

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 Tibullus l. 1, 2

Karl P. Harrington

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 02 / March 1895, pp 108 - 109

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201315, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201315

How to cite this article:

Karl P. Harrington (1895). On Tibullus l. 1, 2. The Classical Review, 9, pp 108-109
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201315

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

33 *ad fin.* πολέμου τε καθεστῶτος καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὅλων τῆς πολιτείας οὕσης.

It is remarkable that the particle γε does not occur in the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. Is it possible that we may have it here? πολέμου γε καθεστῶτος would be an improvement ('considering that there was war'), and would suggest the sense desired by Herwerden who proposed καίπερ πολέμου.

35 § 2. καὶ τοὺς τ' Ἐφιάλτον καὶ Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους τοὺς περὶ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν καθεύλον ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου, καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν ὅσοι διαμφισβητήσεις εἶχον καὶ τὸ κῦρος ὃ ἦν ἐν τοῖς δικασταῖς κατέλυσαν ὡς ἐπανορθοῦντες καὶ ποιῶντες ἀναμφισβήτητον τὴν πολιτείαν.

Two distinct attacks were made on the Areopagus, the first by Ephialtes, the second by Pericles. There is now no justification for Sauppe's rejection of the words καὶ Περικλῆς in Arist. *Pol.* ii. 12 (1274a): καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴν Ἐφιάλτης ἐκόλουσε καὶ Περικλῆς. The notice in our treatise, 27 § 1, τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἔνια παρείλετο saves, beyond dispute, the suspected words. But it is to be observed how the misinterpretation of such a phrase led to the false notion, found in Plutarch, that Pericles was the real mover in the attack which was headed by Ephialtes. The reform of Ephialtes was previous to the prominent appearance of Pericles on the political stage; but it is not unlikely that when Pericles resolved to 'dock' some of the few privileges which Ephialtes had left to the Areopagites, he did not make the motion himself but got another to make it for him. This is the only supposition on which we can explain the words in 35 § 2. What, we are entitled to ask, did they leave unstirred the well-known laws in which Pericles carried on the policy begun

by Ephialtes, and only remove those of the obscure Archestratus of whom or of whose laws we never hear elsewhere? The conclusion seems unavoidable that Archestratus was the instrument of Pericles, and that he is here mentioned because the laws were in his name.

But the sentence requires a slight emendation. According to the text of the papyrus τοὺς τ' corresponds to καὶ τῶν Σόλωνος κ.τ.λ. But it is clear that καθεύλον refers only to the Areopagitic laws, not to the Solonian which were preserved in the Prytaneum; and τῶν Σόλωνος θεσμῶν cannot be separated from καὶ τὸ κῦρος, both depending on κατέλυσαν. It has been suggested that τ' should be omitted: but why should it have been inserted? The true restoration is

καὶ <τοὺς> Ἀρχεστράτου νόμους

47 § 5. εἰσφέρεται μὲν οὖν εἰς τὴν βουλὴν τὰ γραμματ[εῖα τὰ] τὰς καταβολὰς ἀναγεγραμμένα.

So Kaibel and Wilamowitz. But κ stands before τὰς in the papyrus. Read perhaps:

τὰ γραμματεῖα τὰ πεντεκαίδεκα.

1€ (as often 1C) might have become K. Fifteen γραμματεῖα have been mentioned: ten containing the instalments paid in each prytany; three for those paid three times a year; one for those paid in the ninth prytany; and one, in the case of the Basileus, specially reserved for the revenue arising from τεμένη (ἐν γραμματεῖοις λελεγκωμένους does not mean that he used more than one at a time).

J. B. BURY.

ON TIBULLUS I. 1, 2.

et teneat culti iugera multa soli.

In the *Classical Review*, May, 1894, p. 198, the reading *magna* is defended by F. K. Ball, with comparison especially of Ov. *Amor.* 3, 15, 12, and Statius, *Theb.* 5, 550.

1. The MSS. read as follows: *magna*, AVg; *multa*, G, Par. Fris. Diomedes (the MS. testimony is reversed in the note above mentioned); and the combination of both the excerpts with Diomedes is here on the whole to be preferred to AV.

2. *Iugera* occurs but four times in the Tibullus collection, as follows: (a) i. 1, 2 (this passage). (b) ii. 3, 42: *multa innumera iugera*. (c) iii. 3, 5: *multa iugera*. (d) i. 3, 75: *novem per iugera*. In these other cases the text is not in dispute, save that Baehrens characteristically wishes to change the *multa* at ii. 3, 42 to *culta*! *Multa* is therefore rather strikingly in harmony with the usage of Tibullus.

3. Similar are: Ov. *Fast.* iii. 192: *iugera pauca soli*; ex Pont. iv. 9, 86: *iugera multa*

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.