

Sofia Egorova

FORGOTTEN VARIANTS
(HOR. *CARM.* 1. 6. 7; 1. 9. 8; 1. 7. 7)*

Introduction

It is well known that any ancient literary work is in fact a sequence of variants transmitted to our time via the medieval tradition. For quite a period the primary task of scholars was *generalization of the material*, and along with it reducing the number of variants: gathering of a maximal scope of variants was followed inevitably by a sort of cull of variants that were considered impossible, and selection of the most probable variants for a printed edition. Even in critical editions the number of represented variants was limited.

Another goal of the modern scholar is the *conservation of heritage* (including that of medieval and Renaissance periods) in its variety, which seems well within reach in the near future through new forms of publishing.¹

And yet, a general trend in the history of tradition, at least in studies concerning the works of Horace, has been a reduction of scope of material for academic readers, which has led to the loss of variants that were previously available. For this article I have chosen three examples of variants that lost their place even in the *apparatus criticus* though they deserve to be mentioned at least there.

* I am grateful to Denis Keyer and Evgeny Filomonov who provided me with valuable observations. I would also like to thank Sofia Nekhai, as I found her bachelor thesis on Roman wine making and storing very useful.

¹ E.g., a PDF-version of an edition, while having the same page structure as a printed book, does not depend on production costs and the overall dimensions of typography. It can therefore contain more additional information, including on the history of the text.

1. *Duplicis* / *duplices* (Hor. *Carm.* 1. 6. 7)

In the first passage in focus, the manuscript variant *duplices* may point at the correct interpretation:

Nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec gravem 5
Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii,
nec cursus *duplicis/es* per mare Ulixei
nec saevam Pelopis domum

conamur <...>

We do not <even> try, Agrippa, to praise these deeds nor the heavy rage of Pelides, who did not know how to retreat, nor *double journeys of Odysseus* / *the journeys of double-faced Odysseus* across the sea, nor the cruel house of Pelops.

Because the ambiguity of *duplicis* is mentioned by both ancient commentators (see below), editors consider this variant as an authorial one. Scholars without second thought refer *duplicis* to the genitive *Ulixei*;² the last commentators who considered the possibility of *acc. pl.* (with *cursus*) were G. Orelli and H. Schuetz,³ and the former warned readers of it as a mistake: “noli contra iungere *duplicis cursus*”.

The medieval revisers were of a different opinion: we see the reading with *-es* in many reliable codices,⁴ and it is confirmed by the orthographic variant *-eis* in *Blandinius Vetustissimus*.⁵ If we summarize the codicology data, we see that the variant *duplices* (a) is represented in both parts of the existing tradition Ξ and Ψ; (b) is present in two oldest manuscripts of the branch Ξ.⁶

² Further I refer only to the commentators who expressed their opinion clearly; of course there are editions that contain *-is* without an exact specification *gen. sg.* / *acc. pl.*

³ Orelli 1850, 46; Schuetz 1874, 22.

⁴ A (Parisinus 7900), E (Monacensis Lat. 14685), a (Ambrosianus O 136), u (Parisinus 7973), M (Mellicensis 1545), Ott. (Vaticanus Ottobonianus Lat. 1660), Ox. (Oxoniensis collegii Reginensis P2). For details see Borzsák 1984. Keller 1878, ad loc., mentions two more manuscripts of a second rank: v (Nienburgensis, 1878 Dessauensis A, beginning of 10th cent.) and L (Lipsiensis rep. I 4 38), along with evidence preserved by Priscianus.

⁵ Cf. *abl. sg. duplice* (*Epist.* 2. 2. 122).

⁶ Very unfortunately this ode is not represented in *Codex Bernensis* (B, Bern. 363), which contains a sort of anthology. It is another interesting question why this programme poem, composed with a rare meter, did not draw the collector's attention.

