

July 10, 2011

THE ORPHIC POEM OF THE DERVENI PAPYRUS*

David Sider

New York University

Although there are some few places where I argue for something new, the chief aim of this chapter is to present a text and provisional commentary on the Orphic poem contained within the Derveni Papyrus.¹ I draw my knowledge of the readings of the papyrus solely from text of Parássoglou and Tsantsanoglou, as well as the photographs in KPT (see below for abbreviations); the conjectures and many of the parallel texts and alternate readings come from Bernabé's Teubner edition. If nothing else, this chapter will allow for one-stop shopping, as

* Several of the textual notes suggested here were first presented at a conference on the Derveni Papyrus held at the Center for Hellenic Studies, July 2008. In addition to my audience in Washington for their comments at the time, I am grateful to Francesca Angió, Alberto Bernabé, Gábor Betegh, Marco Fantuzzi, and Richard McKirahan for their helpful remarks on an earlier draft of this paper; as well as to Andrew Ford for a spirited discussion that followed a briefer version of this chapter presented at the APA meeting in San Antonio, Texas, Jan. 6, 2011.

¹ The Orphic verses of the Derveni papyrus are gathered in Bernabé 1.14-32 (= 3-18 F), Betegh 96-7, KPT 21, West 114-5 ("an *exempli gratia* reconstruction"). Bernabé (2007a) offers a running commentary on the Orphic poem, but his interest is not primarily philological.

it combines the distinct non-overlapping sets of data from these two sources, as well as taking other scholars' observations into account.² Much of the work on the poem over the past years has been to evaluate its religious and philosophical content, as well as the use made of it by the Derveni author (herein simply the Author), and to this I add nothing; but there still seems to be a place for a study that concentrates on Orpheus' words as poetry. Note that I follow the editorial practice found in collections of poetry such as Page's *Poetae Melici Graeci*; that is, phonology has been regularized (thus, e.g., αἰδοῖον κατ- for αἰδοῖογ κατ-) and elision is printed where the papyrus has *scriptio plena*, although half brackets and dotted letters are printed. (The use of half brackets here will be discussed below.)

To cover familiar ground briefly: The Derveni Papyrus contains (more familiarly, "is") a prose work (to choose the broadest possible term) that frequently quotes from Heraclitus,³ Homer,⁴ an anonymous hymn,⁵ and, most

² The lack of a critical apparatus in KTP has been noted in the reviews; cf. R. Janko *BMCR* 2006.10.29; A. Laks, *Rhizai* 4 (2007) 156.

³ In addition to the passage in col. 4 explicitly credited to Heraclitus, Janko (2001) 23 n.119 thinks that a prose passage set off by paragraphoi in col. 11.8-9 is also by Heraclitus: χρᾶν τόνδε τὸν θεὸν νομίζοντ[εσ ἔρ]χονται πεισόμενοι ἄσσα ποῶσι. Even if the quotation is not meant merely — so Ts. in L-M 14 n.12 — to echo common sentiment, I find nothing particularly Heraclitean in the style of these words, however much they may represent his general beliefs.

⁴ Despite the fact that the Author introduces them with δηλοῖ, which elsewhere assumes Orpheus as subject, it seems to me highly unlikely that two passages quoted one after the other on col. 26 solely to demonstrate that ἐάων means

extensively, a dactylic poem attributed to Orpheus, who is identified as the author of the "hymn" in col. 6.⁶ That scholars cannot agree on the point of view of the Author—is he atheist, literary critic, natural philosopher, or committed Orphic?—is not of concern here. When he wrote is also unknown, but composition is usually placed between the end of the fifth century and the middle of the fourth, which would also give us a *terminus ante quem* for the date of the Orphic poem, which has been placed as early as ca. 500 BC.⁷ The story that

"good things," a meaning the Author would foist on 24 ἔαζ, should also just happen to be (*Il.* 24.527-8) or closely resemble (*Od.* 8.335) two passages from Homer, *pace* Obbink (L-M 41), Janko (2001) 31 n. 186; cf. Betegh 100. Bernabé regards these two passages as coming from a separate Orphic hymn; see his comments to F 687.

⁵ Col. 22.12 Δηῶμήτηρ [P]ἔξα Γῆ Μῆῶτῶηρ Ἐστία Δηῶι, which the Author's language cites as ἐν τοῖς Ὑμνοῖς εἰῶῶ[η]μένον, phraseology that seems imply Orphic authorship but also to preclude it from being in the main poem under discussion. It is not included as part of the Orphic Derveni poem by either Bernabé or KTP. For the scansion of this entirely spondaic line, see Kouremenos ad loc.

⁶ The Derveni papyrus aside, the first author explicitly to attribute hymns to Orpheus is Plato, *Laws* 829e. For the ways in which this poem is and is not typically hymnic, see Calame (2010) 20-21.

⁷ See West 82-94, 108-113. He considers the poem quoted in the papyrus to be an abridgement of the *Protogonos* theogony, but, even if this is true, it may be the

Onomacritus inserted (ἐμποιέων) his own verses into a text of Musaeus—a mythical figure of a status similar to Orpheus—serves as a vivid reminder that even as early as the late sixth century, texts allegedly written by a poet of great (if not mythical) ancestry were altered if not outright forged.⁸ And in fact, according to Diogenes Laertius 8.8, Ἴων δὲ ὁ Χίος ἐν τοῖς Τριαγμοῖς φησιν (scil. Πυθαγόραν) ἔνια ποιήσαντα ἀνενεγκεῖν εἰς Ὀρφέα (sim. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.131.4).⁹

The extant columns of the Derveni papyrus contain only the upper third to half of their original height. Since the Author writes in part in a form that soon became (and still is) standard—citation of a brief passage followed by a commentary that frequently repeats words from the citation before or the one to follow—we can often detect a poetic word in the prose commentary that echoes in part the now lost lemma/citation. These provide one-word fragments such as those which we are all too familiar from the fragments of other poets, where the

Author who is doing his own abridging in that he does not cite every line of the poem he has in front of him.

⁸ Hdt. 7.6 = Onomacritus T 1 D'Agostino Ἐξηλάσθη γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἰππάρχου τοῦ Πεισιστράτου ὁ Ὀνομάκριτος ἐξ Ἀθηνέων, ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ ἀλοῦς ὑπὸ Λάσου τοῦ Ἐρμιονέος ἐμποιέων ἐς τὰ Μουσαίου χρησμὸν ὡς αἰ ἐπὶ Λήμνῳ ἐπικείμεναι νῆσοι ἀφανισίατο κατὰ τῆς θαλάσσης. Cf. E. D'Agostino, *Onomacritus: Testimonia et fragmenta* (Pisa 2007) 33 ff.

⁹ Turnabout is fair play: Suidas s.v. Ὀρφεύς says that it was Orpheus who wrote the *Triagmoi*. On the other hand, the sophist Hippias boasted that he incorporated into his own work verses of Orpheus, among others (B 6 D-K).

word is fairly secure even if we cannot be sure that, now accommodated to the citator's own sentence, the precise morphological case, person, etc., has been reproduced. When the embedded poetic word picks up a lemma only partially legible, it may help in its constitution. In these cases, it seems proper, however unusual, to make use of half brackets, which are normally found when a completely separate author with his own manuscript tradition (e.g., Athenaeus or Plutarch) cites a passage that is also found on a papyrus. The Author's practice of repeating words from the lemma in his commentary satisfies the essential idea behind the use of half-brackets. Although I do not present a complete survey (let alone a commentary) of these isolated fragments, as does Betegh 103-5, I refer to many of them in the commentary.

It is not clear whether the Author quotes from one poem, which he calls a hymn of Orpheus (col. 6.2, 5), in the order in which the lines occur in the poem, as Betegh persuasively argues,¹⁰ or whether he hops about in an attempt to make some point of his own, quoting from various places in the poem as he sees relevant. In either case, we can in our ignorance do no better than follow the Author's own order. In any case, as Betegh says per litt., "even if the commentary is not necessarily line-by-line, the order of the verses as they appear in the papyrus makes good sense."

Orpheus' reputation as supreme singer begins early (unlike, say, his homosexuality, which is a Hellenistic innovation).¹¹ General praise is found in

¹⁰ Betegh 105-8.

¹¹ Pl. *Resp.* 620a does refer to Orpheus' hatred of the tribe of women, but this is because they killed him! References to "Orpheus musicus" are collected by Bernabé 428-43, whose T numbers are given. Note also P.Oxy 3698 ed. Haslam = F 1005a, which may come Eumelus' *Corinthiaca*, Οἰὼν ἀγροῶν φιλῶος υἱὸς |

Ibyc. 306 *PMG* = 864 T ὀνομάκλυτον Ὀρφήν, Pi. N. 4.177 = 972 T ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος δὲ φορμικτὰς αἰοιδᾶν πατήρ | ἔμολεν, εὐαίνητος Ὀρφεύς, and Tim. *Pers.* 221-3 = 902 T πρῶτος ποικιλόμουσος Ὀρφεὺς <τέχνη>αν ἐτέκνωσεν υἱὸς Καλλιόπας <ς> Πιερίᾳθεν. More specific praise, namely that his playing has the power to move birds, plants, fish and rocks, still solidly fifth century, occurs in Sim. 567 *PMG* = 943 T τοῦ [sc. Ὀρφέως, acc. to Tzetzes] καὶ ἀπειρέσιοι | πωτῶντ' ὄρνιθες ὑπὲρ κεφαλᾶς | ἀνὰ δ' ἰχθύες ὀρθοὶ | κυανέου ἕξ ὕδατος ἄλλοντο καλᾶ σὺν αἰοιδᾶ, A. Ag. 1630 = 946 T ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἤγε πάντα που φθογγῆς χαρᾶ (“He leads all things with the power of his tongue in delight”), Eur. *Ba.* 561-4 = 947 T ... θαλάμαις, ἔνθα ποτ' Ὀρφεὺς κιθαρίζων | σύναγεν δένδρεα μούσαις, | σύναγεν θήρας ἀγρώτας, id. *IA* 1211-15 = 948 T (Ἴφ.) εἰ μὲν τὸν Ὀρφέως εἶχον ... λόγον, | πείθειν ἐπάδουσ' ὥσθ' ὀμαρτεῖν μοι πέτρας | κηλεῖν τε τοῖς λόγοισιν οὐς ἐβουλόμην, | ἐνταῦθ' ἂν ἦλθον· νῦν δέ, τὰπ' ἐμοῦ σοφά, δάρκρυα παρέξω, *Tragica Adesp. TGrF* 129.6-8. And of course he charms people as well: Eur. *Hyps.* fr. 752g.10-12, = 1007 T Θρηῖσ' ἐβόα κίθαρις [Ὀρφέως] ... ἐρέτασι κελεύσματα μελπομένα, id. *Alc.* 357-62, 962-72, id. *Medea* 542-3; to say nothing of his charming Hades and Persephone (first in Eur. *Alc.* 357-9).¹²

πλήκῳ τῶ ῥῶ ῶ ῶ ῶ ῶ ῶ ῶ ἐπῶ εῶ [ιγήτιζε. What follows is but a mere sketch of Orpheus the poet; for a far richer account, see Calame (2010).

