

Emendations in Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* book 5*

Abstract: Der Artikel bespricht einige Passagen aus dem fünften Buch von Valerius' *Argonautica* und schlägt über ein Dutzend neue Konjekturen vor. Es wird damit wiederholt argumentiert, daß der Text der *Argonautica* einer gründlichen Neubewertung bedarf.

Keywords: Valerius Flaccus, lateinische Dichtung, Textkritik, Jason

This contribution continues my earlier notes on the text of Valerius' *Argonautica*, and besides individual suggestions, aims likewise to demonstrate that there remains ample scope for further emendation of the poem's text.¹ Here I only propose some sixteen changes in book 5, which, however, should not be taken to imply that the rest of the text is free from unsolved problems.² For each passage, I begin by printing a version of the 'vulgate', with a concise apparatus; γ is the common ancestor of the surviving complete independent manuscripts (V and L), C is the (mostly) lost *codex Carrionis* (when its readings are known), ω is their agreement.

Argonautica 5.39

Book 5 opens with the Argonauts having to deal with the demise of two of their comrades, Idmon and Tiphys (35–40):

non tulit Aesonius geminis flagrantia cernens
corpora cara rogis, sed pectore ductor ab imo
taliam uoce gemit: quid tantum infensa repente

* This publication has emanated from research conducted with the financial support of Taighde Éireann – Research Ireland under Grant number 22/PATH-A/10638..

¹ B. Kayachev, "Emendations in Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* book 8", *Classical Quarterly* (forthcoming), "Emendations in Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* book 7", *Mnemosyne* (forthcoming), "Emendations in Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* book 6" (under review), the first of which also offers an overview of the current state of the textual scholarship on Valerius' poem. Cf. further e.g. T.E. Franklino. "The cause of Idmon's death at Seneca, *Medea* 652–3 and at Valerius Flaccus 5.2–3", *CQ* 70 (2020) 268–75, making an attractive proposal for the text of 5.2.

² I have taken into account the following editions and commentaries, though I may not always cite them individually: G. Thilo, *C. Valeri Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon libri octo* (Halle 1863); E. Baehrens, *C. Valeri Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon libri octo* (Leipzig 1875); P. Langen, *C. Valeri Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon libri octo* (Berlin 1897); C. Giarratano, *C. Valeri Flacci Balbi Setini Argonauticon libri octo* (Milan 1904); E. Courtney, *C. Valeri Flacci Argonauticon libri octo* (Leipzig 1970); W.-W. Ehlers, *Gai Valeri Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon libri octo* (Stuttgart 1980); H.J.W. Wijsman, *Valerius Flaccus: Argonautica, Book V* (Leiden 1996); G. Liberman, *Valerius Flaccus Argonautiques*, vol. 2 (Paris 2002); F. Spaltenstein, *Commentaire des Argonautica de Valérius Flaccus (livres 3, 4 et 5)* (Brussels 2004); J. Mariné Isidro, *Gai Valeri Flac: Argonautiques*, 2 vols. (Barcelona 2017).

numina? quas nostri poenas meruere labores?
bina (nefas) toto pariter mihi funera surgunt
litore. magna adeo comitum numerosaque pubes?

