

## **Presocratics and Papyrological Tradition**



# **Studia Praesocratica**



Herausgegeben von / Edited by  
Richard McKirahan, Denis O'Brien, Oliver Primavesi,  
Christoph Riedweg, David Sider, Gotthard Strohmaier,  
Georg Wöhrle

**Band / Volume 10**



# **Presocratics and Papyrological Tradition**

---

## **A Philosophical Reappraisal of the Sources**

Proceedings of the International Workshop held  
at the University of Trier (22–24 September 2016)

Edited by  
Christian Vassallo

**DE GRUYTER**



Funded by the Schwarz-Liebermann Stiftung im Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft  
and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)

ISBN 978-3-11-066321-1

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-066610-6

ISSN 1869-7143

**Library of Congress Control Number: 2019937407**

**Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;  
detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2019 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)



# Contents

## Abbreviations — IX

Christian Vassallo

## **Introduction. The Presocratics from Derveni to Herculaneum: A New Look at Early Greek Philosophy — 1**

## **Part I: Orpheus and the Orphic Tradition**

Alberto Bernabé and Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal

### **1 Two Aspects of the Orphic Papyrological Tradition: PGurob 1 and the Greek Magic Rolls — 17**

David N. Sedley

### **2 The Opening Lemmas of the Derveni Papyrus — 45**

Richard D. McKirahan

### **3 Some Controversial Topics in the Derveni Cosmology — 73**

Marco A. Santamaría

### **4 Pherecydes of Syros in the Papyrological Tradition — 91**

## **Part II: Pythagoreanism and Beyond**

Leonid Zhmud

### **5 The Papyrological Tradition on Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans — 111**

Kilian J. Fleischer

### **6 Philolaus' Book(s) in Philodemus' *Index Academicorum* — 147**

Aldo Brancacci

### **7 Music and Philosophy in Damon of Oa — 161**



### Part III: Heraclitus

Gábor Betegh and Valeria Piano

- 8 Column IV of the Derveni Papyrus: A New Analysis of the Text and the Quotation of Heraclitus — 179**

Graziano Ranocchia

- 9 Heraclitus' Portrait in Diogenes Laërtius and Philodemus' *On Arrogance* — 221**

### Part IV: Empedocles

Mirjam E. Kotwick

- 10 Aphrodite's Cosmic Power: Empedocles in the Derveni Papyrus — 251**

Simon Trépanier

- 11 Empedocles on the Origin of Plants: *PStrasb. gr.* inv. 1665–1666, Sections d, b, and f — 271**

Giuliana Leone

- 12 Empedocles in the Herculaneum Papyri: An Update — 299**

### Part V: Anaxagoras and his School

Christian Vassallo (with a Foreword by David Sider)

- 13 Anaxagoras from Egypt to Herculaneum: A Contribution to the History of Ancient 'Atheism' — 335**

Michael Pozdnev

- 14 Metrodorus the Allegorist as Reflected in Philodemus' *On Poems*, Book 2: *PHerc.* 1676, col. 2 + *N* 1081, col. 12 (= 61 A 4 DK; Test. 34.3 Lanata) — 415**

### Part VI: Early Atomists

Enrico Piergiacomini

- 15 Democritus' Doctrine of *Eidola* in the Herculaneum Papyri: A Reassessment of the Sources — 437**



Tiziano Dorandi

**16 Anaxarchus from Egypt to Herculaneum — 473**

## **Part VII: The Sophistic Movement**

Andrei Lebedev

**17 The Authorship of the Derveni Papyrus, A Sophistic Treatise on the Origin of Religion and Language: A Case for Prodicus of Ceos — 491**

## **Part VIII: The Papyrological Tradition and Doxographical Questions**

Jaap Mansfeld

**18 Lists of Principles and Lists of Gods: Philodemus, Cicero, Aëtius, and Others — 609**

## **Indices**

**Index locorum — 633**

**Index nominum antiquorum — 679**

**Index nominum recentiorum — 687**







# Abbreviations

- ANRW** Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, Berlin/New York, 1972–.
- AOP** *Archivio dell'Officina dei Papiri Ercolanesi*, Biblioteca Nazionale “Vittorio Emanuele III” di Napoli (cf. *Manus online*).
- Arr.<sup>2</sup>** Graziano Arrighetti (ed.), *Epicuro: Opere*, Turin 1973<sup>2</sup> (1st ed. 1960).
- BNJ** Ian Worthington (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby: The Fragments of the Greek Historians*, 3 vols., Leiden 2015 (Jacoby online: <http://www.brill.com/publications/online-resources/jacoby-online>).
- CAG** *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, edita consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae, 23 vols. and 3 suppl., Berlin 1882–1909.
- CatPErc** Marcello Gigante (ed.), *Catalogo dei Papiri Ercolanesi*, Naples 1979 (cf. [http://cispe.org/language\\_en/biblioteca.mvd](http://cispe.org/language_en/biblioteca.mvd)).
- Chartes** Gianluca Del Mastro (ed.), *Catalogo dei Papiri Ercolanesi online*, CISPE, Naples 2005 (cf. <http://www.chartes.it>).
- CPF** *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini: Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina*, I: *Autori noti*, vols. 1\*–1\*\*\*, Florence 1989–1999.
- CPH** Christian Vassallo (ed.), *Corpus Praesocraticorum Herculanense*, in: Id., *The Presocratics in the Herculaneum Papyri: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, Berlin/Boston, forthcoming.
- DAPR** Christian Vassallo (ed.), *Doxographica Anaxagorea in Papyris Reperta*, in: Id., “Anaxagoras from Egypt to Herculaneum: A Contribution to the History of Ancient Atheism”, in this volume, pp. 339–368.
- DG** Hermann Diels (ed.), *Doxographi Graeci*, Berlin 1879; 1965<sup>4</sup> (repr.).
- DK** Hermann Diels (ed.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, sechste verbesserte Auflage hrsg. von Walter Kranz, 3 vols., Berlin 1951–1952<sup>6</sup> (1st ed. 1903).
- DPhA** Richard Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques*, 7 vols., Paris 1989–2018.
- GE** Hermann Usener, *Glossarium Epicureum*, edendum curaverunt Marcello Gigante et Wolfgang Schmid, Rome 1977.
- EAGLL** Georgios K. Giannakis, *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 3 vols., Leiden/Boston 2014.
- EGPh** André Laks and Glenn W. Most (eds.), *Early Greek Philosophy*, in collaboration with Gerard Journée and assisted by Leopoldo Iribarren, 9 vols., Cambridge (MA)/London 2016; French edition: *Les débuts de la philosophie grecque*, édition, avec la collaboration de Gérard Journée et le concours de Leopoldo Iribarren et David LévyStone, Paris 2016.
- EK** Ludwig Edelstein and Ian G. Kidd (eds.), *Posidonius*, vol. 1: *The Fragments*, Cambridge 1989<sup>2</sup> (1st ed. 1972).
- FGrHist** Felix Jacoby (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 16 vols., Berlin 1923–1958 (now CD-ROM ed., Leiden 2005).
- FHG** Karl Müller (ed.), *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, 5 vols., Paris 1841–1870.
- FHS&G** William W. Fortenbaugh, Pamela M. Huby, Robert W. Sharples and Dimitri Gutas (eds.), *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*, 2 parts, Leiden/New York/Cologne 1992.



- GG Gustav Uhlig and Alfred Hilgard (eds.), *Grammatici Graeci*, 4 vols., Leipzig 1883–1910 (repr. Hildesheim 1965).
- GGPh Friedrich Überweg (ed.), *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*; Hellmut Flashar, Dieter Bremer and Georg Rechenauer (eds.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*, vol. 1: *Frühgriechische Philosophie*, 2 parts, Basel 2013.
- GCS *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, Leipzig 1897–.
- IGUR Luigi Moretti (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae*, Rome 1968–1990.
- IPerg. Max Fränkel (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*, 2 vols., Berlin 1890–1895.
- IPPH Christian Vassallo (ed.), *Index Praesocraticorum Philosophorum Herculaneensis*, in: Id., “A Catalogue of the Evidence for Presocratics in the Herculaneum Papyri”, in: *APF* 62 (2016) 78–108.
- KPT Theokritos Kouremenos, George M. Parássoglou and Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou (eds.), *The Derveni Papyrus, Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Florence 2006 (available online on the website of the Center for Hellenic Studies: <http://dp.chs.harvard.edu/index.php?col=1&ed=KPT>).
- KRS Geoffrey S. Kirk, John E. Raven and Malcolm Schofield (eds.), *The Presocratic Philosophers*, Cambridge 1983<sup>2</sup> (1st ed. 1957).
- LDAB Willy Clarysse et al. (eds.), *Leuven Database of Ancient Books online* (cf. <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/help.php>).
- LSJ Henry G. Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, revised and augmented throughout by Henry S. Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie, Oxford 1940<sup>9</sup> (1st ed. 1843; with a revised supplement 1996).
- MansPr Jaap Mansfeld and Oliver Primavesi (eds.), *Die Vorsokratiker*, Stuttgart 2011<sup>2</sup> (1st ed. 1983).
- M&P Alain Martin and Oliver Primavesi (eds.), *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg* (P. Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665–1666): *Introduction, édition et commentaire*, Berlin/New York/Strasbourg 1999.
- MP<sup>3</sup> Paul Mertens and Roger A. Pack (eds.), *Catalogue des Papyrus littéraires grecs et latins online*, Université de Liège: Centre de Documentation de Papyrologie Littéraire (CEDOPAL), ed. by Paul Mertens, 3rd ed. by Roger A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, Ann Arbor 1965<sup>2</sup> (1st ed. 1952; cf. <http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/index.htm>).
- M&R1 Jaap Mansfeld and David Th. Runia (eds.), *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. 1: *The Sources*, Leiden/Boston 1997.
- M&R2 Jaap Mansfeld and David Th. Runia (eds.), *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. 2: *The Compendium*, part I: *Macrostructure and Microcontext*; part II: *Aëtius Book II: Specimen Reconstructionis*, Leiden/Boston 2009.
- M&R3 Jaap Mansfeld and David Th. Runia (eds.), *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. 3: *Studies in the Doxographical Traditions of Greek Philosophy*, Leiden/Boston 2010.
- M&R4 Jaap Mansfeld and David Th. Runia (eds.), *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. 4: *Towards an Edition of the Aëtian Placita: Papers of the Melbourne Colloquium, 1–3 December 2015*, Leiden/Boston 2018.
- M&R5 Jaap Mansfeld and David Th. Runia (eds.), *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. 5: *An Edition of the Reconstructed Text of the Placita, with a Commentary and a Selection of Parallel Passages*, Leiden/Boston, in press.



<i>OCD</i>	Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth (eds.), with the assistance of Esther Eidinow, <i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> , Oxford 2012 <sup>4</sup> (1st ed. 1949).
<i>OF (vel PEG)</i>	Alberto Bernabé (ed.), <i>Poetae Epici Graeci Testimonia et fragmenta</i> , II.1–2: <i>Orphicorum et Orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta</i> , Munich/Leipzig 2004–2005; II.3: <i>Musaeus; Linus; Epimenides; Papyrus Derveni; Indices</i> , Berlin/ New York 2007.
<i>PCG</i>	Rudolf Kassel and Colin Austin (eds.), <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , 8 vols., Berlin/ New York 1983–2001.
<i>PG</i>	Jean-Paul Migne (ed.), <i>Patrologiae cursus completus, omnium SS. Patrum, Doctorum Scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum: Series Graeca</i> , 161 vols., Paris 1857–1903.
<i>PMG</i>	Denys L. Page (ed.), <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> , Oxford 1962.
<i>RE</i>	August F. Pauly, Georg Wissowa, Wilhelm Kroll <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , 84 vols., Stuttgart/Munich 1894–1980.
<i>SGDI</i>	Hermann Collitz and Friedrich Bechtel <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften</i> , 4 vols., Göttingen 1884–1915.
<i>SFOD<sup>a</sup></i>	Peter Stork, William W. Fortenbaugh, Johannes M. van Ophuijsen and Tiziano Dorandi, “Lycon of Troas: The Sources, Text and Translation”, in: William W. Fortenbaugh and Stephen A. White (eds.), <i>Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes: Text, Translation, and Discussion</i> , New Brunswick/London 2004, 1–78.
<i>SFOD<sup>b</sup></i>	Peter Stork, William W. Fortenbaugh, Johannes M. van Ophuijsen and Tiziano Dorandi, “Aristo of Ceos: The Sources, Text and Translation”, in: William W. Fortenbaugh and Stephen A. White (eds.), <i>Aristo of Ceos: Text, Translation, and Discussion</i> , New Brunswick/London 2006, 1–177.
<i>SH</i>	Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Peter J. Parsons (eds.), <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> , rev. by Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, 2 vols., Berlin/New York 2011 (repr. of the 1st ed. 1983 in only one volume).
<i>SIG</i>	Wilhelm Dittenberger (ed.), <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , Leipzig 1915–1924.
<i>SLG</i>	Denys L. Page (ed.), <i>Supplementum Lyricis Graecis: Poetarum lyricorum Graecorum fragmenta quae recens innotuerunt</i> , Oxford 1974.
<i>SOD</i>	Peter Stork, Jan M. van Ophuijsen and Tiziano Dorandi, “Demetrius of Phalerum: The Sources, Text and Translation”, in: William W. Fortenbaugh and Eckart Schütrumpf (eds.), <i>Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion</i> , New Brunswick/London 1999, 1–310.
<i>SSR</i>	Gabriele Giannantoni (ed.), <i>Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae</i> , 4 vols., Naples 1990.
<i>SVF</i>	Hans von Arnim (ed.), <i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> , vol. 1: <i>Zeno et Zenonis discipuli</i> ; vol. 2: <i>Chrysippi fragmenta. Logica et physica</i> ; vol. 3: <i>Chrysippi fragmenta moralia. Fragmenta successorum Chrysippi</i> , Leipzig 1903–1905; vol. 4: <i>Indices</i> , curavit Maximilian Adler, Leipzig 1924.
<i>TAM</i>	Ernst Kalinka (ed.), <i>Tituli Asiae Minoris</i> , Wien 1901–.
<i>TLG</i>	Maria Pantelia <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Tesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature online</i> , University of California, Irvine 2001– (cf. <a href="http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu">www//stephanus.tlg.uci.edu</a> ).
<i>TM</i>	Mark Depauw and Tom Gheldof, “Trismegistos. An interdisciplinary Platform for Ancient World Texts and Related Information”, in: Łukasz Bolikowski, Vittore Casarosa, Paula Goodale, Nikos Houssos, Paolo Manghi and Jochen Schirrwagen (eds.), <i>Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries–TPDL 2013 Selected Workshops</i> , Cham 2014, 40–52 (cf. <a href="http://www.trismegistos.org">http://www.trismegistos.org</a> ).



TP1 <sup>[D]</sup>	Georg Wöhrle (ed.), <i>Die Milesier: Thales</i> , mit einem Beitrag von Gotthard Strohmaier, Berlin 2009.
TP1 <sup>[E]</sup>	Georg Wöhrle (ed.), <i>The Milesians: Thales</i> , Translation and additional material by Richard D. McKirahan, with the collaboration of Ahmed Alwishah, with an introduction by Georg Wöhrle and Gotthard Strohmaier, Berlin 2014.
TP2	Georg Wöhrle (ed.), <i>Die Milesier: Anaximander und Anaximenes</i> , mit Beiträgen von Oliver Overwien, Berlin/Boston 2012.
TP3	Benedikt Strobel and Georg Wöhrle (eds.), <i>Xenophanes von Kolophon</i> , in Zusammenarbeit mit Elvira Wakelnig, mit Beiträgen von Christian Vassallo, Berlin/Boston 2018.
TrGF	Bruno Snell, Stefan L. Radt and Richard Kannicht (eds.), <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , 6 vols., Göttingen 1971–2004 (2nd ed. vol. 1, 1986).
Us.	Hermann Usener (ed.), <i>Epicurea</i> , Leipzig 1887.
Van Haelst	Joseph van Haelst (ed.), <i>Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens</i> , Paris 1976 (cf. <a href="http://www.ucl.ac.uk/GrandLat/research/christianpapyri.htm">http://www.ucl.ac.uk/GrandLat/research/christianpapyri.htm</a> ).
VH <sup>1</sup>	<i>Herculaneensium Voluminum quae supersunt: Collectio prior</i> , voll. I–XI, Naples 1793–1855.
VH <sup>2</sup>	<i>Herculaneensium Voluminum quae supersunt: Collectio altera</i> , voll. I–XI, Naples 1862–1876.

**Note:** The abbreviations of the names of ancient authors and their works generally follow those of the *OCD*. The acronyms for scientific journals are based on the conventions published in *L'Année Philologique*. Those of all the papyri can be easily found in the *LDAB*. As for the quotation criteria of the papyri, note that I have conventionally decided to distinguish the indication of the columns of the Herculaneum papyri from that of the columns of the Derveni Papyrus and of the Graeco-Egyptian papyri: for the former Arabic numerals are used (except in those cases where a distinction is necessary, for example the columns of the papyri belonging to Epicurus' *On Nature*, Book 2), for the latter Roman ones. This choice is due to the yet far from standardized state of the editions of the Herculanean texts and to the remarkably different criteria adopted by the various editors. This criterion, however, is not intended to isolate Herculanean papyrology from the other fields of the papyrological science: indeed, the very opposite is one of the main aims of this volume.



Christian Vassallo  
**Introduction**

**The Presocratics from Derveni to Herculaneum:  
A New Look at Early Greek Philosophy**

*Tardi ingenii est rivulos consecrari, fontes rerum non videre* (Cic. *De or.* 2.27.117). This quotation, which Hermann Diels chose as the epigraph of his renowned *Doxographi Graeci*, best sums up the aim of the International Workshop *Presocratics and Papyrological Tradition / Vorsokratiker und papyrologische Überlieferung* held at the University of Trier on 22–24 September, 2016. On that occasion a team of specialists<sup>1</sup> discussed some of the most famous papyrological texts, with special regard to the problems of interpreting and editing the testimonia of Presocratic philosophy. These texts hand down important pieces of evidence concerning not only the life and works of the Presocratics, but also their thought and reception in the history of ancient philosophy. Furthermore, they help to increase our knowledge of how Presocratic philosophy – through contributions to physics, cosmology, ethics, ontology, theology, anthropology, hermeneutics, and ‘aesthetics’ (especially poetry and music) – paved the way for the canonic scientific fields of European culture. In accordance with the aim of the conference,

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to mention and thank all them here: Katrin Beer, Alberto Bernabé, Aldo Brancacci, Gábor Betegh, Stephan Busch, Sylvana Chrysakopoulou, Tiziano Dorandi, Alexander Egorov, Holger Essler, Sandra Fait, Kilian J. Fleischer, Maria S. Funghi, Jonathan Griffiths, Victor Gyssembergh, Oliver Hellmann, Gérard Journée, Mirjam E. Kotwick, Bärbel Kramer, Manfred Kraus, André Laks, Andrei Lebedev, Giuliana Leone, Jaap Mansfeld, Richard D. McKirahan, Gabriella Messeri, Glenn W. Most, Fabia Neuerburg, Valeria Piano, Enrico Piergiacomini, Michael Pozdnev, Graziano Ranocchia, Fabian Reiter, Marco A. Santamaría, Andreas Schwab, Johannes Schwind, David N. Sedley, Benedikt Strobel, Simon Trépanier, Piotr Wozniczka, and Leonid Zhmud. A special thanks goes to Georg Wöhrle, for his personal and scientific help at each stage in the organization of the conference, and to the president of the University of Trier Michael Jäckel, for supporting the initiative and accepting to introduce it. My gratitude also goes to my collaborators Spyridoula Bounta (in particular for the guided visit to the *Papyrussammlung* of the University of Trier), Dennis Kaden, Simon Keßler, Stefan Schließmeyer, and Tobias Tack. Many thanks to India Moore Watkins for helping me in general revision of the English texts; to Selene I. S. Brumana for translating Dorandi’s paper into English; and Leonardo Franchi for helping me to translate Brancacci’s paper into English. Obviously, I cannot forget the friendly cooperation of the administrative personnel of the University of Trier, especially of Pia Breit, Silvia Carlitz, Christiane Schwind, and Alexandra Wagner-Casser.



the papers tackled published and partly unpublished papyrological texts and, for the first time in the field of Presocratic studies, also consistently dealt with the Herculanean sources, including the Graeco-Egyptian rolls and the Derveni Papyrus. The present volume gathers the proceedings of this International Workshop and contains various contributions (both by the speakers and by some of the participants in the discussion) encompassing the entire history of Presocratic philosophy and its reception in antiquity, and dealing with several topics in early Greek thought from the Orphics to the Sophists.<sup>2</sup> In doing so, the work conventionally accepts the wider meaning of the word ‘Presocratics’ adopted by Diels, whilst bearing in mind both the advantages and the downsides of this by now classical (and almost irreplaceable) label.

The volume is divided into eight sections. Section 1 deals with Orpheus and the Orphic tradition. The first contribution by **Alberto Bernabé** and **Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal** (*Two Aspects of the Orphic Papyrological Tradition: PGurob 1, and the Greek Magic Rolls*) is devoted to *PGurob 1* and the Greek Magic Rolls. *Gurob Papyrus 1* (3rd cent. BC) is an important document relevant to the study of Orphism that describes a series of ritualistic provisions, including discursive sections in which ritual actions are emphasized, as well as the words that must be pronounced in the ritual. The paper examines in detail the features of the ritual (δρώμενα and λεγόμενα) and points out that they are found all together only in the Orphic tradition. Therefore, according to the authors we must stop saying that the *Gurob Papyrus* is an eclectic Eleusinian, Orphic, and Dionysian document, because it reflects a genuine, unadulterated Orphic ritual. Furthermore, Orphism’s connection with the magical papyrus is established in the paper in three ways: a) a Greek magical papyrus where Bernabé and Jiménez San Cristóbal read: γράφε τὸν λόγον τὸν Ὀρφαϊκόν, b) a well-known formula, the so-called *Ephesia Grammata*, and c) the *epodai* in lead inscriptions from Crete and the South of Italy.

