first time in TO: 150-165).

The known four names of the Samothracian Kabeiroi, i.e. the Great Gods (about the Semitic *Kbr* and its translation s. Burkert 1992: 153 and note 3), can be explained in Thracian, as well as in ancient Greek language, if only their writing out is not made wrongfully by the scholiast (Detschew 1976<sup>2</sup>: 18). From the cultural-historical point of view this is not so important, because the absolute identity of the personifications with the Herodotus' Tetractys does not depend on the linguistic interpretation.

The Great Mother-Goddess (Axiokersa or Artemis) gives birth to her Son (Axieros or Dionysos), and from their sacred marriage springs out the son of the Son (Axiokersos or Ares). The long ago noticed -κερσος, as a composit in the Thracian (Odryasian) royal names, is a good observation about the Samothracian son of the Son, but the Herodotus' Ares is still better for the equivalence of this god with the Thracian king ascends way back to Homer.

The four Samothracian Great Gods stand in their Mythological time of permanent becoming. The Cyclic time of the mystery covers the whole procedure in the Anaktoron and in the Hieron, starting with the washing of the hands and finishing with the receiving of the sacred objects-mediators of the Great Mother-Goddess – the red piece of cloth/dressing (tainía), which is her code in colour, and the magnetite bracelet, which visualises the image of the Mountain-Mother, the genitrix. The Doctrinal time of the mystery disposes its lengthening in the purifying ritual actions, which are strengthened by the luminant received by the future myst. The next phase of this time is visualised by the wooden platform in the central hall of the Hieron where the started for the initiation experiences his inthronization. This inthronization is a typical self-sacrifice, i.e. symbolically human self-offering, and is the sublime rite of the sacrament. In this concentration-inself the mysts perform the four-stepped dance round the wooden platform.

In the Hieron of the Samothracian sanctuary the Doctrinal time continues to be experienced when the myst get up on the platform, towards



which there are two (?) steps, and from there he delivers his oath. It is supposed that after the oath he has taken off his clothes in front of the observing him epopts and has thrown over himself water or blood in the light of torches fixed into specially prepared for them orifices from both sides of clay troughs. The washing up with blood is more probable, although the excavators are not talkative about the designation of these troughs.

The known gloss of **Hesych.** s.v. κοίης Latte· ἱερεὺς Καβείρων· ὁ καθαίρων φονέα· οἱ δὲ κόης Latte offers the difficult for etymologizing and with an obscure origin name of “the priest of the Kabeiroi” (after Георгиев 1977: 152). What is more important is that the gloss reports directly about “a purification from murder”. The dictionary of Hesychius, however, is composed in the 5th century after the closing of the Samothracian sanctuary, and, moreover, in the early Christian milieu of Alexandria. Then it is written “purification from blood”, i.e. from bloody sin, from murder, instead of the mysterial “purification with blood” (s. the opinions in Cole 1984: 116 and note 256). During the Samothracian antiquity of the sanctuary the purification with blood has been preserved even in the Hellenistic period, since the new epopt has put on his body the red cloth (on his waist?). This ritual action poses on him a sacred object with the colour of the Great Mother-Goddess and presupposes that he has achieved the highest initiatory degree.

In the end of this chapter let me add that one mysterial sanctuary is thought in different sacred spaces depending on the kind of Time, in which the started for initiation occurs himself. The Samothracian sanctuary is thought architecturally as a completed Cosmos, since the initiation come to the idea/image of the son of the Son, who functions at the eight, ninth and tenth phase, according to the Orphic-Pythagorean building of the world. On the other hand, the riteness in the Samothracian sanctuary is the process of becoming of the Tetractys, because the initiation is experienced as from the first to the fourth, as well as from the fifth to the seventh (to the sacred marriage) phase of the Tetractys. In this way, the Tetractys actually is thought as a module, which contains in itself the ten phases of the cosmic building according to the 4+3+2+1 formula of Pythagoras.

That what has been spoken in the sacred spaces of Samothrace forming by the kinds of Time of the riteness, has been voiced in secret language. The hesitation whether this language is Thracian, Pelasgian or

“Thracian-Pelasgian” (Георгиев 1977: 151) will remain linguistic problem, but only by means of linguistics it can not be solved, because the fragments from inscribed vessels as well as the piece of votive stele, found during the excavations, do not offer sufficient data (Lehmann 1955). Recently this problem acquired a new character because of the excavations on the southwestern shore of Samothrace. They manifested the opportunity about a Minoan presence in the island, documented by ceramics from the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC. Since on the clay disk and other ceramic articles are spelled out traces of the Linear A writing, the hypothesis that the sacred language of Samothrace is Minoan was already launched (Matsas 1991; 1995).

Samothrace, which lies on the central axis of the Thracian-Phrygian contact zone, the future chôra of Constantinople, is the best place for intersection of different cultural-language phenomena. Suchlike situation is observed already in South-Eastern Thrace where also the Linear A writing was registered (Fol-Schmitt 2000).

The Samothracian enigma will not be solved by a direct answer of the question what is the mysterial language. Whatever is this language, the study has to point up the problem who is called to epiphany and how. I said already that probably this has happened through parole words, which have contained certainly the Great Mother-Goddess–Son paredria.

According to **Hyppolyt.** *Refut. omn. haer.* 5.7 Wendland Ἄτε ... σὲ καλοῦσι Σαμοθράκες Ἄδαμνα σεβάσμιον. In **idem** 5.9 the Samothracians venerated ἀρχάνθρωπος Ἄδάμ, wherefrom, as it could be expected, would follow the presumption about a Biblical borrowing (cf. Detschew 1976<sup>2</sup>: 6). The addition in **Hesych.** s.v. ἀδάμνα: τὸν φίλον, ἀδαμνεῖν· τὸ φιλεῖν Latte equalizes Attis to Adamna in the meaning of the ancient Greek ἀγαπητός, i.e. worshipped/loved, venerated/honoured, according to the explanation of Hyppolytus, which is expressed in σεβάσμιον. In its sensefull meanings stand the initial “awe before god”, which provokes the veneration. This connects Attis-Adamna with the Son-Sun, i.e. with Helios among the Thracians (ТД 2: 68 and XO: 177-180).

Under this state of the sources, the so-called Orphic oath, voiced by the epopt, would contain a parole mysterial word of the described type. It would be a code for the Son and probably – for the Great Mother-Goddess, without uttering their theonyms. The parole call-code should

reveal the synoptic vision in the Mythological time so to reach the Doctrinal one.

This logos-rite is the essence of the Samothracian mystery. In an exoteric milieu however, the sacrament could be seen also through other verbalizations. In Samothrace it could be Hermes/Kadmilos, suchlike is also the oath of the Odrysian kings.

In the **Orphei Hymni** 28 Quandt Hermes inhabits the cave-womb of the Great Mother-Goddess at the summit of the mountain of Parnassus. In the text it is said something exceptional, which concerns the assumed content of the oath of the Thracian kings. In verse 4, the god is called *λόγου θνητοῖσι προφήτα*, i.e. prophet of the logos about the mortals or messenger-interpreter of what is mysterially spoken. In verse 10, the hymn clarifies this logos with the following words – *γλώσσης δεινὸν ὄπλον τὸ σεβάσμιον ἀνθρώποισι*, or – (your) *fearful* (sublime, noble) *weapon of the tongue* (used by you) *is in* (sacred) *esteem with men*.

Precisely these two verses are the most expressive echo of the mysterially spoken by Hermes to the initiated. The unspoken in the sacrament is, as the reader already knows, the sacred marriage, i.e. the creation of the cosmic motion, which is possible in the presence of Hermes. In philosophical-Orphic language it is Eros.

Is that the Orphic oath of the kings-priests and of the Samothracian mysts?

### **Staseis of rite**

The myth of Zagreus is written by Onomacritus (cf. TD 1: № 1 with sources and literature), who has used the Titans of Hesiod and of Homer to transform them into agents of the will of Hera. The god is zoomorphized into the image of bull and is sacrificed, so to endure his literary pathos. The mythographic operation is done over an observed Orphic ethnos' riteness in South-Eastern Europe and in South Italy even before Pythagoras. How he has given meaning to it is clear from the fragment of Alcmaeon, in which the dismembered Zagreus is already equalized with Dionysos. In translation, the fragment says that the "*mighty* (the most venerated since she is the mistress of the living nature) *Ge* (gives) *to Zagreus* (a place, which is) *the highest among* (the places of) *the all* (of the rest of the) *gods*" (cf. TD 1: № 2 with sources and literature).

