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](#)

Notes on Valerius Flaccus

J. A. Nairn

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 01 / February 1899, pp 21 - 22

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042268, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042268

How to cite this article:

J. A. Nairn (1899). Notes on Valerius Flaccus. The Classical Review, 13, pp 21-22
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042268

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTES ON VALERIUS FLACCUS.

IN the following paper I cite from the edition of P. Langen (Berlin, 1896). My remarks concern Books III. to VIII.

III. 122.

inde uagi nec bella modis nec casibus isdem
conseruere manu.

tela is the reading of Vat. *bella* Bentley has been generally received. But cf. VI. 182 sq.

illi ubi consertis iunxere frementia telis
agmina.

Langen there quotes Lucan V. 708 *consertis puppibus agmen*, yet changes the text of our passage.

III. 412. The use of *armenta* for *oves* occurs again in IV. 337, so the conjectures of Köstlin and others are unnecessary.

IV. 221.

ponto uolitet Symplegas inani.

Here is an unnoticed parallelism with Lucan II. 718,

uanaque percussit pontum Symplegas inanem.

VI. 279.

hinc animos acies auget magnoque doloris
turbine Gesandrum Mauors rapit.

The conjecture of Heinsius, *acres* for *acies*, is unquestionably right, yet it has not been accepted by Langen. The mention of *acies* is quite irrelevant, but with *acres* we have Gesander's episode introduced by a reference to him without further delay: the introduction of it by means of *que* (not *at*) is much less appropriate to its length.

VI. 389.

omnes rapturus ab agmine Colchos.

Langen says '*verba obscure dicta: "agmen" hoc loco solam mouendi notionem habere uidetur.*' I take the words to mean 'with intent to sweep the Colchi from the field.' The use of *rapere* for *celeriter capere*, *de-*

vincere, is illustrated in the Lexica from Lucan.

VII. 362.

idem stat fulmina contra
Salvus et in mediis florescunt ignibus herbae.

Said of the *Prometheae florem de sanguine fibrae* 356. *Salvus* is Bährens' conjecture for *Sangus* Vat. I have no hesitation in proposing *Sanctus*.

VII. 587.

inicit Aesonides dextram atque ardentia
prendit
cornua, dein totis propendens uiribus haeret.

The *cornua* in question belong to one of the fire-breathing bulls. *prendit* is Thilo's reading for Vat. *mittit*, adopted by Langen hesitatingly. It does not explain *mittit*. On the other hand *mutat*, the reading of the *codex regius*, does, and gives an excellent sense to boot, albeit at the expense of epic dignity. Iason finds the horn which he seizes first too hot for him to hold—Valerius carries the conception of a fire-breathing bull to its logical conclusion—so he grasps the other; but soon becoming better able to bear the heat, he exerts all his strength and grapples with the animal (*totis propendens u.h.*).

VIII. 162.

quod nullae te, nata, dapes, non ulla iuuabant
tempora.

Said to Medea by her mother. *tempora* is very feeble, and hardly to be defended as Summers (A Study, p. 76) would defend it by *redde diem noctemque mihi*, the words of Medea to the pseudo-Circe VII. 246. One word only is an adequate completion of the sentence, and that is *carmina*, cf. Odyssey I. 152,

μολπή τ' ὀρχηστὺς τε, τὰ γὰρ τ' ἀναθήματα
δαιτός.

For the confusion of trisyllabic words in general v. Markland, preface to Statius *Sylvae*, p. viii.: for the confusion of *carmina* and *tempora*, id. p. 334 of commentary.

VIII. 285.

dixerat atque orans iterum uentosque uiros-
que
perque ratis iit et remos uox alta magistri.

Absyrtus is pursuing his sister Medea, and these words describe his appeal to the crews of his ships (v. 261) to make all speed. The reading of Vat. in 286 is *perque ratis supplex et remigis uexilla magistris*. The number of conjectures on this unhappy line exceeds perhaps that on any other line or passage in the poem. They may be seen, or some of them, in Thilo's critical note, and though Langen's reading is perhaps the least probable of all proposed so far, many earlier efforts are not much happier. But to our task. With one exception all conjectures known to me are based on the assumption that the word *uexilla* is corrupt. There is not the faintest shadow of probability in this: indeed our attempt to restore must proceed on the assumption that *uexilla* is certainly right. It takes little power of divination to see that Absyrtus exhorts personally the crew of his own ship, but in the case of the other ships he is obliged to use *signals*. Further, *magistris* must depend on *supplex*. For the first of these two points we may compare the Agamemnon of Seneca, v. 39 (Agamemnon)

cuius secutae mille uexillum rates ;

also vv. 448 sqq. of the same play,

signum recussus regia ut fulsit rate eqs.

quoted by Köstlin (*Philologus* 48, p. 673). Köstlin, who is the exception referred to above, has done good service in pointing out these passages, and thus making certain what was already probable that such was the meaning. But he falls heavily in the sequel: streicht man von den überschüssigen sinnlosen Silben in *et remigis* das *igis*, so bleibt *et rem*, eine Verstümmelung von *iterum*. There is no syllable superfluous here, though I admit the meaning is conspicuous by its absence. But not for long: *remigis* is simply a corruption, slight if bewildering, of *reliquis*: *per ratis uexilla supplex reliquis magistris*. Absyrtus need not be *magister* of his own ship: the sense is the same. To complete my conjecture, *et* before *remigis* is from the margin, and is itself a corruption of *it*, written originally at the side as a correction of *at(que)*. The absence of a principal verb led Ruperti to this correction, and Thilo prints it in his text. Thus Köstlin's doubt is disposed of (*l.c.*). The lines then run as follows:

dixerat itque orans iterum uentosque uiros-
que
perque ratis supplex reliquis uexilla magis-
tris.

As for the word *reliquis*, Statius uses it three times, and Silius much oftener (Lachmann's *Lucretius*, p. 305). I hope that a single instance of it will henceforth be recognized in Valerius Flaccus.

J. A. NAIRN.

ON THE SEQUENCE AFTER *NE* PROHIBITIVE.

III.

THE following article presents the evidence on the above subject from Plautus and Terence.

The citations, as a rule, follow the numbering as in Ritschl's edition. No example has been entered on either side in which the *Prohibitive* meaning is not legitimate and defensible. *Dramatic emphasis* tells strongly in favour of the prohibitive sense, in situa-

tions where there is otherwise little evidence either way.

It may be proper to add that the French and English translators (Riley and Nisard) are not appealed to as carrying any *critical* authority, but simply as interpreters showing the common sense view of any passage apart from critical theories.