The consensus of the commentators in favour of genitive is even more surprising because they discuss some difficulty in the combination *duplicis Ulixei*. Concerning this epic hero the adjective *duplex* should mean ‘two-faced’, ‘deceitful’ (*OLD* 6b; *ThLL* 5fß), ‘double-dealing’.⁷ Though this attribute suits Odysseus well and an epithet ‘two-faced’ has some parallels in Greek drama,⁸ it is, as commentators admit, rather pejorative.⁹ This detail brings us to a contradiction, since in Horace’s works Odysseus displays positive traits: “elsewhere more Stoic aspects of Odysseus are exaggerated”,¹⁰ “<Odysseus> painted in a more favourable light”.¹¹ Indeed we see that Odysseus is called *laboriosus* (*Epod.* 17. 16) and *patiens* (*Epist.* 1. 7. 40); he is contrasted to his careless companions in one of the *Epistles* (*Epist.* 1. 6. 62–64); and in another, being *providus*, he is “brought to the stage” as a positive character in epic poetry (*Epist.* 1. 2. 17–26). He may of course be incriminated by the dialogue with Tiresias on legacy hunting (*Serm.* 2. 5), but even here Odysseus’ role is restricted to that of a pupil.¹²

There is another inconsequence besides: why this particular trait of a person was named in a list of epic stories, when one of them concerns the *long* return home? The variant *duplices* (or *duplicis* as *acc. sg.*) depicts the journey of Odysseus as doubled in comparison to “usual” (*OLD* 3 ‘double in quantity’, ‘twice as large’; *ThLL* 9 ‘altero tanto maior’) or ones that happened to be long for different reasons (*OLD* 2 ‘split, divided’; *ThLL* 6 ‘in duas causas spectans, e duabus causis existens’).

This possibility was taken into account by ancient commentators. If Porphyrio states only an intended¹³ ambiguity (*Amfibolon; nam et [duplicis*

⁷ Contrary to *simplex* (Nisbet–Hubbard 1970, 85–86). Strictly speaking, the word *duplex* describes a person only once (Cat. 68. 51: *duplex Amathusia*).

⁸ Eur. *Tro.* 286; *Rhes.* 395. In both cases these words belong to the Trojans, and thus the adjective has a pejorative sense.

⁹ “*Duplex* compromises the hero” (Mayer 2012, 93), while the adjective *versutus* used by Livius Andronicus was perceived as neutral or even positive, ‘smart’, ‘inventive’. According to Bentley’s opinion, *duplex* was meant as an analogue of the *versutus*, used in the 1st line of the Latin *Odyssey*, while the words *Pelidae stomachum* resemble that of *Iliad*.

¹⁰ Nisbet–Hubbard 1970, 86.

¹¹ Mayer 2012, 92.

¹² The origin of this satire goes back to Cynic philosophy, not to the general line of epic plots in Greek and Roman literature.

¹³ The word *amfibolon* was used by Porphyrio only here and on *Carm.* 1. 14. 10 (*iterum pressa / iterum voces*), while in many other passages he used just *aut*, e.g. on *Carm.* 1. 12. 17: *aut ad Iouem aut ad mundum refertur*, see also on *Carm.* 1. 25. 10; 1. 31. 17 etc. I am not sure that Horace played these sorts of games with the reader. At least the examples of amphibolia listed by Quintilian (7. 9) do not contain anything similar – i.e. an adjective not only depending on different nouns, but also having different grammar forms.

Ulixi] intellegi potest, quod significat ‘callidi’, potest et [*duplicis cursus]* per accusativum pluralem accipi, id est: itus ac reditus), the commentary by Pseudo-Acro contains both variants of interpretation,¹⁴ one of them shaped with mathematical precision:

aut quia fertur dolosus, aut certe duplices propter *viginti* annos; nam dum alii duces capta Troia post *decem* annos reversi sunt, Ulixes solus post viginti annos ad patriam dicitur reversus.

It is worth noting also that the definition *duplicis* gives a more dynamic image if referring to an action (*cursus*), than if describing a person (*Ulixei*), and emphasizes that it is a prolonged journey that does not suit Horace’s poetry as a plot.¹⁵

In view of these considerations, the relation *cursus duplicis* may be reconsidered, and the variant *duplices* should be mentioned in the *apparatus criticus* as well testified and having a reasonable meaning, as it was in editions by Friedrich Klingner and István Borzsák.

