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The first column of the Orphic/Dionysiac papyrus from Gurôb was published by J. G. Smyly in 1921, and both columns subsequently appeared in Kern’s Orphicorum Fragmenta (fr. 31). I have recently had the opportunity of examining the papyrus in Trinity College, Dublin, and should like to thank the Board of Trinity College Dublin for permission to publish this new edition.

The papyrus (17 x 13 cm.) consists of two columns, though only the line-ends of the first, and the line-beginnings of the second, are extant. There is a lower margin of 1.5 cm., but no top margin. The intercolumnium varies from a maximum 5.5 cm. to a minimum 0.8 cm., and the length of individual lines varies accordingly. Col. i 6, 8, 11 are notably short, but this is not confined to the hexameters: cf. i 13, 15, 17 (where it may have the force of punctuation), 24, 27, 30. The script is a rather messy book-hand, roughly bilinear, though some letters, notably υ, ι, ρ, φ, β, hang below the line. Omicron is generally smaller than the other letters, and hangs from the upper line; sigma is lunate. Mu is made in three movements, and is slightly rounded, as are several other letters, e.g. α, π, ε. Phi is made by a descender with a single cross-bar. Occasional finials are found on some letters, but not with any great regularity. I first read a trema over iota at i 22, though the traces may belong to the letters in the preceding line, and there are no other lectional signs; a trema would not in any case be expected in an early papyrus text. The use of scriptio plena is irregular. A rough comparison might be made with the late third century papyrus of Menander’s Sicyonius, P. Sorbonne Inv. 2272b (E. G. Turner & P. J. Parsons, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World, London, 1987, no. 40), where, however, φ is formed by a descendant and a circle, and there is greater regularity in the script. Eta is in each case rather different, that in P. Gurôb being again slightly more cursive. There can be little objection to Smyly’s proposed dating of the papyrus to the third (probably mid-third) century B.C.

The papyrus is a curious mixture of invocations and prayers and what appear to be instructions for a ritual based around the death (and rebirth?) of the infant Dionysus, which had important ritual and initiatory significance (see West, 143ff.). The prayers are most probably hexametrical, though there is no attempt to make line-length coincide with the end of a hexameter; this may be contrasted with the practice of the Derveni papyrus, which appears to be a much more formal text. The length of individual lines can only remain open to conjecture, though line-lengths in early papyri are often roughly the width of a hexameter. The prose sections probably contain not only instructions for actions to be performed during a ritual (cf. the third person imperatives at i 14–5, and probably at i 2), but also prose statements to be said by the initiate (e.g. [o]ίν[ο]ν ἐπον ὃνος, which may be compared with e.g. ἕρως ἐς γάλες ἐπειν in the gold leaves [A1–3]) or the hierophant.

Burkert and others see the papyrus as a hieros logos, and call attention to the so-called ‘Edict of Ptolemy’ (Philopator IV?), which commanded the collection of exemplars of the hieroi logoi of the

---

1 I am grateful to the following for their assistance with this paper: Dirk Obbink, who provided early advice and a copy of his unpublished paper ‘Poetry and Performance in the Orphic Gold Leaves’; Martin West for copies of his own supplements and notes, and for perspicacious comments on the whole; Richard Janko, Sandy Hardie, Ian Repath, Brian McGing, and especially Alberto Bernabé, who kindly read the paper in draft form, and provided detailed corrections, suggestions and further references.

Dionysiac mysteries, although the precise purpose of this is unclear.² We know that a *hieros logos* was recited at the Samothracian mysteries (Hdt. 2.51), and another at the mysteries of Demeter on Pheneos (Paus. 8.15.4; cf. 8.15.2). We should also note the allegedly ancient scroll containing the *teletē* for the mysteries of Andania which was dug up when the mysteries were re-established in the time of Epaminondas (Paus. 4.26.7, 27.5; F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris, 1969, no. 65.12). Finally, of some relevance is Steph. Byz. s.v. "Λύρη, where the Mysteries at Agrai are described as μίμημα τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον. That the papyrus contains such a *hieros logos* is certainly likely, but that we may have here to do with a text belonging to a lower social and literary level is suggested by the somewhat messy script, occasional errors and perhaps by the irregular line-lengths.

Plato (*Rp*. 2.364e) refers to mendicant seers who provide initiation or purification which purports to be effective for both the living and the dead, and who produce a ‘hubbub of books’ by Orpheus and Musaeus according to which they perform their rites. Theophrastus (*Char*. 16.12) mentions the Ὄρφεοτελεσταί visited once a month for purification by the superstitious man with his wife and children, and the author of the Derveni papyrus criticizes those who expect knowledge through initiation, apparently at the hands of similar wandering hierophants (col. XX). These itinerant priests who are unable to give an account of the rites which they perform are no doubt to be contrasted with those mentioned at Pl. *Meno* 81a: οἱ μὲν λέγοντες εἰς τῶν ἱερεῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἱερεών ὅσος μεμέλεικεν περὶ ὧν μεταχειρίζονται λόγον ὧν τε εἰναι διδόναι. The Derveni author also distinguishes between formal mysteries associated with a city, presumably such as those at Eleusis or Samothrace, and informal ones associated with these wandering priests who receive money for their services. Both forms of initiation are unsatisfactory according to the commentator, but the latter particularly so, because the initiands do not seek further illumination; by implication, the hierophant is probably unable to provide it. Which priests Plato refers to in the *Meno* is unclear, but the distinction between these and the seers in the *Republic* seems roughly comparable to the distinction made in the Derveni papyrus. It might be suspected that the itinerant Ὄρφεοτελεσταί incorporated as many elements from established cults as they could into their own rites, and that these would therefore be highly syncretistic. Furthermore, the copies of the *teleta* carried by such priests, in contrast to the rites of established mystery cults, whose *teleta* were presumably written out in a highly formal style, may have been particularly subject to erroneous or unusual orthography. Both features are found in the Gurôb papyrus. A contrast may be made with the gold leaves, which rely on verbal exchanges which no doubt reflect things said during the mysteries,³ but are not themselves ritual texts. We can also compare the language of the *leges sacrae*, which shows some resemblance to elements in the papyrus.⁴