In the same section, two interesting papers open the debate on the Derveni Papyrus, which continues with other contributions in the volume and deals with several philosophical aspects of this intriguing text. **David N. Sedley** (*The Opening Lemmas of the Derveni Papyrus*) maintains that from col. VII down to

---

<sup>2</sup> The only Presocratics not taken into consideration in the volume are Xenophanes and the Eleatics. In order to complete the inquiry, I refer to the collection of the extant evidence to be found in the *CPF* and, for the Herculanean testimonia, to Vassallo (2014) and (2016b) along with the list of the evidence to be found in the *IPPH*. For an overview, see also the appendix in Vassallo (2016a). With regard to Xenophanes, I refer now to the new edition *TP3*, of which a very interesting preview was given by Benedikt Strobel and Georg Wöhrle during the International Workshop at Trier.



its ending in col. XXVI, the Derveni Papyrus is a cosmogonic commentary on an Orphic hymn. He argues that cols. I–VI are not, as has been assumed until now, a separate disquisition, but the opening part of the same commentary, addressing a now-lost initial lemma in which the Eumenides were invoked. Starting from this hypothesis, the scholar seeks to identify the first five lemmas of the commentary, with the help of revised texts and interpretations of cols. I, IV, and VII of the papyrus.

**Richard D. McKirahan** (*Some Controversial Topics in the Derveni Cosmology*) examines in depth the cosmological aspects of the Derveni text. In particular, the paper addresses, in light of recent discussions, five controversial issues important for understanding the cosmology of the Derveni Papyrus, by attempting to answer the following questions: a) When did the sun first come into being? b) Where does night fit into the cosmogony? c) What is the meaning of ἐπικρατεῖν? d) In what sense are all things called Zeus? and e) Will the cosmos last forever?

This outline of the papyrological tradition of the earliest Greek philosophy is completed by **Marco A. Santamaría** (*Pherecydes of Syros in the Papyrological Tradition*). His contribution tackles the longest fragment from Pherecydes of Syros' lost book, which comes from an Oxyrhynchus papyrus published by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt in 1897 (*PGrenf.* II 11 = fr. 68 Schibli). Two passages mentioning the author in two Herculaneum papyri must be added to this fragment: Phld. *De piet.*, *PHerc.* 247, col. 6a (*sin. pars*).6–22 Henrichs and [Phld.] [*Hist. philosoph.*?], *PHerc.* 1788, col. 1 Vassallo, both of which are accurately examined by the scholar.<sup>3</sup>

Section 2 of the volume analyzes some topical aspects of the papyrological tradition of Pythagoreanism (and beyond). **Leonid Zhmud** (*The Papyrological Tradition on Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans*) provides a very useful overview of the papyrological evidence for Pythagoras and (to a lesser extent) the Pythagoreans, which is collected in the *CPF* and now in the *IPPH*.<sup>4</sup> The scholar shows how some of this scattered evidence can be coherently brought together and provides clues as to the history of Pythagoreanism, while also pointing to other evidence that is worthy of fresh consideration. Practically all the testimonia of the Herculaneum papyri come from Philodemus' writings; they concern Pythagoras, not

---

<sup>3</sup> The original version of Santamaría's paper read in Trier contained a useful *excursus* on the *Sayings of the Seven Wise Men* as well. As is widely known, there are fragments of these *Sayings* in several papyri and *ostraka* from different periods and places, which were compared by the scholar with certain inscriptions and collections preserved through medieval manuscripts. As regards the papyrological tradition of Thales, I would like to refer to Vassallo (2015) esp. 280–293.

<sup>4</sup> As regards the relationship between the Pythagoreans and the Derveni Papyrus, see Betegh (2013).



the Pythagoreans, and are of a biographical more than doxographical character. Philodemus' evidence reflects the early Hellenistic stage of the Pythagorean tradition, before the rise of Neopythagoreanism and the ps.-Pythagorean literature related to it. Later evidence reveals a new perspective on Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans as the philosophical precursors of Plato.

**Kilian J. Fleischer** (*Philolaus' Book[s] in Philodemus' Index Academicorum*) discusses a familiar piece of information concerning Philolaus in the light of a new Herculanian testimonium. Diogenes Laërtius (8.85) reports that Philolaus sold Pythagoras' unpublished books to Plato and, as told in a kind of alternative version, that Philolaus' relatives sold his book to Plato. In each version a huge amount of money is mentioned. Rather recently a passage of Philodemus' *History of the Academy* (PHerc. 1691, col. 2) was discovered that seems to deal with the purchase of Pythagorean books through Plato and the history of their editions. Fleischer demonstrates how a reappraisal of the passage<sup>5</sup> might shed some new light on its credibility and on the details of the transaction. In particular, the question is discussed of exactly which books were given to Plato and whether the whole episode should be regarded as more than a mere anecdote.

Going beyond Pythagoreanism, **Aldo Brancacci** (*Music and Philosophy in Damon of Oa*) tries to reconstruct the figure of Damon, the renowned musicologist admired by Plato and Diogenes of Babylon and indirectly criticized by Philodemus. The paper aims: a) to re-evaluate the traditional link between Damon and the Pythagoric tradition, without considering Damon as a Pythagorean; b) to criticize the thesis, which Andrew Barker and Robert W. Wallace endorse, according to which Damon is a Sophist; c) to assign Damon a specific cultural context, which makes him a major figure of Pericles' circle within a historical period that precedes the theoretical distinction between 'philosopher' and 'sophist' and also the birth of Sophistic as an autonomous philosophical movement; d) to argue in favour of the authenticity of Damon's *Areopagiticus*, whose existence Wallace has recently denied, without adducing any convincing evidence;<sup>6</sup> e) to examine some Herculanian testimonia of Philodemus' *On Music*, which stands out as a very important text that helps better illustrate the cultural objectives that Damon assigns music and, consequently, the nature of his collaboration with Pericles.

Heraclitus is the specific focus of Section 3. **Gábor Betegh** and **Valeria Piano** (*Column IV of the Derveni Papyrus: A New Analysis of the Text and the Quotation of Heraclitus*) offer a novel analysis and interpretation of PDerv., col. IV based on the new papyrological and textual results that have emerged from

<sup>5</sup> In the framework of a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellowship (EU Horizon 2020/Grant Agreement N°. 703798 – AcadHist), Fleischer is working on a new critical edition of the *Index Academicorum*.

<sup>6</sup> Wallace (2015) 77–97.



Piano's recent edition of the first columns.<sup>7</sup> The focal point of the paper is the Heraclitus quotation, for which the two scholars propose a novel assessment by suggesting a new place for a hitherto unlocated fragment of the papyrus. The discussion of the Heraclitus quotation itself is preceded by a close textual analysis and interpretation of the first lines of the column. A re-examination of the Derveni author's reasons for including a reference to Heraclitus at this point in his text offers some new suggestions about the role of the quotation within the general economy of the Derveni author's argument. In this regard, the problem of the differences between the version preserved in the Derveni Papyrus and the versions transmitted through the medieval traditions of Heraclitus' fragments B 3 and B 94 is also taken into account. The paper puts forward some new considerations concerning the question of whether the Derveni author was paraphrasing Heraclitus or quoting him *verbatim*, and, if the latter, of what the extent of the quotation could be. A closely related question that is addressed is whether B 3 and B 94 were originally joined in Heraclitus' text or whether they were put side by side by the Derveni author exclusively on the basis of their content. The paper concludes with some more general remarks about the way in which the new text of col. IV contributes to a better understanding of Heraclitus and of the methods as well as the philosophical and religious views of the Derveni author.

Further aspects of the papyrological tradition of Heraclitus are tackled by **Graziano Ranocchia** (*Heraclitus' Portrait in Diogenes Laërtius and Philodemus' On Arrogance*), who begins by focusing on the core of the *Life of Heraclitus* handed down by Diogenes Laërtius. As we know, this passage is a biographico-characterological portrait in which the haughtiness and the superciliousness attributed to this philosopher are ridiculed for openly satirical and polemical purposes. In the past, substantial analogies have been detected with the moral-protreptic letter *On the Relieving of Arrogance*, amply quoted and paraphrased by Philodemus in the final section of *PHerc.* 1008 (*[On Arrogance]*, cols. 10–24). Significantly, at the beginning of the letter (col. 10.16–26 Ranocchia), Heraclitus is pointedly included, along with other philosophers and poets, amongst those who became arrogant “on account of philosophy.” It is now possible to add further thematic correspondences between these writings to the similarities first identified by Wilhelm Knögel and Serge N. Mouraviev, which suggest that both texts originally belonged to the same philosophical tradition, whose goal was to describe and treat arrogance. This tradition could have encompassed a general illustration both of the vice and its treatment, as well as specific

---

<sup>7</sup> Piano (2016) 65–82. See also Vassallo (2017b).



examples in the form of lively portraits of ‘arrogant’ philosophers and poets, such as Heraclitus, Empedocles, Pythagoras, Socrates, Hippias, and Euripides.

Section 4 on Empedocles covers a wide range of problems and sources, beginning once again with the Derveni Papyrus. **Mirjam E. Kotwick** (*Aphrodite’s Cosmic Power: Empedocles in the Derveni Papyrus*) argues, against the trend in studies on the presence of the Presocratics in this text, that the Derveni author indeed took inspiration from Empedocles’ physical theory. The paper defends this view with an analysis of how both authors explain the combination of heterogeneous particles during the early cosmogonic stages. It argues that the parallels between their accounts are pronounced and that, for the Derveni author, Empedocles’ view on Aphrodite’s power to unify was as promising as Anaxagoras’ view on the unification of unlike particles was insufficient.

The paper of **Simon Trépanier** (*Empedocles on the Origin of Plants: PStrasb. gr. inv. 1665–1666, Sections d, b and f*) focused on the renowned ‘Strasbourg Empedocles,’ which contains the fragments of 74 lines belonging to Book(s) 1 (and 2)<sup>8</sup> of Empedocles’ philosophical poem *On Nature*. The paper seeks to improve the text of section **d**, ll. 11–19 of *PStrasb. gr. inv. 1665–1666*. In particular, the scholar tests the reconstruction advanced by Richard Janko,<sup>9</sup> who proposes attributing sections **f** and **b** to the same column as section **d** and argues that all three sections are from col. 12 of the ancient roll. Several new suggestions are offered to improve the text and thereby support Janko’s reconstruction of the column. Trépanier departs from Janko primarily in arguing that the unity of ll. **d** 11–18 plus sections **b** and **f** can be proven more easily if we assume that the passage is a description of the origins of plants alone, not of animals or of living things in general. This, in turn, provides a new reason for thinking that section **b**, a catalogue of animals (but not plants) with the ‘hard/earthy parts’ on the outside, belongs to the bottom of the same column as section **d**. The catalogue – Trépanier argues – is offered to support an analogy in which the elemental structure of trees, with hard/earthy bark on the outside, is likened to those animals who are hard/earthy on the outside.

The essay of **Giuliana Leone** (*Empedocles in the Herculaneum Papyri: An Update*) is entirely devoted to the Herculanean tradition of Empedocles, a topic that has been rarely tackled by the scholarship. With the exception of the Strasbourg Papyrus, all the papyri concerning Empedocles generally preserve either short quotations or references to his thought. In particular, the Herculaneum papyri transmit Epicurus’, Hermarchus’, and Philodemus’ reception of Empedocles, and in *PHerc.* 1012, which contains a work attributed to Demetrius

<sup>8</sup> As is widely known, while M&P ascribe *PStrasb. gr. inv. 1665–1666* to Books 1–2 of Empedocles’ *On Nature*, Janko (2004) maintains that the papyrus contains only Book 1.

<sup>9</sup> Janko (2004).



Laco, we can also find quotations from Empedocles' poem that are useful for the constitution of its text. Leone provides an important and updated study of these testimonia also in the light of some recent research in Epicureanism and of new editions of Herculean texts.

Section 5 of the volume focuses on the papyrological tradition of Anaxagoras and his School. **Christian Vassallo's** paper (*Anaxagoras from Egypt to Herculaneum: A Contribution to the History of Ancient 'Atheism'*) comes with a foreword by **David Sider**, who is preparing a new comprehensive collection of the testimonia to Anaxagoras for the series *Traditio Praesocratica*. Vassallo offers the first systematic collection of all the papyrus evidence for Anaxagoras preserved in both Graeco-Egyptian and Herculaneum papyri, ordering them in six sections according to their content (Anaxagoras' life and works; the charge of impiety; physics; theology; ethics; along with two testimonia considered spurious or dubious). The essay deals in particular with the testimonia that contribute to a better understanding of Anaxagoras' conception of god(s) and elucidate certain questions concerning his alleged 'atheism,' along with the reasons for the charge of impiety levelled against him. The image of Anaxagoras as an 'atheist,' in addition to the 'Enlightenment' features of his thought, seems to be the outcome of a stratified doxographical tradition that the papyri significantly help to reconstruct.

As regards the 'Anaxagoreans,' **Michael Pozdnev** (*Metrodorus the Allegorist as Reflected in Philodemus' On Poems, Book 2: PHerc. 1676, col. 2 + N 1081, col. 12 [= 61 A 4 DK; Test. 34.3 Lanata]*) analyzes in depth a Philodemian fragment that preserves some remarkable examples of an allegorical Homeric exegesis attributed by the supplementary sources to Metrodorus of Lampsacus (the elder). Pozdnev firstly attempts to argue that this testimonium is not incompatible with the already known reflections advanced by Metrodorus and to illustrate the new doctrines that emerge from the fragment; secondly, he comments on the method of this Homeric scholar and, finally, seeks to uncover his goals. These aims are achieved by outlining the results obtained so far by those very few researchers who have tried to make sense of the seemingly absurd interpretations contrived by the famous critic. It becomes clear that in his reduction of myths to physical conceptions – mostly those attested for Anaxagoras – Metrodorus proceeds from particular Homeric contexts that contain semantic 'hints' that suggest specific allegorical readings. The relevant scenes were largely those open to moral censure. In full accordance with the spiritual requirements of his day, Metrodorus aimed to protect the heroes and gods of epic poetry (probably not only Homeric) against the charge of inappropriate behavior.

In Section 6, a significant portion of the numerous testimonia to the Early Atomists in the papyri are taken into account. A study on some Herculean



sources in this field is carried out by **Enrico Piergiacomi** (*Democritus' Doctrine of Eidola in the Herculaneum Papyri: A Reassessment of the Sources*). The paper analyzes in depth four texts from the Herculaneum papyri (Epic. *De nat.* 2, *PHerc.* 1149/993, col. 109 Leone and *De nat.* 34, *PHerc.* 1431, cols. 20–21 Leone; Phld. *De piet.*, *PHerc.* 1428, fr. 16 Schober and *De mort.* 4, *PHerc.* 1050, cols. 29–30 Henry), which may implicitly report some philosophical tenets of the Democritean theory of εἶδωλα. It also challenges the reconstruction and the interpretation of a text recently edited by Richard Janko (Phld. *De poem.* 4, *PHerc.* 207, fr. 10), in which the scholar sees a clear, but in reality weak, reference to the *simulacra* of Democritus. Based on this analysis, Piergiacomi contends that the Herculanean texts contribute the following information or clarifications to our knowledge of Democritean theory: a) the *simulacra* are living beings, because they have some soul-atoms that are positioned and ordered in a way capable of generating life; b) some *simulacra* cause what the ancient Hippocratic practitioners called the 'pulse,' i.e. a violent, unnatural, and disturbing movement of the vessels, which is partly detached from the influence of the external environment, and partly dependent on us and our beliefs; c) the *simulacra* which determine the birth of the belief in the gods had their origins in the heavens; d) the *simulacra* of corpses transmit forms and colours that create an intense fear of death.

The Section on the early Atomists is brought to a close by **Tiziano Dorandi** (*Anaxarchus from Egypt to Herculaneum*), who dwells on the papyrological tradition of the Democritean Anaxarchus of Abdera (c. 380–320 BC). Of this philosopher we have only three papyrological testimonia: a) *PMich.* inv. 4912a (= fr. 41 Dorandi), which speaks about the bold and scornful bearing displayed by Anaxarchus before the tyrant Nicocreon; b) Phld. *De mort.* 4, *PHerc.* 1050, col. 35.11–34 Henry (= fr. 33 Dorandi), where Anaxarchus is mentioned, along with Zeno of Elea and Socrates, among those who, while not wise, behaved virtuously in the face of an unjust sentence; c) Phld. *De adulat.*, *PHerc.* 1675, cols. 4.34–5.9 Capasso (= fr. 19A Dorandi), a passage that deals with the flattery shown by Anaxarchus towards Alexander the Great.

The Section of the volume on the Sophists tackles only one aspect of a topic – the papyrological tradition of the exponents of the Sophistic movement – that has been in need of a complete reassessment for years. For an overview, see the *CPF* and, with regard to the Herculanean sources, the *IPPH*.<sup>10</sup> However, many

---

<sup>10</sup> In a forthcoming conference I will be holding at the University of Notre Dame during the Spring Term of 2019 (*The papyrological tradition of the Sophists, with special discussion on the Herculanean evidence on Prodicus*), on invitation of Gretchen Reydam-Schils (whom I would like to whole-heartedly thank for this opportunity), I will try to provide an up-to-date overview of the sources involved in this inquiry. Particularly interesting are *PTura* V 222.18–29 for Protagoras



dubious papyri are involved in such a task: we need only consider the fact that in the forthcoming volumes of the *CPF* devoted to the unattributed fragments (*Papiri Adespoti*), about 3% of the texts are considered to belong to a Sophist or traced back to a Sophistic philosophical area. In his paper, **Andrei Lebedev** (*The Authorship of the Derveni Papyrus, A Sophistic Treatise on the Origin of Religion and Language: A Case for Prodicus of Ceos*) attempts to draw an ‘intellectual portrait’ of the Derveni author. In particular, he argues that the author of the Derveni treatise (meaning the complete original text) was an Ionian Sophist and not a Presocratic philosopher in the sense of a φυσικός. His work – according to Lebedev – was not a special commentary dedicated to the Orphic theogony, but a work on the origins of religion and divine names, i.e. one belonging to the genre of Sophistic *Kulturgeschichte*. According to this perspective, which is also favoured by Albert Henrichs and Richard Janko (among others),<sup>11</sup> Lebedev maintains that the work at hand may well have been perceived as ‘atheistic’ in its purpose since it literally dissolved the Olympian gods into the air. The author was not a religious Orphic himself; on the contrary, his work was polemically addressed to contemporary religious conservatives like Diopeithes, who venerated Orpheus as an ancient theologian teaching a creationist cosmogony and tried to ban the teachings of Ionian natural science and Anaxagorean astronomy in Athens. In the second part of his essay, Lebedev argues that the author of the Derveni treatise was in all probability Prodicus of Ceos, whose nickname Tantalos (i.e. ‘enemy of the gods’) was an allusion to his supposed ‘atheism,’<sup>12</sup> There is a neglected piece of evidence in Themistius that describes how Prodicus produced an allegorical interpretation of the Orphic theogony and outlines Prodicus’ theory of the origin of religion (as the deification of what is useful) that is directly attested in *PDerv.*, col. XXIV. For the first time, this attribution explains the reference to Prodicus in the context of Aristophanes’ parody of quasi-Orphic cosmogony in the *Birds*: Prodicus reduced Orphic theogony to Anaxagorean physics, so Aristophanes ridicules Prodicus (and not Orpheus!) and humorously aims to surpass Prodicus in absurdity by reducing theogony to ornithogony. At the end of the paper, Lebedev proposes that we date the Derveni treatise to the decade

---

(cf. Woodruff [1985]); *PTura* III 16.9–18 (cf. Binder/Liesenborghs [1966]) and *PHerc.* 1428 (Philodemus’ *On Piety*: cf. Vassallo [2018]) for Prodicus; *POxy.* XI 1364 + LII 3647 and *POxy.* XV 1797 for Antiphon (cf. G. Bastianini and F. Deleva Caizzi *ap. CPF* I.1\*, 176–222, with bibliography).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Henrichs (1984); Janko (1997), (2001), and (2008).

<sup>12</sup> A more cautious approach to the tradition which makes Prodicus a radical ‘atheist’ is to be found now in Kouloumentas (2018) and Vassallo (2018), who proposes a significant change above all to the piece of evidence by Philodemus’ *On Piety*.



430–420 BC and discusses the possibility that col. V contains another extensive quotation from Heraclitus.

The close relationship between the papyrological tradition and doxographical questions is finally studied in depth in **Jaap Mansfeld's** essay (*Lists of Principles and Lists of Gods: Philodemus, Cicero, Aëtius, and Others*), with a brilliant approach already employed by the scholar in his monumental work *Aëtiana*, which he has been editing with David Th. Runia for several years now.<sup>13</sup> In this paper the Epicurean accounts and overviews of the doxai of philosophers (and poets) concerning gods in the remains of Philodemus' *On Piety* and in Cicero's *On the Nature of the Gods*, Book 1 are compared in chapters 1.7 (*Who the Deity is*) and 1.3 (*On Principles, what they are*) of the Aëtian *Placita*, as well as in some other texts (Clement of Alexandria and Sextus Empiricus). The purpose of this search for affinities is to place these passages within a wider context. What we are dealing with here is not only the fundamental problem of the relationship between Cicero and Philodemus (viz. the Herculaneum papyri that hand down his works, in particular *On Piety*), but also the philosophical problem of hylotheism. A few remarks on passages dealing with Presocratic philosophers are included.

