

UNITED WISDOM

Persephone: transition, loss, and several ways of reading

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-20-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Persephone: transition, loss, and several ways of reading

Epigraph

> *All unwilling.*

Homeric Hymn II to Demeter, Persephone's account, verses 425–433; a short fragment from Hugh G. Evelyn-White's translation, 1914. Edition.

What this article is about

Imagine a fictional scene. A woman unpacks her suitcase after moving and finds a small object from her former apartment. She chose the new place herself; the work is more interesting and the space more comfortable. Yet the discovery makes her sad. Someone offers an appealing explanation: this is Persephone's descent, after which she will become someone different. The image may help, but it may also hurry her. It has already assigned a meaning, a sequence, and a happy ending to an experience that remains ambiguous.

Persephone offers ways to speak about the rupture of a familiar world, a connection with what is absent, a return, and a new role. However, a particular ancient text does not describe every life transition. It contains an abduction, decisions made by more powerful gods, and the voice of the person being taken away. Keeping only the attractive change of seasons can obscure these distinctions. This article proposes several limited readings: literary, seasonal, ethical, and contemporary personal readings. We will follow what each notices, what it leaves outside its frame, and when a symbol begins imposing someone else's story instead of helping a person understand their own.

I. A transition can be chosen or imposed

Not every change is a step a person takes of their own accord. A voluntary move, the loss of a home, a separation by mutual agreement, and the sudden disappearance of someone close can all disrupt familiar life, but they differ in the choices available. A general image of transition should not erase that difference. It affects the task: one person needs to settle into a chosen place, another to recover access to necessities, a third to understand unfinished relationships. Calling everything the same inner maturation removes actual circumstances from consideration too early.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

In the selected passages of the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, Hades takes Persephone away with Zeus's permission; she calls for her mother. This is a narrative about gods, not a clinical description of an experience. For our reading, the first important point is that a more powerful participant's agreement is not the daughter's own agreement. This contemporary ethical distinction belongs to our article. We do not present it as the hymn's only historical function. It helps prevent every rupture of an earlier life from becoming a freely chosen adventure.

In a fictional contemporary scene, a company transfers an employee to another city. She has formally been offered terms, but refusal would mean losing income she needs. Calling this a free choice without discussing the constraints would be inaccurate. Yet declaring her entirely unable to act might also be wrong: questions remain about timing, housing, help, negotiation, and acceptable risk. A symbolic story should not decide in advance how much freedom she has. That has to be established through the available options and the consequences of each.

This gives the reader a first way of approaching the image. Before asking who they will become after the transition, they can ask how it happened in the first place. Which decisions were their own, which were made by others, and which remain open? These questions do not cancel inner experience; they put it back within its circumstances. Sadness is possible when a change was chosen. When a change was imposed, gaining experience afterward does not make the original coercion right. Different answers preserve a person's dignity without requiring them either to romanticize what happened or to give up their own future.

II. An object from the past need not be a secret sign

Let us return to the fictional suitcase. The object may recall a room, a person, a familiar route, or a version of life that no longer exists. Sometimes one wants to keep it, sometimes to put it away, and sometimes deciding is not yet possible. This does not require a dictionary of symbols in which every object has a final meaning. The question can be addressed to the person experiencing it: what is this particular discovery connected with now? The answer belongs to a particular history and may change as the person better understands what they miss.

In an ancient narrative, an object can have consequences assigned by the plot. In contemporary life, a similar object cannot automatically be given the same power. If a reader chooses a pomegranate as a personal image of connection with something absent, that is their metaphor, not the restoration of a law of fate. Not every symbol is a prediction. The difference matters: a metaphor can be discussed, changed, or set aside; a prediction tends to narrow options before facts have been considered. Respect for a myth does not require giving it control of everyday decisions or treating matching objects as evidence of events' hidden structure.

Imagine another fictional scene. A person keeps the key to an old apartment and notices that seeing it always prompts a comparison between past and present. They can consider whether the key helps retain an important memory or mainly sustains difficulty settling into the new place. The same object can do different kinds of work. A decision need not be ceremonial: put it in a separate box, photograph it, keep it nearby, or change nothing for now. None of these options proves maturity by itself.