The papyrus appears to begin with an injunction to collect raw pieces of meat, which suggests that the sacrifice has already taken place. The sacrifice is no doubt referred to in the following prayer (*κριῶ* τε τρόχος τε) to Brimo, Demeter, Rhea and perhaps the Kouretes. We may make some attempt to reconstruct the hexameters as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{δόρον δέξιστε} \text{ ἐμὸν ποινὰς πατεῖρων ἀθεμίστων.} \\
& \text{σώσισον με Βριμοὶ μεγάλη} \\
& \text{Δήμιυτέρ τε Ἔρέα} \\
& \text{Κουρητές τ(ε) ἔνοπλοι [ κικλάσκ(ε)ομεν[^{5}]}
\end{align*}
\]


⁵ *Or καλάμεν;*
The ram may seem unusual for Dionysus, but we may now compare the formula κρίσαι εἰς γάλα εἵπεσες in the gold leaves from Pelinna and elsewhere. The Kouretes traditionally appear as the guardians of Zeus, Dionysus and Zagreus, and towards the end of the column we find a reference to the toys used by the Titans to lure the infant Dionysus away from the protection of the Kouretes. Brimo seems to come from the Eleusinian mysteries; cf. PMG carm. pop. 862 (= Hippolyt. Haer. 5.8.40) ἕρων ἔτεκε πότνια κούρον, Βριμώ Βριμών (the sacred cry at the Eleusinian mysteries) and Richardson on H. Dem. pp. 26ff. She again appears in a Dionysiac context on a recently discovered gold leaf (mid-fourth century) from Phereai: Σύμβολον Ἄνδρικεπαίδθυρσον - Ἀνδρίκεπαίδθυρσον - Βριμώ - Βριμώ. Εἴστι(ΐ) ἕρων λειμώνιν ἀπόνοις γὰρ ὁ μύστης, ταπεινον 7 (see also below on i 22);8 and Theodoret. Graec. affect. cur. 1.22 (109.4 Canivet) links her with Rhea and Cybele: τά τῆς Ἡρεάς ἡ τῆς Κυβέλης ἡ τῆς Βριμώις . . . ταύτης τάς ἄφοτας καὶ τά ἐν αὐταῖς τελουμένα ἀπὸ Φρυγίας εἰς τήν Ἑλλάδα μετεκόμιαν Ἔλληνες. Rhea and Demeter are identified at least as early as the fifth century (Philodemus, de piet. p. 23 Gomperz),9 and for the two names in apposition, we might compare P. Derv. XXII.12 Δημήτηρ [Ὑπερθ]ησά[ς] Ἐστία Δημώ, cited as appearing ἐν τοῖς ὑμνοῖς (i.e. not in the Orphic theogony with which the commentator is primarily concerned). At Ar. Ra. 384ff. Demeter appears as a goddess connected with salvation, specifically in the context of Eleusinian ὅργαι.10

The goat is mentioned again in the following prose passage, where its flesh seems to be divided between edible and non-edible parts (τὸ δὲ λοιπὰ κρέας ἐσθεῖτο), and someone, perhaps the uninitiated (see note), is commanded not to look on. The evidence for ritual omophagy is generally weak,11 but it would seem overly cautious not to accept that food, presumably cooked, was consumed at this point. A second hexametrical prayer follows, addressed to Eubouleus and in the second instance to Eubouleus (probably) and Irikep(a)ios, obviously a variant form for Erikepais (see the commentary):

\[ \text{ṇα ἐν \\ ἔλεος καὶ} Εὐβουλ(ή)ια καλοῦ[μεν]\\ \] . . . εὐρήμας κυκλήσω[μεν]\\ . . . τε φίλους· σὺ ἀπαχόνας [οοο— — Δήμητρος καὶ Παλλάδος ἣμιν\\ Εὐβου]λε[ὐ] Ιρικεπάγη\\ σῶσόν με [᾽Αστεροπη[τά.\\ \]

The presence of Pallas is perhaps surprising, though Athena appears as the mother of the Kouretes/Korybantes, and wife of Helios, at Praisos in eastern Crete (Strabo 10.3.19), and also manages to preserve Dionysus’s heart after his dismemberment (Orph. fr. 35, 210, 214), Demeter requires less explanation, since she has already appeared in the first prayer in association with Rhea. Eubouleus is the same as Dionysus in the Orphic Hymns, where he is also assimilated to other gods (e.g. Adonis, Pluto), and is earlier a chthonic god, associated with Demeter, Kore etc. and of some importance at Eleusis.

