

A. V. LEBEDEV

HERACLITUS IN P. DERVENI

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 79 (1989) 39–47

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

HERACLITUS IN P.DERVENI

The text below is based on the new restoration of PDerv col.I by K.Tsantsanoglou and G.M.Parassoglou¹; the supplements and emendations of the present writer are marked by the asterisk.

- [τ]οῦ ἐα[υτοῦ]* [] [δαίμ]ων*
- 2 ὁ κείμ[ενος] μετὰ θ[εῶν] [όν φησι Κρόνον Ζην]* ἰ δοῦναι
μᾶλλ[ον τ]είνεται [πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον]* - [παρ]ὰ τῆς τύχης γ[ὰρ]
- 4 οὐκ <ἄν>* εἴ[η]* [λα]μμάνεν - [π]*αρ' οὐ τ[έτυκται] [ὅλων τῶ]*νδε κόσμος
κατὰ [Ὀρφέ]*α. Ἡράκλ[ε]ιτος με[ταθέμενος]* τὰ κοινὰ
- 6 κατ[αστέλλ]*εἰ τὰ ἴδ[ι]α ὥσπερ* ἴκε[λα ἱερῶι] λόγῳι λέγων· "[ἄρχει]*
ἥλι[ος] [κόσ]*μου κατὰ φύσιν, ἀνθρῶ[πηίου] εὖρος ποδὸς [ἐὼν καὶ]*
- 8 τοῦ[ς ὄρους] οὐχ ὑπερβάλλων· εἰ γὰ[ρ] [καί]*ροὺς ἐ[νιαυτοῦ]*
[ὕ]π[ερβαλε]ῖ, Ἐρινύε[ς] νιν ἐξευρήσου[σι, Δίκης ἐπίκουροι]."
- 10 [οὔτω δὲ ἔφη ἴνα]* [ὑπερ]βατὸμ ποῆι κ[αὶ ἀσαφῆ τὸν λόγον]*
[πόπαν]*α θύου[σι]*

"... from his own (father?) ... The "daimon" who rests in the abode of gods and whom, as he says, Kronos (=Nous) gives to Zeus, rather refers to the Sun (for it would be impossible to take him from Chance) by whom the world-order of all this (i.e. of the Universe) has been created according to Orpheus. Heraclitus (also) alters common (i.e. current) names and clothes (his thought) in peculiar expressions as if imitating by his words the "Sacred Discourse": "The Sun rules the Cosmos according to the natural order, being (only) one man's foot in width; he does not exceed proper limits, for if he does exceed the due times of the year (i.e. the seasons), Erinyes, the ministers of Justice, will find him out". He said so in order to make his discourse inverted ("hyperbatic") and obscure. (Continued

¹ K.Tsantsanoglou - G.M.Parassoglou, Heraclitus in the Derveni Papyrus, offprint from: Studi e testi per il Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini, vol.3, Firenze 1988, p.125-133 (cited below as Edd.). Earlier attempts based on the preliminary and imperfect text of "Fragm.A": W.Burkert, Atti del Symp.Heracl. 1981, Roma, 1983, v.I, 37-42; J.Mansfeld, Die Vorsokratiker I, Stuttgart 1983, p.266; D.Sider, ZPE 69,1987, p.225-228. I cannot refer seriously to S.N.Mouraviev, ZPE 61,1985,131 who does not hesitate to write such absurdities as λάμμανε γάρ (γάρ after imper.!), κόσμος πηλίκος; (for πηλίκος ὁ κόσμος;), μετρεῖ ὄρους (!) and mistakes ὑπερβατόν for ὑπερβασία. This surprising language (which Mr.Mouraviev imagines to be Greek) rather seems to be Scythian. Mr. Mouraviev also seems not to know that ποῆι is a genuine Attic form which should not be "emended".

In citing PDerv I follow the new numeration of Edd. Thanks are due to Prof. Tsantsanoglou who showed me the photograph of the col.I in Thessaloniki (4.10.87) and made useful remarks on the possibility of some readings.

e.g.: "Erinyes" means "punishments", hence people sacrifice to them numerous cakes because their sins are numerous as well *vel.sim.*)".

