

## RECONSTRUCTING (AGAIN) THE OPENING OF THE DERVENI PAPYRUS<sup>1</sup>

The Derveni papyrus is arguably the most extraordinary new text on Greek religion to emerge since the Renaissance. This carbonized book-roll, dating I believe from as early as 350 BC, was found in the remains of a funeral pyre at Derveni in Greece in January 1962; it is thus the oldest surviving European book. Its final columns were brought out by S. G. Kapsomenos in 1964. However, K. Tsantsanoglou first published its opening columns in 1997, announcing that there were 26 columns rather than 22 as has previously been thought,<sup>2</sup> and the *editio princeps* of the whole papyrus was produced by T. Kouremenos, G. M. Parássoglou and K. Tsantsanoglou in October 2006.<sup>3</sup> This latter edition included a set of photographs of all the fragments, a benefit of inestimable value. It also revealed the surprising fact that a total of 113 pieces, some of them as large as a third of a column in width, were still unplaced. While waiting for the papyrus to be fully published, I had produced an interim text and a translation, based on the information that was then in the public domain.<sup>4</sup> The photographs in the *editio princeps* have now made it possible to apply to the reconstruction of this roll techniques which have been developed for putting together the dismembered *volumina* from Herculaneum. In the course of completing a review of the editors' publication,<sup>5</sup> I constructed a physical model of the entire *volumen* from the published images in order to test their results and to see if further progress could be made. This article presents the results. Our understanding of these columns is at an early stage, but progress can still be made.

There is much at stake in attempting to solve the puzzle of this papyrus. Nobody would ever have predicted that we would find an analysis of an Orphic poem in terms of pre-socratic molecular physics, such as occupies columns 7–26 of the papyrus. The Derveni author's style puts him without any question within the fifth century BC. To see the methods of etymology and allegory applied to the interpretation of such an important religious text was utterly unexpected. We knew of some such speculations about the names of the gods from Plato's *Cratylus*, but the author seems to me to be far more daring and provocative than one could have imagined. His arguments culminate in column 20, when he attacks people who get initiated into the mysteries (he means the Orphic mysteries). They are gullible and waste their money, he argues, because they accept the priest's explanation and do not enquire further into what they have heard. He can enlighten them further about the meaning of the text. He then goes on to explain how it is perfectly proper and pious for Orpheus to have said that Zeus raped his mother, provided that one understands his words correctly, that is allegorically.

<sup>1</sup> I presented the new texts of cols. 6–7 in the Midwestern Colloquium on Ancient Religions at the University of Michigan in March 2007, cols. 2–3 at the XXVth International Congress of Papyrologists in Ann Arbor in July 2007, cols. 1–3 at the Fifth A. G. Leventis Conference at the University of Edinburgh in November 2007, and cols. 4–5 at University College London in January 2008. I am most grateful to audiences on those occasions for suggestions and ideas, and especially to Jan Bremmer, Fritz Graf, Sarah Iles Johnston, and Richard Rawles. I also thank Chad M. Schroeder for help in constructing the model and preparing the digital images that I used in these presentations, and the University of Michigan for the sabbatical leave which has given me time to write up my results. I am especially grateful to the Editors of *ZPE*, and in particular Jürgen Hammerstaedt, for improving this article in numerous ways (including the Latin of the *apparatus*). The remaining errors are mine.

<sup>2</sup> K. Tsantsanoglou, The first columns of the Derveni Papyrus and their Religious Significance, in A. Laks and G. W. Most (edd.), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus*, Oxford 1997, pp. 93–128.

<sup>3</sup> *The Derveni Papyrus. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Studi e testi per il "Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini", vol. 13, Florence, 2006 (henceforward abbreviated to Ts.<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>4</sup> The Derveni Papyrus (Diagoras of Melos, *Apopyrgizontes logoi?*): a New Translation, *CP* 96 (2001), pp. 1–32; The Derveni Papyrus: an interim text, *ZPE* 141 (2002), pp. 1–62. I argued that its author is the 'atheist' Diagoras of Melos, whom the Athenians condemned to death for impiety. Meanwhile Maria Broggiato has shown that John Lydus may have ascribed to Diagoras of Melos an etymological interpretation of the role of Amaltheia in the birth of Zeus (Giovanni Lido, *Sui mesi* 4.71: un nuovo frammento di Diagora di Melo?, *Seminari Romani* 5 (2002), pp. 231–7); the interpretation of Amaltheia as a synonym for 'power', via ἀμαλακικτία, is just the kind of sophistry that could have been used to justify his overthrow of Cronus in the papyrus.

<sup>5</sup> *BMCR* 2006.10.29, with a response by the editors in *BMCR* 2006.11.02 and my reply in *BMCR* 2006.11.20.

The author holds the remarkable belief that God is Mind, and is also identical with the physical element Air. He offers equations between a number of different gods, stating that “‘Earth’ (*Ge*), ‘Mother’ (*Mētēr*), ‘Rhea’ and ‘Hera’ are the same’ (col. 22), and indeed that “‘Heavenly Aphrodite’, ‘Zeus’, ‘Persuasion’ and ‘Harmony’ are conventional names for the same god’ (col. 21): gods of different sexes are equated, and Zeus is part of the equation. It is easy and I believe correct to infer from this that the author was a monotheist, one of those *logioi* who according to Democritus ‘stretch their arms towards the sky, which we Greeks now call “Air”, and say that all things are Zeus, he knows everything, gives and takes away everything, and is king of everything’.<sup>6</sup>

It seems that, when the author refers to multiple gods, he is reporting the opinions of others. According to the editors’ reconstruction of the opening columns, he does believe in *daimones*, which he thinks are souls of the dead. He aims to remove from religion any beliefs which seem impious, including the belief in bloodthirsty deities like the Erinyes (col. 6): he thinks that it is progress to replace them with vengeful souls. In col. 5 as I supplemented it, he also mocks those who refuse to believe literally in the terrors of Hades, ironically offering to enter a shrine to consult an oracle about them. He offers to ask an impertinent question, namely whether it is right to disbelieve in the terrors of Hades, rather like how Chaerephon asked Apollo whether anyone was wiser than Socrates. As I argued in 2001,<sup>7</sup> the opening columns, combined with the criticism of the Orpheotelestai in col. 20, make it clear that the author was discussing the Orphic poem not as an end in itself, but as an illustration of another point. I suggested that his aim was to show that, although religious texts and religious rituals must not be rejected entirely, they both need interpretation and could not be taken literally. To take them literally is a danger to one’s faith in the divine itself. In my view, this author’s extraordinary approach explained why, in the last third of the fifth century BC, many Athenians who held traditional religious beliefs became so suspicious of the pre-socratic physicists that they exiled Anaxagoras and sentenced Socrates to death.<sup>8</sup>

Accordingly, a successful reconstruction of the opening columns will be vital to confirming or refuting this interpretation, or the opposite view that the author was an Orphic priest and religious practitioner. The topics of these columns seem to vary so wildly that one might well have doubted that the reconstruction was correct. However, by making a scale model of the roll and testing every possible reordering of the fragments, I successfully verified the editors’ physical reconstruction of columns 4–7. Indeed, I have been able to place some further pieces in columns 6 and 7, which mostly confirm their text. My model also shows that there were in fact at least 28 columns.<sup>9</sup> Since the first two columns are in a desperate condition, I shall retain the editors’ numeration here.

### 1. New joins in Columns 6–7

First, a tiny triangular piece, fr. I 70, belongs in col. 6, between the lower parts of frs. G 14 and G 2.<sup>10</sup> The fibres are clear and match perfectly, and so do the letters in lines 8–9, which confirm the earlier supplements; the new piece completes the M in μάγοις. It also yields a new reading in line 10. I omit lines 1–7 (the inserted letters are in bold):

<sup>6</sup> Democritus fr. B 30 D.–K.: τῶν λογίων ἀνθρώπων ὀλίγοι ἀνατείναντες τὰς χεῖρας ἐνταῦθα, οὗ νῦν “ἡέρα” καλέομεν οἱ Ἕλληνας, “πάντα, (φασίν), “Ζεῦς” μυθεῖται καὶ πάνθ’ οὗτος οἶδε καὶ διδοῖ καὶ ἀφαιρεῖται καὶ βασιλεὺς οὗτος τῶν πάντων”.

<sup>7</sup> Art. cit. (n. 4).

<sup>8</sup> The link between Anaxagoras and Socrates is of course the fact that Anaxagoras’ pupil Archelaus of Athens was Socrates’ teacher. The reality of this link is confirmed by the report of Ion of Chios, a contemporary witness who had no reason to invent or conceal the facts, that Socrates voyaged to Samos in Archelaus’ company (D.L. 2. 23).

<sup>9</sup> I would need copious photographs to demonstrate this. For all illustrations the reader will need to have on hand the new edition of 2006.

<sup>10</sup> For col. 6 see the new edition, Plate 6, and for fr. I 70 see Plate 30.

## Col. 6

- 7 ἄρα ποιῶσι. ἀνάριθμα [κα]ὶ πολυόμφαλα τὰ πόπανα  
 θύουσιν, ὅτι καὶ αἱ ψυχὰ[ι ἀν]άριθμοί εἰσι. μύσται  
 Εὐμενίσι προθύουσι κ[ατὰ τὰ] ἀντὰ μάγοις· Εὐμενίδες γὰρ [  
 10 ψυχὰί εἰσιν. ὧν ἕνεκ[εν ὁ μέλλων ἰ]ερὰ θεοῖς θύειν  
 11 ὅ[θ]ι[ρ]νίθ[ε]ιον πρότερον [θύει . . . . .]αιποτε[.]ται

‘They sacrifice cakes which are countless and many-humped, because the souls too are countless. Initiates make a first sacrifice to the Eumenides in the same way as *magoi* do; for the Eumenides are souls. For these reasons a person who intends to make offerings to the gods first sacrifices a bird . . .’

