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

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

¹ The Orphic verses of the Derveni papyrus are gathered in Bernabé 1.14-32 (= 3-18 F), Betegh 96-7, KPT 21, West 114-5 (“an exempli gratia reconstruction”). Bernabé (2007a) offers a running commentary on the Orphic poem, but his interest is not primarily philological.
it combines the distinct non-overlapping sets of data from these two sources, as well as taking other scholars' observations into account. Much of the work on the poem over the past years has been to evaluate its religious and philosophical content, as well as the use made of it by the Derveni author (herein simply the Author), and to this I add nothing; but there still seems to be a place for a study that concentrates on Orpheus' words as poetry. Note that I follow the editorial practice found in collections of poetry such as Page's Poetae Melici Graeci; that is, phonology has been regularized (thus, e.g., αἰδοῖον κατ- for αἰδοῖογ κατ-) and elision is printed where the papyrus has scriptio plena, although half brackets and dotted letters are printed. (The use of half brackets here will be discussed below.)

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

---

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

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

4 Despite the fact that the Author introduces them with δηλοί, which elsewhere assumes Orpheus as subject, it seems to me highly unlikely that two passages quoted one after the other on col. 26 solely to demonstrate that ἐάων means
extensively, a dactylic poem attributed to Orpheus, who is identified as the author of the "hymn" in col. 6. That scholars cannot agree on the point of view of the Author—is he atheist, literary critic, natural philosopher, or committed Orphic?—is not of concern here. When he wrote is also unknown, but composition is usually placed between the end of the fifth century and the middle of the fourth, which would also give us a *terminus ante quem* for the date of the Orphic poem, which has been placed as early as ca. 500 BC. The story that "good things," a meaning the Author would foist on 24 ἑᾶς, should also just happen to be (Il. 24.527-8) or closely resemble (Od. 8.335) two passages from Homer, *pace* Obbink (L-M 41), Janko (2001) 31 n. 186; cf. Betegh 100. Bernabé regards these two passages as coming from a separate Orphic hymn; see his comments to F 687.

Col. 22.12 Δημήτηρ [P]έλα Ιη Μηϊτη Έση Ληϊ, which the Author’s language cites as ἐν τοῖς ὡς εἰο[η]μενον, phraseology that seems imply Orphic authorship but also to preclude it from being in the main poem under discussion. It is not included as part of the Orphic Derveni poem by either Bernabé or KTP. For the scansion of this entirely spondaic line, see Kouremenos ad loc.

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

See West 82-94, 108-113. He considers the poem quoted in the papyrus to be an abridgement of the *Protogonos* theogony, but, even if this is true, it may be the
Onomacritus inserted (ἐμποιέων) his own verses into a text of Musaeus—a mythical figure of a status similar to Orpheus—serves as a vivid reminder that even as early as the late sixth century, texts allegedly written by a poet of great (if not mythical) ancestry were altered if not outright forged. And in fact, according to Diogenes Laertius 8.8, Ἰων δὲ ὁ Χῖος ἐν τοῖς Τριαγμοῖς φήσιν (scil. Πυθαγόρας) ἐνα ποιήσαντα ἀνενεγκείν εἰς Ὀρφέα (sim. Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.131.4).9

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

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

8 Hdt. 7.6 = Onomacritus T 1 D’Agostino Ἐξηλάσθη γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἰππάρχου τοῦ Πεισιστράτου ὁ Ὀνομάκριτος ἐξ Ἀθηνέων, ἐπὶ αὐτοκόρῳ ἄλοιπος ὑπὸ Λάσσου τοῦ Ἐρµόνεος ἐμποιέων ἐς τὰ Μουσαίου χορημόν ὡς αἱ ἐπὶ Λήμνῳ ἐπικείμεναι νήσοι ἀφανισώτατο κατὰ τῆς θαλάσσης. Cf. E. D’Agostino, Onomacritus: Testimonia et fragmenta (Pisa 2007) 33 ff.

9 Turnabout is fair play: Suidas s.v. Ὀρφεύς says that it was Orpheus who wrote the Triagmoi. On the other hand, the sophist Hippias boasted that he incorporated into his own work verses of Orpheus, among others (B 6 D-K).
word is fairly secure even if we cannot be sure that, now accommodated to the citator's own sentence, the precise morphological case, person, etc., has been reproduced. When the embedded poetic word picks up a lemma only partially legible, it may help in its constitution. In these cases, it seems proper, however unusual, to make use of half brackets, which are normally found when a completely separate author with his own manuscript tradition (e.g., Athenaeus or Plutarch) cites a passage that is also found on a papyrus. The Author's practice of repeating words from the lemma in his commentary satisfies the essential idea behind the use of half-brackets. Although I do not present a complete survey (let alone a commentary) of these isolated fragments, as does Betegh 103-5, I refer to many of them in the commentary.

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

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

---

10 Betegh 105-8.

11 Pl. Resp. 620a does refer to Orpheus' hatred of the tribe of women, but this is because they killed him! References to "Orpheus musicus" are collected by Bernabé 428-43, whose T numbers are given. Note also P.Oxy 3698 ed. Haslam = F 1005a, which may come Eumelus' Corinthiaca, Ο[ν]ιόδοιγρο[ο]ν φ[i]λός υ[ι][δ]ος.
Ibyc. 306 PMG = 864 T ὄνομάκλητον Ὀρφήν, Pl. N. 4.177 = 972 T ἔξι Ἀπόλλωνος
de φοιμιγκτάς ἄουδαν πατήρ | ἔμολεν, εὐαίνητος Ὀρφεὺς, and Tim. Pers. 221-
3 = 902 T πρῶτος ποικιλόμοιος Ὀρφεὺς <téχναν ἐτέκνωσεν ὕις
Καλλιόπας<.> Πιεριάθεν. More specific praise, namely that his playing has the
to move birds, plants, fish and rocks, still solidly fifth century, occurs in
Sim. 567 PMG = 943 T τοῦ [sc. Ὀρφέως, acc. to Tzetzes] καὶ ἀπειφέσιοι ἐ
πατῶντ᾿ ὄνομες ὑπὲρ κεφαλὰς | ἀνά δ᾿ ἱγκής ὤνθοι | κυκάνεων ἔ ὁδατὸς
ἀλλοτέ καλὰ σὺν ἄουδα, Α. Αγ. 1630 = 946 T ὦ μὲν γὰρ ἦγε πάντα που
φθογγής χαρά, ("He leads all things with the power of his tongue in delight"),
Eur. Ba. 561-4 = 947 T . . . θαλάμας, ἐνθα ποτ Ὀρφεὺς κιθαρίζων ἐ
πάναγεν ἕνθεος μούσας, ἐ σύναγεν θηράς αγώντας, id. IA 1211-15 = 948 T (Iφ.) ἐ μὲν
tοῦ Ὀρφέως εἶχον . . . λόγον, ἐ πεῖθεν ἐπάδουσ᾿ ἄοσθ᾿ ὀμαρτεῖν μοι πέτρας ἐ
κηλεῖν τε τοῖς λόγοιςω σὺς ἐβουλόμην, ἐ ἐνταῦθ᾿ ἂν ἠλθον· νῦν δὲ, τάπ᾿ ἐ
μοῦ σοφᾶ, δάρκρυα παρέξω, Tragica Adesp. TGrF 129.6-8. And of course he
charms people as well: Eur. Hyps. fr. 752g.10-12, = 1007 T Θηράς ἐβόα κιθαρίς
[Ὀρφέως] . . . ἐφέτασι κελέσματα μελπομένα, id. Alc.357-62, 962-72, id. Medea
542-3; to say nothing of his charming Hades and Persephone (first in Eur. Alc.
357-9).\(^{12}\)