General remarks on col.I and Heraclitus quotation

As Edd.(p. 126) rightly point out, in col.XXII, 11-12 τοιοῦτον καὶ τοσοῦτον γινόμενον οἶος ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ λόγου διηγείται (sc. ἥλιος) the autor makes a cross-reference to col.I (τοσοῦτον = εὔρος ποδός). This means, first, that col.I belongs to the initial part of the treatise (ἀρχὴ τοῦ λόγου) and, second, that a discussion of the Sun is likely to have preceded the Heraclitus quotation. On the other hand, lines 1-4 seem to be thematically connected with col.V-VI and the interpretation of the Orphic verses Ζεὺς μὲν ἐπεὶ δὴ πατὴρ ἐοῦ πάρα θέσφατον ἀρχὴν ἢ ἀλκὴν τ' ἐν χεῖρεσσ' ἔλαβεν καὶ δαίμονα κυδρὸν (col.V, 4-5; cf. V, 8; VI, 3-4 παρὰ τοῦ ... πατὴρ ... τὸν δαίμονα λαμμάνειν) in view of col.I,3-4 παρὰ ... λαμμάνειν.² Hence my suggestion that in lines 1-4 the author interprets δαίμων (i.e. Protogonos) as "the Sun". This is only natural since in col.X,9 he interprets the epithet of Protogonos αἰδοῖον (misunderstood as subst. neutr.) as ἥλιος too. Col.VI,5 γινώσκων οὖν τὸ [θερμόμ] etc. presupposes that the reader already knows the allegorical interpretation of ἀλκή and δαίμων as generative heat.³ In col.XI Κρόνος is etymologized as κρούων Νοῦς. Consequently the parenthetical remark in I,3-4 "It would be impossible to take (daimon the Sun) from Chance" implies that Zeus took him from Mind, νοῦς and τύχη being opposed from the teleological point of view. The importance of the Sun as an instrument of creation and a teleological argument for the wisdom of god is emphasized in col.XXII,9-10 τὰ νῦν ἔόντα ὁ θεὸς εἰ μὴ ἤθελεν εἶναι, οὐκ ἂν ἐπόησεν ἥλιον κτλ. Had the Sun been not of its actual size (τοσοῦτον) and temperature (τοιοῦτον), the present world would have been destroyed by excessive heat; hence it cannot be a result of chance. It should be noted that this is basically a genuine Heraclitean idea (in Anaxagoras the Sun is lifeless μύδρος), and the Derveni author himself recognizes his debt to Heraclitus both by citing the Sun fragment in col.I and by referring to it in col.XXII.

Lines 5-6 are of primary importance for the understanding of the theory of "names" and the allegorical method upheld by the Derveni writer. I take κοινά / ἴδια as rhetorical terms which stand for κοινὰ (ἴδια) ὀνόματα or ῥήματα. This interpretation is supported by the rhetorical term ὑπερβατόν in l.10 and especially by l.14 of the so-called "fragm.A": [παρ]*ὰ τὰ κοινὰ ῥ[ήματα]*.⁴ Another important instance is probably found in col. IV,2-3 εἰπεῖν οὐχ οἶόν τ[ε διὰ κοινῶν]* ὀνομάτων τὰ πορρηθέντα. Hence κοινὰ

² The verses are discussed by M.L.West, *The Orphic Poems*, Oxf.,1983, p.84 sq.

³ The author may have interpreted θέσφατος ἀρχή as πῦρ and derived ἀλκή from ἀλέη or ἄλιος and δαίμων from δαίω 'to burn'.

⁴ Edd. now separate lines 13-15 from col.I. On the text of l. 13 see my note to col.I, line 6. In l. 15 read ὑπέχειν δ[ίκην]. Thus l.13-15 speak of someone who "covered" (καταστείλας) his thought (apparently by "unusual" names); he did so "contrary to the current usage" and what he actually meant is "to be punished". The "covering" names with such a meaning seem almost certainly to include Erinyes, and the thematic connection with col.I is apparent. But who is ὁ καταστείλας, Orpheus or Heraclitus, remains uncertain.

ὀνόματα in PDerv means "vocabula a vulgo usitata", simple and clear words of the current usage; (ἴδια, on the contrary, are "unusual" esoteric words unintelligible to common people, such as mythological names and poetic metaphors. The distinction comes near to our prosaic/poetic and, in a sense, to appellativa/propria (provided that the etymology of a "proper name" is obscure). This usage differs drastically from the Peripathetic terminology which equates ἴδιον with οἰκεῖον (i.e. κοινόν of PDerv)⁵, but comes near to that of Anaximenes of Lampsacus⁶ and Epigenes who wrote on τὰ ἰδιάζοντα παρ' Ὀρφεῖ (Orph.fr.33 K. = 1 B 22 DK). According to PDerv col.IV Orpheus' poetry is deliberately enigmatic in order to be unintelligible to βέβηλοι. Orpheus spoke περὶ τῶν ἐόντων πραγμάτων (cf. col.X,5), i.e. about natural phenomena (and, incidentally, moral notions, e.g. ποιναί), but obscured his verses by means of word-transposition (col.V,6 ταῦτα τὰ ἔπη ὑπερβατὰ ἐόντα λανθάνει) and change of κοινά to ἴδια (col.IV,2 as supplemented above).⁷ A good interpreter must detect *hyperbaton* and retranslate ἴδια into κοινά: as a result the *Urweisheit* reveals itself in the form of (mostly Anaxagorean) natural philosophy.⁸ Now we can see how this method is employed in col.I. Speaking about the Sun Orpheus deliberately changed the "common name" ἥλιος to a "peculiar" one, δαίμων κυδρός. To make the meaning of this words even more obscure he also used hyperbaton and transposed δαίμονα κυδρὸν after ἔλαβεν, so that "uninitiated" readers would construe these words with κατέπινεν. As a result of their philological incompetence the absurd myth of Zeus swallowing Protoponos has arisen; what Orpheus actually means is that air (Zeus) receives

