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](#)

Suetonius, Nero, 45

W. Chawner

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 02 / March 1895, pp 109 - 110

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201327, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201327

How to cite this article:

W. Chawner (1895). Suetonius, Nero, 45. The Classical Review, 9, pp 109-110 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201327

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

reti; Verg. *Georg.* iv. 127: *pauca relictī iugera ruris*; Juv. 9, 60: *iugeribus paucis*.

4. *Multa* is quite in harmony also with the spirit of this first elegy, in which the poet so often suggests that, while he once possessed *many* acres, he now has but *few*; cf. vv. 5, 19—20, 37, 41.

5. The whole passage in Ovid (*Amor.* 3, 15, 11—14) reads:

*Atque aliquis spectans hospes Sulmonis aquosi
moenia quae campi iugera pauca tenent,
quae tantum' dicat 'potuistis ferre poetam,
quantulacumque estis, vos ego magna voco.*

(a) The two most important Ovid MSS. (the two Paris MSS.) are not available on this passage.

(b) To back up *parva* here, as K. P. Schulze does, by referring to Hor. *Sat.* 1, 6, 7 (*Olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent*) is idle. For (1) *legionibus* here refers to troops of the Etruscans, who had no Roman 'legiones'; and (2) *legionibus* here naturally = *exercitibus*, a usage sanctioned by the highest authorities of the Augustan age (as well as other periods), e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 9, 368: *cetera dum legio campis instructa tenetur*; *Aen.* 8, 605: *de colle videri poterat legio*; &c.

(c) *Parva* would seem too strong an expression here; for while *pauca* might be accepted as poetic hyperbole, *parva* would appear to carry with it an almost contemptuous seriousness which Ovid would scarcely apply to Sulmo, especially since it is far

from true that the plain of Sulmo was a narrow one.

(d) The *parva* might easily have been interpolated by a misunderstanding of the passage arising out of a confusion of *iugera* with *moenia*, in accordance with which the interpolator might have thought he was properly contrasting *parva* with the *magna* of v. 14.

6. The passage in Statius, *Theb.* 5, 550 (*spatiosaque iugera complet*) is an outrageous hyperbole, as it refers to the size of the dragon that had just killed the child Archemorus. It may be explained as a hypallage for *spatia iugeralia*; i.e. the dragon is said to be stretched out over a space as big as acres. It does not therefore seem a fair parallel to the serious expressions *magna iugera* and *parva iugera*.

7. The 'magna' in our Tibullus passage may have arisen from some copyist's oversensitive ear to assonance, *iugera magna* being easier to write from dictation than *iugera multa*.

8. It seems doubtful, therefore, whether any Latin parallel to the English idiom, 'broad acres,' exists. If one had been in vogue, would 'magna' have been the adjective? or something like *patentia* or *diffusa*?

KARL P. HARRINGTON.

University of North Carolina.

SUETONIUS, NERO, 45.

Alterius [statuae] collo ascopera deligata simulque titulus: Ego quid potui? sed tu culleum meruisti.

THE above is the reading of all the editions. *Ascopera* is a conjecture of Poliziano, for which *ascopa* is found in all MSS. The passage describes an incident at the end of Nero's reign, when derisive mottoes were attached to his statues or written up elsewhere. The words *ego quid potui* have puzzled the editors. One interpretation is 'Ego quid potui (sc. peccare)?' Baumgarten-Crusius in a long note says that the *ascopera* attached to the neck of the statue signified, 'abeundum iam esse in exilium et miseriam Neroni,' and he goes on to explain the words put into the mouth of the *ascopera*; 'Ego cui nulla potestas in civitate sed iustum de te iudicium quid

potui nisi hoc? sed tu, si leges valent, ut matricida culeum meruisti.'