\(^{12}\) To all which we can add a joking statement that his music could animate
torches; Eur. Cyc. 646-8.
The most likely source of this reputation is the early epic tale of the voyage of the Argo,\(^\text{13}\) where tales of rocks and trees "sequacious of the lyre" (Dryden) were part of the narrative and Orpheus' own words, whether actually quoted or not, were characterized as extraordinarily beautiful.\(^\text{14}\) On the other hand, the verses quoted in the Derveni Papyrus or those few other Orphic lines

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

\(^{14}\) To retroject from Apollonius 4.891-911 and the Orphic Argonautica 1268-85, Orpheus would have engaged in and won a singing contest with the Sirens, which would have provided an excellent excuse for the early epic poet to lavish praise on Orpheus' divine singing and to narrate a magical episode in which rocks etc. were animated. According to the fifth-fourth century historian Herodorus, the ἀσθενής Orpheus was brought on board only to contest with the Sirens, not to take his turn at the oars; Herodorus Argonautica fr. 39 FHG = 1010 II T. Orpheus has also been identified as a figure between two Sirens on a vase dated to ca. 580 BC (LIMC Orpheus 6); see further Calame (2010) 14.
that can be dated to the classical period, although not unattractive, are far from the dazzling performance of the mythical Orpheus, an inconstancy that seems to have bothered almost nobody in the ancient world. "But note that Orpheus' poetry—that is, the poetry that was published under his name, such as that in P.Derv.—was compared unfavorably to Hesiod's by Menander Rhet. Διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν 3.340 Spengel [= Hes. T 126 Most] παρέσχετο δὲ τὴν μὲν ἐν ποίησι Ἀρετῆν Ἡσίοδος, καὶ γνοὶ τις ἄν μᾶλλον, εἰ τοῖς Ὀρφεῶς παραθεὶσι.

It is possible that in this early Argonautica, Orpheus indeed sang beautifully (of what we cannot know, tempting as it is to guess that at least once it was of a cosmogonical and cosmological nature), but the poem as a whole seems not to have survived long enough to be cited in the fifth century, by which time the figure of Orpheus took on a separate and distinct existence as the author of τελεταί τε καὶ χρησμοβιβάσι (Plat. Prot. 316d; cf. Aristoph. Frogs 1032) and ἐπωθαι (Eur. Cycl. 614) exclusively; cf. Aristoph. Frogs 1032. We shall thus never know whether his singing in this lost epic was reported directly (and was in fact

---

15 Fourth-century citations of Orphic verses are Pl. Crat. 402bc = 22 F λέγει δὲ ποι ὁ Ὀρφεὺς ὡς "ἐκεῖνος πρῶτος καλλίροος ἦξε γάμμω, ὡς ὁ κασινήτην ὁμομήτορα Τηθύν ὀπτις," id. Phileb. 66c = 25 F "ἲκτη δ’ ἐν γενεά," φησίν Ὀρφεὺς, "καταπαύσατε κόσμον ἁσιδής," [Aristot.] de Mundo 401a25 = 31 F (some of whose nine verses will be quoted below). This is not to deny that later citations, such as those in Damascius, who cites Eudemus, may be of equally early origin—some of them in fact are the same as is found in P.Derv. —but in a text as subject to accretions as this one, earlier is definitely better.

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

Abbreviations

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


Brisson (L-M) Luc Brisson, “Chronos in col. xii of the Derveni Papyrus,” in L-M 149-165.


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fragment number (Kouremenos)</th>
<th>col. &amp; line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3 F) [φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἔστιν] ίθύμας δ´ ἐπίθεσθει [βέβηλοι]</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

v. comm.

1 [ο]́ι Διός ἔξεγάδεύοντο [μεγασθενέ]ζος βασιλέας 8.2

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

Zeus μὲν ἐπεὶ δῶῃ πῶς ἄλογος ἐστὶ πάρα θέ[σ]φατον ἀρχήν

8.4-5

ιαλκήν τ’ ἐν χείρεσι ιαλάβ[έ]ν, κ]αθιὶ δαίμονιατ κυδρόν …

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


4-5 ἐξ ἀδύτου (?.) 11.1

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

1 Νυξ ἐξηθεσεν ἀπαντα τα οι θε[μις ἐκτελέσσ]θάι 11.10


6 ὡς ἀνδρ[ε]ω κα]τα καλὸν ἐδώος νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου 12.2

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

12
Zeus, upon hearing the prophecies from his father….

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

Ouranos the son of Night, who was first to become king.
11 ἐκ τοῦ δὴ Κρόνος αὐτίς, ἔπειτα δὲ μητίτεα Ζεὺς

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

12 μῆτιν κα.[ c.14 ] ᾗν βασιληίδα τιμη[ήν]

15.13-15

c.[ ταίτις Αὐτῆς] εἰώ

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

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

omnia suppl. West excepto basileus pantω [ων (ZPE)

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

v. comm.

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

suppl. ZPE

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

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

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

h.v. composuit Merkelbach e verbis Auctoris; v. comm.
Zeus is king, Zeus of the shining lightning is the ruler of all

19 (Πειθώ θ' Ἀρμονίην τε καὶ Οὐρανίην Ἀφροδίτην) Persuasion, Harmony, and Aphrodite Ourania

h.v. composit Kouremenos e verbis Auctoris; v. comm. θόρυμ δ' Ἀφροδίτη | Οὐρανίη καὶ Πειθώ θ' Ἀρμονίη τε e.g. Merkelbach

20 μήσατο <δ'> Ὀκεανόο μέγα σθένος ευρυ ό ἐξοντος

— contrived the great might of widely flowing Okeanos

h.v. West composit e verbis Auctoris: "Ὀκεανός," “ἐμήσατο,” “σθένας μέγα,” “ ευρυ ἐξοντα” μήσατο δ’ Ὀκεανόν βαθυδίνην ευρυ ἐξοντα e.g. Burkert

21 ἰνας δ' ἐγκαθιστώ[έ]ξ.' Ἀχελοίου ἀργυ[ρ]οδίνεω

23.11

And within he placed the sinews of Acheloios with its silvery eddies

cf. P.Oxy. 221 col. 9,1-2 ἰνας [δ'] ἐγκατέλεξ(α) | Ἀχελοίου ἀργυροδίνεω

22 ἦ πολλοῖς φαίνει μερόπεσσ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν

24.3

She (sc. the Moon) shines on many mortals over the boundless earth
but when the mind of Zeus contrived all deeds.

omnia rest. Ts. (monente West), excepto vous (Sider); φης Ts.