39 toto ω: tuto *Sabellicus*

Many editors have adopted the old correction *tuto* at 39; Liberman conveniently sums up the case against the transmitted *toto*: on the one hand, “il est choquant de voir *toto litore* employé à propos de deux bûchers organisés séparément”, contrast Luc. 9.180–1 *toto litore busta | surgunt* and Verg. *Aen.* 11.199–200 *litore toto | ardentes spectant socios*; on the other, “*nefas* a plus de sens avec *tuto* qu’il n’en peut avoir avec *toto*: il est anormal que des morts surviennent quand on a accosté à un rivage pacifique, c’est le signe de quelque défaveur divine”.³ I think Spaltenstein is right to question the popular correction: “*tuto* ‘sans danger’ n’a aucune raison d’être puisque Jason ne déplore pas, par exemple, un paradoxe tragique qui ferait mourir ses camarades précisément là où tout danger paraît exclu; rien de cela n’apparaît non plus dans les vers suivants”; yet his defence of the *paradosis* does not convince either: “*Toto* est certes bien général, mais l’idée est claire: le rivage entier est occupé par ces funérailles, avec l’emphase naturelle dans cette plainte rhétorique” – this line of reasoning could work, but only if the passage were not specific about the extent of casualties; what is at stake here is not that the whole place is in mourning, but that the Argonauts have lost two of their number (which in and of itself is rather meagre).⁴ I suggest we should write *uno*: having to bury *two* comrades is too much – not for the *entire* coastline, but for a *single* shore. Jason’s point is that they simply cannot afford to lose two crew members on a single stay – their force is not numerous enough to sustain such losses (40). For the wording we may compare 8.267–8 *puppe (nefas) una praedo Phrixia reportat | uellera*, where the nuance is somewhat similar: a single ship has been able to perform such a great deed as stealing the golden fleece. The corruption could be a case of synonym substitution (one quantifier replacing another: cf. in a way Arator, *Apost.* 1.325 *tecum nox sola* [v.l. *tota*] *remansit*), but perhaps more likely is scribal reminiscence of 4.590 *toto non ullus litore Ponti*, from a passage a mere two hundred lines earlier in which Phineus predicts the tragic events of the beginning of book 5.

***Argonautica* 5.50**

³ Liberman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 160 n. 10.

⁴ Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 398; cf. further, and equally unconvincing, J. Strand, *Notes on Valerius Flaccus’ Argonautica* (Gothenburg 1972) 105–9.

Jason continues to lament Tiphys' death (49–51):

hoc labor, hoc dulci totiens fraudata sopore
lumina et admotis nimium mens anxia Colchis
profuit? heu quantum Phasis, quantum Aea recessit!

50 admotis *Gronovius*: attonitis γ

All current editions and commentaries are unanimous in adopting Gronow's *admotis*; the resulting text is fanciful in both sense and expression, but admittedly not too much so, at least according to the usual view of Valerius' style.⁵ The line is commonly taken to mean something like 'a mind growing more and more uneasy as the Colchians drew nearer', but it is not clear that it can bear such a dynamic construal.⁶ It might have been difficult to argue against this text were it actually transmitted, but luckily it is not, and while it may not be impossible to imagine *admotis* being corrupted to *attonitis*, the correction hardly imposes itself. I suggest a far easier solution is to read *attoniti ... cordis*: the difference between *cordis* and *colchis* is minimal (*di* = *ch*; the confusion of *r* and *l* may have been helped by their phonetic affinity, both being liquids), and the toponyms in the following line will have exerted contextual pressure putting the notion of Colchis in the scribe's mind (the ending of *attonitis* will have been a subsequent adjustment). The resulting expression – *attoniti nimium mens anxia cordis*, 'the extremely vigilant mind of a dedicated heart' – may be somewhat unusual, but conveys a fitting sense: though the phrase *mens cordis* is unparalleled, *mens animi* is an established idiom (cf. e.g. Pl. *Epid.* 530 *pauor territat mentem animi*, Lucr. 4.758 *mens animi uigilat*, Catull. 65.4 *mens animi*), and though *attonitus* means primarily 'stunned', it can have a more active/positive sense, "Fascinated (by), intent (on), absorbed (in)" (*OLD* s.v. 5, and note esp. Luc. 5.476 *attonitam miscenda ad proelia mentem*, Juv. 3.7.66–7 *magnae mentis opus nec de lodice paranda | attonitae*).

***Argonautica* 5.126**

The Argonauts sail past the Thermodon (122–7):

Gradiuo sacer et spoliis ditissimus amnis,

⁵ Cf. in general Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 400–1.

⁶ The text should properly mean 'a mind all too worried now that the Colchians have been brought near', but the Argonauts have just entered the Black Sea, and Colchis is still far away.

donat equos, donat uotas cui uirgo secures
 cum redit ingenti per Caspia claustra triumpho
 Massageten Medumque trahens. est uera propago
 sanguinis, est ollis genitor deus. hinc magis alta
 Haemonidae petere et monitus non temnere Phinei.

