The Classical Quarterly

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

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Renkema on Valerius Flaccus *Observationes criticae et exegeticae ad C. Valerii Flacci Argonautica* scripsit E. H. Renkema. Traiecti ad Rhenum : apud Kemink et filium, MCMVI.

Walter C. Summers

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 1 / Issue 01 / April 1907, pp 85 - 88

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800004997, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800004997

How to cite this article:

Walter C. Summers (1907). The Classical Quarterly, 1, pp 85-88 doi:10.1017/S0009838800004997

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

RENKEMA ON VALERIUS FLACCUS.

Observationes criticae et exegeticae ad C. Valerii Flacci Argonautica scripsit E. H.

RENKEMA. Traiecti ad Rhenum : apud Kemink et filium, MCMVI.

A CAREFUL, scholarly production, dealing with upwards of seventy passages of Valerius. Many of the notes on these are illustrative rather than critical, and shew good sense and intelligent study of the Argonautics. I would call especial attention to those on I 609 *sqq.* (the *turbo* corresponds to the *cuspis* with which Vergil's Aeolus opens the cave), 2. 413 (*refugit* simply = *confugit*), 3. 444 *sqq.* (the *effigies* represent the *Minyae*, not the slain Cyzicenes), 5. 211 (*in proram rediit ratis* rightly explained, where Langen went quite astray), 8. 439 *sqq.* (where by careful analysis it is shewn that the condition of the last part of the poem affords no evidence for the view that Val. left it unfinished). Sometimes the text is very successfully defended against emendation : see on 2. 259 ; 6. 213, 606 ; 7. 447 : a good case is made out too for 5. 246 *sqq.* Dr. Renkema sometimes fails to do justice to his predecessors. The explanation of 3. 225 *sqq.* given on p. 32, paragraph 1, is identical with that given by Wagner, developed by me in 'A study of the Argonautica of V.F.' (p. 73), and accepted by Langen in his edition. On 4. 216 we are told that all edd. since Thilo have rejected the MSS. reading *fero*, but Bury very rightly retains it. And on 5. 507 *sqq.* although Bury's name is mentioned, one would hardly guess, I think, that the punctuation proposed by Dr. R. is actually that adopted by Bury, from whom he differs only in retaining *uero* of the MSS.

Of Dr. Renkema's own emendations one may say what one has to say of most collections of the kind : they vary very greatly in merit. There are some very good, perhaps convincing ones : see on 1. 49 (*iamque*), 2. 99 (*foco*), 4. 512 (*ultima*), and add perhaps 1. 149, 563 ; 2. 454. But a good many are very unnecessary. The redundancy of *manus aciesque Pelasgum* in 3. 126 is not in the least suspicious in Valerius (see *Study etc.* p. 69). In 3. 590 *sqq.* Hercules mad with grief for the loss of Hylas runs amok through the woods : 'Hard fate had beasts or guiltless men on whom he lighted in the wilds.' 'Viri illi ubi quaerendi sunt in deuiis saltibus?' asks the matter of fact critic, and changes *uiris* to *auibus*. The thought suits modern sentiment or the practical mind of a keeper on a grouse-moor better than Valerius' epic ideals. In other cases the impetus of emendation seems to have clouded grammatical insight. The reading proposed for 5. 321 *sqq.* involves taking *quaque uia* to mean *quavis uia*. As for *fas aliquae nequeat tibi femina*, Dr. R.'s

remedy for the old crux at 5. 670, if the reader can construe it by himself I advise him to accept it. But in case he fails, it may be well to transcribe the author's rendering: 'An tibi fas est Iuppiter (uelut sanctam legem apud animum statuisti) ut femina ne aliquae quidem possit (ne minimum quidem efficere ualeat)?' Personally, I doubt the construction of *fas*, the use of the plural *aliquae* where even the singular would have been obscure enough, and the position of *tibi*. The question of order arises also in the emendation of 7. 226: to me an emendation which introduces to us the collocation *quid tu nam* is frankly impossible.

But these are of course extreme cases. Most of the emendations are perfectly free from suspicion on the score of language, and substitute for a difficult expression one that is much less dubious. The refutation of these and of some interpretations of the text would take time, and I must content myself with a selection. **I 524.** The Sun-god is here addressing a heavenly Senate, and is pointing out that the Minyae have no right to make an expedition against Aeetes, who has harmed no Greeks—on the contrary he gave Phrixus the hand of his daughter and so

coniugio uidet e Graia nunc stirpe nepotes
et generos uocat et iunctas sibi sanguine terras.