---

6 The supplements, here and in the second prayer printed below, and the arrangement of the hexameters, are largely West’s; see the commentary for a further discussion.


10 For the connection between Orpheus, Dionysus and Eleusis, at least as early as the fifth century, see in general F. Graf, Eleusis and die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit, Berlin & New York, 1974.

11 See e.g. A. Henrichs, HSCP 82, 1978, 149–52.
The final prose section begins with the statement ‘one Dionysus’ (εἷς Διόνυσος); Orph. fr. 239b (from a Hellenistic Hymn to Helios) has εἷς Ζεός, εἷς Ῥάκως, εἷς Ῥάκως, εἷς Διόνυσος (for which Kern lists further parallels), but it is difficult to insert the phrase into the hexameters here.12 The following phrase, θύει διὰ κόλπου, refers to ‘the practice . . . of letting a golden snake – earlier, presumably, a live one – slip through the initiand’s clothing next to the skin, and then pulling it back again’ (West, 96f.), which was a symbolon of the mysteries of Sabazius according to Clem. Protr. II.16: Σαβαζίων γονῶν μυστηρίων σύμβολον τοιού μισομένου θύει διὰ κόλπου θεός θράκων δε έστιν οὕτως, διελκόμενος τοῦ κόλπου τῶν τελευμένων, ἔλεγχος ἂκρασίας Δίως. Kern compares δεσποίνισσας δὲ ύπο κόλπον ἔδων χθονίας βασιλείας from the lamellae from Thurii (A1 – 3), though Festugière rightly notes that ‘ὑπό π’ν’ ἐριφαίνεις πάντα κινήματα’. The phrase was perhaps uttered while the action was performed.13

Ritual consumption of liquid, perhaps wine, follows, with the statement ‘as an ass I drank [ ]’ (see the commentary for the supplement and interpretation). Statements of this sort belong to the symbola of other mysteries. The Eleusinian σύνθημα may be cited: ἐνήστευσα, ἐπίον τον κυκεόνα, ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, ἐργασάμενος ἄπεθεμνα εἰς κόλπον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστην (Clem. Alex. Protr. II.21), and that associated with the worship of Deo at Protr. II.15: ἐκ τυμπάνου ἐφασον, ἐκ κυμβάλου ἐπίον, ἐκυρνοφόρησα, ὑπὸ τὸν παστὸν ὑπέδων,14 both of which describe a series of ritual actions. It is doubtful whether the phrase δίψα αὐτὸς ἐγὼ in the gold leaves from Eleutherna in Crete, and its variants in those from Hipponium, Petelia and Pharsalus, is comparable. The ritual phrase from the lamellae ἔριμος ἐς γάλα ἐπέτων (ἐς) is also frequently cited in this context, and we may now add ταῦρος εἰς γάλα ἔθορες· κρίως εἰς γάλα ἐπέσεις in the Thessalian gold leaves;15 but although the bull, ram and kid are typical ritual animals connected with Dionysus, the ass initially seems to fit uncomfortably in this context. Kern compares Ar. Ra. 159 ὄνος ἄγω μυστηρία, though Dover (ad loc.) takes this simply to refer to Xanthias’s rôle as a ‘beast of burden’. Tierney (p. 85) suggests that the phrase may mean either ‘I am an ass (mystes) celebrating the mysteries’, or ‘I am an ass (animal) bearing the sacra so that the mysteries might be celebrated’, and sees the ambiguity as the basis for the joke.16 The Dionysiac fresco at Portus shows the sacra being carried by an ass, both clearly labelled.17 We find βουκόλος as a term for an Orphic priest in the Orphic Hymns (1.10; 31.7), and βούτης, although only meaning ‘shepherd’ in the Hymns (11.8) may have had a similar force in other contexts. In the parodos of the Cretan priests at E. Cretans fr. 473.9–20 Kannicht, Wilamowitz conjectures βούτης (cf. Diels’s βούτης) for Porphyry’s βροντάς, where it appears to be used of a devotee of Zagreus (who is there associated with initiation, the Cretan Zeus, the Kouretes, the Mountain Mother and escape from rebirth).18 At E. Antiope fr. 203 Nauck βουκόλος again refers to a Dionysiac worshipper, and there is evidence for its use as a cult-title in later associations for members who took part in a form of mimetic dance.19

---

12 See also West, 253; Peterson, Εἷς θεός, Göttingen, 1926.
15 Tsantsanoglou & Parassoglou, Hellenika 38, 1987, 3–16
In the final lines something, possibly the ritual items associated with Dionysus, is placed in a basket. An inscription from Hellenistic Miletus has the slightly obscure injunction: “Whenever the priestess performs the rites of sacrifice (τὰ ιερά) on behalf of the whole city, nobody must ὀμοφάγητον ἐμβαλεῖν before the priestess has done so on behalf of the city”. This must mean something like ‘to throw in one piece of raw meat’, though Henrichs points out that there is no reason to suppose that the ὀμοφάγητον was consumed by the worshippers, and that ‘the alleged omophagy at Miletus was nothing but a peculiar form of Dionysiac sacrifice’. The Eleusinian symbolon quoted above refers to a similar ritual activity. That the tokens are listed in the nominative is attractively explained by Schütz, who supplements e.g. [τὰ σύμβολα, ἂ ἐστι τάδε’].