⁵ Arist., Rhet. 1407 a 31 (the regular term is κύριον). In Aristotle ἴδιον means ἴδιον τοῦ πράγματος, in PDerv ἴδιον τοῦ συγγραφέως.

⁶ Rhet.30,7; p.66,21 Fuhrmann ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ὀνομάτων (sc. σαφῶς ἐροῦμεν) ἐὰν ὅτι μάλιστα τοῖς οἰκειοῖς τῶν πραγμάτων ὀνόμασι τὰς πράξεις προσαγορεύωμεν καὶ ἐὰν τοῖς κοινοῖς, καὶ μὴ ὑπερβατῶς αὐτὰ τιθῶμεν κτλ. As in P.Derv, the two prerequisites of σαφῶς λέγειν are: 1) use of κοινά (lexical means); 2) avoidance of ὑπερβατὰ (syntactical means). Contrast Demetr., De eloct., 192 πρῶτα μὲν ἐν τοῖς κυρίοις (sc. τὸ σαφές), ἔπειτα ἐν τοῖς συνδεδεμένοις. Heraclitus' style is mentioned as a typical example of ἀσύνδετον, resp. ἀσαφές (cf. 22 A 4 DK; 1 d - d² Marc.).

⁷ Κοινὰ ὀνόματα of col.I-IV (and of the preceding fragments) seem to be the same as ἅ ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι ὀνόμασαν in col.XV,8 (exemplified by μοῖρα), λεγόμενα ὀνόματα in col.XVI,9 (exemplified by βασιλεύς) and λεγόμενα καὶ νομιζόμενα ῥήματα in col.XX,8 (exemplified by a colloquial expression μεγάλους ῥύηται). This is, *prima facie*, surprising, for why should the "spoken and current words" be "enigmatic" at all? Note, however, that in the latter instances the author mostly speaks of metaphors (e.g. αἰδοῖον in col.X is interpreted as a metaphor for "generative principle" and βασιλεύς in col.XVI as a metaphor for "all-controlling ἀρχή"), and metaphor is a 'common' word used in a peculiar way. The Derveni writer seems to ignore the later term μεταφορά first attested in Isocrates 9,9 and Anaximenes of Lampsacus 23,1 (μεταφῆρων τρόπος), but μετατίθημι ὄνομα means almost the same as μεταφέρω ὄνομα, cf. also εἰκάσας X,9; XVI,8. In col.XV μοῖρα is taken as *appellativum* (i.e. κοινόν), presumably because "intelligence" is a "part" of the god (aliter W.Burkert, Les Études philosophiques, 1970, Nr.4, p.446 who refers to Anaxagoras' μοῖραι). The opposition ἄνθρωποι ὀνόμασαν / Ὀρφεὺς ὀνόμασεν in col.XV, XIX (Burkert's remarks, *ibid.*, 444sq. are still valuable) must correspond to κοινά/ἴδια of col.I,5-6. Cf. also ἰδία/δημοσία (syn. κοινή) scil. κείμενα ὀνόματα in Plat., Crat. 385 a 8-9; e 1. As in PDerv, the distinction is connected with μετατίθημι ὄνομα 384 d 3-6.

⁸ Note, however, that the cosmic Mind (Γνώμη B 41/85 M.) and the denial of chance (εἰκῆ B 124/107 M.) are Heraclitean, as well as Anaxagorean ideas; and the cosmogonic role of "heat" as active force (col.VI, X-XII etc.) is a peculiarly Heraclitean feature. Ἥλιος, πῦρ, τὸ θερμόν of the Heracliteans are contrasted (and compared) with Anaxagoras' Νοῦς in Plat., Crat., 413 c. The Derveni writer seems to identify Νοῦς and θερμόν: in his natural philosophy he is a Heraclitizing Anaxagorean.

the Sun from the cosmic Mind. Heraclitus (φυσικός and αὐνικτής at once) speaks about the Sun in precisely the same manner. The fragment displays at least one instance of hyperbaton: ἀνθρωπήϊου εὐρος ποδός for εὐρος π. ἄ. (the normal word-order is restored in the "Placita" quotation); and two instances of ἴδια substituted for κοινά: ἄρχει and Ἐρινύες (explained away in col. 11 sq.).

