

*Denis Keyer*

## INTERPRETING HORACE IN TH. ZIELINSKI'S AND M. ROSTOVZJEFF'S CRITIQUE OF I. GREVS

The appearance of Ivan Grevs'<sup>1</sup> “Essays on the History of Roman Land-Tenure” in 1899 (vol. 1: on Horace’s Sabine estate; on Atticus; on the theory of J. K. Rodbertus and K. Bücher)<sup>2</sup> and 1905 (on the evidence of Petronius)<sup>3</sup> gave rise to polemics<sup>4</sup> that have been thoroughly discussed by

---

<sup>1</sup> Rostovtzeff, from whose references Russian works by Grevs (Гревс) are known to most western scholars, renders his name as *Greaves*, which makes it difficult to establish the Russian transcription for bibliographical inquiries. However, this spelling is historically correct. Wjatscheslaw Chrustaljow pointed out to me that Grevs’ ancestor had emigrated to Russia from Britain (allegedly as early as under Peter the Great), and according to Olga Dobiash-Rozhdestvenskaja, a student of Grevs, in English his name was spelled *Greaves* (see Dobiash-Rozhdestvenskaja 1993 [О. А. Добиаш-Рождественская, “Гревс, И. М.”], 327–328; cf. Chrustaljow 2021 [В. К. Хрусталев, “Гревс, И. М.”], 196–200, with literature).

<sup>2</sup> Grevs 1899 [И. М. Гревс, *Очерки из истории римского землевладения (преимущественно во времена империи)*], previously published in *ŽMNP* 297 (1895 Jan.), 303 (1896 Feb.), 306 (1896 July), 307 (1896 Oct.), 313 (1897 Oct.). It was defended as a masters thesis (opponents: F. Sokolov, Th. Zielinski). Vol. 2 was planned as a doctoral thesis, but only single studies pertaining to it have seen print (see n. 3 below).

<sup>3</sup> Grevs 1905 [И. М. Гревс, “Очерки из истории римского землевладения. Крупное домовое хозяйство в эпоху наибольшего экономического расцвета римского мира (Данные Петрония по аграрной истории I века империи)”]. It was originally planned as a part of vol. 2, but Grevs gave up the subject after the publication of Hirschfeld 1902. From 1936 he re-edited his “Essays...” (vol. 1 was augmented by a number of articles, vol. 2 rewritten), but his death in 1941 left the work in manuscript; only one article on Livia’s estate was published: Grevs 1941 [И. М. Гревс, “Эпизод из истории развития земельной собственности римских императоров и ее социальной роли: Земельное состояние Ливии, второй жены Августа”, in: *Ученые записки ЛГУ. Серия исторических наук*]. See in detail Kaganovich 1990 [Б. С. Каганович, “Вокруг ‘Очерков из истории римского землевладения’ И. М. Гревса”, in: *Политические структуры эпохи феодализма в Западной Европе VI–XVII веков*], 211–212.

<sup>4</sup> Reviews on Grevs 1899: [Anon.], 1900 [in: *Русское богатство*]; Zielinski 1900a [Ф. Ф. Зелинский, in: *ЖМНП*], 1900b; Rostovtzeff, 1900 [М. И. Ростовцев,

historians of Russian classical scholarship and which mark an important episode in Russian historiography of ancient Rome.<sup>5</sup>

Critical responses to Grevs mostly concerned historical conceptions of ancient economy,<sup>6</sup> but I would like to focus on one particular aspect of this debate that concerns the role of philology in Rostovtzeff's legacy and methodology. By common consent, Rostovtzeff's position was underpinned by immense knowledge and extensive use of archaeological, epigraphical and papyrological sources, as well as a keen interest in social and economic theories of modern history. Therefore, I will confine the present discussion to two extensive reviews on the first volume of Grevs' "Essays" written by Zielinski and Rostovtzeff in 1900<sup>7</sup> and Rostovtzeff's references to Grevs in his "Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire" in 1926.

Zielinski's review of Grevs is profound and intelligent. He went beyond incisive judgments and astute critical remarks on Grevs' work to make eloquent and passionate statements on the methodology of classical scholarship. Zielinski's fervour was obviously elevated by Grevs' attack on "classical philologists", who had allegedly appropriated Roman antiquity and were obstructing studies that would place it in the context of universal history.<sup>8</sup>

In fact, Zielinski puts forward a kind of manifesto in defense of the unity of "historical-philological method" and then goes on to act as a philologist and a historian in turn. First, he offers philological objections to Grevs' "Essays" on Horace's estate and Atticus; subsequently he

---

in: *Мир Божий*]; Kareev, 1900 [Н. И. Кареев, in: *Русское богатство*]. It is noteworthy that Zielinski 1900b [Ф. Ф. Зелинский, in: *Вестник Европы*] contains also a benevolent review of Rostovtzeff 1899 (М. И. Ростовцев, *История государственного откупа в Римской империи [От Августа до Диоклетиана]*) that was defended as masters thesis in 1899 and published in German in 1902.