The expression *propago* | *sanguinis* at 125–6 has long troubled the editors: in such a context, both nouns would mean ‘offspring’, which makes it absurd.⁷ Meyncke’s proposal to punctuate after *propago* encounters three obstacles: (1) the anaphoric repetition of *est* makes the text easier to parse; (2) without a dependent genitive, the point of *uera* is lost; (3) it is not clear whether *sanguinis* should be construed with *genitor* or with *deus* (and neither option is easy).⁸ The second objection is also valid against Schenkl’s *sanguineusque ollis genitor deus*, and I find Liberman’s *sanguinei*, with *dei* to be supplied from the following clause, unjustifiedly convoluted.⁹ I have thought of writing *Gradiui*: the occurrence of the same name in the same line-initial position four verses earlier might speak in favour of, as much as against, its restoration here, but palaeographically the corruption would not be the easiest (though it is not unimaginable either, if we assume the loss of line-initial *G* as the catalyst). I am inclined to prefer *sanguisque*, for which compare [Sen.] *Oct.* 292–3 *uerumque genus Martis in illis | sanguisque uiris* (of the ancient Romans); the corruption may have been triggered by the omission of *-que*, after which *sanguis* would have been changed to *sanguinis* to restore the metre, or conversely *sanguis* may have produced *sanguinis* by dittography (*ui* → *uini*), subsequently necessitating the omission of *-que*.

***Argonautica* 5.207**

Having reached the mouth of the Phasis, Jason addresses a prayer to the river (204–9):

tunc tibi, fecundi proles Iouis, orte niuali
 Arcados axe deae, fluuio modo, Phasi, quieto
 Palladium patiare ratem. nec dona nec arae
 defuerint tellure mea: ueneranda †fluentis†
 effigies te, Phasi, manet, quam magnus Enipeus

⁷ Cf. Liberman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 164 n. 31; pace Wijsman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 79–80, Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 418.

⁸ G. Meyncke, *Quaestiones Valerianae* (Bonn 1865) 42–3.

⁹ K. Schenkl, “Studien zu den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus”, *SAWW* 68 (1871) 271–382, at 234–5 n. 35; Liberman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 164 n. 31.

et pater aurato quantus iacet Inachus antro.

207 ueneranda *L*: uerenda *V*: reuerenda Heinsius

A well-established crux is *fluentis* at 207, and Spaltenstein's explanation – "une statue de toi en train de couler" – makes poor sense, both factually (the statue must be anthropomorphic, and 'flowing' would hardly be an apposite description) and linguistically (*te manet effigies tui* is awkward, and the assumed omission of *tui* makes the text more difficult to parse but not more elegant).¹⁰ Wagner's *fauentem* is interesting, and has some palaeographical plausibility (*fau* → *flu* would be straightforward, though accounting for the change of the ending might be more difficult); however, it only shows that absolute *ueneranda* 'venerable' is weak (a statue is venerable by implication, and its placement in enjambement suggests that *ueneranda* should be emphatic, not merely ornamental), and that *ueneranda* should be construed as a gerundive with a dative of agent rather than as an adjective. This is the approach taken by the majority of conjectures, which attempt to supply such a dative: for instance, *tuenti* (Sandström), *futuris* (Schenkl), *colonis* and *Pelasgis* (both Liberman); of these, Sandström's proposal is otiose, Schenkl's superficially more attractive but somewhat jarring in that *futuris* and *manet* would presumably refer to two different future points, and both of Liberman's have no palaeographic plausibility (which is not to say that they are impossible).¹¹ While the asyndeton by which the *manet* clause is attached to the preceding negative assertion is in and of itself hardly objectionable, I find Baehrens's proposal to read *-que* after the gerundive attractive (though he also adopted Heinsius's *reuerenda*, for no good reason I believe):¹² it seems preferable to take the latter as a litotes ('there will be offerings and altars in your name'), and the former as adding on to it ('and you will *also* have a statue'), rather than assuming a tighter logical connection between the two, be that adversative ('offerings and altars will not be absent, *but* you will have a statue') or explicative ('there will be offerings and altars, *for* you will have a statue').¹³ I think it not implausible that *flue-* is a straightforward distortion of *-que* (*f* accounting for the bowl, *l* for the stem, of *q*), which leaves *-ntis* to reconstruct a suitable dative from. Baehrens conjectured *natis*, which seems

¹⁰ Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 440.