He wished to lie in love with his own mother

h. v. composit Ts. e verbis Auctoris: "μητρός," "έας," "θέλοντα μιχθήμεναι," "ἐν φιλότητι" ἠθελε μητρός éas μιχθήμεναι ἐν φιλότητι e.g. Ts. ὁ δὲ ἠθελεν ἐν φιλότητι μητρὸς ἐης ἀμμῆμεναι e.g. Merkelbach

COMMENTARY

In a lost transition between the end of col. 6 (on sacrifices, prayers, and souls) and the beginning of col. 7, the Author turns to extensive quotation and commentary on a "sound and orthodox" hymn of Orpheus— ὅμοιον ἐν γιάνδῃ και θεμήτορά λέγοντα (sc. Ορφέα) — which he characterizes as wholly holy: ὁ δὲ [Ορφέα] ἠθελε καὶ ἀμμητος ἐκδικήται μεν οὖν καὶ ἀμβρότο τοῦ πρώτου καὶ μέχρι τελεσθείσου ὁματικος. (The nature and quality of the Author's interpretations need not concern us.)
The Author continues his introduction (see above) to the discussion and exegesis of Orpheus by saying [θ]ύɜφω ἀς γὰρ ἐπίθε[σθαί κελεύσας τοιά[ζ] ̣ ο ὁδίν αὐτ[ο]ύς], which Burkert recognized as the formulaic line end at the beginning of several religious poems. Cf., e.g., Pl. Symp. 218b (Alcibiades): οἱ ἑοὶ ἡκέται, καὶ εἰ τις ἄλλος ἐστὶν βέβηλος τε καὶ ἀγροικός, πύλας πάνω μεγάλας τοῖς ὁσίον ἐπιθεσθέ. That covering one’s ears would hinder hearing hardly needs a classical parallel, but it may be that Odysseus’ description of the wax put in his crew’s ears so that they not hear the Sirens alludes to something similar in the episode in the early Argonautica, where, as we saw above, Orpheus helped the crew sail past the Sirens; cf. Od. 12.177 ἐτάροισιν ἐπ’ οὐσάτα πάσιν ἀλειψα [sc. κηρόν], 199-200 αἰσ οὲ κηρόν ἐλοντο ἐμοὶ ἔριξες ἐταῖροι, 1 ὁν σφι οἐπ’ Ὀσιν ἀλειψ’, ἐμὲ τ᾽ ἐκ δεσμῶν ἀνέλυσαν. Either word for “ear” could well have appeared in the line following 3 F, but in both Clem. Al. Protr. 7.74.4 and Ps.-Justinus Martyr, Coh. ad gent. p. 15 C Morel (both of whom attribute the verses to Orpheus) we find φθέέγξοιαι ὁι θεμις ἐστὶν ὁμήρας δ’ ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι πάντες ὁμός.

There are, however, two possible first halves to this line, (i) the one printed above and ἄείσω ἐνυντοῖσι (attributed to Orpheus by Cyrillus Alex. Contra Julianum 1.35, but to Pythagoras by others), both of which are in accord with what the Author says after the above: οὐτά νομο[θετεῖν φη[σιν τοῖς πολλοῖς c.14 τὴ] ν ἀκοὴν ἅγνεύοντας ....

1 [ο]ἱ Διός ἐξεγέρθηντο [μεγασθεν]έος βασιλήιδος

[ο]ἱ Διός ἐξεγείρθηντο: = ll. 5.637 (of mortals); cf. H. Hom. in Dioscuros 2 οἱ Ζήνος Ολυμπίων ἐξεγέρθησαν; and often in early epic in this sense, most notably
in Hesiod’s genealogical poems; cf. Th. 106 οἱ Γῆς ἔξεγένοντο καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόευντος; Bernabé (2007a) 102-3 notes the emphasis laid on Zeus at this early point in the poem. Xenophanes B 33 begins the process of using the verb to indicate coming into being, while still maintaining its earlier biological sense:

πάντες γὰρ γαῖς τε καὶ ὦδατος ἐκγενόμεσθα,

—a process which Empedocles B 59 continues to develop:

αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μείζον ἐμίσγετο δαίμον δαίμων,
ταῦτα τε συμπίπτεσκαν, ὅπῃ συνέκαθεν ἕκαστα,
ἀλλὰ τε πρὸς τοῖς πολλὰ διηνεκὴ ἔξεγένοντο.

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

eἰσὴ δ’ αἰθέριαν τε φύσιν τὰ τ´ ἐν αἰθέρι πάντα
... ὀππόθεν ἔξεγένοντο.

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

[μεγασθενέως: ZPE’s [ὑπερμενέως, adopted by all but Janko, is acceptable but can be improved upon. It calls for hiatus after ἔξεγένοντο, which can only barely be justified; Homer has a number of examples of hiatus before ὑπέρ(-)20—11 (some examples below) vs. 50 X in the Iliad where there is elision or correction, but only one where, as here, the preceding syllable is short (23.820 Τυδείδης δ´]

20 That is, where a long final syllable or diphthong does not experience epic correction: Il. 3.299 ὁππότεροι πρότεροι ὑπέρ ὀρκα πηµµήνειαν ~ 4.67 = 4.72 ~ 4.136 ~ 4.271, 6.458, 11.297, 14.413, 17.24, 23.73, 23.820.
Moreover, there is never hiatus before ύπερμεν- in Homer (6 X). On the other hand, hiatus after a short syllable, when it does occur, is found at the midline trochaic caesura, as here (and at the bucolic diaeresis); and of these occurrences over 25% are after –ω(υ)τό; cf. Munro Hom. Gr. § 382, citing Knöss De digammo homerico (Uppsala 1872-79) 42-5. And ύπερμεν- is an epithet (of the right shape) of Zeus in Homer. Janko’s conjecture evokes Zeus’ strength more explicitly, but it is rather rare and applied only to mortals—even serving as a proper name—or objects.

[μεγασθεν]έος, which is regularly applied to gods, is preferable; cf. Ba. 3.67-8 μεγασθενη][ς] Ζεύς, A. Eum. 61 [Apollo], Aristoph. Clouds 566 and P. O. 1.25 [Poseidon], Q.S. 2.140 Ζην μεγασθενέι. It also occurs 5 X in the Orphic hymns. Another possibility is [περιφραδ]έος (Apollo, HHerm 464).

[ερισθεν]έος, also suggested by Janko, is, with seven letters restored, said by Kouremenos to be too short, which suggests that a restoration of eight letters is possible. At 13.4 αἴθεξα ἐκθορακέ is an example of hiatus at the bucolic diaeresis after a short vowel; in the verse of a good poet, this might be thought of as vivid writing; more on this later.

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

Between 1 and 2, the Author writes ὅπως δ’ ἄρχεται ἐν τῷ[ίδε δὴ]λοι, leaving the subject of the verb unclear. Tsantsanoglou and Parássoglou take it to be τὰ νῦν ἐόντα, while Bernabé prefers Ζεύς, which is indeed strongly suggested by
Zeus ... ἀρχήν, although the phrase "how Zeus rules" is odd; an inceptive aorist would convey the thought better. "How Zeus begins" (Betegh) should allude to his birth, not, simpliciter, to the beginning of his rule. If the Author, in the manner of a textual commentor, worked his way through the Orphic poem in order, and 2 followed directly on 1, as has been argued by, i.a., Betegh 105-8, it would seem that in this particular telling of the story the emphasis is on Zeus, but this cannot be determined.