¹² To all which we can add a joking statement that his music could animate torches; Eur. *Cyc.* 646-8.

The most likely source of this reputation is the early epic tale of the voyage of the Argo,¹³ where tales of rocks and trees "sequacious of the lyre" (Dryden) were part of the narrative and Orpheus' own words, whether actually quoted or not, were characterized as extraordinarily beautiful.¹⁴ On the other hand, the verses quoted in the Derveni Papyrus or those few other Orphic lines

¹³ Cf the *Hypsipyle* fragment, above, where Orpheus sings to encourage the rowers of the Argo. There is, however, no explicit testimony that such an early epic existed; the closest we have is *Od.* 12.70 Ἄργῶ πᾶσι μέλουσα, which is usually, and reasonably, understood to refer to an early epic *Argonautica*. (That it narrates the adventures of the generation before that of the Trojan warriors does not entail that the poem too antedates Homer.) See P. Dräger, *Argo Pasimelousa* (Stuttgart 1993) 12-18, for a review of Homer's references to this tale, which could have existed only in the form of an oral epic; and M. L. West, "Odyssey and *Argonautica*," *CQ* 55 (2005) 39-64.

¹⁴ To retroject from Apollonius 4.891-911 and the *Orphic Argonautica* 1268-85, Orpheus would have engaged in and won a singing contest with the Sirens, which would have provided an excellent excuse for the early epic poet to lavish praise on Orpheus' divine singing and to narrate a magical episode in which rocks etc. were animated. According to the fifth-fourth century historian Herodorus, the ἀσθενής Orpheus was brought on board only to contest with the Sirens, not to take his turn at the oars; Herodorus *Argonautica* fr. 39 FHG = 1010 II T. Orpheus has also been identified as a figure between two Sirens on a vase dated to ca. 580 BC (*LIMC* Orpheus 6); see further Calame (2010) 14.

that can be dated to the classical period,¹⁵ although not unattractive, are far from the dazzling performance of the mythical Orpheus, an inconcinity that seems to have bothered almost nobody in the ancient world. *But note that Orpheus' poetry—that is, the poetry that was published under his name, such as that in P.Derv.—was compared unfavorably to Hesiod's by Menander Rhet. *Διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν* 3.340 Spengel [= Hes. T 126 Most] παρέσχετο δὲ τὴν μὲν ἐν ποιήσει ἀρετὴν Ἡσίοδος, καὶ γνοίη τις ἂν μᾶλλον, εἰ τοῖς Ὀρφέως παραθείη. It is possible that in this early *Argonautica*, Orpheus indeed sang beautifully (of what we cannot know, tempting as it is to guess that at least once it was of a cosmogonical and cosmological nature), but the poem as a whole seems not to have survived long enough to be cited in the fifth century,¹⁶ by which time the figure of Orpheus took on a separate and distinct existence as the author of τελεταὶ τε καὶ χρησημοφῶδιαι (Plat. *Prot.* 316d; cf. Aristoph. *Frogs* 1032) and ἐπωδαί (Eur. *Cycl.* 614) exclusively; cf. Aristoph. *Frogs* 1032. We shall thus never know whether his singing in this lost epic was reported directly (and was in fact

¹⁵ Fourth-century citations of Orphic verses are Pl. *Crat.* 402bc = 22 F λέγει δὲ πού καὶ Ὀρφεὺς ὅτι “Ὠκεανὸς πρῶτος καλλίροος ἤρξε γάμοιο, | ὅς ῥα κασιγνήτην ὁμομήτορα Τηθὺν ὄπιεν,” id. *Phileb.* 66c = 25 F “Ἐκτη δ’ ἐν γενεᾷ,” φησὶν Ὀρφεύς, “καταπαύσατε κόσμον ἀοιδῆς,” [Aristot.] *de Mundo* 401a25 = 31 F (some of whose nine verses will be quoted below). This is not to deny that later citations, such as those in Damascius, who cites Eudemus, may be of equally early origin—some of them in fact are the same as is found in P.Derv.—but in a text as subject to accretions as this one, earlier is definitely better.

¹⁶ Hence its absence from Kinkel's, Bernabé's, Davies', and West's collections of epic fragments.

stunningly beautiful) or merely said to be so by the *Argonautica* poet. It is almost as if there were two distinct Orpheis, which is in fact exactly what the historian Herodorus said.¹⁷ Who was Orpheus when he was not sailing? A bard like Homer, as suggested by Pl. *Ion* 536b? This would be consistent with Pi. *P.* 4.176, where he is called φορμικτὰς ἀοιδᾶν πατήρ; cf. Timotheus 221-4 = 883 T. Unlike Homer, however, Orpheus is often associated with the wilds of mountains, where those sequacious animals, trees, and rocks are to be found.¹⁸ Later, this led him to be thought of as a pastoral poet, but this is probably due more to his origins as a shamanistic figure somewhat like Dionysus, who too is associated with sites outside the city.¹⁹

Abbreviations

¹⁷ Schol. in Ap.Rhod. 1.23 = 967 T, clearly truncated in transmission, Ἡρόδωρος δύο εἶναι Ὀρφεῖς φησιν, ὧν τὸν ἕτερον συμπεπλευκέναι τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις. The other one, presumably, is the religious seer and author of cosmological/theogonic poetry, as the latter of which he was included by some among the Seven Wise Men; cf. D. L. 1.42 = 887 T.

¹⁸ Cf. Eur. *Ba.* 560-4 ἐν ταῖς πολυδένδροισιν Ὀλύμπου | θαλάμαις, ἔνθα ποτ' Ὀρφεὺς κιθαρίζων | σύναγεν δένδρεα μούσαις, | σύναγεν θῆρας ἀγρώστας.

¹⁹ See, e.g., M. Detienne, "Un polythéisme récrit: Entre Dionysos et Apollon: Mort et vie d'Orphée," *Archives de sciences sociales des religions* 59.1 (1985) 65-75; West 4-7.

- Bernabé (*simpliciter*) Alberto Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci*. Pars 2, fasc. 1-3. Berlin 2004-07.
- Bernabé (2007a) — —. "The Derveni Theogony," *HSCP* 103 (2007) 99-133.
- Bernabé (2007b) — —. "Autour de l'interprétation des colonnes xiii-xvi du Papyrus de Derveni," *Rhizai* 4 (2007) 77-103.
- Betegh Gábor Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation*. Cambridge 2004.
- Brisson (*simpliciter*) Luc Brisson, "Sky, sex, and Sun: The meaning of αἰδοῖος/αἰδοῖον in the Derveni Papyrus," *ZPE* 144 (2003) 19-29.
- Brisson (L-M) Luc Brisson, "Chronos in col. xii of the Derveni Papyrus," in L-M 149-165.
- Calame (*simpliciter*) Claude Calame, "Figures of sexuality and initiatory transition in the Derveni theogony and its commentary," in L-M 65-80.
- Calame (2010) "The Authority of Orpheus, poet and bard: Between tradition and written practice," in P. Mitsis and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Allusion, Authority, and Truth: Critical Perspectives on Greek Poetic and Rhetorical Praxis* (Berlin 2010) 13-35.
- D'Alessio Giovan Battista D'Alessio, "Textual fluctuations and cosmic streams: Ocean and Acheloius," *JHS* 124 (2004) 416-37.
- Janko (2001) Richard Janko, "The Derveni Papyrus (Diagoras of Melos, *Apopyrgizontes Logoi?*): A new translation," *CP* 96 (2001) 1-32.
- Janko (2002) — —, "The Derveni Papyrus: an interim text," *ZPE* 141 (2002) 1-62.
- KTP Theokritos Kouremenos, George M. Parássoglou, and Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou, *The Derveni Papyrus*. Florence 2006.
- L-M André Laks and Glenn W. Most (eds.), *Studies in the Derveni Papyrus*. Oxford 1977.

- Merkelbach Reinhold Merkelbach, "Der orphische Papyrus des Derveni," *ZPE* 1 (1967) 21-32.
- Π The Derveni Papyrus.
- Rusten Jeffrey Rusten, "Interim notes on the papyrus from Derveni," *HSCP* 89 (1989) 121-140.
- Ts. Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou.
- West Martin West, *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford 1983.
- ZPE Anonymi, "Der orphische Papyrus von Derveni," *ZPE* 47 (1982) 1*-12* (following 300).

The fragments are numbered on the left as they are by Kouremenos in KPT 21, except for the first one, which comes from Bernabé. On the right are the locations within the Derveni Papyrus. Concordances with Betegh and Bernabé are made difficult because each editor makes different joins between the lines quoted separately in the Papyrus.

<i>fragment</i>	<i>col. & line</i>
<i>number (Kouremenos)</i>	
(3 F) [φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί·] ἰθύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθεῖ [βέβηλοι]	7

I shall proclaim to those for whom it is proper; close the doors, o profane ones
v. comm.

1	[ο]ἶ Διὸς ἐξεγῶδέωνοντο [μεγασθεν]έος βασιληῶος	8.2
	[ο]ἶ ZPE [μεγασθεν]έος Sider [ύπερμεν]έος ZPE [περισθεν]έος Janko (2002)	

... who were born from great-minded king Zeus

2 Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δῶή πῶαῶ[τρὸς ἐο]ῦ πάρα θέ[σ]φατον ἀρχήν

8.4-5

ἰάλλκην τ' ἐν χεῖρεσσι ἰλάῶβ[εν, κ]αῶιῖ δαίμονιάῖ κυδρόν ...

Zeus, when from his father he took into his hands his divine rule and
valor, (he) — the glorious daimon ...

1 θέ[σ]φατον (ZPE) ἀρχήν Π θέσφατ' ἀκούσας Calame (i.e., = 7) 2 [ἀ]λλκην ZPE

χεῖρεσσι ἰλάῶβεν Sider χεῖρεσσι ε[Π χεῖρεσσι [λ]άῶβεν Rusten 126

χεῖρεσσ' ἰάλλκᾶβεν Janko (2002) χεῖρεσσ' ἔλαβεν West 84 cf. col.8.8-10

4-5 ἐξ ἀδύτοιο (?.) 11.1

ἰΝὺξ ἔχρησεν ἅπαντα τὰ οἱ θε[μ]ικς ἐκτελέεσ]θῶαι 11.10

"From the innermost sanctuary Night proclaimed all that it was right for
him [i.e., Zeus] to accomplish."

ἰΝὺξ Sider ἠ δέ] ZPE ἠ οἱ] West 114 θε[μ]ικς ZPE [ἐκτελέεσ]θῶαι Sider (fort.

[ἦν τελέεσ]θῶαι [ἦν ἀνύσασ]θῶαι Ts. ap. Bern. For ἦν ἀ., Ts. also considers

[ἐξἀνύσασ]θῶαι and [(ἐξ- or ἦν)ἀνύεσ]θῶαι. [ἦεν ἀνύσασ]αι West [ἦεν

ἀκού]σθῶαι Janko (2002) αὐθι τελέεσ]αι Burkert

6 ὡς ἀνῶ ἔῶ[χοι κά]τα καλὸν ἔδῶος νιφόνεντος Ὀλύμπου 12.2

So that he might hold sway over the noble seat of snow-clad Olympus.