¹¹ C.E. Sandström, *Emendationes in Propertium, Lucanum, Valerius Flaccum* (Uppsala 1878) 35; Schenkl, *loc. cit.* (n. 9) 342; Liberman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 169–70 n. 54.

¹² Baehrens, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) XLIII.

¹³ On the semantic values of clausal asyndeton, see J.B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich 1965) 830; cf. further J.N. Adams, *Asyndeton and its Interpretation in Latin Literature: History, Patterns, Textual Criticism* (Cambridge 2021) 20–9.

easy, but cannot mean ‘future generations’, and it is rather restrictive to suggest that the statue will only be venerated by the Argonauts’ children. I think we need a more general term, such as *cunctis*: following *-e* and written as *cūtis*, it could easily be reinterpreted as *-ntis*.

Argonautica 5.303, 305

The first night spent in Colchis proves worrisome (302–5):

praecipue Aesoniden uarios incerta per aestus
mens rapit undantem curis ac multa nouantem.
qualiter ex alta cum Iuppiter arce coruscat
Pliadas ille mouens mixtumque sonoribus imbrem...

303 nouantem *L*: nauantem *V*: mouentem *Reuss*

One recognised difficulty concerns the last word of 303: since Langen *nouantem* is commonly taken to mean “nova consilia capientem”, but as Wijsman admits, this is “a bold use, for which there is no close parallel”; perhaps even more importantly, the point of the passage is that Jason is worried out of his mind, not that he is brainstorming.¹⁴ Reuss’s *mouentem*, adopted by Liberman, has the advantage of following an established usage (*OLD* s.v. *moueo* 19: “To turn over (in the mind), ponder”).¹⁵ However, although, in contrast to *nouantem*, it can perhaps be taken to refer to ‘brooding over’ the potential dangers faced by the Argonauts (rather than to devising new plans), it may still be doubted that this is a good fit for the context – when the simile is over (304–8), the reference is made again only to Jason’s emotional distress rather than to his thoughts: 310 *pectora dux crebro gemitu quatit*. I suggest that we should view *V*’s *nauantem* as the *paradosis* and emend it to *natantem*, in the sense of *OLD* s.v. *nato* 5 (“(of persons or the mind) To be at a loss, be unstable, waver”, cf. esp. Man. 4.256–7 *mutataque saepe | mens natat*, Sil. 7.726 *subitisque bonis mens aegra natabat*), while construing *multa* adverbially. Apart from being marginally closer to the manuscripts than Reuss’s conjecture, *natantem* will be more suitable to refer to Jason’s anxiety and more in tune with the ‘water’ metaphor of the preceding *undantem* (and *aestus*). Another problematic word is *sonoribus*, though it appears not to have troubled editors and commentators; Spaltenstein merely notes: “*Sonores* pour le tonnerre semble n’apparaître qu’ici, mais cet

¹⁴ Langen, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 366; Wijsman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 156.

¹⁵ F. Reuss, “Zu Valerius Flaccus Argon. V–VIII”, *Philologus* 59 (1900) 406–15, at 407.

emploi n’a rien d’inattendu”.¹⁶ The weakness of *sonoribus*, given its unspecificity, is that it can be taken to refer to the noise of the falling rain (cf. e.g. Luc. 9.320 *densis fremuit niger imbris auster*) rather than to thunder; while one may not be absolutely certain, it seems a real possibility that it is a synonym substitution for *fragoribus* (cf. esp. Germ. *Arat.* fr. 3.80 *commixtusque fragor pluuiaribus undis*; see in general *TLL* 6(1).1234.1–41), facilitated no doubt by their graphic (*f* = *f*) and morphologic similarity (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.527, where a mediaeval manuscript gives *sonus* for *fragor*, or Ter. Maur. 238, where the indirect tradition reads *fragorem* for *sonorem*).

