History of Classical Philology

From Bentley to the 20th Century

Edited by
Diego Lanza and Gherardo Ugolini

Translated by
Antonella Lettieri

DE GRUYTER

Published with the contribution of the University of Verona, Department of Cultures and Civilizations.

ISBN 978-3-11-072266-6
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-073038-8
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-073046-3
ISSN 2701-1100

Library of Congress Control Number: 2022930728

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

© 2016 by Carocci editore, Roma. New edition 2020
© 2022 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Editorial Office: Alessia Ferreccio and Katerina Zianna
Cover image: © Acropolis Museum, 2009. Photo by Nikos Daniilidis
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Luciano Bossina

Giorgio Pasquali and Philology as a Historical Science

> They say that ancient Egyptians had one doctor who specialized in matters of the right eye and another in matters of the left; to such limited specialists I would never entrust my eyes.
>
> G. Pasquali

In 1920, three books by Giorgio Pasquali were published: *Filologia e storia* ('Philology and history'), which is the 'Italian manifesto' for classical philology, *Orazio lirico* ('Lyric Horace'), and *Socialisti tedeschi* ('German socialists'). Their author was in the process of finishing a fourth book, a critical edition of the letters by the fourth-century bishop and theologian Gregory of Nyssa. The fruit of several years' work, mostly carried out in Germany before the First World War, was published within a few months, spreading both vertically and horizontally to cover – together with an incredible span of time, space, language, and culture – the most diverse areas within the scope of classical philology: Greek and Latin, poetry and prose, literature and history, paganism and Christianity, methodological reflections and practical demonstrations, and past civilizations and present-day politics. At the time, Pasquali was 35 years old; over the following twenty years, while fascism brought Italy to its knees, he would contribute to the elevation of its philology to the highest degree.

1 Italy, Germany, and Back

Giorgio Pasquali was born in Rome, on 29th April 1885, from a family of the "*generone*", as the Roman upper middle class was known at the time. In fact, his grandfather was a professor of gynaecology and his father was a lawyer. Pasquali was encouraged very early to pursue the study of the German language and culture. While he was still in secondary school, he attended Nicola Festa's university workshops. Festa would later become Pasquali's first teacher, although not his favourite.[1] Festa had at least two merits: firstly, he encouraged

1 There is a recollection of Festa in Pasquali (1988 [1940], 772–774). However, a letter of 12th December 1942 to Fortunato Pintor bears witness to a "latent conflict with the very envious and

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110730388-011

Pasquali to focus his research on the textual criticism of little-known authors (Proclus) and secondly, he set him on the path already cleared by Girolamo Vitelli's school; a school alternatively defined by its opponents with the similarly disparaging names "Florentine" or "Germanizing". He also had a third merit, which is actually the distillate of the previous two: Festa was the first to give Pasquali a book by Wilamowitz (the *Herakles*), the book that "revealed philology to him".[2]

Already during his university years, Pasquali wrote consistently (his most mature work being the *editio Teubneriana* of Proclus' *Commentary on the Cratylus*, 1908) and distinguished himself as the "wonder boy of philology".[3] He also showed an interest in metrics (at the time, still a rare event in Italy), Hellenism (which he defended from "aestheticizing bias"), and "attributive philology" (according to which the discussion on the authorship of a work is the highest achievement of criticism). These works already clearly foreshadow Pasquali's future theoretical cornerstones: "the indissolubility of *recensio* and *interpretatio*, *recentiores non deteriores*, and the full legitimization, and even need, of *emendatio*".[4] Pasquali's pole star truly pointed north, sometimes through a direct Italian connection from Vitelli to Festa, sometimes through Wilamowitz's, Schwartz's, and Wackernagel's books. Even when he was still living in Italy, Pasquali was already absorbing the best of the German method, building up his immunity to the rhetoric and aestheticism characteristic of Italian philology and widening his interests to include a number of disciplines that would later perpetually fuel his philology. The move to Germany was imminent.

Having obtained "a ministerial grant to study abroad for a year anywhere he wished", young Pasquali chose Göttingen, "a university, a great university, and nothing else", that allowed him to live almost "as in a tunnel" ("as is often the case with overly diligent young men"). Pasquali's experience in Göttingen, which was recorded in some very famous and well-written pages, took on for him (and for his students and readers) almost a mythological character. Göttingen is "the city of my heart", Pasquali wrote, and the years spent in Göttingen

---

very spiteful Festa" (Raicich 1983, 209). On Festa, see Gigante (1984) and the other contributions in the volume.

2 Pasquali (1986a, II, 772). The fact that this book was the *Herakles* can be inferred from another passage (Pasquali 1994, I, 75, where he writes: "from no other book have I ever learned so much about the Greek language and spirit").

3 As put by Ettore Romagnoli, at the time a very generous judge who later turned extremely hostile to Pasquali.

4 Degani (1988, 219), see for a well-pondered assessment of this early phase. Similarly, see La Penna (1988, 21–24).

were "the happiest of my life" (Pasquali 1994, I, 93). Some misjudgement resulted from this mythologizing:[5] it has often been forgotten that Pasquali studied in Göttingen only in the winter of 1908–1909 and that in spring he was already in Berlin. It is true that in both places he met the three great teachers whose books he had eagerly read: Wilamowitz in Berlin and Wackernagel and Schwartz in Göttingen, where he also met another fundamental teacher, Friedrich Leo.[6] These scholars left an indelible impression on him: from Wackernagel, Pasquali learnt about the need for a firm grasp on historical linguistics, which should be neither ancillary nor inimical to textual criticism. From Leo, he learnt about the most advanced trends in Latin studies, i.e., the most rigorous approach to the relationship between Latin and Greek poetry (his Plautus and Tibullus immediately come to mind), at a time when the German tradition often erected prejudicial barriers against dealing with Roman values due to an excessively philo-Hellenic ideology. From Schwartz, as Pasquali himself put it, he learnt "new textual criticism",[7] thus overcoming Lachmann's and every other mechanical reconstruction of the text in favour of a historical investigation of tradition in its entirety. If both *Orazio lirico* and *Preistoria della poesia romana* ('Prehistory of Roman poetry') have their roots in Leo (although not exclusively), *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* ('History of tradition and textual criticism') comes from Schwartz. Even just one of these teachers would have been enough to satisfy the appetite of an omnivorous student. Similarly, writing just one of these books would have been enough to be remembered by posterity. However, during those years, Pasquali was blessed with a creative overabundance.

Having returned to Italy from his memorable year in Germany, Pasquali went back and forth between Rome and Messina. However, in December 1911, he applied for his habilitation in Göttingen; a choice had been made. Personal and scientific reasons alike eventually made clear to Pasquali that his German experience could not be limited to just a brief yet productive discipleship. Instead, Germany would become the background of a steady phase of research and teaching.

5 Rectified by Classen (1988, 140 f.).

6 Pasquali penned a portrait of all his teachers (apart from Schwartz, unfortunately): Wilamowitz's and Wackernagel's can be found in *Pagine stravaganti di un filologo* ('Eccentric pages by a philologist') (Pasquali 1994, I, 65–92; II, 216–229); Leo's was collected in *Scritti filologici* ('Philological writings') (Pasquali 1986a, II, 731–735). On Schwartz, apart from Momigliano (1984), see also Bossina (2012, 107–150).

7 In the preface to *Storia della tradizione*, Pasquali defined him the "pioneer of new textual criticism" (Pasquali 1988, XX).

Pasquali taught in Göttingen for four semesters, continuing investigations that, once again, revealed his interest in scarcely trodden paths: he focused on Hellenism rather than classical Athens, with long offshoots into late antiquity (*Quaestiones Callimacheae*, Pausanias, Eusebius of Caesarea's *Vita Constantini*). This period marks the peak of Pasquali's immersion into German culture. He met again with Wackernagel and Leo (although not with Schwartz, who had gone back to Strasbourg) and worked alongside and lived "next door" to Max Pohlenz (Pasquali 1986a, II, 779–785). In Göttingen, he laid the foundations for studies that, in following years, would result in crucial books.