ἀν ἔῶ[χοι κά]τα Ts. ap. Brisson (L-M) 152n10 ἄ[ρξαι κα]τά West ἄρῶῶξῶῶ[ηι κα]τά
Janko (2002) ἄ[ρξηι Burkert ἄ[.... κα]τά ZPE

7 Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δὴῶ πῶαῶτρῶῶς εἰοῦ πάραῶ [θ]έῶσφατ' ἀκούσα[ς, 13.1

Zeus, upon hearing the prophecies from his father....

ἐπει[τ' ἄφραστα θεᾶς] West 114 [θ]έῶσφατ' ἀκούσα[ς Ts., iam [θ]έ]σφατ' ἀκούσα[ς
ZPE

8 αἰδοῖον κατῶέπινεν, ὃς αἰθέρα ἔκθορῶε πρῶτος

13.4

He gulped down the revered one, who was first to spring from the aither

αἰθέρα Π αἰθέρος Lamberton

9 ὃς μέγ' ἔρξεεν 14.5

...who wrought a great thing.

10 Οὐρανὸς Εὐφρονίδης, ὃς πρώτιστος βασιλευσεν 14.6

Ouranos the son of Night, who was first to become king.

Οὐρανὸς Εὐφρονίδης Π -ον -ην Kouremenos (iam -ονῶ -ηνῶ West), qui iungit haec
verba cum fr. 9

11 ἐκ τοῦ δὴ Κρόνος ἀϜύτις, ἔπειτα δὲ μητίετα Ζεὺς 15.6

From whom was Kronos in turn, and then Zeus the planner

ἀϜύτις Bernabé [α]ύτις ZPE

12 μητιν κα.[c.14]εῶν βασιληίδα τιμῶ[ήν]

15.13-15

εσ.[]αῶι ἱναῶςῶ ἀῶπ.[

ειῶ

1 μητιν (Bernabé) vel Μητιν (ZPE)]εῶν possis]ωῶν Ts. καιῶ [μακάρων κατέχ]ων
West (sed iota non legendum; P-Ts.) εἶχ]εν vel κάτεχ]εν Janko (2002) τιμῶ[ήν]

ZPE

2 ἀῶπάῶ[σας Janko

13-14

13 πρωτογόνου βασιλέως αἰδοίου, τῷ δ' ἄρα πάντες 16.3-6

ἀθάνατῶι προσέφυν μάκαρες θεοὶ ἠδῶε θεάιναι
καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ κρηναὶ ἐπήρατοι ἄλῶλα τε πάντα,
ἀῶσσα τότε ἦν γεγαῶτ', αὐτὸς δ' ἄρα μουῶνος ἔγεντο.

ante 1 <κατέπινεν μένος> Brisson (melius: μένος κατέπινεν) 1 τῷ Ts. Betegh τοῦῶ
ZPE 4 ἀῶσσα Ts. ap. Bernabé [ό]σσα ZPE

...of the revered first-generating king; to him were joined all the immortal
blessed gods and goddesses, as well as rivers, delightful springs and all
else that had then been born; but he himself came to be all by himself.

14 [νῦν δ' ἐστὶ]ν βασιλεὺς πάντῳ [ων καὶ τ' ἔσσειτ' ἔπ]ειτα 16.14

Now he is king of all and will be hereafter

omnia suppl. West excepto βασιλεὺς πάντῳ [ων (ZPE)

15 Ζεὺς πρῶτος [γέν]ετο, ἰΖεὺς ἰύστατος ἰ [ἀργικέρανος]

Zeus was first, Zeus of the bright lightning bolt is last

v. comm.

16 Ζεὺς κεφαλῶ ἰλήϊ, [Ζεὺς μέσ]σῶαῶ, Διὸς δ' ἐκῶ [π]άντα τέτ[υκται]

17.12

Zeus is the head/first, Zeus is the middle, from Zeus are all things fashioned

suppl. ZPE

17 [Ζεὺς πνοίη πάντων, Ζεὺς πάντων ἔπλετο] ἰμοῖραῖ 18

Zeus is the breath of all; of all is Zeus the share/fate

h.v. composuit Merkelbach e verbis Auctoris; v. comm.

18 Ζεὺςῶ□□ βασιλεύς, Ζεὺς δ' ἀρχὸς ἀπάντῳ ἀργικέρανος.

19.10

Zeus is king, Zeus of the shining lightning is the ruler of all

- 19 (Πειθῶ θ' Ἀρμονίην τε καὶ Οὐρανίην Ἀφροδίτην) 21.5-7
Persuasion, Harmony, and Aphrodite Ourania

h.v. composuit Kouremenos e verbis Auctoris; v. comm. θόρνη δ' Ἀφροδίτη | Οὐρανίη
Γκαὶ Πειθῶ θ' Ἀρμονίη τε e.g. Merkelbach

- 20 μήσατο <δ'> Ὠκεανοῖο μέγα σθένοσ ἐὺρὺ ῥέοντοσ 23

— contrived the great might of widely flowing Okeanos

h.v. West composuit e verbis Auctoris: "Ὠκεανός," "ἐμήσατο," "σθένοσ μέγα," " ἐὺρὺ
ῥέοντα" μήσατο δ' Ὠκεανὸν βαθυδίνην ἐὺρὺ ῥέοντα e.g. Burkert

- 21 Ἴνασ δ' ἐγκῶαῶτῶ[έλε]ξ' Ἀχελωῖου ἀργυ[ρ]οδίνῶεῶίωϊ
23.11

And within he placed the sinews of Acheloius with its silvern eddies

cf. P.Oxy. 221 col. 9.1-2 .]νασ [δ' ἐ]γκατέλεξ(α) | Ἀχελωῖου ἀργυροδίνεω

- 22 ἦ πολλοῖσ φαίνει μερόπεσσ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν 24.3

She (sc. the Moon) shines on many mortals over the boundless earth

μερόπεσσι ἐπ' Π

23 [ἀντ]ἄωρῶ [ἐ]πῶει δ[ὴ] πᾶν]τῶα Διὸ[ς νοῦς μή]σατῶ [ο ἔ]ρῶγῶαῶ
25.14

but when the mind of Zeus contrived all deeds.

omnia rest. Ts. (monente West), excepto νοῦς (Sider); φρήν Ts.

24 μητρὸς ἑᾶς ἔθελεν μιχθήμεναι ἐν φιλότῃτι

He wished to lie in love with his own mother

h.v. composuit Ts. e verbis Auctoris: "μητρὸς," "ἑᾶς," "θέλοντα μιχθῆναι," "ἐν φιλότῃτι"
ἤθελε μητρὸς ἑᾶς μιχθῆμεναι ἐν φιλότῃτι e.g. Ts. ὁ δ' ἤθελεν ἐν φιλότῃτι μητρὸς
ἑῆς Π μιχθῆμεναι e.g. Merkelbach

COMMENTARY

In a lost transition between the end of col. 6 (on sacrifices, prayers, and souls) and the beginning of col. 7, the Author turns to extensive quotation and commentary on a "sound and orthodox" hymn of Orpheus— ὕμνονῶ [ύγ]ιῶῃ καὶ θεμ[ι]τῶὰ λέγοντα (sc. Ὀρφεία)— which he characterizes as wholly holy: [ὁ δ]ὲ [Ὀρφεὺς]ῶ ... [μεγ]ἄλαῶ ἱερ[ο]λογ]εῶῖῶται μὲν οὖν καὶ ἀῶ[πὸ το]ῦ πρώτου [καὶ] μέχρῃ <τ>οῦῶ [τελε]υτῶαῶῖῶου ῶήματος. (The nature and quality of the Author's interpretations need not concern us.)

(3 F) [φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί· θ]ύρας δ' ἐπίθει[σθε βέβηλοι]

The Author continues his introduction (see above) to the discussion and exegesis of Orpheus by saying [θ]ύρωϑ[ας γὰρ ἐπίθει[σθαι κελ]εύσας τοῖϑ[ς | ὠσί]ν αὐτ[ούς], which Burkert recognized as the formulaic line end at the beginning of several religious poems. Cf., e.g., Pl. *Symp.* 218b (Alcibiades:) . οἱ δὲ οἰκέται, καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος ἐστὶν βέβηλός τε καὶ ἄγροικος, πύλας πάνυ μεγάλας τοῖς ὠσὶν ἐπίθεσθε. That covering one's ears would hinder hearing hardly needs a classical parallel, but it may be that Odysseus' description of the wax put in his crew's ears so that they not hear the Sirens alludes to something similar in the episode in the early *Argonautica*, where, as we saw above, Orpheus helped the crew sail past the Sirens; cf. *Od.* 12.177 ἑτάροισιν ἐπ' οὐατα πᾶσιν ἄλειψα [sc. κηρὸν], 199-200 αἶψ' ἀπὸ κηρὸν ἔλοντο ἐμοὶ ἐρήρηες ἑταῖροι, | ὄν σφιν ἐπ' ὠσὶν ἄλειψ', ἐμέ τ' ἐκ δεσμῶν ἀνέλυσαν. Either word for "ear" could well have appeared in the line following 3 F, but in both Clem. Al. *Protr.* 7. 74.4 and Ps.-Justinus Martyr, *Coh. ad gent.* p. 15 C Morel (both of whom attribute the verses to Orpheus) we find φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί· θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι | πάντες ὁμῶς.

There are, however, two possible first halves to this line, (i) the one printed above and ἀείσω ξυνετοῖσι (attributed to Orpheus by Cyrillus Alex. *Contra Julianum* 1.35, but to Pythagoras by others), both of which are in accord with what the Author says after the above: οὐτι νομο[θετεῖν φη]σιν τοῖς πολλοῖς [c.14 τῆ]ν ἀκοήν [ἀγνεύο]ντας

1 [ο]ἶ Διὸς ἐξεγέϑνοντο [μεγασθεν]έος βασιλῆϑος

[ο]ἶ Διὸς ἐξεγέϑνοντο: = *Il.* 5.637 (of mortals); cf. *H. Hom. in Dioscurus* 2 οἱ Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἐξεγένοντο; and often in early epic in this sense, most notably

in Hesiod's genealogical poems; cf. *Th.* 106 οἱ Γῆς ἐξεγένοντο καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος; Bernabé (2007a) 102-3 notes the emphasis laid on Zeus at this early point in the poem. Xenophanes B 33 begins the process of using the verb to indicate coming into being, while still maintaining its earlier biological sense:

πάντες γὰρ γαίης τε καὶ ὕδατος ἐκγενόμεσθα,

—a process which Empedocles B 59 continues to develop:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μείζον ἐμίσγετο δαίμονι δαίμων,
ταῦτά τε συμπίπτεσκον, ὅπη συνέκυρσεν ἕκαστα,
ἄλλα τε πρὸς τοῖς πολλὰ διηνεκῆ ἐξεγένοντο.

It remained for Parmenides B 10.1-3 to apply it solely to inanimate substances:

εἴση δ' αἰθερίαν τε φύσιν τὰ τ' ἐν αἰθέρι πάντα
... ὀππόθεν ἐξεγένοντο.

