

B.'s own judgments – in effect a commentary. Not surprisingly, all this takes up a great deal of space. At fr. 1, which is a single hexameter in two variant versions, the first and third apparatuses run on from p. 2 to p. 7, overlapping the introduction to the Derveni papyrus. The fact is that B. has determined to shovel in everything that he has collected, everything that anyone might find relevant to the study of the Orphica. I have not yet mentioned the 72-page bibliography, arranged under 31 headings, which precedes the fragments. We may be grateful for this liberality, but there is a danger of not being able to see the trees for the undergrowth. It would have been better to present the texts in a more austere (one-volume) format and to publish a separate commentary, preferably not in B.'s dire Latin.<sup>1</sup>

B. occasionally endeavours to restore verse from Neoplatonist paraphrase, at best controversially (106, 121, 225, 299.2), at worst betraying his own metrical incompetence (145, 151, 256). Several metrically transmitted fragments are printed in unmetrical form (132, 377.7a, 414.1, 437.1), and others appear with glaring misprints (66 [I] 6, 158, 173, 293, 330.1, 386, 401, 413.3). There are altogether too many errors and misprints in the book. (A scholar named Quarry appears once as *Θωαppv.*) Let us hope that the second fascicle will be proof-read more carefully; and that it will nevertheless come soon, as we urgently need the indexes.

All Souls College, Oxford

M. L. WEST  
martin.west@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

## THE DERVENI PAPYRUS

BETEGH (G.) *The Derveni Papyrus. Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation*. Pp. xii + 441, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Cased, £65, US\$110. ISBN: 0-521-80108-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X05000053

This book is a heavily revised version of a dissertation begun in Paris under the joint supervision of Prof. Jacques Brunschwig of the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (Paris) and of Prof. Kornél Steiger, Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest), and written mainly during the academic year 1997–98 at Cambridge (Christ's College), under the supervision of Prof. David Sedley. Defended on 21 September 1999 at the Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest), the dissertation was the first thesis in philosophy to be defended before the University rather than the Academy of Sciences, which makes it a historic event.

In January 1962, during excavations carried out at Derveni, north-west of Thessalonica, a papyrus roll was discovered near one of the group of six tombs at the site. Although it was intended to be burned, this roll escaped the flames, and since it had been carbonised, it was preserved from rot and decomposition. However, its poor state made it hard to unroll. A. Fackelmann, librarian at the National Library at Vienna, dedicated all his patience and skill to detaching one hundred and fifty pieces

<sup>1</sup>E.g. '(ut gratias agam ...) doctis viribus' (x); 'West ... putans fr. 155 in hoc carmine iam legi potueram' (31); '(theogonia) de Proserpina filia ... tractavisset verisimile est sec. Kirk, Raven et Schofield' (32); 'poema in Damascii temporibus deperdidisse videtur' (33); 'de musica ad animas ascendendas' (347); 'quadam fragmenta' (349, three times); *usque* 'until', governing a verb (ibid.); 'ap. Eur. et [= quoque] vestigia de rebus Orphicis inveni possunt' (384); etc. 'Pergit' is constantly used transitively to mean 'continues from'. We also encounter erratic spellings such as 'metaforice', 'ab Hecateo ... Mylesio', 'Sira dea', 'Orac. Sybill.'

from it by means of static electricity. Twenty-two columns of text were thus reconstituted, together with fragments belonging to the preceding columns. In 1982, the *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* proposed an unofficial edition of the text.

In 1997 K. Tsantsanoglou, who was charged with carrying out the diplomatic edition, proposed a reconstitution of the first seven columns, the first four of which were to be added to the twenty-two of the unofficial edition, so that that we now have available a text comprising twenty-six columns. The roll must have been about three meters long, but only the upper part remains. Each column consists of between eleven and sixteen lines, of between thirty and forty-five letters each; that is, the length of a hexameter. Each citation of a verse occupies precisely one line, and is marked as such by a dash or a space left blank at the beginning and the end of the verse. The roll's width remains unknown, since we do not know the number of lines lost. The first seven columns develop the exegesis of one or more religious rituals; the practices of specialists called *magoi* (charlatans) are described, probably in order to criticise them. We then find an 'allegorical' commentary on Orphic verses belonging to a theogony.

