less'. Their continuing confusion is marked not only in the doubt of their $\delta v \sigma \mu \alpha \theta \hat{\eta} \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mu \omega \mathrm{s}$, but also in the way in which they apparently relate Cassandra's knowledge of Greek specifically and only to her speaking Greek (and yet their inability to understand her). They do not seem to realise the full implication of her previous remark; once more, there is a failure of communication in this dialogue. But even their denial of knowledge may be seen as ironically and uncannily cledonomantic. For the strange adjective $\pi v$ Өóк $\rho \alpha \nu \tau \alpha$ 'Delphiordained' is, as well as $\delta v \sigma \mu a \theta \hat{\eta}$, all too applicable to Cassandra's oracles, which stem precisely from her Apollo-ordained frenzy-and after that remark from the chorus, Cassandra indeed immediately turns again to a passage of prophetic fervour and an appeal (1257) to her mastering god. The hard-to-understand ordinances from Delphi are immediately evinced. This dialogue, then, a network of 'méconnaissances' and gaps in the exchange of language, once more brings to attention the role of communication as such in the Oresteia.

A final point: каi $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ at the beginning of 1254 is not, then, to be regarded simply as 'adversative', but also as 'progressive'; both 'adversative' in that her understanding Greek is apparently no help to the chorus' understanding her, and 'progressive' in that her understanding Greek all too well leads to the ironic recognition of an unexpected truth in the chorus' language. Cassandra's metaphorical, sliding language of truth cannot be controlled by the imposition of such rigid distinctions and delimitations in the functioning of such an ambiguous connective-as for example Fraenkel here requires. In the slippage of the text, the attempt to control such ambiguity (an attempt which often calls itself 'objective', 'decisive', 'critical') is seen as arbitrary closure. Cassandra's language of truth, her access to the complexities of events and the language to express them, stands against the commentators' search for the univocal, literal, simple. The exchange between Cassandra and the chorus is not to be simply, 'objectively' controlled. For what the prophetess knows and expresses all too well is the excess in language.

Simon Goldhill

## King's College, Cambridge

## Rhea in Callimachus' Hymn to Zeus










Von Jan first drew attention to the etymological play in I4, an allusion to the derivation of ' $A \pi \iota \delta a \nu \hat{\eta} \epsilon s$ from $\dot{\alpha}-\pi i v \epsilon i v:^{1}$ at the birth of Zeus Arcadia was yet

[^0]waterless, as we learn from 18 ff . The play gains added point from 40 f., where the Peloponnesians thirst no longer: $\pi \alpha \lambda a \iota o ́ \tau a \tau o \nu ~ \delta \delta ́ \mu \nu \nu(N e d a) ~ v ̈ \delta \omega \rho / v i \omega \nu o i$


This is not all. Most ancient etymologists derived ${ }^{\text {' }}{ }^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \alpha$ by metathesis from ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \alpha$, , ground'; ${ }^{3}$ but another tradition, at least as old as Plato, connected the word with $\dot{\rho} \epsilon i \hat{\imath}$. Thus Pl. Crat. $402 \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{c}, \tau i ́$ ov̂v; $\delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ бo七









 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota(f r$. 1084, SVF ii 318) $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$ ‘ $P \epsilon \in \alpha \nu \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \pi^{\prime} \alpha \hat{v} \tau \hat{\eta} S \dot{\rho} \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{v} \delta \alpha \tau \alpha$. Cf. $\Sigma$ Hes. Th. 135 p . 3 I di Gregorio, 'Pєía кала̀ $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu X \rho v ́ \sigma \iota \pi \pi o v(f r .1085) \dot{\eta}$
 A.R. i 1098 p. 97 Wendel. In poetry the link is made explicit at fr. Orph. 132 Kern $=$ Or. Chald. 56 des Places,

 $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \grave{\eta} \nu \epsilon$ є̇ $\pi \imath \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \pi \rho \circ \chi \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \tau \rho \circ \chi \alpha ́ o v \sigma \alpha \nu$. Callimachus has this etymology in mind at 15 ff . When Rhea gave birth to Zeus and 'dropped him from her great lap', we are reminded of the Kó ${ }^{\prime} \pi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ ' $P$ '́as, the northern Adriatic; ${ }^{4}$ yet the goddess whose name suggests flowing water cannot find even a spring in which to wash her infant:
 paradox.

The case for conscious etymologizing is strengthened by Or. Sib. iii 135 ff ., where overt explication of $\Delta i a$ is followed immediately by juxtaposition of ' $P$ ' $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and $\oint \epsilon ́ \epsilon \nu:{ }^{5}$



 тòv тахє́ $\omega$ s $\delta \iota \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \epsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \theta \rho \eta$ ídín $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$



 Eủри́то⿱ тотаноїо . . .