Zeus μὲν ἐπεί δὴ πᾶσα[τρός ἐο]ὐ πάρα θέ[σ]φατον ἀρχήν

For the words restored in half brackets, see col. 8.8-10. These lines may have come immediately after 1; cf. West 114, Betegh 109. This line and 7 Ζεύς μὲν ἐπεί δὴ πᾶσατρός ἐοὶ πάρα [θ]άρσον ἀρχήν are, ignoring the different morphology of the penultimate words, the same except for the last words. There are some examples of this in Homer and other early epic; cf. B. Hainsworth, The Iliad: A Commentary III (Cambridge 1993) 19-21; R. Janko, Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns (Cambridge 1982) 129-30. This near repetition, however, is especially reminiscent of Empedocles, who also plays with the idea of oral formulas, reworking his own lines so closely that editors frequently merge what I believe to be two (or more) distinct quotations into one fragment (as I hope to show in detail elsewhere). Cf. B 121.4, as quoted by most sources, Ἄτις ἀν λειμώνα κατὰ σκότος ἠλάσκουσιν, and the same line as quoted by Proclus, Ἄτις ἐν λειμώνι κατὰ σκότος ἠλάσκονται, where the appropriateness of ἀν(α) ... ἠλάσκουσιν and ἐν ... ἠλάσκονται argue against scribal error. For a more sophisticated example, compare also B 115.1, as quoted by Plut. De exil. 607c, ἔστι τ(ι) ἀνάγκης χρήμα, θεών ψήψιμα παλαιόν, with ἔστιν Ἀνάγκη, χρήμα θεῶν, σφρήγισμα
παλαιόν, as quoted by Simpl. Phys. 1184.9-10 = Emp. fr. 110 Bollack. This literary play with one’s own words/formulae was adopted by Lucretius; cf., e.g., 2.82 avius a vera longe ratione vagaris ~ 2.229 avius a vera longe ratione recedit; see further J. D. Minyard, *Mode and Value in the De Rerum Natura: A Study in Lucretius’ Metrical Language* (Wiesbaden 1978) 44-5. It would be interesting to know whether Empedocles is at all indebted in his own near self-quotation to this Orphic poem. This discussion shows that Calame 67 n. 3 is on weak ground when he argues that 2.1 should be altered to the reading of 7.

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

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

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

4-5 ἐξ ἀδύτοιο (?)

τὴν ξυπούσαν ἀπαντα τὰ θε[με ἐκτελέσθαι

The Author quotes 5 as a single line, but has anticipated it on line 1 of this column, which begins with ... τῆς Νυκτός. "ἐξ ἀδύτου" δ’ αὐτὴν [λέγει] χρήσαι .... It is thus quite likely that the words ἐξ ἀδύτου immediately preceded 5 (same phrase and same sedes at Il. 5.512, Orph. Arg. 956; cf. Aristoph. Eq. 1015-16 Ἀπόλλων ἰαχεῖν ἐξ ἀδύτου). Bernabé joins the two fragments, along with ZPE’s ἡ δὲ.
5 ἤνυξι: Night, as is clear from col. 11.1; see last lemma. Three letters are needed; hence, ἡ δέ in scriptio plena (= ἡ δ’ in meter) was restored by ZPE, which is better than reading the repeated οι in West’s η οι. The choice between ἡ δέ and Νυξ depends in large part on how one understands the line introducing 5: τάδ’ [ἐν ἐχομένωι] ἥδεν (Janko or [ἐπὶ τούτῳ] οι Tz.) λέγει. If the Author is proceeding to a new point, an anaphoric ἡ δέ (or better, ἥδε) is appropriate; but if he, as often, cites a passage to illustrate a point made earlier (cf. his quoting Heraclitus in col. 4, or the way col. 8.1 and 8.3 lead respectively to the quoting of 8.2 and 8.4-5), then Νυξ seems more likely. Since as reconstructed here, Νυξ is not the first word of the sentence, there is no need for a connecting particle in any case, since, as Calame (2010) 20 notes, there is frequent asyndeton in this poem.

ἲν άχοστεν: A violation of Meyer’s first law. West’s conjecture is metrically less likely, but cf. 8 ἐκθοροφόρο πρώτος.

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

Θέμις: θέμις normally derives from the gods and rarely applies to gods themselves; cf. Hes. Th. 396 τὸν δ’ ἐφαθ’, ὡστις ἀτιμος ὑπὸ Κρόνου ἢ’ αγέφαστος, 1 τιμής καὶ γεγαίων ἑπιθυμήμεν, ἢ θέμις ἐστίν, but here it is generalized, unlike the Derveni restoration. See further H. Lloyd-Jones, The Justice of Zeus (Berkeley 1971) 166 n. 23, with bibliography. Athena can tell Ares what not to do (“Ἄρες, ἐπιστρέψε μένος κρατερόν καὶ χείρας ἀπάστοις—οὐ γάρ τοι θέμις ἐστίν ἀπὸ κλυτᾶ τεῦχεα δύσαι ν Ἡρακλέα κτείναντα,” [Hes.] Sc. 446-8). Θέμις can come from Zeus or another god: ὅνες Άχαιῶν ..., οἱ τε θέμιστας πρὸς Διὸς εἰρύσαται (ll. 1.237-9); cf. [Hes.] Sc. 22 ὁ Οἰδόθεν θέμις ἦν. But what is the
supposed sense of the restoration here? That it is “right” for Zeus to accomplish these things; or that he “should” do so? The former is possible (Night to Zeus would be like Athena to Ares); the latter may seem too strong, but is probably correct: Zeus here is subject to the demands of fate as any mortal is. And a god’s "prophecy" may command rather than merely predict; cf. Thuc. 1.134.4 ὁ δὲ θεός ὁ ἐν Δελφοῖς τὸν τε τάφον ἐστερεῖ ἔχοισε τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις μετενεγκεῖν οὔπερ ἀπέθανε.

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

6 ὡς ἀνὸ ἔδ[χοι κάτα καλὸν ἐδῶς νυφόντος Ὀλύμπου ἀνὸ ἔδ[χοι κάτα:] According to the papyrological description of Tsantsanoglou and Parássoglou, the restorations of West, Burkert, and Janko are inconsistent with the horizontal trace before the lacuna that could be the top only of Γ, Ε, Ζ, Ξ, Σ, or Τ. For tmesis with anastrophe when the preposition follows its verb, see H. W. Chandler, Greek Accentuation (Oxford 1881) ¶¶ 922-3. Kouremenos compares Il. 2.699 τότε δ’ ἤδη ἔχεν κάτα γαία μέλαινα, and Od. 9.6 ἡ ὥτ’ εὑφροσύνη μὲν ἔχει κάτα δῆμον ἀπαντά. ὡς ἀν + optative (or subjunctive) is normal in Homer and epic in general, often at the beginning of the line and always so in Orphic literature; cf. H.Orph. 87.12 ὡς ἀν ἔοι, 62.11, 63.13.
The usual sense of this verb in early poetry (and prose) is, in order of increasing metaphorical sense, (i) hold down, cover, (ii) pervade, (iii) suppress/control, (iv) rule (which is a political overlap and extension of [iii]).

E.g., (i) Od. 11.302 τοὺς ἀμφό ἑοὺς κατέχει φυσίζους αἷα; cf. Il. 3.243. (ii) Od. 13.269 νῦς δὲ μᾶλλα δνοφερή κάτεχ᾽ οὐρανών. (iii) Bacch. Dith. 3.28-9 σῆ δὲ βαρεῖαν κάτεχε μήτιν, Theognis 602-3 Τοιάδε καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσαι ἐργα καὶ ὤβης, σατα νὰ τὰ νῦν ἱερήν τήνδε πόλιν κατέχει. (iv) Soph. Ant. 609-10 (Zeů,) δυνάστας | κατέχεις Ὀλύμπου | μαρμαρός σαμίλαν, E. Hec. 79-81 ώ χθόνιοι θεοί, σῶσατε παίδ᾽ ἐμόν, | ὃς μόνος οὐκ οὐκ ἄγιορ ἐτ᾽ ἐμόν | τὴν χιονώδη Θρήνην κατέχει, Orph. H. 2.6 κατέχεις οίκους πάντων; cf. ibid. 18.4, 27.5. Kouremenos considers the use of the verb in the Antigone passage equivalent to that in the Derveni papyrus. Note, however, that the statement quoted is in direct answer to the chorus’ own rhetorical question, τεάν, Zeů, δύνασιν τις ἀνδρῶν ὑπερβασία κατάσχοι; (604-5). That is, Sophocles’ sentence entails the political sense of κατέχω, which perhaps cannot be dated before the second half of the fifth century, which is perhaps too late for a poem that quickly (how quickly depends on when one dates the Author) came to be taken as a work of Orpheus. Sense (iii) is probably best here.