2. *Sabina* / *Sabino* diota (Hor. *Carm.* 1. 9. 7–8)

The second variant left critical editions for quite a long time – Keller and Holder already omit to mention it.¹⁶

<...> atque benignius
deprome quadrimum Sabina/o,
o Thaliarche, merum diota.

... and more lavishly <than usually> pour, Thaliarchos, four-years-old wine from a Sabine amphora.

¹⁴ Ps.-Acro’s collection of late ancient material refers regularly to several variants of interpretation.

¹⁵ Contrary to widespread belief, there are many examples of close combination of a noun with an epithet, e.g. in the same page: *pallida Mors*, *domus exilis*, *tenerum Lycidan*, *aurae fallacis*, *egregii Caesaris*, *pulvere Troico*, *claram Rhodon*, *bimaris Corinthi*, *intactae Palladis*. Moreover, the words *per mare*, depending on *cursus*, would look somewhat extraordinary in the middle of *duplicis Ulixei* even for Horace’s complex syntax.

¹⁶ In contrast to the variant *largiri potis* in the same strophe, which is represented in all critical editions for some odd reason.

We can find *Sabino diota* only in Richard Bentley's commentary:¹⁷

Vir doctissimus Thomas Gale¹⁸ legere maluit *Sabino*. Credo quasi a Graeco διώτης. Neque dissimulandum est, in vetustissimis codicibus Graeviano¹⁹ et Reginensi,²⁰ in illo praesertim, posteriorem a formatam videri ex o. <...>²¹

Before we turn to the variant *Sabina*, let me express a guess as to why this rare word was used by the poet at all. The noun *diota* is a Latin ἄπαξ λεγόμενον meaning according to the *OLD* 'a jar with two handles', and it goes back to the Greek διώτος, which was used only as an adjective.²² (Initially my interest was aroused by the fact that it does not suit for denoting any particular kind of vessels, as they mostly have two handles.)

For the reason of the same situation (at least, the wine is the same) I suggest referring this passage to the expression *Graeca testa* used by Horace in *Carm.* 1. 20. 2.²³ The most reliable explanation of this phrase belongs to Nisbet and Hubbard:²⁴ having noticed the emphasized *ego ipse* (v. 2), the authors of the famous commentary see in this situation an attempt to conserve remarkable wine²⁵ which demanded a certain kind

¹⁷ Bentley 1869, 29.

¹⁸ 1636(?)–1702, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge 1666–1672.

¹⁹ δ, *Harleianus* 2725. Bentley reports further of his own observations, as Graevius lent this manuscript to him in 1702. It was written in France in 9th cent., which makes it indeed valuable.

²⁰ Oxoniensis collegii Reginensis P², 11th cent.

²¹ In *Harleianus* 2725 the letter “a” is bigger than usually and really seems to be made of an “o”, see the British Library open digital collection: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Harley_MS_2725.

²² LSJ quotes some instances: Anticlid. 13; *OGI* 214. 57; *IG* XXII. 120. 44; Plat. *Hipp. Mai.* 288 d; Moeris p. 44. (If after penetration into Latin this word still “required” some noun, the most likely would be *cadus* [10 instances in Horace] or *testa*.)

²³ *Carm.* 1. 20. 1–4: *Vile potabis modicis Sabinum / cantharis, Graeca quod ego ipse testa / conditum levi, datus in theatro / cum tibi plausus...*

²⁴ Nisbet–Hubbard 1970, 247–248. Other commentaries mention pouring wine into old vessels (see e.g. Colum. 12. 28. 4), comparing it with the practice of keeping whisky in old cherry casks (Page 1962, 182), but Greek wines were not considered superior to Italian wines and were usually denoted by an exact region (and so were amphorae); Goldbacher and Schulze (according to Nisbet–Hubbard 1970, 248) interpret *Graeca testa* as a common vessel, but then *ego ipse* is left without significance. Commager 1962, 326 understands the whole situation figuratively, with Italian wine meaning poetry poured into Greek shape.