However, the war was soon to cast an ominous shadow over Europe. Around this time, the sequence of events becomes important and should be reconstructed with great care. On 28th June 1914, when the Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated in Sarajevo, Pasquali was in Göttingen. He learnt the news on "a midsummer evening", while on a walk with Hermann Fränkel. Fränkel, "made wiser by the experience of his people", immediately understood the inevitability of war. Pasquali "shrugged incredulously".[8] However, it would indeed be war, and it would tear Pasquali away from Germany. At that time, possibly nothing else would have pulled him away from Göttingen. In fact, a few months earlier, in March 1914, his failure at a competitive state examination had caused a profound rift with Italy.[9] There was uproar. Not only Pasquali's career but also the very notion of philology was at stake. Facing each other on opposing fronts of the commission there were not only the most important academics of the discipline, but also the standard bearers of two opposing schools entangled in an irreconcilable conflict; Girolamo Vitelli, on one side, and Giuseppe Fraccaroli and Ettore Romagnoli, on the other. Vitelli, who supported the philological method, textual criticism, and the need for conjectural emendations based on the knowledge of style, "metric laws", and the rules of historical grammar and on the rejection of any aesthetic idle talk, fully fell within the 'Germanizing' side of the dispute. His adversaries, despite being excellent scholars of Greek themselves,[10] were similarly unwavering in their rejection of any "scientific" or "critical" application in the realm of literature, which was the uncontested domain of inspiration and taste that cannot be explained away

8 Pasquali (1994, I, 94), which should be read together with Pasquali (2013, 39 and 139).

9 All the details in Pieraccioni (1985).

10 For an overall assessment of *La filologia greca nel secolo XX* ('Greek philology in the twentieth century') in Italy, see Degani (2004, II, 1046–1120). On Romagnoli especially, see once again Degani (2004, II, 937–956); on Fraccaroli, apart from Timpanaro (1972b, 298–305), see the important contributions collected in Cavarzere/Varanini (2000).

with rules (let alone "laws"!), and in their refusal to widen in any way the limited boundaries of a hyper-classical canon of literature. In their eyes, "pure philologists" were nothing but "perfect simpletons" (Fraccaroli);[11] the experts of the emerging discipline of documentary papyrology were "well-rounded imbeciles chasing after the most futile details" (Romagnoli); the classical world was an ethereal and virginal "Minerva" threatened by the unchaste appetites of the "Teutonic ape", to repeat the image that Romagnoli himself would use a few years later to vividly paint the picture. Hence the attack against the German method, its "Teutonic arrogance", and the alleged "truths" of "scientific philology" ("foolish nonsense and lies deserving of the whip and the noose"). Similarly, they fought against the perceived danger of the subsequent "idolatry of the Germans" that was already spreading everywhere in European and American universities, which were like "very many turrets of celluloid directly connected, through a thousand threads, to the great central tower of Berlin", the abode of celestial and primordial beings, i.e., "orthodox philologists" who, by "speaking in their special jargon, reason with a very special logic". Hence also, and inevitably, the very harsh attack, which often did not shy away from naming names, against "German or Germanized" philologists (such as Vitelli), "very scientific and very soporific" historians (such as Beloch), and "ridiculous and extremely annoying" teachers who are nothing but "smart alecs" ready to rear, in turn, "other, littler smart alecs" by unfailingly sending them (indeed!) "on a specialization trip to Göttingen"![12]

This mood, and its language, reached its peak during the war, only to be later relaunched by the jingoistic rhetoric of the "mutilated victory", when more or less genuinely philological concerns were accompanied by much more urticating nationalistic itches and the all-too-literary face of "Minerva" took on all-too-political features. However, the deepest root of the controversy that occasioned Pasquali's failure at the competitive state examination dated back to several years before (Pieraccioni 1985). After the competitive state examination, Pasquali was finally convinced that, between Italy and Germany, the former was no longer the true home of his philology nor his own true homeland. When Peter von der Mühll visited him in Rome, Pasquali wrote a dedication on a book

11 As he put it in the first chapter of his renowned *L'irrazionale nella letteratura* ('The irrational in literature') (1903). However, the passage should be read in its entirety (cf. now Baldi/Moscadi 2006, 33).

12 Romagnoli (1917, respectively 81 f.; 154; 121; 234; 156; 179). For an overview on the relationship between Italian and German philology, see Bossina (2017b). See also Romani Mistretta (2018).

for him: *foris exsuli domi exsul*. In Italy, Pasquali indeed felt in exile (Bossina 2014).

However, the war changed everything once again. In fact, when Italy joined the war alongside the Allied Powers, Pasquali risked becoming an enemy of the Germans too. It is only natural that Pasquali would openly side with neutralism in a passionate letter to *Giornale d'Italia* (dated 14th September), ironically entitled *La 'barbarie teutonica*' ('Teutonic barbarism').[13] It was not enough, though. His position in Göttingen became awkward. Germany was looking suspiciously at the Italian front. On 5th November, Pasquali was transferred to Berlin. It is difficult to say whether this was under pressure and to what extent. The official documents only mention that he was "appointed to act as an assistant of antiquity studies in Berlin". Perhaps there was a pressing philological emergency in Berlin? The impression is that that could hardly be the case: Pasquali was basically bilingual, had a clear understanding of German and Italian politics, wrote in newspapers, was not hostile to Germany, and instead had actually come forward in favour of the neutrality of Italy: could he possibly be of some use at the ministry? Perhaps Wilamowitz, who would soon be very active in the war effort, had mentioned his name as a useful source of information? One thing is very clear, though. When, in 1937, Max Pohlenz wrote a proposal to award Pasquali with a degree *honoris causa*, he clearly stated that "during the winter semester of 1914–1915, he was *invited to move to Berlin due to the precious information that he could offer to our Ministry of Foreign Affairs*".[14] This way of putting it might make the episode sound more sinister than it perhaps was. Moreover, there is no doubt that, in 1937, the relationship between the two regimes was such that insistence on their reciprocal loyalty was advisable. However, when Pohlenz later described Pasquali as a "*friend* of Germany", modern readers unavoidably find themselves asking whether the notion of *friendship* implicit in the passage was actually closer to the sense that the Latin term *amicitia* had in the political lexicon of alliances.

In the meantime, the war went on. Italy joined and Pasquali left Göttingen. The next stop would be Florence, under Vitelli's protection.

13 Mastromarco (1976). On Pasquali's positions with reference to the First World War and Italian colonialism, see now Guida (2017) and Brillante (2019) respectively.

14 From documents preserved in Pohlenz's *Nachlass* ('Estate') at the Staats und Universitätsbibliothek ('State and university library') of Göttingen. See also Classen (1988, 143).

2 Warring States and Warring Philologists

Pasquali's suitcase was full of nearly accomplished studies, the most important of which was the *Orazio lirico*, which was practically finished in 1915. An entire generation was dying in the trenches and many philologists had enlisted. Pasquali served in a "sedentary but demanding position" at the Ufficio storiografico della mobilitazione ('Historiographical office of mobilization') within the Commissariato generale armi e munizioni ('General commissariat for weapons and ammunition'). Fränkel, who was much less sedentary, volunteered in the Uhlan regiment "in the most advanced trenches", "patrolling the front", and taking part in the "gunfire" (Bossina 2012, 51). Wilamowitz lectured officers on the notion of war in the classical world and, in the meantime, lost his son Tycho on the battlefield. Schwartz lost two sons on the Western Front, while a third was wounded. Curtius organized the espionage on the Eastern Front under the watchful surveillance of his French counterpart who, as he would discover only years later, was the historian and Latinist Jérôme Carcopino (Pasquali 2013, 139–148). The list could go on. In the meantime, other Italian classicists, trapped in their "turrets of celluloid", took the anti-philological controversy to its peak. Some examples of Romagnoli's excess have already been quoted. His most accomplished pamphlet, namely, *Minerva e lo scimmione* ('Minerva and the ape') was published in 1917, at the height of the war. It flew off the shelves and, within the year, there even was a second edition in which the author addressed the criticism received. The controversy actually dated back at least to 1898,[15] when Nicola Festa himself, who was Vitelli's disciple and would soon become Pasquali's teacher, published a book on Bacchylides in which he reconstructed, translated, and annotated the text according to the canons of German philology (which is to say, of philology *tout court*). This approach was seen as either a merit or a fault depending on the individual critic's alignment. At the time, Romagnoli replied critically but without yet giving in to hysteria. Fraccaroli's opinion, instead, was extremely harsh. He later expressed it in an essay that specifically aimed at attacking both Festa and Vitelli, i.e., both the school and its "method", as was made clear by its title, namely, *Il metodo critico del Prof. Girolamo Vitelli* ('The critical method of Professor Girolamo Vitelli'). Vitelli responded, Fraccaroli replied to his response. Ermenegildo Pistelli, who belonged to Vitelli's school, writing under the pseudonym of "M. Pier Léon de

15 Teresa Lodi has offered a thorough account of the controversy in Vitelli (1962, 134–142). See also Pagnotta/Pintaudi (2015), Pagnotta (2019).

Gistille" asked Giovanni Pascoli to take a stance (as a philologist, not as a poet). Having been forced to intervene, Pascoli did write something. However, his essay did not go as far as the 'Florentines' had hoped. More comments and more provocations followed and Pascoli wrote once again, this time a bit more vigorously, hoping for pacification. It was February 1900. Rather than peace, an armistice was agreed.

After smouldering for some years, the fire blazed up again in 1909. The pretext this time was Pindar rather than Bacchylides. During a lively lecture in Padua, Romagnoli had made Pindar the boxing ring for his personal reckoning with philology and the Germans, attacking Wilamowitz head-on, who he would later disparagingly define as an "extremely mediocre schoolboy of classical antiquity". Romagnoli toured his lecture all over Italy, daring to take it also to Florence, where, on 23rd May 1909, he delivered it in Vitelli's lecture hall. The clash was inevitable. During those years, Pasquali was moving between Germany and Italy. Due to his German education, his direct and indirect affiliation with Vitelli's school, and his personal involvement in competitive state examinations, he was inevitably drawn into the maelstrom. After Romagnoli's *Minerva*, episodic responses were no longer enough; the circumstances called for a systemic reply. Vitelli started working on it, once again in 1917, with a broad and thorough work entitled *Filologia classica... e romantica* ('Classical and Romantic philology'). However, these warring philologists were living in the middle an actual war. In a letter of 10th November, Pistelli wrote: "we should let it go. [...] the moment is too serious and our every thought must be for Italy". Vitelli too was of the same mind: he vented in his letters and polished his work but left it unpublished. It would be half a century before a loyal disciple, who was already close to her teacher during those days, unearthed it and had it published under the aegis of a quote from Foscolo: "I responded, but then I recovered the dignity of my soul and *I have not degraded myself by having my answer published*".[16] However, how long can one keep silent?