ἐδῶς νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου: Cf., with Bernabé, H.H. 15.7-8 (Zeus) κατὰ καλῶν ἐδῶς νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου | ναίει, Ap.Rh. 1.503-4, (Orpheus) ἦμεθεν δ᾽ ὡς πρῶτον Ὀψιῶν Εὐρυνόμῃ τε | Ὀμέανις νιφόεντος ἔχον κράτος Ὀλύμπου, Orph. H. 15.7 ἐδῶς νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου, II. 24144 ἐδῶς Ὀλύμπου, 18.615 Ὀλύμπου νιφόεντος, Hes. Th. 42 νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου. I omit the parallels adduced where Olympus is the ἐδῶς of the gods. Note also Hes. Th. 117-8 Γαῖ
εὐφύστερος, πάντων ἕδος ἁσφαλές αἰεὶ ἀθανάτων οἱ ἔχουσι κάρῃ νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου (118 = 794 = Orph. H. 25.7 = 59.2).

7 Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δῆδο πῶςατοβός ἐπο πάρα [θ]έσσατ᾽ ἀκούσας

See above, on 2.

8 αἴδοιον καταθέπινεν, ὡς αἴθερα ἐκθροφεῖ πρῶτος

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

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

γένεσιν τούς ἀνθρώπον[ς] νομίζον[τας εἰ]νάκτα τούτω ἐχοῦσατο, ἀλλὰ ό ἄνευ δέ τῶν οἰκοιων [οῦ γίνεται, αἰωνίων εἰκότας τὸν ἔλιω[ν]. In any case, it seems quite unlikely that an epic poet of the fifth century would use the singular in this sense. It is true that, as Burkert ibid. shows, there are near-eastern stories with parallels for the swallowing of a god’s penis, but it may well be that it is stories such as these that led the Author to his interpretation.

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

πρώτον δαίμονα σεμνόν

Μήτιν σπέρμα φέροντα θεῶν κλυτόν, ὅν τε Φάνητα
πρωτογόνον μάκαρες κάλεον.

"...the first august daimon to carry the seed of the gods, famed Metis, whom the blessed ones called Phanes protogonos" (where the epithet is clearly active). Cf. Orph. fr. 243.9 [sc. Ζεύς ἐστι] Μήτις πρώτως γενέτωρ. Damascius paraphrases as follows: Εἰ δὲ ὁ παρ’ Ὅρφει πρωτογόνος (again, I print paroxytone) θεός ὁ πάντων σπέρμα φέρων τῶν θεῶν ἀπό τοῦ ὕστερον πρῶτον ἔχεθος. See further on 13.1. It wouldn’t take a great leap of allegoretic skill to apply the meaning “that which is the primary progenitor” to αἴων understood as a noun = “penis.” For the the paroxytone accentuation and the active meaning, see Philop. De Vocab. Recensio α 20 πρωτογόνος· ἡ πρώτως τεκούσα παροξύνεται.
ὅς reads more easily in this one line with a masc. αἰδοίον, but of course its antecedent could easily have been a genitive in the preceding line; Bernabé 1.19 suggests βασιλῆς or Οὐρανοῦ.

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

αἰθέρα ἐκθορὰ: As in Hesiod, Aither, Chaos, and Chronos are early gods in Orphic cosmogonies. The aither from which the Orphic Phanes (who is nowhere named in the Derveni poem) derives is called "clouds" in later prose paraphrases; cf. Damasc. de Princ. Note Damasc. de princ. 124 [I 317, 2-4 Ruelle] εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν τελείν ἢτοι τὸ κυνομένον καὶ τὸ κύον ὡν τὸν θεόν, ἢ τὸν ἄργητα χιτώνα, ἢ τὴν νεφέλην, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦτων ἐκθροφεῖ ο Φάνης. Attempts to read αἰθέρα as a terminal accusative are thus misguided, as the parallels in Orphic texts show. Furthermore, ... [ἐ]κθύου ὡν τὸν Λαμὸ πρότατον τε [καὶ θε]ροᾷ ὡτατον (col. 14.1) shows that the Author copied his exemplar correctly; i.e., αἰθέρα ἐκθορᾷ cannot be considered an error on his part. Even if he read the accusative as direct object, there is no reason for us to follow him; cf. Bernabé (above, n. 17) 86-7.

Why not the more usual genitive, as in Homer (ll. 10.94-5 κραδὶ δὲ μοι ἐξω 1 στηθέων ἐκθρόσκει) and everywhere else? αἰθέρος ἐκθορᾷ would also avoid hiatus. The only parallel (adduced by Kouremenos) is from an anonymous late epigram, A.P. 9.371.1 Δίκτυον ἐκθρόσκοντα πολυπλόκον ἄρτι λαγῳν, where Scaliger may have been right to conjecture δικτύου...πολυπλόκου. It is possible that the hiatus was intentional, to make the leap vivid.
Between quoting the two lines, the Author says only τὸ δ’ ἐπὶ τοῦτῳ, which lacks the ἐχόμενον he uses elsewhere that would make it explicit that 10 followed immediately upon 9, as West and Kouremenos believe, reading (see the app. crit.) Οὐρανός Εὐφρονίδης. The sense would now be Κρόνος μέγ’ ἔρεξεν Οὐρανός, i.e., Cronos greatly harmed Ouranos. For ἔρεξεν as a euphemism (here for castration), cf. Burkert, Homo Necans (Berkeley 1983) 3, who notes how this verb often substitutes for the act of killing in a sacrificial ritual. For the double accusative construction that would be produced, cf. Il. 3.354 ἐνιοδόκον κακὰ ἕξαι. Reading accusatives would furthermore account for what now looks like asyndeton in 10, although, as Betegh 123 n. 87 observes, this is not a major obstacle to retaining the nominatives; one can imagine that Οὐρανός Εὐφρονίδης is enjambed with a preceding nominative word or phrase. It would also be inept of Orpheus to link one ὅς-clause to another after only four words. On the whole, then, it seems best, or at any rate more cautious, to follow Π and retain the two nominatives.

Εὐφρονίδης: Cf. T. Corsten, Die Inschriften von Kios (Bonn 1985) 21.6 (Late Hellenistic to early Imperial date) = Anth. Pal. Appendix ed. Cougny 4.49
Ωὐρανός Εὐφρονίδης. Matronymics are unusual in Greek; cf. Apollo/Artemis Letoïdes, Cheiron Philyrides, Ares Enyalios (< Enyo). Herakles is often called "the son of Alcmene," although no single matronymic is used, except for Bacch. 5.71 Ἀλκμήνηος θαυμαστὸς ἤρως. Musaeus is the son of Μήνη (Hermesianax fr. 7.15). And the Molionē (dual) are called after their mother Molionē, according
to Eustath. ad Il, p. 3.319.4-11. And of particular interest here, Orpheus is identified as the son of Calliope: Tim. Pers. 223 υἱὸς Καλλίόπας (Τ 902 Bernabé).

