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The formula is so far changed that νόμος is not identified with νοῦς τις, but said more accurately to proceed from νοῦς τις. And the law is again thought of not in the sense of defining rule or πέρας in opposition to the ἀπειρόν, but as reason in opposition to desire—the opposition of νοῦς or λόγος to ὅρεξις. Perhaps, therefore, expression of reason is the most correct English rendering; but then it is difficult to translate the whole sentence, because we have no better word for νοῦς than 'reason.' One is reminded of the precept, 'Never translate if you can help it.'

What Aristotle says in this chapter agrees with the general drift of Politics III. xv-xvi., where both νοῦς and λόγος are used for law.

For the phraseology compare the following passages: 1287a 18, ἡ γὰρ τάξις νόμος. 1287a 19 and 1287a 28, τῶν ἀρα νόμον ἀρχεῖν αἰρετοῦσαν μάλλον ἢ τῶν πολιτῶν ἐνα τινα ... ὁ μὲν οὖν τῶν νόμων κελεύουσα ἀρχεῖν δοκεῖ κελεύουσα ἀρχεῖν τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῶν νοῦν μόνον. 1287a 32, διὸ τέρτερ ὅρεξιον νοῦς ὁ νόμος ἔστιν.

Thus νόμος is identified with νοῦς, or

1 I find that Peters has 'rational ordinance.'
did what above all things they should have avoided. What caused this suicidal change of plan?

The whole responsibility is thrown upon the mysterious message of Themistocles. Ancient accounts of this message, as has frequently been pointed out, are most conflicting. But Aeschylus and Herodotus agree as to its supreme significance: whatever its substance was, whenever it was sent, and whatever other result it had, it certainly occasioned the fatal Persian manœuvre of the following morning, and won Salamis for Greece.

But is it really credible that the Persians were prepared light-heartedly to sacrifice their whole advantage of position, on account of a message claiming to proceed from a Greek admiral who professed secret friendship for the King? Disunion and medism in the Greek camp were indeed neither impossible nor improbable: the message would cause the Persians to keep a sharp lookout for confirmatory signs: but it would do no more. If, however, next morning any movement in the Greek fleet was visible which seemed to corroborate the promise of desertion that Themistocles had made, the easy confidence with which the Persians sailed up the strait is explained. Is there any evidence of such a movement?

It is of course not to be imagined for a moment that a genuine flight on the morning of the battle was either contemplated or attempted. But a feigned flight may well have been proposed as a necessary complement to the otherwise valueless message of Themistocles. This is to assume that the other Greek leaders were parties to that message; in any case, Herodotus is probably wrong in representing them as victims of the trick equally with the Persian. Do our accounts contain any hint of this feigned flight? It has been suggested by more than one commentator that the temporary wavering of the Greeks noticed by Herodotus was in fact such a feint. But there is a clearer indication than this in the same authority; and it is to be sought in the curious story of the behaviour of Adeimantus and his Corinthians.

The Athenian version is that as soon as the battle opened, the Corinthians fled in a panic. Opposite the temple of Athene Sciras they are met by a mysterious vessel, and are informed that the Greeks are winning. They return to find the battle over. In reply to this the Corinthians declare that they were ἐν πρώτοις τῆς μαχησι, and the rest of Greece, says Herodotus, agrees with them rather than with the Athenians. Athenian malice of course kept the discreditable version alive. But is it likely that either story is pure invention? The interpretation of the incident suggested by Macan, and subsequently by How and Wells, is as follows. Diodorus reports the sending of an Egyptian squadron round the south of Salamis to block the other entrance to the straits. The Corinthians, it is suggested, must have been told off to engage this column, and having done so successfully they returned to the main body, to find the battle over. But there are objections to this theory.

1 The total absence of this important feature of the engagement from our better authorities. No reliance is to be placed on Diodorus or his sources. The alleged movement of the Egyptian squadron may itself be a garbled version of the manœuvre reported by Aeschylus—the stationing of sentinel ships round the island.

2 Equally curious is the silence of Corinthian tradition. In the epitaph on the Corinthians slain at Salamis the enemies against whom they fought are given as Medes, Persians, and Phoenicians. Even if the last two lines of the inscription as given by Plutarch are later than the first couplet, the total absence from Corinthian tradition of any engagement other than the main one is very strange.

It seems distinctly more probable that the behaviour of the Corinthians gives the clue to the battle. Their
feigned flight was deliberately planned by the admirals, at the instance of Themistocles, to increase the effect of the message sent to the King. The manoeuvre was misunderstood at the time, and misrepresented later by a tradition hostile to the Corinthians.

Unfortunately the position of the temple of Athene cannot be identified with sufficient certainty to be of any help. By some scholars—e.g., Lolling and Hanvette—it is placed on the north-east of the island near the opening into the Bay of Eleusis, by others at various points further west. Evidently the north-east position suits best this interpretation of the incident. The Corin-

Herodotus then knows the tradition of the feint, but fails to connect it with the message of Themistocles. What of Aeschylus? The poet would neither see nor care to relate all the incidents of the engagement. But a consideration of the relevant lines in the *Persae* shows that the Corinthian incident is by no means alien to the battle as he describes it.