The editors read line 3 of fr. I 70 (= col. 6,10) as ],ρα[, commenting that the damaged letter is ‘very likely’ to be I. The letters ρα rule out their supplement τὸν μέλλοντα. It was not hard to find the right supplement to replace it. I tried ὁ μέλλων μῆρα θεοῖς θύειν, but the correct phrase for ‘offer thigh-bones to the gods’ is μῆρα καίειν. Instead, digital enhancement of the published photographs suggests that the alleged iota may be made up of the tips of the square capital E that the scribe uses, and that one should therefore read ὁ μέλλων ἰερὰ θεοῖς θύειν. There are parallels in Plato and Lysias.<sup>11</sup>

Secondly, I have been able to place within col. 7 two narrow vertical strips of papyrus, which were published as fr. I 7 and I 55 in the new edition.<sup>12</sup> These strips fit perfectly at different heights in the place where they must have formed a *sovrapposto*, since detached, to F 3a from the layer below, which is part of col. 6. (The straight right edge of F 3a is not a *kollesis*, as I at first thought, but must be the result of a razor-cut made by Anton Fackelmann when he opened the roll in July 1962.) The fibres match well on either side in both pieces, so far as one can tell from the published photographs. The new joins confirm the previous editors’ supplements, save that Orpheus’ poem is quoted in direct speech rather than in *oratio obliqua*, i.e. as θύρας ἐπίθεσθε rather than θύρας ἐπιθέσθαι. My text includes one minor change that the spacing requires (καθαρεύ)οντα rather than ἀγνεύ)οντα in line 10), now that the photographs reveal what the papyrus actually looks like; it also reverts to the readings of the editors where they have proved to be correct (the newly joined fragments are in bold):

## Col. 7

- 2 . . ὅ]μνον [ύγ]ιη καὶ θεμ[ι]τὰ λέγο[ντα· ἱερολογεῖ]το γὰρ  
 τῆ]ι ποίει, καὶ εἰπεῖν οὐχ οἶον τ’ [ἦν τὴν τῶν ὀ]νομάτων  
 θέ]σιγ καὶ τ[ά] ῥρήθέντα. ἔστι δὲ μ[αντική ἢ] πόσις  
 5 καὶ ἀνθρώ[ποις] αἰνι[γμ]ατώδης. [ὁ δ]ὲ [Ὀρφεύ]ς αὐτ[ὸ]ς  
 ἐ]ρίστ’ αἰν[ίγμα]τα οὐκ ἤθελε λέγειν, ἐν [αἰν]ίγμασ[ι]ν δὲ  
 με]γάλα. ἱερ[ολογ]εῖται μὲν οὖγ καὶ ἀπὸ [το]ῦ πρώτου  
 καὶ] μέχρι (τ)οῦ [τελε]υταίου ῥήματος, ὡ[ς] δ[η]λο[ί] καὶ ἐν τῶι  
 εὐκ]ρινήτω[ι] ἔπει. “θ]ύρας” γὰρ “ἐπίθεσ[θ]ε” ὁ [κε]λεύσας τοῖ[ς]  
 10 ὡς]ιν αὐτ[ὸ]ς οὐ τι νομο]θετεῖμ φη[σιν το]ῖς πολλοῖς,  
 11 ἀλλὰ διδάσκειν τοὺς τῆ]ν ἀκοὴν [καθαρεύ]οντα, κατ[ὰ]

<I shall also prove that Orpheus composed a> hymn that tells of wholesome and permissible things. For he was speaking allegorically with his poetic composition, and it was impossible to state the application of his words and what was meant. His composition is prophetic and riddling for people. But Orpheus himself did not wish to utter disputable riddles, but important things in riddles. In fact he is speaking allegorically from his very first word right through to his last, as he reveals even in his easily-explained verse: for the one who bids them ‘shut the doors’ on their ears is saying that he is certainly not making laws for the many, but instructing those who are pure in hearing . . .’

<sup>11</sup> Lys. 26.8, μέλλοντος ἄρξεν ἱερὰ θύσαι; Pl. Leg. 10. 910c, θύσαι ἱερὰ θεοῖς.

<sup>12</sup> For col. 7 see Plate 7, and for fr. I 7 and I 55 see Plates 29 and 30 respectively.

Fr. I 7,1 (= col. 7,6) is read by the editors as ]ε[, with the damaged letter ‘part of a midline curve meeting an upright, possibly φ’; this must be N. Lines 2 and 3 read ]πο[ and ]δη[ respectively. The editors read the damaged letter in fr. I 7,4 (= col. 7,9) as the tip of a high horizontal; this must be E. In fr. I 55 (= col. 7,8–11), much of the ink is invisible to the eye or indeed completely lost. The Λ is clear in line 1 (= col. 7,8), there is a diagonal in line 2, and a Σ in line 3. In addition, I have adopted M. L. West’s proposal μ[ωντικῆ<sup>13</sup> in place of the ξ[ενή τις of the editors: they report traces of Z or Ξ, but since West had earlier read α[ύτοῦ<sup>14</sup> it is possible that there were or still are traces of an entire upright rather than the top and bottom of two horizontals.

## 2. The Reconstruction of Columns 1–3

The editors’ reconstruction of the first three columns is profoundly mistaken. To explain this, I must briefly recapitulate some bibliographical aspects as they can be deduced from Herculaneum papyri and from Fackelmann’s report.<sup>15</sup> Like the rolls from Herculaneum, the Derveni papyrus was difficult to unroll. Yet Fackelmann opened it successfully, using a combination of papyrus-juice and static electricity to separate the layers and put them between glass. This extraordinary achievement was made possible by the fact that at Herculaneum the rolls were contorted by superheated steam before they were carbonized and then crushed by debris from the volcano, whereas the Derveni papyrus was simply carbonized. Most of its layers came apart easily, as is evident from the extraordinarily good preservation of the pieces, at least when they were first photographed.

The Derveni papyrus could not be unrolled continuously. In this it resembles other carbonized papyri. The last few columns still formed a scroll.<sup>16</sup> However, its outer parts were broken into hemicylindrical stacks of fragments;<sup>17</sup> there were some small multi-layered slivers of papyrus too. The single layers of each hemicylindrical piece have the important property that they have the same shape throughout. They are effectively a stack of fragments, that ought to get larger as you approach the exterior of the roll, as the circumferences broaden. In Herculaneum papyri they do get larger, but that is not the case with the Derveni papyrus. Its pieces diminish again as you reach the outermost layers, which, as a result of incomplete carbonization, had lost larger parts of their margins when Fackelmann separated the layers.<sup>18</sup> But at least they still have much the same outline as one goes from one layer to the next.

Except in cases where these hemicylindrical pieces have been broken into smaller fragments, two such pieces form a circumference. The pattern repeats with each successive circumference, until you reach either the middle or the exterior. For instance, in col. 20 the editors call the alternating fragments B and D;<sup>19</sup> there are four hemicylindrical pieces, making two circumferences. The editors noticed these recurrences, and exploited them to make a reconstruction of the last 22 columns that is for the most part physically correct. Thus in the middle of the roll, as is seen in the editors’ Plates 7–22, alternating pieces

<sup>13</sup> In P. Struck, *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts* (Princeton, 2004), 33 n. 4, who hit upon the same reading independently. Unfortunately Struck’s text of the rest of the papyrus, on which his discussion of this item relies, was outdated soon after his otherwise excellent book appeared.

<sup>14</sup> *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford, 1983), 78.

<sup>15</sup> In Ts.<sup>3</sup> pp. 4–5, with notes by Tsantsanoglou.

<sup>16</sup> Scholars of the Herculaneum papyri call this a *midollo* or ‘marrow’. Fackelmann called it ‘piece I’ (now fr. A 1–9 and D 12–14).

<sup>17</sup> The Neapolitans called these *scorze*, ‘bark’ like that on a tree. Fackelmann records that, when he came to work on the papyrus, these outer pieces comprised ‘piece II’, a detached stack of 24 layers (now fr. B 1–12 and C 1–12), and ‘piece III’, a stack of 33 layers, the outside of which was completely burned and stuck together. Tsantsanoglou notes that this corresponds to fr. D 1–11, E 1–13, and F 1–9, but fr. F 1–15 can also be referred to it.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. especially Fackelmann loc. cit. 5, on piece III: ‘die äußere Seite war total verkohlt, die Lagen ineinander verschmolzen . . . der Rand war zu 2/3 ebenfalls total verkohlt, während am übrigen Teil des Randes die Lagen schwach zu erkennen waren . . . Die Lagen klebten aneinander. Das Ablösen ergab 33 Lagen, die zum Schluß durch die starke Verkohlungs immer kleiner wurden.’

<sup>19</sup> See their Plate 20. These are Fackelmann’s pieces II and III respectively.

from both hemicylinders<sup>20</sup> build up 23 complete circumferences. Both of them find an immediate continuation, with no layer lost, in the inner continuous scroll,<sup>21</sup> which suggests that they were both broken off from the latter during the excavation.<sup>22</sup> Another stack of fragments was the outermost portion of one of the two hemicylinders.<sup>23</sup>

However, there are serious obstacles to the reconstruction of the opening columns. Many of the unplaced fragments are tiny, and many are very hard to read. The high number of letters per line (36–38) makes filling the lacunae difficult; the ratio of lost to surviving text is very high, and the great width of the circumferences means that it is hard to find matches between the fibres, since the lacunae are broad. Worse still, outer layers of the hemicylindrical pieces were broken into small fragments; the fragmentation is greater in F-fragments 1–15, which belonged to one half-cylinder, than in the G-fragments, which belonged to the other. Most of the large unplaced pieces come from these two series.<sup>24</sup>

Thus there are three constraints on any reconstruction. It must preserve the correct ordering of the layers within their stacks, it must give reasonable lengths for the *kollemata*, or sheets of papyrus, and it must give reasonable widths for the distance from the left margin of one column to that of the next. The principles outlined above prove that the editors' reconstruction of columns 1–3 cannot be right. In the opening columns there was just under one column per circumference, as cols. 4–7 make clear. The alternating fragments from different hemicylinders come from the F series and the G series. The reader needs to bear in mind that a single hemicylinder may break into several fragments. However, in reconstructing col. 2 the editors have juxtaposed three G-layers one after the other.<sup>25</sup> This is physically impossible, since it contradicts the principle of hemicylinders: fragment G 7 cannot belong between G 8 and G 15+G 6, because only a piece from the F series can stand here to complete the circumference, whereas these pieces derive from a piece of the same shape and are therefore from different layers of the same half-cylinder. In the right half of col. 2, the editors placed fragments G 15, G 6 and G 5 next to each other to form a single hemicylinder. Both the letters and the fibres confirm that G 15 joins with G 6, to form two thirds of the hemicylinder; I will call the resultant composite G 15+G 6. However, the narrow fragment G 6 in the centre of the hemicylinder has the same shape as the left side of G 5, and cannot therefore join it; this is confirmed by the fibres, which do not match. Instead, G 6 must belong in a layer that lay above or below G 5. Now G 5 has a vertical crack running down it that corresponds to the location of the right edge of G 6. Digital enhancement of the photograph shows that the right edge of G 6 is in fact a *kollesis*, or join between two sheets of papyrus, where parts of two layers are visible. The editors missed this *kollesis*, no doubt because it is so close to the edge of the fragment.<sup>26</sup> The extra thickness where there were two overlapping sheets of papyrus at the *kollesis* caused the vertical crack that runs down G 5. It also caused another phenomenon in G 5, namely that part of a different, overlying layer, called G 5a by the editors, has remained stuck to the upper right portion of G 5. They rightly interpreted this as a layer from one circumference further in,<sup>27</sup> and therefore placed this fragment one circumference later, in col. 3.<sup>28</sup>

This is correct, but fragment G 5a needed to take fragments G 15+G 6 with it: these pieces too belong in col. 3. Fragment G 6 fits well in shape beside G 5a, although one cannot confirm this from the fibres, because the *kollesis* comes exactly in between and so no match in fibres is expected or possible. When

<sup>20</sup> These are Fackelmann's pieces II and III respectively. The Italians call these hemicylinders *sezioni*.