***Argonautica* 5.378, 380–1**

The following day, Jason meets Medea for the first time (378–81):

si dea, si magni decus huc ades, inquit, Olympi,
has ego credo faces, haec uirginis ora Dianae,
teque renodatam pharetris ac pace fruentem
ad sua Caucaseae producunt flumina nymphae.

379 ora *C*: arma γ || 380 fruentem *Fontius*: furentem γ

My first suspicion falls on *huc* at 378: with an indicative *ades*, should we have a directional or a locational adverb? or in other words, should the phrase mean ‘you have come hither’ or ‘you are here’? Now, *huc ades* is an established invocational formula, with *ades* being an imperative, and it is easy to see how under its influence *hic ades* can be changed to *huc ades*: precisely this has happened at Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.38 in some *recentiores*. While I have not checked every occurrence of a part of *adesse* with *huc* and *hic*, all other examples of *huc ades* are instances of the ritual formula, but contrast Pl. *Amph.* 562 *domi te esse nunc qui hic ades* where *ades* is the indicative form; similarly, I cannot parallel *huc* with *adest*, but note for instance: Pl. *Merc.* 455 *is hic nunc non adest*, Mil. 1019 *sed hic numquis adest?* fr. 6 *nemo hic adest superstes*, fr. 159 *nam hic deus praesens adest*, Ter. *Ad.* 767–8 *ecce autem hic adest | senex noster*, Phorm. 540 *pater adest hic*, Sil. 10.444 *Hannibal hic armatus adest*. This may not amount to absolute certainty, but the possibility seems very real that Valerius wrote *hic ades*. My second concern is about 380 *renodatam*: the verb is only paralleled once in classical Latin, at Hor. *Epod.* 11.28 where it is used of hair, but the issue is its applicability here, not its

¹⁶ Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 446.

rarity. To begin with, *nodare* means “To tie in a knot or knots” (*OLD* s.v. *nodo* 1): accordingly, *renodare* should refer to undoing this action (as it does in Horace), not to untying one thing from another.¹⁷ No less importantly, it is in fact doubtful that it would make practical sense to speak about untying the quiver from one’s body: a quiver is carried on a strap over a shoulder and can simply be taken off (this is no doubt the implication of Verg. *Aen.* 1.323 *succinctam pharetra* and Ov. *Met.* 2.419 *exuit hic umero pharetram*, the most explicit references in poetry as to how a quiver was carried). When allusion is made to untying the quiver, the implication is that it is being opened so as to take the arrows out (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.1.21 *pharetra cum protinus ille soluta*, *Met.* 5.379–80 *ille pharetram | soluit*, Sen. *Herc. f.* 993 *pharetramque soluit*). I think we have no choice but to read *renudatam*, ‘stripped of your quiver’, for which we may compare 135 *umeros nudata pharetris* (of an Amazon); the confusion of *nud-* and *nod-* is quite common (note e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 9.277 *nodato* [v.l. *nudato*], *Ach.* 2.5 *nudatum* [v.l. *nodatum*], 155 *nodare* [v.l. *nudare*]). Finally, I am troubled by 381 *producunt*: Wijsman glosses it with “to conduct, to escort, accompany”, but this is the sense of *perducere* (cf. *OLD* s.v. *perduco* 1: “To conduct, bring, take (persons, etc., to a destination)”), whereas *producere* means “To bring forth, lead out, produce” (*OLD* s.v. *produco* 1).¹⁸ Given that the confusion between *pro-* and *per-* is ubiquitous, I see no reason not to read *perducunt*; for its use with *ad*, compare for instance Verg. *Ecl.* 6.60 *perducant aliquae stabula ad Gortynia uaccae*.¹⁹

***Argonautica* 5.394**

Medea gives Jason directions for finding Aeetes (392–6):

uirgineo cunctata metu sic orsa uicissim:
quem petis Aeetes genitor meus ipsaque iuxta
moenia, si uiuos possis discernere calles.
hac adeo duce ferte gradus. ingentia namque
castra alios aditus atque impius obsidet hostis.