Now that I have outlined the rich variety of this volume, I would like to stress again my gratitude to those who have contributed to its completion. Special thanks go to the *Schwarz-Liebermann Stiftung im Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft* and to the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)*, for having funded both the International Workshop mentioned above and the present publication of its proceedings. I am extremely grateful to the editors of the *Studia Praesocratica* – Richard McKirahan, Denis O'Brien, Oliver Primavesi, Christoph Riedweg, David Sider, Gotthard Strohmaier, and Georg Wöhrle – for accepting to publish the volume in this prestigious series. The book is intended to be the first collection of studies specifically devoted to a multidisciplinary and very fruitful topic in Classics. There is good reason to believe that this subject will not fail to amaze in the next years, both because of reinterpretations of already known texts, and for the probable discovery of new texts that will open up innovative perspectives on Presocratic philosophy and its reception in antiquity.<sup>14</sup> Finally, I wish to highlight that – as its subtitle suggests (*A Philosophical Reappraisal of the Sources*) – the purpose of this volume is eminently

---

<sup>13</sup> Cf. M&R1–5.

<sup>14</sup> The importance and topicality of this theme is confirmed by the increasing number of books in the De Gruyter series *Studia Praesocratica (SP)* which is parallel to the *Traditio Praesocratica (TP)* series. With regard to this field of inquiry, I would like to recall that, thanks to further DFG funding and within the research project *Die Vorsokratiker in den Herculaneischen Papyri* (VA 1030 / 1–1) that I have carried out at the University of Trier, another volume has been published



hermeneutical and philosophical. It is addressed above all to historians of ancient philosophy, even though both papyrologists and Classical philologists will find new food for thought in its pages. On the methodological level, the book aims to bring back to their specific field of study (viz. philosophy and its history, as opposed to papyrology in the strict sense) numerous and relevant sources that are usually neglected by the majority of scholars of Presocratic thought and its tradition, owing to the prejudice according to which papyrological texts are the exclusive competence of papyrologists. It is not my task to explain here the (historical and academic) reasons for this prejudice, which – like all prejudices – amounts to a methodological, or even ‘ideological’ error! I hope that the results of this (first) systematic attempt to make philosophical papyrology a crucial component of the history of ancient philosophy, and in particular of Presocratic thought, will prove a welcome one that will mark a turning point in the scholarship in coming years.

## References

- Betegh (2013): Gábor Betegh, “Pythagoreans and the Derveni Papyrus”, in: Frisbee Sheffield and James Warren (eds.), *Routledge Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, London, 79–93.
- Binder/Liesenborghs (1966): Gerhard Binder and Leo Liesenborghs, “Eine Zuweisung der Sentenz οὐκ ἔστιν ἀντιλέγειν an Prodikos von Keos”, in: *MH* 23, 37–43 [= Carl J. Classen (ed.), *Sophistik: Wege der Forschung*, Darmstadt 1976, 452–462].
- Henrichs (1984): Albert Henrichs, “The Eumenides and the Wineless Libation in the Derveni Papyrus”, in: *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, 2 vols., Naples, II, 255–268.
- Janko (1997): Richard Janko, “The Physicist as Hierophant: Aristophanes, Socrates and the Authorship of the Derveni Papyrus”, in: *ZPE* 118, 61–94.
- Janko (2001): Richard Janko, “The Derveni Papyrus (Diagoras of Melos, *Apopyrgizontes Logoi?*): A New Translation”, in: *CPh* 96, 1–32.
- Janko (2004): Richard Janko, “Empedocles, *On Nature* I 233–364: A New Reconstruction of *P.Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665–6*”, in: *ZPE* 150, 1–26.
- Janko (2008): Richard Janko, “Reconstructing (again) the Opening of the Derveni Papyrus”, in: *ZPE* 166, 37–51.
- Kouloumentas (2018): Stavros Kouloumentas, “Prodicus on the Rise of Civilization: Religion, Agriculture, and Culture Heroes”, in: *PhA* 18, 127–152.
- M&P: Alain Martin and Oliver Primavesi (see the section ‘Abbreviations’ at the beginning of this volume).

---

as part of the *AKAN-Einzelschriften* series, one edited by Vassallo (2017a) and entirely devoted to Presocratic philosophy and its reception in antiquity.



- M&R1–5: Jaap Mansfeld and David Th. Runia (see the section ‘Abbreviations’ at the beginning of this volume).
- Piano (2016): Valeria Piano, *Il Papiro di Derveni tra religione e filosofia*, Florence.
- TP3: Benedikt Strobel and Georg Wöhrle (see the section ‘Abbreviations’ at the beginning of this volume).
- Vassallo (2014): Christian Vassallo, “Xenophanes in the Herculaneum Papyri: *Praesocratica Herculanensia* IV”, in: *APF* 60, 45–66.
- Vassallo (2015): Christian Vassallo, “Supplemento papirologico alle recenti edizioni dei Milesii: *Praesocratica Herculanensia* VIII”, in: *APF* 61, 276–316.
- Vassallo (2016a): Christian Vassallo, “Towards a Comprehensive Edition of the Evidence for Presocratic Philosophy in the Herculaneum Papyri”, in: Tomasz Derda, Adam Łajtar and Jakub Urbanik (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology*, 3 vols., Warsaw, I, 315–345.
- Vassallo (2016b): Christian Vassallo, “Parmenides and the «First God»: Doxographical Strategies in Philodemus’ *On Piety: Praesocratica Herculanensia* VII”, in: *Hyperboreus* 22, 29–57.
- Vassallo (2017a): Christian Vassallo (ed.), *Physiologia: Topics in Presocratic Philosophy and Its Reception in Antiquity*, Trier.
- Vassallo (2017b): Christian Vassallo, Rev. of Piano (2016), in: *Aegyptus* 97, 267–275.
- Vassallo (2018): Christian Vassallo, “Persaeus on Prodicus on the Gods’ Existence and Nature: Another Attempt Based on a New Reconstruction of Philodemus’ Account”, in: *PhA* 18, 153–168.
- Wallace (2015): Robert W. Wallace, *Reconstructing Damon: Music, Wisdom Teaching, and Politics in Perikles’ Athens*, Oxford.
- Woodruff (1985): Paul Woodruff, “Didymus on Protagoras and the Protagoreans”, in: *JHPH* 23, 483–497.

## Addendum

As a sign of gratitude to the University of Trier, I would like to provide the reader with the *Vorrede* I held on September 22nd, 2016, as an introduction to the works of the above-mentioned International Workshop:

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,  
 liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen,

zunächst möchte ich dem Präsidenten der Universität Trier, Herrn Prof. Michael Jäckel, für sein Erscheinen und das Grußwort, mit dem er diese Tagung eröffnet hat, ganz herzlich danken. Ich danke ebenso Herrn Prof. Georg Wöhrle für seine große Unterstützung und das Vertrauen, das er mir stets gewährt hat. Ohne seine Hilfe wäre ich nicht in der Lage gewesen, diese seit langer Zeit geplante Tagung zu verwirklichen. Allen Freunden, Hilfskräften und Kollegen der Universität, den



Mitgliedern des Faches Klassische Philologie und allen Teilnehmern, die meine Einladung angenommen haben, möchte ich meine tiefe Dankbarkeit ausdrücken.

Es ist eine große Ehre, eine solche Veranstaltung an der Universität Trier organisieren zu können. Diese Hochschule zeigt eine immer größere Vitalität in Hinsicht auf die Geisteswissenschaften, von der Klassischen Philologie über die Philosophie bis hin zur Papyrologie. Deswegen scheint sie der beste Platz zu sein, um eine Tagung über die papyrologische Überlieferung der Vorsokratiker durchzuführen. Wie schon das Zitat Ciceros, welches Hermann Diels als Leitspruch seiner *Doxographi Graeci* wählte, besagt, ist es das Ziel der Tagung, aus den *fontes rerum* zu schöpfen und sie zu deuten und zu kommentieren, im Rahmen einer Debatte zwischen Experten der antiken Philosophie und der philosophisch orientierten Papyrologie.

Seit Jahren ist die Universität Trier eines der wichtigsten Forschungszentren für das Studium der vorsokratischen Überlieferung. Ich möchte nur die im Verlag De Gruyter erschienenen Reihen *Traditio Praesocratica* und *Studia Praesocratica* erwähnen. Einige der maßgeblichen Herausgeber sind hier anwesend. Zudem möchte ich betonen, wie wichtig die Anwesenheit zahlreicher Vertreter der Redaktion des *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini* ist. Dieses monumentale und verdienstvolle Werk wurde vor etwa 30 Jahren begonnen und wird bald zu Ende geführt. In den letzten 30 Jahren gab es sowohl im Bereich der philosophisch orientierten Papyrologie als auch der Vorsokratiker-Forschung viele neue Entwicklungen. Die Papyrologie qua Disziplin hat sich sehr verändert, neue Texte sind ans Tageslicht gekommen. Das Studium der Herkulanensischen Papyri, die von Anfang an nicht zum *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini* gehörten, wurde gänzlich revolutioniert: von den multispektralen Abbildungen, von den neuen Methoden der Rekonstruktion der Rollen und von jüngsten Experimenten, verkohlte Stücke virtuell auszurollen. Zweifellos stehen uns in der Zukunft große Überraschungen bevor.

In diesem Zusammenhang will die Tagung folgende Ziele erreichen: Geleistetes rekapitulieren und bewerten; einige noch lückenhafte bzw. unerforschte Bereiche vervollständigen; eine Brücke zwischen Fächern schlagen, die unter dem Dach der Altertumswissenschaften unbedingt zusammenarbeiten sollten. In der Hoffnung, dass diese Ziele erreicht werden, wünsche ich allen einen angenehmen Aufenthalt in Trier und eine fruchtbare Arbeit! Vielen Dank!

Notre Dame, IN, USA  
15 January 2019







---

## Part I: **Orpheus and the Orphic Tradition**







Alberto Bernabé and Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal

# 1 Two Aspects of the Orphic Papyrological Tradition: *PGurob* 1 and the Greek Magic Rolls

## 1 Introduction

Even though the Derveni Papyrus is a very important document, it is not the only papyrus relevant to the study of Orphism. There are others, although not very many, that are interesting, each one disclosing a different perspective. In this occasion, we refer to the Gurob Papyrus 1 and some Magical Papyri. Other papyri could be cited, like *PSI* VII 850 (*OF* 310),<sup>1</sup> *PBerol.* inv. 44 (*OF* 383, 387–389, 392–393, 396–397),<sup>2</sup> and the Bologna Papyrus (*PBonon.* 4).<sup>3</sup>

## 2 The Gurob Papyrus 1

### 2.1 The text

The Gurob Papyrus 1 (found at the lower entrance to Fayum), dated to the middle of the 3rd cent. BC,<sup>4</sup> consists of two columns with 30 and 26 lines respectively;<sup>5</sup> in the first, approximately half of the first lines are missing, but it is possible to reconstruct a text that is quite legible. Only some isolated words can be read from

---

1 Cardin/Ozbek (2011); Jiménez San Cristóbal (2015a).

2 Jiménez San Cristóbal (2015b).

3 Jiménez San Cristóbal (2017).

4 Hordern (2000). Smyly (1921) dates it to the beginning of the same century and West (1983) 170, towards the end of the century.

5 Image in Hordern (2000) pl. III; Morand (2001) 208. Cf. <http://www.trismegistos.org/tm/detail.php?tm=65667>.

---

**Note:** The Spanish Ministry of Economy and Innovation has given financial support for the research for this paper (FFI2013–43126P and FFI 2015–65206P). We are very grateful to Monica Walker for the translation. The following abbreviations are used: *OF* = *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (see the section ‘Abbreviations’ at the beginning of this volume); *OA* = *Argonautica*, *OH* = *Hymni*, and *OL* = *Lithica*.

---

Alberto Bernabé and Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, Complutense University of Madrid (IUCR)



the second column. The first column was first published by Smyly<sup>6</sup> and the full papyrus by Kern, an edition that was followed by others among which can be highlighted the one by Hordern.<sup>7</sup>

The following is the text and its translation:<sup>8</sup>

Col. I	Col. II
ἔκ]αστα ἔχων ἄ εὖρηι	[
τά] ὡμὰ δὲ συνλεγέ[τω	.. [
]. . διὰ τὴν τελετήν.	α. . [
<i>δῶρον δέξ]ατ' ἐμὸν ποινὰς πατ[έρων ἀθεμίστων.</i>	... [
5 ] σῶισομ με Βριμῶ με[ γάλη	..... [
] Δήμητέρ τε Ῥέα	ματ[
] Κούρητές τ' {ε} ἔνοπλοι	αρχα. [
] ὦμεν	πρυσ[
ἴ]να ποιῶμεν ἱερὰ καλὰ	οὐνσ[
10 ] νηι κριός τε τράγος τε	ῥάχος κι[
] ἀπερ<ε>ῖσια δῶρα.	εὐχεσ[θ-
] οὐ καὶ ἐπὶ ποταμοῦ νομῶι	νον π. [
λαμ]βάνων τοῦ τράγου	μὴ ἔχη[
] τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ' [ . . . ] κρέα ἐσθιέτω	τι ἡμε[
15 ] ος μὴ ἐφοράτω	θεν του[
] χου ἀνα<τι>θεῖς {εις} τὸ ἀνηρε	τριχω. [
] αλων εὐχή·	βλέπω[
] νον καὶ Εὐβουλῆα καλῶ[μεν	κααρ. . [
] . . εὐρήας κικλήσκω[μεν	δωι λοι[
20 ] . . [ . ] το φίλους σὺ ἀπαυάνας	επ. . . . [
Δ]ήμητρος καὶ Παλλάδος ὑμῖν	δια. . . . [

<sup>6</sup> Smyly (1921).

<sup>7</sup> Kern (1922) 31; Tierney (1922); Colli (1977) 4 [A 69]; Bernabé (*OF* 578); Hordern (2000), who includes a detailed description of the papyrus; Morand (2001) 276–277; Tortorelli Ghidini (2006) 255. In addition, there are other studies and translations that can be cited, such as that of West (1983) 170–171 and (1993) 181–182 (that includes the text); that of Jiménez San Cristóbal (2002b) 110–114, (2008), and (2009), or that of Graf/Johnston (2013<sup>2</sup>) 150–155 and 217–218. For more bibliography see *OF* 578.

<sup>8</sup> We are following the edition of *OF* 578. In the text we have accepted only the integrations considered to be the most solid. In the commentary other proposals can be found. The complete critical apparatus can be found in *OF* 578. The sections in verse are conventionally shown in cursive. From now on we will refer to col. I simply by the line number. The references to column II will be col. II and the line number. The translation is that by Graf/Johnston (2013<sup>2</sup>) 217–218 with slight modifications.







The papyrus describes a series of provisions to celebrate a ritual (cf. τελετή, l. 3), that include discursive sections in which ritual actions (δρώμενα) are emphasized and the words that must be pronounced in the ritual (λεγόμενα). The δρώμενα are normally indicated in the 3rd person imperative in -τω (συνλεγέ[τω, l. 2, ἐσθιέτω, l. 14, ἐφοράτω, l. 15). The infinitive ἐμβαλ<ε>ῖν (l. 28) seems to be used for a similar mandatory function and it is possible that it was dependent on a principal verb, lost in the lacuna of the text. The λεγόμενα are of two types: hexametric verses and a kind of slogans. Regarding the latter, some are called σύμβολα (l. 23): ἵψα θεὸς διὰ κόλλου (l. 24), οἱ ἱν[ο]ν ἔπιον ὄνος βουκόλος (l. 25) and the other, σύνθεμα (l. 26): ἄνω κάτω (l. 26).

Everything seems to indicate that this text was meant to be used in the rite, in contrast to the Derveni Papyrus, which is a theoretical treaty where certain practices and certain verses of Orpheus are tried to be explained.<sup>9</sup> A plausible context for the Gurob Papyrus is offered by the papyrus of Ptolemy Philopator, from 210 BC,<sup>10</sup> in which it is established that those who celebrate the rituals in honour of Dionysos need to be inscribed in the Archive and they need to deposit the sacred text that they used, sealed. In addition, it is possible that our exemplar could have been one of these sacred texts from the collection of the Philopator.<sup>11</sup>

The ritual act also included prayers, as indicated in the epigraph εὐχή in l. 17, in a verbal form of εὐχομαι in col. II.11, and (in the text of the λεγόμενα) in the exhortative subjunctives: καλῶ[μεν, in l. 18, κυκλήσκω[μεν, in l. 19, and probably ὠμεν (l. 8) that we could read as καλῶμεν or κυκλήσκῳμεν.<sup>12</sup>

## 2.2 The Orphic character of the text

The word τελετή is mostly used to refer to rituals whose peculiar characteristic consists in that the relation that human beings establish with the divinity through them is not based, as in the case of civic rituals, in worshipping them, but in searching in such practices for a solution to the fears of the participants, the fear of sickness, of death, and what happens after it.<sup>13</sup> Numerous texts attributed the foundation of τελεταί to Orpheus,<sup>14</sup> and the characteristics of such rituals were purification and

<sup>9</sup> Graf/Johnston (2013<sup>2</sup>) 150.

<sup>10</sup> OF 44 with bibliography, Graf/Johnston (2013<sup>2</sup>) 218–219.

<sup>11</sup> Wilamowitz (1931–1932) II, 378; Burkert (1987) 70–71; Herrero (2010) 54.

<sup>12</sup> Both proposals by Janko *ap.* Hordern (2000).

<sup>13</sup> Regarding the τελεταί, cf. Sfameni Gasparro (1988); Jiménez San Cristóbal (2002a); Schuddeboom (2009).

<sup>14</sup> OF 546–562.



the prospect of salvation. As we shall see, the content of the Gurob Papyrus conforms to these characteristics. Yet, the adscription of the text to a specific religious movement has been discussed: Smyly<sup>15</sup> considered the text Orphic, although he also pointed out the presence of elements that, in his opinion, are reminiscent of Eleusis (Brimo, Demeter, Rhea, Pallas, and the Curetes) and the Mysteries of Sabazios. The fact is that based on our current knowledge, as we shall see, all these elements also appear in the Orphic sphere. For Tierney<sup>16</sup> Ἰρικεπαῖγε (l. 22) was an unequivocally Orphic trait. Curiously Linforth, in his book on the testimonies regarding Orpheus and the possible Orphic rituals,<sup>17</sup> completely ignores the document, while West<sup>18</sup> believes that the text suggests the syncretism of various Mystery cults and points out Eleusinian elements, from the cult to Sabazios and maybe of the gold tablets, a point of view that should be the recipient of the same observations than those of Smyly. The Gurob Papyrus has been included, as we have seen,<sup>19</sup> in the main editions of the Orphic texts and its latest editor, Hordern, unabashedly qualifies it as Orphic, so that it can be considered an exceptional testimony of one of the books used by Orphic celebrants to perform their rituals. Indeed, numerous sources tell us about the use of books by the followers of Orpheus,<sup>20</sup> which seems to indicate that in the rites of this religious group the texts that referred to mythical predecessors and concrete ritual practices had a significant presence.<sup>21</sup> We will review the elements of the ritual that can be determined in our text and we will point out some parallels.

## 2.3 The initiates and officiants

In l. 15 ἵος μὴ ἐφοράτω excludes particular people from viewing parts of the ritual. Smyly proposed to reconstruct ὁ δὲ βέβηλος μὴ ἐφοράτω, based in the well-known formula of numerous Orphic texts θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι (“shut the doors, uninitiated”),<sup>22</sup> but the reconstruction is not certain.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Smyly (1921).

<sup>16</sup> Tierney (1922) 78.

<sup>17</sup> Linforth (1941).

<sup>18</sup> West (1983) 171.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *supra*, n. 7.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Ar. Av. 966–990, in which a false diviner reiterates that a book must be read, Eur. *Hipp.* 954 (= OF 627), Pl. *Resp.* 2.364e and Schol. *ad loc.*, 201 Greene (= OF 573) in which there are references to many books being used by the officiants; see also Dem. 18.259 and 19.199; Jiménez San Cristóbal (2002b); Henrichs (2003); Bernabé (2011) 32–35.

<sup>21</sup> Jiménez San Cristóbal (2002b) and Bernabé (2008a).

<sup>22</sup> Regarding this formula, cf. Bernabé (1996) 13–37.

<sup>23</sup> See an alternative interpretation of the sentence in § 2.4.



Always in l. 25, if we understand οἱ ν[ο]ν ἔπιον ὄνος βουκόλος as “I drank wine, me the shepherd ass” we would have a first person reference of an officiant,<sup>24</sup> designated with two known terms in the Mystery sphere: ὄνος and βουκόλος. The ass is cited in Aristophanes:<sup>25</sup> ἐγὼ γοῦν ὄνος ἄγω μυστήρια, which appears to be a play on words between “I am an ass (*mystes*) that celebrates the Mysteries” and “I am an ass (animal) who carries the objects to celebrate the Mysteries,” and it is highly possible that the mystic meaning of the ass might have been the reason why he was chosen as the protagonist of the *Golden Ass* by Apuleius.<sup>26</sup> Meanwhile, βουκόλος is documented as the appellation of the priests of Dionysos, especially in inscriptions from the Imperial period,<sup>27</sup> and the name would be in consonance with the frequent identification of the god with a bull in Euripides’ *Bacchae* or in the invocations of the women of Elis.<sup>28</sup>

## 2.4 δρώμενα. 1) Sacrifices

The papyrus informs us about a series of offerings and the way in which they were meant to be presented. In some cases, the λεγόμενα also contained references to the ritual. Even though we will come back to them again, we will also include them among the δρώμενα.

The stage is the banks of a river, that can only be the Nile,<sup>29</sup> probably in a prairie (ἐπὶ ποταμοῦ νομῶι, l. 12). An outdoors sacrifice is consistent with an Orphic context, since Orphic rituals are usually not celebrated within temples.<sup>30</sup> The first preserved sentence (l. 1) has not received a convincing explanation.<sup>31</sup> On the occasion of the *telete*, pieces of raw meat had to be gathered

<sup>24</sup> There are other options of syntactic interpretation. On this point, see Hordern (2000) 139.