<sup>5</sup> See Kaganovich 1990 [Б. С. Каганович, "Вокруг 'Очерков из истории римского землевладения' И. М. Гревса, in: *Политические структуры эпохи феодализма в Западной Европе (VI–XVII вв.)*]; 2007 [*Русские медиевисты первой половины XX века*], 20–28; 71–73 n. 42–82; Alipov 2009 [П. А. Алипов, "Судьба теории Родбертуса–Бюхера в России: критика диссертации И. М. Гревса современниками", in: *Исторический ежегодник 2009*]; Frolov 2006 [Э. Д. Фролов, *Русская наука об античности: Историографические очерки*], 337–349; Cinnella 2005, 195–205.

<sup>6</sup> See Zhmud 2021, 115–133 (in the present fascicle).

<sup>7</sup> Zielinski 1900a, Rostovtzeff 1900.

<sup>8</sup> Grevs 1899, 41–43. Most likely, Grevs echoed this attitude from representatives of ancient history who had by that time separated from the common stem of classical scholarship; cf. *ibid.* 455 with reference to Pöhlmann 1895, 34–55 and Zielinski's answer to it quoted below on p. 172.

supports Ed. Meyer's critique of J. K. Rodbertus' and K. Bücher's theory that oikos-like household management prevailed in ancient economy. Zielinski's remark on the methodology of classical scholarship is worth quoting here in full:<sup>9</sup>

*“Everything that concerns Roman antiquity, – says the author, – has long been considered to be the private property of classical philologists”. As a “classical philologist” I find it my pleasant duty to declare that up to now I do indeed consider everything that pertains to Roman antiquity to be my property, the present review clearly demonstrating this. And it is by no means “due to this fact” that “the history of ancient Rome had not been able for a long time to grow into a perfectly self-standing discipline, that would be engaged in lively communication with homogeneous neighbouring disciplines”, but in consequence of natural conditions, owing to which history cannot be perceived otherwise than through monuments, and the monuments of Roman history form one solidary group, as homogeneous in itself as different from the monuments of the neighbouring disciplines. Philologists are not to blame for it whatsoever.*

As for the book itself, Zielinski sometimes approves of Grevs' argument and agrees with him.<sup>10</sup> Of special interest are his terse objections to Grevs that focus on interpreting Horace's passages about the part of the estate that was run by the poet himself.<sup>11</sup> Thus, according to Grevs, the poet's estate included cornfields, olive plantations, fruit orchards, meadows and vineyards.<sup>12</sup> This conclusion is drawn from *Epist.* 1. 16. 1–4:

ne perconteris, fundus meus, optime Quincti,  
arvo pascat erum an bacis opulentet olivae,  
pomisne an pratis an amicta vitibus ulmo,  
scribetur tibi forma loquaciter et situs agri.

<sup>9</sup> Zielinski 1900a, 158. Here and below I give Russian quotations in my translation; spacing is also mine.

<sup>10</sup> E.g., with Grevs' general estimation of the estate as comprising not less than 350 jugers. The part of it that was leased to five farmers (*Epist.* 1. 14. 2–3; McGann 1969, 73 oddly speaks of four tenants, Horace being one of the five *patres* going to Varia) Grevs 1899, 127 estimates as not less than 150 jugers (with reference to Mommsen <sup>8</sup>1888 I. 93; 184–185 that 20 jugers was a minimum to feed a family in more ancient times). The part run by Horace with the help of eight slaves and a *vilicus* is estimated as ca. 200 jugers (from Colum. *R. r.* 2. 12. 7). Yet even here Zielinski stresses that a part of Horace's income might be not in lands, but in money lent out at interest.

<sup>11</sup> Zielinski 1900a, 160–161.

<sup>12</sup> Grevs 1899, 105 with n. 4; cf. n. 17 below.

Lest you, my good Quinctius, should have to ask me about my farm, whether it supports its master with plough-land, or makes him rich with olives, whether with apples or with meadows or vine-clad elms, I will describe for you in rambling style the nature and lie of the land.<sup>13</sup>

Grevs rightly admits that these words introduce only a hypothetical interrogation of a friend (“It is clear by context that it is no more than a literary figure of speech”), yet he goes on: “... and that all the details serve to describe what actually was in the estate itself”). We can imagine Grevs’ “aha!” moment, counting on his fingers: “There were then (1) cornfields; (2) olive plantations; (3) fruit orchards etc.” But when Horace’s commitment is to respond “in rambling style...”, why should these hypothetical questions imply positive answer? It is not a recognised “literary figure of speech” that they should do so. Zielinski reasonably objects that the implication (“I possess all these things”) is here far from self-evident. The items mentioned are not to be thought of as necessarily present in the estate: they are simply ones about which a friend might ask.

The structure of the epistle and its train of thought can be seen to strengthen this objection. The imaginary questions of a friend focus on potential sources of wealth, i. e., how the owner earns his *income*. Though Horace’s profuse and detailed description of the estate in v. 5–16 is formally introduced as baiting the friend’s curiosity, it surprisingly avoids the subject of material wealth altogether. Instead the poet stresses that the estate’s climate and landscape are pleasant, healthy and an invitation to relaxation (for the sake of convenience, I quote the translation only):

There are hills, quite unbroken, were they not cleft by one shady valley,<sup>14</sup> yet such that the rising sun looks on its right side, and when departing in his flying car warms the left. The climate would win your praise. What if you knew that the bushes bear a rich crop of ruddy cornels and plums, that oak and ilex gladden the cattle with plenteous fruitage, and their lord with plenteous shade? You would say that Tarentum with its verdure was brought nearer home. A spring, too, fit to give its name to a river, so that not cooler nor purer is Hebrus winding through Thrace, flows with healing for sickly heads and sickly stomachs. This retreat, so sweet – yes, believe me, so bewitching – keeps me, my friend, in sound health in September’s heat.