Sometimes we want an object to say what we are not ready to name. It then helps to distinguish uncertainty from a message. We can say that the discovery evokes a strong feeling whose meaning is not clear yet. That is enough to begin reflecting. There is no need immediately to explain sadness as an unfinished stage or declare the object an obstacle to development. The image becomes more precise when context is added: which moment is recalled, what has actually been lost, what connection remains possible, and which question requires a decision of one's own rather than an interpretation of a sign.

III. A rupture can involve several participants

A story of transition does not always belong only to the person leaving. Moving changes the terms of contact with those who remain. Changing jobs reshapes a team's relationships. When an adult child makes an independent choice, parents also experience a change in their familiar role. This does not make every loss equal or give others a right to prohibit someone else's decision. It does help us notice that different participants may tell the same occurrence as different events. The value of a symbolic reading also depends on whose voice it preserves.

Demeter's image invites attention to the person who remains. However, a contemporary mother cannot be named Demeter in advance, or a daughter Persephone. Assigning roles in this way may entrench the initial conflict: one must guard, the other must leave. Yet the actual task may be different. An adult child might want fewer daily calls while a mother wants to know they are safe. Discussing only the severing of an umbilical cord or maternal power can conceal an available agreement about contact. The myth raises a question; answers require contemporary context.

In a fictional scene, a daughter says she will call twice a week instead of every evening. Her mother hears a loss of closeness. The daughter hears the objection as a refusal to recognize her independence. Their descriptions need not coincide completely. They can clarify what matters to each: being able to ask for help, participation in each other's life, predictable contact, or time without explanations. The form of connection can then be discussed, rather than one role's victory over the other. The absence of a daily call does not prove the absence of love; love does not establish a compulsory frequency of calls.

Such a conversation has limits too. If a request for autonomy is met with a threat, an ordinary search for agreement may be insufficient or unavailable. This article does not declare mutual understanding a guaranteed result. It preserves a narrower distinction: one can recognize another person's experience without giving them authority to set every condition of one's own life. One can defend independence without claiming that the other person has lost nothing. Both possibilities exist at once. This double attention makes the image more complex, and therefore more useful, than a predetermined story of correct separation.

IV. A seasonal image suggests rhythm, not a deadline

A seasonal reading of the myth is attractive because it gives change a form: absence, return, another cycle. It may help someone bear the thought that their present way of living is not the only possible one. But a natural cycle and a personal transition have different properties. Spring on a calendar does not oblige anyone to reach a particular degree of recovery. Work, relationships, and memory do not follow one timetable. If an analogy becomes a deadline by which someone must be renewed, symbolic support becomes another demand they have to meet.

In a fictional example, three months pass after a move. The person knows the new neighborhood and manages everyday tasks, but still misses evenings in the former kitchen. Others think adaptation is complete. The person's own experience does not fit that form. They can name separately the skills acquired and the connections missing. Progress in one area then does not become an order to stop feeling something else. This is an editorial distinction between scales of description, not an established scientific norm for adaptation times.

A seasonal metaphor has another boundary: not everything comes back. Sometimes a particular opportunity, person, place, or the health of an earlier period disappears. The future may be meaningful without being a return of the same life. A promise of spring therefore needs care. It may suggest openness to new events if the reader understands it that way. It should not promise compensation for every loss or explain why a loss was necessary. The possibility of continuing and recognition of what cannot be recovered need not compete for the right to be true.

We can give the seasonal image a more limited job. It helps ask what requires attention today and what allows temporary rest. What supports life under the current conditions? Which task is open now, and which remains unanswered? There is no demand to alternate sadness and activity artificially according to a schedule. Sometimes a household task simply needs finishing; sometimes the past needs discussing; sometimes no symbolic explanation is wanted at all. The image is useful insofar as it helps reveal an available rhythm without assigning a universal calendar to inner life.