Unlike Onomacritus, Alcmaeon does a philosophical-speculative mythologization of the Great Mother-Goddess—Son paterfamilias. This equalization is very close to the formula itself, if not it is the formula itself, thought by the initiated. The personal mythocreative work over the oral Thracian orphism ends up with these two authors. The next after them only fabulate the short story-line.

The riteness in oral milieu is much more rich than the literary scheme. I shall give as the last example the recently explored complex of more than ten masoned buildings under tumular embankments west of the town of Kazanluk, Southern Bulgaria. This valley is called the “Valley of Thracian kings” since the archaeological team connects it with the Odrysian dynasty from the 6th till 2<sup>nd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> century BC (the data in Китов 1994; 1994a; 1995, and Kitov 1994; 1994a; 1995, 1997, and Kitov—Krsteva 1992-1993 and Kitov—Dimitrova 1998-1999). The assumption that these buildings, announced only as tombs (?), have been built by Ionian masters (Tsetschladze 1998) can not be confirmed by the archaeological material and by the architecture of the monuments.

After the famous tomb of Kazanluk with the mural paintings of the Great Mother-Goddess and the son of the Son, i.e. of the king, first of all appeared two tombs – wall-painted, half-preserved, beehive, brick-built, near the capital of the Odrysian king Seuthes III, Seuthopolis, South-West from Kazanluk. Amphoras, Thracian warriors in chariots and armament are depicted on the walls of the tombs near the town of Maglzh, zones of different colours – on the walls of the tomb near the town of Kran. In the un plundered tomb in Malkata mogila (rough construction) from the middle of or the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, among the gifts of golden articles of adornment are found also two bone labryses and a solid golden ring with images of the Great Mother-Goddess, giving the royal insignia to the buried son of the Son.

The tomb near the Sashova Mogila with a semi-cylindrical vault proved to be a mausoleum (according to G. Kitov), which has been used a full century before the last burial of a man and of a sacrificed horse (end of 3<sup>rd</sup>-first half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC). The burial in the chamber with a semi-cylindrical vault in Slavchova Mogila near the village of Rozovo has been plundered already during the Antiquity. In the antechamber is preserved a sacrificed horse. This monument is exceptional because of the

circumstance that it reproduces the Mycenaean tradition to pile up the embankment at first and after that to take off part of it so to build the construction.

The architectural construction in the Saraphova Mogila near the town of Kran also is built in the initially piled up embankment. This a fine construction decorated with zones in black, red, white, rose and violet. The coloured decoration is a late Hellenistic variant of the black-red-white Zagreus'-Sabazios' ritual code. This interpretation is confirmed by the burial of the sacrificed horse in the corridor, which closes up the entrance, as well as by the tight bolted, thick, stone door of the central room. It is not found an inventory in this room, but traces of it are noticed. The inventory either has been brought out before the ritually closing of the building, or, it has been regularly put in and brought out if it has functioned, in my opinion, as a sanctuary-heroon.

Suchlike functions probably is to be attributed also to the building in the so-called "Helvetia" tumulus near the town of Shipka. The walls of the antechamber and of the chamber are plastically shaped with stucco so to imitate white stone blocks. The burial bed in front of the entrance is covered with thick lime coat. This empty chamber has been a sanctuary-heroon, which, after the exhausting of its designation, has been closed up with a sacrificed horse posed in the antechamber. The horse is offered there as upon a rock-altar, because the place is shaped with a not high edge to the entrance side with a carved outfall for the flowing away of the blood. This type of sacrifices can be interpreted as a sacrifice of a substitute of the king, of the son of the Son, in cause of which there is no a human burial inside the chamber. The whole construction and the registered in it riteness is a continuing of the rock-cut tradition of Mycenaean Thrace.

From the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC is the construction of the big beehive tomb in the tumulus called "Golyamata Arsenalka" near the town of Shipka. It is of the type of mausoleum, as said by the excavator, i.e. with function of a sanctuary-heroon until the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC (because the remaining from inventory dates the last burial at this time). The floor of the round chamber is paved with big stone plates, which form in the centre three concentric zones round a bothros dug in the stone. The top of the dome is a solar circle.

The ritual-doctrinal function of this type under tumular construction could be perfectly seen in the southern periphery of Ostrousha Mogila, where was found the largest, for now, ritual complex in Thrace. It covers about 100 m<sup>2</sup> and has five rectangular and one round rooms. One of the rectangular rooms has remained undestroyed. It is carved in a monolithic granite block, shaped as a sarcophagus. In the sarcophagus is shaped out of the same granite block a bed, which takes up occupies nearly the all space. The roof of the room is decorated with cassettes, but its centre is moulded in form of solar circle with eight rays each of them in form of triangle. In the cassettes of the roof, in technique of fresco are represented human beings, animals, plants, unfortunately heavily damaged. The building of the complex is dated in the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC. It has been plundered during the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD. Despite that, in front of the entrance it is found ritually buried silver horse-trappings. In course of eight centuries it has been functioned as a sanctuary-heroon of the anthropodaimonized king-orphic and, therefore, has been served for mysterial initiations.

This interpretation is confirmed by the building under the tumulus Shushmanets near the town of Shipka. The colossal architectural construction is built from finely worked stone blocks, upon which lime coat is posed many times. In front of the façade a sacred space is outlined, diligently plastered up, in which are sacrificed four horses and two dogs (=wolves). The semi-cylindrical entrance of the dromos is in the well shaped out of rectangular blocks façade. It is divided by a column in "archaic", as said by the excavator, style. The entrance of the beehive room is closed with a two-leaved stone door, decorated with cassettes on both sides. In the rectangular fields of the cassettes are carved solar disks. The beehive room itself is high and with a diameter about 4 m. In its centre a doric column stands up to the top of the chamber. The column touches a solar disk in the top, from which go out radially 15 rays. The image is formed from the arrangement of the stone blocks. The column is painted with brilliantly white stucco. Its basis is posed in an altar circle, painted also with white. The walls of the chamber are divided into three horizontal zones. The lower two zones are divided perpendicularly into 7 fields each by pseudo-columns in doric style. This is an architectural code of the stereometric organisation of the Cosmos (4+3).

The described construction is an architecturally-ritually replication of the described by Macrobius oracular sanctuary of Sabazios (cf. ТД 2: № 9), which is “taken down” from its rock-cut mountainous environment to the “Valley of Thracian kings”. The rock-cut temples, found in the Rhodopes Mountain, are carved in a monolithic rock, they have an opening at the top and, instead of column, the solar ray itself touches the centre of the floor of the beehive room (Фол В. 1993: 9-76; 2000). The mysterial riteness is experienced between the image-idea of the Sun during the day (Apollo, according to the terminology of Macrobius) and this one of Dionysos during the night (also according to the terminology of Macrobius). Sabazios is the dual Son of the Great Mother-Goddess (ТД 1: № 26).

This neoplatonic evidence however, is complemented and changed by the archaeological evidences. I said already that the sacrifice of the horse can be interpreted as a sacrifice of the substitute of the king-orphic, of the son of the Son. In combination with sacrificed dog/dogs (wolf/wolves) the riteness includes also the other zoomorphic image of the Son-Sun in its hibernal hypostasis or the so-called Apollo-the Wolf (Fol V. 2000). In this way are represented the two basic reincarnations of the Son, perceived as estival (= the horse) and as hibernal (= the wolf) Sun. The sacrifice of both animals symbolizes the entireness of the dual Son, whose son is the king-orphic. Also on that reason, both zoomorphic images are his substitute.

The introduction into the mysteriality of Sabazios is best clarified by **Iambl.** *De myst.* 3.10 des Places through a juxtaposition with the Corybantes. While the might/force/power of the Corybantes has been to guard and complete the enthusiastic devotion, this one of Sabazios consists of that to prepare the initiated for bacchism, purification of the soul and deliberation from old guilts/transgressions (cf. Boyancé 1972: 13-66). The description of Iamblichus is understood in the implied meaning of the description of Demosthenes about the diurnal and nocturnal Sabazios' mysteries (ТД 2: № 5), but as an opposition to the metempsychosis, which do not liberate the souls from the guilt. This is clear from the point of view of the oral orphism. The naming by name-essence is a confession of Faith, which purifies through the *god-in*, i.e. through enthusiasmos and theophoria, so to prepare the souls, i.e. the *happily-daimonian*, for immortality.