<sup>25</sup> Ar. *Ran.* 159.

<sup>26</sup> Tierney (1922) 85; García López (1993) 86, with bibliography.

<sup>27</sup> The term seems to be as old as Eur. fr. 203 Kannicht, and in plural it is used as the title of a work by Cratinus (cf. Ath. 14.42.638d); an indirect testimony can be found in Ar. *Vesp.* 10 (τὸν αὐτὸν ἄρ’ ἐμοὶ βουκολεῖς Σαβάζιον); βουκόλοι are often present in Orphic literature (e.g. *OH* 1.10; 31.7; *OL* 463); cf. Luc. *Salt.* 79 (= *OF* 600 [I]), and in inscriptions, such as *IG* 12(9).262 (Eretria, 1st cent. BC), *IPerg.* 485.18 (1st cent. AD), *IGUR* 4.160 (= *OF* 585). Regarding βουκόλοι, the most exhaustive study is the one done by Morand (2001) 249–287, that includes a complete catalogue of Greek and Latin sources.

<sup>28</sup> Eur. *Bacch.* 920 (ταῦρος ἡμῖν πρόσθεν ἡγεῖσθαι δοκεῖς); *Carm. pop.*, *PMG* 871 (ἄξιε ταῦρε).

<sup>29</sup> Graf/Johnston (2013<sup>2</sup>) 151.

<sup>30</sup> Hordern (2000) 137 accumulates references regarding the prairie of the Netherworld, but in our opinion this scene has very little to do with it.

<sup>31</sup> The first word is uncertain, and neither is εὔρηι, read as a verb by West, but it could be the dative of εὐρύς (Kern edits εὔρηι [sic] by the presence of εὐρήας in l. 19).



(τὰ) ὥμᾱ δὲ συνλεγέ[τω, l. 2). The λεγόμενα specify that a sacrifice had to be celebrated (ἵνα ποιῶμεν ἱερὰ καλὰ, l. 9) and that offerings were made by way of atonement (δῶρον, l. 4; ποινάς, l. 4; δῶρα, l. 11).

The expression ποιῶμεν ἱερὰ καλὰ is frequently used to refer to the celebration of a sacrifice.<sup>32</sup> Everything points out that a ram and a goat were probably sacrificed (ἵ. νηι κριός τε τράγος τε, ll. 9–11).<sup>33</sup> It would seem like a part of the ram had to be separated (λαμβάνων τοῦ τράγου, l. 13).<sup>34</sup> That same part (and probably others) should be offered, possibly to the gods (ἰχου ἀνακτιθεῖς {εις} τὸ ἀνηρε[θέν, l. 16),<sup>35</sup> while the rest of the meat was to be consumed by some of the participants (ἵ. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ [...] κρέα ἐσθιέτω, l. 14).<sup>36</sup> Other people were forbidden to witness the consumption of the meat (ἰος μὴ ἐφοράτω l. 15). It is indubitably a bloody sacrifice (κριός τε τράγος τε), which *prima facie* is contrary to the Orphic interdiction of sacrifice. Nevertheless, there are some indications that in the Orphic rituals, the one that is to be initiated could participate in a first bloody sacrifice, that would place him in the perverse position of the Titans devouring Dionysos, in order to then purify him or herself through a καθαρμός and henceforth maintain a ἀγνεία in which the initiate would not contaminate him or herself with bloodshed. Jiménez San Cristóbal<sup>37</sup> refers back to the theory of the initiation rituals of Van Gennep<sup>38</sup> and his scheme: rupture with the community, life on the margins and reintegration in the new community. According to this scheme, the bloody sacrifice and the consumption of meat supposed a rupture with the Orphic community and in order to reintegrate into society it was necessary to go through purification and abide by the precepts of the group. She also points out, in addition, that in the Greek religion the sacrifice constitutes the

32 Casabona (1966) 11–12. Regarding the correction ῥέζομεν of West (1993) 181–182 (= [1983] 171–172, without Greek text), that solves the metric, Hordern (2000) 136 prefers to maintain ποιῶμεν. We think that this is correct, taking into consideration that this would not be the only case in which the metric of a text of an Orphic ritual is broken due to the intromission of a ritual term; for example, in Lam. Pelinna *OF* 865.1 τρισόλβιε breaks the metric of the verse and appears in non-metric ritual sentences (cf. Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal [2008] 63 and 77).

33 The most likely proposal of integration for νηι is κοι|νή Tierney (1922), that he translates as “ram and goat together.”

34 Smyly (1921), who compares our text with Psell. *De op. daem.*, p. 39 Boissonade, proposes that it would refer to the testicles, while Tierney considers it a reference to the heart, what seems more likely. The heart is the only part of Dionysos that was saved when the Titans devoured the god child (*OF* 314–316) and Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.15.1 speaks of καρδιουκίαι καὶ ἀρρητουργίαι.

35 ἀνηρε[θέν] Janko, better than ἀνηρε[μένον] Tierney, West, since ἀνηρη[η] would be expected, cf. Hordern (2000) 137, who proposes that εἰς is a dittography and corrects ἀνακτιθεῖς.

36 Cf. the parallels of Hordern (2000) 137.

37 Jiménez San Cristóbal (2009) 88.

38 Van Gennep (1909) 116–117 and 128.



basic experience of the sacred and is present in the initiation rituals to a new age group or of entry in a religious community, so that, as Burkert affirms, there is no initiation ritual without sacrifice.<sup>39</sup>

Several documents are consistent with the proposal that bloody Orphic rituals existed: the bone tablets of Olbia (OF 463–465), which could be a reminder of such an initiate sacrifice,<sup>40</sup> the mention of a sacrifice in a Thurii gold tablet closely connected chronologically with the papyrus (OF 492.7), in which καλ{η}ὰ (...) ἱερὰ (with repetition of the ἱερὰ in l. 8) can be read, or in a passage of *The Cretans* by Euripides<sup>41</sup> in which the commemoration of a first bloody sacrifice (τάς τ' ὠμοφάφους δαΐτας τελέσας, v. 12, in punctual aorist, which indicates a past event) contrasts with a sustained purity (ἀγνὸν δὲ βίον τεινομεν, v. 9, with durative present, and τήν τ' ἐμψύχων βρωσιν ἐδεστών πεφύλαγμαι, vv. 18–19, with a perfect of state). Everything seems to indicate that it was the aforementioned ram and goat the ones that were consumed after the sacrifice in the *telete*. The Orphic gold tablets of Pelinna and Thurii quote a bull, a ram and maybe a goat that precipitate in the milk, in a formula of blessedness,<sup>42</sup> but nothing indicates that these animals were sacrificed in a ritual.

The fragmentary testimony of the papyrus does not help to determine what is the situation of the sacrifice in the ritual that is being described. It could exclusively describe the initiation ceremony, and not a τελετή one for the already initiates or it could be a set of various aspects of the ritual, since other parts regarding this issue already mentioned in the papyrus, like the pronunciation of σύμβολα, were not limited to a first initiation. If this is the case, it would be difficult to accept Smyly's proposal ὁ βέβηλος (“the not initiate”) as the subject of μὴ ἐφοράτω (l. 15). It does not seem probable that the people who were not initiated were even present in the rest of the ritual. And if, according to our interpretation, the ones who are being initiated are the only ones that consume the meat, it would be more logical to think that the ones that could not see the bloody sacrifice would be the already initiated, who would participate in other parts of the ritual with those who are being initiated, but who would keep themselves ritually separated from the nefarious acts of bloodshed and the consumption of meat.

<sup>39</sup> Burkert (1998) 86.

<sup>40</sup> West (1982) 25 advances the hypothesis that these were emblems of membership in the thiasus: the bone tablet symbolizes the participation in the common sacrifice, cf. also Bernabé (2008b) 545.

<sup>41</sup> Eur. fr. 472 *TrGF* (Kannicht) (= OF 567): cf. Casadio (1990) and Bernabé (2016).

<sup>42</sup> OF 485–486 (Pelinna); 487.4 and 488.10 (Thurii). Regarding the meaning of the formula cf. Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 76–83. A goat can be read in OF 485.4, according to correction proposed by Méndez Dosuna (2009) αἶζα instead of αἶψα.



## 2.5 δρώμενα. 2) Ritual omophagia?

Another issue would be if the text alludes to a ritual omophagia<sup>43</sup> or whether this meat is cooked over a fire, it is distributed around the faithful, reserving the corresponding parts for the divinity and the priest, and then is consumed in a banquet that follows the sacrifice in the same place.<sup>44</sup> Despite the fragmentary state of the papyrus, the second possibility would be preferable, since the expression τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ κρέα ἐσθιέτω (l. 14: “that he might eat the rest of the meat”) does not mention that it had to be raw meat (as would be expected, due to the strangeness of the practice) and is, nevertheless, very usual in bloody sacrifices in other cults.<sup>45</sup>

It is true that Euripides clearly alludes to raw meat,<sup>46</sup> and Plutarch<sup>47</sup> says that the Titans drink the blood of the god, which could support the hypothesis that they ate their meat raw. An allusion to the omophagia in relation to the Dionysian Mystery cults also appears in Euripides’ *Bacchae*,<sup>48</sup> in an inscription of Miletus<sup>49</sup> and in other places.<sup>50</sup> Even in a passage by Firmicus Maternus,<sup>51</sup> the ritual dismemberment of a bull reproduces the one that the baby Bacchus suffered. But a passage by Clement and others describe how the meat is boiled.<sup>52</sup> Everything points to the references to raw meat appearing in the sphere of myth or in the Christian critical commentaries, or maybe in denominations in the ritual sphere that allude to a mythical tradition, but that the ritual reality had to be different

43 Hordern (2000) 133 refers to the lack of testimonies regarding ritual omophagia. See, also, Henrichs (1978) 151–152 and n. 99, 100, who does not accept the omophagia of the Maenads, and who considers that it was more likely that the meat was previously cooked. Therefore, we do not believe that it is acceptable to read ὠμοφάγιος in l. 26 as Hordern (2000) 139 suggests.

44 Festugière (1935) 374–375 [= Id. (1972) 40–41].

45 Cf. the texts in which τὰ λοιπὰ κρέα or τὰ δεῖν κρέα are used in these contexts for cooked meat, quoted in *OF* 578 *ad. loc.*: in the mysteries of Andania (*SIG* II<sup>3</sup> 736.96), in Halicarnassus, in the thiasos instituted by the testament of Posidonius (*SIG* III<sup>3</sup> 1044.40), or in an inscription of Cos (*SIG* III<sup>3</sup> 1025.23).

46 Eur. fr. 472.12 *TrGF* (Kannicht) (= *OF* 567.12): τὰς ὠμοφάγους δαΐτας.

47 Plut. *De es. carn.* 996c.

48 Eur. *Bacch.* 139: ὠμοφάγον χάριν (“delight of raw meat”).

49 *OF* 583.2–3: μὴ ἐξείναι ὠμοφάγιον ἐμβαλεῖν μηδενὶ πρότερον [ἢ ἢ ἰέ]ρεια ... ἐμβάληι (“nobody is permitted to dispose of the meal of raw meat before the priestess ... dispose of it”), cf. Sokolowski (1955) n. 48, pp. 123 and 125; *IMilet* 6.3.1222.14–23, with ample bibliography regarding the text. See also Bernabé’s notes on *OF* 583.

50 Cf. Dionys. *Bassar.* 9.39; Plut. *De def. or.* 417C; Schol. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 318.5.

51 Firm. Mat. *Err. prof. relig.* 6.5 (p. 89 Turcan).

52 Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.18.1; Firm. Mat. *Err. prof. relig.* 6.3 (p. 88 Turcan). Cf. Henrichs (1972) 67.



and limited to cooked meat. If it is not plausible to accept, as Firmicus mentions,<sup>53</sup> that the Cretes nibbled a live bull (*vivum laniant dentibus taurum*), why would we believe everything else? A parallel phenomenon appears in the versions regarding the behavior of the Maenads.<sup>54</sup>

## 2.6 δρώμενα. 3) Wine

The consumption of wine during the ritual is alluded to in l. 25, where Hordern reads οἶνον ἐπιον<sup>55</sup> (Kern previously read οἶνον πί[νων in the sequence von π.[ in col. II.12). Wine is associated to the Orphic ritual in the gold tablets of Pelinna,<sup>56</sup> where we read the expression: οἶνον ἔχεις εὐδαίμονα τιμάν (“you have wine, blessed privilege”), an obscure sentence that has been the object of several interpretations, from those who consider it to be an echo of the initiation ritual, to those who believe that there is a reference to a funerary ritual with wine libations, to those who see in it the expression of happiness that the deceased will enjoy in the Netherworld. These three interpretations are not really mutually exclusive, but they can be complementary to each other.<sup>57</sup> There are other testimonies regarding libations and the consumption of wine during Orphic rituals, such as the reference in Demosthenes to Aeschines pouring wine to the participants in the rituals that his mother celebrated,<sup>58</sup> the presence of wine in the otherworldly blessedness that awaits the initiates of Musaeus and Orpheus in the ironic description made by Plato,<sup>59</sup> and there are also parallel examples to this expression in the Gurob Papyrus in the σύμβολα and συνθήματα of the Eleusinian Mysteries cited by Clement,<sup>60</sup> but these similarities are not sufficient proof to consider that the

<sup>53</sup> Firm. Mat. *Err. prof. relig.* 6.5 (p. 89 Turcan).

<sup>54</sup> Henrichs (1969) 235–236 collects possible interpretations regarding this ritual; Henrichs (1978) 150–151 affirms that the intended omophagia is not but a particular type of a Dionysian sacrifice, whose ritual details are beyond us. Cf. Bremmer (1984) 274–275; Versnel (1990) 145; González Merino (2009) 157–161 and 272–275; González Merino (2010) 333–344; Alonso Fernández (2013); Porres Caballero (2013a); Porres Caballero (2013b) 72, 478–479.

<sup>55</sup> Hordern (2000) 139.

<sup>56</sup> OF 485–486.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Bernabé/Jiménez (2008) 84–89, where the discussion and a larger bibliography can be found.

<sup>58</sup> Dem. 18.259.

<sup>59</sup> Pl. *Resp.* 2.363c–d; cf. Plut. *Comp. Cimon. et Luc.* 1.2 (= OF 431 [I–II]).

<sup>60</sup> Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.15.3 and 2.21.3; cf. in addition Arnob. *Nat.* 5.26 (*ieiunavi atque ebibi cyconem*); see Hordern (2000) 134.



Gurob Papyrus reflects the Eleusinian rituals. Moreover, Ferrari<sup>61</sup> considers that the wine is limited to the initiation, so that the *mystes* is not only abstemious later, but also that he or she will not receive wine as a reward in the Otherworld.

## 2.7 δρώμενα. 4) Toys

After the indication “to have eaten what was given,” the ritual includes “put in the basket,” quite possibly a *cista mystica* (I. 28: εἰς τὸν κάλαθον ἐμβαλεῖν), a series of objects. Maybe there is another reference to the basket in col. II.22 ἐκ κα[λάθου].<sup>62</sup> In addition, there are also things tossed into a basket in an Eleusinian formula.<sup>63</sup> And the verb ἐμβαλεῖν significantly reappears in the expression ὠμοφάγιον ἐμβαλεῖν in an inscription from Miletus.<sup>64</sup> From the list of objects that must be thrown into the basket we have “a cone, a bull-roarer, knucklebones, and a mirror.” There is a close parallel to this text in a description by Clement<sup>65</sup> of the objects that were used by the Titans to deceive the god in a representation of the myth of Dionysos in a ritual, Clement quotes a verse by Orpheus:<sup>66</sup>

Cone, bull-roarer, toys of flexible members  
beautiful golden apples from the Hesperides of high pitch voice.

And then he adds

And from this *telete* it is not worthless to show you, to condemn them, the meaningless symbols: knucklebones, ball, spinning top, apples, bull-roarer, mirror, woollen flake.<sup>67</sup>

All the objects mentioned in the papyrus appear in Clement’s text, who adds six more, some of which or all could have been in the lost part of the papyrus. This is not the place to further develop the ritual value of each of the elements, something

<sup>61</sup> Ferrari (2011).

<sup>62</sup> Hordern (2000) 140 suggests as an alternative ἐκ κα[θαρών].

<sup>63</sup> Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.21.2 (σύνθημα Ἐλευσινίων μυστηρίων): ἐνήστευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεῶνα, ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἐργασάμενος ἀπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστην.

<sup>64</sup> *OF* 583.2: μὴ ἐξεῖναι ὠμοφάγιον ἐμβαλεῖν μηδενὶ πρότερον [ἢ ἢ ἰέ]ρεια ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἐμβάλλῃ.

<sup>65</sup> Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.17.2; cf. also Leonid. *AP* 6.309.

<sup>66</sup> *OF* 306: κῶνος καὶ ῥόμβος καὶ παίγνια καμπεσίγνια / μῆλα τε χρύσεια καλὰ παρ’ Ἑσπερίδων λιγυφώνων.

<sup>67</sup> Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.18.1 (= *OF* 588 [I]): καὶ τῆσδε ὑμῖν τῆς τελετῆς τὰ ἀχρεῖα σύμβολα οὐκ ἀχρεῖον εἰς κατάγνωσιν παραθέσθαι· ἀστράγαλος, σφαῖρα, στρόβιλος, μῆλα, ῥόμβος, ἔσσοπτρον, πόκος.



that has been treated repeatedly in other occasions.<sup>68</sup> Suffice it to say that the rite described by Clement included a kind of representation of the dismemberment of Dionysos by the Titans and it is very telling that the elements of the ritual described by him in the 2nd/3rd cent. AD coincide point by point with those in the Gurob Papyrus, almost 600 years earlier. These coincidences cannot be casual and they suggest a deep continuity in the ritual practices of these religious groups.

## 2.8 λεγόμενα. 1) ποινή and salvation

The ritual act included the recitation of verses and prayers, also in verse (cf. § 2.1). We will examine the passages that were part of the λεγόμενα in the ritual.

**δῶρον δέξ[ατ]’ ἐμὸν ποινὰς πατ[έρων ἀθεμίστων** (l. 4): This is a very plausible reconstruction done by West.<sup>69</sup> The allusion to a ποινή and to some wicked ancestors fits perfectly into the Orphic myth of Dionysos and the Titans, and the need for human beings, born from their ashes, to pay for the Titans’ crime of having dismembered, cooked and eaten Dionysos child.<sup>70</sup> Similar expressions are found in two gold tablets from Thurii,<sup>71</sup> a fragment by Pindar,<sup>72</sup> and a passage of the *Rhapsodies*,<sup>73</sup> always referring to the need for human beings to be free from this evil Titanic heritage through ritual. Here the ritual includes offerings (δῶρον, cf. δῶρα in l. 11).<sup>74</sup> In addition, there is also a reference to the ritual ποινή through θυσία and χοαί in the Derveni Papyrus.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>68</sup> West (1983) 154–159; Tortorelli (2000); Jiménez San Cristóbal (2005) 342–349; Levaniouk (2007).

<sup>69</sup> West (1993) 181.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Bernabé (2002).

<sup>71</sup> *OF* 489.4 and 490.4, that we reproduce without diacritical marks ποινὰν δ’ ἀνταπέτεισ’ ἔργων ἔνεκα οὕτι δικάων (“I have paid the price that corresponds to wicked actions”).

<sup>72</sup> Pind. fr. 133.1–2 Maehler: οἷσι δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποινὰν παλαιοῦ πένθεος / δέξεται. Cf. Bernabé (1999) 248–249, with bibliography.

<sup>73</sup> *OF* 350: λύσιν προγόνων ἀθεμίστων (“liberation of the wicked acts of his ancestors [or wicked ancestors]”).

<sup>74</sup> Tierney’s reconstruction Καβείρων] before ἀπερ<ε>ισια δῶρα (based on *OA* 27: ἀγλαὰ δῶρα Καβείρων) is not very convincing. A similar expression is found in *Ap. Rhod.* 1.19 and 4.1705, what appears to be an adaptation of the Homeric formula ἀπερείσι’ ἄποινα (*Il.* 1.13; 1.372; 6.46; etc.).

<sup>75</sup> *PDerv.*, col. VI.4–5: τὴν θυσ[ια]ν τούτου ἔνεκεν π[ο(ι)οῦσ]ι[ν] / οἱ μά[γο]ι ὥσπερ ἐι ποινήν ἀποδιδόντες. On the ποινή, cf. Santamaría (2005) and Graf/Johnston (2013<sup>2</sup>) 146–147.



**σωσοι με Βριμῷ μεγάλῃ (I. 5):** This is the first of two appeals to salvation that appear on the papyrus.<sup>76</sup> A very similar expression, σῶσοι με, σωσέκοι με, Δίμητρος κόρη, / σῶσοι με, σεμνή, νεπτέρων ὑπερτάτη appears in an Orphic fragment (*OF* 830a.6–7).<sup>77</sup> It is not clear whether this is a reference to being safe during one's life time on earth,<sup>78</sup> a type of prayer that we find, for example in the *Orphic Hymn to Prothyraia*, in which σῶξε refers to the request for a blissful delivery,<sup>79</sup> or whether it refers to the salvation of the *mystes* after death. Already in the chorus of initiates in the parodos of Aristophanes' *Frogs* appears twice σῶζω, directed to Soteira (probably Persephone) and to Demeter with a sense that seems to be otherworldly.<sup>80</sup> And in a gold tablet from Pherae (Thessaly)<sup>81</sup> the σύμβολον is intended to allow the entry of the initiated into the sacred meadows (presumably that of Persephone)<sup>82</sup> and ἄποινος γὰρ ὁ μύστης, 'the initiate is free from punishment' is added, which implies that it is also speaking of salvation in the Hereafter in relation to Brimo. We can accept the possibility that the papyrus was referring to both.<sup>83</sup> On the same gold tablet of Pherae, the name of Βριμῷ appears for the first time, repeated and qualified as a σύμβολον<sup>84</sup> and it referred most likely to Persephone. Βριμῷ seems to have been originally a goddess of the dead who was worshiped in Pherae, but then it becomes an epithet for several goddesses, Demeter, Rhea, Hecate or Persephone.<sup>85</sup> Within Orphic literature, the epithet is found, referring to Persephone, in the *Argonautica* attributed to Orpheus,<sup>86</sup> alluding to Dionysos and the crime of the Titans, which is the reason why we should attribute this term to this goddess in this case.