Cf. further Herodian Orthogr. 3.2.435 Τά εἰς δὴς μητροανυμικά διά τοῦ ζ γράφεται οἶον Ληταϊδῆς ο υἱὸς τῆς Λητοῦ, Δαναΐδῆς ο υἱὸς τῆς Δανάης, Φυλωρίδης ο υἱὸς Φυλώρας. οθεν Νιοβίδης ο τῆς Νιόβης. οθεν το Φυλωμηλίδης το παρ᾽ Ὄμηρος ου λέγομεν εἰναι πατροανυμικόν ουδὲ λέγομεν τον υἱόν της Φυλωμῆλας. ονομα κύριοι ἐστιν. ει γὰρ η μητροανυμικόν, διὰ τοῦ ζ ἑφειλεν εἶναι καὶ ὁ Διονύσιος λέγει ὅτι ἀπὸ μητέρων οὐ σχηματίζει πατροανυμικὸν ὁ Ὄμηρος. W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, Inscriptions of Cos (Oxford 1891) nos. 10 and 367 lists citizens by both patronymic and matronymic. (Other cultures assign matronymics more freely, such as Russians and Ashkenazi Jews; cf. B. O. Unbegaun, Russian Surnames [Oxford 1972] 21-2, 105-8, 124-5, 342-4.) For Ouranos as son of Night in Orphic theology, cf. Alex. Aphrod. in Aristot. meta. 821.11-12 κατ᾽ Ὄρφηα τὸ Χάος γέγονεν, εἰθ᾽ ὁ Ὀκεανός, τρίτον Νῦς, τέταρτον ὁ Ὀὐρανός, quoting the verse Ὀυρανός, ἣς πρῶτος βασίλευσε θεῶν μετὰ μητέρα Νύκτα.

Night might be given prominence by this matronymic because of her role as nurse in Orphic theology; cf. col. 10.11 τροφίδον δὲ λέγων αὐτήν τῷ αὐτωνίῳ αὐτωνικῷ ἔτη διά which Kouremenos 184 reasonably combines with col. 10.9 πανομφεύουσαν (a hapax, obviously repeated from a lost lemma) and with Procl. In Plat. Crat. 404b = 112 F θεῶν γὰρ τροφῆς ἀμβροσίη Νῦς λέγεται (although not identified as an Orphic view by Proclus) to suggest that the missing line was – ἡ πανομφεύουσα θεῶν τροφῆς ἀμβροσίη Νῦς (6 F). There is also the question, as Betegh per litt. points out, "whether Ouranos had a father at all.”

Night is euphemistically called euphrone as early as Hes. Op. 560. Note also Heraclitus B 26, 57, 99, and, most interesting, 67, a fragment of Orphic-like
polarities quoted by Hippolytus Ref. Haer. 9.10.8, ὁ θεὸς ἤμερῃ εὐφρόνη, χειμών θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός. The word is then common in all three major tragedians, but to judge from its frequent occurrence in Hippocrates and Herodotus, euphrone became the usual word for night in Ionic (which includes Heraclitus).

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

11 ἐκ τοῦ δὴ Κρόνος ἄδυτις, ἐπείτα δὲ μητίετα Ζεὺς

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

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

12 μητίν κα[. c.14 ἑών βασιληδα τιμ[ήν]

ἐκ[. ]ἀδι ἰνατόζῳ ἀόπ.[

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

βασιληίδα τιµήν: The kingly honor in question is the very one of being king; cf. Proclus in Plat. Crat. 105 μόνος ὁ Κρόνος, τὴν τετάρτην βασιλικήν τάξιν κληροσάμενος, παρὰ πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους ύβριστικῶς δοκεῖ κατὰ τὸ μυθικὸν πρόσχημα προσδέχεσθαι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Όυρανοῦ τὸ σκήπτρον καὶ μεταδίδοναι τῷ Δίῳ· καὶ γὰρ ἡ Νίξ παρ’ ἐκόντος αὐτῷ λαμβάνει τὸν Φάνητος·

σκήπτρον δ’ ἀριδείκετον εἰο χέρεσσιν
θήκε θεᾶς Νυκτός, <ἐν’ ἔχη> βασιληίδα τιµή. (168 F)

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

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

13 πρωτογόονοι βασιλέως αἰδοίου, τῷ δ’ ἀρα πάντες
ἀθανατῶι προσέφυν μάκαρες θεοὶ ἡδὲ θέαιναι
καὶ ποταμοί καὶ κρήναι ἐπίρημα ἄλωλα τε πάντα,
This, the longest fragment in the papyrus, presenting no textual problems (two alternate readings in ZPE can no longer be entertained), lays out the notion of a cosmic Zeus, who contains within himself all that was and all that is to be, as close parallels from other Orphic verses make clear, especially 243 and 245 F, which will be cited below. On the join between 13 and 14, see below.

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

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

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

αἰθέρος εὐρείς ἢ δ’ οὐρανοῦ ἀγλαὸν υψός, 5
πόντου τ’ ἄτρυγετόν γαῖς τ’ ἐρμυθέος ἐδη,
Οκεανός τε μέγας καὶ νείατα τάρταρα γαῖς
καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ πόντος ἀπείρατος ἄλλα τε πάντα
πάντες τ’ ἀθάνατοι μάκαρες θεοὶ ἢ δ’ θέαναι.

2 προσέφυν: For this 3 pl. form, cf. Od. 5.481 ἀλλῆλουσιν ἐφυν, Pl. P. 1.42 περίγλωσσοι τ’ ἐφυν. This verb usually indicates close/tight attachment of something that still retains its distinct nature; cf. Od. 12.433 (Odysseus holding
on to the rock between Scylla and Charybdis) τῷ προσφύς ἑχόμην. Aristotle uses it frequently of eggs and embryos attached to the womb, which seems an apt parallel; cf. HA 538a10 ἐν τῇ υστέρᾳ [sc. τὰ ὡμῖ] ἔχει καὶ προσπεφυκότα. As noted above, similar Orphic verses spell out the meaning here, so that we can rule out "be born in addition"; cf. Hesych. π 3751 Schmidt προσέφυ προσεγένετο (for which in this sense, see LSJ s.v. 2). Orphism equates many gods and contains many stories of gods' being swallowed by others, only to be reborn, that is, to regain their separate existence later. This fragment describes the time(s) when Zeus protogonos contains the others gods within himself. Cf. 243.7-10 F [Zeus] ἐν ὧ τάδε πάντα κυκλείται ... πάντα γὰρ ἐν μεγάλῳ Ζηνός τάδε σώματι κείται (~ 245.5 F πάντα γὰρ ἐν Ζηνός μεγάλω τάδε σώματι κείται), 241.2 F τῶν πάντων δέμας εἶχεν ἐνί γαστέρι κοίλῃ.

4 ἀδόσα τῶν ἢν γεγαώτ: The list given at 241.5-9 F (see above) is likewise followed by ὅσα τ᾽ ἐν γεγαώτα. The Orphic author may have been influenced by Ibycus, who alludes to the birth of the Moliones from a silver egg: τοὺς τε λευκίππους κόρους | τέκνα Μολιόνας κτάνον, | ἀλλὰς ἰσοκεφάλους ἐνιγνιός | ἀμφοτέρους γεγαώτας ἐν ὡξῷ | ἀργυρέω (fr. 4).

14...
The Author may introduce this line with the words [ἐτι δὲ ἐν τῷ ἔχωμένω, "and then in the following line," which, if correctly restored, would indeed make for a nice fit with 13.


15 Ζεὺς πρῶτος [γέν]εότο, ἵζε θεότο[ξ] [ἄργικέραυνος]

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

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

16 Ζεὺς κεφαλῶ ἰλή, [Ζεὺς μέσ/vndων, Δωάος δ’ ἐκο [π]άντα τέτυκται]
 = 31.2 = 243.2 F.