P. Gurôb 1: Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i</th>
<th>Col. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>στα ἐχον α ευρη</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ομοφάγητον λεγε</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δια τιν τελετην</td>
<td>α...[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α τεμον ποινασ κατε</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σωσιομ με βριμο με</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δημιου τε πεα</td>
<td>ματ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κουριαςεσ τε ενοπλοι</td>
<td>αρα, [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ομον</td>
<td>πουο[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γα ποιωμεν ιερα καλα</td>
<td>ουνεσ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η κριοσ τε τραγος τε</td>
<td>ραχος κι[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>απεριστα δωρα</td>
<td>ευχεσ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ου και επι ποταμου νομοι</td>
<td>νον π, [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ενων του τραγου</td>
<td>μη εχη[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τα δε λοι πα[[...]] κρεα εσθιετω</td>
<td>τι ημε[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ μη εφορατω</td>
<td>θεν του[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ηου αναθεις εις το ανηρ ε</td>
<td>τριχω, [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αλιων ευχη</td>
<td>βλεπο[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νον και ευβουλεα καλο</td>
<td>καπρ...[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευρησα κιλησκω</td>
<td>δοι λοι[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ητο φιλουσ συ απανανας</td>
<td>επ...[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ημητροσ και παλладος ημιν</td>
<td>δια...[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λευ ρικεπαιγε σωισιο με</td>
<td>θε εκ κα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η τα[ ] εις διωνυσους συμβολα</td>
<td>γευ...[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ωρα θεος δια κολπου</td>
<td>ζε...[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>την καλαθον βαλιν</td>
<td>πορει [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιωνος ρομβος αστραγαλοι</td>
<td>διουλ, [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η εσπεριος</td>
<td>t[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Thrace, 1876, 38 = Pleket, Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum, Leiden, 1958, 91 no. 4. Note also the hymn to Dionysus of the Elean women (PMG 871), possibly of considerable antiquity, which invokes him with the refrain ἕξιε ταξιον.  


21 A. Henrichs (n. 11).  

22 I have indicated the hexameters by putting them in bold type.
P. Gurôb 1: Notes

Column i.

1. We might have e.g. [ἔκαστα (Wilcken) and ἔχον ἀ εὐρη (West), ‘having what he finds’. The objects concerned are unknown and the precise context obscure. Kern writes εὐρη, comparing 19 εὐρής.

2. It is difficult not to read συνλέγε[τω] at the end of the line. [τη] ὀμά δὲ (West) at the beginning of the line is very plausible. The first trace after α is of a triangular letter, then there are slight traces of a curvd descender and a high cross-strike (i.e. ε).

3. Smyly read διοτοκίν τελετήν, and understood διοτοκίν as an infinitive (cf. the infinitive at i 28 ἐμβαλὼν for ὀτίν), comparing the formations διδιμοτοκέν, σκωλικοτοκέν. διὰ τὴν τελετήν is read by Diels (ap. Kern). The letter after the first iota is surprisingly small, and I at first read omicron, but it may simply be the upper half of an alpha. The eta of πατρίδος, see P. J. Parsons a, is attractive, though we find scriptio plena at e.g. i 7 and I cannot see any trace of the right descender of η. The vowel of the line is very plausible. The first trace after η is of a triangular letter, then there are faint traces of a curvd descender and a high cross-strike.

4. Smyly takes ἵματον as a verb, but although one might τέμενειν an oath or even a libation, I find no parallel for the verb with ποινας. West’s suggestion ὅσον δὲξεται ἐμὸν ‘accept ye my [offering]’, is attractive, though we find scriptio plena at e.g. i 7 and I cannot see any trace of the right descender of α. Smyly also has πατα (e.g. πατ-[(p)ο]; this division would be unusual, but erroneous divisions are attested for some texts, where they correspond to the low literary level of the writer: see P. J. Parsons and E. G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World2, London, 1987, 17 n. 96), but the ε is clearly, though faintly, preserved. Kern proposes πατε[λ][ρος], which he takes to refer to Κρόνος; West more plausibly suggests πατε[λ][ρος ὧν ἀθεμίστου], comparing Orph. fr. 232 ὅργα τ’ ἐκτελέσουσι λύσιν προγόνων ἀθεμίστων μαλάκων, Pl. Rp. 2.364a–365b (see above, p. 132); to these add Pi. fr. 133 S.–M. οὖσι δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποινάν παλαιῶν πένθεος δέξεται. P. Derveni VI.4–5 τὴν θυσίαν τοῦτού ἐνεκε[ν] π[ιο]οῦ[σ]ι[ν] ὡς περει ποινήν ἀποδιδόντες (K. Tsantsanoglou in Studies on the Derveni Papyrus, ed. A. Laks & G. W. Most, Oxford, 1997, 95; at VI.8–9 the mystai are said to perform sacrifices to the Eumenides in the same way). Two of the gold lamellae from Thurii have ποινάν δ’ ἄνταπετεια’ ἐργαν ἐνεκ’ οὕτι δικαιῶν (Α2–3.4), of a soul appearing before Persephone, and in the gold leaf from Pherae (quoted above, p. 133) the initiate is said to ποινας.