**Δίμητέρ τε Ῥέα (I. 6):** It does not seem (*pace* Hordern)<sup>87</sup> that we should reconstruct τε after Ῥέα (understanding that the goddesses would have been mentioned separately).

<sup>76</sup> Cf. I. 22.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Morand (2001) 218–220.

<sup>78</sup> For example *Od.* 9.430 (σῶοντες ἐταίρους); *Il.* 21.238 (ζωούς [...] σάω); *Pl. Cri.* 44b (σώθητι).

<sup>79</sup> *OH* 2.14. Cf. Ricciardelli (2000) 141.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Faraone (1997) 47, that also refers to this passage of the *PGurob*.

<sup>81</sup> *OF* 493.

<sup>82</sup> Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 155–158; cf. a gold tablet from Thurii (*OF* 487.6): λειμῶνας (...) Φερσεφονείας.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. *Pl. Resp.* 2.364e in which the acts of the initiates produce a liberation "in life and death" (εἰσι μὲν ἔτι ζῶσιν, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ τελευτήσασιν).

<sup>84</sup> *OF* 493.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Morand (2001) 278–279; Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 155–157; Graf/Johnston (2013<sup>2</sup>) 150 and 196–200; cf. the bibliography cited in *OF* 99 n. to I. 17 in the app. crit.

<sup>86</sup> *AO* 17.

<sup>87</sup> Hordern (2000) 136: "Ῥέα / [τε] would be quite acceptable both metrically and in view of the preceding τε."



In the Orphic sphere both goddesses are identified.<sup>88</sup> Thus, it can be understood that the author considered one the name and the other the epithet or nickname of a single goddess.

**Κούρητες τ' {ε} ἔνοπλοι (l. 7):** The Curetes are part of Orphic myths and rituals and their usual role is to take care of the gods during their childhood. They appear in the *Rhapsodies*,<sup>89</sup> two full hymns in the corpus of the *Orphic Hymns*<sup>90</sup> are dedicated to them, and in other texts even the same<sup>91</sup> or a very similar formula appear.<sup>92</sup> It seems to be a traditional denomination, as we found a very similar expression in Plato.<sup>93</sup>

**References to sacrifice and invocations:** This part in verse was closed with references to the celebration of the sacrifice and the offering of gifts, which have already been mentioned:<sup>94</sup> ἵνα ποιῶμεν ἱερὰ καλὰ / ] νηι κριός τε τράγος τε / ] ἀπερ<ε>ῖσια δῶρα. Afterwards the text of the papyrus once again goes back to the instructions of the celebration of the ritual.

## 2.9 λεγόμενα. 2) εὐχή

Smyly<sup>95</sup> considers that εὐχή (l. 17) “is probably a kind of heading,” which is quite possible even though, as Hordern<sup>96</sup> indicates, “there is no heading introducing the first prayer.” The εὐχή is found in the Orphic sphere in the gold tablet from Thurii *OF* 492.7 and in the *PDerv.*, col. VI.1 as one of the procedures that μειλίσσουσι τὰς ψυχάς.

**Ἰνον καὶ Εὐβουλῆα καλῶ[μεν (l. 18):** In the appeal at least two divinities are invoked. Eubuleus is another name given to Dionysos as it appears in the gold

<sup>88</sup> For example in *PDerv.*, col. XXII (= *OF* 398): ‘Γῆ’ δὲ καὶ ‘Μήτηρ’ καὶ ‘Ρέα’ καὶ ‘Ἥρη’ ἡ αὐτή; or in the *Rhapsodies* (= *OF* 206.1): ‘Ρεῖη τὸ πρὶν ἐοῦσα, ἐπεὶ Διὸς ἔπλετο μήτηρ, / Δημήτηρ γέγονε. Cf. Bernabé (2010).

<sup>89</sup> *OF* 198; 213; 267–268; 278–279; and 297, in relation to Dionysos.

<sup>90</sup> *OH* 31 and 38.

<sup>91</sup> *OH* (in *Mus.*) 20: Κουρήτας τ’ ἐνόπλους.

<sup>92</sup> *OH* 31.1: σκιρτηταὶ Κουρήτες, ἐνόπλια βήματα θέντες.

<sup>93</sup> *Pl. Leg.* 7.796b: Κουρήτων ἐνόπλια παίγνια.

<sup>94</sup> § 2.4.

<sup>95</sup> Smyly (1921) 7.

<sup>96</sup> Hordern (2000) 138.



tablets from Thurii<sup>97</sup> and in an Orphic hymn transmitted by Macrobius.<sup>98</sup> Only the end of the first name remains, for which Πρωτόγον]ον (Smyly) or ἀγ]νόν (West) have been proposed.

**] . . εὐρήας κυκλήσκω[μεν (l. 19):** It is possible to read γα]ίας εὐρήας.<sup>99</sup> West proposed “and let [us] call upon [the Queen] of the broad [Earth].” The following sentence is more difficult: ] . . ] . . ]το φίλους σὺ ἀπαύανας. Tierney<sup>100</sup> interpreted the verb in the ordinary sense of ‘sear’, following the idea that it referred to the punishment of the Titans.<sup>101</sup>

**Δ]ήμητρος καὶ Παλλάδος (l. 21):** Two goddesses, Demeter and Pallas, are mentioned in the genitive, the first is familiar to the Orphic rituals; it is the new name of Rhea when Cronos makes her the mother of Zeus in the *Rhapsodies*,<sup>102</sup> and in a version of the death of Dionysos she reconstructs his body.<sup>103</sup> The presence of the latter can be explained in the light of an Orphic verse that calls Athena Παλλάς and Σώτειρα,<sup>104</sup> in the context of the myth of Dionysos and the Titans, because she was the one who saved the beating heart of the god when he had been dismembered.<sup>105</sup>

**Εὐβου]λεὺ Ἱρικεπαῖγε (l. 22):** Afterwards Dionysos is invoked through two of his epithets. The first could be Εὐβου]λεῦ, a plausible reconstruction, since it appears in the papyrus before, but we could also read βασι]λεῦ.<sup>106</sup> Meanwhile, Ἱρικεπαῖγε is a strange epithet that with several reading variants is applied to Phanes in the *Rhapsodies*,<sup>107</sup> so Smyly<sup>108</sup> considered that in this case it could also refer to the same

**97** OF 488.1, 489.2, 490.2, 491.2. The metric imposes the correction Εὐβουληῖα : -λεα pap. Zuntz (1971) 311 n. 1 believes that the presence of εἷς Διόνυσος (l. 23) excludes that Eubuleus is Dionysos. Morand (2001) 193 denies it with good reason.

**98** Macrob. *Sat.* 1.18.12 (= OF 540.4). Cf. Ricciardelli (2000) 354–355; Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 102–104.

**99** Bernabé *ap.* OF 578. Cf. West (1983) 171.

**100** Tierney (1922) 86.

**101** Cf. Hordern (2000) 138, who cites Ar. *Ran.* 194 for ὁ Αὐαίνου λίθος in Hades and the references to ‘thirstiness’ (αὖος) in the Orphic gold tablets as indication that the verb is connected with the life after death.

**102** OF 206.

**103** That Bernabé calls the “Egyptian version” (cf. OF 57–59).

**104** OF 316

**105** Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.18.1 (= OF 315). Cf. Tierney (1922) 81.

**106** Graf/Johnston (2013<sup>2</sup>) 151.

**107** OF 135; 139; 143.4; 162; 167.2; 170; 241.1. Cf. also OF 134, with commentary. Regarding the explanation of the script cf. Hordern (2000) 138.

**108** Smyly (1921) 6, followed by Kern (1922).



god, but it is much more likely<sup>109</sup> that it alludes, just like Eubuleus, to Dionysos as there are many parallels of this use in the Orphic tradition;<sup>110</sup> particularly interesting is the gold tablet of Pherae<sup>111</sup> that has been repeatedly cited, in which the god is called Ἀνδρικεπαιδόθυρσον, not only because the epithet is mentioned as a σύμβολον, but also because the first element (which the word θύρσος follows) gives a reasonable explanation for the strange epithet Ἴρικεπαῖγε. Cf. the explanation of Bernabé and Jiménez San Cristóbal: “Probably it (Ἀνδρικεπαιδόθυρσον) is a mystic name shaped as a composite of ἀνὴρ ‘adult male’ and παῖς ‘child’, thus resulting in a hybrid suitable for referring to Dionysos as an ‘adult male-child’; afterwards the original name was probably altered in several forms as Ἴρικεπαῖος (OF 139; 143, 4; 170 etc.), Ἴρικαπαῖος (OF 135; 162) (...) [and here Ἴρικεπαῖγε]. The reverse process is, of course, possible, that is a name Ericepaeus (whose meaning was certainly already unknown even to the faithful) being deformed, by a kind of popular etymology, but the Pherae tablet is the oldest attestation of this name, for which reason we consider the first explanation more plausible.”<sup>112</sup>

At the end of the verse we can read ]ητά, for which there has been a number of different proposals, without being able to ascertain the validity of any of them.<sup>113</sup>

## 2.10 λεγόμενα. 3) σύμβολα and σύνθεμα

Before the σύμβολα a formula appears that we do not know how the author of the papyrus would call, εἰς Διόνυσος (l. 23), which evokes a passage attributed to Orpheus by Macrobius and the ps.-Justin:<sup>114</sup> εἰς Ζεὺς, εἰς Ἄϊδος, εἰς Ἥλιος, εἰς Διόνυσος (“only one Zeus, only one Hades, only one Helios, only one Dionysos”). This statement seems to be in line with the Orphic tendency to assimilate various gods,<sup>115</sup> but the full verse is not consistent with what remains of our papyrus.

<sup>109</sup> OF 578 *ad loc.*, cf. also Morand (2001) 192–193; Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 154.

<sup>110</sup> Procl. *In Ti.* 1.336.15 (= OF 140 [XI]), Hesych. s.v. Ἴρικεπαῖος· ὁ Διόνυσος; inscription from Selendus in Asia Minor (TAM V 2.1256.5–6, 2nd cent. AD; OF 662). Morand (2001) 193–194 points out clear points of contact with the *Orphic Hymns*.

<sup>111</sup> OF 493.

<sup>112</sup> Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 155.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Hordern (2000) 138, who prefers ἀστεροπ]ήτα West (cf. gold tablets from Thurii OF 489.5 and 490.5).

<sup>114</sup> Macrobi. *Sat.* 1.18.18; ps.-Just. *Coh. ad Gr.* 15.1 (= OF 543), who adds at the beginning of the verse the following: εἰς θεὸς ἐν πάντεσσι.

<sup>115</sup> Versnel (1990); Bernabé (2010).



The word σύμβολα introduces passwords<sup>116</sup> in the manner of a heading;<sup>117</sup> such “passwords” would have been revealed to the *mystes* during the ritual and he or she should pronounce them in successive cultic celebrations,<sup>118</sup> or, once dead, in his or her transit to the otherworld to be recognized as an initiate. We find σύμβολα in two gold tablets: one from Pherae and that from Entella. In the tablet from Pherae, these passwords are supposed to be said out loud to facilitate access to the “sacred meadows” by showing with it his or her condition as *mystes*;<sup>119</sup> in the tablet of Entella<sup>120</sup> the statement σύμβολα appears before a fracture, so that the formulae cannot be read. These σύμβολα recall those mentioned in the celebrations of Sabazios by the mother of Aeschines, as ἔφυγον κακόν, εὖρον ἄμεινον, as related by Demosthenes.<sup>121</sup>

**lyra (l. 24):** It would probably be the end of a first σύμβολον, for which Herrero proposes λύρα,<sup>122</sup> instrument of Orpheus and which fits with the presence of the lyre in the Mysteries with escatological connotations.<sup>123</sup>

**θεὸς διὰ κόλπου (l. 24):** “God on the bosom” is an expression that we find in a passage of Clement attributed to the cult of Sabazios.<sup>124</sup> Clement explains that it is “a snake that crawls on the bosom of the celebrants, proof of the incontinence of Zeus,” which has led to the explanation<sup>125</sup> that the ritual act would be a kind of commemoration of the sexual union of Zeus with Persephone in snake form. Such an interpretation does not seem appropriate in this context,<sup>126</sup> but the term can

---

116 Müri (1976).

117 Cf. Smyly (1921) 7: “σύμβολα is probably a kind of heading (...) indicating that the following expression were mystic passwords, or test phrases.”

118 Cf. Firm. Mat. *Err. prof. relig.* 18.1 (p. 115 Turcan); Celsus *ap. Orig. C. Cels.* 6.22, referencing the Mysteries of Mitra.

119 Gold tablet from Pherae (= *OF* 493): σύμβολα· Ἀνδρικεπαιδόθυρσον. Ἀνδρικεπαιδόθυρσον. Βριμῷ. Βριμῷ. εἴσιθι ἱερὸν λειμῶνα. ἄποινος γάρ ὁ μύστης.

120 Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 49 and 153–154.

121 Dem. 18.259.

122 Herrero (2007) 19 n. 13.

123 Cf. Hardie (2004).

124 Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.16.2: Σαβαζίων γοῦν μυστηρίων σύμβολον τοῖς μουμένοις ὁ διὰ κόλπου θεός· δράκων δέ ἐστιν οὗτος, διεκόμενος τοῦ κόλπου τῶν τελουμένων, ἔλεγχος ἀκρασίας Διός; Diod. Sic. 4.4 identifies Sabazios with the Dionysos who is the son of Persephone: φασι γάρ ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Φερσεφόνης Διόνυσον γενέσθαι τὸν ὑπὸ τινων Σαβάζιον ὀνομαζόμενον.

125 Dieterich (1891) 37 [= Dieterich (1911) 97] refers to an act of symbolic adoption of the *mystes*. Cf. Harrison (1903) 593. Festugière (1932) 137–138 prefers to see a ἱερὸς γάμος.

126 The sexual atmosphere seems particularly far removed from the Orphic rituals and from Orphic life in general, which is characterized by unadulterated puritanism, cf. Burkert (1975) 97.



relate to that found in a gold tablet from Thurii, “I plunged beneath the lap (ὐπὸ κόλπου) of my lady, the subterranean queen.”<sup>127</sup> Zuntz sees in the formula an allusion to the refuge of the faithful in the bosom of the goddess,<sup>128</sup> but it seems more likely that it refers to a kind of second birth within the divine mother after death.<sup>129</sup> This interpretation, which has important archaeological support,<sup>130</sup> allows us to understand the phrase as meaning “(I will become) god through the bosom (of the Mother).”

**οἱ ν[ο]ν ἔπιον ὄνος βουκόλος (l. 25):** This is an explicit mention of drinking during the celebration of the τελετή. Parallel examples are found in ritual phrases of the Eleusinian Mysteries cited by Clement.<sup>131</sup> Wine is a regular feature in initiation practices and funerary libations, but also an essential component of otherworldly happiness.<sup>132</sup> Its particular connotations make wine exceed the limits of ritual practice fulfilled in life to become a key symbol of the Orphic doctrine of salvation.<sup>133</sup>

**Ι.ιας σύνθεμα (l. 26):** The first letters should be the end of a word in the genitive, perhaps γίγας, but the ωμοφαγίας proposed by Hordern seems to be too dubious.<sup>134</sup> σύνθεμα (a late form of σύνθημα) is difficult to distinguish from σύμβολα. Smyly<sup>135</sup> defined both as “Divided Words, resembling a sign and countersign.”<sup>136</sup>

**127** OF 488.7: δεσποίνας δ' ὑπὸ κόλπον ἔδυν χθονίας βασιλείας. διὰ in the formula of the Gurob Papyrus suggests that the sentence is being said while the action is taking place. Cf. Hordern (2000) 134.

**128** For a discussion on these hypotheses see Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 29–132, with bibliography.

**129** Dieterich (1925<sup>3</sup>) 55; Burkert (1975) 97, who puts the sentence in relation with a passage at the end of Plato's *Republic* (10.621a), where the souls, once their destiny is known, have to “pass under the throne of Need.”

**130** Mainly feminine Anatolian, Cycladic and Minor Asian-Cycladic idols such as goddesses of life and death, Etruscan figures and terracotta statues, cf. Thimme (1985); Fridh-Haneson (1987); Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 130, with bibliography.

**131** Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.15.3: τὰ σύμβολα τῆς μνήσεως ταύτης ἐκ περιουσίας παρατεθέντα οἶδ' ὅτι κινήσει γέλωτα καὶ μὴ γελασεῖουσιν ὑμῖν διὰ τοὺς ἐλέγχους· “ἐκ τυμπάνου ἔφαγον· ἐκ κυμβάλου ἔπιον” κτλ.; *ibid.* 2.21.2: κάστι τὸ σύνθημα Ἐλευσινίων μυστηρίων· “ἐνήστευσα, ἔπιον τὸν κυκεῶνα” κτλ.

**132** Cf. Casadio (1999).

**133** On ὄνος and βουκόλος, cf. § 2.3.

**134** Hordern (2000) 139. Cf. what has been said above § 2.5, in relation to this practice.

**135** Smyly (1921) 7–8.

**136** Cf. *signa* and *responsa* in Firm. Mat. *Err. prof. relig.* 18.1.



**ἄνω κάτω (I. 26):** It could suggest the transit of the souls from the world above to the infernal one, in a similar way as βίος / θάνατος / βίος expresses the idea of the soul from Hades to our world in a bone tablet from Olbia.<sup>137</sup>

**καὶ ὃ σοι ἐδόθη ἀνίλωσαι (I. 27):** It seems to be part of the instructions (“and what has been given to you, consume it”) and not another σύνθεμα (the term is in singular). It probably refers to pieces of meat, cooked, that were distributed among those who were to be initiated so that they could eat it. The repertory of objects used in the ritual continues.

## 2.11 Column II

Very little information can be obtained from col. II. Incomprehensible due to lack of context is ῥάχος,<sup>138</sup> maybe ‘twig, branch’ of the vine,<sup>139</sup> in II.10. There seems to be another reference to a prayer in II.11 (εὐχεσ[θ-]); maybe οἶνον π[ίνων could be read in I. 12, in which case it would mention again the consumption of wine; in col. II.13 there seems to be a prohibition to possess something (μὴ ἔχη[ maybe μὴ ἐχῆ[τω Wilcken<sup>140</sup>]; in col. II.12 βλέπω[, “I see” is plausible (but βλέπω[μεν is also possible), and the consumption of another comestible seems to be alluded to in col. II.23 γεύ...[, that Wilcken reconstructs as γεύ[σασθαι and that Hordern<sup>141</sup> suggest that it could be interpreted as “of the Titans consuming Dionysos’ body,” while for II.15 πορεύ[ suggests πορεύ[α ‘journey’, probably in relation to Apollo carrying the relics of Dionysos to Delphi or to Athena taking the heart of the baby god to Zeus.<sup>142</sup>

## 2.12 Conclusions

- 1) We can see that the literary and ritual elements in the Gurob Papyrus are found in several religious ambiances, but they are only found all together in the Orphic tradition. Similar expressions and ritual elements are maintained

<sup>137</sup> Bone tablet from Olbia OF 463. Hordern (2000) 139 also puts in relation this expression with the pairs of opposites from the Olbia tablets (OF 464–465) and also with Heraclitus’ 22 B 60 DK (= fr. 33 Marcovich): ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω μία καὶ ὤντη.

<sup>138</sup> Maybe better ῥαχός, cf. ῥηχός *ap.* Hdt. 7.142, although ῥάχος is frequently found in the MSS.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. Theophr. *Caus. pl.* 3.7.3.

<sup>140</sup> Wilcken (1924) 71.

<sup>141</sup> Hordern (2000) 140.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. OF 578 for other similar dubious proposals on this part.



in Orphic texts with similar chronology, but found in distant places, such as the gold tablets or the Derveni Papyrus, or in texts that refer to nearby phenomena in space, but separated by centuries, as *Protrepticus* by Clement of Alexandria. In addition, there are references that have been compiled in the *Rhapsodies*, on a date which we place between the 2nd and the 1st cent. BC, which is a clear indication that we are dealing with features of a phenomenon that extends in space, lasts for centuries, and excludes the question of occasional and independent facts.

- 2) The use of books for religious practices defines the Orphics from the time of Euripides and Plato onwards. The papyrus could be considered to be one of the functional texts that the *mystai* used during the *telete*, which presupposes the existence of other texts where some aspects to which the papyrus alludes could have been developed at length.<sup>143</sup>
- 3) The Gurob Papyrus demonstrates the existence in Egypt of a complex mythology and a ritual in which several ecstatic divinities are implied, as they occur in the *Orphic Hymns*, but at an earlier period.<sup>144</sup>
- 4) The antiquity of a number of elements of the myth of Dionysos (the toys, the *cista mystica*, the intervention of Pallas) and the association of this myth to the *τελετή* and to the fate of human beings can now be attested, a combination that once more is especially significant because it predates Neoplatonic formulations by centuries.
- 5) Although the vocabulary referring to the frantic aspects of Dionysism can be found, such as *ὠμόα*, it seems clear that the wild and violent characteristics may belong to the myth, but not to the ritual, which seems to be mimetic and sweetened.
- 6) The importance of wine in the ritual can be attested.
- 7) The common elements, even in the minute details, that the papyrus presents with the Orphic gold tablets, with the Derveni Papyrus, with the *Orphic Hymns*, with the rites celebrated by Aeschines in honour of Sabazios, with the descriptions done by Clement,<sup>145</sup> with the *Rhapsodies*, and with a wide range of diverse texts spread in space and time, excludes it from being a syncretic and isolated rarity, and it places the papyrus instead as an early link in a long chain of similar rites, which indicate the presence of a consistent

<sup>143</sup> For example, the most probable model that provides the material to write the gold tablets could have been a *Descent of Orpheus to the Otherworld*, from which we have several references. Cf. *OF* 707–711. Regarding the question cf. Riedweg (1998) and Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 231–233.

