The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Aristides and the Battle of Salamis

Ronald M. Burrows

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 05 / June 1897, pp 258 - 259

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00031991, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00031991

How to cite this article:

Ronald M. Burrows (1897). Aristides and the Battle of Salamis. The Classical Review, 11, pp 258-259 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00031991

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

down to us without having suffered corruption during the eight centuries after Lucan's death. I certainly neither said nor thought anything of the sort. My contention is this. On Prof. Francken's own shewing [pp. xxii, xxvii] the recension now represented by V and its kindred MSS is as old as the fifth century at least. M and its kindred are derived from a separate line of copies. This is set forth by Dr. Francken [p. xxxvi]. Therefore in one form or other we have two independent lines of tradition. If this be so, what is the authority of readings in which both traditions agree? I said (and say still), it is so great that we ought not to set it aside on the ground of arguments from within, unless those arguments are of quite overwhelming cogency. Further, assume that the collective wisdom of modern scholars decides that a certain traditional reading is undoubtedly corrupt. Nay, assume again that they agree to accept a particular correction. And lastly, assume that this 'correction' is an improvement. I answer as follows. I respect the negative *virorum doctorum consensus*, but it does not amount to mathematical certainty. Affirmative *consensus* is very rare indeed, and it tells only (at the most) what the writer ought to have written. In the case of Lucan there is no little reason for thinking that he often wrote what he had better not have written. Therefore, to improve the text is not necessarily the same thing as restoring the author's words. The inference

is, put what you please in your notes, but be very slow to meddle with the text.

To take a recent instance. In VII 141 we have *tunc omnis lancea saxo erigitur*. The late Prof. Nettleship proposed *derigitur*. This Dr. Postgate rightly rejects, but conjectures *corrigitur*. Mr Owen (*C.R.* April 1897) rejects this, and proposes *exigitur*. Now there is negative agreement enough. But what is the metaphor in *erigitur*? I believe it means 'set up straight on end', applied to what has been beaten down. A daring way of saying 'brought to a point', but I do not think it is too bold for Lucan. The spear head is to begin with rather blunt than bent, and it is ground to a new point. The sense of 'made fit for action' may also hang about the word. Compare Stat. Theb. iii 582-4

tunc fessa putri robigine pila
haerentesque situ gladios in saeua recurant
uolnera et attrito cogunt iuuenescere saxo.

and Sidon Apollinaris vii 412

dum falce recocta
ictibus informat saxoque cacuminat ensem.

With the MSS tradition at its back, I would let *erigitur* stand.

I have wandered from Prof. Francken, of whom let me take leave with many thanks and high respect. W. E. HEITLAND.

27 April, 1897.

ARISTIDES AND THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS.

I HAD occasion in the March number of the *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles* to discuss the interesting article which Professor Bury contributed to the *Classical Review* of December 1896 on some points connected with the Battle of Salamis. It will be remembered that Professor Bury supports his theory that Aristides was one of the regular strategi, in command of the land forces stationed on Salamis, by connecting his timely arrival at that island on his way from Aegina (Hdt. VIII. 79) not with his first return from exile, but with a special mission which had been sent to bring from Aegina the images of the Aeacidae. As the *Revue* is not yet widely known on this side of the Channel, it may be worth while to bring before the notice of your

readers two suggestions which I made in it on this point, the more especially as Professor Bury has kindly written to say that he accepts them.

The first is the meeting of an obvious objection. [How is it, it may be asked, that Herodotus not merely fails to associate the discharge of this mission with the name of Aristides, but seems to imply that while he reached Salamis overnight, the trireme with the Aeacidae did not do so till the next morning (viii. 79, 83)?]

The answer is that Aristides did not arrive till after midnight (viii. 70, 75, 76 and 81), so that the fleet in general must have already 'turned in,' and could not realise the presence of the Aeacidae till the next morning.

Thus the two events, the appearance of Aristides before the Council, and the first popular welcome given to the Heroes that were to guide to victory, would be from the outset dissociated in Herodotus' mind. Neither Aristides nor Themistocles, we may be sure, gave a thought to the Aeacidae that night. The 'See! They've come!' of the common sailors was the point of interest and the source of information.

The second point is a slight correction, a correction, however, which strengthens Professor Bury's general position, by bringing it into closer relation to Herodotus' narrative. Aristides cannot, as he thought, have had a right to take part in the Council. Only one general can have been allowed in it from each city. The Athenian system of divisional commands could not entitle them to a preponderance of voting strength. Whether or no Aristides was a strategus, he was certainly not the Athenian commander-in-chief, and we can therefore still follow Herodotus when he tells us that he was only admitted on sufferance, and withdrew as soon as the news was told (viii. 80, 81).

I may add that the only serious objection to this part of Professor Bury's theory that occurs to me is that the Aeginetans seem to have claimed credit for the subsequent achievements of the trireme which brought the Aeacidae (viii. 84), and that it is improbable that an Athenian would be put in even temporary command of an Aeginetan ship. It may be argued however that the fact that the Aeacidae were their own local Heroes would be itself enough to account for the Aeginetans' interest. If, however, as seems more probable, the ship was their own, Aristides need not have been in direct command, but may have gone under its escort as the representative of the rest of the fleet. In this case indeed we have a fine instance of the Panhellenism of the hour, of the deliberate reconciliation of Athens and Aegina in face of the common enemy.

Herodotus does not tell us in so many words whether or no it was an Aeginetan ship in any one of the three passages in which he refers to it (viii. 64, 83, 84), but it is improbable that we can found on this any valid argumentum ex silentio.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

HORRET IMPERSONAL.

IN Mr. E. W. Watson's interesting essay 'The Style and Language of St. Cyprian,' contained in vol. iv. of *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, Oxf. 1896, I read (p. 313):

'The only impersonal verb which appears first in Cyprian is:—

horret 781 18 [of Hartel's edition] *nec delectat id dicere quod aut horret aut pudet nosse*. This does not seem to be cited elsewhere; was it improvised by Cyprian for uniformity with *pudet*?

Two Christian writers possibly were led by Cyprian to combine *horret* and *pudet*.

Cassian. inst. xii. 28 *pr. audiui in hac dumtaxat regione quod horret pudetque revolvere, quendam iuniorum, cum a suo increparetur abbate, cur humili-*

tatem, quam renuntians per modico tempore retentaret, coepisset excedere, . . . summa contumacia respondisse. . .

Oros. hist. vii. 4, 10 *referre singillatim facta eius horret pudetque*.

None of the editors of the Vienna series notice this usage in their *indices*. Indeed any arguments drawn from the silence of such an *index* are precarious to the last degree. The only remaining example which I have at hand is of course independent of Cyprian.

Anmian. xxix. 2, 15 *horret nunc reminisci quo iustitio humilitati tot rerum apices visebantur*.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

ON SOPHOCLES' *TRACHINIAE*, 781, 782.

DR. H. W. HAYLEY and myself were discussing, the other day, the difficult passage in the account of the murder of Lichas, which has come down to us in this shape:—

κόμης δὲ λευκὸν μνελὸν ἐκράνει μέσου
κρατὸς διασπαρέντος αἵματός θ' ὁμοῦ,

and has given rise to numerous conjectures, when it occurred to us that the following