

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](#)



N. Heinsius and the Cologne MS. of Silius

Walter C. Summers

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 03 / April 1902, pp 169 - 172

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205751, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205751

How to cite this article:

Walter C. Summers (1902). N. Heinsius and the Cologne MS. of Silius. The Classical Review, 16, pp 169-172 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205751

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.

Blass complained of this,¹ though he does not seem to have seen the importance of the matter, and he missed some very instructive passages in this connexion. At l. 177 Heinsius says 'Mod. ad Liu. xxi. reposuit ex C *feruida*, r̄q̄ *neruis* relicto, ut in Agrippinis membranīs sic quoque uideatur fuisse, nec displicet.' Here he is actually inferring *ex silentio* from Modius, when he had beside him a collation of the MS. There is no doubt Heinsius, or Heinsius as edited by Drakenborch, was sometimes quite content to follow Modius' account of C and let his own collation go. This is shewn by some passages where his note shews misunderstanding of Modius' words. Thus at 9. 240 Heinsius says '*mobilis agger* ex Col. Modius,' but Modius says '*ita membranae, nisi quod mobilis ex molibus feci*.'² At l. 340 Modius had said '*reponendum, cum libri ueteres habeant omnis pro omneis* (which his vulgate, the Basle edition, has), *pudet omnis*.' I have no doubt at all he meant C by his *libri ueteres*, and as an actual fact *omnis* is the reading of the best MSS. Heinsius' note however runs '*pudet omnis* cum Modio et Colon.', evidently mistaking Modius' conjecture for a reading of C. Another example of the desperate state of these Heinsian notes is ll. 214. Here Modius corrected to *rapite*, *ite* in 211 and *pateatne* in 215. Yet Heinsius says '*rapite ite* cum Modio ex scriptis . . . deinde scribendum *pateatne*, *etc.*, quamquam aliter scripti.' The last words shew that he has mistaken Modius' correction in 215 (doubtless based on C) for a conjecture of his own!

Blass³ has shewn that when Heinsius' note says a given reading is in *scripti*, we cannot assume that he knew it was in C. He points out, among other considerations, that sometimes Heinsius says '*scripti* so and so,' and later on gives us another reading, as that of C. He even finds passages where none of the 3 MSS. known to Heinsius have the reading assigned to *scripti*! These points are mentioned by Blass in a footnote, and I cannot but think that if they had been brought into greater prominence, Heinsius' testimony to C would have been less valued by scholars. As an actual fact,

his testimony to the Oxford MS. is not at all reliable. Whether he was to blame for this is another matter: the collation he used was not his own make; but then, neither was his collation of C. And, to tell the truth, his evidence as regards the readings of the old editions is not to be depended on. Drakenborch noted this. He only secured copies of the first Roman and the first Venice editions when his own edition had advanced some way in the press.⁴ But from Bk. 7 onwards he begins to cite R¹ independently of Heinsius, and it is not long before their voices clash. At 7. 416 Heinsius says '*perculsa* scripti et Rom. ed.' Drakenborch's note follows with '*Romana princeps et quidquid praeter Romanam quam N. Heinsius consuluit ueterum editionum uidi stant pro vulgata lectione*' (*i.e. perculsa*). At 8. 233 Heinsius says R has *aequantem*, Drak. notes '*R. princeps aequam te*.' And so every now and then afterwards. Most of the divergencies are slight, but then so are the points for which Heinsius cites C: Modius had reaped the best corn before him. It is just possible that, as Drak. hints above, Heinsius used a Roman edition later than the *princeps*. That Drakenborch is always right as regards R¹, I can positively affirm, and I can also state that Heinsius did not know R². But there seems to have been a Roman edition of slightly later date than these, and it is possible that the key to the matter is here.

I do not however believe so. Exactly the same phenomenon occurs with regard to the editions of Marsus. Here Drakenborch's notes of discord begin at 9. 50. Heins. says '*ed. Marsi armis*': Drak. notes '*omnes quas ego quidem uidi (uidi autem tres) Marsi edd. habent in aruis*.' He has similar notes at 199, 377 of this same book and elsewhere. And it so happens that in preparing my critical edition of Silius I found certain readings ascribed by Heinsius to Marsus,⁵ which I proposed to mention in my apparatus. The Rylands Library at Manchester, which has put at my disposal a greater number of the old editions of Silius than any other one editor has used, happens to have no copy of Marsus, but I had three of his editions consulted⁶ in reference to these

¹ l.c. p. 208.