The surprising and nevertheless unquestionable result of Tsantsanoglou's and Parassoglou's publication is that "what has been known up to the present as two distinct and independent fragments (B3 and B 94 DK = 57 and 52 M.) appears now as one continuous fragment."⁹ This conclusion must be supplemented by the recognition of the almost absolute superiority of the Derveni text. Any serious edition of Heraclitus to come will cite B 3 and B 94 only as *testimonia* under the most complete and authentic *verbatim* quotation of PDerv. The compiler of "Placita philosophorum" 1,21,4 (Plut., Stob.) quotes from the Sun fragment only so much as is necessary for the chapter περὶ μεγέθους ἡλίου and eliminates the poetic word-order.¹⁰ Both Plutarchus quotations are apparently abridged. In *De exilio* 604 A (=52 a¹ M.) he cites only that part which is suitable to illustrate his thought that every planet is bound by its orbit (and hence is not free), the preceding text being irrelevant to his subject. In *De Iside* 370 D (=52 a² M.) Plutarchus is mainly interested in the opposition Ἥλιος / Ἐρινύες which he interprets as good and evil principles (presumably Light and Darkness) of the world comparable with Empedocles' Philia and Neikos, Anaxagoras' Νοῦς (!) and matter, as well as with dualistic conceptions of Eastern religions (Osiris and Typhon, Ohrmuzd and Ahriman etc.) . Note, however, that both the qualification of *Helios* as ἀρχή and its juxtaposition with Polemos - βασιλεύς (B 53/29 M.) prove that Plutarchus knows the complete text and confirm the reading ἄρχει. The character and reasons of the Derveni quotation are quite different. The Derveni writer is interested not only in Erinyes and the size of the Sun (col.XXII,11), but also (and, perhaps, first of all) in the idea of the Sun as demiourgos and the divine Ruler of the Cosmos. What is more, unlike Plutarchus, he is interested in Heraclitus' diction and style. He does not only work Heraclitus' words into a period of his own (as Plutarchus does), but carefully marks the beginning of the quotation (λέγων) and proceeds to comment on the lines quoted. Hence ὑπερβάλλων and ὄρους are *lectiones preferendae* to Plutarchus' ὑπερβήσεται and μέτρα (52 a¹ M.) as attested by a superior source (see also note to line 8 below). The slight semantical difference between the more general ὑπερβήσεται μέτρα and the more precise ὑπερβάλλων ὄρους is not unimportant for such crucial problems of the Heraclitean scholarship as the nature of cosmic

⁹ Edd., p. 130. Confirmatory evidence is found in Ps.-Heraclit., Epist.IX, 21-25 Tarán, where B 94 and B 3 are joined: πολλαὶ Δίκης Ἐρινύες, ἀμαρτημάτων φύλακες ... οἶδα ἥλιον ὀπίσος ἐστί.

¹⁰ It has long been seen that B 3/57 M. betrays a dactylic metre. If Heraclitus quotes a traditional φάτις from epic poetry (Orphic? Cyclic?), the original line may have run, e.g. ἀνθρωπήϊου <τ'> εὐρος (ἐὸν) ποδός <ἥλιος ἄρχει ?>. G.S.Kirk's thesis (Heraclitus, The Cosmic Fragments, Cambr., 1970, p.280,294 followed by M.Marcovich, Eraclito, Firenze, 1978, p.218) that B 3, Δίκης ἐπικούροι from B 94 and ὥρας αἰ πάντα φέρουσιν (B 100/64 M.) derive from a later hexameter exposition of Heraclitus now proves to be wrong. Note that in the Derveni text ἐξευρήσουσι Δίκης ἐπικούροι turns out to be a dactylic *clausula*, cf. the remarkable dactylic *clausulae* in B 5/86 M. and, most probably, B 100/64 M.

"measures" (B 30/51 M.) and the structure of the Cosmic Cycle. "Όρους is apparently a more suitable word for certain "boundary-marks", "turning-points" or "terms" (μέτρα does not imply a necessary connotation of "point"). These "turning-points" can only be τροπαί ἡλίου which the Sun never "exceeds" in his year course thus ensuring the alternation of seasons.¹¹ Day and Night also have their "turning-posts" (τέρματα, syn. οὔρος = ὅρος), i.e. the equinoxes, and so everything in the world oscillates between a fixed *maximum* and *minimum*. I think that the Derveni fragment (when added to the existing evidence) makes untenable the artificial interpretation of μέτρα in B 30/51 M. as "*quanta*" of fire and brings fresh support to Kahn's reconsideration of the problem.¹² Μέτρα ... μέτρα certainly refers to the temporal regularity and periodicity of the fire's "kindling" and "quenching".¹³