5. Hunt (ap. Smyly) plausibly proposes με[γάλη].

6. Smyly claims that Ρέα [τε] is an unlikely restoration, since the amount of space left in the inter-columnium suggests that a short word is unlikely to have been delayed until the next line. But this is not supported by the practice elsewhere in the papyrus where regular line-end is avoided. ‘Ρέα [τε] would be quite acceptable both metrically and in view of the preceding τε.

7. For the apparently traditional phrase here, cf. Pl. Lg. 7.796b, which refers to Κορηθῶν ἐνόπλια παγίνα, a Cretan choral dance performed in armour, Orph. H. 31.1 σκωλικατ Κορηθῆς, ἐνόπλια βήματα θέντες, Orph. Hymn. in Mus. 20 Κορηθῶς τ’ ἐνόπλους Κορήβαντας τ’ ἰδέ Καβεῖροις.

8. The traces are consistent with ίομεν (Smyly), but the papyrus at this point has been torn, and the lower section is covering the upper (as is also the case at i 28). Either καλ[ο]μεν or κιλλ[η]κομεν (both Janko) is possible, and we may compare the probable appearance of these forms at i 18, 19.

9. Smyly prints ἵνα, and suggests ἰνα (to account for the form of the verb), but there are faint traces before ν which clearly belong to a separate letter, possibly ι. ποιμεν here is unmetrical, a difficulty felt by West who read ξομεν, and prints καὶ πεξομεν. This provides good sense, and πεξομεν is an expected verb in such a context. But I do not think that anything other than ποιμεν (ποιμεν) can be read in the papyrus, and ποιεο is an equally acceptable verb here. It may simply be that the composer was not a particularly competent versifier; the hexameters in the Pelinna gold leaves (P1–2) also show several unmetrical elements.

cites Hsch. ὀργά ά τά ἱερά. οἱ δὲ τά μυστήρια and calls attention to the ambiguity of the word. Here, probably 'rites'.

10. '(κρῆ)νη litterarum vestigii vetatur; sed cf. 12 ποταµοῦ'; so Kern, whose meaning is unclear, since ν is quite legible in the papyrus. There are small traces of ink in the middle of the line, perhaps compatible with e.g. 1, ν, η etc. But [κρῆ]νη hardly seems expected in this context (though acceptable in an Orphic environment elsewhere: cf. the spring which appears in some of the gold lamellae, B1–2). Tierney suggests κολυνεία, translating 'a ram and a goat together'.

11. Tierney's Καβείρων] ἀπερίστα ἄγάρα, for which he compares Orph. Arg. 27 ἄγαλα ἄγάρα Καβείρων, has nothing to recommend it. For the combination in hexameters, cf. A. R. 1.419 ἀπερίστα ἄγάρα. Confusion between ει and ι is common in papyri in general, and is found again here at e.g. ι 28.

12. Tierney cites the tradition that the Kouretes guarded Zagreus by a river (the Hydaspes at Nonn. D. 24.43), and unjustifiably concludes that the sacrifice must have taken place out of doors. The gold leaf from Pherae (above, p. 133) has ἐπίστ(ι) ἵερον λειµάνα (of the initiate), and for the holy meadow in the afterlife cf. Pi. fr. 129 S.–M. φοινικορόδοις (δ’) ἐνι λειµόνεσσι, Ar. Ra. 449; a gold leaf from Thrui (A4) λειµάνας τα ἱερούς καὶ ἄλασα Φερσεφονείας; D. S. 1.96.5, probably depending on Hecataeus Abder. (FGrH 264 F 25) τάς δὲ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐν Ἀιθίῳ τιμορίᾳ καὶ τοὺς τῶν ἐνεβέβον λειµάνας, . . . παρεσασαγενεῖ μιμησάμενον τὰ γινόμενα περὶ τὰς ταφὰς τὰς κατ’ Αἰγύπτων . . . τοῦ δ’ ὶρφεως τοῦτο καταδείξαντος κτλ. Orph. fr. 222; Pl. Gorg. 524a, Rp. 616b; Plut. fr. 178 Sandbach τόποι καθαροὶ καὶ λειµάνες ἔδεξαντο; AP 7.189.3–4; Orph. H. 18.1–2. Some such reference may have been made here.

