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](#)

On Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, 781, 782

F. D. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 05 / June 1897, pp 259 - 260

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032017, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032017

How to cite this article:

F. D. Allen (1897). On Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, 781, 782. The Classical Review, 11, pp 259-260 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032017

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

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 μυελὸν ἐκράνει μέσου
κρατὸς διασπαρέντος αἵματός θ' ὁμοῦ,

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

version, involving the change of three letters, would be satisfactory and probable :—

κοπηὶ δὲ λευκὸν μελὸν ἐκράινει μέσου
κρατός, διασπαρέντος αἵματος θολοῦ.

κοπηὶ is an older suggestion of Hense's; θολοῦ was found by Mr. Hayley and myself together, in such a way that it is hard for

either of us to claim it. I cannot prevail on Mr. Hayley to print this conjecture over his own signature, although we both think that it should be made known.

The adjective θολός is known from Athenaeus and lexicographers, and is implied in the verb θολῶ.

F. D. ALLEN.

Harvard University, January 1897.

AUSONIUS (?) IDYL 13.

Quam longa una dies, aetas tam longa
rosarum :

Cum pubescenti iuncta senecta brevis.

or Quas pubescentis iuncta senecta premit.

Quam modo nascentem rutilus conspexit
Eous,

Hanc rediens sero vespere vidit anum.

Sed bene, quod paucis licet interitura diebus

Succedens (or -ndens) aevum prorogat ipsa
suum.

Collige, virgo, rosas, dum flos novus et nova
pubes,

Et memor esto aevum sic properare tuum.

In the last two lines the poet bids the maiden gather her rosebuds while she may; she is to gather her flowers betimes, while she is as yet a fairer flower than they. As in Herrick and as in Milton, so here too the notion of 'gathering roses' is bound up with the notion of 'being gathered': the poet is, in fact, playing with two ideas at once, as the remainder of his hexameter clearly shows. But what has the last couplet but one to do with these ideas? 'Rosa succedens aevum prorogat ipsa suum' means, I suppose, 'the rose-bush yields fresh roses to replace those that die.' 'Rosa' for 'rose-bush' is in itself sufficiently awkward in a poem in which the word is continually and consistently used in the sense of 'a rose.' But it is impossible after the line that precedes it, in which *interitura* has

nothing to do with a rose-bush, but only with a rose blossom.

The maiden is invited to make the most of her youth: for youth is short-lived like the rose. But, if she is to learn the lesson from the rose, the poet must have said that the rose makes the most of its youth. If she is to prolong her youth by 'gathering her flowers', that is by submitting herself to be gathered, she must be told that the rose too prolongs its life by letting itself be gathered. The thought that we require is supplied by the elegant lines of Florus on the rose:

totum lux quarta peregit
floris opus. Pereunt hodie nisi mane
leguntur;

to which an anonymous hexameter adds a sort of Scholium in these words:

ne pereant lege mane rosas: cito virgo
senescit.

Returning to our own passage, I think it will now be clear that for *Succedens* we require *Succidens*. The rose is said to prolong its own life by *cutting it short*; in other words, by allowing itself to be plucked.

E. C. MARCHANT.

NOTES ON AUSONIUS.

The following notes may be useful to future commentators. It has often been remarked with surprise how little Juvenal has been cited or copied by later authors.

The following passages in Ausonius seem reminiscences of the Satirist: and cadences in whole passages might be cited as echoes of those in his great original.

(1) Epigrammata xxxv. 9, 10.
Miremur periisse homines? Monumenta
fatiscunt,
Mors etiam saxis, nominibusque venit. Cf.
Juv. x. 146.

(2) Comm: Prof. i. Tiberius Orator 17.
Dicendi torrens tibi copia. Juv. x. 9.