At the end of the war, Pasquali returned to Florence where he succeeded Vitelli in his professorship. Vitelli, in fact, had appointed him to take his place in order to devote himself entirely to the study of papyri, thus retiring "at still a

16 Vitelli (1962, 143). On this work, see Timpanaro (1963) and La Penna (1983, 271), who has expressed a harsh but justified opinion: "a not unimportant but nonetheless unexciting document; and, indeed, I do not think that it excited anyone".

young age".[17] Pasquali took on Vitelli's fight. It was his turn to respond and thus *Filologia e storia* was written.

The reasoning of Romagnoli and his clique was linear and, therefore, potentially alluring, despite its hyperbolic, aggressive, arrogant, and, as it would soon become clear, '*naturaliter* fascist' language. The German method and its Italian replicators were accused of the following errors: *a*) the misleading search for a *scientific truth* (while, by definition, civic, literary, and critical history "never offer an absolute truth"); *b*) the positivistic reduction of any study to a simple verification of "facts"; *c*) the subsequent loss of the notion of value (since not "all facts", and therefore not all works, deserve consideration: Romagnoli 1917, 79–81); *d*) a show of technicism that apes natural sciences (from the adoption of *sigla*, abbreviations, and symbols to the definition of stemmata and statistics to finally arrive at the formulation of actual phonetic "rules", metric "laws", etc.); *e*) the liberty, by virtue of these alleged "laws", to emend the transmitted text or, even worse, to expunge and integrate it; *f*) and, finally, the upheaval, in the exercise of this new "criticism", of well-established aesthetic values. According to Romagnoli, all these faults can be reduced to a sequence. The German grammarian (whom Romagnoli calls "Herr Philologus" or, less graciously, "Eselkopf", i.e., 'donkey head') discovers that, in the past, there was no distinction between σ and ς. Instead, the 'crescent-shaped' c was always used. Thus, he changes all *sigmas*. Then, he discovers that Sappho's Aeolian dialect is not in line with the "paradigms of his manuals" and therefore decides to change all the forms in Sappho and to rewrite Homer in Aeolian. And then come the emendations: "every time he would not understand, and one would not believe how many times the Germans do not understand what is most obvious, Eselkopf would *emend*", changing "Aeschylus' divine harmony into his second-rate Teutonic Greek". Then, there is statistical analysis and, finally, the search for the "sources". Eventually, having disfigured the texts as he pleases and having turned them into a mishmash of recurrences and loans, he ends up disliking them: "the more one counts every καί, changes the endings, and turns it all into Aeolian, the more a strange phenomenon takes place: as it happens, Herr Philologus indeed does not think that the famous classics are as wondrous as the humanists made them out to be". Thus, Cicero becomes "a scoundrel, Livy a fibber and a bootlicker, Horace a copycat of the Greeks, and all much worse for them" (Romagnoli 1917, 97–100). From Winckelmann to Wolf and from Lachmann to Wilamowitz, the long and tormented evolution from classi-

17 Thus, in the dedication to Vitelli (and to Schwartz) in *Storia della tradizione*. Pasquali wrote a famous and successful *Ricordo* ('Recollection') of Vitelli (now in Pasquali, 1994, II, 205–215).

cism to Romanticism and from positivism to historicism is thus turned into a farce.

It is impossible to go into the details of Pasquali's thorough, sparkling, and never unbecoming reply. What stands out is its rejection of any subservience to natural sciences and, on the contrary, the declaration that philology is a "historical discipline".[18] Another aspect that stands out is Pasquali's ability to assert the reasons behind rational criticism (linguistic analysis, definition of 'laws', emendation and conjectural criticism, search for the sources) while showing their benefits precisely from an *aesthetic* point of view, thus responding to Romagnoli and the anti-philologists using their own arguments. In fact, as soon as the reader steps out of "modern poetry written in the native language", they immediately feel that they are on a "remote" and "foreign" linguistic context. Thus, it is impossible to "immediately feel" those works, nor can they be "savoured" unless one "trains" in that language with "patient study and long practice". Hence the conclusion that the "aesthetic emotion" derives precisely, and exclusively, from that very "linguistic preparation". Thus, all the aids that this loathed philology has taken on over time – its lexicons, grammars, concordances, investigations into the most minute details, and even statistics – are not an idle hotchpotch or an attack on the purity of the classics, but rather tools for "*aesthetic* enjoyment", that is, the only real form of enjoyment. Even the infamous metric "rules" and "laws" are nothing but "generalizations of empirical observations" (just like in any grammar) that are not intended to ape the exactitude of natural laws or, even further from it, their inviolability. What really matters is understanding that, in devising and then broadly conforming to certain metric outcomes, ancient poets were "fulfilling their own *aesthetic* need and that of their public". Likewise, the crusade against conjectures, that is, against the emendation of the text of the tradition, is a crusade against style. In fact, "by emending the text of an ancient writer well, one proves to know their way of thinking, their art, and their language".[19]

It may seem surprising that the advocate of an eminently historical and rational philology and future reviewer of Maas's hypergeometric 'textual criticism'

18 Pasquali (1998, 50): "Philology is neither an exact science nor a natural science. It is essentially, and possibly even exclusively, a historical discipline. This much is well known by any rigorous philologist who has taken some time to reflect upon their own profession". It should be noted that in this circumstance, certainly because of the controversy with Romagnoli, Pasquali hesitates in calling it a "science" and rather uses the word "discipline". Elsewhere he spoke instead of "science" and "sciences of the spirit", calqueing the German *Geisteswissenschaften*.

19 Pasquali (1998, respectively 5–10; 59; 14).

would rely so much on aesthetic motivations in his response, but he took a gamble and he certainly came out on top. In fact, Pasquali understood that the only way to defeat the anti-philologists was to play them at their own game, by demonstrating that poetry does not fall outside critical reasoning or history (hence the later clash with Croce, on which more will be said later on). *Filologia e storia* virtually marked the point of no return and the controversy died out after its publication. Although insisting on military metaphors while people were actually dying at the front might seem inappropriate, the over forty (!) contributions to the debate that were published between 1898 and 1920 easily constitute a 'twenty years' war' that potentially could have wrecked Italian philology.[20] It was the umpteenth attempt (another one would take place ten years later) to stall Italian classical studies on provincial and reactionary positions. It was also thanks to Pasquali that this attempt failed.

3 *Orazio lirico* and Hellenism

But what about Horace? Was it true that "foolish philologists" had transformed him into a "copycat of the Greeks"? At the time when Romagnoli expressed his cutting assessment, the *Orazio lirico* was yet to be published (as mentioned above, it would only be published in 1920). However, it had been "fully thought out and mostly written" (Pasquali 1964, XXXV). Therefore, Romagnoli's words certainly could have not gone unnoticed by Pasquali. There is no doubt that, in his *Orazio lirico*, Pasquali collected all of the most innovative suggestions coming from the rediscovery of Hellenism and that his book was therefore to be read against the background of that broad and productive field of studies (of course, mostly German) investigating the influence of Greek models on Latin poetry.[21] However, the main merit of this volume was the fact that it articulated these well-established lines of research into two original and specific directions. Internally, Pasquali shifted the focus of the comparison from archaic Greek lyric poetry to Hellenistic poetry. Usually, Horace's *carmina* were investigated in the light of archaic monodic and choral lyric poetry (Alcman, Sappho, Anacreon) and his epodes in that of ancient iambographers (Archilochus). More generally, the 'sources' of inspiration behind his verses – apart from the *sermones*, whose

20 A choice of the most relevant pages of this key controversy can be found in Baldi/Moscadi (2006).

21 For an overall assessment, see La Penna (1964).

debt to Hellenistic diatribe had already been noticed – were essentially found in the Greek poetry from the seventh to the fifth century. Pasquali certainly did not repudiate this current (the first chapter is, in fact, on Horace and Alcaeus). However, the bulk of the book is in its second chapter on Horace and Hellenistic poetry, which is precisely 500 pages long (!). In it, Pasquali collected the "sources", the "elements", and the "lyrical motifs" in a way that goes beyond the retrieval of the letter to encompass everything, from eros to the "sentiment of nature" and from "religion" to "philosophy", thus investigating Horace's poetry in the broader and more articulated background of Hellenistic culture in its entirety. As Pasquali himself would put it later on, the idea behind the work was, "all thanks to the comparison with the epigrams, to make Hellenistic lyric poetry perceivable or intuitable again through Horace's odes, which draw some motifs from it, although transforming them" (Pasquali 1986a, II, 751). This means not only assessing what Horace might have drawn from Hellenistic poetry but also whether and how much that lost Hellenistic poetry could be reconstructed or, indeed, "intuited" based on Horace. The historicist value of the analysis is implicit in its very declaration of intent: "to understand the poet as his contemporaries did" (Pasquali 1964, XXXVI). This does not deny the universal, or even timeless, value of Horace's poetry. What is rejected, instead, is the fact that such value could be understood outside of its ties to its own time. These ties plunge Horace once again into the entirety of Hellenistic history, which spans archaeology, painting, the relationship with the literary tradition of Rome and its Greek predecessors, the institutions and the political propaganda, the customs of everyday life, and ultimately the history of a civilization in its fuller sense.