² Blass, strangely enough, cites this passage (note 37) to shew that Drakenborch, whilst professing to give Modius' note from *Novantiquae Lectiones*, edits it and edits it wrongly. This is true, but he omits to notice that Heinsius' note contains the same mistake. This rather suggests that Drakenborch is really responsible for both; however, Barth has made the same mistake, *Adversaria* l. 20.

³ l.c. note 38.

⁴ See his ed., preface p. 8.

⁵ Or '*Ven. vetusta*,' which means the same.

⁶ The Venice editions of 1483 and 1492, the Paris one of 1512. My thanks are due in this matter to Dr. J. P. Postgate and the Rev. Dr. Sinker of Trinity College. There is a Venice ed. of 1493, which I have not seen, but various circumstances make me confident its readings will not make any difference in the matter.

readings, and am in a position to state that neither in text or note are they to be found there. The readings are: 4. 7 *aures*, 10. 67 *furit*, 588 *in strage*, 601 *nostro*, 11. 31 *iam tum*, 58 *Pacuio*, 163 *magnum in magnus postum*, 561 *quin*, 13. 189 *fortunae*, 466 *Clausi*, 722 *aequatum*, 14. 635 *macie*. Three of these I find first mentioned by Dausqueius as his own conjectures, and though Dausqueius says nothing at 11. 58, he makes the correction at 313 and refers to this passage. The other readings I cannot find mentioned by anyone before Heinsius: it is to be noted that he approves of them all¹ with the solitary exception of 11. 31 where he has a conjecture of his own. It is possible however that *iam tum* was his earlier conjecture. Anyhow, I feel sure that, in some way or other, these readings had got into the margin of Heinsius' ed. Colinaei, no doubt originally distinguished as his own conjecture or that of Dausqueius.² Afterwards, some mistake was made: perhaps Heinsius put *v* (vel) before his conjectures and this was taken to mean Veneta, but it is not of much use to try to guess how the confusion arose. We have seen above that Heinsius could mistake a correction of Modius from C for a conjecture of his own.³ The whole matter shews on how weak a foundation Heinsius' testimony to C's readings stands. When I say Heinsius' testimony, I do not wish to absolve Drakenborch and his printers from a share of the blame. No doubt Heinsius' own notes were not always clear, as Drakenborch's remarks on 13. 612 shew. Still, it is ridiculous to find Heinsius contradicting himself in the same note, as at 1. 642. Here he says at the outset C had *exycit* and proposes *exigit*. He quotes passages to support this, among them one from Silius, where, says he, 'Col. *denuo exiit*.' *Denuo* implies that he had said C read *exiit* here, and that the printers put *exycit*. How perplexing too is the situation at 8. 351. Here two readings are possible: *diuersa turbati* or *diuersi turbata*. Barth argues for the former, Heinsius gives the latter and says 'confirmat Col.' Yet the closing

¹ In 11. 163 the reading as given is unmetrical, but Heinsius gives a conjecture which adopts both the *magnum* and the *positum*, and no ed. before him does this.

² The ed. Colinaei *did* contain conjectures in addition to the collation copied from the Gryphian: Drakenborch's Preface, p. 6.

³ Blass also believes he has given us some of Livineius' conjectures as if they were readings of C (l.c. p. 210). But I doubt the instances he gives. In 7. 497 where he assumes *furorem* was really not in C, but came from Livineius, it is worth noting that the Parma ed. gave this reading long before.

words of his note seem to me to suggest that he meant to give the same as Barth, and Drakenborch anyhow implies that Barth and Heinsius were agreed and it is Barth's reading that he interprets. That C did have what Heinsius is made to say it had is not likely; S at any rate have the other reading. I believe the evidence of Heinsius was correct enough, but the printers falsified it.

Whilst handling this subject, I may as well state my position as regards the famous passage concerning Anna Perenna in the 8th book, which is not in any extant MS. Its genuineness is well proved by Heitland, *Journal of Philology*, 1896. But I cannot agree with him that we have no ground for doubting it was in C. The mere fact that we have no reading of C cited in reference to these lines *may* be explained by his theory, that they were got by fresh reference to the St. Gall MS., in which case they would be carefully copied, so that 'no variant sufficient to attract the attention of a sixteenth century collator presented itself in the text of C as compared with a careful copy of S.' But I must point out that this collator was comparing C with the Gryphian text, which contained some considerable divergencies from the text of these lines as given first by Constantius; and Heitland's hypothesis is that Constantius got them from S. Thus we have such variants as 172 *noscis, nescis*; 204 *Latiis, Latii*; 223 *ubi, qua*. Heitland himself sees that his theory is a little difficult to maintain with regard to a much more important variant, after l. 157, where Constantius gave a line which all edd. including Gryphius omitted. If, as he assumes, the line was in S, it must also have been in C—the edd. and C had no connexion, and could hardly have hit upon the same error of omission. How then is it that the collator did not record the line, which C had, but the Gryphian had not? Of course he may have overlooked it, as Heitland hints, but as an actual fact the collator was wide awake here. No sooner does the mysterious passage end than he reappears, and tells us that the line *haec ut Roma cadat &c.*, given first by Constantius and in connexion with these new lines, was not in C.