The "souls" in Iamblichus are a convention which has replaced the energetic unity.

Sabazios is the naming of the Beyond (of the Orphic immortality), while Zagreus is the naming of the chthonic being of the Faith.

The higher Orphic initiatory-mysterical riteness is consisted in together with an elective thinking of the Agonistic time, so that *the aloneness of the self-concentration* can be achieved. The elective thinking is combined with the monoscenic/synoptic one, whereat the new stasis of *the Faith-in-permanent-becoming* is achieved. The believer is visited by the daimonian thinking, which guarantees him the trust in the grand Life-Death-Beyond cycle. The son of the Son (=King, Teacher) is the only one, who in his quality of happily-daimonian could occur in the Doctrinal time of the immortal illumination.

All this passing over to different Thinking–Time–Space, i.e. to different staseis of the orphic Teaching–Faith–Rite could be observed *above the excavated–archaeological reality in the culture-historical context* on the terrain of the Starosel site in Sredna gora mountain. Near the village of Starosel, Hissaria region, Central South Bulgaria, G. Kitov and his expedition did excavate the biggest (till 2000) Thracian royal (Odryian ?) temple built from stone blocks. The triumphal stairs, entrance and doors lead away to a (anti- ?) chamber with semi-cylindrical roof and, after it, to the beehive chamber with ten pseudo-columns. The plan and the execution of the enormous construction, as well as, the sacral  $4+3+3=10$  orphic module of the Cosmos (realized by the two sacred marriages between the Great Mother-Goddess and her Sun, and the sun of the Sun) as in Sveshtari royal tomb near the town of Isparih, do demonstrate the functioning of a sanctuary-heroon of the orphic king and of the happily-daimonic initiated aristocrats. This functioning of the empty building for orphic mysterical initiations in the *Life Beyond* is absolutely confirmed by the rich burials in mound tombs all around it.

The oral Orphic Faith-riteness in immortality is deciphered as through the written as well as through the archaeological evidences.

### **Teaching in remembering**

Than the faith of the spoken word becomes equal to the ritual agon. It is not being devoted *to* but being initiated *into*. The initiation consists of learning how, when, and where the naming could be properly exercised



so that what is named could become a bow-string letting the believer fly toward the Knowledge. If the Zagreus's faith is a being into suffering, the Sabazios's one goes through it. Hence the two constitute the orphism as a trust in deathlessness. *The deathlessness of the believer consists of his mediation between the living who hold on their trust and the god.* The god is believed as intellectual mediator, as daimon with a body of energy, and this daimon *passes from the doctrinal to the astral initiation into the divine Memory-Knowledge.* This transition is achievable by means of *training for remembering* in kinds of Time. The namedness *what*, i.e., the non-articulated essence, can not be remembered in the for- or frowardness of the finite or infinite Linear time where it could create a theological problem. It appears in the for- and frowardnesses of the Mythological, the Cyclic, the Agonistic and the Doctrinal (heroic, gradual, and spiral) time through the namednesses *how, when, and where.* Thus the non-articulated essence of the divine Memory-Knowledge bears the touch of a way of thinking which does not formalize the cause-effect set of discerning-knowing-naming but creates it monoscenically/synoptically, daimonically, by choice, and epiphatically.

The thinking of kinds of Time outside of the Linear time with mind and heart or the formalizing of the mere existence of them being thought is possible with the technique of which hitherto I spoke, namely with the dialogue between the logos-metaphor of the believer and the anticipated logos-metaphor of the believed spirituality. The high intensity of this purely intellectual contact is not only its characteristic but is in itself a mystical initiation into mystery as it is said with hermetic insight by Iamblichus in *On the Egyptian Mysteries.* Such an insight is not a bizarrery for his epoch as well as for the magics of uniting the Hellenic and the Aegyptian personifications of Hermes and Thoth. Iamblichus puts the doing of the verbal mystery initiation under the patronage and guidance of Hermes, θεὸς ὁ τῶν λόγων ἡγεμὼν (Iambl. De myst. I.1 des Places), who is also the hegemon of the faith-Orphic logos.

The dialogue between the logoi-metaphors is constituted in this book as interactivity of the Orphic orality and the ancient Greek literary formulaity. Bearing in mind this interactivity it is possible to make a rapprochement toward the mechanism of remembering as a tool to bring with on the road to deathlessness. For now such a rapprochement is most perti-

ment to the data in the Derveni Papyrus. All studies of this text, still preliminary because of the condition of the find, unanimously put it into the frame and the main documents of the ancient Greek literary Orphism. If this interpretation should be followed, an easier finale of the study couldn't be desired. The wary refrain from such an interpretative strategy is supported by at least two circumstances. The first of them comes from the papyrus discovered on the chest of the deceased disintegrated before the sight of the excavators in a grave at Callatis, modern Mangalía, on the Black Seaside (Pippidi 1967). This find, although unfortunate gain, will not remain the only one and it suggests that the function of the Orphic papyri is close to the function of the Orphic pectorals and golden tablets. The researchers of Derveni Papyrus, as it appears so far, are not interested in the culture-historical characteristics of the riteness/rite in which the papyrus roll is situationally named in its quality of written holy logos-metaphor. In other words, the circulation of such a logos-metaphor exists in bicultural milieu along the Hyperborean diagonal (southwest—northeast).

The second circumstance, because of which the analysis of Derveni papyrus as a philosophical and allegorical treatise with cosmo- and theogonic character known to and to a considerable degree adopted by the deceased should be acknowledged with a refrain, is due to the crater of the Derveni necropoleis. The connecting of the find with the papyrus is already suspected as a conspiracy against the high literature and is rejected without argument because of that by Funghi 1997: 29, n.12. The explicitness of such a statement is only a sign of hurry bearing in mind the proximity of the two graves from one and the same necropoleis. The graves dated before the beginning of the 3rd century BC are situated in a necropoleis placed on the top of a hilly crown above the most convenient coastline of the bay of Thessaloniki. The necropoleis is at a distance of 10 km north from the town of Thessaloniki and of about thirty from the necropoleis of Sindos.

Already at the time of the essay of Mihailov 1991 on the Derveni crater a hesitancy appeared whether the two stone cist-graves (B with the crater and A with the papyrus) at a distance of 4.5 m one in relation to the other could have been further related. This hesitancy, articulated most openly and skillfully by Carpenter 2000, is expressed also by the author's

own admission that the images on the crater are analyzed by him only at literary level. I am allowed, therefore, to go back to the aforesaid rule that one sees what is known to him or her and to be convinced that the possessors or the contemplators of the artifact have had another interpretation, the one of their own. Astieioneios, son of Anaxagoras from Larissa, according to the inscription with silver letters on the bronze crater, does not reveal the interpretation of his own of the images and scenes of the crater, e.g. of the possessed Theban women (??), of Dionysos and Ariadne, of Pentheus most probably as the bearded man (?). Carpenter 2000: 57, against his position of a reader of Euripides, asks himself whether it is possible to interpret the scene of the central frieze, the one of Dionysos and Ariadne, as a mysterial initiation, or, in other words, whether it is possible to think that Astieioneios is initiated. His response is that the Orphic-Bacchic mysteries are dubious because the images on the crater are not "more religious" than the hundreds of images on the Attic red-figured vases especially on the craters among them.

Whether the images under question are more or less religious would be a conclusion of excessive commitment. If instead of the literary interpretation one proceeds from the norm that everyone conveys different semantics in what he or she sees then the conventional scenes on the crater will be understood in two ways. To the non-Orphics they show the theonymically doubtless Dionysos in his frenzied riteness. To the Orphics the representation in itself names the Son of the Great Mother-Goddess in papedria with her and the dismemberment of his prophet who is the mental Teacher, that is of the bearded man but in "Thracian" and not "Apollonian" image, by the priestesses of the goddess. In such an interpretation the Derveni crater re-creates an Orphic faith-riteness/rite situated in the sanctified orality of the stone cist-grave B. The stone cist-grave B could be a good example in a textbook with its color scheme. Two thirds of it, that is from the bottom upwards, are painted in the red of hierogamy mystery, and the topmost third belt is decorated with branches, red hips (raspberries, strawberries ?) and leaves. This decoration represents the sacred grove of the Great Mother-Goddess, as well as the dismemberment of the Teacher already done, delicately suggested by the red fruits, i.e. the drops of his blood. If all the data communicated by the archaeologists are correct then Astieioneios, defined archaeologically as a man in his prime,

has been cremated together with a woman (?). Besides by the crater itself, the high social (aristocratic ?) position of the deceased (the man and the woman ?) is eloquently characterized by a gold coin of Philip II, by a gold ring and by three gold pins.