In 1997, A. Laks and G.W. Most (Oxford, Clarendon Press) published an English translation of the text (augmented by four columns reconstituted by Tsantsanoglou), together with several studies. Then, in 2000 R. Janko published an English translation (*CPh* 96, pp. 1–32), and in 2002 an interim edition (*ZPE* 141, pp. 1–62) with translation of the text. We should note that after these publications, two important works appeared: those of A. Bernabé (new edition of the Orphic fragments, München and Leipzig, 2004) and of F. Jourdan (French translation of the Derveni papyrus ed. by Janko with notes, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2003). The situation is still changing rapidly, as could be observed at the International Conference organised by Prof. Bernabé and Prof. Casadesús at the beginning of this year (at Palma de Mallorca, 3–6 February 2005).

Materially, the work published by Betegh is as follows. We first find the text of the manuscript with an English translation. B. makes no claim to produce a critical edition, but he indicates in the apparatus other scholars' valuable suggestions in order to justify his choices for problematic readings; in the first two pages, he explains in what way he has made use of Janko and Laks & Most. Then come chapters on the discovery of the papyrus and the reconstitution of the first columns. B. next proposes a reconstruction of the poem commented on in the papyrus, and then turns to its allegorical interpretation. He defines the method used, the way the interpretation is presented, and the structure of the story, in which several gods take part. He then investigates the ideas of the author of the commentary. The key concept in the interpretation proposed by the commentator is that, when Zeus swallows the various gods and fashions the new world which is to become ours, theogony becomes cosmogony. It is thus appropriate to translate the names that occur in the theogonies as if they were natural forces acting in the cosmogony. There then follows, quite naturally, a chapter on cosmology, that is, on the structure of the world presupposed in the commentary. From this point on, B. seeks to determine the commentators' place in the context of pre-Socratic philosophy, to which he devotes two chapters, one on Anaxagoras and the other on Diogenes of Apollonia and Archelaus of Athens. However, once he has examined all the points of contact between the commentator and these philosophers, B. refuses to adopt a definitive stance regarding the identity of the author, even though he explains in an appendix why he cannot accept the hypothesis of Janko, who proposes Diagoras of Melos. Nevertheless, this prudent position does not prevent B. from insisting on the fact that the approach of the

commentary's author is akin to that of the exegetes who interpreted oracular responses at the time.

Matters are different with regard to Heraclitus, who is cited by name in the papyrus and of whom we find a citation (fragments B 3 + B 94DK) in column 4. Thanks to this citation, we can link cosmology with eschatology, a connection which goes without saying in Antiquity. In a sense, all eschatological doctrines necessarily imply a cosmology, for if the soul survives the death of the individual, one has to know where the soul goes after it leaves the body. The question arises here of the speculations on the fate of souls that may have been present in the commentary, and on the similarities that might exist between this commentary and the gold leaves that some have qualified as Orphic.

A bibliography and indexes *uerborum, locorum*, of modern names and of subjects complete this impeccably produced work.

I hope I have made readers aware of the importance of this work. I now turn to the points of my disagreement with B.

1) Some of these concern the translation and interpretation. The most important is the following. In column XIII, 4 we read: *αἰδοῖον κατέπιεν, ὃς αἰθέρα ἔχθορε πρῶτος*. B. translates, 'He swallowed the phallus of [...], who sprang from the aither first'. For B., *αἰδοῖον* is the accusative singular of the neuter *αἰδοῖον*, which signifies a phallus (p. 112). The subject of *κατέπιεν* is Zeus (p. 112), and the phallus he swallows is that of Ouranos. Since the subordinate clause is introduced by the relative pronoun *ὃς* in the masculine singular, it is indeed necessary to hypothesise that the phallus in question belongs to a god, and for him this god is Ouranos, castrated by Kronos. To justify this interpretation, B. refers to the beginning of l. 3 of column XVI: *Πρωτογόνου βασιλέως αἰδοίου*, which he translates, 'the phallus of the first-born king.' For him, then, *αἰδοίου* is the genitive singular of the neuter *αἰδοῖον*, which signifies 'phallus'; and he makes *πρωτογόνου βασιλέως* the complement of the noun *αἰδοίου*. In addition, he identifies this king with Ouranos, on the basis of XIV, 6 *Οὐρανὸς Εὐφρονίδης, ὃς πρῶτιστος βασιλευσεν*. In an article published in *ZPE* 144 (2003) 19–29 I showed why I could not accept this. I translate: 'He swallowed down the reverend one, who was the first to leap forth into ether'. This reading of the column inspires two questions, one of them concerning the identification of *πρωτόγονος*, and the other the meaning of *αἰδοῖον*.