<sup>21</sup> I.e. Fackelmann's piece I.

<sup>22</sup> I owe this suggestion to J. Hammerstaedt.

<sup>23</sup> Fackelmann's piece IV. This was broken into two smaller stacks. It was the outer part of the hemicylinder of his piece II. It joins the layers of piece II, with no layer lost in between, at cols. 6–7 (Ts.<sup>3</sup> Plates 6–7). Fackelmann's mention of a photograph permits one to identify piece IV with fr. G 1–21.

<sup>24</sup> See the new edition, Plate 27.

<sup>25</sup> See their Plate 2.

<sup>26</sup> The first *kollesis* that they observed is in col. 4, near the left edge of fr. F 15 (see their Plate 4).

<sup>27</sup> The Neapolitans call this a *sovrapposto*.

<sup>28</sup> See their Plate 3.



fragment G 15+G 6 is placed in col. 3, the fibres of the left edge of fragment G 15 match the right edge of fragments F 9+F 8, which the editors put in the left half of column 3. Moving fragment G 15+G 6 to col. 3 has the valuable effect of bringing the discussion of the Erinyes closer to col. 4, where Heraclitus refers to them, rather than leaving them in col. 2, where they are further removed from that discussion. It also implies that fragment G 11 cannot be from col. 3 where the editors had put it. Fragment G 11 is from the left half of a G-layer. My reconstruction established that it belongs to the previous layer, i.e. in column 2, where it joins the left edge of G 5. The fibres confirm this join.

Does this reconstruction pass the twin tests of width of *kollema* and width of column? The distance from the left margin of the new col. 3 to that of col. 4 is 11.7 cm., which is average for this part of the roll. However, the length of the *kollema* which begins at the right edge of fr. G 6 half-way across the new col. 3 and ends near the left edge of fr. F 15 near the right margin of col. 4 works out at 12.85 cm., which is shorter than the average in the roll of 15.8 cm.; the shortest *kollema* previously known is reported to be 13.7 cm. wide (col. 26),<sup>29</sup> and the second-shortest is 14.4 (col. 25). But the *kollemata* early in the roll seem to be shorter than the rest: cols. 7–25 are all written on sheets 16.0–17.0 cm. wide, whereas the first two *kollemata* are 14.0 and 14.6 cm. wide respectively.<sup>30</sup> I do not think this finding disproves my proposed order of fragments: all the other arrangements of fragments that are possible (and I have tested them all) give readings that diverge from what is expected much more than this does. I shall return to the text of col. 3 below.

Col. 2, according to my reconstruction, is in a sad state. It was 10.65 cm. wide, which is close to the average of 11.1. A *kollesis* ought to have fallen about one-third of the way across the column, but no such *kollesis* can be identified in any of the surviving pieces. This coincides with where the F-fragment ought to be. Since the F-layers were breaking up into small fragments, I believe that the left half of col. 2 disintegrated because of the *kollesis* (or else stuck to the overlying layer) and will be very hard to reconstruct, if it is not destroyed entirely. All that can be recognized of the left part of col. 2 is the margin, and little sense can be extracted from the remaining text.

Col. 1, however, is much better preserved. There are two G-fragments, G 7 and G 17+ G 8. The latter contains the ends of col. 1, the intercolumnium, and a few letters from the left edge of col. 2. The former, G 7, is displaced from the old col. 2, where the editors had put it between other G-fragments, impossibly, as we have seen. If G 7 is moved to col. 1, it accords well with the right edge of col. 1 (= fr. G 8 col. i), since both G-fragments are concerned with signification (σημαίνειν) and both also have the distributive adjective ἕκαστος in them. This led me to search for unplaced F-fragments that might occupy the middle of the column, where the F-layer must have broken into pieces. I found that F 10 and F 18 are both concerned with signs (σημεῖα), and both also mention prayer (εὐχή). F 18 also mentions ἕκαστος. F 14 mentions prayer also, and like F 18 mentions fire. Hence I propose that these pieces form the middle of col. 1. The high level of repetition in the style of this treatise makes such a tightly bound verbal nexus plausible in principle.

I fitted the pieces together according to the shapes and the sense that emerged. Although it is hard to be certain of the fibres because of the distances between the pieces, the right edge of G 7 appears to match the left edge of F 14. The distance from the left margin of col. 1 to that of col. 2 was 11.9 cm., which is wide but paralleled in col. 5. The widest column, col. 20, was 12.2 cm. The *kollesis* would have fallen in the lacuna to the left of G 7, affecting only a few letters close to the left margin. This rearrangement of fragments resulted in the following new text of cols. 1–3. (In the headings, the hemicylinders are delimited by upright bars ||.)<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Ts.<sup>3</sup> p. 6. I could not measure this, since the editors do not illustrate the *agraphon* at the end of the roll (one would like to be sure that it has no writing!).

<sup>30</sup> These are my calculations, based on the model. The editors think the first two *kollemata* are wider (14.6 and 14.9 cm. respectively), but the model and experiments with Adobe Photoshop show that this is inaccurate.

<sup>31</sup> Note that I have printed without dots all those letters where the editors put dotted letters on the left-hand as well as the right-hand page, which I took to mean that the letters are damaged but nonetheless certain (see *BMCR* 2006.10.29); the editors'

Col. 1 (G 7 ll + F 10 + F 14 + F 18 + H 45 ll + G 17 + G 8 col. i)

1 .....(.)]κευ[.....  
 ...(.)]ηιδ[.....] ἐπὶ τα[.....(.)  
 ...]δαραμ[.....(.)]κοῖς καὶ κα[. . .]ιν[.....  
 ...(.)].ντανα[.....]αι τὰ σημε[ῖα ἀ]ν' ἕκατογ[  
 5 μερ]ίδι νειμ[..... δ]ύο εὐχῆς [. . .].α  
 ...] ἐπέθηκε[ν ὧ]ς περ φυσικ[ὸς] .εχ[. . .] μ]ηδὲ ἐὰν  
 κατ'ἄ τὰ σημαι[νό]μενα εὐχα[ῖς ἱερείᾱ] θεῶν  
 ἐκά[ς]των κάω[σιν] ἀνημμέ[να] .....].εξ[. . .]υ  
 ...]μωσ ἐπ' [εὐ]χῆς ..... λ[. . .] μ]ι ἀνγίε  
 10 .....(.) π]υρός, ὕδατος δε[. . .] .[. . .] σημ]εῖα  
 .....(.) ἐστ]ιν ἕκατα σημεῖα [. . .] .....(.)  
 12 .....(.)]λυς καὶ τὰλλ' ὅσα [. . .] .....

*incertum quot versus desint*

‘. . . towards (?) the . . . for (*plural noun missing*) and they burn (?) . . . allocate the signs to each (*object missing*) in turn (*1–2 words missing*) two (*noun missing*) of prayer (*word damaged*). He added these things (?) like a natural scientist (*word damaged*), and not even if, according to (?) the things that are signified, with prayers (*word missing*) for each of the gods they burn sacrificial victims (?) that are ignited . . . but all the same (?) in the case of a prayer . . . might pollute . . . of fire, but (*subject missing*) of water . . . signs

reply in *BMCR* 2006.11.02 did not contradict my interpretation, though one may heartily wish that they had explained their practice. Such letters are shown underlined (e.g. δ) in the *apparatus criticus*. Thus the sigla there are as follows:

Bernabé	<i>Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et Fragmenta. Pars II: Orphicorum et Orphicis Similium Testimonia et Fragmenta fasc. 1</i> (Munich and Leipzig, 2004); cf. La Théogonie orphique du papyrus de Derveni, <i>Kernos</i> 15 (2002) pp. 1–38
Burkert	W. Burkert, Orpheus und die Vorsokratiker. Bemerkungen zum Derveni-Papyrus und zur pythagoreischen Zahlenlehre, <i>A&amp;A</i> 14 (1968) pp. 93–114, esp. p. 93 n., and new conjectures communicated to me privately
ed.	Der orphische Papyrus von Derveni, <i>ZPE</i> 47 (1982), after p. 300 (edition of columns 3–26)
Ferrari	F. Ferrari, Note al testo delle colonne II–VII del papiro di Derveni, <i>ZPE</i> 162 (2007) pp. 203–11
Kouremenos	Th. Kouremenos in Ts. <sup>3</sup>
Laks et Most	A. Laks and G. W. Most (edd.), <i>Studies on the Derveni Papyrus</i> , Oxford 1997
Livrea	E. Livrea, Eraclito nel papiro di Derveni, <i>ZPE</i> 164 (2008)
Par. <sup>1</sup>	G. M. Parássoglou and K. Tsantsanoglou, Heraclitus in the Derveni Papyrus, in A. Brancacci et al. (ed.), <i>Aristoxenica, Menandrea, Fragmenta Philosophica</i> , Studi e Testi per il Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini 3, Florence 1988, pp. 125–33 (col. 4)
Par. <sup>2</sup>	G. M. Parássoglou and K. Tsantsanoglou, Heraclitus 1T, <i>Corpus dei Papiri filosofici</i> I.1**, Florence 1992, pp. 221–6 (col. 4)
Ts. <sup>1</sup>	readings and conjectures by K. Tsantsanoglou in Laks and Most 1997, pp. 9–22, with his edition of columns 1–7 (ibid. pp. 93–128)
Ts. <sup>2</sup>	readings and conjectures of K. Tsantsanoglou in Bernabé 2002, 2004 (vid. sup.)
Ts. <sup>3</sup>	T. Kouremenos, G. M. Parássoglou and K. Tsantsanoglou, <i>The Derveni Papyrus</i> , Florence 2006
*	the present editor
α̇	littera dubia quae aliter legi potest
α̂	littera fracta quae tamen secundum edd. pr., ut videtur, non dubia est
[α]	littera ab editore suppleta
{α}	littera ab editore deleta
<α>	littera ab editore inserta
[α]	littera e fonte gemino ab editore suppleta
[α]	littera a librario deleta
`α'	littera a librario supra versum addita
[.]	littera deperdita
[]	una vel nulla littera deperdita
[.(.)]	una littera vel duae litterae deperditae
.....	reliquiae totidem litterarum incertarum.