If, as has been suggested, the Author quotes the lines in the order of the poem, this early reference to Zeus demonstrates his importance here.

[μεγασθεν]έος; ZPE's [ὑπερμεν]έος, adopted by all but Janko, is acceptable but can be improved upon. It calls for hiatus after ἐξεγένοντο, which can only barely be justified; Homer has a number of examples of hiatus before ὑπερ(-)²⁰—11 (some examples below) vs. 50 X in the *Iliad* where there is elision or correption, but only one where, as here, the preceding syllable is short (23.820 Τυδεΐδης δ'

²⁰ That is, where a long final syllable or diphthong does not experience epic correption: *Il.* 3.299 ὀππότεροι πρότεροι ὑπερ ὄρκια πημήνειαν ~ 4.67 = 4.72 ~ 4.136 ~ 4.271, 6.458, 11.297, 14.413, 17.24, 23.73, 23.820.

ἄρ' ἔπειτα ὑπὲρ σάκεος μεγάλοιο). Moreover, there is never hiatus before ὑπερμεν- in Homer (6 X). On the other hand, hiatus after a short syllable, when it does occur, is found at the midline trochaic caesura, as here (and at the bucolic diaeresis); and of these occurrences over 25% are after –ο(ν)τὸ; cf. Munro *Hom. Gr.* ¶ 382, citing Knös *De digamma homerico* (Uppsala 1872-79) 42-5. And ὑπερμεν- is an epithet (of the right shape) of Zeus in Homer. Janko's conjecture evokes Zeus' strength more explicitly, but it is rather rare and applied only to mortals—even serving as a proper name—or objects.

[μεγασθεν]έος, which is regularly applied to gods, is preferable; cf. Ba. 3.67-8 μεγασθενή[ς] Ζεύς, A. *Eum.* 61 [Apollo], Aristoph. *Clouds* 566 and P. O. 1.25 [Poseidon], Q.S. 2.140 Ζηνὶ μεγασθενεί. It also occurs 5 X in the Orphic hymns. Another possibility is [περιφραδ]έος (Apollo, *HHHerm* 464). [ἐρισθεν]έος, also suggested by Janko, is, with seven letters restored, said by Kouremenos to be too short, which suggests that a restoration of eight letters is possible. At 13.4 αἰθέρα ἔκθορῶε is an example of hiatus at the bucolic diaeresis after a short vowel; in the verse of a good poet, this might be thought of as vivid writing; more on this later.

βασιλῆῶος: Zeus is never called by this title in Homer, but he is in Hesiod and the Hymns—a well known fact, which also serves to remind us that, although Homer offers guidance whenever the text of Orpheus is in doubt, allowance should always be made for changes in metrics, vocabulary, and myth.

Between 1 and 2, the Author writes ὅπως δ' ἄρχεται ἐν τῶ[ιδε δη]λοῖ, leaving the subject of the verb unclear. Tsantsanoglou and Parássoglou take it to be τὰ νῦν ἑόντα, while Bernabé prefers Ζεύς, which is indeed strongly suggested by

2.1 Ζεὺς ... ἀρχήν, although the phrase "how Zeus rules" is odd; an inceptive aorist would convey the thought better. "How Zeus begins" (Betegh) should allude to his birth, not, *simpliciter*, to the beginning of his rule. If the Author, in the manner of a textual commentor, worked his way through the Orphic poem in order, and 2 followed directly on 1, as has been argued by, i.a., Betegh 105-8, it would seem that in this particular telling of the story the emphasis is on Zeus, but this cannot be determined.

2 Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δῶδῃ πῶαῶ[τρὸς ἐο]ῦ πάρα θέ[σ]φατον ἀρχήν
 ἰά[λ]κην τ' ἐν χεῖρασσι ἰλῖά[ω]β[εν, κ]αῶιῖ[δ]αίμονιαῖ[α] κυδρόν ...

For the words restored in half brackets, see col. 8.8-10. These lines may have come immediately after 1; cf. West 114, Betegh 109. This line and 7 Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δῆδῃ πῶαῶτρῶδς ἐοῦ πάραῶ [θ]έῶσφατ' ἀκούσα[ς] are, ignoring the different morphology of the penultimate words, the same except for the last words. There are some examples of this in Homer and other early epic; cf. B. Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary* III (Cambridge 1993) 19-21; R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge 1982) 129-30. This near repetition, however, is especially reminiscent of Empedocles, who also plays with the idea of oral formulas, reworking his own lines so closely that editors frequently merge what I believe to be two (or more) distinct quotations into one fragment (as I hope to show in detail elsewhere). Cf. B 121.4, as quoted by most sources, ἄτης ἄν λειμῶνα κατὰ σκότος ἠλάσκουσιν, and the same line as quoted by Proclus, ἄτης ἐν λειμῶνι κατὰ σκότος ἰλάσκονται, where the appropriateness of ἄν(α) ... ἠλάσκουσιν and ἐν ... ἰλάσκονται argue against scribal error. For a more sophisticated example, compare also B 115.1, as quoted by Plut. *De exil.* 607c, ἔστι τ(ι) ἀνάγκης χρῆμα, θεῶν ψήφισμα παλαιόν, with ἔστιν Ἀνάγκη, χρῆμα θεῶν, σφρηγισμα

παλαιόν, as quoted by Simpl. *Phys.* 1184.9-10 = Emp. fr. 110 Bollack. This literary play with one's own words/formulae was adopted by Lucretius; cf., e.g., 2.82 *avius a vera longe ratione vagaris* ~ 2.229 *avius a vera longe ratione recedit*; see further J. D. Minyard, *Mode and Value in the De Rerum Natura: A Study in Lucretius' Metrical Language* (Wiesbaden 1978) 44-5. It would be interesting to know whether Empedocles is at all indebted in his own near self-quotation to this Orphic poem. This discussion shows that Calame 67 n. 3 is on weak ground when he argues that 2.1 should be altered to the reading of 7.

2.1 μέν: "Emphaticum," Bernabé 3.207 (citing Denniston *Greek Particles* 359-61), but this can not be sure and it remains quite possible that this clause was followed by one with δέ; see below.

2.2 χείρῃσι ἰλάβην: What I print is a simple combination of Rusten's and Janko's readings. The latter, followed by Bernabé, is surely right to regard the Author's quoting this verse six lines later in a different word-order as the equivalent of a separate quotation that calls for half-, not full, brackets; see the introductory paragraph, above. Π has *scriptio plena* elsewhere; if [ή δέ] ἔχρησεν is correctly restored at col. 11.10, where there is space for three letters; note also 16.9 δὲ ἄρα (prose) and 24.3 μερόπεσσ(ι) ἐπ'. At 13.4 there is hiatus which for metrical reasons cannot be mitigated by elision: αἰθέρα ἔκθορε. The reason for choosing Rusten's avoidance of elision is that λαβ- is most common in Homer among past indicatives (39 X), but the choice of this, ἐλαβ- (6 X), or ἔλλαβ- (19 X) is determined in all places but one by metrical convenience, the exception, also at the midline caesura, being *Il.* 8.116 ἐν χείρῃσι λάβ', where no ms. offers the variant χείρῃσ' ἔλαβ'. The same words occur at 15.229, but here the verb is imperative; i.e., no temporal augment is possible. For elision of this word at the

midline caesura, cf. *Od.* 19.356 δεξαμένη χεῖρ' εἰσ' ἴστε κτλ., *West Greek Metre* 36.

δαίμονῶϊ αἰ κυδρόν] Gods can be glorious; cf. Hes. *Th.* 442 κυδρὴ θεός, *Op.* 257 (Dike), *Od.* 11.580 etc. (Hera), *Hom.Hy.Dem.* 179 (Demeter), *Hom.Hy.Herm.* 461 (Apollo), etc. In Orphic poetry, Eros receives this epithet, *Orph. Argon.* 14. The problem is the syntax. As quoted, this phrase would seem to be the direct object of ἔλαβεν, which presents an odd picture, or perhaps a striking syllepsis, especially with the phrase "in his hands." It is easy, though, to imagine that the Author, quoting whole lines, has truncated the grammar, so that (as my commas and translation indicate) ἔλαβεν takes only "rule and valor." It is true that in "correcting" the word order, the Author again presents a text that on the surface allows δαίμονα to be another object, but again he may be simply finishing the line but not the syntax. This was the view of Rusten and West, both of whom attempted to find from the Author himself the line containing the verb governing δαίμονα.

4-5

ἔξ ἀδύτοιο (?.)

ἰΝὺξ ἔχρησεν ἅπαντα τὰ οἱ θε[μικετέλεεσ]θῶαι

The Author quotes **5** as a single line, but has anticipated it on line 1 of this column, which begins with ... [τῆς Νυκτός· "ἔξ ἀδύτοιο" δ' αὐτήν [λέγει] χρῆσαι It is thus quite likely that the words ἔξ ἀδύτοιο immediately preceded **5** (same phrase and same sedes at *Il.* 5.512, *Orph. Arg.* 956; cf. Aristoph. *Eq.* 1015-16 Ἀπόλλων ἴαχεν ἔξ ἀδύτοιο). Bernabé joins the two fragments, along with ZPE's ἡ δέ.

5 ἰΝύξ: Night, as is clear from col. 11.1; see last lemma. Three letters are needed; hence, ἡ δέ in *scriptio plena* (= ἡ δ' in meter) was restored by ZPE, which is better than reading the repeated οί in West's ἡ οί. The choice between ἡ δέ and Νύξ depends in large part on how one understands the line introducing 5: τὰδ' [ἐν ἐχομένω]ωι (Janko or [ἐπὶ τούτω]ωι Ts.) λέγει. If the Author is proceeding to a new point, an anaphoric ἡ δέ (or better, ἡδε) is appropriate; but if he, as often, cites a passage to illustrate a point made earlier (cf. his quoting Heraclitus in col. 4, or the way col. 8.1 and 8.3 lead respectively to the quoting of 8.2 and 8.4-5), then Νύξ seems more likely. Since as reconstructed here, Νύξ is not the first word of the sentence, there is no need for a connecting particle in any case, since, as Calame (2010) 20 notes, there is frequent asyndeton in this poem.

ἰΝύξ ἔχρησεν: A violation of Meyer's first law. West's conjecture is metrically less likely, but cf. 8 ἔκθοροεῶ πρώτος.

οί: Almost certainly Zeus, although Rusten 131 f. is hesitant; see next lemma.