The archaeological context of the rich grave B suggests, most probably, a doctrinal participation of the deceased into a men's Orphic society. The Derveni papyrus text represents a point of intersection between the Thessalian (esoteric) orality and the Macedonian dynastic literary tradition. From this point of view the papyrus roll should be added in most natural way to the Orphic set of silent (non-worded) namednesses. Its more than 200 fragments are discovered among the remains of a pyre for the funerary cremation of the deceased. They are dated to the second half of the 4th century BC, to about its end and certainly not later than to 300 BC (Funghi 1997: 25). The reconstructed 26 columns of the Derveni papyrus are still non-published in text-critical edition. Consequently, any more or less decisive attempt to creation of working hypotheses on the basis of the text as a whole or of parts of it is embarrassed by different readings, reconstructions and translations. The anonymous edition of the papyrus in the ZPE 1982 (cf. Merkelbach 1967 with the first publication of S. G. Kapsomenos in 1964) is used here and, first of all, the translation and the attributed numbering of Lacks–Most 1997: 9-24 together with the readings, the reconstruction of the text and the commentaries in the papers in the *aforecited*, edited by the mentioned authors, collection.

An introduction pertinent to my studies should be the following quotation from Lacks and Most (1997: 5-6) which expresses hesitancies provoked not so much by the reconstructed columns of the Derveni papyrus as by what is perceived out of them. “Why did some man in a Macedonian village in the fourth century BC apparently choose not only to have the text of this papyrus accompany him in his tomb, but to have it burned together with him, thereby strengthening even further the connection between text and ritual already present – if the interpretation sketched above is correct – within the very practice of initiatory interpretation?” This standpoint (cf. the assumption of Алексиева 1999: 19 and Alexieva 2002 about an initiatory scenario including a ritual and a verbal part) encompasses the essential problem situation of what is done through naming, that is through being named, and this problem situation could be enlarged with

additional perplexities. The editors of the collection ask themselves whether a believer in Orphism, strongly influenced by the Heraclitean notion of the sun, might have given "a particular significance" to the cremation as a type of burial "even if in this period it was fairly common in Macedonia anyway." According to the sequence of the properly articulated questions – "fortunately, many questions remain open," as it is said by Laks and Most – the main question is whether the element of fire does not offer a fundamental connection between the first part (col. I-VII) and the second part of the papyrus text and the circumstance of its incineration. This hesitancy is in itself a confirmation of the presupposed. The confirmation consists of the conclusions about a (Orphic – A. F.) community for which and in the milieu of which the text is designed. "Was it much influenced by Oriental religious practices, and if so by ones imported recently or at a much earlier date, or is it rather to be understood within the context of indigenous Greek traditions? Where there other such groups, and if so what relations did they have with one another? What was the social structure of such an interpretative community, and what were the relations between the exegete, the initiates, the other members, and the text or texts which bound them all? What was the relation between the author of the text and the man buried with it? For what readership was it intended? The rough, often asyndetic style of the treatise might suggest that it was used only internally within such a community..." and in the end of this sequence of problems the authors ask the last question – "Might recent work on such interpretative communities as the ones implied by the texts of Hermes Trismegistus which circulated in Egypt several centuries later offer a model for understanding this group?" (Laks–Most 1997: 6).

It is extremely tediously to repeat the preliminary notes of preceding analyzers in a study in course of an introduction of the source data. In this case however the long quotation is obligatory due to the skillfully articulated problem situation from the point of view of looking for the dividing line between the ancient Greek philosophical-religious Orphism and the Thracian ethnos' Orphism. Yet, this line is not passed through by the authors of the cited formulations. Such a pass through the fascinating captivity of the papyrus text with its literary, speculative and allegorical allusions towards the elusiveness of the oral faith-riteness/rite would allow

the questioners to obtain the answers in a scenery but unknown to them landscape.

"The man from a Macedonian village" is the carrier of the oral Orphic faith confessed by him without "Oriental influences imported recently or at a much earlier date" and in the scope of the indigenous ethnos' Orphic namedness. Such a namedness is Greek according to the language of the contact and because of the area of dissemination of the old Thessalian-Boeotian-Delphian mysterial initiation and also Thracian according to the classificatory designation. It is no doubt that the fire is the link between the cremation of the believer in the Zagreus' and fiery stasis, corresponding to the Sabazius' and solar one. At the point of intersection of the old Orphic orality and the new Orphic literariness of the 5th and 4th centuries BC this evident in itself link between the two stases is explained with the Heraclitean excerpt.

Such as the author of the texts upon the Orphic golden tablets is the author at least of the first part of the papyrus text, which is the main concern of the cited authors and upon which I will comment further in my arguments. This author is the anonymous Teacher, named as an exegete, of the very subtly defined "interpretative (interpreting ?) community." The closed esoteric society of initiates through mystery listens to the text that is being uttered, pronounced, voiced but not read in the sense of a dictation in a classroom. Under the conditions of an expressed oral ethnos' culture-paideia, dawned by the Orphic faith in the immortality through a Zagreus' anthropodaimonian stasis, the closed groups of initiates are isolated one from another. There is no reason to assume that their existence should be statistically fixed or explicitly mentioned in the text out of the charlatans' impostures of prophecies that are cast off with anger by the author of the papyrus text.

Such is approximately the discerning-knowing-naming of the southwestern Thracian and eastern Macedonian Orphic-Bacchic mystery initiatoriness. The assumption that such a community might be juxtaposed with the Hermetic communities in Egypt is a successfully found exit from the so well put questions. Also, there is no reason for moving heaven and earth to find the answers. It is confirmed by the first seven columns of the Derveni papyrus (s.v. Lacks-Most 1997: 10-12 and Tsantsanoglou 1997:

93-128 with the works cited there). They encompass incomparable evidences about the interactivity of the oral and literary Orphism.

The severely damaged first column partially preserved in its righthand end offers the possibly repairable name of the Erinyes in line 7 and the inarguable pronoun “every” in line 4. The second column confirms the name of the Erinyes in line 3. It seems that the Erinyes are identified with the souls (of the dead). Inarguable are also the honours, most probably prescribed to them, consisting of libations in droplets, sacrifices of birds, and of something that is adjusted or adjustable to the music (ll. 5-8). The *daimones* appear in col. III (ll. 4,6) who are beneath “this soil” (grave, mound, tomb ?). To each man a daimon is attached, goes the expression in line 4. The *daimones* are named servants of gods (l. 7) and unjust men or sinners are mentioned together with them (l. 8) who, or perhaps the daimons (?), are responsible for something because they have caused it.

In his commentary to the first three colons of the Derveni papyrus Tsantsanoglou 1997: 99-106 notices first of all, with certain surprise, that “no mention is made of the official gods of the underworld, Hades/Pluto or Persephone.” The variant explanations given by the Grecists of this truly difficult for understanding omission fit entirely the usual text-critical analysis. They, however, are not appropriate in the situation where the first lines of the papyrus are not perceived as literary work but as a *record of oral teaching*, i.e., as an *introduction into initiation*. Tsantsanoglou 1997: 102 expresses similar to this standpoint but he applies it to the second part of the text where the allegorical interpretation of the Orphic theogony and the exegesis of the cosmogony are combined with the Ionian nature philosophy: “there are many strong indications that the exegesis itself forms part of initiatory procedure” (cf. Obbink 1997: 39-54). The initiatory mystical riteness that leads to the mystical fact of the rite (to the rite) does not operate with the theonyms of the Underworld. The believer alone achieves the immortality in the Beyond being in the anthropodaimonian stasis, i.e., being a mediator. *The immortality consists of mediation* fulfilling by the believer between the paredroi Great Mother-Goddess-Son and the still living initiates. It was said above but it is obligatory to be repeated, the Erinyes, who are named Eumenides in column VI, perhaps are indeed identified with the souls of the dead, accord-

ing also to the old hypothesis of E. Rohde. The text of the papyrus however identifies them with the *daimones* (cf. Tsantsanoglou 1997: 100).