According to my interpretation, *αἰδοῖον κατέπιεν* is to be understood here as an accusative masculine singular adjective qualifying an implied *θεόν* or *δαίμονα*, which is the direct object of the verb *κατέπιεν*, and the antecedent of the masculine singular relative pronoun *ὃς*, which is itself the subject of the verb *ἔχθορε*, governing the following relative. The subject of *κατέπιεν* is Zeus, who, according to the *Rhapsodies* (OF 67 Kern = 241 F Bernabé), swallows Protogonos, the *θεόν* or *δαίμονα* qualified as *αἰδοῖον*. The first-born, or Protogonos if we consider this to be a proper name, is the first god to emerge from the egg and to leap into the ether (*ὃς αἰθέρα ἔχθορε πρῶτος*). In this context, the expression *πρωτογόνου βασιλέως αἰδοίου*, cited at the beginning of column XVI, line 3 must be connected to a preceding verse, which must contain at least one noun governed by a verb. The genitive masculine singular, *βασιλέως*, should be the complement of a noun like *μένος*. Interpreted as an adjective qualifying *βασιλέως*, *πρωτογόνου* would refer to Protogonos, who may be qualified as 'first-born king', since he is the first being to burst forth from the primordial egg. The implied noun governing the genitive *πρωτογόνου βασιλέως αἰδοίου*, for instance *μένος*, can be interpreted as the direct object of the verb *κατέπιεν* or its equivalent: thus, we would read '... he swallowed down (*κατέπιεν*) the strength (*μένος*) of the

reverend first-born king (*πρωτογόνου βασιλέως αἰδοίου*) ...'. After swallowing the god who is at the origin of all things, Zeus will cause the universe in its totality to come forth from himself, as described in the following verses of the column, which allude explicitly to verses from the *Rhapsodies*.

The importance of this point is considerable, for the position one adopts completely modifies one's idea of the succession of the gods in the theogony commented on in the Derveni Papyrus. In addition, it allows us to determine whether it is or is not relevant to invoke the *Rhapsodies* in order to understand the papyrus' theogony. This a problem which divides the interpreters. B. tries to answer my objections (pp. 117–22) with great honesty and cleverness, putting forward internal and external arguments against them. I have answered the internal arguments in my paper. The external arguments deal primarily with the neuter *αἰδοίου*, which signifies a phallus. The real question is: does *αἰδοίου* mean 'phallus' in the Orphic poem, or is the sexual meaning imported by hostile or mocking readers, whom the commentator was attempting to combat by means of allegory? I would give the second answer.

2) Ever since W. Burkert (*Antike und Abendland* 14, 1968, 93–102; *ZPE* 62, 1986, 1–5) the writing of the commentary has been considered to date from the years 420–400. Since neither the objects found near the papyrus nor its script provide external proof, two arguments of a philosophical nature have been put forth to justify this hypothesis. The citation of Heraclitus and the (supposed) influence of the Pre-Socratics on one hand and the absence of Platonic citations on the other have been adduced, yet neither of these two reasons is determinant. I must admit B. does not use this argument based on the lack of Platonic elements. However, his acknowledgment of Anaxagoras' crucial influence (through Archelaus of Athens?) on the commentary of the Derveni papyrus makes his agreement with it implicit. Nothing proves that Plato's renown quickly transcended the city of Athens and spread throughout Greece, particularly as far as where the commentator lived, probably a small town. Moreover, Plato was hostile to allegory, and even within Aristotle's school, allegory was not widely practised. Finally, Heraclitus was cited continually through the ages.