Θέ[μυς]: θέμυς normally derives from the gods and rarely applies to gods themselves; cf. Hes. *Th.* 396 τὸν δ' ἔφαθ', ὅστις ἄτιμος ὑπὸ Κρόνου ἠδ' ἀγέροστος, | τιμῆς καὶ γεράων ἐπιβησέμεν, ἢ θέμυς ἐστίν, but here it is generalized, unlike the Derveni restoration. See further H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley 1971) 166 n. 23, with bibliography. Athena can tell Ares what not to do ("Ἄρες, ἔπισχε μένος κρατερόν καὶ χεῖρας ἀάπτους· οὐ γὰρ τοι θέμυς ἐστὶν ἀπὸ κλυτὰ τεύχεα δῦσαι | Ἡρακλέα κτείναντα," [Hes.] *Sc.* 446-8). Θέμυς can come from Zeus or another god: υἱὲς Ἀχαιῶν ..., οἳ τε θέμυστας πρὸς Διὸς εἰρύαται (*Il.* 1.237-9); cf. [Hes.] *Sc.* 22 ὃ οἱ Διόθεν θέμυς ἦεν. But what is the

supposed sense of the restoration here? That it is “right” for Zeus to accomplish these things; or that he “should” do so? The former is possible (Night to Zeus would be like Athena to Ares); the latter may seem too strong, but is probably correct: Zeus here is subject to the demands of fate as any mortal is. And a god’s “prophecy” may command rather than merely predict; cf. Thuc. 1.134.4 ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὁ ἐν Δελφοῖς τὸν τε τάφον ὕστερον ἔχρησε τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις μετενεγκεῖν οὐπερ ἀπέθανε.

[ἐκτελέεισ]θῶαι: The word to be supplied seems to have been paraphrased in the Author’s preceding sentence as ποῶσι, the best Homeric word for which is (ἐκ)τελέεσθαι: *Il.* 7.353, 12.217; cf. Hes. *Sc.* 21-2 = fr. 195. ἐκτελέσαι μέγα ἔργον, ὁ οἱ Διόθεν θέμις ἦεν—whereas neither ἀνύσασθαι nor ἀνύεσθαι occurs in early epic, and indeed the middle occurs only once, at *Od.* 16.373 (as either ἀνύσσεσθαι or ἀνῆ□□□□□□□□σεσθαι), and then not again until *P. P.* 2.49; cf. V. Magnien *Le futur grec* (Paris 1912) 1.111; and the middle is generally rare.

6 ὡς ἄνῶ ἔῶ[χοι κά]τα καλὸν ἔδῶος νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου

ἄνῶ ἔῶ[χοι κά]τα: According to the papyrological description of Tsantsanoglou and Parássoglou, the restorations of West, Burkert, and Janko are inconsistent with the horizontal trace before the lacuna that could be the top only of Γ, Ε, Ζ, Ξ, Σ, or Τ. For tmesis with anastrophe when the preposition follows its verb, see H. W. Chandler, *Greek Accentuation*² (Oxford 1881) ¶¶ 922-3. Kouremenos compares *Il.* 2.699 τότε δ’ ἤδη ἔχεν κατά γαῖα μέλαινα, and *Od.* 9.6 ἢ ὅτ’ ἐϋφροσύνη μὲν ἔχη κατά δῆμον ἅπαντα. ὡς ἄν + optative (or subjunctive) is normal in Homer and epic in general, often at the beginning of the line and always so in Orphic literature; cf. *H. Orph.* 87.12 ὡς ἄν ἔοι, 62.11, 63.13.

The usual sense of this verb in early poetry (and prose) is, in order of increasing metaphorical sense, (i) hold down, cover, (ii) pervade, (iii) suppress/control, (iv) rule (which is a political overlap and extension of [iii]). E.g., (i) *Od.* 11.302 τοὺς ἄμφω ζωοὺς κατέχει φυσίζοος αἶα; cf. *Il.* 3.243. (ii) *Od.* 13.269 νῦξ δὲ μάλα δνοφερὴ κάτεχ' οὐρανόν. (iii) Bacch. *Dith.* 3.28-9 [σ]ὺ δὲ βαρεῖαν κάτεχε μῆτιν, Theognis 602-3 Τοιάδε καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπάλεσεν ἔργα καὶ ὕβρις, οἷα τὰ νῦν ἱερὴν τήνδε πόλιν κατέχει. (iv) Soph. *Ant.* 609-10 (Ζεῦ,) δυνάστας | κατέχεις Ὀλύμπου | μαρμαρόεσσαν αἴγλαν, E. *Hec.* 79-81 ὦ χθόνιοι θεοί, σώσατε παῖδ' ἐμόν, | ὄς μόνος οἴκων ἄγκυρ' ἔτ' ἐμῶν | τὴν χιονώδη Θρηίκην κατέχει, *Orph.H.* 2.6 κατέχεις οἴκους πάντων; cf. *ibid.* 18.4, 27.5. Kouremenos considers the use of the verb in the *Antigone* passage equivalent to that in the Derveni papyrus. Note, however, that the statement quoted is in direct answer to the chorus' own rhetorical question, τεάν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἀνδρῶν ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι; (604-5). That is, Sophocles' sentence entails the political sense of κατέχω, which perhaps cannot be dated before the second half of the fifth century, which is perhaps too late for a poem that quickly (how quickly depends on when one dates the Author) came to be taken as a work of Orpheus. Sense (iii) is probably best here.

ἔδος νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου: Cf., with Bernabé, *H.H.* 15.7-8 (Zeus) κατὰ καλὸν ἔδος νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου | ναίει, *Ap.Rh.* 1.503-4, (Orpheus) ἤειδεν δ' ὡς πρῶτον Ὀφίων Εὐρυνόμη τε | Ὀκεανὶς νιφόεντος ἔχον κράτος Οὐλύμπιοι, *Orph.H.* 15.7 ἔδος νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου, *Il.* 24144 ἔδος Οὐλύμπιοι, 18.615 Ὀλύμπου νιφόεντος, *Hes. Th.* 42 νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου. I omit the parallels adduced where Olympus is the ἔδος of the gods. Note also *Hes. Th.* 117-8 Γαῖ'

εὐρύτερον, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ | ἀθανάτων οἱ ἔχουσι κάρη
νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου (118 = 794 = *Orph.H.* 25.7 = 59.2).

7 Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δὴ ᾧ πᾶσιν ἀποτρῶδός ἐοῦ πάρα ᾧ [θ]έωσφατ' ἀκούσα[ς

See above, on 2.

8 αἰδοῖον κατῶέπινεν, ὅς αἰθέρα ἔκθορῶε πρῶτος

Bernabé adds this line to 4-5, which would indeed fit nicely, but the word ἀφα[ιρεῖ]ν in the sentence preceding the citation of 6 suggests that another line or two was quoted in the lines lost after 5. Furthermore, the two lines can be consecutive only if αἰδοῖον is neuter, arguments against which I lay out below.

αἰδοῖον: Since Orphic verses tell of Zeus' swallowing of Protogonos, who is called αἰδοῖος at 13.1 by Zeus, it is likely that αἰδοῖον is masc. sg.; so West 85-6; Brisson. Many, however, take the Author's allegoresis as fact, maintaining that αἰδοῖον is neuter, meaning penis,²¹ but this sense of this word in the singular first appears only toward the end of the fifth century (3 x in Hdt., but he uses it far more often in the plural; Philolaos[?] B 13). The Author (of the late fifth, as I think, or early fourth century) himself uses the singular αἰδοῖον = genital organ only when specifically interpreting the αἰδοῖον of the poem in this way (col. 13.9 αἰδοίῳ εἰκάσας τὸν ἥλιον, 16.1 [αἰδοῖ]ον τὸν ἥλιον ἔφ[η]σεν εἶναι); elsewhere he reverts to the more normal plural; cf. col. 13.7-9 ἐν τοῖς αἰδοῖοις ὄρων τὴν

²¹ E.g., Betegh 163; Janko (2001) 24; Burkert, *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis* (Cambridge, Mass. 2004) 90-1; Bernabé (2007b) 70-84.

γένεσιν τοὺς ἀνθρώπου[ς] νομίζον[τας εἶ]νῶαι τούτῳ ἐχρήσατο, ἄνευ δὲ τῶν αἰδοίων [οὐ γίν]εῖσθαι, αἰδοίῳ εἰκάσας τὸν ἥλιο[ν]. In any case, it seems quite unlikely that an epic poet of the fifth century would use the singular in this sense. It is true that, as Burkert *ibid.* shows, there are near-eastern stories with parallels for the swallowing of a god's penis, but it may well be that it is stories such as these that led the Author to his interpretation.

Wild allegoresis is one thing; willful misreading something else. The Author, as Betegh, *per litt.*, emphasizes, must have understood the poem in this way. How could the Author, who presumably saw a complete poem, have gone so wrong? West 85 thinks that his text was faulty. Perhaps the preceding line named Protogonos, which he took as an ordinary compound adjective, πρωτόγονος (as accented by editors) or, more likely, πρωτογόνος; cf., e.g., Orph. 140 F (cited several times by Damasc. *de Princ.*)

πρῶτον δαίμονα σεμνόν

Μῆτιν σπέρμα φέροντα θεῶν κλυτόν, ὃν τε Φάνητα

πρωτογόνον μάκαρες κάλεον.

"...the first august daimon to carry the seed of the gods, famed Metis, whom the blessed ones called Phanes *protogonos*" (where the epithet is clearly active). Cf. Orph. fr. 243.9 [sc. Ζεύς ἐστι] Μῆτις πρῶτος γενέτωρ. Damascius paraphrases as follows: Εἰ δὲ ὁ παρ' Ὀρφεῖ πρωτογόνος (again, I print paroxytone) θεὸς ὁ πάντων σπέρμα φέρων τῶν θεῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὠοῦ πρῶτος ἐξέθορε. See further on 13.1. It wouldn't take a great leap of allegoretic skill to apply the meaning "that which is the primary progenitor" to *aidoion* understood as a noun = "penis." For the the paroxytone accentuation and the active meaning, see Philop. *De Vocab.* Recensio a π 20 πρωτογόνος· ἢ πρῶτως τεκοῦσα παροξύνεται.

ὄς reads more easily in this one line with a masc. αἰδοῖον, but of course its antecedent could easily have been a genitive in the preceding line; Bernabé 1.19 suggests βασιλῆος or Οὐρανοῦ.

κατῶπιεν: Regularly used of the gulping down of solids, most notably and pertinently in Hesiod's *Theogony*, of Cronus' swallowing his children: 459 τοὺς μὲν κατέπινε μέγας Κρόνος, 467, 473.

αἰθέρα ἔκθορῶε: As in Hesiod, Aither, Chaos, and Chronos are early gods in Orphic cosmogonies. The *aither* from which the Orphic Phanes (who is nowhere named in the Derveni poem) derives is called "clouds" in later prose paraphrases; cf. Damasc. *de Princ.* Note Damasc. *de princ.* 124 [I 317, 2-4 Ruelle] εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν τελεῖν ἦτοι τὸ κούμενον καὶ τὸ κύον ὧν τὸν θεόν, ἢ τὸν ἀργῆτα χιτῶνα, ἢ τὴν νεφέλην, ὅτι ἐκ τούτων ἐκθρῶσκει ὁ Φάνης. Attempts to read αἰθέρα as a terminal accusative are thus misguided, as the parallels in Orphic texts show. Furthermore, ... [ἐ]κῶθῶ□□□ρηι τὸν λαμῶ□□πρότατόν τε [καὶ θε]ρμῶ□□[τ]ατον (col. 14.1) shows that the Author copied his exemplar correctly; i.e., αἰθέρα ἔκθορῶε cannot be considered an error on his part. Even if he read the accusative as direct object, there is no reason for us to follow him; cf. Bernabé (above, n. 17) 86-7.