. . . all (*plural subject missing*) are signs . . . much (?) (*singular noun missing*) and the other (*plural noun missing*), as many as . . .’

imagines contuli et frr. coniunxi (nisi quod F 18 + H 45 et G 17 + G 8 coniunxerat Ts.<sup>3</sup>); fibrae frr. G7 et F14 bene congruunt 1 υ vel φ, ψ οὐκ εὐ vel κεφ[ Ts.<sup>3</sup>: οὐκ εὐ[χ- \* 2 η vel μ, ν potius quam π Εὐμε]νίδι Kouremenos p.143 3 δα[ρα Ts.<sup>3</sup> μ[όνος Ts.<sup>3</sup> p. 143: ν[ηφαλίος Ferrari μ vel ν, π κ vel χ κά[ουε]ιν \* 4 καὶ \* ], vestigia incerta π[άντα Ts.<sup>3</sup> α vel λ να[όν Ts.<sup>3</sup>: να[μίον Ferrari fort. κ]αὶ vel εἶν]αι vel -τ]αι χημεῖ[α Ts.<sup>3</sup> υ vel ι[ nihil in fine versus deesse censeo 5 μερ]ίδι \*: Εὐμεν]ίδι Ts.<sup>3</sup> et πραπ]ίδι Ferrari, longiora νεῖμ[αι Ts.<sup>3</sup>, sed μ monstat imago δ]ύο \*: τα]ῖθ' vel ἄνε]υθ' Ts.<sup>3</sup> ο vel θ α potius quam λ, δ ς vestigium incertum 6 ταῦτ' potius quam πυρὶ \* ἐπέθηκε]ν Ts.<sup>3</sup> (ε potius η; π vel γ) ὠ]περ \*: οἱ]ἄπερ vel καθ]ἄπερ Ts.<sup>3</sup> ς potius quam α φουκι[ός Ts.<sup>3</sup> ε vel ξ χ. vestigia dubia μη]δὲ εἶν \* η vel ν ε vestigium valde dubium α potius quam δ imago: δ Ts.<sup>3</sup> υ vel η 7 κατ]ἄ τὰ \* (α vel ς imago ut videtur): ] τὰ Ts.<sup>3</sup> χημαι]νόμμενα \*: χημαι]νόμμενα Ts.<sup>3</sup> εὐχα]ίτε ἱερεῖα \* α vel λ, sed fort. ad stratum alium pertinet θ vestigium incertum ε vel τ, π, γ, ζ, ξ imago ut videtur θεῶν \*: Ἐρι]γύων Ts.<sup>3</sup> (υ vel ι; υ potius quam τ) 8 ἐκά]κτων \*: μύ]κτων Ferrari: ]κτων Ts.<sup>3</sup> κάω]κιν \*: κατ] Ts.<sup>3</sup>, haud recte ἀνημμέ]να \*: ἀνημμέ]ν- Ts.<sup>3</sup> vestigia incerta in fine versus: nihil leg. Ts.<sup>3</sup> 9 ἀλλ' ὄ]μωε \* μωε Ts.<sup>3</sup>: pro μ fort. potius ς imago, ut mihi videtur εὐ]χῆς Ts.<sup>3</sup> . . . . vestigia valde dubia μι]ἄνει \*: κερδ]ἄνει vel ζηρ]ἄνει vel φ]ἄνει possis α vel δ, λ υ vel π, η ut videtur fragmentum abscissum litt. ς praebens temere sub finem versus collocatum esse iudicavit Ts.<sup>3</sup> 10 π]υρὸς Ts.<sup>3</sup> in asyndeto: distinxi ε vel ι[ (ι praef. Ts.<sup>3</sup>) ], [, vestigia in alto χημ]εῖα potius quam μαντ]εῖα \* 11 ἐκτ]ιν \* ι potius quam η, π 12 πο]λλὸς Ts.<sup>3</sup>: ἰ]λλὸς vel ἀχ]λλὸς \* λ vel α, δ α vel λ, δ

The new col. 1 is about divination from signs, apparently using lots. ἀνά with the accusative has its distributive function in line 4.<sup>32</sup> In line 5 the editors restored Εὐμεν]ίδι νεῖμ[αι, but the Eumenides are always a plurality. Instead I suggest (ἐν) μερ]ίδι, ‘in turn’. Sortition is a known form of divination both in Greece and the Near East; the number δύο ‘two’ appears next to a mention of prayer. Another possibility is that the topic is the division of meat at a sacrifice, where the officiant allocates more to a given portion to keep the portions equal.

Line 5 is short. The scribe’s practice elsewhere suggests that it is the end of a sentence, possibly indeed of a quotation. In accord with this, line 6 may well have said that someone ‘added this like a natural scientist’, unless ἐπέθηκεν refers to putting a substance on a sacrificial fire. We may compare how in col. 4 the author says that Heraclitus ‘was speaking like a μυθόλογος’ when the Ephesian says that the Erinys will keep the Sun within his bounds. Each time the author is concerned to note that someone who might have been expected to speak in religious terms, i.e. a religious expert, is speaking like a physicist, or vice versa.<sup>33</sup> After something about things that are signified and prayer, some people burn an object or objects that have been lit. Prayer and pollution seem to be mentioned. Pollution would be a perfectly appropriate topic, since one of the purposes of divination is to find out what is causing pollution so that it can be remedied. At the end of the column fire is contrasted with water; the editors had already suggested that F 18 referred to pyromancy and hydromancy.

Divination from fire and from water are rarely attested directly in Greece until the Roman period. However, Philochorus and Apollonius Sophista<sup>34</sup> tell us that the θυοκκοῖ, a kind of *mantis* known from Homer onwards,<sup>35</sup> divined the future from offerings made by means of fire. A scholiast on *Il.* 24. 221 calls them λιβανομάντιες, ‘diviners from incense’. Later the main form of divination from fire was lychnomancy, which meant gazing into the flame of a lamp, as in Lucian’s *Lychnopolis* in *Vera Historia* 2. Both lychnomancy and lecanomancy, i.e. divination by gazing into a bowl of water, are well attested in the magical papyri from Egypt of the Roman period. It is not clear to me whether the author is speaking of Persian or Greek practices, just as the identity of the μάγοι in col. 6 remains hotly debated; are they the Persian caste of priests or the itinerant Greek magicians? We are very ill informed about Persian divination. Herodotus<sup>36</sup> and Diogenes Laertius<sup>37</sup> credit the magi with divination, but the only methods speci-

<sup>32</sup> *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v. ἀνά, C. II. 2.

<sup>33</sup> A philosopher can charge with atheism either mythographers and poets, as Isocrates does in his *Busiris*, or scientific materialists, as Plato does in *Leg.* 10, 886a–b, where he gives ἀμαθία alongside ἡδονή as the causes of such beliefs, exactly as the Derveni author does (col. 5, 8–10). This does not of course make Plato any less of a *physikos* than our author is.

<sup>34</sup> Philochorus 328 fr. 178b Jacoby; Ap. Soph. p. 88,33 Bekker.

<sup>35</sup> *Il.* 24. 221, μάντιες . . . θυοκκοῖ.

<sup>36</sup> 7. 37, 7. 43.

<sup>37</sup> 1. 7.



fied are divination from dreams and from eclipses. However, Strabo<sup>38</sup> states that ‘the Persians’ practised necromancy and hydromancy. Lecanomancy was already known to the Hittites and to Joseph in *Genesis* 44. Writing in the sixth century AD, Agathias alleges that the Persian magi practised pyromancy.<sup>39</sup> Heraclitus, who is soon quoted in col. 4, was undoubtedly influenced by Persian religion, above all in the role he gives to fire, but the author quoted him for a different reason – because he was a physicist who resembled a religious expert, or *vice versa*.

In my reconstruction, col. 2 is still very fragmentary, since I have been unable to find any F-fragments that can be proved to belong in the missing F-layer. In addition, the photograph of much of fragment G11 is very hard to decipher, even though the fibres prove that it belongs to the left of fr. G 5a. Accordingly, I will print only lines 7–9 here, and cannot supply an *apparatus criticus* either.

## Col. 2 (G8 col. ii ll + &lt;fr. F deperdita ut videtur&gt; ll + G11 + G5 + H7)

7 κα[.....(.)]ι πάντα χρῆ [ ]  
 .....(.)] ἄδικοι οἱ... θεῖόν τι [ ]  
 9 .....(.)]λοῦ δ[ί]κηι [ ]

‘... all (*masculine plural noun missing*) must ... unjust persons (*word damaged*) something divine ... but not (?) with justice ...’

The editors saw in line 8 a reference to a kind of bird (ὀρνίθειόν τι), but the bird belongs in col. 6, not here. References to wrongdoers and justice lead well into the appearance of the Erinyes in the next column. A reference to justice seems more apt to the context than had the editors’ ὕμνου ἀρμ]οστο[ὺ]ς τῆι μου[τ]ι κῆι.