The literary daimonianness is not one and the same with the oral one. The Erinyes/Eumenides, who most generally speaking are mentioned only in three late Orphic fragments (OF II 197, 337<sub>s</sub>, 360), are perceived in the multinamedness of the daimonian hypostases, identified with the souls in spaces where the ethnos' faith has had already the beginning of its transformation into literary one. In the doctrinal initiation, recorded on the papyrus with a still inelegant wording, the Erinyes/Eumenides/souls/daimons are defined as θεῶν ὑπηρέται (col. III 7), as servants of the (Orphic – A.F.) gods. Thus Hermes is named twice by Prometheus (Aeschyl. Prom. 954, 983 Murray), but the poor taste of this address does not obliterate the image of Hermes as mediator and hegemon of the logos of the Orphically recorded mystery riteness/rite. The daimons serve the gods precisely as their intellectual mediators, as it was said several times above, and that is why the immortals in the Beyond, those who are happily-daimonian, are unequivocally discerned and distinguished from the ἄνδρες ἄδικοι (col. III 8). These unjust men – there is no reason to perceive them as sinned Christians – are the uninitiates and because of this they are not happily-daimonian. Since they do not live justly, they will not reach the anthropo-daimonian stasis.

The record of the Orphic orality is the most authentic in the second column where the ritual practices for expression of veneration of the Erinyes/Eumenides/souls/daimons are mentioned. The first sacred act is the libation, reconstructed in col. II 5 as *choai* that volens-nolens is to be accepted as the right reading since a standard text-critical edition of the preserved parts of the papyrus has not appeared yet. This remark is obligatory, because the *choai* is followed by the certain reconstruction of σταγῶσι in a sense of “in drops, drop by drop.” The latter provokes Tsantsanoglou 1997: 102 to write that this is “somewhat puzzling.” In this literary—non-literary synonymy, i.e., in the point of intersection of the initial speculating and the Orphic sacred acts, the libation drop by drop is not somewhat puzzling. According to the described in detail above ritual acts in which Orpheus helped by Medea reaches the oak to bring the Golden Fleece, the singer performs λουβῶς round the bothros (Orphei Ar-



gon. 964 (967) Abel), i.e., libations drop by drop (s. Rudhardt 1992<sup>2</sup>: 240 about λείβειν). Vian 1987: 144 does not accept this reading (?).

The libation in droplets is a typically Orphic vision. The drops of blood of dismembered Orpheus spot the mountain of Pangaeus according to the well-known mytholegend of (Pseudo-) Plutarch. These are the spots where the plant cithara that utters sounds during Dionysian orgies. The Orphic Leibethra, where the well-known story about the urn and the remains of Orpheus is situated, is a toponym originated from λείβειν (**Strab.** 9.2.25; 10.3.17 Meineke; **Paus.** 9.34.4 Rocha-Pereira). The name signifies the place where the blood of Orpheus has been fallen down drop by drop. The sacred liquids water, milk, honey, wine, blood are analyzed variously from the point of view whether they were used as mixtures or not (Tsantsanoglou 1997: 103), but it is relevant to remark that their Orphic and ritual semantics is quite certain. The blood/wine names Orpheus in the pathos of his god, in his dismemberment and, in the same time, signifies the hierogamy colour of the Great Goddess-Mother thought also as the fertilizing and purifying force of the spring water. Orpheus pours round the botros water and blood.

The second offering is birds (?), as it is mentioned in col. II 7. The supposed cocks and doves might be indeed perceived as ornitomorphic link to the winged Erinyes/Eumenides (Tsantsanoglou 1997: 104) that correspond to the souls and to the daimons. This synonymy, encompassed by the papyrus text, requires not to forget that the companions of the Great Mother-Goddess are the birds of prey while all the rest could be sacrificed to her. The association provoked by the mentioning of the sacrifice forms the pargedria Great Mother-Goddess-Son that is confirmed by the purely Orphic ritual act defined as “adjusted/adjustable to the music” in col. II 8. The destroyed by the fire words in this line of the papyrus could be correctly supposed as hymns (s. **Orphei Hymni** 69, 70 Quandt about the Erinyes and the Eumenides) or as dithyrambs. In every case the sacred music should be appropriate to the Zagreus’ mystery initiation the record of which is encompassed by the first six columns of the Derveni papyrus.

The fourth column is called Heraclitean since there is in it a quotation from Heraclitus (cf. Tsantsanoglou 1997: 105-110; a thoroughful analysis in Sider 1997). The possible additions, notes, and propositions as to the text of the “author of the papyrus” (col. IV 1-6), as to the text of Heracli-

tus (col. IV 7-9) are made skillfully and precisely because of that they support the cautious confidence that the text under question represents perhaps a record of the voice of the Teacher-initiator. It seems that this voice sounds highly and vigorously in the rhetorically asked question whether the Cosmos is not characterized by order exactly because of such reasons (col. IV 4). The reasons themselves are not explained in the preceding fragmentary lines besides the ambiguous (because of lost words) remark that a change is going (?). It is reasonable to think that for the keeping of *τύχη* (col. IV 3) in its meaning of fortunate fate (?) there is a requirement (for the initiates – A.F.) to change the common notions in the way in which Heraclitus does so, transforming the common sense, speaking as a teller of myths. The mythonarrative of the fragment is about the sun. In its own nature the sun is as wide as a human foot and it does not exceed its boundaries. If the sun goes outside its own width, the Erinyes, the assistants of *δίκη*, will find it out there (and will bring it in – A.F.). The desperately damaged text of col. IV 10-12 poses only roughly the meaning of *ὑπερβατὸν* (transgression ?) ... of *δίκη*.

Initially it seemed to me useful to go back to the already used above clarification of how a myth is made through the binary opposition Justice—Injustice and to find with pleasure that the anonymous Teacher-initiator ascribes this technique to mythologists and, with a slight irony, Heraclitus (and his manner) is also ranked among them. Later, I left aside this intention on the grounds that the mythonarrative itself exercises a pressure on the reader to be accepted as a pure allegory and, precisely because of the press of the genre, diminishes the feeling about insanity. It does not seem to me that the escape from such an entanglement could reside either in the very presence of the Heraclitean fragments in the papyrus text or in the philosophising about in what degree the Ionian thinker might have borrowed Orphic notions or whether the later Orphicising authors might have ascribed to him more orphism than he himself might have taken.

The record of the words of the Teacher-initiator in col. IV is clear from the point of view of the believed introduction into the mystery sacrament of the hierogamy. Accordingly to this record, the cosmic Orphic order is supported by constants that are named *κείμενα* in col. IV 2. The fortunate inevitableness *τύχη* supports the order under the condition that

the believer “gives rather than he harms,” i.e., the believer achieves an equilibrium upon and out of self. Such a stasis could be, of course, hyper-interpreted as a balance of the four stages of the tetrad or of the four essential forces of the human being: mind, sensibility, will and ethics. Therefore, *the self-transforming toward an ecstatic equilibrium through the mystery self* carries the guilt/responsibility for the Cosmos as the sun does so. The allegory of this mythonarrative is not highly probable in an initiatory instruction, but the metaphority is obligatory. The Sun, the Son of the Great Mother-Goddess, is unexpectedly inserted in the hypothetically Heraclitean text in the moment when the orality begins to be evident in and through the literariness. As those introduced into the hierogamy sacrament keep their ecstatic stasis in their faith, so the sun keeps it in paredria with the Great Mother-Goddess, i.e. with the Cosmos. This paredria could not be destroyed because otherwise the cosmic order would be destroyed. The Erinyes/Eumenides/souls/daimons, i.e., the intellectual mediators differently named in the other records of the ethnos’ oral faith. The mythonarrative in which the Sun with width of a human foot becomes a personage under control is a metaphor of *the visible part of the Son, of the solar disk*. This part, this visible disk, is observed and kept in the name of Justice or the Orphic Goodness. It seems that on this ground the badly preserved *transgression ... of justice* could be understood as a warning not to transgress the defined limits (of behaviour – A. F.). The understanding that such a peril exists is suggested in the notion about the transgressed boundary in the meaning of ὑπερβατόν.