<sup>13</sup> Here and below the *Epistles* transl. by Fairclough <sup>2</sup>1929, with slight corrections.

<sup>14</sup> In v. 5 both codd. and editors vacillate between *ni* and *si* (in case of the latter *laudes* is the apodosis; cf. McGann 1960, 205 with n. 2: “...the sense is something like ‘if you were to find yourself in a place where the mountains, which crowd close to one another, are parted ... you would praise its temperate climate. <Such, you must know, is the setting of my farm>’”).

Thus, while the imaginary questions of a friend remind us of a catalogue of the main items of agricultural income, the answer to them scarcely mentions any of these items at all (only bush fruits and pigs that are introduced, indirectly, as consuming acorns from shady trees – in fact, both might as likely be items of home consumption as sources of income).

The train of thought seems therefore to be as follows: “If you just learn in detail how pleasant and healthy the climate and landscape are here, you will not bother me, trying to find out which products bring me wealth”. That is to say, the implied answer to the anticipated interrogation would be not “All the items on the list”, but “It does not matter”. The estate's charm surpasses by far its commodities.<sup>15</sup>

The rest of the epistle (v. 17–79) supports this interpretation. Its point is that Quinctius, whom everyone calls *beatus* (‘rich’ or ‘blessed’, v. 18), must not depend upon the opinion of the crowd; instead he must remember that truly *beatus* is he who is virtuous and wise (*bonus et sapiens*, v. 20).<sup>16</sup> In particular, he must not be afraid to lose his possessions (v. 75–76). The preamble (v. 1–16) can only provide a logical link to this sermon if it is understood as stressing the insignificance of material values.<sup>17</sup>

Zielinski's second objection to Grevs concerns the epistle to the bailiff, who longed for the countryside while in Rome and now, conversely, longs for Rome (1. 14. 21–26):<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. McGann 1960, 207: “All that he does is implicitly to correct the suggestion that the farm is a valuable property (cf. *opulentet*, 2) by choosing to speak, and at no great length (8–10), only of produce which is of little material value <...> It is as if Horace wished by writing a description of this kind to show that the value of the farm lay for him, not in its produce, which is all that Quinctius is interested in, but in other, less material, advantages”.

<sup>16</sup> For the thought cf. *Carm.* 2. 3. 17 ff., 4. 9. 45 ff.

<sup>17</sup> Likewise, McGann 1960, 207. Grevs 1899, 105–106 n. 4 comes close to this understanding. He does note that the interrogation on the sources of income in v. 1–4 is left unanswered: in his opinion, Horace turns to praising of natural beauties due to a momentary sentiment of enjoying nature and despising material values. Yet Grevs insists (on no firm grounds, see n. 12 above) that all the questions in v. 1–4 imply positive answer, regarding them as a vague “literary figure”.

The tone of *Epist.* 1. 16, that agricultural profit was insignificant as compared with the estate's non-material advantages, might indirectly suggest that it was insignificant. On the other hand, Horace may simply have chosen to play down his material wealth for this rhetorical purpose. After all, he did have cornfields and meadows (see n. 26 below).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *Serm.* 2. 7. 28–29: *Romae rus optas, absentem rusticus urbem / tollis ad astra levis.*

...fornix tibi et uncta popina  
 incutiunt urbis desiderium, video, et quod  
 angulus iste feret piper et tus ocius uva  
 nec vicina subest vinum praebere taberna  
 quae possit tibi, nec meretrix tibicina, cuius 25  
 ad strepitum salias terrae gravis...

'Tis the brothel, I see, and greasy cookshop that stir in you a longing for the city, and the fact that that poky spot will grow pepper and frankincense [*which only grew in the East – DK*] as soon as grapes, and that there is no tavern hard by that can supply you with wine and no flute-playing courtesan, to whose strains you can dance and thump the ground.

Grevs takes this as evidence for cultivating vineyards in the *Sabinum*. In his opinion, the grapes do not grow there only from the bailiff's point of view. The remark on the soil that "will rather grow eastern spices than grapes" would then be merely an exaggerated reference to the difficulty of his work.<sup>19</sup> Zielinski objects that it would be incompatible with the future tense of *feret* in the *quod*-clause. If the clause represented the bailiff's thoughts, a subjunctive would be required. A linguistic detail is here crucial for the interpretation of the passage from which historical conclusions are drawn – truly, a boon for anyone upholding the unity of classical philology and ancient history.

It seems that Zielinski's argument here, however grammatically correct, does not completely refute the possibility of vines growing in the estate. The indicative does show that the statement is meant to convey objective truth – yet, it still might be an exaggeration and imply that Horace here rehearses the way his bailiff thinks and speaks on the subject ("vine is indeed damn hard to grow there"). So the question is whether one can take this statement other than literally, thus admitting actual existence of vines, no matter how painfully cultivated.