## Col. 3 (F9 + F8 ll + G15 + G6 + G5a ll + F7 col. i)

1 .....(.)]ων· [.....  
 .... θυ]ηλαί, ὧς[.....(.)] Ἐριν[υ.....(.)]  
 .....(.)]ῶγ γίνεται[ι.....(.)] τιμῶν [.....(.)]ρη  
 τοὺς ἡ]δη ἐξώλεα[.....(.)] χ]οαὶ σταγόων Ἐρινύων οἱ δὲ  
 5 δ]αίμονες, οἱ κατὰ [τοὺς μ]άγους τιμὰς [τ]ηροῦσι [τῶν] [ ]  
 θεῶν, ὑπερέτα δ[ί]κη[.....] ἐκάτοισ ὀρ[.....]ι  
 εἰσιν, ὅπως περ α[.....(.)]οστο[.....]νοι·  
 αἰτίην [δ’ ἔ]χουσι[.....(.)]ς τ[οιο]υτο[.....]  
 οἷους γ[.....]ε[.....(.)]νε[.....]  
 10 ..]υτ[.....]

*incertum quot versus desint*

‘... divinations from burnt-offerings (?), as ... Eriny(e)s ... becomes ... libations in drops to the Erinyes honour (*word missing*) those people who are already annihilated. But the *daimones*, who according to the *magoi* observe the honours of the gods, are servants of justice ... for every (*plural noun missing*) ... , just as ... (*plural participle missing*). But they are responsible ... such persons ... as ... later (?) ...’

imagines contuli et fr. coniunxi 1 v imago: ι Ts.<sup>1</sup>, Ts.<sup>3</sup> spat. vac. ii litt. ut videtur: incertum est an verba in fine versus desint 2 θυ]ηλαί\* η vel π, ν, κ, ι λ vel α αἰως Ts.<sup>3</sup> i pes lineae vert. fort. ω pars dext. [vestigia incerta ε vel κ, χ Ἐριν]υ- Ts.<sup>1</sup>: num κριν[-?] 3 δαίμ]ῶγ Ts.<sup>3</sup> γίνεται[ι ed. v vel η ι vel ν, η ρ vel β, π, γ η vel ε, ν, π, γ, ι] (linea vert. sin.) λ potius quam α, δ ρ vel β χ]ρη Ferrari: sed fort. etiam ἀ]ρη vel βλά]βη 4 τοὺς ἡ]δη\*: ἡ δὲ δ[ί]κη Ferrari δ vel λ, κ, α, χ ἐξώλεα Ts.<sup>3</sup> αἱ\* χ]οαὶ Ts.<sup>3</sup> ν: potius γ, π, ρ ε vel τ, ζ, ξ, γ Ἐρινύων ed., sed litt. ω paene certam praebet imago (ω potius quam ε) οἱ Battezzato et Ts.<sup>3</sup> 5 δ]αίμονες ed. οἱ ed.: οἱ West ap. Laks et Most p. 83 κατὰ Ts.<sup>3</sup>: κάτω ed. τοὺς μ]άγους\* (α vestigium medium lin. vert. praebet imago; γ imago): ] τοὺς Ts.<sup>3</sup> τ]ηροῦσι Ts.<sup>3</sup> τῶν vel τὰε\* 6 δ[ί]κηε\* δ[ Ts.<sup>3</sup> potius quam ζ, χ[: κ] ed. ap. fr. B 5 ἐκάτοισ\* (ι vestigium medium lineae vert. in spatio angusto praebet imago):

<sup>38</sup> 16. 3. 39.

<sup>39</sup> *Hist.* 2. 25.

ἐκάτο[ι]c Ts.<sup>3</sup> ὀρ[κ- \* (litt. ρ certam praebet imago): ὀρ[νίθειον Ts.<sup>3</sup> 7 ] fort. λ vel c, α, δ, κ, χ ut videtur ἄρμ]οστο[ὺ]c Ts.<sup>1</sup>: fort. ὀστο[ῖ]c vel πολ]λοστο[ῖ]c vel -οc το[ὺ]c potius quam ν]όστο[ι]c 8 δ' Burkert: τ' Ts.<sup>3</sup> ἔ]χουc Ts.<sup>3</sup>: ἔ]χουc[ι ed. fort. το]ῦc: ]c Ts.<sup>3</sup> τ[οιο]ύτο[- \*; τ[ι]c ]υτο[ Ts.<sup>3</sup> ο vel θ 9 γ vel π 10 fort. το]ῦc τ[ι]c vel μ]υct[- vel ὑct[ερ-

The new col. 3 may open with a reference to *θυηλαί*, which Hesychius defines as ‘divination by means of burnt offerings’.<sup>40</sup> Next we have a mention of the Erinyes and ‘people who are wiped out’ (ἐξώλειc). This is the normal term for people who are destroyed so utterly that even their descendants are annihilated, often because they are under a curse. Thus Antiphon speaks of ‘swearing the greatest oath, putting yourself under the curse that you and your family and your household will perish utterly’.<sup>41</sup> People who die before their time or under a curse can be expected to cause problems after their deaths. The new reconstruction seems to say that ‘libations in drops of the Erinyes honour those who are already wiped out’, but *χοαὶ Ἐρινύω[ν]* must be an objective genitive, meaning ‘libations to the Erinyes’; cf. *χοαὶ κεκμηκότων*, ‘libations to the dead’.<sup>42</sup>

The opinion that libations offered to the Erinyes placate the souls of those who have perished ἐξώλειc is, I believe, an interpretation by the author. The traditional view was that the Erinyes can act on behalf of the dead to carry out their anger; thus in Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* it is not Clytaemestra’s ghost that takes vengeance for her killing, but rather the Erinyes at her behest. The Derveni author is explaining that people placate the Erinyes with libations when, in his view, they are really mitigating the wrath of the angry dead. This is definitely an anti-traditional view, i.e. a learned interpretation, for the following reason: as S. I. Johnston remarked,<sup>43</sup> in traditional belief those of the untimely dead who were *men* would not be expected to become *female* ghosts. Thus it is an interpretation of the same allegorical kind that we know from the rest of the papyrus, and not evidence for popular belief. Indeed, it implies that the Erinyes as such do not exist. The view that the Eumenides are the souls of the dead was embraced by intellectuals like Plato, who believed that the souls of the angry dead could take revenge on their oppressors directly and without the intervention of deities like the Erinyes: compare *Leg.* 927A–B, in a discussion of the proper treatment of orphans, where Plato says ‘the souls of the dead have some power, even though they are dead, by which they are concerned with human affairs . . . Let people fear . . . the souls of the dead, who have it in their nature to care in particular for their own offspring, and to be kindly (εὐμενεῖc) towards those who honour them and hostile to those who dishonour them’.<sup>44</sup> Plato’s use of εὐμενεῖc of course evokes the Eumenides without acknowledging their existence. Somewhat similarly, an unidentified Pythagorean writer reported by Alexander Polyhistor thought that the air was full of souls, which people considered to be *daimones* and heroes and deemed responsible for divination of all kinds; but that writer also held that the Erinyes exist, since they fetter the souls of the impure in unbreakable bonds.<sup>45</sup>

The Derveni author continues that ‘the daimones, who according to . . . observe the honours of the gods, are servants’. *τιμαὶ θεῶν* and *ὑπηρέται θεῶν* are familiar expressions.<sup>46</sup> He attributes this opinion

<sup>40</sup> θ 837, τὰc διὰ θυμάτων μαντείας.

<sup>41</sup> *De caede Herodis* 11.9.

<sup>42</sup> Pseudo-Aristotle, *De mundo* 400<sup>b</sup>22.

<sup>43</sup> *The Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1999, p. 274.

<sup>44</sup> αἱ τῶν τελευτησάντων ψυχὰι δύναμιν ἔχουσιν τινα τελευτήσασαι, ἣ τῶν κατ’ ἀνθρώπους πραγμάτων ἐπιμελοῦνται . . . φοβεῖσθαι . . . τὰc τῶν κεκμηκότων ψυχὰc, αἷc ἐστιν ἐν τῇ φύσει τῶν αὐτῶν ἐκγόνων κῆδεσθαι διαφερόντως καὶ τιμῶσιν τε αὐτοὺc εὐμενεῖc εἶναι καὶ ἀτιμάζουσιν δυσμενεῖc.

<sup>45</sup> D.L. 8. 31–2 = Alex. Polyh. F 93 Jacoby (58 B 1a D.–K.): καὶ ἄγεσθαι τὰc μὲν καθαρὰc (sc. ψυχὰc) ἐπὶ τὸν ὕψιστον (τόπον) (add. Cobet), τὰc δὲ ἀκαθάρτους μῆτε ἐκείναιc πελάζειν μῆτε ἀλλήλαιc, δεῖσθαι δ’ ἐν ἀρρήτοιc δεσμοῖc ὑπὸ Ἐρινύων. εἶναί τε πάντα τὸν ἀέρα ψυχῶν ἔμπλεων· καὶ ταῦτα δαίμοναc τε καὶ ἥρωαc νομίζεσθαι καὶ ὑπὸ τούτων πέμπεσθαι ἀνθρώποιc τοὺc τε ὄνειρουc καὶ τὰ σημεῖα νόσου τε καὶ ὑγείαc, καὶ οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώποιc, ἀλλὰ καὶ προβάτοιc καὶ τοῖc ἄλλοιc κτήνεσιν, εἷc τε τούτουc γίνεσθαι τοὺc τε καθαρμοὺc καὶ ἀποτροπιασμοὺc μαντικῆν τε πάσαν καὶ κληδόναc καὶ τὰ ὅμοια.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. A. *PV* 954, θεῶν ὑπηρέτου; Soph. *Ant.* 845, τιμάc γε τὰc θεῶν πατῶν; Xen. *Mem.* 4. 3. 14, τοὺc ὑπηρέταc δὲ τῶν θεῶν εὐρήσειc ἀφανείc ὄνταc; D.S. 8. 30. 1, τηροῦντα τὰc πρὸc τοὺc θεοὺc τιμάc; D.S. 1. 73. 3, τὰc τε θυσίαc . . . συντελοῦσι καὶ τοὺc ὑπηρέταc τρέφουσι . . . οὔτε γὰρ τὰc τῶν θεῶν τιμάc ᾤοντο δεῖν ἀλλάττειν; Plut. *De def. or.* 417A–B, ἡμεῖc δὲ



- οὐκ εἶ[α λα]μύανειν. ἄρ' οὐ τά[ξιν ἔχει διὰ τῶ]νδε κόσμος;  
 5 κατὰ [ταύτ]᾿ Ἡράκλειτος, μα[ρτυρόμενος] τὰ κοινά,  
 κατ[ατρ]έφει τὰ ἴδ[ι]α, ὅσπερ ἴκελα [μυθο]λόγωι λέγων [ἔφη·  
 “ἥλι[ος] [μεθό]δου κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρ[ωπ][η][ίου] εὖρος ποδός [ἔστι,  
 τοῦ[τ] οὐρου]ς οὐχ ὑπερβάλλων· εἰ κ[ατά τι οὐ]ρουσ ἐ[ῶ]του  
 ἐκβή[ε]τα], Ἐρινύε[σ] μιν ἐξευρήσου[σ]ι, δίκης ἐπίκουροι,  
 10 ὅπως μὴ . . . . ὑπερ]βατόμ ποῆι κ[. . . . .”  
 . . . . .]αι θύου[σ]ι. . . . .  
 . . . . .]αδικη[σ]ι. . . . .  
 . . . . .]αμήνιτα κ[. . . . .  
 14 . . . . .]ς, ἱπαιε[σ]ι. . . . .