¹⁷ On its meaning in Horace, cf. L.C. Watson, *A Commentary on Horace’s Epodes* (Oxford 2003) 381.

¹⁸ Wijsman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 191.

¹⁹ After completing this paper, I discovered that my proposals to read *renudatam* at 380 and *perducunt* at 381 had been anticipated by H.M. Poortvliet, review of Liberman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2), *Mnemosyne* 60 (2007) 503–19, at 511, but without much argument; the former has also been discussed recently in an excellent article by N. Bruno, “Latin lexicography and textual criticism: a lexical note on Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* 5.380”, *TC* 15 (2023) 181–9, who, however, does not quite explain what is wrong with *renodatum*. Since the two conjectures have not yet found their way into critical editions, and since new arguments can be adduced in their support, I thought that it might be useful to keep the above discussions.

The point appears to be that the Argonauts have to take a small side road, because the main road is under the control of the besieging forces, but 394 *uiuos* patently makes no sense, *pace* Wijsman (“paved roads are held by the enemy, only small *natural* tracks are available”).²⁰ Watt revives the old conjecture *ueros* (“if you can make out *the right* path”), but surely the noun – “A rough track, path” (*OLD* s.v. *callis* 1) – ought to be the emphatic term here: the difficulty lies in making out the path altogether, not in figuring out which path is the right one (for this implication of *callis*, cf. Stat. *Theb.* 2.496–7 *fert uia per dumos propior, qua calle latenti | praecelerant*).²¹ Delz’s *dubios* could convey some such notion (*OLD* s.v. *dubius* 7: “Not certainly perceptible to the senses”), but it can as easily have a rather inapposite sense (*OLD* s.v. 8: “Untrustworthy, unreliable”), and the ambiguity would be detrimental.²² I tentatively suggest *curuos*: ‘if you can make out this winding path’; for the adjective used of a path, cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 650 *longa curua fila collegit uia*, and for *callis* defined by an epithet referring to its physical features, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.405 *conuectant calle angusto*. The corruption will have involved the misdivision (and at the same time misreading) of *sicuruos* as *sic uiuos*, no doubt under the influence of *sic* two lines earlier, after which *sic* will have been corrected to *si*, but *uiuos* left unchanged.

***Argonautica* 5.436–7**

On the doors of the Sun’s temple, Jason sees a digest of his own adventures (435–7):

texitur Argea pinus Pagasaea securi;
iamque eadem remos, eadem dea flectit habenas;
ipse subit nudaque uocat dux agmina dextra.

435 ipse *C*¹: ipsa γ

The central problem here is the content of 436–7: what exactly do the lines describe, both individually and in relation to each other? The former line appears to refer to Athena steering

²⁰ Wijsman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 195; contrast Liberman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 181–2 n. 114, Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 489.

²¹ W.S. Watt, “Notes on Latin epic poetry”, *BICS* 31 (1984) 153–70, at 166.

²² J. Delz, “Beiträge zur Textkritik”, in M. Korn, H.J. Tschiedel (edd.), *Ratis omnia vincet: Untersuchungen zu den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus* (Hildesheim, 1991) 9–16, at 16.

the Argo, the latter to a ‘leader’ (*dux*, which could be either Athena or Jason, depending on whether one reads *ipsa* or *ipse*) summoning the Argonauts. If that is what the lines are saying, they are out of chronological order: Spaltenstein does not consider this an issue (“ces ecphrases juxtaposent des imaginations sans chronologie”), but others follow Langen in transposing 436 after 437.²³ Now, it is in fact questionable that 436 can refer to navigation: while *flectere habenas* is an established poetic idiom used of changing the course of a horse by pulling the reins (cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 12.471 *manibusque undantes flectit habenas*), and could thus be applied figuratively to steering a ship, *flectere remos* has a rather inapposite sense, ‘to bend the oars (by pushing them hard against the water)’ (cf. Ap. *Arg.* 2.591–2 ἐπεγνάμπτοντο δὲ κῶπαι | ἥντε καμπύλα τόξα, Catull. 64.183 *fugit lentos curuans in gurgite remos*, Verg. *Aen.* 3.384 *lentandus remus in unda*) – it would be absurd to imagine Athena actually engaged in rowing.²⁴ Ehlers is right to take the line in reference to the Argo being equipped with oars and rigging (“*habenae*] armamenta; nondum de navigatione narratur”), but *flectit* cannot convey such a sense.²⁵ Thilo’s *nectit* might work with *habenae* understood concretely as ‘ropes’, but not with *remos*.²⁶ More or less *exempli gratia*, I propose *figit* (the corruption might be somewhat easier to explain in uncial script, with *G*, *E*, *C* and *T* all looking pretty much alike), in the sense of “to attach, fasten on, fit” (*OLD* s.v. *figo* 5b) or perhaps more specifically “To attach (as an organ, limb, or component part); to fix in position, fit; to attach (as a fixture), fix” (s.v. *affigo* 3).²⁷ With 436 thus understood, it makes sense to read *ipse* at 437: once the Argo is ready, Jason makes his appearance and gathers the Argonauts. I see two potential issues in this line. First, while it seems likely that *nuda* can only be taken to mean ‘unarmed’, it is less clear what significance this detail is supposed to have in the context, whether the reference is taken to be to Jason or to Athena.²⁸ I think we rather need a standing epithet, such as *ualida* (*ua* can account for *nu*, and *li* may have been omitted by skipping from *l* to *d*); for the resulting noun phrase, cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.404 *ualida*

²³ Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 502; contrast Langen, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 378, Wijsman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 211–12, Liberman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 183–4 n. 128.

²⁴ Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 502 believes that “Val. pense à la direction que les rames donnent au bateau d’après *navem flectere*”, but this is farfetched.

²⁵ Ehlers, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 123.

²⁶ Thilo, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 150.

²⁷ The use of *simplex pro composito* is a standard feature of Latin poetry, cf. e.g. S. McGill, *Virgil: Aeneid Book XI* (Cambridge 2020) 303; A. Cucchiarelli, *A Commentary on Virgil’s Eclogues* (Oxford 2023) 566.

²⁸ Wijsman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 212, referring the line to Jason, explains: “the hand is unarmed, they are invited, not forced, to come” – but this might rather be construed as a sign of weakness, as if Jason were *imploring* others to join him. Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 503 gives an even more fanciful explanation: “Val. paraît penser ici à la figure d’Athéna Promachos, qui seule explique *nuda dextra*. [...] Val. la montre ainsi qui mène les héros à une aventure qui, cette fois, n’est pas guerrière”.

quatiens uenabula dextra. Second, and more essential, it seems doubtful that *dextra* can function as an instrumental ablative with a verb such as *uocare*: surely *uocat* ought to imply an oral and/or linguistic action, which a *dextra* could not perform (unless one imagines Jason sending out handwritten summons). I have argued elsewhere that at 6.607 *uocati* is an error for *citati*, caused by *-quecitati* being misinterpreted as *-q*; *uocitati* (subsequently ‘corrected’ to *uocati*);²⁹ I suggest we are facing a similar corruption here, an original *-queciet* being misdivided and misread as *-q(ue) uocat* (*q*; is a common abbreviation for *que*; *ue* → *uo*, *cie* → *ca*). For *cire* with *dextra*, we may compare 7.578 *dextra ciet obuius ignem*, though here the verb should of course be taken in the sense of “To call, rouse up, muster, summon” (*OLD* s.v. *cire* 2, note esp. Catull. 68.88 *coeperat ad sese Troia cire uiros*).

***Argonautica* 5.446**

Jason’s grim future is likewise depicted on the temple doors (442–8):

urbs erat hinc contra gemino circumflua ponto,
 ludus ubi et cantus taedaeque in nocte iugales
 regalique toro laetus gener; ille priorem
 deserit, ultrices spectant a culmine Dirae.
 deficit in thalamis turbataque paelice coniunx
 pallam et gemmiferae donum exitiale coronae
 apparat ante omnes secum dequesta labores.

Commentators do not seem to be concerned by 446, but I find saying that Medea *deficit*, “has no more energy” (Wijsman), unmotivated and rather counterintuitive, given that she is in fact quite industriously planning and carrying out her revenge.³⁰ I think it will make better sense to read *deficitur* for *deficit in*, while taking the verb in the sense of *OLD* s.v. *deficio* 2 (“(pass., w. abl. or ab) To be left without, lack”): Medea is being deprived of her marriage. The change is minimal (*ur* ~ *in*), and the misdivision was no doubt influenced by *deserit* written right over *deficit(ur)*.

***Argonautica* 5.459**

Finally, Aeetes and his entourage make an entrance (459–62):

²⁹ B. Kayachev, “Emendations in Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* book 6” (under review).

³⁰ Wijsman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 216.

tum gener Albanis Styry qui aduenerat oris,
 distulerant sed bella toros. tum Phrontis et Argus
 Aeolidae fraterque Melas, quos aduena Phrixus
 progenuit, pariterque leui Cytisorus in hasta.

Again, the line does not seem to have troubled editors and commentators, but I can see no reason why Valerius would not have written *uenerat* instead of *aduenerat* at 459: the prefixed verb introduces an easily avoidable elision, but more importantly it prompts (mis)construing *Albanis ... oris* as a dative rather than an ablative (*aduenire* can take the dative, cf. esp. 534–5 *cuperem haut tali uos tempore tectis | aduenisse meis*, though note 1.156–7 *Iouis armiger aethra | aduenit*). While scribes are not unknown to add prefixes to simple verbs (metre permitting, usually), here a further stimulus may have been provided by *quos aduena* written, with only one line intervening, exactly under *qui uenerat* in the same metrical position after the hepthemimeres.

***Argonautica* 5.483**

Jason explains to Aeetes what brings him to Colchis (479–84):

meque neque huc enses araeque egere paternae
 nec tua Thessalicis quamquam incluta nomina terris
 sponte sequor. cui non iusso tot adire uoluptas
 monstra maris, cui Cyaneos intrare fragores?
 scepra tui toto Pelias sub †nomine† Phoebi
 maxima sorte tenens...

It is clear that the transmitted *nomine* at 483 cannot be right, but it is less clear that either Sabellicus' *lumine* or Heinsius' *numine* is much of an improvement: Liberman prefers the former, Spaltenstein the latter, but both seem to ignore that neither term makes good sense with a quantifier such as *toto* (contrast Stat. *Silv.* 1.4.73 *sole sub omni*, where the generalisation implies the sun's movement).³¹ Baehrens's *momine* is I think a step in the right direction, but the noun, on the one hand, is extremely rare (in poetry it is largely confined to Lucretius) and, on the other, appears to have an abstract and/or technical sense (cf. *TLL*

³¹ Liberman, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 186 n. 141, Spaltenstein, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 513–14.

8.1390.6–22).³² We need a more concrete term referring to the sun’s course through the sky, and either *limite* or *tramite* would fit the bill, but the latter might be slightly easier to account for in terms of palaeography (*tra-* → *no-*), though 480 *nomina*, in the same metrical position, must have been an influence too; for *trames* used of the sun’s route, note especially Sen. *Apoc.* 2.4.3 *obliquo flexam deducens tramite lucem* [sc. *Phoebus*].

Boris Kayachev

boriskayachev@gmail.com

Department of Classics

Trinity College, Dublin

College Green, Dublin 2

³² Baehrens, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) XLV.