$\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \alpha \chi \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha, 32)$ 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: $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime}{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \mu o \iota, \delta \mu \omega a i ́, \quad \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \epsilon \in a$
 $\mu \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$. 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).
$\mu \epsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \gamma \kappa о v \rho o s ~ s e e m s ~ t o ~ m e ~ t o ~ m e a n ~ ' w i t h ~ d a r k, ~$ malignant eyes＇；cf．LSJ s．v．$\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ III． 4.

Another interpretation，however，seems possible as well：Fraenkel ${ }^{14}$ remarks ad A．Ag．391 that какòs $\chi$ алкós loses the fine lustre of its surface；instead there appears an unsightly blackness which cannot be removed：како仑̂ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \chi \alpha \lambda \kappa о \hat{v} \tau \rho o ́ \pi о \nu . . . \mu \epsilon \lambda a \mu \pi \alpha \gamma \eta$ йs． If we assume for beautiful Truth the possession of ${ }^{\prime} \rho \mu \mu \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \rho \mu \alpha i \rho o \nu \tau \alpha$ ，her opposite Untruth has＇dark， dull，false eyes＇．

Tjitte H．Janssen
Rembrandtlaan 6，
1624 GL HOORN，
Nederland
${ }^{14}$ E．Fraenkel，Aeschylus Agamemnon（Oxford i950）．

## Euripides，Bakchai 877－8I＝897－90I

|  | 877 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 878 |
|  | 879 |
| $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \chi \chi \theta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \rho \epsilon i \sigma \sigma \omega$ калє́ $\chi \epsilon \iota \nu ;$ | 880 |
| ő $\tau \iota$ ка入òv фídov ${ }_{\text {a }}$ ¢í． | 88 I |

877 ooфòv editores vetustiores，Grégoire：${ }^{1}$ ooфóv； editores recentiores：$\sigma o \phi o ́ v$ ，Ammendola ${ }^{2}$ ooфóv；$\hat{\eta} \tau \iota$ Willink ${ }^{3}$ тò delerunt Dodds，${ }^{4}$ Willink $878-9 \beta$ po 0 oîs $\ddot{\eta}$ editores plerique：$\beta$ pooois；$\hat{\eta}$ Blake，${ }^{5}$ Roux ${ }^{6}$

The correct interpretation of these lines significantly affects our understanding of the attitude of Dionysiac worshippers towards violence．If the chorus is here saying that power over one＇s enemies is the best possible gift from the gods and furthermore that this statement constitutes wisdom，violence and vindictiveness are essential ingredients of Dionysiac religion．If，on the other hand，they are renouncing power over their enemies，Dionysiac religion is essentially peaceful and non－aggressive．The first interpretation，that triumph over one＇s enemies is the greatest gift and that knowing this constitutes wisdom，is the popular view at the present time．It is the interpretation which is found in all current English translations of the play，including those of Arrowsmith ${ }^{7}$ and Kirk．${ }^{8}$ It is also the view of several scholars who have undertaken a detailed study of the passage．These include Dodds，${ }^{9}$ Winnington－Ingram，${ }^{10}$ and Arthur．${ }^{11}$ Others who have studied the passage have reached the opposite conclusion，that the greatest

[^0]gift consists of caution and respect，which in turn lead to restraint and avoidance of violence．These include Blake，${ }^{12}$ Festugière，${ }^{13}$ and Roux．${ }^{14}$ The aim of this paper is to reach a greater degree of certainty concern－ ing the meaning of the passage by a close examination of the grammatical constructions．