The context clearly lays stress on the absence of urban entertainment rather than weariness of vine growing: the bailiff cannot get any wine

---

<sup>19</sup> Grevs 1899, 107–108 with n. 1. Against the commentaries that usually take it as indication that the *Sabinum* produced no vine (thus, e. g., Orelli–Baiter–Kirschfeld 1884, 343; Schuetz 1883, 107; Kiessling 1884, 74 ad *Carm.* 1. 20; Mueller 1893, 112; Mueller 1900, 87; Wilkins <sup>2</sup>1892, 178 later followed by Kiessling–Heinze <sup>13</sup>1968, 96; Préaux 1968, 148; Nisbet–Hubbard 1970, 246–247 a.o.) he puts forward the following reconstruction of events: when Horace got possession of the estate, the vines were either absent or neglected, so he ordered the lazy bailiff to grow them, despite his grumbling (v. 22–23); the cultivation of soil in v. 26–28 in his opinion also refers to the planting of the vineyard.



examples of material troubles, mentioned as hypothetical obstacles for *recte et suaviter vivere*. Indeed, if someone were to say “I feel sad not because my car crashed or my villa burned down, but because I cannot find peace with myself”, it would not be clear if they in fact own a car or a villa.

A more complicated case is *Carm.* 1. 20. 1–4, where Horace mentions a bottle of Sabine wine that he himself sealed on the day of Maecenas’ first appearance in public after recovering from a serious illness:

vile potabis modicis Sabinum  
 cantharis Graeca quod ego ipse testa  
 conditum levi, datus in theatro  
 cum tibi plausus...

You will drink from modest cups a cheap Sabine wine that I stored away in a Greek jar<sup>23</sup> and sealed with my own hand on the day when you ... were given such applause in the theatre..., transl. Rudd 2004)

Here Zielinski succinctly defends the interpretation that is also preferred in a number of commentaries: “Horace speaks here of a self-bottled wine, not a self-produced one”. Indeed, a cheap sort of wine and second-rate cups are here contrasted with the poet’s efforts to add sentimental value to the bottle: he stored and sealed it himself on the joyous day.<sup>24</sup> It is not stated (though some assume it as self-evident) that the wine comes from Horace’s estate, and in view of *Epist.* 1. 14. 23 discussed above, this possibility, if not ruled out completely, remains dubious.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Nisbet–Hubbard 1970, 247–248 plausibly explain the reference to *Graeca testa* as the one “impregnated with salt which would act as a preservative” and dismiss the idea of flavouring purposes, because “Greek wines, like Italian, might be good, bad, or indifferent”.

<sup>24</sup> Nisbet 1959, 73–74 (cf. Nisbet–Hubbard 1970, 245–246) ingeniously explained that in *Epist.* 1. 5. 4–5 (*vina ... diffusa palustres / inter Minturnas Sinuessanumque Petrinum*) Horace “is deliberately offering his friend wine from his ancestor’s battlefield” (cf. Liv. 8. 11. 11), that is, something also of sentimental value.

<sup>25</sup> Romano 1991, 564 remarks that even if the wine did not come from the estate, the epithet *Sabinum* (“our local Sabine wine”) was enough to hint at the gift of the estate. Heinze (Kiessling–Heinze <sup>13</sup>1968, 96) adds that since only bottling and sealing are mentioned as done by Horace himself (*ipse*), his personal input (by contrast with that of, e.g., the wine merchant) must be reduced to these two operations. Indeed, if the wine came from Horace’s estate, *ipse* would lose in significance – it goes without saying that everyone seals his home-grown wine himself. On the other hand, in this case *ipse* might imply that Horace was not content to have it done by a slave (Fraenkel 1957, 215 n. 2). Thus, whether or not Horace’s estate grew vines ultimately boils down to the interpretation of *Epist.* 1. 14. 23.



Therefore Zielinski insists on crossing out vineyards as actually contradicting Horace's references, and olive plantations as not properly attested by them, while assenting to the rest.<sup>26</sup>

In Rostovtzeff's view, Grevs' study on Horace as a source for agricultural history is diligent and thorough:<sup>27</sup>

Everything that one could retrieve from Horace and partly also from other poets contemporary to him has been retrieved by the author in full and the evidence he has collected gives a lively and relief image, despite its hypothetical character.

Rostovtzeff's objections remain in the field of history and historical concepts: he complains of insufficient attention to other sources, of underestimating the development of economic forms in the Hellenistic epoch, and (as does Zielinski) of the implausibility of J. K. Rodbertus' and K. Bücher's theory. Thus, while Zielinski pointedly examines Grevs from both a historian's and a philologist's point of view, Rostovtzeff settles for the role of a historian.