Another key aspect is the fact that a relationship of contiguity with the Greek world does not simply mean a dull and mechanical, though necessary, 'search for the sources' (*Quellenforschung*). Rather, recognizing a "source" is essential to understanding the deviations from and the variations on the source itself, thus clarifying the mechanisms of *aemulatio*, or *zelos*; that is, the programmatic and conscious overcoming of the model in a new poetic work. Behind this approach, as will be explained in more detail later, there is a long debate on the notion of 'source', 'plagiarism', and 'originality', both in its German predecessors and in their often underappreciated Italian counterparts, that would later lead to the identification of an 'allusive art'. The book aroused a great deal of interest. Some authoritative reviewers, such as Jacoby and Reitzenstein, found it too unbalanced in favour of the Greeks and too forgetful of features that are uniquely Roman. Of course, there were also the foreseeable, although no less discouraging, slatings of the Italian anti-philological front, for

example with Corrado Barbagallo, a disciple of Romagnoli, who poured into his review a "hair-raising hotchpotch of Crocean idealism and anti-German hatred" (La Penna 1964, XVII). Pasquali himself was ambivalent about the book. In 1926, in a well-pondered survey on the "studies of Greek in Italy", he still spoke of it with ill-concealed pride, observing that his attempt to make Horace interact with Hellenistic lyric poetry "wronged neither the Hellenistic poets nor Horace" (Pasquali 1986a, II, 751). Later, when talking about "allusive art" in 1942, Pasquali would admit that that book, which even he "had almost completely forgotten", was "becoming once again dear" to him (Pasquali 1994, II, 277). However, in 1948, the awareness of having underestimated the autobiographical dimension in Horace drove him to almost repudiate it, "denying my publisher the permission to reprint that book and refusing to rewrite it" (*ibid.*, 307 f.). This assessment seemed too harsh even to Eduard Fraenkel, a man who, some years later, would lay a cornerstone for Horatian criticism and who was certainly not renowned for being easily swayed.[22]

4 Of Using Schwartz against Maas

The opening of Pasquali's most celebrated work is extremely famous in its own right: "This book was born out of a review". Indeed, the starting point for its creation was the invite received by Pasquali in 1929 to write for *Gnomon* a two-part review of Paul Maas's *Textual Criticism*, which had been published two years before, in 1927, as part of the successful volume *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* ('Introduction to the science of antiquity') edited by Alfred Gercke and Eduard Norden.[23] Pasquali made his review – which, "against all rules", was twice as long as the essay it reviewed – the core of an autonomous and markedly original reflection on the issues of textual criticism, which later evolved into a book that was extraordinary in its erudition, intelligence, courage, and readability and that, ever since its first edition of 1934, has become a classic of the discipline, namely, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*. The book's origins, the divergence of opinions, and the authoritativeness of the scholars involved ensured that *Textual Criticism* and *Storia della tradizione* were pitched as mutually exclusive and perceived as such from their very first re-

22 Fraenkel (1964, 606): the translation of this passage in Pasquali (2013, 200 f.) is reductive and ineffective.

23 Gercke/Norden (1927). The review for *Gnomon* (5, 1929, 417–435; 498–521) is now in Pasquali (1986a, II, 867–914).

views. When reconstructing the genesis of Pasquali's volume, it is easy to perceive how its main issues refer to much earlier reflections. After all, the quickness of Pasquali's reaction and the abundance of thoughts and examples poured into the book show that, at its foundation, there was already quite advanced and autonomous research. After all, Pasquali never shied away from admitting that, although philology itself had been "revealed to him" by Wilamowitz's *Herakles*, what had actually pushed him towards this "new" philology was Schwartz's edition of Eusebius (1903–1909). This means that the origins of the book should be traced back as far as 1909, when Schwartz finished his epochal edition and Pasquali, as has already been mentioned, was his student in Göttingen. From this perspective, the modern reader of *Storia della tradizione* is tasked with recognizing, in the magma of Pasquali's exposition, the main threads that reconnect him, on the one hand, to his predecessors and, on the other hand, to the dense succession of research, ideas, and debates in which he and Maas were involved during the first half of the century. The crucial difference lies in the fact that, while research done by others provided Pasquali with food for thought, the bread and butter of Maas's research was earned in solitary reflection (which of course does not make it any less nourishing).

The key role played by Schwartz's teachings is acknowledged, and perhaps even paraded, both in his review and in *Storia della tradizione*. In studying the complex manuscript tradition of Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica*, Schwartz had realized that variants that were substantial in number and importance could not simply be explained away with the normal process of textual corruption to which every text is subjected in the course of its transmission. The opinions, the information, and the meaning itself were different. These differences could not be explained in any other way unless assuming that, during different stages of the composition, Eusebius himself had changed his own text. For example, the ascent of a new emperor might allow or suggest the rephrasing of a certain passage in a different way. To make matters even more complex, no textual family is immune from reciprocal contamination, thus making it impossible to reconstruct the text mechanically. Therefore, according to Pasquali, Schwartz had demonstrated some general principles by turning Eusebius' practical example into a theory (Pasquali 1988, 135–141): *a*) genuine lections can be found even in interpolated codices (a notion that anticipates and is perhaps even more precise than Pasquali's famous motto *recentiores non deteriores*); *b*) the transmission of a work does not happen through mechanical transcriptions; on the contrary, there were "always new recensions", especially in the case of "widely read books"; *c*) the notions of "archetype" and "family trees" are both misleading (Schwartz went even further and called them 'fairy tales'); *d*) "the great majority

of errors are not due to a swapped letter, which is mostly the concern of modern textual criticism". These principles are technically, consciously, and conspicuously anti-Lachmannian and assume an idea of philology that is neither mechanical nor geometrical, but rather eminently *historical*. Pasquali accepts them *in toto*, but with a caveat for the third one: according to him, in fact, the "fight against the archetype" is "unjustified" when it turns into a systemic refusal. In this regard, his formulation is more cautious: it is *not always* necessary or possible to postulate the existence of an archetype.

Pasquali's German teachers[24] had freed him from Lachmann and, therefore, appeared to him as the champions of a "*new* textual criticism". He applied their methodical lessons in two works that were genuinely his own: the edition of Gregory of Nyssa's letters and the study of Tertullian's *Apologeticus* (Pasquali 1959; 1929b). The edition of Gregory of Nyssa was decisive, since it confirmed in practice most of the principles already observed in Eusebius, including: *a*) the non-mechanical origin of many corruptions; *b*) the widespread diffusion of "horizontal" contamination, as he would later define it; *c*) the consequential non-existence of a single archetype; *d*) the possibility of countering horizontal contamination with a principle of choice that uses the so-called criterion of "lateral areas". The first three points are as anti-Lachmannian as they are philo-Schwartzian, as could be expected from a disciple. The fourth point, of which Pasquali was always fond and proud, was instead his own, overcoming, so to speak, Lachmann with Lachmann himself. In fact, Pasquali derived from linguistics the notion that peripheries tend to be more conservative than the centre. When applied to textual criticism, this could mean that the same lection in two codices from different lateral areas that were not in communication with one another should be considered more credible than the variant from a codex linked to a more vibrant cultural centre. Pasquali reckoned that this criterion could also be successfully applied to argue against contamination, thus finding in Lachmann himself an unlikely ally.[25] In 1931, between the review and his *Storia della tradizione*, Pasquali published a pioneering study that would later find an outlet in his main work (and also become the starting point for *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method* by Timpanaro, who was his student). This study was an investigation of the "theologians who preceded Lachmann". With his investigation, Pasquali not only outlined the history of that laborious and fascinating

24 Apart from Schwartz, also Pohlenz, who demonstrated the *non*–mechanical transmission of the *Moralia*: Pasquali (1988, 118 f.); cf. also Pasquali (1986a, II, 782).

25 Pasquali (1988, XVII–XVIII; 7–8; 159 f.), which should be read together with Timpanaro (1985, 45–48).

intellectual achievement that is *philologia sacra*, the undiscussed teacher of her sister *philologia profana* (Canfora 2008), but also understood that the most revolutionary and methodically valiant Lachmann was not the editor of Lucretius but rather the editor of the New Testament. In this role, in fact, Lachmann was faced not with a handful of manuscripts of a text with a very limited tradition, but rather with the largest tradition of all and its textual families with their geographical differences. In this case, it was the horizontal axis of space, rather than the vertical axis of time, that was clearly at work.[26]

In the meantime, the methodological implications of his experience with Gregory of Nyssa were such that they "pushed him to look elsewhere", as he would put it later. This 'elsewhere' was Tertullian. Since it is very unlikely that Pasquali agonized over the fate of the ancient Church, it is clear that the choice of the *Apologeticus*, to which he devoted an essay (and a university course) was certainly dictated by issues of methodology. Apart from being of extraordinary historical interest, in fact, this work was widely discussed at the time also because it was transmitted by two differing versions. Pasquali, using his own and other scholars' investigations, demonstrated which of the two came first. However, he also believed that he could prove that both went back *recta via* to Tertullian. Hence his conclusion: "in such a tradition, there is no place for one archetype" (Pasquali 1988, 17). An opinion that, as will be demonstrated later, directly reconnects him to Schwartz against the Lachmann of Lucretius.