The initial words [ἄρχει] ἥλι[ος κόσμ]ου κατὰ φύσιν are not attested elsewhere in a *verbatim* quotation (hence their special value), but there is abundant evidence on the Sun as divine Ruler of the Cosmos in the Heraclitean tradition.¹⁴ The main relevant text which preserves something of Heraclitus' original wording is found in Plut. Quaes.Plato., 1007 DE (cf. fr.B 100 DK = 64 M.) ὧν (sc. περιόδων) ὁ ἥλιος ἐπιστάτης ὧν καὶ σκοπὸς ὀρίζειν καὶ βραβεύειν ... ὥρας αἱ πάντα φέρουσι καθ' Ἡράκλειτον ... τῷ ἡγεμόνι καὶ πρώτῳ θεῷ γίνεται συνεργός. Here the Sun appears as a chief and game-steward who regulates the recurrent cycles of the seasons (as if they were running on a stadium).¹⁵ King and Arbiter are similar, but not identical metaphors. Given that the supplement ἄρχει is correct and that Heraclitus constructed many metaphorical models of the Cosmos, it is better to separate the Derveni fragment from the Stadium image.¹⁶ The original text of the Sun

¹¹ So rightly Ch.Kahn, *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus*, Camb., 1979, p.159-161 (though he still relies on Plutarchus' μέτρα). *Contra* Edd., p. 132. The Derveni author does not reduce ὅρους to the size of the Sun only, for he says τοιοῦτον καὶ τοσοῦτον col.XXII,11. Τοιοῦτον means "of such heat" (which varies with the seasons) or "of such nature and function", i.e. observing the τροπαί, regulating the seasons etc, and thus testifying to the divine Providence. Cf. Diog.Apoll. B 3 DK.

¹² Kahn, *Art and Thought*, 134 sq., 147 sq.

¹³ The "quantitative" or "meteorological" (and I would add: the materialistic) interpretation of ἀπτόμενον μέτρα ἀποσβεννύμενον μέτρα which has dominated the exegesis of Heraclitus in this century, was first proposed by J.Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, L., 1920 (1st ed. 1892), p. 134, n.4 who took μέτρα as "internal accusative" ("with its measures kindling ... ") claiming (in his denial of *ekpyrosis*, *ibid.* 161) that μέτρα in B 30/51 M. and B. 94/52 M. "must be the same thing". But the Derveni text eliminates μέτρα from the Sun fragment altogether (it would be sheer fancy to interpret ὅρους as "portions" of fire!), while μέτρα ... μέτρα in B 30 apparently has adverbial force and is an archaic expression for κατὰ περιόδους (so rightly understood by all ancient readers). *Contra* Kirk, 317; Marcovich, 193.

¹⁴ Plat., *Crat.* 413 b 4-5 τὸν ἥλιον ... ἐπιτροπεύειν τὰ ὄντα (etymology of δίκαιον, cf. Δίκη of our fragment); Hippocr., *De victu* I,10 (DK I,185,21-22) ἰσχυρότατον πῦρ πάντων κρατεῖ διέπον ἕκαστα κατὰ φύσιν κτλ.; Scythinus of Teos, 22 C 3,1 DK Apollo the Sun ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος συλλαβών; Ps.-Heraclit., *Epist.* V, p.323,8-10 Τάραν οἶδα κόσμον φύσιν ... μιμήσομαι θεόν, ὃς κόσμον ἀμετρίας ἐπανισοῖ ἡλίῳ ἐπιτάττων; cf. *ibid.* IV, p.316,49 ἔργα ἡλίου = θεοῦ μαρτυρία and IX, p.352,57-63 (γῆ) οὐρανῷ συνάρχει ... ἡλίου φῶς ...; Macrobius, *Somn.Scip.* I,20,3 hunc ducem et principem (sc. solem) quem Heraclitus etc.

¹⁵ See my article "The Cosmos as a Stadium. Agonistic metaphors in Heraclitus' Cosmology", in *Phronesis* 1985 Nr.2, p. 136 sq. The Derveni fragment confirms this reconstruction in general and corrects it in details.