A quarter of a century later, in his famous monograph "Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire",<sup>28</sup> Rostovtzeff makes complimentary

---

<sup>26</sup> Horace's estate did contain cornfields (*Epist.* 1. 14. 27–28) and meadows (*ibid.* 29–30). Large cattle is sacrificed in *Epist.* 1. 3. 36 (*votiva iuvenca*), *Carm.* 1. 36. 2 (*vitulus*) and 4. 2. 54 (*tener vitulus*). Goats were certainly bred there (*Carm.* 1. 17. 1–9; 3. 13; 3. 18. 5). Pigs are attested in *Epist.* 1. 16. 9–10. Sheep are not mentioned explicitly, though they might be implied by *pecus* (*Serm.* 2. 6. 14) and *parvis alumnis* (*Carm.* 3. 18. 3–4) along with goats (pace Schmidt 1997, 19 n. 37, *Carm.* 3. 18. 9–16 is usually taken to describe the feast of *Faunalia* in general, not necessarily in the *Sabinum*). The cultivation of fruit trees, according to Schmidt 1997, 19 with n. 40, is only confirmed by the cursed tree in *Carm.* 2. 13, since it was planted and grown in his land (*produxit... agro... statuit meo*) – yet, it was not necessarily a fruit tree. There was a *hortus* (*Serm.* 2. 6. 2, *Epist.* 1. 14. 42), but whatever was there might as well be grown for home consumption.

Thus, if *Epist.* 1. 8. 4–6 and 1. 16. 1–4 discussed above are not taken into account, the variety of products firmly attested for the *Sabinum* is reduced. Some of the other passages cited as evidence (e. g., *Epod.* 1. 27 and *Carm.* 3. 16. 35–36 by Schmidt 1997, *ibid.*; cf. also n. 32 below) are not relevant (cf., on the other hand, n. 31 below).

<sup>27</sup> Rostovtzeff 1900, 96.

<sup>28</sup> <sup>1</sup>1926; Germ. transl. 1928, <sup>2</sup>1957. Cf. the enthusiastic laudation in Jones 1952, 358: "He seems to have studied and mastered every possible primary source in his field, and to have read, criticized, and remembered every modern publication in all the languages of Europe. How he achieved this result I do not know, but it must have been the fruit of unremitting labour and a vast capacity for organization, aided by a prodigious memory. The results are plain to see in the notes to his great works, which are the wonder and despair of scholars. In them he corrects and supplements the articles and monographs which he cites, and where, as often, the evidence had not been previously collected by himself or others, cites it in detail, often with reasoned emendations of the published texts of inscriptions and papyri".

reference to Grevs' essays on Horace and Petronius – of course, along with abundant references to new scholarly literature; the remains of Horace's Sabine villa were excavated by that time, and by general consent it turned out to be somewhat less modest than one might infer from Horace's verses.

Rostovtzeff sums up the evidence on Horace's estate as follows:<sup>29</sup>

The careful investigation of Horace's scattered remarks on his estate by I. Grevs has shown that it was a plot of land large enough to provide its owner with a decent income. The poet paid much attention to his property and transformed part of it into a model farm run on scientific lines (...) On the model farm one part of the land was cultivated as a vineyard, another as a fruit and vegetable garden, the largest part as cornfields. The meadows and woods which were owned by Horace were used for feeding a large number of oxen, sheep, goats, and pigs.

This description follows Grevs and, as Zielinski plausibly showed, with regard to vineyards and olive plantations Grevs' conclusions were in turn drawn from controversial interpretations of *Epist.* 1. 16, 1. 14 and 1. 8. These details, though not fatal,<sup>30</sup> are partly relevant for Rostovtzeff's arguments. Without vineyards and olives the varied produce of the *Sabinum*, displayed as a typical medium-sized estate, appears less impressive. The *Paradebeispiel* is partly unreliable and possibly exaggerated.

Rostovtzeff could hardly have been unfamiliar with his teacher's review of Grevs. Either he had studied Zielinski's arguments, considered them to be wrong and sided with Grevs, or else he had rejected them as implausible *a limine*. Either way, to him Grevs' study was a carefully examined body of evidence that confirmed his own views, so that he incorporated it into his impressive panorama without realizing the significance of Zielinski's objections.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Rostovtzeff 1926, 61.

<sup>30</sup> Substantial archaeological evidence for Campanian villas suffices to support Rostovtzeff's arguments.

<sup>31</sup> Admittedly Rostovtzeff's judgement, however philologically unfounded, finds some support in a recent archaeobotanical research of the villa's garden (Ramsay 2006, 305–306): "at Horace's Villa the crop species present were barley, wheats, olives, grapes and legumes, as seen from the carbonized material that remains. Moreover, most of the material recovered appears to indicate waste products that had been cleaned out of a hearth or oven and deposited on the villa's garden to act as a fertilizer". I do not venture to say whether this proves that all these items were cultivated in Horace's estate.

A historian's viewpoint is naturally predisposed to take all agricultural references in Horace as referring to the Sabine estate. Grevs and Rostovtzeff were not the only ones to fall into this methodological trap.<sup>32</sup>

It was much more important for Rostovtzeff to master a huge array of historical, archaeological, epigraphic and papyrological evidence than to plod through interpretation of single details, which, if conducted systematically, would no doubt ruin his project. The scope of his study was too large for scrutinizing philological nuances. If interpretation of a text did not influence historical conclusions directly (as was the case, e.g., with restoring texts on papyri), Rostovtzeff understood the study of texts as collecting evidence and taking them into account rather than their hermeneutical examination.