It should be noted that what has just been recounted happened *before* Pasquali's review of 1929, which means that, on a positive note, Pasquali's reflections were disconnected and independent from Maas's theory, but also, on a negative note, that, when later reading *Textual Criticism*, Pasquali superimposed on Maas's work a polemical intent that had actually preceded it and did not belong to it.[27] From this perspective, a very little-known document can be enlightening; namely, Pasquali's report on his "scientific and didactic activity" for the 1924–1934 decade, submitted to the University of Florence (Pasquali 1990). In it, when retracing the path that brought him to write his "latest book", i.e., *Storia della tradizione*, Pasquali identified its antecedent in his research on Gregory of Nyssa and Tertullian, without even mentioning his review of Maas.

26 However, the geographical criterion can be found already in Bentley and, *in nuce* also in Bengel: cf. Timpanaro (1985, 45).

27 Nothing demonstrates this point more clearly than the notion of 'archetype'; in fact, on such a key issue, Pasquali attacked Maas with the arguments that Schwartz had used against Lachmann, not always realizing that Lachmann's notion of archetype was different from Maas's: cf. Montanari (2003, 431 ff.).

Pasquali was also very receptive to the important progress that was being made in the field of Italian literature at the time. The key figure of this new phase was undoubtedly Michele Barbi, who was also promoting in his field a "new philology"[28] that was perfectly in agreement with Pasquali's. Barbi, to whom Pasquali also dedicated an extraordinary *Ricordo* (Pasquali 1994, II, 434–451), had gained his professorship in Florence in 1923. From that moment onwards, the two scholars worked side by side, inspiring one another. Pasquali was also strongly influenced by Vittorio Rossi's studies on the tradition of Petrarch's *Epistolae familiares*, which showed the ongoing process of self-correction practised by the author over three distinct phases: the first draft of the letter, the finished text ready to be sent out; and the subsequent 'official' publication, when the letter itself was recovered from Petrarch's own archive to be substantially reworked. Pasquali deemed that a similar process might have taken place also in the case of ancient authors, from Cicero to Libanius and Augustine. Any scholar looking for some backing to the theory of "authorial variants" could not have asked for a more effective model. Pasquali had already mentioned this model in his review of Maas; later, he also wrote an independent essay on it and turned it into one of the most exciting outcomes of *Storia della tradizione*.[29] However, Barbi's research on Boccaccio's autographs, where he demonstrated the existence of several authorial versions for some of *The Decameron*'s novellas, had already played a key role for Pasquali. Of course, Pasquali also had Manzoni and the long gestation of his novel *The Betrothed* in mind, from *Fermo e Lucia* ('Fermo and Lucia') to the *Sposi Promessi*. In his *Ricordo di Michele Barbi* ('Recollection of Michele Barbi'), Pasquali wrote:

> I am proud that, even in his old age, he did not refuse to read a volume of mine on method [= *Storia della tradizione*], openly accepting some technical terms that I suggested in it; and that he even seems to see in me almost a precursor because of my systemic research on authorial variants. *However, I must state that he had considered this possibility for The Decameron much earlier than I had even attempted to formulate a theory of my own*, for what little that is possible in such an ever-changing subject.[30]

The discussion above necessitates further enquiry into another crucial aspect of Pasquali's work. Pasquali's criticism matured through the study of three Chris-

28 Which is indeed the title of the important collection of Barbi's studies, which Pasquali thoroughly reviewed in *L'edizione dei classici italiani da Dante a Manzoni* ('The edition of Italian classics from Dante to Manzoni') (1938), now in Pasquali (1994, II, 154–175).

29 Rossi (1933); Pasquali (1994, I, 360–376; 1988, 457–465).

30 Pasquali (1994, II, 443). In an earlier passage, on 440, Pasquali acknowledged Barbi's precedence also in the field of "lateral areas".

tian writers; Eusebius, Gregory, and Tertullian. Let us include (together with Pohlenz) Plutarch; four prose writers. Let us also include (together with Rossi and Barbi) Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Manzoni. The total is seven prose writers, all very widely read; the last three (or five, if including Tertullian and Eusebius) demonstrably practised self-correction. According to Pasquali, the methodological superiority of the 'Lachmann of the New Testament' over the 'Lachmann of Lucretius' falls within the same principle: the rigorous methods of stemmatics and a mechanical *constitutio textus* immediately become inadequate as soon as they are applied to complex textual traditions which have endured over time, have spread widely across geographical spaces, and have remained interesting to other authors and readers, making them innately subject to modernization. In fact, Pasquali observed, only the closed and narrow tradition of difficult and sophisticated poets such as Lucretius and Catullus could allow Lachmann to develop his mechanical criteria (Pasquali 1986a, II, 923).

It should thus be clear how interesting the publication of *Textual Criticism* in 1927 would prove to be for Pasquali. Its eighteen, extremely schematic pages contained, as Pasquali himself put it, a *critica textualis ordine geometrico demonstrata*; that is, a quintessential method and practice of textual criticism that promised to set unchallengeable rules for editing. It is worth reasserting that, while *Storia della tradizione* is commonly read as a counterpoint to or perhaps even the historicist antidote to Maas's theoretical schematism, it is often forgotten that the publication of *Textual Criticism* for Pasquali represented, first and foremost, the appearance of an ally. It is true that, thanks to Schwartz, Pasquali had devoted years to overcoming Lachmann and that Maas might have indeed seemed to him like the reincarnation of that ancient ghost. However, it should not be forgotten that the most implacable enemy, at least because of its virtual omnipresence in Italy, was not the excess of Lachmann's method, but rather the lack of any method whatsoever, the adherence to outdated methods, and even the rejection of criticism as such. Maas's theory meant, first and foremost, a stern refutation of the criterion of the *codex unicus*, of the alignment to *codices plurimi*, and of the fetish of the *codex optimus*. It was a theoretical defence (which, in Maas, took a splendidly concrete form) of emendations *ope ingenii*. All these battles were Pasquali's own battles. In fact, Pasquali still had to face opponents who considered a critical edition as a "foolish" endeavour and the Homeric question as a "German lie" and who, at best, were founding series of publications with the explicit intent of purging them from conjectural criticism altogether (as Carlo Pascal wrote in the inauguration to the *Corpus*

Paravianum).[31] Against this disease, Maas's eighteen pages were like a miraculous elixir. In fact, Pasquali's review includes dozens of laudatory adjectives and expressions of jubilation, to the point that the spirited conjecturer and papyrologist Wilhelm Crönert once amused himself by underlining every such instance in his personal copy of *Gnomon* (now kept in Göttingen: cf. Bossina 2010, 260 f.), where they dot the pages as gems in a crown. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that, twenty years later, Pasquali himself would promote the Italian translation of *Textual Criticism*.

Of course, that crown also had some thorns. In April 1929, Pasquali forewarned Maas that he was writing a review of his work and they would "quarrel" (*verzanken*).[32] Maas was ready, as he put it, for "a bitter controversy". When the first part was published, which was far from negative, Maas did not react. He preferred to wait for the second part, fearing "venenum in cauda". On 9th October, having read Pasquali's long review in its entirety and the "very comprehensive assessment that I have received in it", Maas sent Pasquali an important letter that summarized, in his characteristically hyper-synthetic prose, all the points on which they disagreed and that would divide them over the following thirty years. Apart from some observations on specific issues, Maas understood the need to respond to Pasquali's three main objections; namely, *a*) the refusal to posit the existence of an archetype in every tradition; *b*) the caution against corrupted traditions; *c*) the opportunity to sometimes postulate the existence of several authorial versions. These were all principles clearly meant to limit the application of stemmatics and, in fact, they could be traced back to Pasquali's interpretation of Schwartz.

Maas's reply was a mix of determination, precision, and repression. His precision can be appreciated in his referring to the notion of archetype "as I define it" (meaning, not Lachmann's archetype). As is clearly stated in *Textual Criticism*, Maas defined the "archetype" as "the specimen from which the branching started", regardless of its chronological positioning. Therefore, the archetype is "immune" from all the errors "started *after* the branching". However, if *all* the following witnesses share at least *one* common error, that error must have already been in the "archetype" itself when the branching first happened. It goes without saying that, in this case, the correction of the error cannot come from the tradition but only from conjecture. The tone of Maas's letter

31 Pasquali (1994, I, 191–193); Gabba (1972, 446 f.). Pasquali also took part in the foundation of the Edizione Nazionale dei Classici Greci e Latini ('National Edition of Greek and Latin Classics'): see Brillante/Fizzarotti 2021.

32 On what follows, see again Bossina (2010).

was peremptory and, at one point, even harsh: "if there is *one* common error, then there is also an archetype, as I define it. The ancient works that have no such error and, therefore, need no conjecture are a rare exception, which is why I have not mentioned them. *To fight against this notion of archetype is like tilting at windmills*". In this scenario, Pasquali and Schwartz star as Don Quixote (and not, one hopes, also as Sancho Panza).