¹⁶ It is possible, however, that Plutarch conflates in B 100 political and agonistic metaphors. Ἐπιστάτης can mean both ἄρχων and ἀγωνοθέτης. If the first be true, then ἐπιστάτης ὀρίζει, but σκοπὸς

fragment discovered in PDerv makes apparent the Heraclitean origin of the brilliant passage on Sun the President, Divine Law and Cosmopolis in Plutarch's *De exilio* 601 AB anticipating the quotation of B 94/52 M. in 604 A (note the Heraclitizing *asyndeton*): οὔτοι τῆς πατρίδος ἡμῶν ὄροι [εἰσί] (sc. αἰθὴρ καὶ γῆ), καὶ οὐδεὶς οὔτε φυγὰς ἐν τούτοις οὔτε ξένος οὔτε ἀλλοδαπός, ὅπου τὸ αὐτὸ πῦρ ὕδωρ ἀήρ, ἄρχοντες οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ διοικηταὶ καὶ πρυτάνεις ἥλιος σελήνη φωσφόρος· οἱ αὐτοὶ νόμοι πᾶσι, ὑφ' ἐνὸς προστάγματος καὶ μιᾶς ἡγεμονίας τροπαὶ βόρειοι τροπαὶ νότιοι ἰσημερίαί Πλειὰς Ἄρκτου ὦραι σπόρων ὦραι φυτειῶν· εἷς δὲ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἄρχων. The παλαιὸς λόγος of Plato, Legg.715e quoted by Plutarchus immediately afterwards is usually thought to be Orphic (see Diels-Kranz, Orpheus B 6 and Kern, Orph.fr.21). But except the ἀρχή - μέση - τελευτή formula (cf. PDerv, col.XIV,12; Orph.fr.21a,2; 168,2) there is nothing "Orphic" in it. Κατὰ φύσιν and θεῖος νόμος are Heraclitean, not Orphic phrases. The "revolving god" (θεὸς ... περιπορευόμενος) can only refer to the Sun, but in the Rhapsodies fr. 158, 160 K. Dike accompanies Zeus, not the Sun. The divine Sun who governs the world κατὰ φύσιν and is accompanied by Dike looks as a paraphrase of the Derveni fragment of Heraclitus.

The alleged physical opinion "on the size of the Sun", when considered in its original context, turns out to be a part of a rhetorical antithesis. Πούς is the *smallest measure* of length (in measuring distances). Κόσμος, on the contrary, is *the largest* thing we can imagine. It is a typically Heraclitean paradox: the smallest governs the largest (and so in man: the tiny sparkle of the mind controls the body, cf. 22 A 15 DK). The addition of ἀνθρωπείου makes the paradox even more striking: the supreme *god* is one *man's* foot in length. Why so? Apparently because πῦρ is τὸ τιμιώτατον. The Sun is εἷς ἄριστος in the cosmos, whereas the other elements (the huge masses of air, sea and earth) are πολλοί and κακοί. One the best must ἄρχειν, the worthless "many" must ἄρχεσθαι. This aristocratic dogma pervades Heraclitus' "cosmology" and gives new support to Diodotus' report that Heraclitus' book is not περὶ φύσεως but περὶ πολιτείας, τὰ δὲ περὶ φύσεως ἐν παραδείγματι εἶδει κεῖσθαι (ap. DL IX 15). It should be added only that πολιτεία means the Ideal State based on religious and metaphysical principles. Heraclitus' view of the Sun has nothing to do with natural science; it is rather comparable with the Sun metaphor of Plato's *Politeia* (the humorous remark about Ἡρακλείτεος ἥλιος in Resp.498 b seems to be a masked recognition of Plato's debt). The Derveni fragment is a parable about the Ideal Ruler: the divine βασιλεύς rules the City of "gods and men" according to the ξυνός and θεῖος νόμος described in B 114/23 M. The political order manifested by Nature is

βραβεύει. And ἀναδεικνύουσι is comparable with ἔδειξε (sc. βασιλεύς) in B 53/29 M. Cf. the anonymous saying (?) οὐκ ἄρχομεν οὐδὲ βουλευόμεν οὐδ' ἀγωνοθετοῦμεν in *De exilio* 604 B after Heraclitus' B 94/52 M. It is the Sun who ἄρχει and ἀγωνοθετεῖ in the Cosmopolis, but even he is not absolutely free.

βασιλεία; hence kingship is κατὰ φύσιν, and democracy (the rule of the "many") is a perversion of the Natural Law.¹⁷

Textual notes to lines 1-11

Line 1. [τ]οῦ ἐ[αυτοῦ] scil. πατρός. E.g. οἱ δὲ τὸ ῥῆμα οὐ γινώσκοντες νομίζουσι παρὰ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ πατρὸς λαμμάνειν. The author probably reinterprets πατρὸς ἐοῦ (col.V,4; X,1) "his own father" as "good father", see the reinterpretation of μητρὸς ἐὰς in col.XXIII,2 and cf. col.VI,2-4.