*incertum quot versus desint*

‘. . . regarding the gods he who alters established <opinions confers benefit by> making public <his reasoning>, rather than causes harm. <For nobody’s reasoning ever> prevented <the world> from undergoing the affects<sup>49</sup> of fortune. Does not the world have its order by means of these? In the same way Heraclitus, bearing witness to shared <affects>,<sup>50</sup> overturns those which are individual. Speaking like a mythologist (?), he said: “the sun, in accord with the nature of <our> method,<sup>51</sup> is in breadth the size of a human foot, and does not wax beyond its size; for if it exceeds its own boundaries at all, the Erinyes, allies of justice, will discover it, <so that> (*singular subject missing*) may <not> make <the sun> excessive <in size>.” . . . they sacrifice . . . (in)justice . . . things lacking in divine wrath . . .’

imagines contuli fr. coniunxerunt edd. 1 τ]οῦ Par.<sup>1</sup> εἰ[ Ts.<sup>3</sup> (ι vel κ, μ): ἐα]ντοῦ Lebedev ap. Par.<sup>2</sup> (α vel λ, δ) περὶ τῶν  
 \*: οὐκ ἦθελεν ὁ πατήρ τῶν Livrea θ]εῶν Ts.<sup>3</sup> (ε vel ζ praebet imago) 2 κείμ]ενα Ts.<sup>1</sup>: κείμ]ενοσ Par.<sup>1</sup>, sed lacunam iii litt.  
 statuit Ts.<sup>1</sup> p. 96 μεταθ]εῖς \* et ὠφέλει διὰ τὸ Hammerstaedt: μεταθ]εῖς εἰς κόσμον Νοῦσ Livrea: μεταθ]ε- Ts.<sup>3</sup>: μεταθ]έμενοσ  
 ὠφέλειαν θέλει Ts.<sup>1</sup> p. 107: μετὰ θ]εῶν Par.<sup>1</sup> τ vel υ α vel λ ἦ potius quam ο φυσικὸσ coniecērim ἐ]κδοῦναι Ts.<sup>3</sup>:  
 ]δοῦναι Par.<sup>1</sup> (δ vel α) 3 μᾶλλ]ον Par.<sup>1</sup> ἦ Ts.<sup>1</sup>: ἄ Ts.<sup>3</sup>: num ὁ? γίνεται Ts.<sup>3</sup> (litt. c paene certam nec γ nec ε esse dicit Ts.<sup>1</sup>  
 p. 96) ][ vestigia ii pedum lin. vert. hab. imago ut videtur τοῦσ ἀνθρώποσ vel τὸγ κόσμον Ts.<sup>1</sup> p. 107 τ vel υ pars extrema  
 dextra et fort. pes (sed atramentum non esse crediderunt Par.<sup>1</sup>) τὰ Ts.<sup>3</sup>: τ]ὰ Par.<sup>1</sup> πᾶ]θη \* (π vel γ imago; α vel λ, χ): γᾶ]ρ Ts.<sup>3</sup>:  
 γ]ᾶρ Par.<sup>1</sup> 4 οὐκ εἶ[α Par.<sup>1</sup> (ι vel κ, η): οὐκ (ἄν) εἶ]η Lebedev ap. Ts.<sup>1</sup> p. 108 λα]μύανειν Ts.<sup>3</sup> (ι caput; υ vestigium medium  
 fort. lin. vert.) ἄρ' οὐ Par.<sup>1</sup>: π]αρ' οὐ Lebedev ap. Par.<sup>2</sup>: γ]ᾶρ οὐ[τοσ Par.<sup>1</sup> τά[ξιν ἔχει Ts.<sup>1</sup>: τά[σεται olim \* α vel λ, χ  
 διὰ Par.<sup>1</sup>: ἐκ Ts.<sup>1</sup>: ὁ Burkert τῶ]νδε Lebedev ap. Par.<sup>2</sup>: τό]νδε Par.<sup>1</sup>: τή]νδε Par.<sup>1</sup> υ linea vert. in fine notam interrogationis  
 Par.<sup>1</sup> 5 κατὰ Ts.<sup>1</sup> (α vel λ imago) ταύτ]᾿ Ts.<sup>3</sup> (α vel δ imago): ταύτ]α Par.<sup>1</sup> Ἡράκ]λειτοσ Ts.<sup>3</sup> (λ vel α praebet imago; ε  
 vel ζ, ξ) μα]ρτυρόμενοσ Ts.<sup>3</sup>: με[τασκευάζω]ν Par.<sup>1</sup> (litt. ε potius quam α legi dixit Ts.<sup>1</sup> p. 97): με[γάλα νομίζω]ν olim \* τὰ  
 Ts.<sup>3</sup> (τ vel γ imago) 6 κατ[ατρ]έφει Ts.<sup>3</sup>: κατ[αγρ]άφει brevius esse monuit Ts.<sup>1</sup> p. 97: κατ[αγγέλλ]ει Par.<sup>1</sup> ἴδ[ι]α Ts.<sup>3</sup>, qui  
 diaeresin praesto esse notaverunt (δ vestigium sin. inf.): ἴδ[ι]α Par.<sup>1</sup> ἴκελα Ts.<sup>3</sup> (α vel λ, χ imago): ἴκελ]α Par.<sup>1</sup>: ἴκελ]οί Ts.<sup>3</sup>:  
 ἰκέλ]ωσ Par.<sup>1</sup> μυθο]λόγωι Ts.<sup>1</sup>: φυσιο]λόγωι Par.<sup>1</sup>: ἱερο]λόγωι Sider ap. Laks–Most p. 135: θεο]λόγωι brevius esse dixerunt  
 Par.<sup>1</sup> ἔφη Par.<sup>1</sup>, qui verbum non fuisse φησι monstrant, nullo vestigio apicis supra litt. primam eminente: ὦδε Ts.<sup>1</sup> 7 sqq.  
**Heracliti Ephesii fr. B 3 + B 94 D.–K.** (agn. West), sed etiam v. 10 ad verba Heracliti pertinere opinor 7 ἥλι]οσ Par.<sup>1</sup> ι  
 pars inf. lin. vert. μεθό]δου \*: . . ]δου Ts.<sup>3</sup>: ἐου]τοῦ Ts.<sup>1</sup>: ἐαν]τοῦ vel θνη]τοῦ Par.<sup>1</sup>: κτύ]φοσ Livrea, haud recte δ potius  
 quam τ, γ, ε, ζ, ξ φύσιν Par.<sup>1</sup>: φύσιν Ts.<sup>3</sup> ἀνθρ[ωπ][η][ίου Ts.<sup>3</sup>: ἀνθρ[ωπ]εῖοσ Par.<sup>1</sup>, ut testis Heracliti (sc. Aët. II.21) εὖ]ροσ  
 Ts.<sup>3</sup> (ε vestigia trium brachiorum praebet imago) ἔστι Par.<sup>1</sup> 8 τοῦ[τ] οὐρου]ς Ts.<sup>1</sup> (υ vel τ): τὸ μ[έγεθο]ς Ts.<sup>3</sup>, brevius (μ  
 vel κ, ι, ε; c in frustulo parum a suo loco remoto): τοῦ[τ] οὐρου]ς Par.<sup>1</sup>, qui dixerunt οὐρου]ς longius esse ὑπερβάλλων Ts.<sup>3</sup> (ε  
 partem dext. praebet imago) εἰ κ[ατά τι οὐ]ρουσ \* (προ]υσ pap., cum atramenti macula supra lin.): εἰκ]ότασ οὐ]ρουσ Ts.<sup>3</sup>: εἰ  
 γᾶ]ρ τι εὐ]ρουσ Par.<sup>1</sup> (α pes sin.): ι[. . . ὄ]ρουσ ed. ἐ[ῶ]του Ts.<sup>1</sup>: ἐ[ῶ]του vel ἐ[κβή]ετα Par.<sup>1</sup>: εἴ]ρουσ Ts.<sup>3</sup> 9 ἐκβή]ετα]  
 ι \* (ι vel η, υ): ἐ]κβή]ετα]ι Par.<sup>1</sup>, sed vestigium caput litterae κ esse non potest (tantum φ vel ψ fuerit) et macula esse videtur:  
 ὑ]π[ερβαλε]ῖ Par.<sup>1</sup>: ἐοῦ· εἰ δὲ μ]ή Ts.<sup>3</sup> Ἐρινύε]σ ed.: -ε]σ Ts.<sup>3</sup> μιν imago et testes Heracliti (Plut. Mor. 370d, 604a): νιν  
 perperam ed., Ts.<sup>3</sup> ἐξευρή]σου]σ Par.<sup>1</sup> υ pars extrema sin. Δίκης ἐπίκουροι Par.<sup>1</sup> ex Heraclito (etiam 12 contuleris), in  
 lacuna litt. fere viii quam statui: ἐπικουρή]σου]σ Sider, ZPE 69 (1987) 225–8: ταῦτα δοκεῖ εἶναι Burkert: καὶ φυλά]ζου]σ Par.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>49</sup> This is my attempt to render πάθη here, which needs to mean both ‘changes in the heavenly bodies’ and ‘mental sensations, experiences’. English has no word with exactly this semantic range.