<sup>144</sup> Morand (2001) 276–282; Graf/Johnston (2013<sup>2</sup>) 152.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. Herrero (2010) 147–148 with a detailed comparison between the two texts.



religious movement (but certainly not monolithic), since ancient times, that has its own ritual vocabulary and its own details in the ritual δρώμενα.

- 8) The rituals are clearly connected with salvation.
- 9) We must stop saying that the Gurob Papyrus is an eclectic Eleusinian, Orphic, and Dionysian document.<sup>146</sup> It reflects an Orphic ritual, without quotation marks, and without adulteration. The Orphic cults are Dionysian and the Orphic Mysteries have common elements with the Eleusinian ones, since they have parallel rituals, with similar purposes, the main difference being that the latter are official and structured and the former are more free and dispersed in space.
- 10) The text can be a very enlightening example of the Orphic *traditio* (παράδοσις), i.e. how the sacred stories were transmitted to the *mystai* in the celebration of the mysteries. In this text, the story from beginning to end is not told, but alluded to symbolically by reference to the gods and the objects that the Titans used to coax Dionysos. In any case, there is no complete narrative of the myth. As a matter of fact, a story that includes cosmogonies, theogonies, religious stories like the death of the Titans and the origin and destiny of the soul is unknown as such until the *Rhapsodies*, which were compiled quite possibly between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st cent. BC.<sup>147</sup>

### 3 Orphics and Greek magical papyri

The connection of Orphism with the magical papyri is established in two ways: one is a Greek magical papyrus<sup>148</sup> where we read:

γράφει τὸν λόγον τὸν Ὀρφαϊκόν· “ασκει καὶ τάσκει”

write the Orphic saying “*askei kai taskei*,”

where obviously the three words stand here for the whole formula,<sup>149</sup> because it is well-known. Indeed, it is the so-called *Ephesia Grammata*, that we cannot discuss here in detail.<sup>150</sup> It suffices to mention the oldest occurrence, from the 4th cent. BC.<sup>151</sup>

<sup>146</sup> Burkert (1987) 70–71.

<sup>147</sup> As West (1983) wants, cf. Baumgarten (1998) 113 ff.

<sup>148</sup> *PMag.* VII 450 (= *OF* 830 [I]). Cf. Edmonds (2013).

<sup>149</sup> McCown (1923) 132.

<sup>150</sup> Cf. Bernabé (2013).

<sup>151</sup> Anaxil. Com. fr. 18.6–7 *PCG*.



ἐν σκυταρίοις ῥαπτοῖσι φορῶν  
Ἐφεσῆια γράμματα καλά.

Carrying about, on little bits of stitched leather,  
lovely Ephesian letters.<sup>152</sup>

The *Ephesia Grammata* most probably did not have anything to do with Ephesos. This is indicated in a testimony in the *Etymologicum Magnum*:<sup>153</sup>

ἢ ἀπὸ ἐφεσίων τινῶν οὐσῶν ἐπαιδῶν δυσπαρακολουθήτων, ὡς προεῖρηται· ὁθεν καὶ ἐφέσια λέγονται.

Or it is because they are liberating incantations, hard to understand, as it has been said, the reason why they are called “liberating.”

Wünsch<sup>154</sup> explains ἐφέσια as a derivative of ἐφήμι, with the meaning of “to loosen”; so it would be better to write ἐφέσια without a capital letter. The complete formula was offered, with variants, by Clement of Alexandria<sup>155</sup> and Hesychius<sup>156</sup> and we present it here following the reconstruction proposed by Bernabé:<sup>157</sup>

ἄσκι, κατάσκι, αἶζ, τετράζ, Δαμναμενεύς, ἁᾱσία.

In this same work, Bernabé tried to determine the origins of the formula, that can be clearly traced to a series of documents considerably old, most of them written in lead, and that combines all or a great part of the words that composed those *Ephesia Grammata*. Moreover, fragments were edited in the *Orphicorum fragmenta*.<sup>158</sup>

We are not surprised at the relation of magic with Orphism.<sup>159</sup> In the Derveni Papyrus we can see how the Magi recite a spell to liberate the *daimones* that become an hindrance when they are performing a ritual<sup>160</sup> and Plutarch warns

152 Transl. by Ch. B. Gulick.

153 *Etym. Magn.* 402.28.

154 Wünsch (1900) 84–85.

155 Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.8.45.2

156 Hesych. s.v. Ἐφέσια γράμματα.

157 Bernabé (2013).

158 *OF* 830.

159 Cf. Martín-Hernández (2010).

160 *PDerv.*, col. VI.2.



that the *magi* ordered their possessed to recite and enunciate to themselves the *Ephesia Grammata*.<sup>161</sup>

There are other elements that agree to relate the *Ephesia Grammata*, the *epodai* and Orphism.<sup>162</sup> The lead inscriptions come from the geographical zones where more gold tablets have been found, i.e. Crete and the South of Italy. Furthermore, there are a great coincidence of symbols between the former and the gold tablets. We will simply cite two examples:

- a) A goat that must be taken out of the garden (of Persephone) at milking time, which has an interesting parallel in the texts of the already mentioned tablets in which the initiate is assimilated with a goat that has fallen in milk and in the importance of milk and breastfeeding in Dionysian rituals.<sup>163</sup>
- b) Damnameneus is one of the Dactyls of Ida, who are usually considered to be the authors of the *Ephesia Grammata*.<sup>164</sup> We can see the Dactyls of Ida in relation to Orpheus and with the rituals supposedly founded by him in several literary passages.<sup>165</sup> In these texts it can be seen that the Dactyls knew of ἐπωδαί, and this is precisely what these texts that we mentioned are.

In a study published by Bernabé and Martín-Hernández<sup>166</sup> more points of contact are highlighted between the Getty Hexameters and the tablets, from which it can be inferred that there were close relations between the world of the Orphic Mysteries and that of these apotropaic texts. It could be said that the same or similar professionals, in close scenes (the south of Italy and Crete), offered from Classical times types of texts that were attributed to Orpheus, due to the prestige of this Thracian bard, and which were similar, but not the same, because they have different purposes: the tablets, eschatological, and the lead inscriptions, protection against the evils of this world.

<sup>161</sup> Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 706E1–2: ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ μάγοι τοὺς δαμονιζομένους κελεύουσι τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλέγειν καὶ ὀνομάζειν, (...), “for just as sorcerers advise those possessed by demons to recite and name over to themselves the Ephesian letters, (...)” (transl. by E. L. Minar Jr.).

<sup>162</sup> Bernabé (2013); Bernabé/Martín-Hernández (2013).

<sup>163</sup> See Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 76–83.

<sup>164</sup> Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.8.73.1.

<sup>165</sup> See AO 25, Diod. Sic. 4.43.1 (= Dionys. Scyt. fr. 18 Rusten), 4.48.6 (= Dionys. Scyt. fr. 18 Rusten) and 5.64.4 (= Ephor. *FGrHist* 70 F 104); cf. Bernabé (2000) 47–48. For the Dactyls connected to the cult of the Mother Goddess, cf. Strab. 10.3.22. Cf. also OF 519–523.

<sup>166</sup> Bernabé/Martín-Hernández (2013).



## References

- Alonso Fernández (2013): Zoa Alonso Fernández, “Maenadic Ecstasy in Rome: Fact or Fiction?”, in: Bernabé *et al.*, 185–199.
- Baumgarten (1998): Roland Baumgarten, *Heiliges Wort und Heilige Schrift bei den Griechen, Hieroi Logoi und verwandte Erscheinungen*, Tübingen.
- Bernabé (1996): Alberto Bernabé, “La fórmula órfica ‘cerrad las puertas, profanos’. Del profano religioso al profano en la materia”, in: *’Ilu, Revista de Ciencias de las Religiones* 1, 13–37.
- Bernabé (1999): Alberto Bernabé, “Una cita de Píndaro en Platón, *Men.* 81b (Fr. 133 Sn.-M.)”, in: Juan A. López Férez (ed.), *Desde los poemas homéricos hasta la prosa griega del siglo IV d.C.: Veintiséis estudios filológicos*, Madrid, 239–259.
- Bernabé (2000): Alberto Bernabé, “Tradiciones órficas en Diodoro”, in: Minerva Alganza Roldán, José M. Camacho Rojo, Pedro P. Fuentes González and Miguel Villena Ponsoda (eds.), *Εμείκεια: Studia Graeca in memoriam Jesús Lens Tuero*, Granada, 37–53.
- Bernabé (2002): Alberto Bernabé, “La toile de Penélope. A-t-il existé un mythe orphique sur Dionysos et les Titans?”, in: *RHR* 219, 401–433.
- Bernabé (2008a): Alberto Bernabé, “Características de los textos órficos”, in: Bernabé/Casadesús, 241–246.
- Bernabé (2008b): Alberto Bernabé, “Las láminas de Olbia”, in: Bernabé/Casadesús, 537–546.
- Bernabé (2010): Alberto Bernabé, “The Gods in Later Orphism”, in: Jan N. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine (eds.), *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, Edinburgh, 422–441.
- Bernabé (2011): Alberto Bernabé, *Platón y el orfismo: Diálogos entre religión y filosofía*, Madrid.
- Bernabé (2013): Alberto Bernabé, “The *Ephesia Grammata*: Genesis of a Magical Formula”, in: Faraone/Obbink, 71–96.
- Bernabé (2016): Alberto Bernabé, “Two Orphic Images in Euripides: *Hippolytus* 948–957 and *Cretans* 472 Kannicht”, in: Jacqueline Assaël and Andreas Markantonatos (eds.), *Orphism and Greek Tragedy*, Berlin, 183–204.
- Bernabé/Casadesús (2008): Alberto Bernabé and Francesc Casadesús (eds.), *Orfeo y la tradición órfica: un reencuentro*, Madrid.
- Bernabé *et al.* (2013): Alberto Bernabé, Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal and Raquel Martín-Hernández (eds.), *Redefining Dionysos*, Berlin.
- Bernabé/Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008): Alberto Bernabé and Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets*, Leiden/Boston.
- Bernabé/Martín-Hernández (2013): Alberto Bernabé and Raquel Martín-Hernández, “*Orphica et magica*. Rasgos órficos en las ἐπιγράμματα suritálicas: consideraciones sobre los *Hexámetros Getty*”, in: Emilio Suárez de la Torre and Aurelio Pérez Jiménez, *Mito y magia en Grecia y Roma*, Barcelona, 117–148.
- Bremmer (1984): Jan N. Bremmer, “Greek Maenadism Reconsidered”, in: *ZPE* 55, 267–286.
- Burkert (1975): Walter Burkert, “Le laminette auree: Da Orfeo a Lampone”, in: *Orfismo in Magna Grecia*, Naples, 81–104.
- Burkert (1987): Walter Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge (MA)/London.
- Burkert (1998): Walter Burkert, *Sauvages origines: Mythes et rites sacrificiels en Grèce ancienne*, Paris.
- Cardin/Ozbek (2011): Marta Cardin and Leila Ozbek, “Orfeo e Dioniso: nuove indagini su un frammento mitografico trascurato (*PSI VII 850*)”, in: *Studi e testi per il corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini: Papiri Filosofici: Miscellanea di Studi VI*, Florence, 137–162.



- Casabona (1966): Jean Casabona, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec: des origines à la fin de l'époque classique*, Aix-en-Provence.
- Casadio (1990): Giovanni Casadio, "I Cretesi di Euripide e l'ascesi orfica", in: *Didattica del Classico* 2, 278–310.
- Casadio (1999): Giovanni Casadio, *Il vino dell'anima: Storia del culto di Dioniso a Corinto, Sicione, Trezene*, Rome.
- Colli (1977): Giorgio Colli, *La sapienza greca*, vol. 1, Milan (3rd ed. 1981).
- Dieterich (1891): Albrecht Dieterich, *De Hymnis Orphicis, capitula quinque*, Marburg [= Id., *Kleine Schriften*, Leipzig/Berlin 1911, 69–110].
- Dieterich (1925): Albrecht Dieterich, *Mutter Erde*, Stuttgart (1st. ed. 1904).
- Edmonds (2013): Radcliffe G. Edmonds III, "The Ephesia Grammata: Logos Orphaïkos or Apolline Alexima Pharmaka?", in: Faraone/Obbink, 97–106.
- Faraone (1997): Christopher Faraone, "Salvation and Female Heroics in the Parodos of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*", in: *JHS* 117, 38–59.
- Faraone/Obbink (2013): Christopher Faraone and Dirk Obbink (eds.), *The Getty Hexameters: Poetry, Magic, and Mystery in Ancient Selinous*, Oxford.
- Ferrari (2011): Franco Ferrari, "La donna di Pelinna e i simposi oltremondani", in: *Prometheus*, 37, 97–106.
- Festugière (1932): André-Jean Festugière, *L'ideal religieux des Grecs et l'Evangile*, Paris.
- Festugière (1935): André-Jean Festugière, "Les mystères de Dionysos", in: *RBi* 44, 191–211; 366–396 [= Id., *Études de religion grecque et hellénistique*, Paris 1972, 13–63].
- Fridh-Haneson (1987): Britt M. Fridh-Haneson, "Votive terracottas from Italy: Types and Problems", in: Tullia Linders and Gullög Nordquist (eds.), *Gifts to the Gods*, Stockholm, 67–75.
- García López (1993): José García López, *Aristófanes: Las Ranas*, Murcia.
- González Merino (2009): Juan Ignacio González Merino, *Dioniso: El dios del vino y la locura*, Córdoba.
- González Merino (2010): Juan Ignacio González Merino, "Ὀμοφαγία, ¿término órfico?", in: Alberto Bernabé, Francesc Casadesús and Marco A. Santamaría (eds.), *Orfeo y el orfismo: Nuevas perspectivas*, Biblioteca Virtual Cervantes, 333–344 (online: <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra/orfeo-y-el-orfismo-nuevas-perspectivas--0/>).
- Graf/Johnston (2013): Fritz Graf and Sarah I. Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets*, London (1st ed. 2007).
- Hardie (2004): Alex Hardie, "Muses and Mysteries", in: Penelope Murray and Peter Wilson, *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City*, Oxford.
- Harrison (1903): Jane Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, Cambridge (3rd ed. New York 1959).
- Henrichs (1969): Albert Henrichs, "Die Mänaden von Milet", in: *ZPE* 4, 223–241.
- Henrichs (1972): Albert Henrichs, *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos*, Bonn.
- Henrichs (1978): Albert Henrichs, "Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina", in: *HSCPh* 82, 121–160.
- Henrichs (2003): Albert Henrichs, "*Hieroi logoi* and *hierai bibloi*: The (Un)written Margins of the Sacred in Ancient Greece", in: *HSCPh* 101, 207–266.
- Herrero (2007): Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, "Las fuentes de Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2.12–22: Un tratado sobre los misterios y una teogonía órfica", in: *Emerita* 75, 19–50.
- Herrero (2010): Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, *Orphism and Christianity in Late Antiquity*, Berlin.
- Hordern (2000): James Hordern, "Notes on the Orphic Papyrus from Gurôb (*P. Gurôb* 1: Pack 2464)", in: *ZPE* 129, 131–140.



- Jiménez San Cristóbal (2002a): Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, “Consideraciones sobre las τελευταί ὄρφικας”, in: José F. González Castro and José L. Vidal (eds.), *Actas del X Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* III, Madrid, 127–133.
- Jiménez San Cristóbal (2002b): Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, “Los libros del ritual órfico”, in: *Estudios Clásicos* 44, 109–123.
- Jiménez San Cristóbal (2005): Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, *Rituales órficos*, Doct. Diss. Madrid (online: <http://eprints.ucm.es/tesis/fl/ucm-t25949.pdf>).
- Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008): Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, “El ritual y los ritos órficos”, in: Bernabé/Casadesús, 731–770.
- Jiménez San Cristóbal (2009): Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, “¿Hubo ritos de paso cruentos en el orfismo?”, in: *Synthesis* 16, 83–97.
- Jiménez San Cristóbal (2015a): Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, “El PSI 850 (OF 310): Nuevas propuestas de lectura”, in: Jesús de la Villa Polo et al. (eds.), *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y formas del Mundo Clásico* III, Madrid, 53–62.
- Jiménez San Cristóbal (2015b): Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, “The Rape of Persephone in a Berlin Papyrus”, in: *LEC* 83, 237–260.
- Jiménez San Cristóbal (2017): Ana I. Jiménez San Cristóbal, “La escatología del Papiro de Bolonia (P. Bon 1.4 [P. Bon. inv. 24])”, in: María J. Albarrán Martínez, Raquel Martín-Hernández and Irene Pajón Leyra (eds.), *Estudios papirológicos: Textos literarios y documentales del siglo IV a.C. al siglo IV d.C.*, Madrid, 21–53.
- Kern (1922): Otto Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, Berlin (2nd ed. 1963; repr. Dublin/Zürich 1972).
- Levaniouk (2007): Olga Levaniouk, “The Toys of Dionysos”, in: *HSCPh* 103, 165–202.
- Linforth (1941): Ivan M. Linforth, *The Arts of Orpheus*, Berkeley/Los Angeles (repr. New York 1973).
- Martín-Hernández (2010): Raquel Martín-Hernández, *Orfeo y los magos: La literatura órfica, la magia y los misterios*, Madrid.
- McCown (1923): Chester C. McCown, “The *Ephesia Grammata* in Popular Belief”, in: *TAPhA* 54, 128–140.
- Méndez Dosuna (2009): Julián Méndez Dosuna, “¿Un nuevo testimonio de αἴζα ‘cabra’ en una lámina órfica?”, in: Ángel Martínez Fernández (ed.), *Estudios de Epigrafía Griega*, La Laguna, 369–375.
- Morand (2001): Anne-France Morand, *Études sur les Hymnes orphiques*, Leiden/Boston/Cologne.
- Müri (1976): Walter Müri, “Σύμβολον: Wort- und sachgeschichtliche Studie”, in: Id., *Griechische Studien: Ausgewählte Wort- und sachgeschichtliche Forschungen zur Antike*, ed. by Eduard Vischer, Basel, 1–44.
- Porres Caballero (2013a): Silvia Porres Caballero, “Maenadic Ecstasy in Greece: Fact or Fiction?”, in: Bernabé et al., 159–184.
- Porres Caballero (2013b): Silvia Porres Caballero, *Dioniso en la poesía lírica griega*, Diss. Madrid (online: <http://eprints.ucm.es/24575/1/T35156.pdf>).
- Ricciardelli (2000): Gabriella Ricciardelli, *Inni orfici*, Milan.
- Riedweg (1998): Christoph Riedweg, “Initiation–Tod–Unterwelt: Beobachtungen zur Kommunikationssituation und narrativen Technik der orphischbakchischen Goldblättchen”, in: Fritz Graf (ed.), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale*, Stuttgart/Leipzig, 359–398.
- Santamaría (2005): Marco A. Santamaría, “Ποινὰς τίνειν: Culpa y expiación en el orfismo”, in: Antonio A. Ezquerro and José F. González Castro (eds.), *Actas del XI Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, 3 vols., Madrid, I, 397–405.



- Schuddeboom (2009): Feyo L. Schuddeboom, *Greek Religious Terminology – Telete & Orgia*, Leiden/Boston.
- Sfameni Gasparro (1988): Giulia Sfameni Gasparro, “Ancora sul temine τελετή: osservazioni storico-religiose”, in: Sandro Boldrini (ed.), *Filologia e forme letterarie: Studi offerti a Francesco Della Corte*, 5 vols., Urbino, V, 137–152.
- Smyly (1921): Gilbert J. Smyly, *Greek Papyri from Gurob*, Dublin.
- Sokolowski (1955): Franciszek Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris.
- Thimme (1985): Jürgen Thimme, “Die religiöse Bedeutung der Kykladenidole”, in: *Antike Kunst* 8, 72–86.
- Tierney (1922): Michael Tierney, “The Origins of Orphism”, in: *ITHQ* 17, 112–127.
- Tortorelli Ghidini (2000): Marisa Tortorelli Ghidini, “I giocattoli di Dioniso tra mito e rituale”, in: Marisa Tortorelli Ghidini, Alfredina Storch Marino and Amedeo Visconti (eds.), *Tra Orfeo e Pitagora: Origini e incontri di culture nell'antichità*, Naples, 43–80.
- Tortorelli Ghidini (2006): Marisa Tortorelli Ghidini, *Figli della terra e del cielo stellato*, Naples.
- Van Gennep (1909): Arnold van Gennep, *Les rites de passage*, Paris (repr. New York 1969).
- Versnel (1990): Hendrik S. Versnel, *Ter Unus. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes: Three Studies in Henotheism*, Leiden.
- West (1982): Martin L. West, “The Orphics of Olbia”, in: *ZPE* 45, 17–29.
- West (1983): Martin L. West, *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford.
- West (1993): Martin L. West, *I poemi orfici*, transl. by Marisa Tortorelli Ghidini, Naples.
- Wilamowitz (1931–1932): Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 vols., Berlin (3rd ed. Darmstadt 1959).
- Wilcken (1924): Ulrich Wilcken, “Referate”, in: *APF* 7, 71–72.
- Wünsch (1900): Richard Wünsch, “Neue Fluchtafeln”, in: *RhM* 55, 73–85.
- Zuntz (1971): Günther Zuntz, *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia*, Oxford.