According to the more popular derivation,
 identified. ${ }^{6}$ In Call. H. у a flowing of water ( $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$
${ }^{2}$ In itself the drinking = inhabiting expression is of course a topos: $c f$. E. Norden, Sitz. d. kön. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1917, 673-4, cl. (in addition to the examples given by G. L. McLennan, Callimachus. Hymn to Zeus [Rome 1977] ad loc.) Crinag. AP ix 291.2 = Garland of Philip 1924 Gow-Page, id., $A P$ ix $430.1-2=1987-98$ Gow-Page, id., APl 61.5-6=1933-4 Gow-Page, Nemes. Cyn. 67-8
${ }^{3}$ For a full collection of evidence see O. Gruppe, Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte (Munich 1906) is24 n. 2.

 'Péas Kóдтоs ó 'Ióvıos $\pi \rho \omega ́ \not \eta \nu$ є́калєìтo.
${ }^{5}$ I find no comment by V. Nikiprowetzky, La troisième Sibylle, Études juives ix (Paris/La Haye 1970).
${ }^{6}$ See E. Cahen, Les hymnes de Callimaque (Paris 1930) 23.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \alpha \chi \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha, 32)$ from the earth ( $\Gamma$ aîa, 29) reconciles the two alternatives of $\dot{\rho} \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ and $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \rho a .{ }^{7}$
N. Hopkinson

## Peterhouse, Cambridge

${ }^{7} \mathrm{McLennan}$ makes the interesting suggestion that we should see in $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \alpha \rho a i ́$ an allusion to adverbial $\dot{\rho} \in i a$, with implicit contrast of Rhea and Gaia.

I am indebted to Dr F. J. Williams for useful criticism.

## 

In frr. 122 B and ${ }_{123} \mathrm{~B}$ (DK) Empedocles mentions a series of opposite personifications, e.g. Beauty and Ugliness (122.3), Movement and Rest (123.2); the last pair mentioned in fr. 122 is Nemertes-Asapheia.

Nemertes is known to us from Hom. Il. xviii 46, and Hes. Th. 262; on both occasions she appears in a catalogue of Nereids. Hesiod emphatically says that she has her father's character, about which he has told us
 $\gamma \in$ ívato Móvios. Nereus' name, furthermore, is explained by the adjectives $\nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \eta$ 's and $\eta \eta^{\prime} \pi \iota o s(235)$,

The original meaning of $\nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \eta$ 's, 'unerring', develops easily into 'true'2—cf. Hom. Il. vi 376, where Hector says: $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime}{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \mu o \iota, \delta \mu \omega a i ́, \quad \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \epsilon \in a$ $\mu \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$ !, and the reply in 382: ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \omega \gamma \alpha a \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \in a$ $\mu \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$. The meaning of $\nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \epsilon \in a$ here is clearly 'true'. The same meaning can be distilled from the fact that $\psi \epsilon \hat{v} \delta o s$ is the opposite of $\nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \eta \eta_{s-c f . ~ O d . ~ i i i ~}^{\text {- }}$
 These words remind us of the catalogue of the Nereids in the Iliad mentioned above, where the meaning of the name Nemertes seems to be strengthened by the immediately following name Apseudes: for such litoteslike combinations $c f$. ., e.g., Critias, fr. I.4, where Anacreon is said to be $\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{v} \nu \dot{a} \lambda u \pi o v$.

So the meaning of the name Nemertes is 'Truth', pace van der Ben, who renders the name 'Unfallible'; 3 the meaning 'Truth' is also given by Guthrie, ${ }^{4}$ Wright, ${ }^{5}$ and DK.

The name Asapheia is a neologism derived from (a) $\sigma a \phi \eta^{\prime} s$ analogous to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta^{\prime}{ }_{5}-\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a$; van der Ben ${ }^{162}$ gives some other parallels: $\Lambda \iota \nu \nu \omega \rho \epsilon \iota \alpha, ~ ' A \mu \alpha ́ \theta \epsilon \iota \alpha$, 'Hрıү'́vєıa and 'A $A \rho \epsilon$ '́кєıа. Empedocles had other personifications at his disposal to express the opposite of Truth-e.g. Pseudos (Hes. Th. 229); Apate (ibid. 224); ${ }^{6}$ Lethe. ${ }^{7}$ So Empedocles coined the name Asapheia probably metri causa.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$. Boeder, 'Der frühgriechische Wortgebrauch von Logos und Aletheia', Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte iv (1959) 91, observes that $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota a$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \eta \dot{\eta}^{\prime} s$ are never used as predicate or attribute with the exception of Hes. Th. 233.
 replaced by $\sigma a \phi \eta^{\prime} s, \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \eta \eta^{\prime}$ and esp. $\dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \eta_{\eta} ;$ cf. ibid. 98.
${ }^{3}$ N. van der Ben, The Proem of Empedocles' Peri Physios (Amsterdam 1975) 107.

4 W. K. C. Guthrie, A History of Greek Philosophy ii (Cambridge 1965) 255.
${ }^{5}$ M. R. Wright, Empedocles: the extant fragments (New Haven/ London 1981) 280.
${ }^{6}$ For the implications of this word see M. L. West, Hesiod, Theogony (Oxford 1966) ad loc.
${ }^{7}$ For Lethe and its negative $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ ' ${ }^{\prime}$ see West (n. 6) 230-1, 233, Boeder (n. I) 92-4.