Neither of these interpretations carries conviction. The latter evidently adopts the gloss of Suidas: Ἀσκοπήρα· τὸ μάρσιπιον ἦτοι τὸ σακκοῦθιον (wallet, knapsack) and throws emphasis on the latter part of the compound—πήρα. There appears to be no authority for this meaning except Suidas. A similar gloss is found in Ducange (*Gloss. m. et i. Lat.*) s.v. ASCOPERA idem quod *ascopa*, marsupium. But he gives a quotation from a Chronicle of the tenth century: Cum sciret non nisi in *ascopera* nisi modicae quantitatis vinum haberi, where a. obviously means ἀσός, uter. And Lewis and Short quote from the Vulgate, Judith 10, 5: Imposuit itaque abrae suae *asco-peram* (v.l. *ascopam*, LXX. ἀσκοπήθιον) vini.

This is satisfactory evidence that in later Latin *ascopera* was used of a receptacle for liquids like the simple ἀσκός. If the usage may be assumed to reach back to Suetonius' time we can get a much more pointed meaning out of the words by punctuating: *Ego quid? potui; tu autem culleum meruisti*—

where *potui* is the dative expressing the purpose, 'the predicative dative,' and the meaning is: 'What am I? A sack to drink from. But you have deserved a sack of another kind.' The allusion is of course to the well-known punishment of matricides.

W. CHAWNER.

NOTE ON HOR. OD. IV. ii. 49.

It may seem rash to attempt to emend an author like Horace, who is so much read, and has had so many editors; and it may be thought presumptuous to meddle with a passage on which so many well-known scholars have spent their efforts; still the emendation which I have to propose is at once so simple and so probable that I can think of no reason why it should have escaped so many generations of editors.

The traditional reading of the best MSS. in this passage is:—

teque dum procedit, io triumphe!
non semel dicemus, io triumphe!

and this Hirschfelder (4th ed. of Orelli) retains, finding none of the emendations yet suggested an improvement on the MSS.

With this reading *Triumphus* is personified (as it is taken in *Epodes* ix. 21) and *procedit* refers to Augustus. But it should be noted that throughout the poem the second person refers to Iulus as in verses 2, 33, 41, and again in v. 53, the first line of the following stanza. The variant *procedis* does not eliminate the difficulty of the passage, whether the 2nd person is under-

stood to refer to Augustus or to the personified *Triumphus*.

'*Procedit*' should clearly be kept, from MSS. evidence as well as from intrinsic probability; and the word can only refer to the 'triumphator.' The next step is to get rid of the pronoun: editors who have done this are Meineke and Bentley; but the former's 'atque' is as prosaic as the latter's 'isque' is weak and un-Horatian: nor can one see how the reading 'te,' which has the consensus of the MSS., could have arisen from either of them.

I propose to read '*terque*': 'and we, as Caesar doth advance, the citizens, not once alone will raise the cry "Io Triumphe!" but thrice "Io triumphe!"' etc.

I do not wish to lay any stress on the antithesis '*ter...non semel*' (the Greek πολλάκις τε κοῦχ ἄπαξ) but rather on the 'thrice-repeated cry' *io triumphe*, with which one may compare the threefold repetitions in the chant of the Arval Brethren, also the thrice-uttered Greek shout of triumph 'τῆνελλα καλλίνικε'—καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλῶς κεχλαδῶς, Pindar *Ol.* ix. 2.

H. F. H.

θερίδιον.

In Julian's charming epistle to Evagrius (numbered 46) occurs a word *θερίδιον*, which ought to find a place in the lexicons:—

τοῦτο ἐμοὶ μεираκίῳ κομιδῇ νέψ·θερίδιον
ἐδόκει φίλτατον.

θερίδιον is formed from *θερίζω* as *χειμάδιον* from *χειμάζω*.

L. and S. quote Xenophon and Aristotle for *θερίζω* with the meaning of *passing the summer*; but omit the noun. The whole of this letter of Julian shows that he uses it here to indicate a dwelling for the summer.

E. J. CHINNOCK.