The fifth column represents its text in such a satisfactory degree of preservation that it could be understood without difficulties in spite of the differences in the translations-interpretations of Lacks–Most 1997: 11 and Tsantsanoglou 1997: 97-98 to whom I give my preferences. According to the unknown author, the act of consulting an oracle has the purpose of understanding whether it is right... Why they do disbelieve the terrors of Hades, asks the author (col. V 4-5). Since they do know neither how to understand dreams (visions, phantasms) nor any of the other things what sort of examples or arguments would have made them trust (the terrors of Hades, according to Tsantsanoglou). For, being subdued to sin as well as pleasure, they *neither learn nor believe*. Because if they do not learn or

know, there is no road (way) for them to believe, *even if they see ...* the disbelief ... it appears (col. V 3-14).

The reconstructed lines are a bitter admission on behalf of the Teacher-initiator for which he uses the painful examples of the synonymy of the disbelief and the ignorance. Those who neither learn nor know could not be believers, says the papyrus. With other words, the *Faith is Knowledge* (of the divine essence – A. F.), the text says. *The Knowledge is the naming* of the “terrors of Hades.” These “terrors of Hades” are nothing else but an expression of the literary convention-compliance to voice trivialities so that the essence, i.e., the mystery fact, the mystery of *paredria*, would remain hidden in the record. The fifth column is a brilliant example of a record of orality.

The sixth column genuinely represents sacraments and namings from the registrar of the oral Orphic initiatory faith (from here onward s. the reconstruction and the translation of Tsantsanoglou 1997: 98, 110-117). The fragment begins with the sentence that the “prayers and offerings appease the souls” (col. VI 1). The applied verb *μειλίσσω* relates the expressed notion to the interpretations of the rare in literary texts meanings of *μείλιγμα* – the purifying rite for honouring and gratifying the Eumenides (Aeschyl. Eum. 107 Murray) – as well as to the interpretation of an appearing here namedness, clarified in the commentary of the theonym Melinoe [supra]. The rapprochement of the souls/daimons and the Erinyes/Eumenides is contextually expressed here and is confirmed in col. VI 2-4. In these lines it is announced that the enchantment, *ἐπωδή*, the incantation of the *magoi*, is powerful enough to change the daimons who hinder the souls. *The daimons hinder the souls because they are their adversaries.* This is why the *magoi* perform the sacrifices, as if paying compensation (col. VI 4-5). Over the sacrifices they *pour water and milk*, from which they may also their *choai* (col. VI 5-7). The *magoi* make offerings of innumerable and many-knobbed (naveled) cakes, because the souls are also innumerable. The *mystai* (initiates) make perform *preliminary sacrifices*, *προθύουσι*, to the Eumenides in the same manner as the *magoi*, because the Eumenides are souls (col. VI 8-10). Whoever intends to sacrifice to the gods in their (of the souls’ – A. F.) name must first make an offering of bird (col. VI 10-11). The rest of the text is badly damaged.

Of course, the presence of *magoi* in the text provokes immediately the standpoint about a direct Iranian borrowing in regard to the sacrifices and the incantation, but such a hypothesis would be an expression of too simplified understanding as of the Orphic teaching as well as of the sacrifices of the Persian *magoi*. The mentioning of the *magoi* in the record of the Orphic oral doctrinality in col. VI of the Derveni papyrus is only an explanation of the role of the Teacher-initiator in the magical faith that the gods might be compelled to answer benevolently the prayer-call. This is not a testimony about participation of the Persian *magoi* in the Orphic "interpretative (interpreting ?) community." It testifies the synonymy of the Persian *magos* and the teacher-exegete, who, naturally, is not mentioned in the text. The characteristic of the *magos* corresponds entirely to the one of the teacher-exegete because the latter is ἐπαιιδός, ἐπαδός, or "enchanter, charmer" (cf. the data in Hristova 1997: 105 on **Hippolyt.** Refut. omn. haer. IV 37. 1-25 Marcovich). In the stylistics of the accepted here terminology it is relevant to remark that the religious behaviour is an expression of the literary historical memory-knowledge that supports the state polis' ideology with an ethos written for mortal citizens. The non-literary historical memory-knowledge enlivens the oral (royal) doctrine/faith/riteness-rite or the Thracian Orphism through the trust in deathlessness. The gods must be compelled to accept this trust as a ritual stasis which, in the best sense, could be recorded as it could be already seen in the inscriptions of Kotys/Kotes and in the Orphic golden tablets. The explicit formulaity of the latter is preserved by the tablet A1 from Timpone Grande on which the happily-daimonian one states θεός ἐγένου ἐξ ἀνθρώπου. The ecstatic Orphic ritual stasis is a typically Thracian aristocratic *techné* for doctrinal training and practice, while the enthusiastic Orphic ritual stasis is rather and more often an exoteric Hellenic *téchne*. Burkert 1992: 178, n. 2 distinguishes two kinds of *téchne* to be achieved in a mystery in the Derveni papyrus: Dionysian and Orphic.

Not naming himself but likening himself to the Persian *magoi*, the Teacher-initiator, the magician-enchanter, is, as it seems, an extremely highly-educated anonymous author (?) who suggests the connection between these two stases. Such a connection is suggested already through the Heraclitean quotation on the sun, but Heraclitus and his oracles soften the initiatory associationality and this is so not only in this excerpt. Graf

1992<sup>2</sup>: 21-23 analyzes the sixth column of the Derveni papyrus on the basis of Clement of Alexandria and the well-known passage, **Plat. Rep.** 2.364B Burnet (cf. Tsantsanoglou 1997: 110). He quotes the negative interpretation of the expert in the pagan mysteries Clement of Alexandria: "*Against whom are Heraclitus the Ephesian's prophecies addressed?*" The derision made by Clement of Alexandria encompasses a priceless list of the "clients" of Heraclitus; they are the "*wanderers of the night*" according to the expression of the early Christian author. These wanderers of the night are the "*magi, bacchants, maenads, initiates,*" whom *Heraclitus threatens with tortures after death, with tortures with fire.* The *magi*, the possessed teachers, are one and the same with the followers of Dionysos as well as with the initiates because all of them carry the god in themselves in one and the same way. As it became clear in the analysis of the golden Orphic lamellae from Hipponion and Pherai (cf. Tsantsanoglou 1997: 116), the *mystai* are *bacchoi*, and the man, who is *pais* (child-servant of the god), is marked with the sign of Dionysos, i.e. with the *thyrsos*.

Only Zagreus the nocturnal hunter, who is the generalized image of all believers carrying the god in themselves, is missing in this list. In his study, Graf 1992<sup>2</sup>: 36-37 is only a pace away from such a conclusion, adding to his analysis the epigram of Catullus in which there is a registration of the folklore superstition that the Persian *magus* "must be born from the mother and the son". The verse is a suggestion for the Orphic vision about who is the child-servant, and an indirect evidence about the way in which the non-named in the papyrus teacher-initiator is thought.

The dual hypostasis Sun-Fire (which corresponds to Apollo-Dionysos in the ancient Greek translation-designation) is explicitly demonstrated through the characteristic of the *magoi* who are in position to change the daimons when (if) the latter are adversarial to the souls. The *magoi*, therefore, realize the mediation between the divine intellectual energy and the believer who achieves it in his immortality. They endure a punishment: they make their sacrifices as "compensation" (sic), i.e., if they had not succeeded before to perform their mediation between the gods-paredroi and the ecstatic/enthusiastic ritual stasis of the believers. To ensure their success they make libations with water and milk and offerings of knobbed cakes. The *mystai* and the *magoi* alike make sacrifices to the Erinyes/Eumenides/souls/daimons. Who are the gods-paredroi? Dionysos-Son and the Great Mother-Goddess are ritually

Son and the Great Mother-Goddess are ritually named as through the sacral libation liquids as well as through the cakes.

The seventh column is a real present for the Orphic orality: it begins mentioning that when a hymn (poem) is being performed in a religious service it *says sane* (normal, good) *and righteous* (according to the law) *words*. It is added that no one could say what is the interpretation of the words although they are spoken. This is so because the hymn (poem) is unfamiliar and enigmatic to people. The anonymous Teacher-initiator explains that "Orpheus did not intend to use it for saying disputable riddles, but for saying great things in riddle form." He makes a holy discourse from the first word to the last. And he makes it clear – in the easily recognizable for the prepared reader verse – *to put doors to their ears because he does not legislate for the multitude, but teaches those whose hearing is pure* (cf. the difference in the translations of Lacks–Most 1997: 12 and Tsantsanoglou 1997: 98, commentary 117-128).

