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](#)

Summers on the Argonautica A Study of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus, by Walter C. Summers, B.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. London: G. Bell & Sons.) 2s. 6d.

R. C. Seaton

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 02 / March 1895, pp 111 - 113
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201352, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201352

How to cite this article:

R. C. Seaton (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 111-113 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201352

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SUMMERS ON THE *ARGONAUTICA*.

A Study of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus, by WALTER C. SUMMERS, B.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. London: G. Bell & Sons.) 2s. 6d.

A WARM welcome must be given to this little book, which forms an excellent introduction to the study of a poet not much read in this country. It is divided into nine sections in which the following subjects are discussed: the name of the author and scope of the poem, similarities of thought and language between Valerius and later writers, the indebtedness of Valerius to his predecessors, especially Apollonius Rhodius and Vergil, the syntax and metre of Valerius, and finally we have some literary and textual criticism. Mr. Summers has treated his subject thoroughly and systematically from his own point of view, but it may perhaps be regretted that he has not made it a more complete 'study' in itself by incorporating the results of the investigations of Schenkl, Thilo and other scholars who are often quoted. As it is, the work of Mr. Summers has to be supplemented by continual reference to their writings, which are more or less difficult of access. Thus the date and life of Valerius are not discussed because 'they have been adequately treated by other writers, especially Thilo.' We should like to see a short statement of Thilo's results. Again, in giving lists of contradictions and lack of connexion in the *Argonautica*, and of imitations from or by other writers, Mr. Summers only makes additions to the lists given by other scholars. I can only say I think it a pity that he has so limited himself.

There is little doubt that the poem, like most other Latin epics, was intended to be in twelve books, and the only question is whether its unfinished state—for we have only about seven and a half books—is due to Valerius himself or to some other cause. The argument of Baehrens to prove that Valerius lived to finish his work amounts to no more than the statement that from a calculation of dates he had time to do so, and that it was customary (?) with the Epic poets of Rome to write and recite a book each year—assuredly a *debile fundamentum* (as Baehrens himself allows) on which to build his conclusion! On the other hand, the absence of reference in Statius to any

incidents on the return voyage of the Argo does not go far to show that Valerius did not finish the poem (the view to which Mr. Summers inclines) when the admitted rarity of reference to these later incidents in other writers is taken into consideration. Schenkl's alleged proof of the original incompleteness of the *Argonautica* from examples of contradictions and want of connexion in the text at various points may be met by the supposition that Valerius, like Vergil, lived to complete his poem but not to revise it, for the examples given by Schenkl and added to by Mr. Summers are not more remarkable than similar examples in the *Aeneid*.

However it be, this point will probably remain a matter of conjecture, as will also the question how far, in his account of the return voyage, Valerius diverged, or intended to diverge, from Apollonius. Certainly the ingenious parallels that are brought forward from the Orphic *Argonautica* tending to show that the author of the latter had Valerius before him—a relationship which Mr. Summers claims, and apparently with good reason, to be the first to have expounded—point to a great divergence from the Greek. This imitation, however, if once admitted, is also evidence *pro tanto* that Valerius did complete his work. Consequently, to save the opposite theory, Mr. Summers has recourse to the highly improbable hypothesis that the account of the return voyage in the Orphic poem 'may be due to some plan of it left behind by Valerius.'

Mr. Summers acutely traces the debts owed by Valerius to his predecessors as regards the subject-matter, but I cannot agree that there is much likelihood of Valerius having had the present Scholia of Apollonius before him, without further evidence that these Scholia were in existence at that time. The three Scholiasts on Apollonius whose names are given are Lucillus of Tarrha, Sophocles, and Theon. Of Sophocles nothing is known, of Lucillus hardly anything, and if Theon, as is thought likely, was the well-known grammarian of that name and father of Hypatia, his date is of course much later than Valerius. No doubt an unmistakable reference of Valerius to these Scholia would be a different matter, and would in its turn help to date them for us, but the two references given are merely conjectural. Far the most important pre-