V. Different versions do not make one biography

A myth exists in particular narratives, not only in our familiarity with a character's name. Details from one text cannot be quietly moved into another to create the most convenient story. In Book V of Ovid's Metamorphoses, in the selected episode of Proserpina, the nymph Cyane tries to stop the abductor. She objects to the violent means of forming the union. This is a separate literary version, not a forgotten line from the Homeric hymn.

Accuracy about a name matters here for reasons beyond an examination in antiquity. If we combine elements of different versions without explanation, the reader can no longer check where our interpretation came from. The resulting story may be convincing, but its persuasiveness will have been partly produced by the selection itself. Such a combination can sometimes be permissible as an explicitly declared authorial composition. A research article needs to identify where a retelling ends and a proposed combination begins. The same gods appearing in different works do not create one unchanging system of details and emphases.

A similar problem arises in personal application. A person chooses from several memories only those that fit an image of a forced descent. Everything successful and independently chosen stays outside the frame. Or the opposite happens: a story of maturation removes others' actions that caused actual harm. Both selections can make a story appear complete. It therefore helps to retain at least one episode that is inconvenient for the chosen reading. This does not require making good and harm equivalent. A counterexample helps show how accurately the image describes this particular transition.

If two versions do not agree, we do not always need to choose a winner immediately. We can distinguish their tasks. One helps name lost control, another a continuing connection, a third an available next step. But one task must not cancel another: a new step does not prove the past was voluntary, memory does not prescribe abandoning the present, and a new role's name does not establish a diagnosis. Multiple readings become workable when each retains its area and boundary. Otherwise they become a way to fit any story to an explanation already accepted.

VI. Loss and new tasks may take different amounts of time

Contemporary discussions of loss also offer models, but these should be read within their own scope. The abstract of Margaret Stroebe and Henk Schut's 1999 article presents an approach that distinguishes tasks associated with loss from tasks of restoring everyday life, with movement between them. We read the abstract, not the whole article. This is a theoretical model of coping with bereavement following death, not a study of Persephone or an established order for every move. The everyday examples that follow are a limited editorial application of the distinction.

In a fictional scene, a person handles documents in the morning but cannot look at photographs of their former home in the evening. It would be inaccurate to declare their entire condition from either episode alone. Being able to perform an action does not prove the absence of sadness. Sadness does not prove an inability to handle the next particular task. At the same time, we do not prescribe movement between two kinds of attention as a compulsory norm. If something is unavailable, it matters first to see the circumstances and needed help, rather than tell a person how their inner work ought to be organized.

The distinction is also not advice to keep constantly busy. Sometimes new activity meets an actual need; sometimes a pause is needed; sometimes a person does not know why they are taking on another task. The decision can be discussed through its action and consequences. Did it help accomplish something necessary, maintain a connection, or preserve energy? Did it create a new obligation that is hard to manage? No single correct motive is required here. It is enough to consider a particular task within the present day, leaving broader experiences open to further understanding.

A significant boundary separates us from the myth. Gods in the plot govern a cosmic order; contemporary people handle tasks in a particular environment without that power. Neither the condition of the surrounding world nor loved ones' feelings should be explained by someone's insufficiently completed grief. A model and a metaphor may offer language, but they do not issue a duty to recover for everyone's well-being. Support becomes more concrete when, instead of judging a stage, one can offer understandable help: sort out one document, bring food, sit nearby, or leave some time without another conversation.

VII. A new role does not cancel how it was acquired

A person may acquire skills and influence after an event they did not choose. This is possible without recognizing the event itself as good. Stories of development often connect the two conclusions too quickly: because the result matters, the path appears necessary and therefore justified. Yet a useful consequence does not establish the rightness of the original action. This distinction matters for an ethical reading of Persephone. We can discuss the character's new role without turning it into proof that coercion was desirable or assigning the harmed person a duty to be grateful for acquired depth.

In the hymn, Hades promises Persephone power in his kingdom. This statement exists within the gods' relations and does not cancel the abducted daughter's voice. A contemporary editorial application raises a question: what exactly is offered to a person in exchange for lost choice? The answer cannot consist only of assessing a new role's attractiveness. We must also consider whether refusal is available, the terms of participation, and the possibility of revising the arrangement. This is our ethical distinction, not a claim that the ancient text formulates a contemporary theory of consent or employment relations.