13. Smyly suggests [τάς ὀργεῖς λαμβάνων, comparing Michael Psellus Τίνω περὶ δαίμον. δωξάζ, ὶἘλλήνες 39 Boisson: τραγοσκελές μιµήσατο λόγον περὶ τοῖς διδύμοις, ὑπὲρ ὧς Ὀμής, δίκαιος ἀποτείννυ τῆς βίας τῇ Δήμητρι, τράγῳ ὀργεῖς ἀποτείμων, τοῦ κόλατοι ταύτης κατεῦθυν ὦσπρι δὴ καὶ εὐαυτό. We might also think of the removal of the heart (Tierney: τὴν καρδιὰν λαμβάνων; also favoured by Bernabé, who refers to Clem. Protr. II.15.1 Δήος δὲ μυστήρια καὶ Δίως πρὸς μπέτα Δήμητρα ἀφροδίσιοι συμπλοκαὶ καὶ μηνίς . . . τῆς Δηούς, ης δι’ χάριν Βριμό προσαγορευνθήμει λέγεται, ἱκτηρίας Δίως καὶ πόμα χολής καὶ καρδιουλκίας καὶ ἄρρητουργίας), as that part of the slain Dionysus preserved by Athena. However, various parts of the sacrificed animal might be omitted from the meal (cf. Clem. Strom. II.20.106 ἐνετεύθεν ῥήμαται καὶ τὸν εὐρόντα τῶς τελέτας οὐ μόνον τινὸς ζώον ἀπαγορεύειν ἀπέστεια, ἀλλ’ ἐστίν αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν καταθυμομένων ὑπεξείλετο τῆς χρήσεως μέρη δ’ αἰτίως ἄρ’ ἵσοισαν οἱ μύσται), and the reference need not be so precise.

14. σα is written above the deleted letters, which look like [κρ’, ι, perhaps [κρα]]. The lambda is clear, but οι less so. I at first read λετ[κρ’, ], but of course λετόπα would be nonsensical, and λετά here inexplicable. For the expression τὰ λοιπὰ κρέα, cf. Syll. II 736.96, 1044.40, and τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κρέα at 1025.23, 55 (also Ovid, Met. 12.154 sacræ tulere suam, pars est data cetera mensis). Diels (ap. Kern, corrigenda et addenda) proposed λεπισταχ’ ‘Stücke, denen die Extremitäten fehlen’, but this fails to account for the expunction and the clear epsilon in κρέα.

15. Smyly read [σ], and suggested e.g. [ό δὲ βεβηλοῖ] (cf. the phrase θύρας δ’ ἐπίθεθες βεβηλοῖ). There are traces of a curved down-stroke, compatible with σ, and before that a small letter apparently hanging from the upper line, which can only be ο. There are faint traces before that of an angled stroke on the bottom line. West has [μ], which I find difficult to justify from the papyrus. Hardly (νεό)μυστ[ς] (Tierney), though the traces of the second letter seem more compatible with σ than anything else.

16. My reading [ξου] is supported by Wilcken, while Smyly has [ξλου]. The chi is quite clear, though it is at a slightly odd angle which may have led Smyly to accept λλ. The chi at ii 11 is roughly comparable. Perhaps e.g. παντὸξου, or the name of the god or his worshipper, Βάξξου, ἴξοξου (in which case probably not to be connected with the following verb); Schütz has μόσξου.

The last word looks like ἀνηρε-, but ἀνηρε- or even ἀνηρε- might also be possible. The distinction between rho and iota is not always clear, since the bowl of rho can sometimes be written rather perfunctorily. Tierney, Diels and West all supplement [μενον], and it would be difficult to understand
ανηρε[μενον] as anything other than a medio-passive perfect participle from ἀνηρέω; but we would properly expect ἄνηρημένον, and although confusion between eta and epsilon is not inconceivable, even at this early date, Janko perhaps rightly prefers a form of the aorist passive, e.g. ανηρε[θεν], where short ε is regular.

The second εις may be the product of dittography, and I suspect that we should read φαντατιθείσος (εις) to ανηρε-; this provides 'dedicating the chosen' (sc. piece(s), presumably a reference to the parts removed at i 13).

17. Smyly believed ἐυχὴν to be a heading rather than a part of a sentence, and that ἅλλων was more probably the last word of the preceding sentence since the prayer is in the singular. West restores plural verbs (despite με at 22, but we should note ἥμιν at 21), and takes ἅλλων as a dependent genitive; so already Tierney (whose Γάλλων, however, is scarcely justifiable) and Schütz (μεγάλλων). Such headings are also a feature of the magical papyri, though there is no heading introducing the first prayer here at i 4.

18. Smyly tentatively restores Προστογόνον, who is invoked in the large lamella from Thurii (Orph. fr. 47) and who is identified with the sky in P. Derveni, while West has ἅγγινον with an unspecified name in the lacuna. The accusative of Eubouleus appears as -ης at Orph. H. 41.8, and needs to be restored so here for the metre, though καί needs to be scanned long before the vowel.

19. The first traces are compatible with τ or π, perhaps ι (there are faint remains of either a crossbar or finials); Bernabé suggests the attractive γαίας, already presupposed by West’s translation, ‘and let [us] call upon [the Queen] of the broad [Earth]’. Smyly reads εὐημος, a personification of the Bacchic cry, to be derived (inexplicably) from εὕμος; Wilcken and Hunt rightly prefer ευρημος.

20. The omicron in ιτις is surprisingly large, but it looks unlikely to be anything else. Initially I thought of θ. We might read η for ι, since only the right down-stroke is still visible. The crossbar of τ is very faint. ἀπαυάναις ‘blight’, of either the punishment of the Titans, or of uninitiated sinners? (so Tierney). Ar. Ra. 194 refers to ὁ Ἀδαϊνὸν λίθος as a place in the underworld, and the gold leaves (B) have δίψη δ’ εἴμ’ αὐτός καὶ ἀπόλλυμαι, which suggest that the verb was generally associated with the after-life.