²⁵ Recall that Horace “bottled” this wine on the day of ovation for Maecenas after recovery from decease. The same was done when the poet avoided death by a falling tree: Nisbet–Hubbard 1970, 244 calculated that the wine was then kept for 8 years, since 33 BC (*Carm.* 3. 8. 12: *consule Tullo*) until 25 BC (*Carm.* 3. 8. 16–24). (There

of vessel: “a Greek jar was impregnated with salt which would act as a preservative... *Graeca* like *levi* emphasizes the care taken to preserve a wine of great sentimental value but relatively little²⁶ staying power”.

I have to admit that this theory has a weak point: there are no parallels for using *Graecus* with a vessel in the context of storage, only with *vinum*, e.g. Cato, *Agr.* 24.²⁷ Meanwhile, whatever kind of vessel was meant in *Carm.* 1. 20, in our case the noun *diota* can mean the same, and this is the reason why a rare Greek word was used. (The phrase *Graeca testa* could not be used in *Carm.* 1. 9, as there “was no more place” for adjectives.)

Let us return to the variant *Sabina*. It was ignored by Keller and Holder, most probably as a secondary one.²⁸ Another reason – the major part of the mss. – was formulated already by Bentley himself:

...utcumque hoc fuerit; Graece certe δίωτος vel διωτίς diceretur; non διώτης nec διώτη. Neque enim ulla composita ex οὔς terminationes eas recipiunt. ...²⁹ *Glossae Philoxeni: diota, amphorion, oinophorion*. Sed nec inde quicquam didiceris, generisne sit masculini, an feminini. Quare *tutius est, ut in re adeo incerta plurimorum codicum auctoritatem sequamur*.

This passage (belonging to a scholar who was by no means cautious) brings us to a conclusion: if one bases the state of the text upon a quantitative argument, the other variant should be indicated in critical editions.

is still a question whether Horace had his own vineyard. The passage usually used as a *contra* argument, *Epist.* 1. 14. 23 f., does not exclude grapes, as the other plants mentioned there as growing *ocius* [‘more easily’, *OLD* s. v. *ociter* 4], can be nothing other than ἄδύνατον: these spices come from the East [Mayer 2012, 209].

²⁶ Galen (Athen. *Deipn.* 1. 27 b) reports that Sabine wine was kept from 7 to 15 years. As another way to conserve a vessel, Horace mentions pitch (*Carm.* 3. 8. 10).

²⁷ *Vinum Graecum hoc modo fieri oportet. Uvas Apicias percoctas bene legito. Ubi delegeris, is eius musti culleum aquae marinae veteris indito vel salis puri modium; eum in fiscella suspendito sinitoque cum musto distabescat.*

²⁸ Lucian Müller’s commentary may contain some traces of this discussion, as he considered it necessary to mention “diota = δίωτος, like lagoena – λάγυνος” (Müller 1895, 16). This analogy could explain the noun of -a type, represented in a major part of our tradition. Meanwhile Ernout (Ernout 1950 [A. Эрну, *Историческая морфология латинского языка*, пер. М. А. Бородиной], 53–54) notes of Greek loanwords: “Resemblance of declination of the Greek words with -ος and the Latin words with -us was so great, that the Romans could not ignore it. That is why loanwords received the ending -us: Σικελός > *Siculus*, σκόπελος > *scopulus*, Εὐάνδρος > *Evander* or *Evandrus*”. From the rule thus formulated we see that the noun *lagoena* is an exception, while the analogy proposed by Müller was based on another vessel’s denoting. However, the loanwords of this field usually represent the initial declination shape, as e.g. *cadus*, *crater*, *hydria*.

²⁹ Bentley discusses mistakes in scholia, among them in Hesychius’ note s.v. Ἐνώταις.

3. *Fronti* / *frondi* (Hor. *Carm.* 1. 7. 7)

As the third case, I have chosen not a manuscript variant but a conjecture made in the Renaissance period. This is the text in question:

sunt quibus unum opus est intactae Palladis urbem
carmine perpetuo celebrare et
undique³⁰ decerptam³¹ **fronti** praeponere olivam;

There are those whose only task is to praise the city of the innocent Pallas with an endless song and *to put an olive branch picked elsewhere in front of the face* (i.e. to wear an olive wreath).