At this point, the introduction of the elusive and unsatisfactory category of "exception" was a necessary evil for Maas's system. Using this category meant responding to Pasquali with the claim of having guessed the rule while leaving the study of the exception to him. Where does the boundary between the two lie, though? Maas also introduced an even subtler distinction between classical and non-classical. Responding to Schwartz's argument and Pasquali's use of it, Maas said: "I intentionally left out Schwartz's Eusebius [...] because it is not a typical case" and "because Eusebius is not a classic". He then added: "the notion of classical is absolutely key to my argument. However, I should have expanded more on it than I did". The concession is only apparent; over the following thirty years, Maas would publish three other editions of *Textual Criticism*, all updated and expanded. As it will be mentioned later, he added an appendix on *Indicative Errors and Stemmatic Types*, a famous *Retrospect* that includes important notions such as the concepts of "latent evidence", "diagnostic conjectures" (En. trans. by B. Flower, 50 and 53), and an explicit rebuttal of Pasquali's principle of *recentiores non deteriores* (to which he would oppose the drastic *comburendi non conferendi*).[33] However, on the "notion of classical" – which had been previously deemed to be "absolutely key" and on which he admitted that he had not said enough – not a single word is spent. Thus, the repression of Eusebius applies to all cases of contamination. For Maas, they all fall in the category of "exception" and, as such, a handbook on textual criticism should not concern itself with them. As he would later say in the introduction to the Italian translation of his work (which was promoted by Pasquali!), "contaminated tradition" is a "special" case, dealt with in *Storia della tradizione*. He omitted it from his essay because it "cannot be methodically disentangled". Hence his famous quote: "no medicinal herb has yet been found against contamination".

Finally, his response to the issue of different authorial versions is also as precise as it is elusive. If authorial versions are independent from one another and did not contaminate one another, the issue is non-existent as each derives from its own "archetype" (as defined by Maas). If instead a contamination did

33 On which, see Carlini (1997).

take place, then the issue falls back into the territory for which no 'medicinal herb' has been found, and theoreticians should not concern themselves with it.

Thus, there was no actual self-criticism from Maas. At least, not explicitly. In fact, there was an indirect admission of a gap in his system in 1937, ten years after the first edition of *Textual Criticism* and three years after the publication of *Storia della tradizione*, when Maas published a brief but intense essay on *Indicative Errors and Stemmatic Types*.[34] These pages served the purpose of filling a considerable gap in his textual criticism, which began with the *recensio*, the *examinatio*, and the *emendatio*, thus omitting everything that, logically, precedes the *recensio* itself and on which the latter should be based, namely, stemmatics. It seems legitimate to regard *Indicative Errors and Stemmatic Types*, with its definition of indicative error and conjunctive error,[35] as the outcome of the clash with Pasquali. *Indicative Errors and Stemmatic Types* would later be added to the second edition of *Textual Criticism*, although not where one would expect it, i.e., in the opening, but rather as an appendix. Instead, when in 1949 Maas wrote *ex novo* the short but meaningful article *Textual Criticism* for the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, stemmatics was rightfully placed *before* textual criticism.

Thus, the letters of 1929 facilitate an understanding of *Storia della tradizione*; Pasquali was responding not only to *Textual Criticism* but also to Maas's letter. The same was true of the article in *Edizione critica* ('Critical edition') written in 1932 for the *Enciclopedia Italiana* ('Italian encyclopaedia'), which implies the objections that Maas had privately sent to Pasquali and possibly represents the peak of the tension in the relationship between the two scholars.[36]

In the meantime, another war and the vile persecution of the Jews were looming on the horizon. Maas had to leave for Oxford,[37] and Pasquali experienced his worst depression.[38]

34 See the detailed analysis by Canfora (1982).

35 Two testimonies that share an error. As it is unlikely that they both came to it independently, they must derive from a common model.

36 Pasquali accepted the objection on contaminated traditions (which do not necessarily exclude an archetype). However, he also insisted especially on "authorial variants" as a 'third path' that Maas did not take into account. Interestingly, this debate took place without Pasquali ever even naming Maas explicitly, including in the bibliography. See, nevertheless, Ziffer (2021, 81).

37 On Maas's circumstances during those troubled years, Mensching (1987).

38 In 1942–1943, he even asked to be excused from teaching: Pasquali (1986a, 272).

The recovery started in 1947. Pasquali's first piece of work after the catastrophe of the war was a *Preghiera* ('Prayer') (Pasquali, 1947). This text is only one page long. In it, Pasquali announced his intention of rewriting *Storia della tradizione* and asked for the help of anyone who had any ideas to contribute. He soon realized that rewriting the whole volume would be impossible. Therefore, he moved towards a miscellaneous publication collecting the contributions of all scholars interested in carrying on his reflection. This option would also be discarded shortly afterwards. This was a phase in Pasquali's thinking characterized by an intense self-criticism, especially on the key issue of his clash with Maas over the true "architrave" of his book, as it has been defined (Canfora 2012); namely, "authorial variants". Some scholars whose opinion mattered to Pasquali a great deal, such as Ulrich Knoche and Günther Jachmann, had become more and more explicit in their reservations. In 1941, Jachmann even defined the research on authorial variants as the "weird pet of current classical philology" (Jachmann 1941, 47). Knoche too, who had been a precious reference point for Pasquali on Juvenal, was starting to retract his own hypotheses. After all, Pasquali had already started to have second thoughts early on (much before Jachmann's attack). When reviewing Barbi's extraordinary studies, Pasquali had written, already in 1938: "Barbi seems keen on attributing the merit of this doctrine on 'authorial variants' to me. However, I 'insisted so much on it' precisely because of his own example and that of other Petrarchan scholars". Pasquali makes it sound as if recognizing the other's precedence is basically tantamount to a charge of aiding and abetting. In fact, he continued: "I must add that, while I deem it absolutely certain for many ancient Italian authors and many Greek authors (including Eusebius, but also Pseudo-Hippocrates' *Letters*), and also for several Latin authors (including Ausonius and Prudentius), I am now starting to have some doubts with regard to Juvenal and Martial" (Pasquali 1994, II, 166). After the war, as demonstrated by his preface to the reprint of *Storia della tradizione*, Pasquali was consumed with scepticism. He explicitly said that the principle had been "abused" and that he too had "likely gone too far". He even expressed the fear that "my work, in this respect, might have caused more harm than good". "I feel the duty", he concluded, "to admonish novices, including experienced novices, the ὀψιμαθεῖς of this philology, to be cautious" (Pasquali 1988, XXI f.).

To the modern observer of this phase, it almost feels as if Pasquali was paying for his victory against anti-philologism twenty years before. The Italian philological tradition was one which had long resisted 'criticism' and had remained intolerant of 'scientific' methods, the honest detection of errors, and the practise of conjecture; as a result, some elements of Pasquali's historicism, and

specifically the option to 'save' some variants as 'authorial', offered a precious alibi for the refusal to 'judge', i.e., to *choose* (cf. Timpanaro 1985, 99: En. trans. by G.W. Most, 135 f.). From this perspective, the Pasquali of *Storia della tradizione* risked annulling the Pasquali of *Filologia e storia*, with one supporting those whom the other had defeated. At any rate, the two different approaches had been used to combat two different enemies. At his most 'philological', Pasquali objected to the excess of aestheticism, while at his most 'historical', Pasquali objected to the excess of Lachmannism. Thus, he fortified Romagnoli's insipid water with the excellent wine of philology and watered down Maas's pure wine with the sobering water of history. Inverting the recipes could obviously cause undesirable effects.

The theoretical and also practical legitimacy of the principle of authorial variants would soon be articulated wisely, and from within Pasquali's own school.[39] However, there is every reason to think that, after a phase of excessive scepticism, the opposite temptation would cyclically resurface, thus causing the discipline to err once again towards the side of its abuse. In fact, relying on the theory of authorial variants offers a great reassurance to those who are anxious about choosing the invention of a medieval mind in their edition, thus confining the real author to the critical apparatus. Postulating that both variants are indeed 'authorial' limits the liability, mitigates the risk, and satisfies many misgivings. This resource is in fact too tempting, including from a psychological point of view, for it not to be abused again sooner or later.

Pasquali was less critical, and actually duly faithful to his approach, with regard to the accusation of having put too much stress on "exceptional" cases rather than the "rule". This had been, in fact, Maas's periodical refrain. For example, Pasquali knew that, in the margins of his copy of *Storia della tradizione* (which still exists), Maas had jotted down a series of observations and thoughts, which Pasquali had hoped to be able to use for his reworking of the volume. However, when Pasquali asked Maas for his help, Maas simply replied that, on the whole, his notes contained nothing but a generic "opposition to your basic approach", i.e., the excessive "importance given to singular, atypical cases" and the "refusal to describe the rule" (letter from November 1948). In his article for the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Maas publicly maintained that Pasquali "treats predominantly the problems of *abnormal* transmission". A similar opinion had been expressed by the reviewer of *Storia della tradizione* in *Gnomon*: Maas dealt with the "rule" and Pasquali with the "anomalies" (*Ab-*

39 See Scevola Mariotti's contributions collected in Mariotti (2000, 539–563 and then 607–609).

normitäten), to the point of even fearing that "Pasquali's book might somehow induce the complete abandonment of Maas's *norms*". It is a cry for help: "if it were so, every foundation would collapse, even the courage to start would be lost, and finally the very possibility of achieving the goal [= preparing an edition] would become depressingly moot"! The reviewer opted for a medical image; Maas deals with the "general anatomy", Pasquali with "specific physiology" (Seel 1936). Which doctor should one see, though?