<sup>50</sup> I.e. the πάθη we all experience while waking, as opposed to individual visions in dreams. The neuter antecedent is understood from line 3: cf. D.L. 9. 7 = fr. A 1 D.–K., εἴρηκε δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν κόσμωι συνισταμένων πάντων παθῶν, ὅτι τε ὁ ἥλιός ἐστι τὸ μέγεθος οἶοσ φαίνεται.

<sup>51</sup> The ‘method’ (a new and no doubt controversial supplement) is Heraclitus’ epistemology, which is what unites the ideas in this fragment with the sentence that introduces it: see especially fr. A 19, quoted in n. 54 below.



10 ὅπως μὴ \*: ὅπως δὲ μὴδὲν Ts.<sup>3</sup>: γὰρ Δίκη ἐάν τι Sider loc. cit.: ἄτοπα, ἤμ μὴ τις Burkert: οὕτω δ' ἔφη ἵνα Lebedev ap. Par.<sup>2</sup> κ[αὶ Lebedev ap. Par.<sup>2</sup> ποδὸς οὐρῶι Burkert: ἀποσβέουσι vel κατασβέουσι Sider: ἀσαφή τὸν λόγον Lebedev ap. Par.<sup>2</sup>  
 11 ἥλιον ἐμμένοντα ἀκούη Burkert ]αὶ Ts.<sup>3</sup>: κ[αὶ \*: ]α Par.<sup>1</sup>: πόπαν]α Lebedev ap. Par.<sup>2</sup> α vel λ, δ θύου]α Lebedev ap. Par.<sup>2</sup> ο vel θ υ vestigium sin. sup. 12 δίκης Ts.<sup>1</sup>: Δ- Ts.<sup>1</sup> p. 97 ἐπίκουροι \* 13 ἀ]μήνιτα \*: μὴνι τα[κτώι potius quam δυς]μήνιτα vel ὄξυ]μήνιτα Ts.<sup>1</sup> p. 97 14 ς vel τ : vestigium incertum ι pars sup. lineae vert. π vel τ, ζ, ε, ξ fort. α vel λ, δ (apex) ι Ts.<sup>3</sup> ε potius quam γ, π ἐ]c[τ]ι παίc leg. et suppl. Ts. per litt. ap. Ferrari, qui Heraclit. fr. B 52 agnovit (quod plane incertum esse censet Livrea)

The editors had already restored θ]εῶν in line 1; their new supplement ἐ]κδοῦναι ‘divulge, make public’ in line 2 seems certain, according to their own reports. Hence I suggest that col. 4 began with the claim that a religious innovator is right to publish his views, since doing so confers benefit rather than harm. The reference to someone or something that prevented the world from being subject to the vicissitudes of destiny, which the author thinks give it its order, will make sense if the author is denying that the views of the physicists could cause harm. His point will have been that the πάθη that we observe in the heavens continue unchanged whatever we consider their causes to be – gods, δαίμονες, Δίκη or τύχη: in other words, free thinking cannot cause eclipses or other phenomena that were popularly thought to signify divine wrath, as we see from Aristophanes’ *Clouds* or the conduct of the Athenian forces laying siege to Syracuse in 413 BC. He supports this point by citing Heraclitus, who asserted the claims of κοινὰ πάθη at the expense of ἴδια πάθη such as we experience in dreams.<sup>52</sup> The contrast between ξυνόν, i.e. κοινόν, and ἴδιον was central to Heraclitus’ thought: for he held that reason is shared and divine, whereas sensation is individual and unreliable (ἄπιστα): this latter term supplies the missing link in sense with col. 5, which is on ἀπιστίη.<sup>53</sup> The author probably likened Heraclitus to a religious expert, since the latter’s expression brings together physics with the Erinyes; if so, the author regards him as essentially a φυσικός.<sup>54</sup>

The editors did not manage fully to restore the fragment of Heraclitus itself. My suggestion μεθό]δου replaces the previous proposal ἐω]υτοῦ. The editors report that, although the letter appeared to be T, it is actually the right half of Δ; it sounds as if there is no doubt about it. They have allowed only three letter-widths before it, but my model shows that there is certainly room for four. ‘Method’ illustrates perfectly the point that the Derveni author makes in introducing the extract. I think the fragment continued for one additional line, since the content of line 10 seems still to relate to it.

The editors place fr. H 8 below fr. G 4 in the middle of the column. This is plausible enough but may never be proved for certain, because the H-series are to be placed so far down in the columns that confirmation from the horizontal fibres of adjacent fragments will always be lacking. If, however, fr. H 8 is rightly placed, I suggest that the text broke off during a discussion of how ordinary people try to placate the Erinyes by sacrificing and avoiding unjust actions that might provoke divine anger. In col. 5 the author

<sup>52</sup> Cf. B 89, ὁ Ἡράκλειτος φησι τοῖς ἐρηγορόσιν ἕνα καὶ κοινὸν κόσμον εἶναι, τῶν δὲ κοιμωμένων ἕκαστον εἰς ἴδιον ἀποστρέφεσθαι; also fr. A 16, cited in the next n.

<sup>53</sup> The connections between these terms and ideas emerge a long and important testimonium to Heraclitus’ epistemology, which I need to quote *in extenso*, namely S.E. *Adv. math.* VII 127–34 = fr. A 16: τὸν δὲ λόγον κριτὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποφαίνεται . . . τὸν κοινὸν καὶ θεῖον. τίς δ’ ἐστὶν οὗτος, συντόμως ὑποδεικτέον· ἀρέκει γὰρ τῷ φυσικῷ τὸ περιέχον ἡμᾶς λογικόν τε δὴν καὶ φρενήρες . . . (129) τοῦτον οὖν τὸν θεῖον λόγον καθ’ Ἡράκλειτον δι’ ἀναπνοῆς πᾶσαντες νοεροὶ γινόμεθα, καὶ ἐν μὲν ὕπνοις ληθαῖοι, κατὰ δὲ ἐγερσιν πάλιν ἔμφρονες· ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ὕπνοις μυκάντων τῶν αἰσθητικῶν πόρων χωρίζεται τῆς πρὸς τὸ περιέχον συμφυΐας ὃ ἐν ἡμῖν νοῦς, μόνης τῆς κατὰ ἀναπνοὴν προσφύσεως σωιζομένης . . . , χωρισθεὶς τε ἀποβάλλει ἢν πρότερον εἶχε μνημονικὴν δύναμιν· (130) ἐν δὲ ἐρηγορεῖ πάλιν διὰ τῶν αἰσθητικῶν πόρων . . . προκύψας καὶ τῷ περιέχοντι συμβαλὼν λογικὴν ἐνδύεται δύναμιν . . . (131) τοῦτον δὴ τὸν κοινὸν λόγον καὶ θεῖον καὶ οὐ κατὰ μετοχὴν γινόμεθα λογικοί, κριτήριον ἀληθείας φησὶν ὁ Ἡράκλειτος· ὅθεν τὸ μὲν κοινήν πᾶσι φαινόμενον, τοῦτ’ εἶναι πιστόν (τῷ κοινῷ γὰρ καὶ θεῷ λόγῳ λαμβάνεται), τὸ δὲ τι μόνῳ προσπίπτον ἄπιστον ὑπάρχειν διὰ τὴν ἐναντίαν αἰτίαν . . . (133) διὰ τούτων γὰρ ῥητῶς παραστήσας ὅτι κατὰ μετοχὴν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πάντα πράττομεν τε καὶ νοοῦμεν ὀλίγα προσδιεληθῶν ἐπιφέρει “διὸ δεῖ ἔπεσθαι τῷ (ξυνῶν), τουτέστι τῷ κοινῷ· ξυνὸς γὰρ ὁ κοινός. “τοῦ λόγου δ’ ἐόντος ξυνὸς ζῶουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ ὡς ἴδιαν ἔχοντες φρόνησιν” (fr. B 2). ἢ δ’ ἐστὶν οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἄλλ’ ἐξήγησις τοῦ τρόπου τῆς τοῦ παντὸς διοικήσεως, διὸ καθ’ ὅτι τὸ ἀνὸς τῆς μνήμης κοινωνήσωμεν, ἀληθεύομεν, ἃ δὲ ἀνὸς ἰδιάσωμεν, ψευδόμεθα. (134) νῦν γὰρ ῥητότατα καὶ ἐν τούτοις τὸν κοινὸν λόγον κριτήριον ἀποφαίνεται, καὶ τὰ μὲν κοινήν φησι φαινόμενα πιστὰ ὡς ἀνὸς κοινῷ κρινόμενα λόγῳ, τὰ δὲ κατ’ ἴδιαν ἐκάστῳ ψευδῆ.

<sup>54</sup> The alternative would be ‘physicist’ (φυσικὸς/λόγῳ), but since Heraclitus believes that fire is divine and permeates everything, a notion very like that of the Derveni author, I think it most likely that the latter regarded him as a physicist. In the light of the model my former supplement ἱερο]λόγῳ turns out to be too short.



goes on to challenge their excessively literal belief in the terrors of Hades, which is of course the place where the Erinyes were thought to punish the souls of sinners after their deaths. New suggestions are in bold type:

## Col. 5

- 1 . . . . "Αἰ]δου δειν[ἀ . . . . .  
 χρη[κτη]ριαζομ[ε . . . . .]δοιγε[. (.)  
 χρη[κτη]ριαζον[ται . . . . .].[.] . . . .[. . . .]ι  
 αὐτοῖς πάριμεν [εἰς τὸ μα]ντεῖον ἐπερ[ω]τή[χ]οντες,  
 5 τῶμ μαντευομέν[ων ἔν]εκεν, εἰ θέμι[**ς ἀπι**τ[η]ῆ[α]ι  
 ἄν "Αἰδου δεινά. τί ἀ[πι]τ[η]τοῦ[ς]ι; οὐ γινώ[κ]οντες ἐ]νύπνια  
 οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλωμ πρ[α]γμάτων ἔκατ[α], διὰ ποίων ἄν  
 παραδειγμάτων π[ι]στεύοιεν; ὑπὸ τ[η]ῆ[ς] ἄμαρτ[ί]ης  
 καὶ [τ]ῆ[ς] ἄλλης ἡδον[ῆ]ς νενικημέν[οι, οὐ] μανθ[ά]νο]υσι  
 10 οὐδὲ] πιστεύουσι. ἀπ[ι]στή δὲ κάμα[θί]η τὸ αὐτό· ἦ γὰρ  
 μὴ μα]νθάνωσι μη[δ]ὲ γινώ[κ]ωσι, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως  
 πιστεύου]σιν καὶ ὁρ[ῶ]ντες ἐνύπνια . . . . .  
 . . . . . τ]ῆν ἀπιτ[η]ῆ[α]ιν . . . . .  
 14 . . . . .]φαίνεται [ . . . . .