There is no variance in all existing manuscripts for this passage.³² The variant *decerptae frondi* is shown in some editions as belonging to “Erasmus apud Glareanum”.³³

Heinrich Glarean³⁴ states in his notes: ³⁵

Porphyrion nihil hic dicit, apud quem puto bene habuisse lectionem ... Legendum itaque putat D. Erasmus, praeceptor noster ...: *undique decerptae frondi praeponere olivam*. Ut sit ordo: quibusdam unum opus

³⁰ Emendation of Bouhier *indeque* will not be discussed here.

³¹ The manuscript *Paris.* 7975 and the 1st version of the *Paris.* 7972 contain the variant *decertam*. This reading must have arisen from the practice of writing from dictation, and was meant to be some participle that does not exist in classical Latin. The only way to “justify” this word is to interpret it as a compound of the adjective *certus* (OLD s.v. *de-* with the meaning of completeness, e.g. *debello*, *deparcus*). Of course, this variant cannot be accepted, but it combines two manuscripts and is of some importance for the history of tradition. The variant *decerptam* is read in *Turicensis Carolinus* 6.

³² The note “[codd. Cr.]” in Keller’s edition can be understood as referring to the codices revised by Jacob Cruquius, but his commentary reports quite clearly that in all manuscripts he saw *fronti*, while another variant – *undique decerpta* (sic!) *frondi* (with a misprint, I believe, as the combination *ae* is reproduced in full in his edition, while if it were a sort of *abl. abs.*, some commentary would be added) – is typical of the books published “recently”, which is of course “ex emendatione Erasmiana Glareano teste” (Cruquius 1579, 23–24).

³³ There are no editions that print the text with this emendation, including one of Karl Lehrs 1869, xli, who finds it very attractive. Erasmus’ emendation is reported by Fenlon–Groote 2013, 233 (without any proposal concerning the text, but with the significance of Glareanus’ edition pointed out).

³⁴ Henricus Glareanus (1488–1563).

³⁵ Glareanus 1543, ad loc. (These sheets at the end of the book have no page numbers, only a typographical mark, here e.g. it is “Aa ii”).

esse, olivam praeponere frondi undique decerptae hoc est *omnibus arboribus praeponere solent olivam arborem Atheniensibus gratam* ...³⁶

Erasmus' emendation gives quite an acceptable sense – they prefer olive branch to other foliage – and removes two difficulties: the not quite clear *undique*³⁷ and a strange expression that means literally *to put an olive branch in front of the face*. There are two passages with a wreath described in a similar way, but they contain other verbs, namely Val. Fl. 3. 436: *praetextere (glaucasque comis frondes)* and Sen. Med. 70: *praecingens (tempora)*.

The fact that Erasmus changed the ending of the participle also (*decerptae frondi*) made his conjecture popular only for some time, until the scholars noticed that the reading *decerptam* was testified by Ps.-Acro's commentary (who adds a note: *Ex omnibus conlectam*, which, in my opinion, does not suit the idea of a wreath – according to the commentator's vision, these persons rather collect prize olive branches won in all places).

Meanwhile if one suppose a possibility of a minimal emendation: *undique decerptam frondi praeponere olivam*, this would make some sense and give more ironic detail (the beginning of the whole sentence implies some irony with “quibus unum opus est”) – “they prefer to <every other>³⁸ foliage an olive branch, picked elsewhere, i.e. not in a sacred grove, and it shows their valuing it as a symbol of Athens.

Another element of comparison – in our case the Dative of *frons*, *frondis* – seems to be necessary, depending upon the verb *praeponere*, if it has the most common meaning ‘to prefer’ (*OLD* 3).³⁹ This meaning is advisable, as the spatial meaning ‘to place in front’ usually denotes not the location itself but the order of progress, e.g. a sequence of rooms

³⁶ Glarean himself keeps the reading *fronti*, and supposes that *decerpta* means a particular kind of wreath, “cropped” (called usually *tonsa*, e.g. Verg. *Georg.* 3. 21).