Imagine a fictional family example. An eldest child is given responsibility for younger siblings early. In adulthood, they organize work well and notice others' needs quickly. Those abilities can be recognized. But they do not imply that the former distribution of responsibility was proportionate. One can value what was acquired and discuss its cost at the same time. Wanting to use the skill now does not necessarily mean agreeing with the past. Wanting to reduce habitual responsibility does not necessarily mean rejecting a strength. The task is choosing the current extent of participation.

The image of new power can easily become a demand that a person appear transformed. Difficult experience can then be presented only as a source of wisdom. Unfinished sadness, irritation, and the absence of a clear meaning no longer fit the attractive story. Yet a person does not have to prove a loss's usefulness to be entitled to further life. They can develop new possibilities without a final answer to why everything happened. A meaningful story sometimes remains open-ended. This is more honest than a completed plot in which another person's action is automatically justified by our later ability to live.

VIII. Returning may restore a connection, not the past

A reunion in a literary plot can easily be taken as the cancellation of a rupture. Contemporary returns, however, often bring together people who have lived apart and changed in different circumstances. Even if a relationship keeps its name, its terms need to be discovered again. The home may be the same while work, habits, expectations, and available time differ. Returning therefore does not always mean that the earlier order should resume automatically. Sometimes it creates an opportunity to preserve a connection in a form that previously could not be named or agreed.

In a fictional scene, a person visits relatives after several years abroad. The family is glad, and also expects them to occupy their former place in everyday life again. The person is glad, and also needs a different schedule. Neither gladness removes the need to discuss these differences. They can identify what time is actually shared, where independence is needed, and which obligations each is willing to take on. This conversation may be less ceremonial than the promise of finally coming home. But it defines what returning will look like after the festive evening.

Memory need not restore the whole past either. A particular conversation, gesture, recipe, route, or language can be preserved without declaring earlier life ideal. The past's importance can also be recognized without requiring a new place to copy it exactly. These are different ways of continuing a connection. Once distinguished, they offer more choices than keeping everything or discarding everything. A retained object can be one limited sign of memory, rather than a contract of eternal loyalty to an earlier order. Here the decision belongs to the person, not to the interpreter of their symbols.

Some returns are impossible or unwanted. A right to connection may then be exercised differently or remain without a chosen form. We cannot promise that a symbolic exercise will replace a meeting that cannot happen or remove actual consequences of loss. We can only explore what continuation is available today. Sometimes it is a conversation with a living participant; sometimes a private note; sometimes no action. A deliberate pause need not be explained as a refusal to develop. It may mean that the question remains significant but an answer has not been found or is not needed immediately.

IX. An image is useful while it allows one's own story

Let us return to the discovered object. Reading the myth does not give it a final decoding. The woman may realize she misses a particular person and call them. She may notice that moving solves a work problem without yet solving the question of companionship. Or she may simply leave the object on a shelf. All these answers can relate to her actual circumstances. She need not choose whichever best reproduces Persephone's plot. The image's value lies in the appearance of a precise question, not in a life story's obligatory conformity to a literary sequence.

Several readings can check one another. The literary reading returns to the plot's particular words and participants. The ethical reading asks about choice and cost while preserving the abducted person's voice. The seasonal reading allows thought about rhythm without setting a deadline. The personal reading relates the image to one's own event. A scientific model, when included, requires a separately established subject and boundaries of reading. These perspectives are not five identical pieces of evidence. Their usefulness differs, and combining them does not turn a metaphor into a diagnosis, historical fact, or guarantee of recovery.

It helps to notice when a symbol stops allowing objection. If every doubt is called resistance to transition, all sadness an unfinished descent, and every success proof that loss was right, the selected story can no longer be tested. The person must agree with it whatever happens. The question can be restored to a workable form: what exactly did the image help reveal, which observation does it not explain, and which conclusion remains our proposal? This preserves an important recognition without giving one story authority to determine the meaning of every subsequent event.