Line 2. Alternatively, read ὁ κείμ[ενον] μεταθ[έμενος] ὄνομα ἴδιον ἀπ[ο]δοῦναι (sc. βούλεται vel sim.) with μεταθέμενος sc. Ὀρφεύς, κείμενον ὄνομα = κοινόν 1.5 and ἀποδοῦναι "to assign" (a name to something), i.e. Orpheus changed the commonly accepted word ἥλιος to the peculiar δαίμων. In this case read in line 1 [ταῦτα λέγ]ων or [διὰ τούτων τῶν ἐπ]ῶν and take τείνεται as Med.

Line 3. The suggestion of Edd. (p.128) μᾶλλον τείνεσθαι = ὄρους ὑπερβάλλειν is unlikely, since τείνεσθαι never means ἀυξάνειν. For τείνω εἶς or πρὸς τι "to intend, to refer" etc. (of λόγος etc.) see LSJ, s.v. τείνω A 1 4; B III 2. So also in Passive: Eur., Rh.875. Plato employs the term in "Cratylus" where he parodies hermenteutic and etymological methods similar to those of the Derveni author: 439 c 1 ὀνόματα ἐς ταῦτον τείνοντα. 402 c 3 πρὸς τὰ τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου τείνει (in a comparison between Orpheus and Heraditus!).

Line 4 οὐκ <ἄν> εἶ[η]: ἄν with opt. is omitted also in col.XXII,8. Edd. read εἶ[α] "did not allow", but the subjects they propose are unlikely. I do not write λαμμάνε(ι)ν in view of κρούεν XII,1.

[π]αρ' οὗ τ[έτυκται] κτλ.: I modify the proposal of Edd. ἄρ' οὐ τ[έτυκται] διὰ τό]νδε, since ὅδε in Prose can hardly refer to a before-mentioned person; besides, such questions are alien to the author's style. Cf. πάντα τέτυκται quoted in col.XIV,2 and τάδε πάντα in the same "Hymn to Zeus", Orph.fr. 168,7.10. On the expression "all this" as an early idiom for "the Universe" see the illuminating remarks of M.L.West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*, Oxf., 1971, p.196. To fill the space more exactly read 1.4-5 [π]αρ' οὗ τ[ῶν ἀπάντων τῶ]νδε κόσμος κατε[στάθη], cf. in cosmogonical context col.VI,6; XIV (ter); XXII,9; κατασυνεστάθη XVIII,3. Heracl. B 30/51 M.

Line 5. μα[ρτυρόμενος] proposed by Edd., p.130 might speak in favour of the epistemological interpretation of κοινά/ἴδια suggested by Heracl. B 2; B 114 (23 M.), since Heraclitus' evaluation of κοινά in this case must be positive (e.g. μα[ρτυρόμενος] τὰ κοινὰ κατ[αρρίπτει] τὰ ἴδια ὡσπερ ἴκε[λα ξυνῶι] λόγῳ λέγων), but the crucial α is illegible (cf. Edd., p.127) and other instances of κοινά in PDerv confirm the rhetorical

¹⁷ It is important to note that both Plutarchus in *De exilio* and the author of the IX Letter (p.350, 18 sq. Ταράν τοῦτο γὰρ κοινὸν πάντων ἐστὶ χωρίον ἐν ᾧ νόμος ἐστὶν οὐ γράμμα ἀλλὰ θεός κτλ.) independently connect B 94/52 M. with the theme of Cosmopolis.

interpretation. For μετατίθημι ὄνομα "to change the use of words" etc. see LSJ, q.v.II 4 and cf. note to 1.2.

Line 6. κατ[αστέλλ]ει is suggested by "Fragm.A.", 1.13 (now separated from col.I) κατ]αστείλας in a similar context (cf.1.14): "to cloth" seems to mean the same as to speak παρὰ τὰ κοινὰ ῥήματα. Edd., p.130 try καταγγέλλει, -κρύπτει (which would require ἰδίως), -χωρίζει.

ὡσπερ scripsi, ὡσπερ Pap., Edd.

ἄρχει: if the verb is too long, read ἄναξ, cf. Heracl. B 93/14 M. (Plutarchus compares ἄναξ with ἥλιος; Apollo is identified with the Sun also in 22 C 3,1 DK). Less probable substantives would be οὐρος or σκοπός (B 100/64 M.), cf. Orph.fr.96 καὶ φύλακ' αὐτὸν (sc. ἥλιον) ἔτευξε κέλευσέ τε πᾶσι ἀνάσσειν.

Line 7. κόσ]μου is confirmed by DL IX 7 εἶρηκε ... περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ... ὅτι τε ὁ ἥλιός ἐστι τὸ μέγεθος etc. and Epist.V, 8-10 cited in n.14. Less probably χρο]ίου (cf. B 100/64 M.) or δρο]ίου (of the Sun's "orbit").