³⁷ On Cruquius' view, the result of some corruption that took place between Porphyrio and Ps.-Acro. Since the early commentaries of the modern period (see Glarean's edition, fol. XIII et al.) *undique* is interpreted geographically (if the contest is held in Rome, the olive branch is broken there etc.) or topically (“from every source, i.e. literary, historical, and mythological” [Mayer 99]).

³⁸ In my opinion, the noun *frons* can be considered collective, as without any specification (“of an olive-tree”, “of a poplar”) it can denote any foliage (e.g. as a stuff [Var. *L.* 7. 24: *frondem* and *flores*]), and so within this context next to the olive-tree mentioned it may mean “any other kind of foliage”. It was used by Horace at least twice in the context of a wreath (*Carm.* 3. 18. 14; *Epist.* 2. 1. 110).

³⁹ The note in the *ThLL* has another structure with the meaning of preference being denoted as initial: “I pertinet ad aestimationem ... II ad ordinem”.

(Cic. *De orat.* 2. 320), a suburb situated before a town and thus protecting it from enemies (Cic. *Agr.* 1. 20), of elements of sentence or literary work (Quint. 9. 4. 34; Tac. *Hist.* 4. 39), etc.

It is also quite important that Horace uses this verb with this meaning at least once (*Serm.* 2. 6. 92): *urbem praeponere silvis* (*dat.*).

Taking into account the series of difficulties in this passage, it seems quite possible that it is a very early corruption which (a) is represented in the whole existing tradition, and (b) seemed to late ancient and early medieval correctors to be a *lectio difficilior* in comparison with *frondi* in the time when it was still present in mss. It may have happened in Late Antiquity,⁴⁰ certainly after Porphyrio as he mentions no difficulties here.

Sofia Egorova

Saint Petersburg State University (SPbSU);

Bibliotheca classica Petropolitana

s.egorova@spbu.ru

Bibliography

- R. Bentley (ed.), *Quintus Horatius Flaccus* I (Berolini ³1869).
 S. Borzsák (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Stutgardiae 1984).
 S. Commager, *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study* (New Haven – London 1962).
 I. Cruquius (ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus, ex antiquissimis undecim libris... expurgatus et editus* (Antverpiae 1579).
 A. Ernout, *Istoricheskaya morfologia latinskogo yazyka* [*Historical Morphology of Latin Language*], transl. by M. A. Borodina (Moscow 1950).
 I. Fenlon, I. M. Groote, *Heinrich Glarean's Book: the Intellectual World of a Sixteenth-Century Musical Humanist* (Cambridge 2013).
 H. Glareanus (ed., comm.), *Quinti Horati Flacci Opera cum quattuor commentariis ... Adiectae in calce libri Henrici Glareani adnotationes* (Parisiis 1543).
 O. Keller, A. Holder (eds.), *Q. Horatii Flacci Opera* (Lipsiae 1899).
 Fr. Klingner (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Leipzig 1959).
 K. Lehrs (ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Opera* (Leipzig 1869).

⁴⁰ Perhaps when some work on revision of Horace's text was undertaken, as the subscription by Mavortius, cos. 527 indicates.

- R. Mayer (ed., comm.), *Horace: Odes. Book I* (Cambridge 2012).
 L. Müller, *Quinti Horatii Flacci Carmina II* (St Petersburg 1895).
 R. G. M. Nisbet, M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes. Book I* (Oxford 1970).
 G. Orelli (ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Rec. G. Orellius, cur. G. Baiterus. I* (Turici ³1850).
 T. E. Page (ed., comm.), *Q. Horati Flacci Carminum Libri IV, Epodon Liber* (London – New York 1962).
 H. Schuetz (comm.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Teil 3: Oden und Epoden* (Berlin 1874).

In the article three variants for the text of Horace's odes are reconsidered, as they were omitted from editions, unnecessarily in my opinion.