*incertum quot versus desint*

‘. . . the terrors of Hades . . . ask an oracle . . . they ask an oracle . . . for them we will enter the prophetic shrine to enquire, with regard to the things that are prophesied, whether it is right if one were to disbelieve in the terrors of Hades. Why do they disbelieve? Since they do not understand <the nature of> dreams or any of the other things, what sort of proofs would induce them to believe? Since they are overcome by error and pleasure as well, they do not learn or believe. Disbelief and ignorance are the same thing. For if they do not learn or comprehend, it cannot be that they will believe even if they see dreams . . . disbelief . . . appears . . .’

imagines contuli fr. coniunxerunt edd. 1 τὰ "Αἰ]δου \* τὰ ἐν "Αἰ]δου olim \* ex imagine veteri: . . . .]η Ts.<sup>1</sup> (pes dext. lineae vert.) ο vestigium valde dubium δειν[ἀ \* ex imagine (ιν lineae vert. pes et vestigium incertum): δε[.] Ts.<sup>1</sup> 2 χρη[κτη]ριαζομ[ενοι (cf. 4) vel -όμ[ε]θα \* (cf. πάριμεν ap. 5): χρη[κτη]ριαζομ[ε] ed. litt. ]δοιγε[ fort. alium ad stratum pertinent δ Ts.<sup>3</sup>, sed litt. certam praebet imago litt. οἱ et ε certae habendae γ vel ρ potius quam κ 3–12 Orph. T 473 Bernabé 3 χρη[κτη]ριαζον[ται \* (litt. ρ alterae pedem sub lin. praebet imago): χρη[κτη]ριαζον[ται Ts.<sup>2</sup>; χρη[κτη]ριαζον[ται Ts.<sup>3</sup> ][.]. . . . . [ Ts.<sup>3</sup> (papyrus abrasa est) κα]ι potius quam α]ν \* -μενο]ι Ts.<sup>3</sup>; ἔπ[ε]ις]ι Burkert: αὐ[το]ῖ] Ferrari 4 υ Ts.<sup>3</sup> post αὐτοῖς dist. Laks et Most πάριμεν [εἰς Ts.<sup>1</sup>, sed v certa habenda ex imagine veteri: παριμε. [ ed. τὸ Ts.<sup>1</sup>: τι bene Ferrari ]ν ed.: ] υ Ts.<sup>3</sup> ἐπερ[ω]τή[χ]οντες Ts.<sup>1</sup> (τ potius quam γ; litt. c certa habenda): -[σο]σι Burkert 5 μαντευομέν[ων ed.: μαντευομένων Ts.<sup>1</sup>, haud recte θέμι[ς \*]: θεμι[τὸν Kouremenos ἀπιτ[η]ῆ[α]ι \* ἀπιτ[η]εῖν τὰ olim \*: τὸν π]εδῶ]ν ἐν Ferrari θεμι[. . .] ηδῶ[.] Ts.<sup>3</sup> (η vel ν; δ potius quam c; α vel λ) 6 ἄν \* (α vel λ; ρ potius quam ν, γ, ut videtur): ἐν Ts.<sup>1</sup>: ἄρ' Ts.<sup>3</sup>, cui obloquitur Ferrari post δεινά dist. \* ἀ[πι]τ[η]τοῦ[ς]ι, ed.: ἀπιτ[η]τοῦ[ς]ι Ts.<sup>1</sup>, haud recte γινώ[κ]οντες Ts.<sup>1</sup> (c vestigium incertum) ἐ]νύπνια Ts.<sup>1</sup> (νυ vestigia incerta): τὰ ἐνύ]πνια ed. 7 οὐδὲ Ts.<sup>1</sup> (ο vel θ imago) πρ[α]γμάτων ed. (ρ vel κ, π): παραγμάτων Ts.<sup>1</sup>, haud recte ἔκατ[α] \* ἔκατ[ον] Ts.<sup>3</sup> dist. Ts.<sup>1</sup> διὰ ποίων Ts.<sup>1</sup> (δ vestigium inf.) 8 παραδειγμάτων Ts.<sup>3</sup> (ρ vel ν, η; α vel δ imago) π vel γ dist. Ts.<sup>1</sup>: hypostigmen post π[ι]στεύοιεν posuerit Burkert τ[η]ῆ[ς] \* (lineola in alto ut videtur): [τε γὰρ Ts.<sup>3</sup>, longius: τ[η]ῆ[ς] τε Burkert: τ[η]ῆ[ς] τε Ts.<sup>2</sup> α vel λ, δ ἄμαρτ[ί]ης \* (litt. ι supra τ scripta est): ἄμαρτ[ί]ης Ts.<sup>1</sup> c vestigia 9 καὶ Ts.<sup>3</sup>, sed litt. κ vestigium minimum est τ[η]ῆ[ς] Ts.<sup>1</sup> ἡδον[ῆ]ς Ts.<sup>3</sup>; -c Ts.<sup>2</sup>: -c ed. νενικημέν[οι Ts.<sup>3</sup> dist. Ts.<sup>1</sup> οὐ] μανθ[ά]νο]υσι Ts.<sup>1</sup> (litt. μ et ν θ et υ certae habendae; α vel λ, δ) 10 οὐδὲ Ts.<sup>1</sup> πιστεύουσι Ts.<sup>1</sup> (litt. π paene certam habuit ex imagine veteri) dist. Ts.<sup>1</sup> ἀπ[ι]στή \* ex imagine veteri (π lineae vert. incerta): ἀ[πι]στή Ts.<sup>1</sup> κάμα[θί]η Ts.<sup>1</sup> (α vel λ) τὸ αὐτό \*: ταυτόν Ts.<sup>1</sup> ἦ γὰρ Ts.<sup>1</sup> 11 μὴ μα]νθάνωσι Ts.<sup>1</sup> ν lineae vert. μη[δ]ὲ Ts.<sup>1</sup> η pars sup. lineae vert. γινώ[κ]ωσι \* (κ paene certum habendum): -κωσι]ν Ts.<sup>1</sup>: -κωσι] ed. οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως Ts.<sup>1</sup> 12 πιστεύου]σιν Ts.<sup>1</sup> (c vel ε; ι pes lineae vert.) ἐνύπνια \* 14 ι vestigia lineae vert.

Despite my initial doubts, the model that I constructed supports the editors' belief that the traces visible in lines 2–5 of fr. G 10 belong to the same layer as those in lines 6–9 of the same fragment, since there is no location available in the columns on either side where they might belong. Hence I suggest εἰ θέμι[ς

ἀπιτ]ῆςα[ι] | ἄν "Αἰδοῦ δεινά in lines 5–6. There is room for only a single narrow letter at the end of line 5, because from the very left edge of the following fr. G 3 the surface is preserved with no ink on it: this is the intercolumnium after col. 5. At the start of line 6 the editors had read ἐν but now read ἄρ, which they interpret as ἄρα with an elision, but this yields impossible syntax: hence I suggest ἄν.

#### 4. Summary and Conclusion

In the light of the analysis above, my current understanding of these columns is as follows. Col. 1 is about how signs from divination are interpreted: the Derveni author quotes a writer on divination who talks ‘like a natural scientist’. By this he intends to show that even religious authorities offer interpretations, just as he himself wishes to do. Col. 2 begins a discussion of the punishment of injustice, which popular belief ascribed to the Erinyes. Col. 3 suggests that those who pour libations to the Erinyes are trying to placate the souls of those who have been killed. The μάγοι consider the δαίμονες, i.e. the Erinyes, to be servants of the gods, whereas in the author’s view they are the souls of people who have been killed; he returns to this in col. 6, when he says that the Erinyes are actually the souls of the dead. Cols. 4–5 supply a bold justification for the author’s right to reinterpret matters of religion. In col. 4 he argues that those who change established views about the gods do not do harm, since private opinions cannot alter celestial phenomena: these are controlled by τύχη. Likewise Heraclitus, he says, insisted that our shared sensations about phenomena such as the size of the Sun are credible, whereas private sensations like those in dreams are not. But when Heraclitus said that the Erinyes control the size of the Sun, he was speaking like a religious storyteller; perhaps the author implies that Heraclitus did not mean that the Erinyes actually exist as such. Col. 5 argues that private beliefs which we cannot all verify from observation, such as the existence of terrors in Hades, are incredible: the author offers to prove that they are false by asking an oracle whether it would be right to disbelieve in them. People disbelieve because such beliefs are incredible, even though they may dream about them; therefore phenomena like dreams need interpretation. In col. 6 the author returns to his interpretation of the Erinyes and δαίμονες as the souls of the dead, arguing that the rites used by the μάγοι and the initiates support his interpretation. In col. 7 he embarks on an interpretation of a similarly incredible text – the Orphic poem which has the gods violate the most fundamental taboos about sex and violence among kindred.

I need not repeat here my argument that the author need not have been a priest or diviner, but only a layperson like Chaerephon, to enter the oracular shrine and ask his question; nor that this question, which may have seemed innocuous to the writer, would have seemed just as provocative as Chaerephon’s was to the Athenian jurors who sat in judgement upon Socrates. There is nothing in the new edition that undermines this interpretation, and much in the preceding columns, insofar as the published photographs permit them to be reconstructed, that seems to me to support it. The author of the Derveni papyrus was a φυσικός and, from a traditional viewpoint, a blasphemer against the gods. If the Athenians did sentence him to death for impiety, as they sentenced Diagoras of Melos, this would certainly have been in accord with the attitudes that they are documented to have held in the closing decades of the fifth century BC.

In conclusion, these remarks can mark only yet another stage in our effort to understand the opening columns of the Derveni papyrus. However, I think I have shown on papyrological grounds that the editors’ reconstruction of these columns is mistaken, and that something more both correct and more coherent can be put in its place.