The oral Orphic teaching encompasses the necessity for an interpretation on behalf of the Teacher because without a doctrinal initiation the words are spoken but are not being understood. The form of the expression makes the great things hidden into the holy logos that is discerning-knowing-naming by and for a few. They are allowed to stand "behind the door" where they "hear purely." In fact, the seventh column reveals the technique for the oral initiation in the teaching about the immortality in which the cremated deceased receives the being in his Zagreus' anthropodaimonian stasis. To this stasis belongs as the mentioning of the Orpheus' name as well as the hymns/poems/words kept silent in the Orphic golden lamellae. With the papyrus on his chest the believing "Macedonian villager" starts his journey to the Beyond in the way of the happily-daimonian Thracian aristocrats, the Olbian esotericoi, and the Orphics in the necropoleis in Crete, South Italy and North Greece, i.e. with the namedness of the put on their chests formulaity.

Due to the Derveni papyrus the content of this formulaity could be enriched. This formulaity is thought and believed in the starting situation of the deceased encompassing as the formalised record of rites (mystery facts) in the first part of the papyrus as the philosophical-speculative allegoricality in the second. The first part of the papyrus and the cremation altogether are indisputably interconnected record and riteness-rite. The

question of Lacks–Most in which way the second part could be placed in this interconnection is easily answered if it is to be seen as an *another naming of the mysterial fact*.

This naming begins with the eighth column (further on s. Merkelbach 1967, PDerv. = ZPE 1982, and the translation of Lacks–Most 1997: 12–22) where the Orphic Zeus appears. He takes from his father the *strength and the glorious daimon*, who is interpreted in the ninth column as fire, i.e. as (energy) intellectual mediator. *He/it* (daimon/fire) *changes, if it is mixed*, i.e., if he/it intervenes in the thinking–speech/speech–thinking of the believer who could begin to see being in a state for discerning-knowing-naming. The tenth column explicitly explains that (in the oral orphism – A. F.) “*speaking*” and “*teaching*” *are one and the same, have the same meaning*. As I already explained above, the Thracian Orphism is a faith of the spoken word and this faith acquires according to the eleventh column its remarkable synonymity: ‘*proclaiming the oracle*’ and ‘*preventing harm*’ *have the same meaning*. The proclamation of the oracle happens *during the night* (sic) *in the remotest shrine*, in the depth of night, where *the daylight overtakes it* while it remains in the same shrine. This picture of the Sabazian “remotest” shrine, built on the doctrinal top of Zilmissos where the day and the night (Apollo and Dionysos) balance themselves, is commented also, as it seems, in the twelfth column where *Olympus and Time* are juxtaposed. *They are the same thing and this monovalence is the ideal categoriality* that would be the characteristic of *the time of the sacred mountain*, of the innermost holy place. While Olympus and Time are the same thing, Olympus and Heaven are not although the latter *is wrongly understood by some*, says the text. *Olympus is long*, while *Heaven is wide*. The sacred mountain is the discerning-knowing-naming of the road to the Beyond. *The sacred mountain is white*, as is the road, *as well as is the time*. Olympus–road–time are white and this Sabazian colour suggests *the constant becoming, returning, shared living through, solitude, and illumination*, i.e. the all kinds of Time except the Linear one.

The main male Orphic deity Zeus is introduced in its, the so-called by the interpreters of the papyrus erotical, aspect of a party in an incest. It seems that the sun too is thought in the aspect of incest. This extremely clumsy representation of the faith in its literary form repeats itself in the fragmented thirteenth column and not so clumsy in the fourteenth. The



literary-theogonic notion about the (first) hierogamy is mentioned, the one between the Earth and the Sun from which Kronos is born. The fifteenth column is a causal sequence in the course of the discourse of teaching because not only Zeus, in the damaged text, but also Metis is mentioned in connection most probably with the "royal honour." These literary identifications of the main male Orphic deity are thought together with ὄρχή. The latter is a dual term for the cosmic principle as well as the principle of power, and both meanings fit the Son of the Great Mother-Goddess who is cryptically suggested through the theonyms Zeus, Metis, and perhaps the not preserved Phanes, Protogonos, Dionysos. There is a cryptical reminding of the Son in the Sun which is being seen as *separated and confined in the middle, but holds fast both what is above it and what is below it*. The sentence offers once more, this time more expressive, visualisation of the Sabazian temple, described by Macrobius.

West 1994: 301 sagaciously and finely remarks that "the Semitic concept [according to the author, Phoenician] that naming something is equivalent to bringing it into being." This sentence reminds me the Egyptian borrowings in the oral Thracian Orphism and is close to the general conclusion of this study that the Orphism is a faith of the spoken word. It is related to the last three columns of the Derveni papyrus where Zeus is named. His naming continues in the sixteenth column in which his theonym signifies the Sun. In this column the Sun is called a genital organ, i.e. an agent of the hierogamy. It is added (by the teacher-initiator – A. F.) that *the things that are now come to be from the existing things as onto the first-born king all the blessed gods and goddesses grew and rivers and lovely springs and everything else that had been born then; and he himself, the king, was alone. He is the Mind itself out of which everything grew*, i.e., according to the language of this study, the Everything/Whole/Wholeness.

The king who is the Mind (Teacher – A. F.) confirms in the seventeenth column that *everything was not born, but existed*. In the same way *the air existed before it was named*. The namedness of the Everything/Whole/Wholeness acquires the name of Zeus in the adduced verse in which it is said that *Zeus the head, Zeus the middle, and from Zeus all things are made*.

The naming continues in the eighteenth column where it is recorded that the existed things are before (their existence) in the air, being breath/breathing. The Teacher-initiator does not mention here the Egyptian Ptah as we could have done so. He simply says that *Orpheus named this breath/breathing Moira who is wisdom*. Even before Zeus received his name, Moira was already the the wisdom of the god. This is why the nineteenth column states that each thing has received its name from what dominates in it. Zeus is named according to the same principle. With such a technique of naming *it is indeed not possible to listen and in the same time to learn the meaning of words*. This rule is announced in the twentieth column and is supplemented with a scenery explanation of the literary and polis' profanization of the oral Orphism. The Teacher-initiator is curious about those who perform holy rites in the cities since they perform them *before they have known*, without even asking further questions about what they have learned, seen, heard, or thought. *Before performing the holy rites they hope that they will know, but after having performed them they go away deprived of such a hope*, because they do not perform the discerning-learning-naming under the guidance of the teacher-initiator.

In col. XXI this training is outlined with more details. According to the text, the Everything/Whole/Wholeness is divided by the teacher in pieces jumping and being set together in relation one to another. In this way each of them comes to its fellow. If Aphrodite is the persuasion and Zeus is the harmony, they come together rekating themselves in relation one to another. In the language of this study, the Son and the Great Mother-Goddess come together to form their unity. This is why the persuasion (of the Great Mother-Goddess – A. F.) and the harmony (of her Son – A. F.) are the two names of one and the same god. It is added in the excerpt that he (the god, the Son – A. F.) existed before, but he was-called “to be born” after it was separated (from the Great Mother-Goddess – A. F.).

This notion is confirmed in the following col. XXII where it is explicitly said that Ge, Meter, Rhea, Hera are one and the same. Ge is named, conventionally (among the initiates – A. F.), Mother because all things are born from her; Ge or Gaia according to each one's (ancient Greek – A. F.) dialect. The quoted verse says simply *Demeter, Rhea, Ge, Meter, Hestia, Deio*. A study of the oral Thracian Orphism does not have anything more to add to this statement and it is so because in both columns

the distinguishing is made according to the "conventional, prescribed rule," i.e., according to the orphically correct rule, as well as according to the natural, non-prescribed one. The doctrinal opposition was analyzed in the chapter "There is no word without a Teacher" but it is necessary to add now that the indicated names give power to the deity that is being believed. In col. XXIII this is explained with the statement that *Ocean is the air and air is Zeus, and the one Zeus does not contrive the other one but the same one acquires great strength.*

The naming provokes the faith that is naming. This is why in col. XXIV the namings are thought as equal measurements from the centre. This is proved with the statement that the Moon shines for many mortals but not for all together. Thus the distinguishing and the discerning-knowing-naming are again confirmed as an initiatory procedure. In col. XXV *the things are invisible during the day when they are under the light of the sun and are visible during the night and they exist. If god did not wish the things that are now to exist he would not have made the sun.*

Overcome by the light of the sun the things seemingly disappear but the mind sees them. In col. XXVI the mind is named *mother of all things*. It is perceived in this heavily fragmented text the oftenly discussed "erotic aspect" of Zeus, i.e. the kept in silence by the analyzers on "unknown reasons hierogamy. Also, Hermes who gives goods is mentioned.