κατὰ φύσιν: note the typically Heraclitean syntactical ambiguity: ἄρχει κατὰ φύσιν or κατὰ φύσιν ἐὼν ? There is even a third possibility: κόσμου κατὰ φύσιν, i.e. "as compared with the constitution of the cosmos" (Fränkel's "Proportion"), cf. Phronesis 1985 Nr.2, p. 149. The reading οὐ κατὰ φύσιν (Edd., p. 131) is out of question: first, because it is *contra usum dicendi* (which requires παρὰ φύσιν); second, because it contradicts the *consensus* of ancient tradition which ascribes to Heraclitus the acceptance, and *not the denial* of the ἥλιος ποδιαίως.

[ἐὼν καὶ]: if this (most obvious) supplement is too long, omit καὶ; *participia asyndeta* are not unparalleled in Heraclitus: B 52/93 M., B 58/46 M. etc.; Epist. Heraclit. VI,33 Tarán (of the cosmic God who puts the Universe in order by means of the Sun, cf. ib.V.,11) πλάττων ἀρμολζόμενος διαλύων πηγνὺς χέων.

Line 8. τοῦ[ς ὄρους] οὐχ ὑπερβάλλων: I hesitate between this supplement of Edd.,p.132 and τὸν [δρο]μον] οὐχ ὑπερβάλλων "not going beyond its course" (i.e. fixed orbit), since one might rather expect Ionic οὔρους (attested in B 120/62 M.) which, as Edd. note, is too long; ὑπερβάλλω occurs in agonistic contexts (Soph.El.,716) and its combination with δρόμος would be quite natural. Plutarchus' ὑπερβήσεται (-σεθαι) on the one hand, and PDerv XXI,5-6 (ὑπερβάληι) on the other, do not prove that the Derveni author substitutes his own word for Heraclitus' ὑπερβαίνειν, since Plutarchus both times quotes from memory, while the preference for ὑπερβάλλω in two Ionic writers is only natural. That ἥλιος ὑπερβάλλοντι is a good Ionic phrase is proved by Herod.IV,184,6 explained as "nimis urenti" by H.Stein (ad loc.) and "rise high" by J.E.Powell, Lex.Herod., q.v.I,3. The two interpretations do not exclude one another, since the more the Sun "rises high", the more is its heat. The only possibility to retain Plutarchus' μέτρα is to read τὸ μ[έτριον], cf. Democrit. B 233 DK εἴ τις ὑπερβάλλοι τὸ μέτριον. Another possibility, τὸ μ[έγεθος] would be favoured by the doxographic tradition.

και]ροὺς ἐ[νιαυτοῦ (or ἐ[τείους DK 1,142,5): cf. Plut.,Def.or.416 A; B 100/64 M.; ὑπ. καιρόν Democr.B 235. Edd., p.132 propose [ό]ρους and ἐ[αυτοῦ] or ε[ίμαρμένης] (I would prefer οὔρους and ἐωτοῦ or εἴμαρμένους; other suggestions of Edd., ibid. [ό]ρους ε[ύ]ρους or [εὔ]ρους ἐ[οικότος] etc. are highly artificial). Since Heraclitus is an extremely exquisite writer and we cannot expect from him a rather monotonous repetition of ὄρους ὑπερβ.. it is better to read εἰ γὰρ τι οὔ]ρους ε[ίμαρμένους] in the case if any other reading than τοῦ[ς ὄρους] is preferred at beginning of l.8. Οὔροι εἴμαρμένοι "predestinated terms" would certainly refer to the summer and winter τροπαί and the sense would be almost the same as with καιροὶ ἐνιαυτοῦ. Cf. 22 B 137 DK and the connection between the extreme points of the Sun's year cycle and the πεπρωμένη μοῖρα in De victu I,5 (DK I,182,15; 183,7). To violate what is εἴμαρμένον by the gods is a kind of crime which is likely to be punished by Erinyes.

Line 10. [ὑπερ]βατόμ: in col.V,6 ὑπερβατά is adjective; the substantive τὸ ὑπερβατόν is not attested before the first century B.C. That is why I supply λόγον. Ὑπερβατόμ καὶ ἀσαφῆ (or, e.g. αἰνιγματώδη) refers to the syntactical and lexical obscurity respectively.

Line 11. E.g. [Ἐρινύες γὰρ ποιναὶ (εἰσι) καὶ πόπαν]α θύου[σι αὐταῖς πολυάριθμα ὅτι καὶ τὰ ἀμαρτήματα πολλά ἐστι] vel sim. (perhaps, starting from the end of l.10). Cf. Epist.Ps.-Heraclit.,IX,21 Τάραν πολλὰ Δίκης Ἐρινύες ἀμαρτημάτων φύλακες.