Though sometimes purely philological research allows one to draw reliable conclusions that have historical relevance, this happens relatively rarely. For the most part, the use of a hermeneutical approach is restrictive: it can bring to light interpretations unobvious at first sight and thus spare historians from drawing premature conclusions from texts.

---

<sup>32</sup> E.g., for one of the recent researchers of the *Sabinum* vineyards are proven by *Epist.* 1. 14. 22 f. and *Carm.* 1. 20 because they “make good sense against the background of a personal vineyard in the estate given by Maecenas” (Schmidt 1997, 19 with n. 38; cf., however, n. 25 above). Neither interpretation nor translation of *Epist.* 1. 14. 22–23 is given (presumably taken in the same way as Grevs, cf. n. 19–20 above), and the alternative view that the cheap Sabine wine in *Carm.* 1. 20 was purchased elsewhere and only bottled in the estate is not mentioned. Instead Schmidt cites *Epist.* 1. 8. 4–5 (which, as shown above, does not necessarily refer to Horace's own estate) and *Carm.* 1. 9. 7 (also far from compelling, see n. 20 above). Cf. Wili 1980, 161 with n. 6 (a complimentary reference to Lugli 1926, 458): “Zwar sterben die eiligen Leser nicht aus, die meinen, es sei nie eine Weinrebe auf Horazens Gut gewachsen. Sie vergessen den eben zitierten Vers [*Epist.* 1. 16. 11 *dicas adductum propius frondere Tarentum – D. K.*] wie das *vile potabis Sabinum* (c. I 20), sie spüren nicht die südliche Atmosphäre der Sabiner Episteln des ersten Buches und haben wohl die Gegend nie gesehen”.

In favour of olive plantations Schmidt 1997 with n. 39 also cites *Epist.* 1. 8. 4 f. and 1. 16. 1–3. Conceding that the catalogue of questions is left unanswered, for him this seems to suggest that Horace's implied answer was “My farm is no monoculture”: “Der unbeantwortete Fragenkatalog in *epist.* 1, 16, 1–3, der <...> auch Oliven aufzählt, kann kaum bedeuten, dass Horaz dies alles nicht habe, sondern – das ist der Tenor von *epist.* 1, 16, 1 ff., – nicht im Sinn jeweiliger ausschließlicher kapitalistischer Monokultur”. However, the subject of monocultural or diversified strategy in farming is not likely to be the scope of vv. 5–16 (why dwell on the subject *loquaciter* and yet not mention any relevant details?), and it cannot be logically linked with the rest of the epistle.

In the same vein H. Philip 1968, 1591 oddly cites *Carm.* 1. 31. 15–16 *me pascunt olivae, // me cichorea levesque malvae*; clearly, this praise of a simple vegetarian diet by contrast with luxury has nothing to do with the Sabine estate.

After all, this was probably why history could not develop hand in hand with philology anymore. Due to multiplying fields of knowledge and progressive specialization, they were bound to separate despite their common basis, so clearly and eloquently outlined by Zielinski:<sup>33</sup>

I cannot think of a more inept controversy (*than that concerning the relative importance of history and philology – DK*). To my mind, it is the same as if two chess players were to debate where a given square, say, G7, is to be referred: to the vertical line G or to the horizontal line 7. (...)

There is no possibility whatsoever of substantively demarcating the respective spheres of history and philology. This possibility existed as long as philology was understood as critique and interpretation of texts, and history as so-called political history; since, however, they both, extending their horizons, developed into disciplines, they inevitably mingled. In terms of science there is no history and no philology, but one historical-philological science. The difference lies only in the aspect. This or that phenomenon of the historical-philological science will have a philological aspect, if it is studied as depending on the sources from which we retrieve it; but the same phenomenon will have a historical aspect if it is studied in connection with other phenomena with which it forms a joint evolutionary chain. Which of the two aspects is “better” – let children argue over it; to a mature mind they are both equally necessary.

Rostovtzeff’s grandeur and success in studying social and economic history was in the first place enabled by going beyond the limits of purely literary sources and producing a cyclopic masonry of various fields of knowledge. Perhaps, occasional neglect of what Zielinski calls “philological aspects” was a *sine qua non* of this grandeur. Since, however, the use of any literary evidence involves some philological interpretation, historical studies cannot ignore philology’s relevant achievements. To be an expert in all the problems that philological interpretation might have to tackle is, of course, impossible. But the case in question proves that merely taking renowned commentaries into account may help to avoid erroneous assumptions and soften the break between philology and history.

Denis Keyer  
*Saint Petersburg Institute for History, RAS;*  
*Saint Petersburg State University*

keyer@mail.ru  
d.keyer@spbu.ru

---

<sup>33</sup> Zielinski 1900a, 169.