deceutors of Valerius are Apollonius and Vergil, and to them naturally most space is devoted. The influence of Apollonius is both direct and indirect. The direct influence appears under three aspects: (1) more or less literal renderings of the Greek, (2) similes, (3) various episodes. Of the episodes it is said that Valerius 'likes to treat with comparative brevity points which had already been dwelt upon in detail, and conversely.' From this I see no reason to dissent, but when it is added as an example 'that the gathering of the heroes which takes up only a score or so of lines in Greek, occupies here [in Valerius] a couple of hundred,' I am not sure that I understand what is meant. In Apollonius the gathering of the heroes, which I should take to mean the catalogue of the Argonauts, occupies 211 lines, not merely a score or so. The indirect influence of Apollonius is found all through the poem. Most readers will agree with Mr. Summers that Valerius is superior in artistic arrangement and probability. Two pages are devoted to a comparison between Apollonius and Valerius in their treatment of love. On this well-worn theme I do not desire to say much, because after all is said each reader will probably retain his own view. I do not however consider that Prof. Ellis in his review of the present work in the *Academy* some time ago has quite done justice to Mr. Summers on this point. He writes: 'I cannot agree with Mr. Summers in his apparent preference for Valerius in his treatment of love: he finds this superiority in the gradual and artistic development of Medea's passion. But the natural frigidity (which he admits) of the Roman always makes itself felt, nor can it be said that his genius led him instinctively to the exhibition of female passion. Whereas from the moment when Apollonius' Medea appears upon the scene, it is perceptible that the poet has reached the point of real interest, the vital centre of his art. Till then he is the mere narrator; thenceforward he is identified with his heroine, and steps, so to speak, on the stage in his own person.' With the excellent judgment herein contained I agree emphatically: at the same time Mr. Summers hardly goes so far as to pronounce in favour of Valerius in his description of love on the whole. What he says is, 'The strong point in the description of Valerius is that he has depicted the *gradual growth* of love better than either of his predecessors.' Upon this however I should at once join issue. Vergil's Dido I put aside, as a delineation incomparably

superior to anything in Apollonius, much more in Valerius; but, after all, is there such a thing in ancient classical literature as the gradual growth of love? I fail to see it either in Euripides, Apollonius, Vergil, Ovid, or Valerius. Love is represented as something introduced into the human soul from outside and is entirely beyond the control of the subject of the passion. It is a fate, a disease, a heaven-sent plague. Hence the mechanical contrivances for its production which are so tasteless to us, such as the arrows of Eros &c. In Apollonius Eros shoots an arrow at Medea. It takes effect and inflames her with the love for Jason required for the purposes of Hera. Cupid takes the form of Iulus *noctem non amplius unam* and inspires Dido with love for Aeneas. Ovid's heroines are victims to fate, Phaedra, Ariadne, Hypsipyle. Medea says of her love for Jason *et me mea fata trahebant*. Is it different with Valerius? We read that Juno borrows the cestus of Venus and repairs to Medea in the guise of her sister Chalciope. Mr. Summers says 'the use of the cestus is not at all clear.' But surely it is very clear, its use is the same as in the 14th book of the *Iliad*, viz. to give the wearer the power of inspiring love whether it be for herself, as in Homer, or for some one else, as in Valerius. It is true that Medea had had a previous chance meeting with Jason, but that was not enough. It was necessary that she should have an all-absorbing passion for him and this had to be brought about by the application of some external force. What appears to be the gradual growth of love is, I venture to think, rather the various manifestations of the passion which, subsisting there all the time, a full-blown rose from the first, is ready to be called into action at the 'psychological moment.' If these remarks are just, and they enunciate the same view as that taken by Sainte-Beuve in his well-known article on the Medea of Apollonius, then the alleged superiority of the Roman poet falls to the ground.

