

And 1135 is the year unambiguously indicated by 'era .M.C.LXXIII.'; for the Spanish era, used until the fourteenth century, reckoned its years from 1 January 38 B.C.

However, from the many other manuscripts of this translation, in which this date recurs with various corruptions,¹ it is clear that not Cod. Bern. 404, but the translation itself, is dated by the *subscriptio*. We are therefore reduced to other evidence, including the matter relating to the years 1178 and 1179 reproduced by Hertz.² Hagen (*Catalogus codicum Bernensium* 366–7) dates Cod. Bern. 404 to the thirteenth century; *sed de hoc uiderint periti*.

I conclude with the remark that this article is intended not merely to correct an error, but also to demonstrate the debt that Gellian scholars owe to Hertz. It is always from him that we must start.

115 Kingston Road, Oxford

L. A. HOLFORD-STREVENS

¹ See Alonso, pp.38–9, where however Cod. Bern. 404 is not listed.

² *Ed. mai.*, II.lxi n.††, lxii–lxiii n.**.

NOTES ON AUSONIUS *PROF. BURD.* 16.9 ff. (PEIPER), PUBLILIUS SYRUS 341, AND MARTIAL XI.50 (49)

Ausonius, *Prof. Burd.* 16.9 ff. (Peiper)

nobilis et dotata uxor, domus et schola, cultae
principum amicitiae contigerunt iuueni,
dum Constantini fratres opulenta Tolosa
exilii specie sepositos cohibet.

This passage is discussed in *AJPh* 97 (1976), 252, by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, who rightly draws attention to the 'absurdity' of *exilii specie sepositos* and observes that 'Ausonius must be saying that the brothers were banished in fact, though not in name'. Shackleton Bailey's solution is to replace *exilii* with *hospitii*, which gives excellent sense, but, even on the assumption of psychological error by a scribe, which is how Shackleton Bailey explains the corruption, may seem rather hard to credit. An easier solution might be to write *auxilii* for *exilii*: in appearance Constantine's brothers were being helped and protected, in reality confined in exile.

Publilius Syrus 341

libido cunctos etiam sub uultu domat.

So the manuscripts, presenting a statement, 'libido cunctos . . . domat', which leaves *etiam* without adequate meaning in its context. Salmasius proposed *cinctos* (= *strenuos*), but, even if *cinctos* could stand for *strenuos*, which I doubt, it is not apparent why the active and energetic as a group should be imagined to be less susceptible to lust ('etiam cinctos libido domat') than others. Cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.9.9–10 'mitte puellam, strenuus exempto fine sequetur amans'. Those who are likely to be less susceptible, though even they fall, are those who are on guard

against *libido*, the *cauti*. For the corruption of *cautos* to *cunctos* cf. Claud. *D.R.P.* iii.206.

Martial XI.50 (49)

iam prope desertos cineres et sancta Maronis
nomina qui coleret pauper et unus erat.
Silius optatae succurrere censuit umbrae,
Silius et uatem, non minor ipse, colit.

This is the text as printed by Lindsay and Heraeus. In *censuit umbrae* and *non minor* . . . *colit* it incorporates early emendations, but these are so generally accepted—and, as it seems to me, with such good reason—that there is no need to discuss them further. An obvious problem remains in the pointless iteration of the proper name *Silius*, and consideration of the legitimacy of the expressions *optatae* . . . *umbrae* and *succurrere censuit* is involved in any attempt to decide which occurrence of *Silius* should be removed, and how.

In *JPh* 30 (1907), 254–5 (= *Classical Papers*, pp.730–1), Housman declared that *optatae* . . . *umbrae* was ‘mere nonsense’ and asserted that *succurrere censuit* was not the same as *succurrere statuit* but rather meant ‘advised that assistance should be rendered’, which was not in fact what *Silius* did. He was answered, briefly and pertinently, by Heraeus (*Adnot. crit.* to ed., p.xlviii), who on the first count compared Mart. X.71.3 ‘*caras* . . . *umbras*’ and Cic. *Ad Quint. Fr.* ii.7 (6).2 ‘*mi optime et optatissime frater*’ and on the second referred to *TbLL* iii.795.72 ff. where three passages from Columella are cited to illustrate *censere* = *uelle*: iii.21.6 ‘*si* . . . *fructum carpere censuerit*’; v.8.3 ‘*nos in hoc genere arboris diligenter praecipere censuimus*’; and ix.11.2 ‘*turba uetustior* [sc. *apium*] . . . *minoribus parere non cense[n]t*’ (I give the text of Lundström’s edition). In all three examples it is as easy to understand *censere* = *statuere* as = *uelle* (*TbLL*’s equivalent). On this evidence from Martial himself, Cicero, and Columella, Heraeus’ tacit conclusion, that ‘*optatae succurrere censuit umbrae*’ may here signify ‘*carae umbrae succurrere statuit*’, seems justified.

Housman’s objections to line 3, issuing in the conjectural restoration *optandum tantae succurrere censuit umbrae*, led him, necessarily, to retain *Silius* in line 4. Defence of line 3 against his objections seems to leave the choice open for the elimination of one otiose appearance of the proper name. But is the choice entirely open? Removal of *Silius* in line 3 (Lindsay proposed *illius*, which is feeble) leaves untouched a slight infelicity in line 4 which is not affected either by Ribbeck’s *filius ut* for *Silius et* or by Young’s *fatum* for *uatem*. *Silius* honours the poet, *non minor ipse*. Not less himself a what? Not less himself a poet, of course, which is how W. P. Ker in the Loeb edn. in fact translates. I find myself wondering, therefore, whether Martial may not perhaps have written

Silius optatae succurrere censuit umbrae
et <uates> uatem non minor ipse colit.