Why not the more usual genitive, as in Homer (*Il.* 10.94-5 κραδίη δέ μοι ἔξω | στηθέων ἐκθρῶσκει) and everywhere else? αἰθέρος ἔκθορε would also avoid hiatus. The only parallel (adduced by Kouremenos) is from an anonymous late epigram, *A.P.* 9.371.1 Δίκτυον ἐκθρῶσκοντα πολύπλοκον ἄρτι λαγῶν, where Scaliger may have been right to conjecture δικτύου...πολυπλόκου. It is possible that the hiatus was intentional, to make the leap vivid.

David Sider 2/5/09 9:36 AM

Comment [1]:

Between quoting the two lines, the Author says only τὸ δ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ, which lacks the ἐχόμενον he uses elsewhere that would make it explicit that **10** followed immediately upon **9**, as West and Kouremenos believe, reading (see the app. crit.) Οὐρανὸν Εὐφρονίδην. The sense would now be Κρόνος μὲγ' ἔρεξεν Οὐρανόν, i.e., Cronos greatly harmed Ouranos. For ἔρεξεν as a euphemism (here for castration), cf. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (Berkeley 1983) 3, who notes how this verb often substitutes for the act of killing in a sacrificial ritual. For the double accusative construction that would be produced, cf. *Il.* 3.354 ξεινοδόκον κακὰ ῥέξαι. Reading accusatives would furthermore account for what now looks like asyndeton in **10**, although, as Betegh 123 n. 87 observes, this is not a major obstacle to retaining the nominatives; one can imagine that Οὐρανὸς Εὐφρονίδης is enjambed with a preceding nominative word or phrase. It would also be inept of Orpheus to link one ὅς-clause to another after only four words. On the whole, then, it seems best, or at any rate more cautious, to follow Π and retain the two nominatives.

Εὐφρονίδης: Cf. T. Corsten, *Die Inschriften von Kios* (Bonn 1985) 21.6 (Late Hellenistic to early Imperial date) = *Anth. Pal. Appendix* ed. Cougny 4.49 Οὐρανὸς Εὐφρονίδης. Matronymics are unusual in Greek; cf. Apollo/Artemis Letoïdes, Cheiron Philyrides, Ares Enyalios (< Enyo). Herakles is often called "the son of Alcmene," although no single matronymic is used, except for Bacch. 5.71 Ἀλκμή<ν>ιος θαυμαστός ἦρωας. Musaeus is the son of Μήνη (Hermesianax fr. 7.15). And the Molionē (dual) are called after their mother Molionē, according

to Eustath. ad Il, p. 3.319.4-11. And of particular interest here, Orpheus is identified as the son of Calliope: Tim. *Pers.* 223 υἱὸς Καλλιόπας (T 902 Bernabé). Cf. further Herodian *Orthogr.* 3.2.435 Τὰ εἰς δης μητρωνυμικὰ διὰ τοῦ ι γράφεται οἷον Λητωΐδης ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Λητοῦς, Δαναΐδης ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Δανάης, Φιλυρίδης ὁ υἱὸς Φιλύρας. ὅθεν Νιοβίδης ὁ τῆς Νιόβης. ὅθεν τὸ Φιλομηλείδης τὸ παρ' Ὀμήρω οὐ λέγομεν εἶναι πατρωνυμικὸν οὐδὲ λέγομεν τὸν υἱὸν τῆς Φιλομήλας. ὄνομα κύριόν ἐστιν. εἰ γὰρ ἦν μητρωνυμικόν, διὰ τοῦ ι ὄφειλεν εἶναι· καὶ ὁ Διονύσιος λέγει ὅτι ἀπὸ μητέρων οὐ σχηματίζει πατρωνυμικὸν ὁ Ὀμηρος. W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos* (Oxford 1891) nos. 10 and 367 lists citizens by both patronymic and matronymic. (Other cultures assign matronymics more freely, such as Russians and Ashkenazi Jews; cf. B. O. Unbegaun, *Russian Surnames* [Oxford 1972] 21-2, 105-8, 124-5, 342-4.) For Ouranos as son of Night in Orphic theology, cf. Alex. Aphrod. in *Aristot. meta.* 821.11-12 κατ' Ὀρφέα τὸ Χάος γέγονεν, εἴθ' ὁ Ὠκεανός, τρίτον Νύξ, τέταρτον ὁ Οὐρανός, quoting the verse Οὐρανός, | ὃς πρῶτος βασίλευσε θεῶν μετὰ μητέρα Νύκτα.

Night might be given prominence by this matronymic because of her role as nurse in Orphic theology; cf. col. 10.11 **τροφῶν** δὲ λέγων ἀν]τῶν ὧν ὠιδῶν ὠιδῶ [ζε]τῶαι which Kouremenos 184 reasonably combines with col. 10.9 **πανομφεύουσιν** (a *hapax*, obviously repeated from a lost lemma) and with Procl. in *Plat. Crat.* 404b = 112 F θεῶν γὰρ τροφὸς ἀμβροσίη Νύξ λέγεται (although not identified as an Orphic view by Proclus) to suggest that the missing line was – =× πανομφεύουσα θεῶν τροφὸς ἀμβροσίη Νύξ (6 F). There is also the question, as Betegh per litt. points out, "whether Ouranos had a father at all."

Night is euphemistically called *euphrone* as early as Hes. *Op.* 560. Note also Heraclitus B 26, 57, 99, and, most interesting, 67, a fragment of Orphic-like

polarities quoted by Hippolytus *Ref. Haer.* 9.10.8, ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμῶν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός. The word is then common in all three major tragedians, but to judge from its frequent occurrence in Hippocrates and Herodotus, *euphrone* became the usual word for night in Ionic (which includes Heraclitus).

βασίλευσεν: The aorist of this and similar verbs is often inceptive and must certainly be so in a genealogical narrative. With **πρῶτος**, the sense is that there was no king before Ouranos; that is, there was no hierarchy among the gods.

11 ἐκ τοῦ δὴ Κρόνος ἀῶτις, ἔπειτα δὲ μητίετα Ζεὺς

ἀῶτις^{5/6}: A frequent sedes for this word in early epic, but the sense "in turn, next," although frequent in Hesiod (especially, as here, in genealogies) and the *Hymns*, is not found in Homer; cf. *LfggrE* s.v. 3bβ. The alpha is dotted "because the foot of a right-hand oblique can be seen in the photograph and there is no other possibility of reading it" (Bernabé per litt.).

μητίετα: The Author adduces the transparent meaning of this common early epic epithet of Zeus (35 X) to argue that Orpheus equates Zeus with Nous, i.e., μήτις.

12 μῆτιν κα.[c.14]εῶν βασιληίδα τιμῶ[ήν]
εσ.[]αῶι ἱναῶςῶ ἀῶπ.[
ειῶ

1 μῆτιν: Since these lines are cited in order to show that Zeus is Nous (see above), lower-case *metis* is probably preferable (so Bernabé and Betegh 162-3) to seeing a reference to the distinct deity Metis (as in *ZPE*), who in Orphic texts is masculine and equated to Phanes and Zeus. And if this is indeed what the Author is doing, it is also likely that here at least he is adducing this passage from elsewhere in the poem.

βασιληίδα τιμῆ[ήν]: The kingly honor in question is the very one of being king; cf. Proclus *in Plat. Crat.* 105 *μόνος ὁ Κρόνος, τὴν τετάρτην βασιλικὴν τάξιν κληρωσάμενος, παρὰ πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους ὑβριστικῶς δοκεῖ κατὰ τὸ μυθικὸν πρόσχημα προσδέχεσθαι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ τὸ σκῆπτρον καὶ μεταδιδόναι τῷ Διῖ· καὶ γὰρ ἡ Νύξ παρ' ἐκόντος αὐτὸ λαμβάνει τοῦ Φάνητος·*

*σκῆπτρον δ' ἀριδείκετον εἶο χέρεσσι
θῆκε θεᾶς Νυκτός, <ἴν' ἔχη> βασιληίδα τιμῆν. (168 F)*

For this line end, always preceded by a form of ἔχειν (the simplex only), cf. Hesiod *Th.* 462 *ἐν ἀθανάτοισι ἔχει βασιληίδα τιμῆν*, Isyllus 64, and two oracles of Apollo (71.3, perhaps of the early fifth century, and 431.1 P-W), as well as in some later writers. It is therefore unlikely that a form of κατέχω (West, Janko) is to be read here.

2-3: Because no *paragraphos* is present in the left-hand margin and the poetic word ἵνας appears (as in **21**), it is likely that these two lines continue the poetic quotation, as noted by Ts.

13 *πρωτογόνου βασιλέως αἰδοίου, τῷ δ' ἄρα πάντες
ἀθάνατῶι προσέφυν μάκαρες θεοὶ ἠδὲ θεαῖναι
καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ κρῆναι ἐπήρατοι ἄλῶλα τε πάντα,*

ἄῶσσα τότε ἦν γεγαῶτ', αὐτὸς δ' ἄρα μουῶνος ἔγεντο.

This, the longest fragment in the papyrus, presenting no textual problems (two alternate readings in ZPE can no longer be entertained), lays out the notion of a cosmic Zeus, who contains within himself all that was and all that is to be, as close parallels from other Orphic verses make clear, especially 243 and 245 F, which will be cited below. On the join between **13** and **14**, see below.

1 πρωτογόνου: See above, where I argue that the sense is not the passive "protogenous" (an archaic English word), but the active "first progenitor." Note 243.5 F Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἀπάντων ἀρχιγένεθλος (where the immediate context strongly suggests an active meaning).

βασιλέως: On the vexed question of who this is (which would take us beyond our immediate concern with the poetic text), see Betegh 118-19, who argues for Ouranos.

1-4 πάντες ... ἄλλα τε πάντα: A similar listing of Zeus-contained gods are also listed in the parallel texts; cf., e.g., 241.5-9 F

αιθέρος εὐρείης ἠδ' οὐρανοῦ ἀγλαὸν ὕψος, 5
πόντου τ' ἀτρυγέτου γαίης τ' ἔρικυδέος ἔδρη,
Ωκεανός τε μέγας καὶ νείατα τάραρα γαίης
καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ πόντος ἀπειρίτος ἄλλα τε πάντα
πάντες τ' ἀθάνατοι μάκαρες θεοὶ ἠδὲ θεάιναι.