Pasquali found shelter from this crossfire where he would have least expected it; in France, from the great codicologist Alphonse Dain. Not only did Dain react enthusiastically to *Storia della tradizione*, but he also steeped his famous volume *Les manuscrits* ('Manuscripts') in the same pragmatism and the same rejection of any geometrizing short cut when it comes to textual criticism (Dain 1949). Pasquali returned the favour with a very positive review of *Les manuscrits*, which helped him enormously against Maas and his other opponents. "The very peak" of Dain's wise precepts was in his recovery of a "clever aphorism by Bidez: 'tous les cas sont spéciaux'". This was a way to answer, with the French, to his German opponents (the world truly was upside down!). To those who accused him of only having dealt with special cases, in fact, he replied that "*all* cases are special"!

When Pasquali realized that he would not be able to rewrite his volume and decided to reprint it as it was, he nonetheless wanted to at least add some appendices. The first appendix was indeed his review of Dain, which confirmed its programmatic value. The second[40] directly referenced, once again, Schwartz, whom he described as "perhaps the greatest philologist of the last fifty years". The purpose was clear: while, on the one hand, Pasquali was ready to take a step back on the issue of 'authorial variants', on the other hand, he was not willing to compromise on the need to refresh textual criticism in the long and rich stream of history. In this regard, the incompatibility with Maas continued to be clear-cut. Ever since his review of 1929, Pasquali had invited Maas to merge into his *Textual Criticism* some other memorable pages of his of a different nature, namely, *Schicksale der antiken Literatur in Byzanz* ('The fate of ancient literature in Byzantium'). This work of Maas's was a genuinely historical essay, the only one in which he focused on the 'history of the tradition' of the texts (at least Greek texts) and their posthumous fate. Maas never accepted Pasquali's invite.

40 *Congettura e probabilità diplomatica* ('Conjecture and diplomatic probability'): with a collection of examples from contemporary press.

After the end of the war, when Pasquali went back to his old project of having *Textual Criticism* translated into Italian, he once again expressed his *desideratum* to Maas, namely, that his excellent original book, having been opportunely enriched with *Indicative Errors and Stemmatic Types*, would now take the last step towards history and be completed by *Schicksale* (possibly even in the most natural order, i.e., *Schicksale* → *Indicative Errors and Stemmatic Types* → *Textual Criticism*, that is, an order in which tradition comes *before* criticism). Maas was enthusiastic at the idea of a translation, but firmly rejected the suggestion of history entering his work: "I would be very pleased", he wrote to Pasquali in January 1952, "by an Italian translation of my *Schicksale der griech. Lit. in Byzanz*, but please *not in my Textual Criticism, from which every history of tradition is fundamentally excluded*". There really was no chance for a synthesis of the two systems.

Moreover, Maas also suggested that Pasquali could have *Schicksale* translated into Italian and then published in his own book, thus actually presenting it within a historical context. Pasquali did precisely as suggested. Thus, the second edition of *Storia della tradizione*, together with the noble words of self-criticism in the preface, Dain's strategic pages, and a renewed homage to Schwartz, also included Maas's 'historical' short essay. It was a masterly stroke on Maas's part, who thus managed to apply his final seal to the volume of his 'opponent' without having to recant his own positions. And there it was, in Pasquali's book, alongside with Dain and Schwartz: the most important *critic* among the greatest *historians*.

Finally, the book that had originated from Maas also went back to Maas. Those were also the very last pages that Pasquali ever wrote, a few weeks before his tragic death.

5 Archaic Rome and 'Allusive Art'

But let us take a step back. The controversy against the anti-philologists was not the only front on which Pasquali was engaged. In fact, it was followed by the controversy against the idealists – who were more Crocean than Croce himself and worshipped pure aesthetics – and the clash with the nationalist zealots – who, enamoured by Rome because of fascism, were looking in every corner of the Latin world for proof of the long-lasting genius of the Italian race.

In 1936, only two years after the publication of *Storia della tradizione*, and then again in 1938, Pasquali published two remarkable volumes: *Preistoria della poesia romana* (dedicated to Barbi) and *Le lettere di Platone* ('Plato's letters').

These works clearly had very different goals and yet they exhibited traits characteristic of Pasquali's philology, that is, the refusal to compartmentalize philological studies and the conviction, already stated in *Storia della tradizione*, that "at least within the sciences of the spirit, there should not be disciplines with strict boundaries, 'compartments', *Fächer*, but only problems that often need to be resolved with methods coming from a number of different disciplines at the same time" (Pasquali 1988, XIV). Thus, the first book led from a complex metric problem, i.e., the origin of the Saturnian verse, to then expand its perspective to encompass the history of archaic Rome. The second volume, instead, led from the issue of the authenticity of Plato's letters to then cover the history of Sicily.

Preistoria della poesia romana dealt with extraordinary technical competence with an issue regarding which, once again, the tradition of Italian criticism was incredibly behind; namely, the study of classical metrics. Versification in Latin, whether in the form of Virgilian hexameters or centos in elegiac couplets, had been cultivated in Italy ever since the age of humanism, later resulting, via the erudition of ecclesiastical seminaries, in both the symposiac poems written by good old countryside priests and the indisputable virtuosity of Giovanni Pascoli's poetry in Latin (incidentally, Pasquali wrote some important pages on Pascoli too). Thus, behind the 'barbarian' translations that were all the rage also in Italy, including Romagnoli's illustrious examples, there were at least some rudimentary notions of metrics. However, apart from this minimal threshold, there was no in-depth study, in schools or elsewhere, of the technical foundations of metrics and its important repercussions in terms of textual criticism, colometry, and, more generally, the issue of the reproducibility of rhythm, etc. Thus, the field of metrics experienced the same phenomenon observed in textual criticism, that is, the fact that "under the pretext of uncertainty", "the highest degree of lack of preparation" becomes the norm "even with regard to issues that have been conclusively confirmed".[41] Pasquali expended himself generously on this issue, at times using the same argument already proposed in *Filologia e storia* against the refusal of textual criticism: "I believe that those who do not try to *recreate the sound* of poetry for themselves and others are giving up a great deal of their *aesthetic enjoyment* of it" (Pasquali 1994, I, 178). The quote, which is dated 1923 and was meant as a polemical attack against well-established practices in schools, cuts deeper than might appear at first. It

41 Timpanaro (1981, 11; however, the entire essay is crucial). On Pasquali's metric studies and his pride for his involvement on the subject, Gentili (1988). On the study of grammar and metrics in Italy during the nineteenth and the twentieth century, Rossi (1983); on the teaching of Greek and Latin, Neri (2012), and Baldo (2012).

alludes to the debate on a very complex issue, that is, whether an intensive *ictus* existed or not in Greek and Latin metrics and, consequently, whether the modern, 'accentual' way of reading poetry allowed for a real experience of the ancient verses in their acoustic and aesthetic dimensions. Wilamowitz (remembering, for example, how persuasive Gottfried Hermann's renditions had been) believed that it did. So did, for a long time, Peter von der Mühll and Eduard Fraenkel, who had authored some essays especially focused on this issue that Pasquali himself had reviewed positively. Later, Pasquali changed his mind: "I have more and more doubts every day", as he wrote in his 1930 review of Erich Bethe's *Die griechische Dichtung* ('Greek poetry'). However, the finishing stroke came from some observations by Willy Theiler (cf. Timpanaro 1981, 27). Pasquali's opinion changed also with regard to the Saturnian verse, an issue on which he overcame his teacher Leo, eventually arriving at the conclusion that the origins of the most ancient of Latin verses, and therefore of the very core of Roman poetry, were to be found in Greece. The constituent parts of the Saturnian verse, in fact, did not come from Rome nor, for that matter, from the Italian peninsula. Thus, the Saturnian verse was not 'indigenous' but rather imported, at least in terms of the basic *cola* of which it was composed. However, the final synthesis – the "original" synthesis, as Pasquali put it – was indeed Roman (cf. Pasquali 1981, 135).

Clearly the issue was no longer metric but rather historical, since it directly involved the relationship between Rome and the Greek world. In order to prove this relationship, Pasquali deployed all the clues that his polymorphic erudition had been able to collect across the most varied fields, from political history to linguistics and archaeology. Paradoxically (though perhaps less so to those who are familiar with Pasquali), the historical part was almost more convincing (and better suited to stand the test of time) than the section on metrics. In fact, the chapter on *La cultura di Roma arcaica* ('The culture of archaic Rome') is undoubtedly one of the very best in the book. After all, only a historical analysis could have allowed one of the most crucial aspects of Rome's debt to Greece to be determined, i.e., its time frame. Literary evidence (*Carmen arvale*) did not allow Pasquali to travel any further back in time than a relatively recent *ante quem* term, i.e., the fourth century BC. However, historical and political reasons suggested a need to go much further back in time. In fact, in order to be able to speculate about such a debt to Greece and, at the same time, affirm its autonomous cultural reworking, it was necessary to presume that Rome must have had a close relationship with the Greek world while also being, in turn, a vibrant civilization in its own right. Neither the fourth century (when Rome was sacked by the Gauls) nor the fifth century (when it lost its upper hand on the Latin

League) could offer the right background, which was instead to be found in the sixth century BC, in the "great Rome of the Tarquinii".