David N. Sedley

## 2 The Opening Lemmas of the Derveni Papyrus

### 1 Introduction

In the twenty columns running from col. VII to the end (col. XXVI) the text partially preserved by the Derveni Papyrus takes the form of a running commentary, lemma by lemma, on a theogonic poem attributed to Orpheus. The first six columns, by contrast, along with any small fragments that may precede them in the sequence, have always been regarded as different in genre: not part of the commentary as such, but a critical interpretation of various religious practices and beliefs.

As far as I am aware, no attempt has yet been made to call into question this seemingly unparalleled division of the text.<sup>1</sup> In the later tradition, it is normal for a commentary to start with a prologue, but the material surviving from *PDerv.*, cols. I–VI does not seem to be prefatory to the main content of the ensuing commentary.<sup>2</sup> At least, any such view of its role would need to be proposed and

---

1 Cf. Laks/Most (1997) introduction, 5, for the observation that the relationship between the two parts of the papyrus is among the questions that have insufficiently engaged scholars. Two decades later, that remains broadly true.

2 As noted by e.g. Frede (2007) 14.

---

**Note:** Warm thanks (although none of those named should be assumed to agree with my contentions) to Valeria Piano and Gábor Betegh for a constant and unfailingly rewarding interchange of ideas; to Glenn Most for a searching critique of the penultimate draft; to André Laks, Radcliffe Edmonds and Richard Janko for invaluable discussions of various issues raised by the paper; to Valeria Piano also for her meticulous and generous advice on the viability of various restorations (reflecting her seminal work in Piano [2011]); to members of the audience at the September 2016 Trier conference for their questions and criticisms; and to Richard Janko for patiently filling in details of his newly emerging revised transcription, drawing on innovative photographic data, for which see now Janko (2016) and Kotwick (2017). I have chosen to use Janko's transcription, the most recent full-scale revision of the text, as my own starting point, while acutely aware that like all previous reconstructions it remains provisional (as Janko [2016], himself underlines), and must await the evaluation of scholars who unlike me have the full range of technical skills required. Where I present re-edited texts, my app. crit. records the authorship only of the restorations I adopt, since I cannot pronounce on which of the many other readings are still palaeographically likely or even possible. Very extensive information on past conjectures can be found in the app. crit. of Janko (2002), and in that of Piano (2016) 63–82.

---

David N. Sedley, University of Cambridge



defended, and no one seems to have attempted that yet. Nor could the religious disquisition plausibly be explained as the end of a separate work, merely sharing a papyrus roll with the commentary, since the transition from it to the commentary would have to be located, with scant plausibility, within a single column (the lower half of col. VI).

My aim here is to construct a case for a simpler solution which has not yet been considered, let alone tested, that of assigning the whole of cols. I–VI to the commentary proper.<sup>3</sup> Towards that end, I shall seek to identify the first lemmas cited from the Orphic poem, linking each to the corresponding portion of commentary.

## 2 Cols. I–VI as part of the commentary

Two specific features seem to me to add impetus to the idea that the commentary is already under way in I–VI.

First, the Furies – as for convenience I shall call the deities referred to here as the Eumenides and as the Erinyes, whether these are taken to be closely related or altogether identical – are repeatedly named in these opening columns: at the very least III.5, IV.9, and VI.9 (*bis*).<sup>4</sup> Their function in these sentences, and in others where they seem implicitly present, is not always recoverable, but it is certainly diverse: thus in col. IV they are presented as Heraclitus' way (in all probability

---

<sup>3</sup> I shall speak for convenience of cols. I–VI, without excluding the likelihood that the commentary on the opening lemma started one or more columns earlier. Janko (2016) 10–11 has in fact identified what looks like an underlined omicron in the left margin of col. VI, just below l. 6, as a stichometric number marking line 1500 of the full text. If he is right, there was a good deal of other material before what the editors call col. I. The hypothesis of my paper, which identifies the badly burnt and barely surviving outer fragments of the roll with the start of the commentary, favours the hitherto universal assumption that these fragments were located at or very near the roll's beginning. But if Janko's proposal were to gain acceptance, there would be no insuperable problem about filling the extra space with appropriate material: not just an authorial *sphragis*, but a prologue, quite possibly including a full exposition of the author's own cosmogonic theory (since in the preserved commentary this is presupposed rather than expounded); perhaps an introduction to the Orphic poem; even a transcript of it. The first step, though, is for Janko's proposal to be considered and critically discussed from a papyrological point of view.

<sup>4</sup> Valeria Piano warns me that the apparent references to Furies in cols. I.6 and II.3 are textually doubtful (the first of these warnings being now confirmed by Janko [2016] 15 and Kotwick [2017]), but that on the other hand there are further references waiting to be inserted, in the detached fragments G6.2 and G9a.2. Even if none of those currently confirmed proves to be in the small scraps surviving from cols. I–II, their prominence within what is agreed to be a continuous religious context must be significant.



endorsed by the commentator himself) of representing a cosmic principle concerned with the restoration of balance; whereas in VI.4–5 they are treated as giving meaning to a sacrificial practice which is explained as itself being a kind of penal restitution. It should be a credible hypothesis, therefore, that this long discussion was preceded by a lemma from the Orphic poem in which the Furies were mentioned or invoked by name, and that our commentator is drawing out the lemma's multiple implications, both cosmological and religious. Here we might compare col. XX, which is certainly part of the theogonic commentary, but which in its preserved lines is focused on criticizing current understandings of religious ritual.<sup>5</sup> We should therefore not be surprised to find a comparable theme included in cols. I–VI even if they too are taken to be part of the commentary.

Much meticulous scholarship has been devoted to teasing out the rich religious content of cols. I–VI, and I know of no reason why any of those findings should be endangered if it were to turn out that the formal context is commentatorial rather than straightforwardly discursive. Indeed, some of the problems should be eased, since the passage would no longer have to be assumed to have had a progressive internal structure; instead, the juxtaposition of various topics would primarily reflect the fact that they were issues independently raised by the poem's opening lemma.

The second reason for hypothesizing that the commentary is already under way in these opening columns lies in a phrase in col. IV. It has proved particularly resistant to interpretation under the prevailing assumptions,<sup>6</sup> but to my eye looks very much like an exegetical comment on a lemma. I read it as follows<sup>7</sup>: μετὰ τῆς τύχης γὰρ | οὐκ εἴ[α λα]μάνειν (3–4), “For he did not make it possible to take it (sc. some word or phrase) with ‘chance’.” The implied subject is, I assume, Orpheus, as regularly in the ensuing commentary, and the commentator is ruling out a certain construal of the lemma's wording, in favour of a different one. We may compare VIII.4–12, where again two alternative grammatical construals of a lemma are distinguished, and the commentator's preference indicated. I shall say more about this proposed reading in §§ 6–7, but for now I list it as *prima facie* support for identifying at the very least col. IV itself, but more probably the whole of cols. I–VI, as commentary on a lemma.

A natural objection is that, by the Derveni author's usual standards, six or more columns is surprisingly long for commentary on a single lemma, given that

<sup>5</sup> On the problem that this poses for the accepted division of the *PDerv.* text, cf. Laks (1997) 124–127.

<sup>6</sup> These difficulties are well illustrated by the attempts to translate and explain the lines in KPT, 130 and 153–154, on the assumption that the content is religious.

<sup>7</sup> So far as the text itself is concerned, the completion μετὰ has already been proposed by Parássoglou, and the rest is due to Tsantsanoglou, independently confirmed by Valeria Piano (pers. comm.). The only novelty I offer lies in my proposed interpretation of the words.



in the remainder of the papyrus lemmas occur at an average of at least one per column, probably two.<sup>8</sup> However, the lemma I am postulating has every chance of being the poem's opening, and it is an easily confirmed fact about ancient commentaries, like some modern commentaries, that the opening line or lines of the work often receive a uniquely thorough exegesis, verging on saturation.<sup>9</sup> Such an imbalance could be intentional, to signal the special importance of the work's opening, or may reflect initial ambitions of exhaustive coverage on the part of the commentator, ambitions which later lose momentum.

In the present case I think the former explanation carries more weight. The author clearly has a substantial religious agenda to deliver, seemingly including his demonology and eschatology. Since in line with a well-established Hesiodic tradition he took the ensuing theogonic narrative to amount to a cosmogony, he may have preferred so far as possible to tie his cultic and religious material to a lemma preceding that narrative. An opening invocation of the Furies, it seems, provided him with just the right opportunity, especially given the role that the restitution of imbalances which they represent was to play in the cosmogony proper.

A prominent issue which further prolongs the commentary in this early part of the text is the author's methodology for exegesis of the Orphic text. It was usually in the prologue to an ancient commentary, much as in the introduction to a modern one, that general exegetical issues were addressed. Whether or not the Derveni commentary originally included such a prologue, it seems that while commenting on the first lemmas the author took every opportunity to support his exegetical methodology by pointing to textual evidence for Orpheus' apparent endorsement of it. Thus in col. I, as I shall propose reconstructing it below, Orpheus' decision not to start out in the manner typical of a treatise on nature, with postulates about the cosmic elements, is explained and justified (see § 3). And in col. IV, again on the reading that I will be offering, he cites the combined textual support of Orpheus and Heraclitus for a principle of universalizability: when Orpheus appears to speak of a particular case, we should look for the universal cosmic truth that it embodies (see §§ 6–7).

With so much to be packed into the commentary on the opening lemma, it becomes less surprising that it should have run to six or more columns. However, for anyone who retains doubts about this, at the end of the next section I shall sketch in passing the alternative possibility that what I am calling the first lemma was in fact divided into two.

---

<sup>8</sup> I rely on the figures of Betegh (2004) 96–97.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. in Procl. *In Alc. I*, the number of Budé pages taken up by the commentary on each of the first eight lemmas is: (1) 28, (2) 5, (3) 5.5, (4) 21.5, (5) 8, (6) 5, (7) 4.5, (7) 7.5, (8) 4.



### 3 The opening lemma

If, as suggested above, the phraseology of col. IV reveals it to be part of the commentary on an opening lemma, what did that lemma say? The majority of the lemmas identified in the Derveni author's commentary have at least approximate parallels elsewhere in Greek poetry, but it is not clear that this lemma, or at least the part of it under discussion in col. IV, does. That apparent lack makes our task harder, but not impossible. As well as referring to the Furies (see § 2 above) the lemma will, if I have understood IV.3–4 correctly (see further, commentary *ad loc.*, § 7 below), have included the word τύχης (or Τύχης, if referring to a goddess of that name, cf. Hes. *Theog.* 360), closely enough preceded by a word that might have been mistakenly construed with it for the commentator to warn us against the error, and therefore almost certainly adjacent: I suggest τὰ τύχης. Of these, τὰ was probably understood by the commentator himself as nominative, because in l. 4 as I shall reconstruct it he takes this word to stand proxy in the poet's mind for another nominative, κόσμος. The context will have been such that τὰ served as a relative or demonstrative pronoun, the two being functionally more or less equivalent in epic verse. One may therefore conjecture the content of the opening lemma to have been very approximately the following:

κλυτέ μου Εὐμενίδες, λώβης τε κακῶν τε βροτείων  
 τιμωροὶ πάντων, τὰ τύχης ἔκτος δι' ἀνάγκης  
 προσδέχεται ποινήν.

Hear me Eumenides, avengers of all the outrage and wrongdoings of mortals, which, not left to chance, await requital through necessity.

There are, in the later Greek tradition, Orphic hymns addressed both to the Erinyes (Hymn 69) and to the Eumenides (Hymn 70, from which I have in fact borrowed the opening formula κλυτέ μου Εὐμενίδες), even if these two sets of deities can, with some caution,<sup>10</sup> be treated as interchangeable in the classical period. We cannot safely rule out the conjecture that our Orphic poem likewise started with an invocation of the Furies. Since the Furies seem to have no role in the ensuing theogonic narrative, they would presumably not be mentioned at the outset merely as all or even part of the poem's theme (in the manner of the Homeric Hymns), a theme which in any case, as we shall shortly see, was to be announced only at a later point, in lemmas (3)–(4). So if the Furies were named

<sup>10</sup> See Henrichs (1994). For the widespread cults of the Furies in the archaic and classical periods, cf. Brown (1984).



at the outset, but not for thematic reasons, the obvious alternative is that they were, for whatever reason, being invoked there. True, in the most obvious surviving forerunners – Homer, Hesiod, the Homeric hymns – the Furies have no known prehistory as poetic addressees. But we know too little about the genre to which this Orphic poem belonged, and would do well to treat the Derveni Papyrus itself as a better guide to its conventions than any known poetic antecedent can be.

There is a reason why an opening address to the Furies has not yet even been entertained as a possibility. It has, quite understandably, been assumed that the Derveni Papyrus itself contains evidence for the poem's having had a different opening. We know for sure that the poem deployed the well-known warning to the uninitiated that they should “put doors on their ears,” as it is paraphrased in col. VII. It has been universally and rightly agreed that this refers to the well-known hexameter line φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί· θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι, to which I shall return in the next section. And that line has widely been assumed to have been the poem's opening one.

But suppose for now that, rather than starting the entire poem, this line itself was preceded by an invocation of the Furies. It then becomes possible that the opening sequence was:

- (1) invocation of the Furies, unfailing punishers of human wrongdoing;
- (2) an instruction that the uninitiated should now close their ears, it not being *themis* for them to hear what follows;
- (3–4) the poem's topic;
- (5) start of the theogonic narrative.

This conjectural structure is arrived at by continuing the above *exempli gratia* reconstruction of the poem's opening, with the help of textual evidence that we will encounter in cols. VI–VII (see §§ 4–5), to which finally is added lemma (5), cited at VIII.2.

- (1) κλῶτέ μου Εὐμενίδες, λώβης τε κακῶν τε βροτείων]  
τιμωροὶ πάντων, τὰ] τύχης [ἔκτος δι' ἀνάγκης  
προσδέχεται ποινήν. ]
- (2) φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί· θύρας [δ'] ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι,]
- (3) ὄφρα φῶ ἀμφὶ θεοὺς πρῶτ[ους] ἔργ' ο[ὐ]κ ἄτ[έλεστα]
- (4) οἱ Διὸς ἐξεγένοντο [περιφραδ]έος βασιλῆος.
- (5) Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δὴ πατρός ἐοῦ πάρα κτλ.

- (1) Hear me Eumenides, avengers of all the outrage and wrongdoings of mortals, which, not left to chance, await requital through necessity (...)



- (2) I shall make utterance to those for whom it is lawful: put on doors, you profane,
- (3) so that I may tell of accomplished deeds<sup>11</sup> concerning the first gods
- (4) who sprang from Zeus the resourceful king.
- (5) Zeus, when from his father etc.

The transition from proem to narrative occurs at (4)–(5), formally marked by the asyndeton in (5).<sup>12</sup>

But why should such a poem start with (1) the address to the Furies, and only then proceed to (2) the warning to the uninitiated? An attractive conjecture is that the appeal to these avenging deities was intended to reinforce the ensuing warning. The comparatively unfamiliar idea that not only retribution for injustice but also the punishment of impiety is the province of the Furies,<sup>13</sup> who act through unerring necessity, not chance, has an encouraging parallel in the late Hellenistic Orphic Hymn 70.4–5, addressed to the Eumenides:

αἱ πάντων καθορᾶτε βίον θνητῶν ἀσεβούντων,  
τῶν ἀδίκων τιμωροί, ἐφεστηκυῖαι ἀνάγκη.

(...) you who oversee the life of all mortals who act impiously,  
punishers of the unjust, set over necessity.

Could this even be a distant echo of our Orphic poem?

Scholarly discussions of the injunction<sup>14</sup> regularly take it to have been the Orphic poem's first line, but the evidence seems to me insufficient to enforce that conclusion. True, both the verse's potential initial asyndeton and its frequency of quotation in later authors put one in mind of an opening line. And it does occur as first line of one poem, namely the (probably late Hellenistic) Jewish *Testament of Orpheus*, and as the opening of a much later prose work, Porphyry's *On Statues*

<sup>11</sup> For the preserved letters in (3), see p. 58 below.

<sup>12</sup> For the asyndeton that typically marks the transition between announcing a narrative and embarking on it, see e.g. Hes. *Op.* 109.

<sup>13</sup> I owe the possibility of such a connection to conversation with Gábor Betegh. Cf. also the ps.-Heraclitean Letter 9.3, where, as Mansfeld (2015) 86–87 points out, Hesiod's 30,000 φύλακες who watch over human morals (*Op.* 252–254) are re-identified as the (comparatively few) Erinyes – a functional equivalence explored also, and in great detail, by Piano (2016) e.g. 152–160 and 171–172. The relevance of this is increased by what we will see to be the Derveni author's own Heraclitean leanings.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. West (1983) 82–84. The content of the present paragraph has benefited a great deal from discussion and debate with Valeria Piano.



(fr. 351 Smith). On the other hand, the only evidence similar in date to our Orphic poem is Empedocles' functionally equivalent formula (31 B 3.4 DK), where the Muse is asked to convey "those things that it is lawful for short-lived beings to hear" (ὧν θέμις ἐστὶν ἐφημερίοισιν ἀκούειν). This likewise is obviously prefatory, and explicitly part of a divine invocation, but is not his opening. Even if the line about 'doors' may have *typically* served as an opening, as it surely did, we cannot assume that it always did so, if only because it might well have had to compete for first place with other prefatory lines. And in particular, it would hardly have been natural for it to precede a divine invocation. True, it contains no initial connective, and asyndeton is normal syntax for a poem's opening line. But asyndeton can be used for other purposes too: for example to mark a change of address (cf. Hes. *Op.* 9), or to introduce a gnomic utterance (cf. *ibid.* 293), both of which apply to our line.<sup>15</sup>

In this section I have assumed, as the simplest working hypothesis, that despite its length nearly the whole content of cols. I–VI is from the author's commentary on a single lemma. However, the suggested opening of the Orphic poem, κλῦτέ μου Εὐμενίδες, borrowed from the later Orphic hymn to the Eumenides mentioned above, offers us a further refinement of that assumption: that the very first lemma, addressed in cols. I–II (quite possibly along with one or more earlier columns), was nothing more than an opening imperatival formula, represented in my reconstruction by the conjecture κλῦτέ μου, with the commentator then turning to the Eumenides only with a second lemma, which if so occurred before col. III, where the persistent talk of the Furies has already started.

With or without such a sub-division of the Orphic poem's opening lines into two lemmas, it remains highly credible, and consistent with the exiguous remains of cols. I–II, that in these very early columns the author addressed the implications of Orpheus' invocatory formula. If Richard Janko's reconstitution and transcription of col. I<sup>16</sup> were to gain acceptance on papyrological grounds, it would, I suggest, invite completion along the following lines:<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Further alternatives for the 'doors' line's construal in the Orphic poem are that it was not asyndetic there but was preceded by a connective phrase, e.g. ὥς δ' ἐπιεικὲς / φθέγγομαι κτλ.; and that the construction was appositive, e.g. "Heed this warning: I shall (...)."

<sup>16</sup> See n. 4 above for elimination of col. I's supposed references to the Furies, and Janko (2016) 17 for the exclusion of some other readings hitherto reported. But the text proposed below is based on the data of Kotwick (2017), who reproduces Janko's new provisional text of col. I. This differs substantially from the readings of the same column proposed in Janko (2008) 43, on which cf. the balanced critical cautions of Piano (2011) 26–29. I do not yet know how far Janko's methodology has differed in arriving at his current version. Note that this reconstituted column corresponds only in part to what Piano (2016) 67–69 and 90–91 numbers as col. 0.

<sup>17</sup> Janko's own partial reconstruction, as represented in Kotwick (2017), is as follows: . . . ]ιδ[ . . . φυσι]κοῖς, καὶ κα[ . . . ] . . . ἀραλ[ . . . ]αι τὰ σημε[ῖα . . . ]οιρ[ . . . ]



## Col. I

- ...ιδ[... φυσι]κοῖς, καὶ κα[...]  
 ...] παραλ[λάξ]εται τὰ σημειωτὰ τῆς μ[οί]ρας. πῦρ γάρ  
 5 οὐχ[ι] δαπανᾷ τὸν ἥλιον. προέγνω οὖν ἔν[ε]καστον  
 μερ[ί]δι νείμ[α]ς [...]α η[...], [κ]αὶ  
 οὐχ[ι] ὑπέθηκε[ν] ὥσπερ φυσικ[ός], ἔφη δὲ οἷ[α] θεὸν  
 κατ[ὰ] τὰ σημαι[νόμενα] εὐχα[ί]ς θεοκλυ[τῶν].  
 τί δ' ἐ τῶν τ[ε] καὶ [...] ἀνημμέ[νων] ὄντων τοιούτων  
 10 ὁ κόσ[μ]ος ἀπ[ὸ] ἀρ[χ]ῆς τ[ι]ν[ος] ἀ[ν] μέν[οι] ἢ οὐκ ἄλλ[ο] ἢ προ[σ]ῆ  
 μοῖρά ἐστι π[υ]ρός; ὕδατος δ' ἐ[ῖ]ναι δὴ[λησιν] ψε[υ]δ[ῆ] σημ[ε]ῖα  
 ὁμοίως ἐστ[ί]ν, ἕκαστα σημεία ἀνθρώ[πινα] ὄντα  
 περὶ τοὺς θε[ο]ύς. καὶ τᾶλλ' ὅσα [φ]α[ν]έρ[ο]ν[ται] [...]