The two parts of the Derveni papyrus separated by the seventh column form the unity of the formulaic orality and the riddle literariness. The esoteric society of the eventual "Macedonian villagers" is an out-of-polis' thiasos of Orphic-Bacchic (ecstatic-enthusiastic) type (cf. the out-of-polis thiasoi in TD 2: 216-223). It is led by an anonymous teacher (exegete). The formulaic orality of his instructions is being understood irreproachably by his apprentices who are Sabaziastai. They purify themselves with the blood of the sacrificed birds and they know that the mixture of blood (=wine) and water is the paretia Son (in hierogamy death and in new birth) – Great Mother-Goddess (in self-conception). For the Sabaziastai it is natural that the daimons are adversarial to the souls when they are on the road because when the deceased starts his journey to the Beyond the rest of the souls impede them (the Sabadziastai) from mediating him to the deathlessness.

The interpreter hardly could be convinced that his apprentices could discern and learn the riddles of Orpheus in a way to be capable to name them, i.e. to trust their namings, without him. The mystery fact or the rite, however, is mastered in full as an experienced initiation. We are perhaps under the obligation to think, according to the conventional standard of the literary history, that the tablets and the papyrus are attentively read and diligently commented. The vocalization of the text, however, has the effect of a hymn upon the believer. It is a calling for the opening of the Grave-Door to the Beyond. Besides that, the text is aimed to avert the pseudo-sage as well as to the discerning-knowing-naming of the Doctrinal time in the Space of illumination. The technique of naming itself – Sun, Night, Zeus, elements, i.e. drops, that join themselves and form the Everything/Whole/Wholeness – stands out of any literariness, influenced or not by Plato. This is the technique of the naming in the most manifested Orphic-Bacchic area of the oral riteness the centres of which are in Southwest Thrace and East Macedonia.

In this area even the most badly preserved fragment of the second column, the one about the adjust/adjustable to music, sounds clearly. *The namedness that is being done is equal to the Orphic music because it awakens the memory-knowledge.* Pórtulas 1996 who does not know the study of Mihailov 1956 but works on Sabbatucci 1991 does not situate Eumolpus among the “ethnic problems” or the “tribal” ones but defines him as a personification of the “alteridad del iniciado.” Out of the academic requirement to prove or to argue the “Thracian origins,” in the very end of my study I can re-word this irreproachable characteristic asking the question how, in fact, this alterability (otherness) of initiation could be named. My answer is the following: *the alterability of initiation is the mystery deathlessness.*

Before exposing the three remarkable arguments about the immortality of the soul – the intertransition of the opposites or how the living are born from the dead, the teaching is remembering and the soul is equal to herself and, because of it, is indestructable – **Plat.** Phaed. 70C-85B Burnet introduces the requisit for the true knowledge. This is the death (**Plat.** Phaed. 67B-69E Burnet). The one, the believer, who defines the philosophy as μελέτη θανάτου, i.e. training in dying (**Plat.** Phaed. 67E, 81A Burnet), considers it equal to μελέτη μνήμης, i.e. training in remembering of

*the consistency of the one in the Beyond.* This idea appears in its Neoplatonic stylized version γυμνασία καὶ ἐπιμέλεια μνήμης in **Iambli.** Vita Pyth. 164 Klein-Deubner.

To achieve this aim, the soul, according to Plato, summons the elements of the whole body to the wisdom, justice, courage and to the mind itself. This act is *a kind of purifying rite.* This is why it is likely that those who established the initiation through the mysteries were not common people. Whoever arrives to Hades uninitiated and uninitiated into the mysteries, continues Plato, will sink into the mire, whereas he who arrives there purified and initiated will dwell with the gods. After that the famous text about the many who carry the thyrsos and few who experience the divine inspiration (**Plat.** Phaed. 69C Burnet; cf. OF II 5).

The mysteries that are marked with the Dionysian thyrsos are the hierogamy Sabazian sacraments that are being thought/believed. The one who is capable of doing *epode*, i.e. to cure the fear of death and to train in remembering, must be sought everywhere in Hellas as well as among the barbarians. If such an epodos is to be sought, all countries must be wandered. The pure intellect transforms the discerning-knowing-naming into energy and this is the Orphic deathlessness itself.

Seemingly, the teacher-initiator from the Derveni papyrus carries the thyrsos indeed.

### **The travel**

The last chapter is a quite brief review of the author's logos. The review is provoked by fearing the possibility that someone without complete understanding of what was said could impede another one who has achieved it.

1. The Man is both subject and subject-matter of a research but what is objectively existing for him is a quality of the first position, not of the second one.

2. What is objectively existing manifests itself in the discerning-knowing-naming that is being done by the Man in the Linear time of his historical being, but is being thought by him in the Mythological, Cyclical, Agonistic, and the Doctrinal one.

3. The conveyor of the kinds of Thinking-Time-Spaces believes them as well as communicates them in his logos-metaphor. Any kind

of Thinking-Time-Spaces represents an accomplishment of the objective subjectivity for its conveyor.

4. The logos-metaphor is comprehensible, cognizable and discernible through an interaction with another metaphoricality in the intersections of ethnosness (orality) and polisness (literariness).

5. While in the tension of interactivity the oral historical memory-knowledge-Knowledge clarifies the ethnos' culture-attitude (paideia) to the degree of manifested Faith. In the problem situation indicated by the *Thracian Dionysos* this Faith is defined as *Thracian orphism*.

6. As the modifier *Thracian* is ethnos' and not ethnic idiosyncrasy in Southeastern Europe during the Antiquity, the *orphism* is a neologistic designation of the orally confessable Faith in the co-consisting of immortality. Consequently, Thracian Orphism is a classificatory term for the interactive field between the oral Faith and its initial literary form. This Faith is being *thought* in the esoteric circles, almost solely and entirely male aristocratic fellowships, in the pathos (suffering) of the Son of the Great Mother-Goddess. The exoteric confession of this Faith is being *endured* through the co-experiencing of the pathos of god, thus achieving release-purification, during his theophoria.

7. The esoteric ecstasis and the exoteric enthousiasmos could bring reliance because of the consisting of the Faith in riteness/rite, i.e., in the preparation of the believer for and in his/her participation in the mystery fact.

8. The rite, the mystery fact, is a sacred activity of the gods *paredroi*. It is generated by the asymmetry of the cosmic tetradic (tetrachordic) model. During its functioning the degreed- (phasic-) rhythmized 4+3+3 *becoming of the Universe* is put into motion by the vision of the sacred marriage.

9. The hierogamy is a (self-) sacrifice of the Son and his new birth (out of the bosom of the Great Mother-Goddess) in the Mythological and Cyclical time. In the Agonistic time the (self-) sacrifice of the Son is also an action-duty for the believers; in the Doctrinal one it is an initiation into the coming of the pais of the Son, of the king/priest/prophesier/teacher.

10. The mysterial initiation into the faith-riteness/rite is co-consisting of ideas/images-images/ideas. They are thinkable through the anthropodaimonic mediation between the mortals and immortals. The anthropodaimonic happily-daimonic orphic fulfils their intellectual contact through prayers and messages.

11. The consistencies of ideas/images-images/ideas through anthropodaimonic mediation during the mysterial initiation are due to the *logos that makes rite*, or, in other words, to the namedness of the mystery fact.

12. The namedness of the mystery fact begins uttering the proper names in the early callings of the divine, continues adding later the common names, and is in its state of completion in the text-contextual structural relations of the linguistic system. Then, with the progress of the statehood of ethnos as well as the one of polis the verballity becomes this one of the languages of namings that influences the rest .

13. The namings, announced and/or passed over in silence in some of their languages, compose the ethnos' (orally confessable) Orphic Faith in the voyage Life-Death-Beyond where the intellectual energy does not die away, but undergoes transformations.

Translation: Petya Hristova