17 [Ζεὺς πνοή πάντων, Ζεὺς πάντων ἐπλητο] ἵμοίραι

supporting this is that Orpheus in the papyrus is cited for some of the same lines as are found in 31 F, as well as in the similar 243 F; see comm. on 16 and 18. Merkelbach ibid. completed the line with a conjecture that accounts for Moïra, replicating the frequent asyndeton found in 31 and 243 F, but since Moira does not figure much in other Orphic verses, the second half cannot be as persuasive as the the first. On the whole, though, Merkelbach’s line is more convincing than West’s [Zeüs πάντων τέλος αὐτὸς ἔχει, Zeüs] Moïra [κράται]。

18 Ζεῦς ἁβασιλεύς, Ζεῦς δ’ ἄρχός ἀπαντώτων ἀργικέραυνος.

= 31.7 F. Cf. also 243.4-5 F Ζεῦς βασιλεύς, Ζεῦς αὐτὸς ἀπάντων ἀρχιγένεθλος. ἐν κράτος, εἰς δαίμων, γενέτης μέγας, ἄρχός ἀπαντών.

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

19 (Πειθῶ θ’ Ἀρμονίην τε καὶ Ὠρανίην Ἀφροδίτην)

Orpheus has clearly been joining several gods under the same name— Ἀφροδίτη Ὠρανία καὶ Ζεῦς καὶ ἀφροδισιάζειν καὶ θόρνυσθαι καὶ Πειθῶ καὶ Ἀρμονία τῶν αὐτῶν θεῶν ὄνομα κέιται—but his syntax cannot be recovered and Kouremenos’ reconstructed line is best accepted only exempli gratia. This fragment number would be better served with the one word θόρνη (cf. col. 21.1 θόρνη δὲ λέγ[ω]), a hapax which the context clearly associates with other words (such as ἀφροδισιάζειν, col. 21.8) for sexual intercourse, a metaphorical sense of
“jump” found elsewhere; cf. Nic. Ther. 99 with schol. ad loc. θορνύντας ὀχεύοντα. (Ts. in L-M 19 n. 53 tentatively suggested that θόφη should be read for θόφη.)

20 μήσατο <ὁ> Ωκεανοί μέγα σθένος εὐρύ ὀξόντος

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

21 ἵνας δ’ ἐγκώβαστο ἔλει Ἀχελώου ἀργυροδένεισι
ἀργυροδένεισι

ἵνας ... ἀργυροδένεισι: The Author not only sees veins within Acheloius literally (by means of allegoresis; see next lemma), he also seems to detect it in Orpheus’ words; that is, ἵνας ἀργυροδένεισι. This is shown by the Author’s unusual use of the demonstrative adjective, so that τάοδ’ ἵνας ~ τάς δίνας (col. 23.13)—unusual for him, that is; he uses the demonstrative pronoun often enough, but not the demonstrative adjective. Since the usual phrase is in the singular—cf. ll. 21.356 ἵς ποταμοῖο, Pi. fr. 70 + *249b ἵς Ἀχελώου—something like this may have been in the mind of the poet as well as of the Author; cf. Kouremenos p. 259. The adj. is used exclusively of rivers and quite often of Acheloius: Hes. Th. 340, Panyassis fr. 28.1 Matthews = 31.1 Bernabé, Callim. H.Dem. 13, Dionys. Perieg. 433, 1140
Ἀχελωίου: There are several 5th-cent. passages where Acheloius is used for water in general: Eur. Andr. 167, Ba. 625, Hyps. fr. 753, fr. 365, Soph. Athamas fr. 5, Achaeus Aithon 20 F 9 TrGF, Aristoph. Lys. 381 (water in a bucket, an inappropriate and hence intentionally pompous example); cf. Bond on fr. 753 (p. 86). These can be regarded as simple metonymy, but as the adjective ἄργυροδίνεω shows (see below), Orpheus is referring to Acheloius not only in his original role as river, but more specifically as the river that once seems to have had something of the same status as Oceanus. Cf. Serv. ad Verg. G. 1.8 = Orph. F 154 Bernabé nam, sicut Orpheus docet et Aristophanes comicus et Ephorus historicus tradunt, Acheoloon generaliter propter antiquitatem fluminis onnem aquam veteres vocabant; Ephorus ap. Macrobr. Sat. 5.18.7 = FGrHist 70 F 20a τοῖς μέν οὖν ἄλλοις ποταμοῖς οἱ πλησιώχοι μόνοι θύουσιν, τὸν δὲ Ἀχελώον μόνον πάντας ἀνθρώπους συμβεβηκέν τιμάν, οὐ τοῖς κοινοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀντὶ τῶν ἱδίων <ὀνομάζοντες τοὺς ἄλλους ποταμοὺς, ἄλλα> τοῦ Ἀχελώον τὴν ἱδίαν ἐπιωνυμίαν ἐπὶ τὸ κοινὸν μεταφέροντας, τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὕδωρ ὀλῶς, ὅπερ ἐστὶν κοινὸν ὄνομα, ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδιᾶς ἐκείνου προσηγορίας Ἀχελώον καλοῦμεν, τὸν δὲ ἄλλων ὀνομάτων τὰ κοινὰ πολλάκις ἀντὶ τῶν ἱδίων ὀνομάζομεν τοὺς μὲν Ἀθηναίοις Ἰωναῖοι, τοὺς δὲ Λακεδαιμονίους Πελοποννησίους ἀποκαλοῦντες. τούτου δὲ τοῦ ἀπορήματος οὐδὲν ἔχομεν αἰτιώτατον εἰπεῖν ἢ τοὺς ἐκ Δαδώνης χρησιμοῦς· σχεδὸν γὰρ ἐν ἀπασιν αὐτοῖς προστάτευεν ὁ θεὸς εἰὼθεν Ἀχελώον θύειν, ὡστε πολλοὶ νομίζοντες οὐ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν διὰ τῆς Ἀκαρνανίας ἰέοντα, ἄλλο τὸ σύνολον ὕδωρ Ἀχελώον ὑπὸ τοῦ χρησιμοῦ καλεῖσθαι, μμοῦνται τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ προσηγορίας. σημεῖον δὲ ὅτι πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀναφέροντες οὕτω λέγειν εἰώθαμεν· μάλιστα γὰρ τὸ ὕδωρ Ἀχελώον προσαγορεύομεν ἐν τοῖς ὅρκοις καὶ ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις, ἀπερ πάντα περὶ τούς θεοὺς. Note also Schol. ad Il. 21.195 [P.Oxy. 221 col. 9.21] ἔφορος δ’ ἐν β’ [φησι] τὸ ἐν Δαδώνης ἑαυτίου σχεδὸν ἐν ἀπασὶ τοῖς
χρησµµοίς προστάάττειν Ἀχελώος θύειν, ὅθεν τούς Ἕλληνας πάν[τ]α[.] ποταµον νοµίζειν Ἀχελώον. See further Betegh 215-17. Note, however, ll. 21.194-5, where Acheloius and Oceanus are distinguished (οὐδὲ...Ἀχελώος...οὐδὲ...Ὠκεανός).

ἐγκαθιστείτείς: Although the Author glosses this word (in the infinitive) as ἐγκαθιστεύτω[θ]έω, a hapax presumably meaning something like “push down in(to),” an unknown sense of ἐγκαθιστεύω, it may be that Orpheus’ meaning is “assigned/allotted,” as in Hsch. ε 210 ἐγκαθιστεύσαι ἐγκαθιστεύει (the first word is not in LSJ; nor is this meaning of the latter). The meaning can now be something like “Zeus assigned the veins of Acheloius”; that is, with Acheloius = water in general—not merely because the Author says so, but because D’Alessio has shown that this is indeed an early belief—“Zeus allotted each of the veins of water,” which now means that Zeus ordered the disposition of the earth’s various bodies of water (πάντες ποταµοι καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα 1 καὶ πᾶσαι κρήναι καὶ φράεατα μακρά, ll. 21.196-7, introduced by εξ οὐ, whose reference D’Alessio shows is Acheloius, not Oceanus).