In the first case (*Carm.* 1. 6. 7) *duplices* (vs. *duplicis*) is represented in a large number of reliable manuscripts, though it is not considered principal because of both ancient commentaries mentioning the ambiguity “*duplicis Ulixei – duplicis cursus*”. Meanwhile the adjective *duplicis*, *duplices* or *dupliceis* as referring to the noun *cursus* suits the main topic of the ode better – Horace rejects epic subjects, one of them being the *redoubled* journey of Odysseus, i.e. twice longer than that of other Greek heroes.

The second variant – *Sabino diota* in place of the usual *Sabina diota* (*Carm.* 1. 9. 8) – was found only in two manuscripts, and thus the editors chose the variant for publication taking into account the majority of mss.. I also consider this rare Greek word to mean the same as the *Graeca testa* (*Carm.* 1. 20. 2 according to the interpretation of Nisbet and Hubbard), a vessel impregnated with salt, used for conserving.

The third variant in *Carm.* 1. 7. 7 is not represented in manuscripts and is a part of a conjecture by Erasmus (he proposed *decerptae frondi* in the place of *decerptam fronti*). The existing text contains the phrase *fronti praeponere olivam* which has no parallel for the meaning ‘to place in front’. Meanwhile a more common meaning ‘to prefer’ with the Dative *frondi* could be understood as “to prefer an olive even picked elsewhere to <any other> foliage”.

В статье рассматриваются три текстологических варианта в одах Горация, на взгляд автора незаслуженно потерявшие место в критических изданиях.

В первом случае (*Carm.* I, 6, 7) *duplices* (vs. *duplicis*) засвидетельствовано в значительном числе надежных рукописей, однако не считается античным чтением, поскольку оба древних комментария упоминают двусмысленность *duplicis Ulixei – duplicis cursus*. Между тем отнесение прилагательного *duplicis*, *duplices*, *dupliceis* к существительному *cursus* гораздо лучше вписывается в контекст оды – отказываясь от эпических сюжетов, Гораций не берет-ся описывать удвоенные путешествия Одиссея, т. е. в два раза более длитель-ные по сравнению с другими героями Троянской войны.

Второй вариант – *Sabino diota* вместо общепринятого *Sabina diota* (*Carm.* I, 9, 8) – представлен лишь в двух кодексах, и издатели 18–19 вв. приняли решение в выборе варианта исходя из подавляющего большинства рукописей. Попутно автор статьи предлагает понимать само существительное *diota* как то же, что *Graeca testa* в *Carm.* I, 20, 2 (по предположению Нисбета и Хаббард), т. е. пропитанный солью сосуд, лучше сохраняющий вино.

Третий текстологический вариант (*Carm.* I, 7, 7), хотя и является частью конъектуры Эразма Роттердамского (он исправлял *decerptam fronti* на *decerptae frondi*), решает текстологическую проблему: существующий текст содержит выражение *fronti praeponere olivam* не находит убедительных параллелей к значению ‘располагать впереди’, тогда как обычное значение ‘предпочитать’ намного лучше согласуется с существительным *frondi*: “предпочесть <любой другой> листе сорванную невесть где оливу”.

CONSPECTUS

Yael Young

- Aryballos and Hanger: an Iconography of a Unified Entity
in Athenian Vase Painting 5

Gauthier Liberman

- Petits riens sophocléens : *Œdipe à Colone* I 26

Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg

- Dionysios I. von Syrakus. Modell einer Machtergreifung 44

Carlo M. Lucarini

- Herakleides Pontikos und die ps.-plutarchische Schrift *Περὶ μουσικῆς* ... 71

Enrico Cerroni

- Semantic Shifts in Hellenistic Greek: ἀνάτασις and παράστασις 88

Andrea Scheithauer

- Die Zerstörung von Städten in der Darstellung griechischer
epideiktischer Epigramme 104

Sofia Egorova

- Forgotten Variants (Hor. *Carm.* 1. 6. 7; 1. 9. 8; 1. 7. 7) 126

Wjatscheslaw K. Chrustaljow

- Was für ein Buch hat Asconius eigentlich geschrieben? Zur Frage nach
den Zielen und Methoden des antiken Kommentars zu Ciceros Reden .. 137

Denis Keyer

- Beans and Phases of the Moon in Columella (*R. r.* 2. 10. 12) 157

- Keywords 165