To these negative arguments, positive ones may be added in favour of a Stoicising influence: they are as follows. In column XXVI of the Derveni papyrus, the commentator hastens to explain that Zeus does not wish to unite with his own mother, but with that good mother known as the intellect (*Noûs*), which, as mother of all things, must be identified with Destiny (*Μοῖρα*), which is in reality the thought (*φρόνησις*) of Zeus, identified with the air. Zeus is simultaneously the fire that makes the elementary particles surge forth, and the air which, by its cooling action, makes them combine to constitute existing realities, in the same way as Aphrodite and Peitho do on the sexual level. In this perspective, fire is on the side of the masculine and of ejaculation, whereas air is on the side of the feminine and of embraces. In this Zeus, a warm and intelligent breath, we find, it seems to me, an allegorical interpretation of the physical type akin to that promoted by the first Stoics, and of which we find traces in the treatise *De mundo*, attributed to Aristotle but of Stoic inspiration.

We thus find ourselves in a context which is not that of the research on nature carried out by the pre-Socratics, but that of the cosmological system developed in the framework of Stoicism. It should be noted that Zeno founded his school around 300, a mere two decades after the death of Aristotle in 322. Moreover, Themelis and Touratsoglou (P.G. Themelis and I.P. Touratsoglou, *Oi tafoi tou Derbeniou*, Athens 1997, 211) have maintained that the evidence favours a date for the burials in the late fourth to early third century. Two additional arguments tending in the same direction

may be advanced. (1) The Stoics recognised Heraclitus as their ancestor in the field of philosophy. (2) The Stoics, too, made a very broad and elaborate use of allegorical interpretation on the basis of etymology. (3) Such a change in historical context radically modifies all evaluations of the commentator's situation within the religious context, and in particular the Dionysian tradition, to which the gold leaves testify; but this is not the place to elaborate on this subject.

In conclusion, this book is, on a material and argumentative level, the best to be found in English on the Derveni papyrus. Although one can dispute the translation of one or another essential passage, the arguments advanced by B. to justify his position are strong and very well developed. Nevertheless, this work, with regard to its philosophical interpretation of the commentary and its reconstitution of the religious context in which the commentary was written, remains heavily dependent on the hypothesis of a date for its composition in the period of 420–400, which orients the author's conclusions towards pre-Socratic influence. B. does not make use of this hypothesis concerning dating, and would be happy to accept that the text was written any time before the archaeological date of the roll, that is, some time before 300. Nevertheless, most of his commentaries deal with pre-Platonic thinkers, which means that one way or another he accepts a predominantly pre-Platonic influence on the commentator, if not historically at least philosophically. This is the most important issue. Situating the writing of this commentary after Plato (438–348) and after Aristotle (384–322), in a Stoic context (Zeno lived between 335 and 263) radically modifies the interpretation: it focusses attention on the importance of allegory and on the development of a cosmology involving providential warm breath (*πνεῦμα*) associated with Zeus.

It is not the least merit of this exemplary book that, through the quality and presentation of its arguments, it leads us to raise such essential questions.

CNRS–Paris

LUC BRISSON

Translated by Michael Chase

lbrisson@agalma.net

## PINDAR'S ANCIENT EDITORS

NEGRI (M.) *Pindaro ad Alessandria. Le edizioni e gli editori.* (Antichità Classica e Cristiana 34.) Pp. 253. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 2004. Paper, € 28.60. ISBN: 88-394-0689-1.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X05000065

This is not a book that will increase one's understanding of Pindar. Rather, as the title suggests, it concentrates on the rationale adopted by Alexandrian scholars, especially Aristophanes of Byzantium, for the organisation of the four books of epinicians. Negri rejects Slater's assertion that Aristophanes was responsible only for cataloguing, not for editing, Pindar's odes (see fr. 381 in Slater's edition of Aristophanes) and rightly argues against a strict distinction between cataloguing and editing.

After a thorough discussion of the possible rationale used by Aristophanes for his edition of the epinicians, N. concludes that there were three primary criteria. The first was hierarchical, i.e. the prestige of the festivals, contests and victors, the second a combination of aesthetic and artistic features, and the third an 'imprescindibile principio, la parola del poeta.' On pp. 44–118 we are provided with an exhaustive

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved