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 Lucretius V, 1442

W. A. Merrill

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 03 / April 1902, pp 169 - 169

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0020574X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0020574X

How to cite this article:

W. A. Merrill (1902). On Lucretius V, 1442. The Classical Review, 16, pp 169-169
doi:10.1017/S0009840X0020574X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

new theory of his own; his careful and scholarly examination of instances, especially in connexion with the MS. evidence, is in the

main of the nature of negative criticism, directed against Prof. Goodwin's theory.

E. A. S.

ON LUCRETII V, 1442.

Iam mare velivolis florebat † propter odorest

ALL Lucretian scholars now regard the last two words as corrupt, and Mr. Housman (*Journal of Philology*, 25, 243) is probably right in tracing them to 2,417 'araque Panchaeos exhalat propter odores.' If this opinion be correct, no emendation based on resemblance to these words is entitled to consideration unless supported by other and weightier arguments. The old vulgate *navibus*, which goes back to Marullus, has been revived by Brieger and Giussani, and is well supported by the usage of Ennius. I would go farther and would write *navibu' ventis*, comparing Ennius, Ann. 380 V. 'hostes accedere ventis | navibus velivolis;' Cato, Orat. 1, 8, J. 'omnem classem ventus auster lenis fert, mare velis florere videres.'

The accumulation of ablatives is Lucretian, as Munro has shown on 1, 183. Furthermore, *navibus* may be defended by C.I.L., 9, 60, 2, 'navibus velivolis magnum mare saepe cucurri;' and Enn. Tr. 74 R., 'rapit ex alto naves velivolas,' and 52, 'velivolantibus navibus.' I cannot believe that Servius' *navibu' pontus* is right; possibly *altum* is the missing word, which could be supported from Ennius, and which Lucretius may have used instead of his frequent epithet *magnum*, an epithet that would be out of place here. Servius, quoting from memory then, wrote *pontus* for *altum*. Cf. Lucr. 3, 1030 'ire per altum.'

W. A. MERRILL.

University of California.

N. HEINSIUS AND THE COLOGNE MS. OF SILIUS.

FOR our knowledge of the now lost Cologne MS. of Silius we are almost entirely dependent on the information given us by Modius and Heinsius. The latter possessed a collation of it in a copy of the Gryphian edition (probably that of 1547).¹ This he copied into an ed. Colinaei, which, with another edition, containing his explanatory notes, passed into the hands of Drakenborch. The latter in his edition carefully distinguished by the addition of the author's name the notes of Heinsius from those of others and himself.

It is of high importance to the student of Silius to know whether this collation was a good one. Heinsius, on rather slight grounds, believed it had been made by Carrio: even if it was, we do not know under what circumstances, and so with what degree of accuracy. As however it is certain that Modius in his *Novantiquae Lectiones* emended almost always by the aid of this Cologne MS., the natural way of

testing the collation would be to see whether the collator had observed the variations from the Gryphian text offered by C in the passages handled by Modius.

Here however we at once meet with a difficulty. Gryphian and ed. Colinaei alike are lost; our only knowledge of this collation must be gleaned from Heinsius' notes in Drakenborch. At 1. 431 Modius altered *missus* of the vulgate to *Temisus*. Heinsius' note runs: 'scribe *Temisus* cum Modii membranis.' At 613 of the same book Modius corrected *comae* to *togae*. Heinsius says 'togae Mod. ex Col.' It is needless to add examples; these two are typical instances. At such passages, *unless the collation was very imperfect*, Heinsius must have found C's reading recorded in the Gryphian, and duly transferred it to his ed. Colinaei. But Drakenborch gives the note such a form that we cannot tell whether Heinsius is not simply taking Modius' word for the reading.²

² Exceptional cases occur, where Heinsius says 'in Coloniensi legitur, etiam Modio teste' or the like (14. 422) or even says expressly that his collation differs from Mod. here (so 8. 671).

¹ Blass, *Die Textesquellen des Sil. Ital.* pp. 206, 207.