21. Δήμητρος Smyly, no doubt rightly.

22. λευ Πικεσίγιε σωσίσος με Smyly. Wilcken read Ἰρικεπαίγε as a Hellenistic variant on Ἰρικεπαίος (so also Festugière), and Tierney claims the gamma represents an intervocalic spirant, which is plausible before the front vowel ε (but not in the nominative before ο). L. Threatte, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions, Berlin & New York, 1980, i.441, provides instances of γ as a glide between ι and a following front vowel (all in the name Ἰερον-, which appears elsewhere as Ἰερων-); for further instances in the Hellenistic and later papyri, see E. Maysler & F. Schmoll, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit Li², Berlin, 1970, 142, and F. T. Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, Milan, 1976, 72. The first traces lack the finials typical of π, and look more likely to be τ. Eripepaoi is a non-Greek name which seems to derive from an Asiatic Dionysus-cult, and which according to Malalas means ‘life-giver’ (Orph. fr. 65). West restores Ἰρικεπαίος, which Seaord on E. Ba. 1157 tentatively translates as ‘Man-and-boy-thyrsos’. But the coincidence of the element -κεσι- in all three words suggests that they should be connected. Both Ἰνδρικεπαίος- and Ἰρικεπαίος are probably mystic names based on Eripepaoi; perhaps each mystery cult had its own version, which it believed to be particularly efficacious and secret. We might supplement, e.g. Εὐβούλευς, who is identified with Eripepaoi at Orph. H. 6.4.

23. Wilcken read ητα, whence Diels’s conjecture Φάνητα, but Smyly prefers Ἰτα and supplements Λικνίτα, an epithet of Dionysus as god of the λίκνον (Orph. H. 46.1, 52.3). Only the upper half of a down-stroke survives, with space for the rest of η after it, and it does not ascend above the line as

---

23 Richard Janko calls my attention to the Hittite root pa(ı)- ‘give’.
usual for i. West convincingly suggests ἀστεροπήτης ‘hurler of lightning’, which appears as an epithet in the gold leaves from Thurii (A1–3) ἀλλὰ με μοιρ’ ἐδάμασσε καὶ ἀστεροπήτης κεραυνόι.

Smyly takes σύμβολα to be a heading, and Firmicus Maternus, de errore 18, tells us that symbola were the means of mutual recognition between initiates. They appear to have consisted of two parts, a signum and a responsum, and Smyly takes the Eleusinian symbolon to be a liturgical dialogue of this sort.

24. Certainly not ἠπρα (Smyly), since the traces of the cross-stroke meet the right descender in its centre, not at the top as expected for η.

25. Smyly writes ἴν ἐπιοῦν, and rightly notes that ψυχρὸν ὅν is against the traces. Only the lower halves of the descendants (straight and lacking finials) are preserved, and ἔφα is also possible. Both traces descend below the line, but this is also occasionally found for the first stroke of ν. I have thought of ὅν ὅν; cf. Kern’s supplement at ii 12. Wine is a possession of the initiate in the Orphic/Bacchic gold leaf from Pelinna: οἶνον ἔχεις εὐθύμων τιμήν ‘you have wine as your fortunate honour’, and some Thracian Dionysiac prophets drank wine in order to deliver their prophecies (Aristot. ap. Macr. Sat. 1.18.1; cf. Athen. 2.38a). Initiates were widely believed to celebrate a symposium in the afterlife (cf. e.g. F. Graf, Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit, Berlin & New York, 1974, 98–103).

The syntactical connection between ὅνος and βοῦκολος here is unclear. If we accept the view that the symbola were a type of liturgical dialogue, we might have two speakers here: A. ‘As an ass I drank [wine]’, B. ‘As a herdsman I ...’. Less plausible is to supplement βοῦκολος [τε] ‘an ass and a herdsman drank ... ’ Alternatively, only one speaker may be concerned; cf. the phrase ἔφυγον κακόν· εὖρον ἀμεινον. Smyly suggests ‘I drank as an ass, I became a herdsman’.

26. Ἰ[.] ο[[σ] Smyly. E.g. ὑργίς, followed by a stop, or perhaps ωμόφορος. West has ἔβας. The σύνθεμα is no doubt the following words, ἄνω κάτω, a pair of opposites reminiscent of the opposite pairs found on the bone tablets from Olbia (e.g. βίος : θάνατος : βίος – ἀλήθεια, εἰρήνη : πόλεμος – ἀλήθεια : ψεῦδος, σῶμα – ψυχή; see F. Tinnefeld, ZPE 38, 1980, 67–71, L. Zhmud, Hermes 120, 1992, 159–68; SEG 28.659–61), and cf. also perhaps Heracl. fr. 33 Margovich (22 B 60 DK) ὅδος ἄνω καὶ κάτω μία καὶ ὁμήτω.

27. Smyly wrongly has ἵ στιν σοι ἀνήλικος, Wilcken (correctly) ἴ καὶ ὅ σοι κατλ.; West reads ἀνήλικος. Presumably pieces of meat from the sacrifice (no doubt cooked; see above p. 135) were handed out by the hierophant, and were then ritually consumed by the initiates.