The last line has been much worried by emenders and in my *Study etc.* p. 71 I proposed to render 'and calls for sons-in-law and invites the lands united in blood to himself (*sc.* to send them).' Dr. R. objects that Phoebus has just explained that he quartered Aeetes in a remote part of the world so that he might live unmolested, and that it would be absurd for him now to say that Aeetes invites Greek immigration. There is much logic in this, but Phoebus is making a speech, and even a god cannot always be logical. Certainly the authors of the extant Roman declamations were not: with them each argument seems to be taken separately and worked up by itself, without much regard for what precedes. And so I think Phoebus in Valerius has two distinct arguments: (1) 'Tis hard that Aeetes who lives out of the turmoil of civilisation should be molested, and (2) He is no foe of Greece. In developing the second, he has rather forgotten the isolation on which he laid stress in the first. Anyhow, it was Phoebus who had disposed Aeetes' habitation: what attitude that king proposed to take towards foreigners was another matter. Dr. R.'s own interpretation is 'And calls (the Greeks) his sons-in-law.' I quite admit the possibility, indeed probability, of a silver poet's using this rhetoric in reference to a person who had only *one* Greek son-in-law. But what about the rest of the line? Aeetes was certainly in a position to 'call (Greece) a land allied in blood to him,' but the mention of so plain and prosaic a fact, the necessary result of the grandchildren being sons of a Greek, after a highly rhetorical statement seems the worst of bathos. **I 779 sqq.** This is one of the worst *cruces* in Val. Dr. R. handles it well, and I believe is right in joining *exorabile retro*, '(a charm) to win back the ghost.' But I strongly doubt if *retro* refers to the return of the evoked ghost to Hades. Seneca is particularly given to using the word in reference to return to life: see H.F. 55 *patefacta ab imis manibus retro*

viast (cp. 280), Tr. 433 *recto peruiumst iter* (cp. 724), Pha. 93 *inuui retro lacus*. Nor does Dr. R. mention the difficulty which seems to me most desperate: how can Alcimedea, a heroine and the mother of the hero Jason, be said to have acted *gentis de more nefandae*? Whatever the passage means, whencesoever it may have come to its present position, I feel certain that *Thessalis* means 'a Thessalian witch.' **III 539** *Eoi fercula regni*. Dr. R. says this '*sanam interpretationem non admittit*.' As he gives no reason why he rejects the ordinary rendering 'trays laden with the spoils of the East,' one is driven to conjecture. The word *fercula* does not strike one as very suited to the dignity of epic poetry, but I know at least one passage where it occurs, and that is Stat. Th. 12. 524, a context very similar to ours. If however the genitive is the stumbling block, I can only say that 3. 610 *monstra nouercae* (=a nouerca missa) and 8. 355 *uirginis unda* (=a uirgine concitata) seem as bold. **IV 130** *reges preme, dure, secundos*. Dr. R. refuses to translate this as an apostrophe to Jupiter: 'Oppress, if you will, cruel God, those whose sway is inferior to yours.' His emendation *rex te premit arte secunda* is sufficiently refuted by the explanation: 'arte luctandi diuino fauore secundata,' but it may be well to give some evidence in support of the other rendering. The realms of Neptune and Pluto continually take the respective epithets of *secundus* and *tertius* in the silver poets, of course in reference to the division of the world between Jupiter and his brothers. Sen. H.F. 599, Pha. 904, Luc. 5. 622 will illustrate what I mean in the case of Neptune. It is Neptune who is speaking in Valerius, and had the latter written 'regem—secundum,' I think none could have objected. Cp. the extension of the usage in Luc. 9. 645 where *numen secundum* of course means that Phorcys came next to Neptune in the marine hierarchy. The plural is however perfectly defensible, for (1) silver rhetoric, as we saw above, loves invidious plurals, and (2) *reges secundos* is I think a fair poetic equivalent for 'omnem regem, siue secundum siue tertium siue adhuc inferiorem.' Cp. further Seneca, Ep. 92. 7 *animalium numero pulcherrimo ac dis secundo*, 90. 28 *secunda numinum forma*.

IV 230

nec pretium sonipes aut sacrae taurus harenae,
praemia sed manes.

Dr. R. will not believe that *sacrae* refers to competitions at Olympia or some similar festival, and takes it as equivalent to *nefandae*. The other use of *sacer* is pretty common (I have noted Ov.] M. 1. 446 *instituit sacros celebri certamine ludos*, Sen. Const. 9. 5 *in certaminibus sacris*, Sil. 14. 54 *sacra corona*, Quintil. 2. 8. 7, 3. 7. 4) and is almost certainly to be assumed here. Val. is thinking of games in Homer and the Epic rather than of the historic festivals with their crowns: in the Nemean games of Statius (*Theb.* 6. 664) a horse is given to one of the victors. **V 618** *Geticis ueniens Gradiuus ab antris*. 'Quid sibi uolunt antra illa Getica? Nam Getarum regionem planam ac campestem fuisse nemo ignorat.' Yet Claudian wrote *Procubat horrendus Getico Gradiuus in Haemo* (*Prob. et Olybr.* 120) in days when these regions were only too familiar to the Romans. **VII 171** *Tum Venus*

aligerum mater sic fatur Amorum. As the speech which immediately precedes this line is addressed to Venus, Dr. R. objects to her being designated afresh 'tanta uerborum ambage.' But surely we have a very similar state of things in V. 356. At l. 352 Medea *nutricem adfata timore est*: her speech occupies ll. 353-5, and then the nurse's reply is introduced with

audit uirginei custos grandaeva pudoris
Henioche.

These lines seem to me modelled on Homer's τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα, Ἀτρεΐδῃ Μενέλαε διωτρεφὲς ὄρχαμε λαῶν, and the like. The Latin epic refused to take over the whole stock in trade of the Greek, but it had no objection to introducing, occasionally, most of its mannerisms. Ennius was probably much more Homeric than Vergil in this respect: among his fragments I note *respondit Iuno Saturnia, sancta dearum* and *olli respondit rex Albai longai*. It would be in no way surprising to me if Valerius when he penned these lines was under the influence of the archaistic tendency which, although it came to a head much later, certainly existed in Nero's time and must have gained force under such an emperor as Vespasian.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

Sheffield.