1. He begins his description of the fighting thus:

\[ \text{πρώτον μὲν ἡχή κέλαδος Ἑλλήνων πάρα μολπηδὸν ηὐφήμησεν.} \]

This is the first dramatic contact of the fleets: the Persians are filing

thians sailed up the strait till they were just out of sight, and the Persians were well inside, then returned to take part in the fighting. The κέλας θείη πομητῇ may be a boat sent to give the signal for return: or else this divine intervention simply stands for an inexplicable change of tactics, like the similar intervention of the φάσμα γνωσία in the case of the main squadron. There is no reason to believe that the whole Persian fleet was engaged: but after the victory the remnant which never entered the strait was no longer formidable either in numbers or in prestige.

hurriedly up the strait, the Corinthians are just turning, the rest of the Greeks are sailing into action after their feigned hesitation.

2. φόβος δὲ πᾶσι βαρβάροις παρὴν γνώμης ἀποφαλέσων· οὐ γὰρ ὦς φυτῇ παίαν ἐφύμνουν·

This is precisely the situation imagined. The Persians at first think that the Greeks are actually in full flight. Too late they are undeceived.
3. θεός δὲ πάντες ἥσαν ἐκφανεῖς ὑδέων.¹
   I.e., both the Corinthians who are returning and the rest of the Greeks who were at first concealed by Cynosura.

4. 'Ελληνικαί τε νήσει οὐκ ἀφρασμόνω κυκλῷ περίες ἐθεινον² . . .

This may perhaps mean that the Corinthian vessels on their return kept close to the Attic shore, the remainder of the fleet attacking the front and left wing of the Persians.

---

NOTES ON THE NEW CALLIMACHUS AND MENANDER.  EP. 357.

CALLIMACHUS.

There are two or three passages in the fragments of Callimachus published in P. Oxy. VII. 1011 which seem to me not yet to have met with adequate explanation.

P. 23, vv. 6, 7.

οὖνα καὶ<θ>’ ἐνεκ’ οὐ τι θεῖς ἑδεις ἕρα
φιγοκτίς,
ἐξενεπειν καὶ τῶν ἤρυγων ἱστορίην.

Hunt’s punctuation, which I have given, is clearly wrong; but I doubt if Von Arnim is right in connecting ἐξενεπειν with φιγοκτίς, nor do I suppose that ἑδεις is used exactly in the sense ‘to see.’ It is rather to ‘look on,’ with a view to writing on it: a strange use, but one that is more or less established by Herodas IV. 74, where Dr. Headlam cited Himer. Or. XIV. 23. It is not followed in these passages by an infinitive, but we know this as a use of βλέπειν. Alexis, fr. 97, Ael. V.H. II. 44. In these two passages the infinitive need bear no other meaning than the nature of the look; but this will not satisfy Menander, Ep. 181, ὁ προσών εὐθὺς ἀρπάξειν βλέπει, where the sense must be ‘seek to,’ which would do as a rendering here. ‘Well was it for thee that thou soughtest not to publish . . . and didst not belch forth their tale.’ ἐδεις and βλέψαι are more or less identified in post-classical authors.

Vv. 297 sq.

τὴν δ' ἄγμος φανείνα ταύρος ἡ δήφην ἐξέληνε καὶ τὰς ἐπείν᾽ ὁ κακὴ λωβή ὄσ δὴ μὲν ἤμεων καὶ σὺ; μὴ μὲ ποίησαι ἐνστηκτον' ἡ γὰρ γειτονεσ' ἀποθεινεῖς.

The first two lines as printed by Hunt are sound. βλέπειν τινά=to throw a glance at someone, was previously unknown except in the doubtful instance of Herodas III. 16* (where now read Ἀδης, as Dio. Chrys. cited below)—unknown, that is, for writers of a respectable period. But they had fair authority. Compare Philostr. Her. IV. ταυρήδων ὑποβλέψας τῶν βασιλέα, and for my reading in Herodas, Dio. Chrys. II. 302 ὑποβλέψας ὅσπερ ἀστρατη. Clearly Dio might have written ἀστρατηφανείσα. In v. 299 I have given Von Arnim’s punctuation. καὶ σὺ δὴ ὃς μὲν ἠμῶν πράττεις; is the prose order. A grave error, I think, has been made by Editors in trying to find an equivalent for ‘tolerant,’ or ‘orderly,’ in εὐστήκτον. The sense is not good in view of the succeeding sentence; since the interlocutor has been already attempting mediation, the imperative would naturally be present (Headlam, C.R. XIV. 3, XIX. 30); and thirdly, if the relations of the δήφην with a third party are concerned, it is not likely that the middle voice would be used; in fact, I know of no instance earlier than late imitators of the Epic: Quint. Sm. III. 623 μέσοφ' ὅτε μοι κατένευεν Ὀλυμπίοις νίεα διὸν ἐκπαγὼν θήσεων καὶ ὕρηνον . . . ἀλλὰ μν ὀξύμορον ποιήσατο.

We require then ‘Don’t make me . . . with you’; and the obvious supplement is ‘angry.’ The nearest word we actually have elsewhere is εὐκνωστόν; but this is not close enough, and I

³ But ἑδεις λαξων takes an accusative in Solon fr. 34; compare Eratosthen. Schol. A.P. v. 240.
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