My own view, gathered from a careful study of the notes in Drakenborch's edition, is that C had not the lines. Heinsius says they were not in the *vetusta exemplaria*: his whole note shews that he assumed they were not in C. Now I do not believe he simply inferred this from the collator's silence, for (1) he was not in the habit of inferring any-

thing from this,¹ and (2) he knew the importance of the matter and would in that case have told us how matters stood. Compare his first note, *re* the title of the poem: *quam operis huius inscriptionem membr. Colonienses prae se tulerint haud scio*. I believe then that he found a definite statement in his Gryphian to the effect that C had not the lines, but that Drakenborch as usual jumbled all the MS. information together. That he *has* abridged Heinsius' note

¹ See Blass, l.c. p. 210.

I feel certain: that scholar would not have contented himself with a simple *an Sili sint multum ambigo*. It is even possible that the note on the line *haec ut Roma cadat &c.*, referred to above is the mangled remnant of a note on the whole passage. But that is pure conjecture, as indeed the whole question is one of more or less probability. But I think the balance favours the absence of the lines from C.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

THE LATIN PROHIBITIVE, AND PROF. ELMER.

NOTHING could have induced me to add to the woes of a philological public, long since weary of this discussion, had not Prof. Elmer employed such unusual methods in his reply. Because of these and the peculiar position I seem to hold among his critics, I see myself compelled to preface my answer with a frank personal statement. Three times, at least, within the past year, Prof. Elmer has charged me with either not reading all of his original article or certainly not weighing or reading every statement with scrupulous care. He has also been kind enough to suggest that a previous study of the grammars would have saved me from what he regards as serious mistakes. Here, I regret to say, Prof. Elmer and the facts are strangers. I have read *The Latin Prohibitive* more than twenty times, spending at times weeks, even months on a single sentence or principle. I have read nearly every author from Plautus to Livy (not to mention my special field of Silver Latin), with reference to the prohibitive, in most cases, from two to eight times. I have thus been able to include in my collections all examples cited by Prof. Elmer, and also to make substantial additions of interest and importance to his lists. The addenda, errata, etc., in my possession would easily make an article nearly as long as his original paper. On several points (invariably the ones which I am accused of ignoring or not weighing with sufficient care), not content with special reading and the consultation of all syntactical works accessible, I have carried on an extended correspondence with the most prominent grammarians in this country, and views that I have held have had the support of their opinions. While I doubtless deserve the severest censure for the time I have wasted, Prof.

Elmer, instead of subjecting me to reproach, should hail me as his most devoted student.

Now a word as regards Elmer's own procedure. It is certainly not too much to expect that an author should be perfectly familiar with his own work before criticising others for their ignorance of it. Either Elmer is sadly ignorant or forgetful of what he has written (as I shall show from his own pages), or more than once in his present paper he deliberately misstates. I sincerely hope the former to be the case; but a critic as merciless as the Cornell scholar, and so fond of making strong and sweeping statements, should be sparing in the use of his picturesque and vigorous vocabulary until absolutely certain that his own work is flawless.

Let us turn to Elmer's reply. In my paper (*C.R.* xv. 157-159), I cited fourteen examples which I regarded as prohibitions, and which had not been given in *The Latin Prohibitive*. Of these Prof. Elmer says: 'As a matter of fact all but one of them were intentionally omitted by me . . . The only one of the fourteen instances that should have been included in my list is *Haut.* 292 (I am quoting from Elmer's corrected proofs, so am certainly not misrepresenting him), and this instance, as will be seen below,' etc. Now, in the final list of presents given in a footnote below, *Haut.* 292 does not occur, is not cited in any part of his reply, and is moreover *obsecro ne conicias*—an instance of a class which Prof. Elmer does not regard, so he says, as prohibitive, and which he censures me to the extent of forty-three lines (practically a verbatim reproduction of *A.J.P.* xxii. 82-83), for using, ignoring his treatment in 'inexcusably careless fashion'! This is an excellent beginning for a critic who is