2 προσέφυν: For this 3 pl. form, cf. *Od.* 5.481 ἀλλήλοισιν ἔφυν, *Pi. P.* 1.42 περὶ γλωσσοῖ τ' ἔφυν. This verb usually indicates close/tight attachment of something that still retains its distinct nature; cf. *Od.* 12.433 (Odysseus holding

on to the rock between Scylla and Charybdis) τῷ προσφύς ἐχόμεν. Aristotle uses it frequently of eggs and embryos attached to the womb, which seems an apt parallel; cf. *HA* 538a10 ἐν τῇ ὑστέρα [sc. τὰ ῥά] ἔχει καὶ προσπεφυκότα. As noted above, similar Orphic verses spell out the meaning here, so that we can rule out "be born in addition"; cf. Hesych. π 3751 Schmidt προσέφυ· προσεγένετο (for which in this sense, see LSJ s.v. 2). Orphism equates many gods and contains many stories of gods' being swallowed by others, only to be reborn, that is, to regain their separate existence later. This fragment describes the time(s) when Zeus *protogonos* contains the others gods within himself. Cf. 243.7-10 F [Ζεύς] ἐν ᾧ τάδε πάντα κυκλεῖται ... πάντα γὰρ ἐν μεγάλου Ζηνὸς τάδε σώματι κεῖται (~ 245.5 F πάντα γὰρ ἐν Ζηνὸς μεγάλῳ τάδε σώματι κεῖται), 241.2 F τῶν πάντων δέμας εἶχεν ἐνὶ γαστέρι κοίλῃ.

θεοὶ ἠδὲ θεάιναι: A variation of the epic formula (πάντες τε) θεοὶ πᾶσαί τε θεάιναι (*Il.* 8.5, 20, 19.101, *Od.* 8.341, *H.Ap.* 311).

4 ἄῤῥσσα τότ' ἦν γεγαῶτ': The list given at 241.5-9 F (see above) is likewise followed by ὅσσα τ' ἦν γεγαῶτα. The Orphic author may have been influenced by Ibycus, who alludes to the birth of the Moliones from a silver egg: τοὺς τε λευκίππους κόρους | τέκνα Μολιόνας κτάνον, | ἄλικας ἰσοκεφάλους ἐνιγυῖους | ἀμφοτέρους γεγαῶτας ἐν ᾠέφ | ἀργυρέφ (fr. 4).

14 [νῦν δ' ἐστὶ]ν βασιλεὺς πάντῳ [ων καὶ τ' ἔσσειτ' ἔπ]ειτα

The Author may introduce this line with the words [ἔτι δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐχ]οῶμένω,
"and then in the following line," which, if correctly restored, would indeed make
for a nice fit with **13**.

βασιλεὺς πάντῳ [ων: Cf. Hes. fr. 308.1 αὐτὸς γὰρ πάντων βασιλεὺς, Corinna,
fr.1a Δεὺς πατεῖ[ρ πάντων]ν βασιλεὺς, and, most famously, Pi. fr. 169.1 Νόμος ὁ
πάντων βασιλεὺς θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων.

15 Ζεὺς πρῶτος [γέν]εῖτο, ἰΖεὺς ἰύστατος ἰ [ἀργικέραυτος]

The first three words are (re)quoted ([λέ]γεῖται) at col. 18.12-13. Since **16** (see
below) appears twice elsewhere in Orphic poetry preceded by this line, the
Author's statement (col. 17.6) that ἕστατον ἔφησεν ἔσεσθαι τοῦτον (hence the
"will be" in the translation) strongly suggests that it did so here as well.

[ἀργικέραυτος]: Zeus' epithet below, **18**, as well as 3 x in Homer (in the
vocative), Pi. O. 8.3, Bacch. 5.58 (by sure conjecture), Cleanthes 1.32.

16 Ζεὺς κεφαλῷ ἰλήϊ, [Ζεὺς μέσ]σῳαῶ, Δωῖος δ' ἐκῶ [π]άντα τέτ[υκται]
= 31.2 = 243.2 F.

17 [Ζεὺς πνοίη πάντων, Ζεὺς πάντων ἔπλετο] ἰμοῖραῖ

Col. 18 begins [τὴν δὲ Μοῖρα]ν φάμενος [δηλοῖ] τήνδ[ε γῆν] καὶ τᾶλλα
πάν[τ]α εἶναι | ἐν τῷ ἀέρι [πνε]ῦμα ἔόν. τοῦτ' οὖν τὸ πνεῦμα Ὀρφεὺς |
ὠνόμασεν Μοῖραν, which, Merkelbach *ZPE* 1 (1967) 24 saw, looks like a prose
paraphrase of 31.5 F Ζεὺς πνοίη πάντων and, comparing col. 19.1-4. Further

supporting this is that Orpheus in the papyrus is cited for some of the same lines as are found in 31 F, as well as in the similar 243 F; see comm. on 16 and 18.

Merkelbach *ibid.* completed the line with a conjecture that accounts for Μοῖρα, replicating the frequent asyndeton found in 31 and 243 F, but since Moira does not figure much in other Orphic verses, the second half cannot be as persuasive as the first. On the whole, though, Merkelbach's line is more convincing than West's [Ζεὺς πάντων τέλος αὐτὸς ἔχει, Ζεὺς] Μοῖρα [κραταιή].

18 Ζεὺς ὠ□□ βασιλεύς, Ζεὺς δ' ἀρχὸς ἀπάνωτων ἀργικέραυτος.

= 31.7 F. Cf. also 243.4-5 F Ζεὺς βασιλεύς, Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἀπάντων ἀρχιγένεθλος.
| ἐν κράτος, εἷς δαίμων, γενέτης μέγας, ἀρχὸς ἀπάντων.

ἀρχός: In Homer, exclusively of mortals; in *H.H.Herm.*292, Hermes is the ἀρχός of thieves; next again used of a god (Helios) by Pi. *O.* 7.71. Perhaps there is meant to be an echo here of 2 ἀρχίην, as suggested by Bernabé (2007a) 104.

19 (Πειθῶ θ' Ἀρμονίην τε καὶ Οὐρανίην Ἀφροδίτην)

Orpheus has clearly been joining several gods under the same name— Ἀφροδίτη οὐρανία καὶ Ζεὺς καὶ ἀφροδισιάζειν καὶ θόρνυσθαι καὶ Πειθῶ καὶ Ἀρμονία τῶι αὐτῶι θεῶι ὄνομα κεῖται—but his syntax cannot be recovered and Kouremenos' reconstructed line is best accepted only *exempli gratia*. This fragment number would be better served with the one word **θόρνη** (cf. col. 21.1 θόρνη δὲ λέγ[ων]), a *hapax* which the context clearly associates with other words (such as ἀφροδισιάζειν, col. 21.8) for sexual intercourse, a metaphorical sense of

"jump" found elsewhere; cf. Nic. *Ther.* 99 with schol. ad loc. θορνύντα·
ὀχεύοντα. (Ts. in L-M 19 n. 53 tentatively suggested that θόρη should be read for
θόρη.)

20 μήσατο <δ'> Ωκεανοῖο μέγα σθένος εὐρὸν ῥέοντος

As noted in the critical apparatus, West, quite convincingly, puts together a verse
from the poetic words embedded in the Author's text. The subject is almost
certainly Zeus, but in a context where one god goes under many names, I've left
a blank in the translation.

21 Ἴνας δ' ἐγκῶαῶτῶ[έλε]ξ' Ἀχελωῖου ἀργυ[ρ]οδίνεω

ἀργυ[ρ]οδίνῶεῶ

Ἴνας ... ἀργυροδίνεω: The Author not only sees veins within Acheloius
literally (by means of allegoresis; see next lemma), he also seems to detect it in
Orpheus' words; that is, Ἴνας ἀργυροδίνεω. This is shown by the Author's
unusual use of the demonstrative adjective, so that τὰσδ' Ἴνας ~ τὰς δίνας (col.
23.13) —unusual for him, that is; he uses the demonstrative pronoun often
enough, but not the demonstrative adjective. Since the usual phrase is in the
singular—cf. *Il.* 21.356 ἴς ποταμοῖο, *Pi. fr.* 70 + *249b ἴς Ἀχελωῖου—something
like this may have been in the mind of the poet as well as of the Author; cf.
Kouremenos p. 259. The adj. is used exclusively of rivers and quite often of
Acheloius: *Hes. Th.* 340, *Panyassis fr.* 28.1 Matthews = 31.1 Bernabé, *Callim.*
H.Dem. 13, *Dionys. Perieg.* 433, 1140

Ἀχελωΐου: There are several 5th-cent. passages where Acheloius is used for water in general: Eur. *Andr.* 167, *Ba.* 625, *Hyps.* fr. 753, fr. 365, Soph. *Athamas* fr. 5, Achaëus *Aithon* 20 F 9 *TrGF*, Aristoph. *Lys.* 381 (water in a bucket, an inappropriate and hence intentionally pompous example); cf. Bond on fr. 753 (p. 86). These can be regarded as simple metonymy, but as the adjective ἀργυροδίνεω shows (see below), Orpheus is referring to Acheloius not only in his original role as river, but more specifically as the river that once seems to have had something of the same status as Oceanus. Cf. Serv. ad Verg. *G.* 1.8 = Orph. F 154 Bernabé *nam, sicut Orpheus docet et Aristophanes comicus et Ephorus historicus tradunt, Acheloon generaliter propter antiquitatem fluminis omnem aquam veteres vocabant*; Ephorus ap. Macrob. *Sat.* 5.18.7 = *FGrHist* 70 F 20a τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ποταμοῖς οἱ πλησιόχωροι μόνοι θύουσιν, τὸν δὲ Ἀχελῶν μόνον πάντας ἀνθρώπους συμβέβηκεν τιμᾶν, οὐ τοῖς κοινοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀντὶ τῶν ἰδίων <ὀνομάζοντες τοὺς ἄλλους ποταμούς, ἀλλὰ> τοῦ Ἀχελῶου τὴν ἰδίαν ἐπωνυμίαν ἐπὶ τὸ κοινὸν μεταφέροντας. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὕδωρ ὅλως, ὅπερ ἐστὶν κοινὸν ὄνομα, ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐκείνου προσηγορίας Ἀχελῶν καλοῦμεν, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ὀνομάτων τὰ κοινὰ πολλάκις ἀντὶ τῶν ἰδίων ὀνομάζομεν τοὺς μὲν Ἀθηναίους Ἴωνας, τοὺς δὲ Λακεδαιμονίους Πελοποννησίους ἀποκαλοῦντες. τούτου δὲ τοῦ ἀπορήματος οὐδὲν ἔχομεν αἰτιώτατον εἰπεῖν ἢ τοὺς ἐκ Δωδώνης χρησμούς· σχεδὸν γὰρ ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτοῖς προστάττειν ὁ θεὸς εἴωθεν Ἀχελῶφ θύειν, ὥστε πολλοὶ νομίζοντες οὐ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν διὰ τῆς Ἀκαρνανίας ῥέοντα, ἀλλὰ τὸ σύνολον ὕδωρ Ἀχελῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ χρησμοῦ καλεῖσθαι, μιμοῦνται τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ προσηγορίας. σημεῖον δὲ ὅτι πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀναφέροντες οὕτω λέγειν εἴωθαμεν· μάλιστα γὰρ τὸ ὕδωρ Ἀχελῶν προσαγορεύομεν ἐν τοῖς ὄρκοις καὶ ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις, ἅπερ πάντα περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς. Note also Schol. ad *Il.* 21.195 (*P.Oxy.* 221 col. 9.21) Ἐφορος δ' ἐν β' [φησὶ] τὸ ἐν Δωδώνηι μαντεῖον σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς

χρημοῖς προστάπτειν Ἀχελώω θύειν, ὅθεν τοὺς Ἑλληνας πάν[τ]αῶ[.]
ποταμὸν νομίζειν Ἀχελῶον. See further Betegh 215-17. Note, however, *Il.*
21.194-5, where Acheloius and Oceanus are distinguished
(οὐδέ...Ἀχελώιος...οὐδέ...Ὠκεανός).