## Bibliography

- [Anon.], rev.: Grevs 1899, *Russkoje bogatstvo* 1900: 7, 33–38.
- P. A. Alipov, “Sud’ba teorii Rodbertusa – B’uhera v Rossii: kritika dissertacii I. M. Grevsa sovremennikami” [“The economic theory of Rodbertus and Bücher in Russia”], *Istoricheskij jezhegodnik 2009* (Novosibirsk 2009) 37–46.
- W. K. Chrustaljow, “Grevs, I. M.”, in: *Slovar’ peterburgskih antikovedov XIX – nachala XX veka* [= *A Biographical Dictionary of St Petersburg Classicists in the 19th – early 20th Centuries*] I (St Petersburg 2021) 196–200.
- E. Cinnella, *Lo zar e il latino. Gli studi classici in Russia tra Otto e Novecento* (Pisa–Florence 2018).
- O. A. Dobiash–Rozhdestvenskaja, “Grevs, I. M.”, in: *Enciklopedicheskij slovar’ Brokgauz i Jefron. Biografii* [*Encyclopedic Dictionary Brockhaus and Efron: Biographies*] IV (Moscow 1993) 327–328.
- Sofia K. Egorova, “Goracij i vinodelije” [“Horace as Vigneron”], *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология* [= *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology*] 24: 2 (2020) 1040–1046.
- H. R. Fairclough (ed., tr.), *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica* (Cambridge, Mass. – London 1929).
- E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957).
- E. D. Frolov, *Russkaja nauka ob antichnosti: Istoriograficheskie ocherki* [*Russian Science of Antiquity: Historiographic Essays*] (St Petersburg 1999 [2006]).
- I. M. Grevs, *Ocherki iz istorii rimskogo zemlevladienija (preimushchestvenno vo vremena imperii)* [*Essays on the History of Roman Land-Tenure (From the Times of the Empire mostly)*] I (St Petersburg 1899).
- I. M. Grevs, “Ocherki iz istorii rimskogo zemlevladienija. Krupnoje domovoje hoz’ajstvo v epohu naibol’shego ekonomicheskogo rascveta rimskogo mira (“Dannye Petronija po agrarnoj istorii I veka imperii)” [“Essays on the History of Roman Land-Tenure. The Large House-Economy in the Time of the Highest Economic Bloom of the Roman World. (The Data of Petronius on the Agrarian History of the 1<sup>st</sup> Century AD”], *ŽMNP* 361 (1905, Sept.) 42–93.
- I. M. Grevs, “Epizod iz istorii razvitija zemel’noj sobstvennosti rimskih imperatorov i ejo socialnoj roli: Zemelnoje sostojanije Livii, vtoroj zheny Avgusta” [“An Episode from the History of the Land Ownership of Roman Emperors and Its Social Function: The Estate of Livia, Augustus’ Second Wife”], *Uch’onyje zapiski LGU. Serija istoricheskikh nauk* 12 (1941) 27–45.
- H. Philip, “Sabinum”, in: *RE* 1A (1968) 1590–1592.
- O. Hirschfeld, “Der Grundbesitz der römischen Kaiser in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten”, *Klio* 2 (1902) 45–72, 284–315 (= idem, *Kleine Schriften* [Berlin 1913] 516–575).
- A. H. M. Jones, “Michael Ivanovitch Rostovtzeff, 1870–1952”, *PBA* 58 (1952) 347–361.
- B. S. Kaganovich, “Vokrug ‘Ocherkov iz istorii rimskogo zemlevladienija’ I. M. Grevsa” [“On the ‘Essays on the History of Roman Land-Tenure’ by

- I. M. Grevs”], in: V. I. Rutenburg, I. P. Medvedev (ed.), *Politicheskiye struktury epochi feodalizma v Zapadnoj Jevrope (VI – XVII vv.)* (Leningrad 1990) 198–216.
- B. S. Kaganovich, *Russkije medijevisty pervoj poloviny XX veka [Russian Medievalists of the First Half of the 20th Century]* (St Petersburg 2007).
- N. I. Kareev, rev.: Grevs 1899, *Russkoje bogatstvo* 1900: 11, 1–27; 12, 1–20.
- A. Kiessling (ed., comm.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden* (Berlin 1884).
- A. Kiessling, R. Heinze (eds., comm.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden* (Berlin <sup>13</sup>1968).
- G. Lugli, “La Villa Sabina di Orazio”, *Monumenti dei Lincei* 31 (1926) 457–598.
- M. J. McGann, “The Sixteenth Epistle of Horace”, *CQ* 10 (1960) 205–212.
- M. J. McGann, *Studies in Horace’s First Book of Epistles*, Coll. Latomus 100 (Bruxelles 1968).
- Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte* I (Berlin <sup>8</sup>1888).
- L. Mueller (ed., comm.), *Satiren und Episteln des Horaz. Tl. II: Episteln* (Prag–Wien–Leipzig 1893).
- L. Mueller (ed., comm.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden. Tl. 2: Kommentar* (St Petersburg – Leipzig) 1900.
- R. G. M. Nisbet, “Notes on Horace, Epistles 1”, *CQ* 9 (1959) 73–76.
- R. G. M. Nisbet, M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book I* (Oxford 1970).
- Io. G. Orelli, Io. G. Baiter, W. Hirschfelder (eds., comm.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus* II. 2 (Berlin 1884).
- R. von Pöhlmann, “Zur Methodik der Geschichte des Altertums”, in: idem, *Aus Altertum und Gegenwart* (München 1895) 34–55.
- J. Préaux (ed., comm.), *Horace, Épîtres, Livre I* (Paris 1968).
- Jennifer Ramsay, “The Archaeobotanical Remains from the Garden”, in: B. Frischer a.o. (eds.), *The Horace’s Villa Project 1997–2003. Vol. 1. Report on New Fieldwork and Research* (Oxford 2006) 303–306.
- E. Romano, *Q. Orazio Flacco. Le opere. I: Le odi, il carme secolare, gli epodi. T. 2: Commento* (Rome 1991).
- M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Istorija gosudarstvennogo otkupa v Rimskoj imperii (ot Avgusta do Diokletiana)* [*History of the State Lease in the Roman Empire (From Augustus to Diocletian)*] (St Petersburg 1899).
- M. I. Rostovtzeff, rev.: Grevs 1899, *Mir Bozhij* 1900: 4, 95–99.
- M. Rostowzew, *Geschichte der Staatspacht in der römischen Kaiserzeit bis Diokletian*, *Philologus-Suppl.* 9: 3 (Leipzig 1902) 331–512.
- M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1926; <sup>2</sup>1957).
- E. A. Schmidt, *Sabinum: Horaz und sein Landgut im Lizenzatal* (Heidelberg 1997).
- H. Schütz (ed., comm.), *Horatius Flaccus* 3: *Episteln* (Berlin 1883).
- W. Wili, “Fundus Sabinus”, in: H. Oppermann (ed.), *Wege zu Horaz, Wege der Forschung* 99 (Darmstadt 1980) 159–165 [= W. Wili, *Horaz und die augusteische Kultur* (Basel 1948) 38–44].