The sections on the imitations from previous Latin writers (in which Mr. Summers refutes Bæhrens, who denies any imitation from Ovid and allows very few from Lucan), on the syntax and the prosody of Valerius are very well done. I cannot help thinking that in one point, where it is said that of the genuine trochaic caesura we have four or five examples while Mueller admits only one, Mr. Summers has misunderstood Mueller, who seems to have meant only

one case of a trochaic caesura without a hephthemimeral caesura too. Mueller's example is iii. 191

frater Hagen Thapsumque securigerumque
Nealcen.

In all the other cases cited by Mr. Summers there is a hephthemimeral caesura as well. It is clear that *egō* in viii. 158 cannot stand and we must adopt Mueller's *ego o* or make some greater change. Speaking of Valerius' style, Mr. Summers finds, peculiar to Valerius, 'a fulness and copiousness of expression which adds little to the meaning.' But surely this repetition of the thought is a marked feature of Vergil's style too, to which Henry in his voluminous and amusing commentary constantly calls attention, speaking of it as *theme* and *variation*.

The last section deals with the text in a judicious and conservative manner. ii. 641

cannot, I believe, be satisfactorily translated as it stands, nor does Mr. Summers make much of it. In vii. 156 we should surely read *pudore* with Baehrens (after Voss) for *pudori*, and thus at once restore sense and grammar. I have noticed a few examples of slight errors or misprints. At the bottom of p. 49 two more commas are needed to make the sense obvious. Twice the late Prof. Sellar has his name spelt Sellars, in the note on p. 21 *Mên* should be *Mene* or *Mênê*, and on p. 71 *uestu* is a misprint for *ueste*. It has naturally occurred to me to attempt to point out what I consider to be defects rather than to take up room with commendation, the former being a more useful if less gracious task, but I cannot conclude without expressing once more my sense of the great merit of Mr. Summers' work.

R. C. SEATON.

THE NEW EDITION OF PAULY'S ENCYCLOPAEDIA.

Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, neue Bearbeitung, herausgegeben von G. Wissowa, (Metzler) Stuttgart. 1893—4. Vol. I 2902 columns (*Aal* to *Apollokrates*). 30 Mk.

PAULY'S *Real-Encyclopädie*, originally published in six volumes (1839—52), takes its title from its first editor, AUGUST PAULY (1796—1845), who was one of the staff of teachers at the Gymnasium at Stuttgart. The first volume of the original work appeared in 1839, and, after the death of Pauly, the last three volumes were edited by Teuffel (1820—78) and Walz (1802—1857), the former of whom completely recast the first volume for its second issue in 1864—6. A new edition of the whole work is now in preparation under the general editorship of Dr. Georg Wissowa, Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Marburg, who is already known as the editor of the second edition of Mommsen's *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer*. He has secured the co-operation of nearly 120 experts in different departments of Classical learning; the work will be comprised in ten large volumes of about 1450 pages each, and will be completed in ten years.

The first volume, which has been published
NO. LXXVI, VOL. IX,

in two parts, now lies before us. It is practically an entirely new work, and, owing to its thoroughness and completeness, deserves the warmest welcome from all who know the value of a comprehensive and absolutely trustworthy book of reference in the departments of Classical Mythology, Geography, Biography, History, Literature, Archaeology, Art and Antiquities. One of the many advantages of the new edition is that it includes all the names of persons of any historical importance whatsoever. Thus, under the heading of *Alexandros* we have no less than 107 persons of that name; under that of *Annius*, as many as 127 members of the *gens Annia*, including Milo and Marcus Aurelius. It does not profess to compete with what has been justly described by Mr. Tozer as 'that model of compendious learning,' Pape-Benseler's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, which necessarily includes many names entirely unknown to fame. Thus Agamestor son of Laius (Apoll. Rhod. 2, 852), Agasicles of Sicyon (Pausan. 2, 10, 3), and Agathophanes of Cythnos (known by an inscription alone) are to be found in Pape-Benseler, but not in the new Pauly. Similarly, the Amaryllis of Theocritus, who lives in the *Pastoralia* of Longus, and is immortalized by Virgil and Milton, has apparently too shadowy an existence to find