The basic idea inherent in $\dot{a} \sigma a ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \alpha$ is that of the negative of $\sigma a \phi \eta$ ' , 'clear, distinct'; ${ }^{8}$ but in view of the fact that ' $A \sigma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \phi \in \iota a$ is a neologism it seems legitimate to take into account the fact that 'lie, untruth' is a regular opposite of $\nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \eta \eta_{s}$. A close relationship between the concepts of 'clearness' and 'truth' is suggested for example by comparison of Parmenides fr. IB.29-30,
 and Xenophanes fr. 34 B. $1-4$, where $\tau o \dot{o} \mu \notin \nu \sigma a \phi \epsilon \in(\mathrm{I})$ is the opposite of $\delta$ óкos $\delta^{\prime}(4)$-so it seems that the meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota \alpha$ and $\tau \dot{o} \sigma a \phi^{\prime} s^{9}$ is very similar. The same is suggested in Page's note ad Eur. Med. 72: $\mu \hat{v} \theta$ os $\epsilon i \sigma a \phi \eta_{S} \delta \delta \delta \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$., 'the story which is clear . . is the true story ${ }^{\prime} .^{10}$ One might argue that clarity is still at the centre of the meaning there, but there is certainly no broad distinction of meaning, if any, between Pene-
 $\pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \sigma \alpha ́ \phi a \epsilon i \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$, and Telemachus' reply: $\tau o \iota \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$
 finally, there seems to be no doubt possible in Il. iv 404: $\mu \dot{\eta} \psi \epsilon \dot{\psi} \delta \epsilon^{\prime}, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s, \sigma a ́ \phi a \operatorname{\epsilon i\pi \epsilon iv,~where~Leaf~}$ prefers the meaning 'truly', referring to Soph. El. 1223, Trach. 387, and Eur. Med. 72.

So, in view of the fact that there is no parallel to support a distinct meaning for the neologism $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \phi \epsilon \iota a$, and because the idea naturally and not infrequently opposed to $\nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \eta_{s}$ is 'Untruth', I accept the meaning 'Untruth' in the present passage-pace DK 'Verworrenheit', Guthrie 'Obscurity', van der Ben 'Uncertain', Wright 'Uncertainty' and Lloyd 'Obscurity'. ${ }^{11}$

The meaning of $\mu \epsilon \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \kappa o v \rho o s$ is disputed: some connect the element -коvроs with $\kappa \in i \rho \omega$, e.g. LSJ 'black-haired' (so Guthrie). But Wright 281 observes correctly: 'the color of the hair is irrelevant'. On the same grounds we can reject Wilamowitz' 'mit schwarzem Haarschur'. ${ }^{12}$ The derivation from коv $\rho \eta$, 'pupil', seems preferable—cf. van der Ben 162 . DK had already translated 'schwarzaugige', but, again, I can see nothing relevant in the dark colour of the pupils(!) or of the eyes: the pupil of the eye tends to be black, while dark eyes can be very beautiful and are in consequence an inept opposite of the preceding $\epsilon \in \rho \sigma \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$, the qualification of $N \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} s$.

It is therefore with good reason that van der Ben tries to expand the meaning 'with dark pupils', but his 'blind' seems too subtle: " with dark pupils then means with pupils without light or vision", "blind"'-the meaning accepted by Wright 281-2. Van der Ben bases this interpretation primarily on Soph. $A j$. 95s, $\kappa \in \lambda \alpha \iota \nu \omega \pi \alpha \nu$ $\theta \nu \mu o ́ v-b u t ~ t h e ~ a d j . ~ к \epsilon \lambda a \iota \nu \omega ́ \pi \eta s$ does not imply blindness of the soul: $c f$. Stanford ad loc., 'Jebb may be right in giving the ending full value as "-faced" here so as to suggest "the dark soul which watches from its place of concealment with malevolent joy"'. ${ }^{13}$ So
${ }^{8}$ Boeder (n. 1) 93 argues that 'the $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega \nu$ prevents his knowledge from being shared with someone else'-which could be qualified as $\dot{a} \phi a \nu \epsilon ́ s$ or äd $\eta \lambda o v$ : but the former word is not found in epic at all, while the latter is found once meaning 'invisible' (Hes. Erga 6).
${ }^{9}$ For $\tau \grave{~ o ̀ ~} \sigma a \phi \notin ́ s$ ('Klarheit und Zuverlässigkeit die auf Augenzeugenschaft beruht') see H. Fraenkel, Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums (München 1962) 382-3, esp. n. 20; also id., Frühgriechisches Denken (München 1960) 342-9.
${ }^{10}$ D. L. Page, Euripides Medea ${ }^{2}$ (Oxford 1952).
${ }^{11}$ G. E. R. Lloyd, Polarity and Analogy (Cambridge 1966) 63 n. I.
${ }^{12}$ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Sitz. d. preuss. Akad.d. Wiss. Berlin 1929, 639 f .
${ }^{13}$ W. B. Stanford, Sophocles Ajax (London 1963).


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ F. von Jan (de Ian), De Callimacho Homeri interprete (diss. Strasburg 1893) 80 n. I, cl. Eustath. ad Dion. Perieg. 414 (Geog. Gr. min., ed. Müller ii 293).