This approach does not deprive the myth of depth. It restores tensions that disappear in a ready-made story of renewal. Persephone, Demeter, Hades, and Zeus need not become internal parts of every contemporary person. They remain participants in a particular narrative that can be read carefully and applied within limits. In our fictional scene, the transition can be both a right choice and a real loss. Recognizing this doubleness does not require either side to win. It makes room for a new life that does not have to prove the old one was unnecessary.

What this means in practice

If Persephone's image resonates with you, first name the particular change. Clarify what you chose, what happened without your choice, and which questions remain open. Then distinguish what was lost from what is new: which connections or possibilities actually disappeared, what remains, and what you do not yet know. You do not need to assign yourself the myth's entire plot or find a compulsory lesson.

Choose one small question for today if you wish. What might help you settle into a new place, what contact would you like to keep, or which condition of a new participation needs discussing? An answer may be an action, a request, a pause, or recognition that no solution is available. Assess it through its connection to the actual task, not its resemblance to a literary role.

When speaking with someone else, it helps to ask whether they want an image at all. They may want to describe a particular loss or receive everyday help. Symbolic depth does not make that wish less meaningful. In the opening scene, it is enough to allow the woman both to want a new life and to miss the former one. The object in her suitcase then stops being an assignment in correct transformation and becomes part of a story she still has the right to tell herself.

If you offer this reading to someone close, leave them the option of refusing without explanation. Agreeing to discuss a myth today does not mean agreeing to future interpretations of their behavior. You can later return to an ordinary conversation: what has changed, how can you help, which decision belongs to them? Respect is checked here through the availability of refusal, not the beauty of the analogy found.

Key quotation

> *Tell me truly.*

Homeric Hymn II to Demeter, Demeter's address to Helios, verses 64–73; Hugh G. Evelyn-White, 1914. Text. The speaking character is identified: this is Demeter's request for information, not a universal authorial formula for healing.

Connections between traditions

Reading or comparison	What it helps notice	Where the boundary lies
Hymn ↔ a contemporary distinction about choice	The voice of the person whose life changes matters.	The contemporary ethical frame is editorial, not attributed to the ancient author.
Hymn ↔ Ovid's Proserpina	Similar characters can receive different narrative emphases.	Cyane belongs to the selected Ovid episode; the versions are not merged.
Seasonal image ↔ personal transition	Rhythm can help name a present task.	Nature's calendar does not set a person's recovery deadline.
Stroebe–Schut model ↔ editorial reflection	Loss and everyday tasks can be considered separately.	The abstract concerns bereavement; application to moving is limited and unproven.
A new role ↔ assessment of a past event	What was acquired can be valued while its cost is acknowledged.	A useful consequence does not justify coercion.

This is a map of limited comparisons, not a claim of agreement among traditions, proof of universal psychology, or a reconstruction of every historical function of the myth.

Primary sources

1. Homeric Hymn II to Demeter. Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White, Loeb Classical Library 57, 1914. Edition information and selected opening passages, conversation with Helios, return, and concluding negotiations were checked. Neither the whole collection nor a complete historical study of the mysteries was read.

2. Ovid, Metamorphoses, V, Proserpina and Cyane episode. Henry Thomas Riley, 1851; electronic edition based on 1893/1899 reprints. Selected passages around V.385–437 were read. Translator's commentary is not the ancient narrator's speech; this work is not quoted here.

3. Stroebe, M.; Schut, H. The dual process model of coping with bereavement: rationale and description. Death Studies 23(3), 1999, 197–224; DOI 10.1080/074811899201046. The PubMed abstract and bibliographic record were read; the full text, empirical works described there, and their results were not checked.

International rights for these particular electronic copies have not been established: UNKNOWN. Project Gutenberg states a license with a territorial qualification. Full source texts are not reproduced. Explicitly excluded Sujato/SuttaCentral translations were not used.

Tags

Persephone, Demeter, Hades, Zeus, Helios, Cyane, Proserpina, Homeric hymn, Ovid, myth, transition, loss, choice, coercion, consent, autonomy, seasonal metaphor, memory, return, role, boundaries, interpretation, textual variants, Stroebe, Schut, bereavement, abstract, UNKNOWN, fictional scene, personal story

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity among traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.