3 φυσι]κοῖς Janko || 4 σημει]α Tsantsanoglou || 6 μερ[ί]δι Janko || 7 ὥ]σπερ Janko || 8 σημαι[νόμενα]  
 εὐχα[ί]ς Janko || 10 ἀπ[ὸ] Janko || 11 π[υ]ρός Tsantsanoglou || σημ[ε]ῖα Janko || cett. Sedley

(...) for natural philosophers (...) the signs received will differ from the component.<sup>18</sup> For fire does not consume the sun. Therefore he (sc. Orpheus) had prior knowledge when he assigned each single thing to a sector [of the world], and did not hypothesize<sup>19</sup> in the manner of a natural philosopher, but instead said the sorts of thing that one says when invoking a god in accordance with signs resulting from prayers. Why, given that things ignited (...) <sup>20</sup> are of such a kind, would the world have its stability from some principle which is nothing but a certain quantity of fire? And of water's being subject to destruction there are

δαπανᾷ[...]ιον...οε[...],ν ἕκαστον [μερ]ίδι νείμ[α] [...]α η[...],αι [...] ὑπέθηκε[ν], ὥσπερ φυσικ[ός], χρᾶν τιν[α] θεὸν [κατ]ὰ τὰ σημαι[νόμενα] εὐχα[ί]ς. ὅταν δὲ τῶν τελετῶν κάω[σιν] ἀνημμέ[να] ἱερά, δι[ὰ] τοιούτων χρησ[ι]μὸς ἀπ[ὸ] εὐ[χ]ῆς τ[ι]ν[ος] ἢ π[υ]ρ[ὸς] ἢ ὕδωρ [...] ληπ[ο] [...] π[υ]ρός· ὕδατος δ' ἐ[ῖ]ναι δη[λοῖ] τοιαῦτα σημ[ε]ῖα. [καὶ γὰρ ἐστ]ιν ἕκαστα σημεία ἀνθρώ[ποις] [...] οὺς καὶ τᾶλλ' ὅσα [...]μενον[ται] [...]

18 If the conjectured μοῖρα (4, 11), 'portion' or 'part,' is correct, it would be a mark of Anaxagorean influence: cf. 59 B 11–12 DK.

19 For ὑποτίθεσθαι and ὑπόθεσις used of assuming an initial explanatory set of principles in a scientific inquiry, cf. Hippoc. VM 1: ὁκόσοι ἐπεχείρησαν περὶ ἱητρικῆς λέγειν ἢ γράφειν, ὑπόθεσιν σφίσιν αὐτέοισιν ὑποθέμενοι τῷ λόγῳ, θερμόν ἢ ψυχρόν ἢ ὑγρόν ἢ ξηρόν ἢ ἄλλ' ὅ τι ἂν ἐθέλωσιν (...); Arist. Cael. 3.5.303b10–11: ἔνιοι γὰρ ἔν μόνον (sc. στοιχείον) ὑποτίθενται, καὶ τοῦτο οἱ μὲν ὕδωρ, οἱ δ' ἄερα, οἱ δὲ πῦρ, κτλ.

20 In l. 9 the trace reported by Janko as ω is just the left tip of a horizontal, at an unusual height which he says (pers. comm.) matches one or two cases of *omega* elsewhere in the Derveni Papyrus but no other letter. My *obelus* is not meant to imply the presence of an uncorrected error: it is conceivable that if we had more text to the right we would find a scribal correction, perhaps to καύσει, "by combustion."



likewise false signs, all of them being human signs relating to the gods. And all the other things that we say [are indestructible] (...)

If, as I suggest, the opening lemma was or included the poem's initial divine invocation, such a restoration makes ready sense. The implicit question is why, on our commentator's interpretation of the poem as a cosmogony, was it appropriate for Orpheus to start it by invoking divine authority? Because, the answer goes, revealed divine signs are superior to ambivalent human signs. For example, when fire or water is under consideration as a major cosmic component, its nature cannot be accurately learnt from phenomenal fire or phenomenal water, neither of which manifests the kind of permanence that a cosmic component must have. Thus fire in our direct experience burns itself out, but cosmic fire, such as that constituting the sun, does not.

If Janko (2016) is right to find a citation from Parmenides' proem in the fragments of the column preceding this one, it could indicate that the same theme was already present there too. The superiority of divine over human signs (cf. 28 B 1.28–32, B 8.2–4, 55–61, B 19 DK), justifies approaching a divine authority for an understanding of the nature of the universe, as Parmenides describes himself as doing in his own proem. Plato too, we should recall, considers prayer the proper prelude to a cosmogonic narrative (*Ti.* 27c1–d1).

## 4 The second lemma

If the sequence (1)–(2) is accepted, it becomes a credible hypothesis that the second lemma, namely the well-known injunction to the profane to put on doors, was introduced in the lost lower part of col. VI, and my aim in the present section is to confirm that this is indeed so.

The formulaic line constituting the lemma is:

φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί· θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι.<sup>21</sup>

I shall make utterance to those for whom it is lawful: put on doors, you profane.

The hypothesis that it was cited *verbatim* in the lower part of col. VI explains why when we get to the top of col. VII this lemma is evidently already under discussion: for example, VII.3 θεμ[ι]τά picks up θέμις from it. Starting at VII.4 the author explains a general principle of Orphic exegesis, namely that no expression is used with its

<sup>21</sup> For the exact wording of this injunction, see esp. Tsantsanoglou (1997) 124–128, and the evidence collected in Bernabé's *OF* II.1, 2–14.



merely superficial meaning, but always with some riddling religious function. He then remarks that that general principle applies *even* to the line about ‘putting on doors’ (8–10) – ‘even’, no doubt, because this line uniquely is addressed to the profane, who of all auditors might seem to have the least chance of deciphering any religious subtext. Why they nevertheless can aspire to understand it will become clear when we encounter the commentator’s own idiosyncratic interpretation of the line.

First I shall set out the readings and restorations of col. VII in the *editio princeps* of KPT,<sup>22</sup> but for present purposes I shall supply their translation just for ll. 7–11:

Col. VII

- ... ]οσξ[  
 . . ὕ]μνον [ύγ]ιή καὶ θεμ[ι]τὰ λέγο[ν]τα; ἱερουργεῖ]το γὰρ  
 τῇ] ποήσει. [κ]αὶ εἰπεῖν οὐχ οἶόν τ[ε] τὴν τῶν ὀ]νομάτων  
 λύ]σιν καί τ[οι] ῥηθέντα. ἔστι δὲ ξ[ένη τις ἡ] πόησις  
 5 κ]αὶ ἀνθρώ[ποις] αἰνι[γμ]ατώδης. [κα]ὶ [Ὀρφεύ]ς αὐτ[ὸ]ς  
 ἐ]ρίστ’ αἰν[ιγμ]α]τα οὐκ ἤθελε λέγειν, [ἐν αἰν]ιγμ[α]σ[ι]ν δὲ  
 μεγ]άλα. ἱερ[ολογ]εῖται μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄ[πὸ το]ῦ πρώτου  
 ἀεὶ] μέχρι <τ>οῦ [τελε]υτ[αίου] ῥήματος, ὡς δηλοῖ] καὶ ἐν τῷ  
 εὐκ]ρινήτω[ι] ἔπει· θ]ύρας γὰρ ἐπιθέ[σθαι κε]λεύσας τοῖ[ς]  
 10 ὡσ]ί]ν αὐτ[οὺς] οὔτι νομο]θετεῖμ φη[σιν τοῖς] πολλοῖς  
 ..... τῇ]ν ἀκοήν [ἀγνεύο]ντας κατ[ὰ]  
 ..... ]σειτ[...].  
 ..... ]ωι τ[... ]ε γ[... ]... [ ... ]  
 ..... ἐν δ]ὲ τῷ ἐχομ[έ]γωι πα[ ... ]  
 15 ..... ]τ... εἰγ[... ]κατ[ ... ]

(7–11) In fact he is speaking mystically, and from the very first word all the way to the last. As he also makes clear in the well-recognizable verse: for, having ordered them to “put doors to their ears”, he says that he is not legislating for the many, but [addressing himself to] those who are pure in hearing (...)

I find two problems with the translated portion of the column.<sup>23</sup> One of them concerns ll. 9–11. The earlier part of the column (echoed at XIII.5–6) has emphasized the deeply enigmatic nature of *all* Orpheus’ verse-writing; yet the decoding of ‘put on doors’

<sup>22</sup> Janko’s text in Kotwick (2017) improves upon *ed. pr.* palaeographically, and I shall take account of it in offering my own text below.

<sup>23</sup> I am not here evaluating the overall reconstruction of the column by KPT. However, their construal of ῥηθέντα (4) as qualifying ὀνομάτων (3) in a πρὸς τὸ νοούμενον construction (172) strikes me as scarcely credible.



here, despite purportedly illustrating that very feature, turns out on the contrary to be one that any reader would have understood without help. I shall return to this later.

The second problem concerns the meaning of [εὐκ]ρίνητω[ι in l. 9. It is translated by Tsantsanoglou (1997) as “easy to distinguish”; in the above translation as “well-recognizable”; and by other scholars as “well-chosen” or “easy to interpret.” Such renderings, and even the editorial accentuation of it as paroxytone, treat εὐκρίνητος as if it were the verbal adjective of κρίνω, with prefix εὐ- added, on the model of e.g. εὐμνημόνευτος, “easy to remember,” derived from εὐ + μνημονεύω. But that model would have resulted in the (well attested) form εὐκρίτος, not in εὐκρίνητος. Rather, this otherwise unattested<sup>24</sup> word, if the reading is correct, can only be the verbal adjective of the verb εὐκρινέω, “clarify,” cognate with the adjective εὐκρινής, “clear,” and should therefore have been accented εὐκρινητῶι, not εὐκρινήτωι. Tsantsanoglou ([1997] 124) himself recognized that the latter model was the appropriate one for its formation, namely from εὐκρινέω, but nevertheless accented, translated and interpreted it as if it were constructed on the former model, e.g. “easy to recognize.” Conceivably it was in response to this linguistic anomaly that Janko (2002) went so far as to emend the text, substituting the thinly attested but not inappropriate verbal adjective εὐθ[ρ]υλήτω[ι which he translated “well-known.”

Perhaps, though, we can extract adequate sense from the verb εὐκρινέω, and avoid the resort to emendation. In pre-imperial Greek the verb unfortunately has at most one attestation, a textually dubious and unhelpful one in Xenophon.<sup>25</sup> On the other hand, in writers of the imperial era εὐκρινεῖν commonly means “clarify,” “elucidate,”<sup>26</sup> and is the verb used in the *Progymnasmata* of the 5th-cent. AD rhetorician Nicolaus when he says that it is the job of philosophers to

<sup>24</sup> I am assuming that we should set aside an isolated and very dubious reading in the early imperial medical writer Aret. *SD* 2.1.6 (= 43.5 Hude; for details see Tsantsanoglou [1997] 123–124), where εὐκρίνητοι has been introduced by way of editorial emendation for the transmitted εὐκρινήτοι. Even if the emendation were accepted, it would be a rare medical technical term, of no plausible relevance to the *PDerv.* passage.

<sup>25</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 4.2.6: (...) ὅτι τοὺς στρατευομένους δεῖ εὐκρινεῖν. But the last word is printed by O. Keller quite plausibly as εὐ κρίνειν, which if accepted would eliminate even this isolated attestation. If alternatively it is a genuine occurrence of εὐκρινεῖν, whatever it might mean here in Xenophon it offers little help with the *PDerv.* passage. It is translated by C. L. Brownson (Loeb edition) “select with care,” while LSJ suggest “keep distinct,” “keep in good order,” all of these apparently being guesses.

<sup>26</sup> “Lucidity,” expressed as εὐκρίνεια and τὸ εὐκρινές, becomes a major theme in the rhetorical handbooks, probably boosting the popularity of the cognate εὐκρινεῖν for “elucidate.” Cf. already Pl. *Soph.* 242c1–2, ῥαδίως δ’ ἀλλήλοις ὁμολογῶμεν ὡς εὐκρινῶς ἔχοντες, which 244a4–b1 shows to refer to the attainment of interpretative clarity.



“elucidate allegories,” εὐκρινεῖν τὰς ἀλληγορίας (7.7).<sup>27</sup> This latter seems a highly appropriate sense of εὐκρινεῖν for us to expect in VII.9. The εὐκρινητὸν ἔπος thus understood would be “the verse to be elucidated,”<sup>28</sup> presumably indicating the lemma currently selected for decipherment.<sup>29</sup>

Assuming the above accentuation and interpretation of [εὐκ]ρινητῶ[ι, I offer a suggested text and translation of the whole of col. VII, revised so as to address both of the problems I have listed, along with a paraphrase of what appears to be lost at the end of col. VI. At some key points I have taken into account the new readings of Janko (2016), who also reports an adjustment to the line numbers in col. VII, adopted below.

## Col. VI

τὸ δὲ ἐχόμενον·]

“φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί· θύρας δ’ ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι.”]

## Col. VII

τὰ πρ[άγ[ματα. τῶι

δὲ πρ[οσέ[θηκεν οἷς ἔπεισι χρᾶσθαι θέ[μις, ἄ[σσα  
 λώβ[η]ν ὁκ[νο]ί[η] καὶ θεμ[ι]τὰ λέγο[ι]. ἐκεκάθ[αρ]το γὰρ  
 τῇ[ι] ποίησει. [κ]αὶ εἰπεῖν οὐχ οἶόν τ[ε] ταῦτα δι’ ὀνομάτων  
 5 φη[σίν], καί τ[οι] ρήθέντα. ἔστι δὲ μ[υ]στική ἢ πόσις  
 κ[αὶ] ἀνθρώ[ποις] αἰν[ι]γμ[α]τώδης, [κα]ὶ [Ὀρ]φ[εὺς] αὐτ[οῖς]  
 ἐ[ρ]ιστ’ αἰν[ι]γμ[α]τα οὐκ ἔθελε λέγειν· [ἐν αἰν]ίγμ[α]σ[ι]ν δὲ  
 τὰ κ[α]λά. ἱερ[ολογ]εῖται μὲν οὐγ καὶ ἀπὸ [το]ῦ πρώτου  
 καὶ μέχρι οὗ [τελε]υτ[αί]ου ρήματος, ὡ[ς] δηλο[ί] καὶ ἐν τῶι  
 10 εὐκ[ρι]νητῶ[ι] ἔπει. θύρας γὰρ ἐπίθεσ[θα]ι ὁ κελεύσας τοῖ[ς]  
 ὡσί[ν] αὐτ[οὺς] χρῆναι εὐ[σε]βεῖν φη[σιν] τοῖ[ς] πολλοῖς,  
 τῇν τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπῶ[ν] ἀκοήν [διορθο]ῖντας, καθ[  
 .....]η[ι] .....]νειτ[ι]  
 ..... ἐν τούτ[ω]ι τ[ῶ]ι ἔπει[ι] .....

<sup>27</sup> Nicolaus goes on (7.12) to treat ἀναπτύσσειν, “unfold” or “unravel” as equivalent to εὐκρινεῖν.

<sup>28</sup> I have chosen this formulation out of caution, in order to allow for the wide modal range of the -τός termination. Typically it signifies “φ-ed” or “φ-able,” but it can also, more appropriately to our passage, carry the force of a Latin gerundive, “φ-worthy,” “needing/due/deserving to be φ-ed,” this being for example a very common use of αἰρετός.

<sup>29</sup> In the classical and Hellenistic periods the preferred verb for ‘elucidate’ would be not εὐκρινεῖν but διευκρινεῖν (or middle διευκρινεῖσθαι), as already at Pl. *Prm.* 135b2, and frequently in Polybius. It therefore seems possible that the fully correct reading of VII.8–9 would be ὡς δηλοῖ καὶ ἐν τῶι <δι>ευκρινητῶι ἔπει. But it seems prudent to stick to the transmitted text.



15 ..... ἐν δ]ἐ τῶι ἐχομ[έ]γωι πα[ρ'] αὐτά·  
 “ὄφρα φῶ ἀμφὶ θεοὺς πρῶ]τ[ους] ἔργ’ ο[ὕ]κ ἀτ[έ]λεστα”

1 litteras αῖγ huc rest. Janko || 2 litteras μισα huc rest. Janko || 3 ]ῆν ὁκ[vo]λη leg. et suppl. Janko ||  
 litteras αῖρ huc rest. Janko || 4 [τῆ]ι Tsantsanoglou || 5 μ[υστικῇ] Janko || 6–7 Tsantsanoglou (sed  
 αὐτ[οῖς] potius quam αὐτ[ὸς] leg. et coni. Janko) || 8 ἱερ[ολογ]εῖται ... ἀ[πὸ τοῦ] Tsantsanoglou  
 || 9 [καὶ] Betegh || οὐ Kotwick, cett. Tsantsanoglou || 10 [εὐκ]ρινῆ[τῶι] Sedley (iam [εὐκ]ρινῆ[τῶι]  
 Tsantsanoglou) || cett. et 11 ὡσὶν Tsantsanoglou monente Burkert || 11 εὐ]σεβεῖν Sedley (iam  
 ἀ]σεβεῖν leg. et prop. Janko) || φη[σιν τοῖς] Tsantsanoglou || 14 Janko || 15 ἐν δ]ἐ τῶι ἐχομ[έ]γωι  
 Tsantsanoglou || 16 ἔργ’ ο[ὕ]κ ἀτ[έ]λεστα Janko || cett. Sedley

(VI) Next line: “**I shall make utterance by the means by which it is lawful. Put on doors, you profane.**” [He said ‘make utterance’ because he used his voice to do more than merely state] facts. And to it (VII) (...) he added which verses it was lawful to use, meaning whichever shunned outrage and spoke lawful things. For they had been purified by his poetry. And he is saying that it is not possible to say these things through the medium of words, even though they were said. His poetry is initiatory, and enigmatic for people to understand, and Orpheus had no wish to speak captious enigmas to them. But in enigmas fine things are found.<sup>30</sup> So he performs holy discourse both from his first expression and right down to his last,<sup>31</sup> as he shows even in the verse that is to be elucidated. For one who gives the instruction to put doors on the ears is telling the many that they should themselves act piously, by rectifying the way they listen to his verses, in so far as (...) in this verse [he says (...)], and in the following one, going further: “(...) so that I may tell of accomplished deeds concerning the first gods (...)”

Let me start with the alternative restoration I have proposed for 10–12 (= 9–11 *ed. pr.*): “For one who gives the instruction to put doors on the ears is telling the many that they should themselves act piously, by rectifying the way they listen to his verses.” A construal along these lines has the advantage of appropriately illustrating the hermeneutic principle which the author says is being exemplified, namely that everything Orpheus says has a hidden religious force. For it emerges that the injunction does not, as typically (and no doubt correctly!) understood,<sup>32</sup>

30 At 7–8, where I propose [ἐν αἰν]ίγμασ[ιν] δὲ / [τὰ κ]αλά, editors have followed Tsantsanoglou in reading [ἐν αἰν]ίγμασ[ιν] δὲ / [μεγ]άλα. I find that the former reads more convincingly, being in effect a context-appropriate variant of the proverbial saying χαλεπὰ τὰ καλά.

31 The common emendation to <τ>οῦ is not required. This redundant οὐ after μέχρι has parallels in Herodotus, see Tsantsanoglou (1997) 123, and Kotwick (2017), *comm. ad loc.*

32 Cf. Pl. *Symp.* 218b5–7.



indicate the secrecy of the ensuing revelations. Rather, Orpheus<sup>33</sup> is urging the many, i.e. those not yet initiated, nevertheless to be pious, by listening through self-imposed ‘doors’ which – presumably by opening as well as closing them<sup>34</sup> – they can use to elucidate, censor, purify, or otherwise rectify what they hear. By a curious kind of reflexivity, this sort of listening must be, or include, the very skill now on display, that of filtering out the superficial meaning of an Orphic verse and hearing instead its true but hidden meaning.

So radical a hermeneutic transformation of the lemma is entirely in the style of the audacious decodings that follow in the rest of the commentary. It thereby exemplifies, better than the superficial exclusionary reading did,<sup>35</sup> what the author has been saying in the opening lines of col. VII about the religious riddles concealed in every line of Orpheus’ poetry.<sup>36</sup>

The proposed reading would if correct make a significant difference to our understanding of the commentator’s religious or cultic outlook, suggesting that it is less elitist, secretive, esoteric and exclusionary than is widely assumed. Note for example that Orpheus’ word βέβηλοι is interpreted, not as altogether dismissive of the vulgar ‘profane,’ but as offering advice to the ‘many.’ Later on, at XXIII.1–3, we learn that a verse there under consideration “is unclear to the many (τοῖς μὲν / πολλοῖς ἄδηλον) but clear to those with correct knowledge,” which further strengthens the impression that in the commentator’s view the many have *not* been barred by Orpheus from listening to the poem, but simply lack the hermeneutic skills to recognize its true meaning by themselves. It could even be the needs of such non-experts that the commentary is primarily designed to serve.<sup>37</sup> How after all were the many supposed to recognize the real meaning of the advice to ‘put on doors,’ addressed especially to them, if not with the help of an expert interpreter?

But, it may be asked, how could the second half of the lemmatized verse be interpreted as non-esoteric when the first half consists in the blatantly esoteric

33 The definite article in l. 10, (...) ἐπιθέσ[θα]ι ὁ κελεύσας (...), suggests that the author’s exegesis of the ‘doors’ verse applies not only to Orpheus but to anyone who uses it.

34 I conjecture that from the end of l. 17 the papyrus read roughly “in so far as (καθό) [or ‘just as,’ (καθάπερ)] doors determine what is admitted and what excluded.”

35 KPT, 173 recognize that ll. 10–12 (as conventionally restored) do not treat the ‘doors’ injunction as enigmatic: they resolve the problem by suggesting that εὐκρίνητος means “easy to understand” and hence that the interpretation illustrates the foregoing words about Orpheus’ hidden meanings by providing a *contrasting* example, an Orphic utterance that is easily understood.

36 On the rationale of encoding and decoding in *PDerv.*, see esp. Most (1997).

37 At XXV.12–13 we read that Orpheus did not want ‘everyone’ to know his hidden meaning, but that too falls far short of restricting its understanding to a closed group of initiates, allowing the prospect of enlightenment to anybody, provided they learn how to read him.