28. εἰς τόν κάλαθον ἐμβάλλειν Smyly, probably rightly, though the papyrus has been torn so that εμ is no longer clearly legible. Cf. perhaps ii 22 καὶ ἐκλαθοῦ (see n.).

29–30. κύονος is proposed, and ἀστράγαλοι read, (no doubt correctly) by Smyly. In addition to (pine-)cone, bull-roarer, knuckle-bones and mirror, the toys used by the Titans to lure the infant Dionysus away from the protection of the Kouretes included a ball, apples, puppets (with jointed limbs), wool/fleece and sometimes the narthex (Clem. Strom. 1134b–39b), 4.137–8; Et. Gen. s.v. ρόμβοι; Eustath. in Dion. Per. 1134; for its explicit use in Bacchic rites, cf. A. fr. 57.8f. Radt; E. Hel. 1362; AP 6.165.1; and for its use simply ἐν τοῖς τελεσαίς, Archyt. 47 B 1 DK; Epithian. Expos. fidei 10; Diog. trag. fr. 1.3 Snell; Nonn. D. 29.190. See Gow on Theocr. 2.30 and JHS 54, 1934, 1ff.

For the ritual use of the mirrors, cf. the inscription on a mirror from Olbia (Dubois, Inscriptions grecques dialectales d’Olbia du Pont, Geneva, 1996, 144ff. no. 92): Δημόνισσα Ἀπασία ἐν αὐτὶ καὶ Λήνα(ι)ς Δημόλκο εἰς; Io. Lyd. De mens. 4.51 (107.19 Wünsch) ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ δὲ τοῦ Διονύσῳ τὰ
mustæria § tele›to . . . ka‹ e‡soptron (sc. parelãmbanon) oflone‹ tÚn diaug∞ oÈranÒn, and see W. K. C. Guthrie, Orpheus and Greek Religion, London, 1935, 122ff.; I. M. Linforth, The Arts of Orpheus, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1941, 315; Seaford on E. Ba. 918–9, CQ 37, 1987, 76–8. In P. Soc. Ital. 850 (ii/iii s. A.D., transcr. G. Coppola; cf. U. Wilcken, APF 8, 1927, 270) we also find mirrors together with Orpheus, though the exact nature of the text is unclear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recto</th>
<th>Verso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κατασκευα[ ] ‘Or-]</td>
<td>]δ[ ραστι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φεώς αὐτώ(ί) [ κάτο]-</td>
<td>]ς γαϊς φι-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτρόν ύμ[</td>
<td>]θέσθαι τι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ δίσκος δια[</td>
<td>] . . . ρακίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοῦ δὲ κατόπτρου</td>
<td>]μος ἀρπα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διονύσσα(ι) αν . [</td>
<td>]γος ἰηθιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ... πο [.</td>
<td>]ζην . . ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]παρατ[</td>
<td>]κελευν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>μ[η χαναι[ ]ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]φόβου . [</td>
<td>]οπας π[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column ii

10. It is difficult not to read ράχος in preference to Wilcken’s ράκος, though the significance of either is unclear. Phot. Lex. s.v. ράχος has οἱ μυρίκτινα ράβδοι, and Kern and LSJ assume this to be the sense here, though for no good reason.

11. Kern’s text wrongly inserts a line, εὐχέσ[θω, after 11, though the corrigenda make clear that this is simply an error, and that εὐχέσ[θω is intended as an alternative supplement to εὐχέσ[θαι.


13. μὴ ἔχη Kern. ἔχει]τω Wilcken. ‘Post vs. 2 et 26 paragraphos very doubtful indicat Smyly’ (Kern). I cannot see these.

17. The irregularity of the right column edge is remarkable, despite Maas’s law that left-hand margins generally drift to the left, and Kern suggests that it may indicate the beginning of direct speech (hence βλέπω, perhaps βλέπω[μεν, as West restores the verbs in the prayers in col. i).

22. Kern prints θ . εἰκα, but there are traces after the first descendant which suggest kappa. Perhaps εκ κα[λεθου (cf. i 28), but I have also thought of e.g. (-θ' δ? [ευς]θ?)] ek κα[θαρων as in the formula in the gold lamellae from Thurii, ἔρχομαι ἐκ καθαρῶν καθαρά (A1–3).

23. γεύσασθαι Wilcken. Either in a ritual context (cf. i 25 επιον, ii 12), or of the Titans consuming Dionyus’s body?

25. E.g. πορτία vel sim.

26. Perhaps δίου (Δίου?) or a word ending -δίου (West); without a context one can only speculate. I have thought of some form of ὀύλος or ἱούλος, either ‘corn-sheaf’ (which we might connect with the Eleusinian mysteries) or the song in honour of Demeter; thus e.g. δι’ ὀυλον, δ’ ἱούλον (cf. PMG Carm. pop. 849 = Semus FGrH 396 F 23); or perhaps ὀύλος ‘destructive’ (even a compound in δι(α)· ‘thoroughly destructive’?) as an epithet of the Titans. The last line of column ii is roughly in line with the last one of column i.
P. Gurôb 1 (Pack 2464); J. Horderm, pp. 131–140