Thus the primary sense of ἵνας is indeed “sinews” or “veins,” not “strength,” although as D’Alessio argues, the latter is not totally to be precluded from the semantic range of this word in poetic texts, especially given μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοίο (ll. 18.607 = 21.195). Veins, though, are to be understood metaphorically as the various flowing bodies of water, all of which derive from Oceanus/Acheloius—in other words “the veins of Acheloius” is a kenning, as West saw, comparing Choerilus 2 TrGF γῆς φλέβας [sc. τούς ποταµούς]; cf. I. Waern, ΤΗΣ ΟΣΤΕΑ: The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry (Uppsala 1951) 95-6. The image is repeated in [Hipp.] De Hebdomadibus c.6 1.22 ff. R. aqua … fluminum imitatio est venae et qui in venis est sanguinis, a text dated ca. 60-30 BC by
J. Mansfeld, *The Pseudo-Hippocratic Tract ΠΕΡΙ ΕΒΔΟΜΑΔΩΝ Ch. 1-11 and Greek Philosophy* (Assen 1970) 229-30. That is, the Author has taken the Homeric ἴς ποταμοίο (ll. 21.356), where the sense is “the river’s strength,” made it plural and returned the metaphor to its original meaning. Note too that he Choerilus phrase is parallel only with φλέβες = ἱνες; the genitives are different. γῆς is possessive; Ἀχελώου is the same to a certain extent (they are indeed his veins), but also and more so genitive of material; i.e., veins (consisting) of water.

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

22 ἥ πολλοῖς φαίνει μερόπεσσ’ ἐπ’ ἀπείρονα γαῖαν

Since immediately before adducing this line, the Author says the following of the moon: ὅσα δ[ὲ] μὴ κυκλοειδέα οὐχ οἴον τε ἱσομελὴ εἶναι, it seems almost certain that he found the hexametrical *hapax ἱσομελή* (though not necessarily in the accusative) in a nearby verse, which, context suggests, must apply to the moon. Merkelbach tentatively conjectured ἱσομελής δ’ ἄρ’ ὑπέρβαλεν ἄστρα σελήνη. For a moon with limbs, cf. Emped. B 31, which refers to the γυνᾶ of the Sphere; see further Kouremenos ad loc., against Betegh 247-8, who prefers to take
the "limbs" literally and have them refer to the horns of the moon. These do in fact figure in many lunar descriptions, but this epithet is largely meaningless, since the horns must needs always be equal. All that can differ is whether the line drawn through the points of the horn are upright or tilted; cf. Theophr. De Signis 27.

This verse is introduced with the words δηλοὶ δὲ τόδε, which elsewhere in the papyrus assumes a poet as subject, most likely Orpheus, although in these cases the verb is fleshed out with ἐν τούτῳ/τούτοις. Kouremenos would thus seem to justified in assuming τὸ ἐπος as subject here from the words of the Author immediately following: τούτο τὸ ἐπος δόξειν ἂν τις ἀλλὰς εἴρηται.

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

ἐπὶ ἁπειρονα γαίαν: = ll. 7.446, Od. 25.79, 17.386, Hes. Th. 187, Op. 487, fr. 43a.83 (same sedes); ll. 24.342, Od. 1.98,


[αὐτ]ὰδὲ ἐ[ἰ]πδεί δὴ[η]: 28 X in Homer, and often in the Homeric Hymns.
νοῦς: The φρήν can be "turned" (of Zeus; Il. 10.45), and can remember, learn, and experience various feelings, but, although there is no reason why the phren should not actively plan and execute, nowhere in early Greek literature does it actually do so. It is significant that the only time the nominative singular occurs in Homer (see above), it is the subject of a passive verb. The plural nom. is common in Homer, but whether steadfast or not, they do serve in any executive role; note e.g. Il. 1.103-4 = Od. 4.661 μένεος ἃ μέγα φρένες ἀμφιμέλαιναι πύμπλαντ', 10.10 τρομέντο ὅ ὁ φρένες ἐντός. Elsewhere mental activity occurs in or in accord with one's phren; cf. S. D. Sullivan, Psychological Activity in Homer (Ottawa 1988) 188, "nowhere [sc. in Homer] will it be said that it is phrenes that make a choice." The closest one finds in later literature are several passages where one's own phren "makes" or "puts" a person in one or another state of mind; cf. Aristoph. Aes. Pers. 769 φρένες γὰρ αὐτοῦ θυμόν ἑκακοστρόφουν, Aristoph. Lys. 708-9. Note, though, Aes. Suppl. 598-9 ἔπος σπεῦσαι τι τῶν βουλίος φέρει φρήν, Eur. IT 655 ἔτι γὰρ ἀμφύλογα δίδυμα μέμονε φρήν.

Nous, on the other hand, unlike phren, figures often in the Author's text, sometimes suggesting that it was in an Orphic verse, most notably soon after quoting 23: col. 26.1 μήτηρ ὁ Νοῦς ἔστιν τῶν ἀλλων. Nous, furthermore, plays an active role in the formation of the universe in Anaxagoras' cosmology; cf. B 12 καὶ γνώμην γε περὶ παντὸς πάσαν ἵσχει καὶ ἵσχυε μέγιστον [sc. νοῶ]-καὶ ὅσα γε ψυχήν ἱσχει καὶ τὰ μεῖζα καὶ τὰ ἐλάσσω, πάντων νοῶς κρατεῖ, καὶ τῆς περιχώρησις τῆς συμπάθης νοῶ εκφάγησε, ὡστε περιχώρησι τὴν ἄρχην....καὶ τὰ συμμετέχοντα τα καὶ ἀποκρινόμενα καὶ διακρινόμενα πάντα ἐγγὺς νοῶς, καὶ ὅποια ἐμμελεῖ ἑσεθαι καὶ ὅποια ἢν, ἀσά νῦν μὴ ἔστι, καὶ ὅσα νῦν ἔστι καὶ ὅποια ἐσται, πάντα διεκόσμησε νοῶς, καὶ τὴν περιχώρησιν
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ταύτην, ἣν νῦν περὶ χωρέει τά τε ἀστρα καὶ ὁ ἡλίος καὶ ἡ σελήνη καὶ ὁ ἀήρ καὶ ὁ αἰθήρ οἱ ἀποκρινόμενοι; see also B 13. Note too Eur. Tr. 886 Ζεὺς εἴτε ἀνάγκη φύσεως εἴπε νοῦς βροτῶν. This would provide yet another link between the Papyrus and Anaxagoras, and perhaps Diogenes of Apollonia as well; cf. W. Burkert, "Orpheus und die Vorsokratiker," A&Α 14 (1968) 93-114; Janko (2002) 3-4; A. Laks, Diogène d’Apollonie (Sankt Augustin 2008) 269-74 ("À propos du papyrus de Derveni").

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

μὴ σατὸ δ’ ἐν ὑγιαῖ: As in ll. 10.289, Od. 3.261, 24.199, 24.444, Hes. Th. 166, 172.

24 μητρὸς εᾶς ἔθελεν μιχθήμεναι ἐν φιλότητι

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

μιχθήμεναι ἐν φιλότητι: The preposition is not necessary, but cf. ll. 2..232 μίσγει ἐν φιλότητι, 14.237 παραλέξομαι ἐν φιλότητι, HHom 13.5 init. μιχθείσ’ ἐν φιλότητι.