

of a collapsing bridge it is said: 'iam saxa fatiscunt Emotaeque trabes' (865–6).

That leaves *sonora*, which is not in suspicion, according to Klotz, '*modo ne cum loco coniungatur*'. Yet with *loco* it clearly goes: why is the locus *sonorus*? Garrod implies the answer: in his apparatus he confesses to an, as we can now see, illicit desire — to emend the text to include a reference to Amphion. But Garrod's heart was in the right place: the locus is *sonorus* because the walls were brought there by music — a subtly Statian allusion, developed explicitly in 873 ff.

II

Through the night Argia, with the elderly Menoetes for companion, presses on towards the Argive corpses mouldering outside Thebes (*Theb.* 12.228 ff.). Finally, breathless, Menoetes says 'I think Thebes is not far off: the air is filthy, the birds of prey come back through the void. Yes, the walls are not far off: their shadows and the watch-fires can just be seen. The walls are near. Night was just becoming more silent herself and only the stars were loosening the blackening shades.' Argia shuddered.

Well she might shudder at such inconsequentiality. Why is the old man waxing lyrical in the imperfect tense about the darkness? He is not of course: in the editions the speech of the old man is not closed soon enough. It ends at *iuxta* (line 253) not *tenebras* (254). In fact this is a finely atmospheric piece of writing. The old man pants out a few words: his speech is broken: three times he says the walls are near, but each time gaining in assurance. He falls quiet. Silence. '*Modo nox magis ipsa tacebat*'. Only the stars break the darkness. We can feel the chill — and Argia does. Finally she too speaks. . . . Now read on.

University College, Cardiff

KEN DOWDEN

A MISDATED MANUSCRIPT OF GELLIUS

The manuscript B of Aulus Gellius, containing *N.A.* 9–12 and 13.5, and now split at *potuit/admonendi* 12.10.3 between Cod. Bern. 404 and Cod. Lugd.-Bat. B. P. L. 1925, is dated by Hosius (Teubner edn., I.xii) and Marshall (O.C.T. I.xvii) to 1173 on the strength of the *subscriptio* to an astronomical work immediately preceding Gellius in Cod. Bern. 404. This work is the 'Liber Atphargan'i [*sic*] in scientia astrorum et radicibus motuum caelestium' translated by Johannes Hispalensis;¹ the *subscriptio*, quoted in full by Hertz (*ed. mai.*, II.lxi), indicates the date as follows (I expand contractions): Expletus est die uicesimo quarto .V. mensis lunaris anni Arabum quingentesimi .XXVIII. existente, .XI. die mensis Martii era .M.C.LXXIII. It is surprising that no one till now has bothered to calculate the equivalent in our calendar of 24 Jumādā 'l-'Ūlā, A.H. 529: it is the period from sunset to sunset, or in astronomical reckoning from noon to noon, on 11–12 March 1135.

¹ See M. Alonso Alonso, 'Juan Sevillano: sus obras propias y sus traducciones', *Al-Andalus* 18 (1953), 17–49. Johannes' original was al-Farghānī's astronomical compendium (*Kitāb fī jawāmi'* 'ilm an-

nujūm), later translated anew by Gerard of Cremona; the title 'liber Atphargan' i etc.' implies *Kitāb al-Farghānī fī 'ilm an-nujūm wa-'uṣūl al-ḥarakāt as-samāwiyya*.

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.

Publius 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