To begin with，$\tau o ̀$ oodóv in 877 cannot be taken by itself to mean＇wisdom＇．There are two reasons for this． The first is the use of the expression $\tau \dot{o}$ oo 0 óv elsewhere in the play．It has long since been noted that Euripides in Bakchai is drawing a sharp distinction between true wisdom and false wisdom or mere cleverness．The word used for＇wisdom＇is oo申ía and the words used for ＇cleverness＇are $\tau \grave{~ \sigma o \phi o ́ v, ~ \sigma o \phi i ́ \sigma \mu a \tau a, ~ a n d ~ \sigma o \phi i \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota . ~}$ The contrast between the two is stated explicitly at 395： tò $\sigma o \phi o ̀ v ~ \delta ' ~ o v ~ \sigma o \phi i ́ a, ~ ' c l e v e r n e s s ~ i s ~ n o t ~ w i s d o m ' . ~ T h e ~$ negative connotations of ooфíquaza $(30,489)$ and $\sigma o \phi i \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$（200）are readily evident from the context． The expression $\tau o ̀ ~ \sigma o \phi o ́ v ~ i n ~ i t s ~ o t h e r ~ t w o ~ o c c u r r e n c e s ~$ besides 395 and $877=897$ is a negative entity．It is clearly
 $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \kappa \rho \omega \nu \tau \grave{o} \sigma o \phi \grave{\nu} \nu \eta v \bar{\rho} \eta \tau \alpha \iota \quad \phi \rho \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，＇no argument will cast them［the ancestral traditions］down，not even if cleverness has been found by acute minds＇．At ioos， although the text is corrupt，$\tau \dot{\text { ò oodóv }}$ is contrasted with Bpotєíws＂̈́ $\chi \epsilon \iota$ in 1004 and hence must also be a negative entity．Thus on the basis of the usage of these words in the play alone the interpretation of $\tau \dot{o}$ ooфóv in 877 as＇wisdom＇is extremely unlikely．Arthur＇s theory that $\tau \dot{o}$ oobóv is the positive entity and oodia the negative entity is not adequately supported by the evidence．${ }^{15}$ The use of oooós apart from the expression ro oo oóv is ambiguous in the play and the meaning depends on the speaker．In the usage of Kadmos（179 bis， 186）$\sigma 0 \phi o$ ós clearly means＇wise＇．Similarly the word means＇wise＇in the usage of Dionysos（480，64I，656， 839），the chorus（427），Teiresias（266），and the Mes－ senger（ 1 I 5 I）．Pentheus（ 655 ter， 824 ）and Agaue（ 1190 ）， on the other hand，use the word with the meaning ＇clever＇．

The second reason why $\tau \dot{o}$ ooфóv in 877 cannot be taken by itself to mean＇wisdom＇is the alternative question construction in which the expression occurs． Alternative questions of the form $\tau i ́ \ldots \ddot{\eta} \tau i ́$ are a favorite device of the Attic orators．The useful observa－ tion is that in this construction both questions expect the same answer．Thus at Aischines iii i $5 \varsigma: \tau^{\prime} \pi \sigma \tau^{\prime} \alpha \nu \in \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath}, \eta_{\eta}$ $\tau i \phi \theta \epsilon \prime \gamma \xi \epsilon \tau a \iota$ ；＇What will he claim，what will he say？＇ the expected answer is ouv $\delta \dot{\epsilon} v$ ．A similar answer is expected at Demosthenes ix 16：$\tau i ́ \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau$＇$\epsilon \sigma \tau i v, ~ \eta \eta ~ \tau i ́$ $\tau o v ́ \tau \omega \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota ;$＇What are these things，of what concern are they to the city？＇At Andokides i 129 ：$\tau i \stackrel{s}{ } \dot{\alpha} \nu$
 óvouáoal；＇What could he be？An Oidipous or an Aigisthos？What should one call him？＇the expected answer to the second question is likewise Oiסímove $\ddot{\eta}$ $A{ }^{\prime} \gamma_{\iota} \sigma \theta o v$ ；There are numerous other examples in the orators．The question words in alternative questions of this type can also occur in two repeated constituents with the rest of the sentence shared by both constituents． A good example of this is found at Dem．ix 43：$\tau i s \hat{\eta} \nu$
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