A. S. Wilkins (ed., comm.), *The Epistles of Horace* (London 1892).

L. Zhmud, "Mikhail Rostovtzeff and the Modernisation of Antiquity", *Hyperboreus* 27: 1 (2021) 115–133.

Th. Zielinski, rev.: Grevs 1899, *ŽMNP* 330 (1900a July) 156–173.

Th. Zielinski, rev.: Grevs 1900; Rostovtzeff 1900, *Vestnik Jevropy* 1900b (Aug.) 586–624.

I. Grevs' study of Horace's Sabine estate (Grevs 1899) was reviewed by Zielinski 1900a, who made astute critical objections along with eloquent remarks on the unity of historical-philological method. In particular, he showed that Grevs' conclusions on the existence of vineyards and olive plantations in the estate was drawn from controversial interpretations of *Epist.* 1. 16, 1. 14 and 1. 8. M. Rostovtzeff's famous monograph (Rostovtzeff 1926) displays Horace's *Sabinum* as a typical medium-sized estate with reference to Grevs 1899; he follows Grevs in treating the part of the estate run by Horace himself as a diversified farm that cultivated vines along with fruit and vegetable gardens, thus ignoring Zielinski's objections and possibly exaggerating the diversified commercial production of the *Sabinum*.

Рецензия Ф. Ф. Зелинского на труд И. М. Гревса о сабинском поместье Горация (Grevs 1899) содержит тонкие критические замечания вкуче с яркими высказываниями в защиту единства историко-филологического метода (Zielinski 1900a). В частности, он показал, что заключения Гревса о наличии в поместье виноградников и оливковых плантаций основаны на спорном толковании *Epist.* I, 16; I, 14 и I, 8. В знаменитой монографии М. И. Ростовцева (Rostovtzeff 1926) сабинское поместье Горация изображается типичным поместьем средней руки; при этом Ростовцев, ссылаясь на Гревса, вслед за ним считает часть поместья, не сдававшуюся внаем, многопрофильным хозяйством, содержащим в т.ч. виноградники и плодово-овощной сад; тем самым он не учитывает возражения Зелинского и, возможно, преувеличивает многопрофильность хозяйства Горация и объем ее продукции.

## CONSPECTUS

ALEXANDER GAVRILOV, DENIS KEYER	
Preface .....	5
MICHAEL POZDNEV	
Das historisch-philologische Vorgehen bei Aristoteles und in der Wissenschaft seiner Zeit: Einige Randbemerkungen .....	9
ALEXANDER K. GAVRILOV	
The Scholarly Program of M. I. Rostovtzeff .....	30
ARNALDO MARCONE	
Rostovtzeff and Italy: A Long History .....	37
VLADIMIR KASHCHEEV	
Nikodim P. Kondakov and Mikhail I. Rostovtzev: A Teacher and his Disciple. ....	50
ALAIN SCHNAPP	
Des monuments à l’histoire : la raison des ruines et Michel de Montaigne	86
WJATSCHESLAW K. CHRUSTALJOW	
Michail Rostovtzeff als Universalhistoriker .....	99
LEONID ZHMUD	
Mikhail Rostovtzeff and the Modernization of Antiquity .....	115
DMITRI PANCHENKO	
Rostovtzeff and his <i>Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire</i> : A Comment on a Scholarly Masterpiece .....	134
STEFAN REBENICH	
Die wissenschaftliche Internationale der Altertumskunde: Ein Brief Michael I. Rostovtzeffs an Alfred von Domaszewski .....	144
DENIS KEYER	
Interpreting Horace in Th. Zielinski’s and M. Rostovtzeff’s Critique of I. Grevs .....	161
Keywords .....	176

---

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке  
Summary in Russian and English