ἐγκῶαῶτῶίελεῖξ': Although the Author glosses this word (in the infinitive) as
ἐῶγῶκῶαῶτῶῶ[σ]αῶῶ, a *hapax* presumably meaning something like
“push down in(to),” an unknown sense of ἐγκαταλέγω, it may be that Orpheus'
meaning is “assigned/allotted,” as in Hsch. ε 210 ἐγκεκλάρωται· ἐγκαταλέγει
(the first word is not in LSJ; nor is this meaning of the latter). The meaning can
now be something like “Zeus assigned the veins of Acheloius”; that is, with
Acheloius = water in general—not merely because the Author says so, but
because D'Alessio has shown that this is indeed an early belief—“Zeus allotted
each of the veins of water,” which now means that Zeus ordered the disposition
of the earth's various bodies of water (πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα |
καὶ πᾶσαι κρῆναι καὶ φρέατα μακρά, *Il.* 21.196-7, introduced by ἐξ οὗ, whose
reference D'Alessio shows is Acheloius, not Oceanus).

Thus the primary sense of ἴνας is indeed “sinews” or “veins,” not
“strength,” although as D'Alessio argues, the latter is not totally to be precluded
from the semantic range of this word in poetic texts, especially given μέγα
σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο (*Il.* 18.607 = 21.195). Veins, though, are to be understood
metaphorically as the various flowing bodies of water, all of which derive from
Oceanus/Acheloius—in other words “the veins of Acheloius” is a kenning, as
West saw, comparing Choerilus 2 *TrGF* γῆς φλέβας [sc. τοὺς ποταμούς]; cf. I.
Wærn, *GHΣ ΟΣΤΕΑ: The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry* (Uppsala 1951) 95-
6. The image is repeated in [Hipp.] *De Hebdomadibus* c.6 1.22 ff. R. *aqua ...*
fluminum imitatio est venae et qui in venis est sanguinis, a text dated ca. 60-30 BC by

J. Mansfeld, *The Pseudo-Hippocratic Tract ΠΕΡΙ ἙΒΔΟΜΑΔΩΝ Ch. 1-11 and Greek Philosophy* (Assen 1970) 229-30. That is, the Author has taken the Homeric ἴς ποταμοῖο (*Il.* 21.356), where the sense is “the river’s strength,” made it plural and returned the metaphor to its original meaning. Note too that the Choerilus phrase is parallel only with φλέβες = ἴνες; the genitives are different. γῆς is possessive; Ἀχελῷου is the same to a certain extent (they are indeed his veins), but also and more so genitive of material; i.e., veins (consisting) of water.

This sense seems preferable to that of LSJ s.v. 1 “build in,” for which they adduce Thuc. 1.93.2 *πολλάι τε στῆλαι ἀπὸ σημάτων καὶ λίθοι εἰργασμένοι ἐγκατελέγησαν* and (in the Suppl.) Call. *Aetia* fr. 64.7 Pf. (*The Tomb of Simonides*) *πύργω δ’ ἐγκατέλεξεν ἐμὴν λίθον*, where the reference (the embedding of carved stelae into other structures) is so close to Thucydides’ that one wonders whether there is an allusion here to Simonidean inscribed epigrams’ being used to build Themistocles’ long walls. See also Suda ε 77 *Ἐγκατελέγησαν λίθοι: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐγκατωκοδομήθησαν*. (LSJ s.v. *καταλέγω* confounds the two semantically distinct λέγω’s.)

22 ἢ πολλοῖς φαίνει μερόπεσσ’ ἐπ’ ἀπείρονα γαῖαν

Since immediately before adducing this line, the Author says the following of the moon: *ὅσα δ[ὲ μ]ῆ κυκλοειδέα οὐχ οἷόν τε ἰσομελῆ εἶναι*, it seems almost certain that he found the hexametrical *hapax ἰσομελῆ* (though not necessarily in the accusative) in a nearby verse, which, context suggests, must apply to the moon. Merkelbach tentatively conjectured *ἰσομελῆς δ’ ἄρ’ ὑπέρβαλεν ἄστρα σελήνη*. For a moon with limbs, cf. Emped. B 31, which refers to the *γυῖα* of the Sphere; see further Kouremenos ad loc., against Betegh 247-8, who prefers to take

the "limbs" literally and have them refer to the horns of the moon. These do in fact figure in many lunar descriptions, but this epithet is largely meaningless, since the horns must needs always be equal. All that can differ is whether the line drawn through the points of the horn are upright or tilted; cf. Theophr. *De Signis* 27.

This verse is introduced with the words δηλοῖ δὲ τόδε, which elsewhere in the papyrus assumes a poet as subject, most likely Orpheus, although in these cases the verb is fleshed out with ἐν τούτῳ/τούτοις. Kouremenos would thus seem to be justified in assuming τὸ ἔπος as subject here from the words of the Author immediately following: τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος δόξειεν ἄν τις ἄλλως εἰρησθαι.

ἦ: Selene, as the Author's context makes clear. Elsewhere in Orphic literature, Zeus is either simply equated with Selene (Ζεὺς Ἥλιος ἠδὲ Σελήνη 31.6 F), or, in a descriptive passage on Zeus' body reminiscent of the Metaphysical poets, the sun and the moon are his eyes, ὄμματα δ' ἠελίος τε καὶ ἀντιόωσα σελήνη (243.16 F). In another fragment, Selene is listed with, fire, water, earth, heaven, Phanes, and night as the ἀθανάτων γεννήτορας (619 F). There is nothing so overtly theological or allegorical in this isolated line, but it could readily serve as a descriptive expansion in such a context. Cf. Hes. *Th.* 372 ἦ πάντεσσι ἐπιχθονίοισιν φαίνει.

ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν: = *Il.* 7.446, *Od.* 25.79, 17.386, Hes. *Th.* 187, *Op.* 487, fr. 43a.83 (same sedes); *Il.* 24.342, *Od.* 1.98,

23 [αὐτ]ᾶρῶ [ἐ]πῶει δ[ὲ] πᾶν]τῶα Διὸς νοῦς μή]σατῶ [ο ἔ]ρῶγῶα

[αὐτ]ᾶρῶ [ἐ]πῶει δ[ὲ]: 28 X in Homer, and often in the *Homeric Hymns*.

νοῦς: The φρήν can be "turned" (of Zeus; *Il.* 10.45), and can remember, learn, and experience various feelings, but, although there is no reason why the *phren* should not actively plan and execute, nowhere in early Greek literature does it actually do so. It is significant that the only time the nominative singular occurs in Homer (see above), it is the subject of a passive verb. The plural nom. is common in Homer, but whether steadfast or not, they do serve in any executive role; note e.g. *Il.* 1.103-4 = *Od.* 4.661 μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφιμέλαιναι πίμπλαντ', 10.10 τρομέοντο δὲ οἱ φρένες ἐντός. Elsewhere mental activity occurs *in* or *in accord with* one's *phren*; cf. S. D. Sullivan, *Psychological Activity in Homer* (Ottawa 1988) 188, "nowhere [sc. in Homer] will it be said that it is *phrenes* that make a choice." The closest one finds in later literature are several passages where one's own *phren* "makes" or "puts" a person in one or another state of mind; cf. Aristoph. *Aes. Pers.* 769 φρένες γὰρ αὐτοῦ θυμὸν ῥακοστρόφουν, Aristoph. *Lys.* 708-9. Note, though, *Aes. Suppl.* 598-9 ἔπος σπεῦσαί τι τῶν βούλιος φέρει φρήν, Eur. *IT* 655 ἔτι γὰρ ἀμφίλογα δίδυμα μέμονε φρήν.

Nous, on the other hand, unlike *phren*, figures often in the Author's text, sometimes suggesting that it was in an Orphic verse, most notably soon after quoting 23: col. 26.1 μήτηρ ὁ Νοῦῶδες ἔστιν τῶν ἄλλωνῶ. *Nous*, furthermore, plays an active role in the formation of the universe in Anaxagoras' cosmology; cf. B 12 καὶ γνώμην γε περὶ παντὸς πᾶσαν ἴσχει καὶ ἰσχύει μέγιστον [sc. νοῦς]· καὶ ὅσα γε ψυχὴν ἔχει καὶ τὰ μείζω καὶ τὰ ἐλάσσω, πάντων νοῦς κρατεῖ. καὶ τῆς περιχωρήσιος τῆς συμπάσης νοῦς ἐκράτησεν, ὥστε περιχωρησαὶ τὴν ἀρχήν....καὶ τὰ συμμιγόμενά τε καὶ ἀποκρινόμενα καὶ διακρινόμενα πάντα ἔγνω νοῦς. καὶ ὅποια ἔμελλεν ἔσεσθαι καὶ ὅποια ἦν, ἄσσα νῦν μὴ ἔστι, καὶ ὅσα νῦν ἔστι καὶ ὅποια ἔσται, πάντα διεκόσμησε νοῦς, καὶ τὴν περιχώρησιν

ταύτην, ἦν νῦν περὶ χωρέει τά τε ἄστρα καὶ ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη καὶ ὁ ἀήρ
καὶ ὁ αἰθήρ οἱ ἀποκρινόμενοι; see also B 13. Note too Eur. *Tr.* 886 Ζεὺς εἴτ'
ἀνάγκη φύσεος εἴτε νοῦς βροτῶν. This would provide yet another link between
the Papyrus and Anaxagoras, and perhaps Diogenes of Apollonia as well; cf. W.
Burkert, "Orpheus und die Vorsokratiker," *A&A* 14 (1968) 93-114; Janko (2002) 3-4;
A. Laks, *Diogène d'Apollonie*² (Sankt Augustin 2008) 269-74 ("À propos du
papyrus de Derveni").

Normally one should not restore in violation of Naeke's (or anybody's)
law, but this is acceptable here (whether with νοῦς with or φρήν) because in our
small sample of Orphic verses in the papyrus we find **13.1** αἰδοίου|⁸, **16** Δῶιός δ'
ἐκ ᾧ|⁸ (where ἐκ looks backward not forward), and **18** ἀπάντων|⁸

μή]σατῶ [ο ἔ]ρωγῶαῶ: As in *Il.* 10.289, *Od.* 3.261, 24.199, 24.444, *Hes. Th.* 166,
172.

24 μητρὸς ἐᾶς ἔθελεν μιχθήμεναι ἐν φιλότῃτι

As the app. crit. shows, this verse can be regarded only as a recreation *exempli gratia*, however reasonable and attractive, and as such does not warrant much comment.

μιχθήμεναι ἐν φιλότῃτι: The preposition is not necessary, but cf. *Il.* 2..232
μίσγειαι ἐν φιλότῃτι, 14.237 παραλέξομαι ἐν φιλότῃτι, *HHom* 13.5 *init.* μιχθεῖσ'
ἐν φιλότῃτι.