Thus, the problem that was originally metric and had then turned historical suddenly became political. In fact, in 1936, at the height of fascism, when the "Empire" had returned (in May) "on the fated hills of Rome" and every possible anniversary was programmatically observed to celebrate the continuity of the Roman fasces (Cagnetta 1979 and 1998b), it was not easy to maintain that, even if just by means of lyrical *cola*, the core of the most ancient Latin poetry was not an autonomous creation of the genius of the Italian race, but rather something imported from abroad. Pasquali, as he put it, was "scared of his own courage". In fact, he knew that he would have to face "bold" and "dangerous" "zealots", "who, I am sure, will blame me for tearing yet another leaf – they indeed speak like this – from the imperishable wreath that crowns the brow of immemorial Rome, as if it were a reason for pride for a state not to be in contact with other civilizations, that is, outside of history" (Pasquali 1981, 87).

However, apart from the attacks coming from fascist nationalists, Pasquali also easily anticipated the opposition from the Crocean front, including the prevailing idealistic current, which was tenaciously against breaking down poetry into its constituent elements, recognizing its stages of evolution, and researching its "sources" since poetry was, by definition, an act of individual inspiration that cannot be reduced to the influence of external models: "very scholarly parrots will be scandalized at the title of this book", Pasquali wrote in the preface, "and will not be able to refrain from teaching me that poetry does not have a prehistory because its origin is in the artist's soul" (*ibid*., 88). This is one of the most effective quips in the controversy between Pasquali and the Croceans; a controversy that, precisely at that time, escalated after an unpleasant clash with Croce himself.[42]

In truth, it was Croce who started the controversy, in an essay in which he attacked the short-sightedness of those philologists who had excessively belittled the value of Terence as an imitator of Menander. The targets included Pasquali, who was guilty of having approached the relationship between the two writers, and specifically between the *Hecyra* and the *Epitrepontes*, as a change for the worse from a "genial artist" to a "skilled playwright". The controversy was bitter. However, neither Pasquali's response, which was not among his most successful, nor Croce's counterargument helped to make any progress at all in an issue that was instead very important, i.e., whether and

42 On this controversy, Timpanaro (1972a, 129–131), La Penna (1988, 47–51), and the faultless analysis by Cagnetta (1998a).

how much one should take into account, when assessing a piece of art, the recognition of its sources, echoes, allusions, and reminiscences. In truth, using these terms actually assumes the accomplishment of a process that, at the time, was instead still *in fieri* and that Pasquali himself would later fulfill in his famous *Arte allusiva* ('Allusive art') (1942; now in Pasquali 1994, II, 275–282). Rather than the cruder notion of "source", in this essay Pasquali would later distinguish with great precision among "echoes" (which "can also be unconscious"), "imitations" (which the poet "might wish escape the reader's notice"), and actual "allusions" (which "achieve the intended effect only on a reader who clearly remembers the text to which they allude"). This essay would be epochal. However, it must be pointed out that, while its precise formulation only took place in 1942, all its basic elements were already widespread in the literary debate at the time of the controversy with Croce over Terence; in fact, via different routes, these same elements can be traced back at least as far as the 1870s, both in Germany and in Italy.[43]

Thus, Pasquali crystallized in a theory a long critical process that, from a brutish hunt for similarities denounced as plagiarism, had evolved into the recognition of an 'emulative' intention, a challenge from the modern author to the ancient, to finally reach the understanding that the reader too was being similarly challenged. Hence the perfectly clear conclusion to which Pasquali came in his essay, which Croce missed completely, that all poets 'imitate' but not all 'allude' (and not all readers 'understand'). "Allusive art" truly was "the most mature expression of Pasquali's love for erudite poetry" and, at the same time, another demonstration of his philology "drenched in historicism" (or "rotten with history").[44]

On the other hand, this book was also the confirmation of his belonging to that very school that had supported him in his battle against the anti-philologists. The position of the Florentine anti-Crocean current was easy to frame; against Croce in terms of literary criticism and against Romagnoli in terms of textual criticism, but with Romagnoli (and, obviously, against Croce) in terms of their support of fascism.

In such a context, it is easy to move from one issue to another. It is likely, or perhaps even probable, that politics also had an impact on the genuinely critical issue of the conflict between Croce and Pasquali. "To an extent, Pasquali

43 See Citroni (2011) and Bossina (2014). Collection of texts in Pasini (1988).

44 Timpanaro (1972a, 130 and 120) and Contini (1972, 21). Cf. also La Penna (1988, 51): "Croce tended to isolate poetry in literature, while Pasquali instead searched in literature the whole of humanity in a certain historical context".

certainly gave in to fascism", as a loyal (although, never partisan) student of his wrote (Timpanaro 1994); a fact that has been assessed very differently depending, one might say, on the expectations that one has for intellectuals (cf. Canfora 2003a). However, the most misleading defence of all, even if not meant as an acquittal, is attributing to Pasquali a lack of interest in or even awareness of politics. His book on the *Socialisti tedeschi* (cf. Canfora 2014), his *Testamento di Teodoro Mommsen* ('Theodor Mommsen's testament'), his *Storia dello spirito tedesco nelle memorie di un contemporaneo* ('History of German spirit as recollected by a contemporary') could have not been written by an author uninterested in politics. The universal mission that Pasquali attributed to Caesar against Boissier's criticism (which he deemed to be moralistic) was later rejected by Roman historians (this interpretation had already been Eduard Meyer's; cf. Càssola 1988). However, it also proved that he was neither alien to nor displeased by a certain level of political cynicism in historical investigation. Therefore, the issue must be examined from another point of view. Pasquali, who came from a middle-class background and had received a liberal education, showed at first some unequivocal signs of opposing fascism, both privately, which is less important, (in a letter from May 1923 he called himself a "keen anti-fascist"),[45] and publicly, by signing in 1925 Croce's famous *Manifesto degli intellettuali antifascisti* ('Manifesto of anti-fascist intellectuals'). During the following years, he compromised somewhat, although without ever selling out his erudition, instead preserving his dignity and autonomy of judgement even when other intellectuals and classical philologists failed miserably (with their rhetoric of the Roman Empire, their evident racism, their celebration of the state, their use of sorry historical analogies, etc.). Nonetheless, despite being few in number and not particularly rich in content, there still are some pages in Pasquali's production that cannot but be read with embarrassment today.[46] His ineptitude at being perpetually in the opposition, a somewhat inertial acquiescence, his weakness for satiating his vanity's unruly appetites with public honours, and especially his "pathological"[47] wish to be appointed to the Royal

45 A letter, still too little known, of 7th May 1923 to his brother-in-law Angiolo Nosei recounts of a sort of conspiratorial probing among his colleagues at university: "I have discovered another keen anti-fascist (alongside Limentani, Salvemini, myself, Romano, and Benedetto), that is, De Sarlo!". He then adds: "Vitelli, instead, is taking a step back; he is annoyed at the threats against the Statute, which at any rate have been partly taken back". The letter should be read carefully in its entirety: Gomez Gane (2002, 40–42).

46 See Raicich (1988, 182–185); Pasquali (1994, I, 397–400).

47 Thus Goffredo Coppola, in a radio comment from January 1945: Canfora (2005, 741–747). On the "mania and fixation" of becoming an Accademico, cf. Valgimigli (1965, 510).

Academy of Italy (which had been systematically thwarted by Mussolini) pushed him to some acts of obsequiousness, at least on the surface, in the hope of having "the 'sin' of his semi-young age forgiven" (Canfora 2005, 197), that is, the fact that he had signed Croce's *Manifesto*. The conflict with Croce, apart from some serious and important critical issues (which did exist and of which Pasquali often had a better understanding), should also be read against the background of the process of 'rehabilitation' that Pasquali believed that he had to undergo: "We knew", Arnaldo Momigliano wrote in a very important testimony, "it was the price Pasquali – a former anti-fascist – had to pay to become Accademico d'Italia" (Momigliano 1969, 107).

And yet, given the price paid by Pasquali, the prize could have been greater. During those years, the problem of the originality of Latin poetry and how to measure it was not just an issue of literature. Germany was promoting its own identification with Greece (according to Niebuhr's famous saying, Germany was to be "the Greece of modern day"), which implied that reacting to the exaggerated notion that Latin poetry was a parasitic imitator of Greek poetry entailed giving the young Italian nation a path to cultural assertion that would free it from the scientific 'protectorate' of Germany (cf. Cagnetta 1998a). From this point of view, the battle between the Croceans and the anti-philologists was neither specious nor futile. Pasquali, who was not indifferent to this need, could not accept, however, that the redemption of Latin poetry should be brought about via excessively autarkic or negationist short cuts: the Latins (meaning, the Italians) certainly had their own originality, which should be reasserted. However, this should not mean having to deny the influence of the Greeks (meaning, the Germans). For a philologist who seemed too German to Italian conservatives (such as Romagnoli) and too Latin to German conservatives (such as Wilamowitz) (cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1983, 110 f.), this was not just a scientific and cultural issue but rather a problem concerning the core of his own humanity and identity.

There is no doubt that Pasquali acted as an intermediary between the two traditions and that, in doing so, he worked hard so that Italian studies could be freed of provincialism and the most advanced fields of international philology could look at Italy without condescension. He was successful on both accounts (cf. Classen 1988; 1993; 2012). Florence became the mandatory stop for every young German visiting the South, while Germany was the philological reference point of every Italian wishing to broaden their horizons. When a car accident prematurely took him away from his studies and his teaching (on 9th July 1952),

the "tear", which was "harsh, unacceptable",[48] went far beyond the borders of Italy and well past the boundaries of classical studies.

Pasquali left students everywhere; as one of the most illustrious of them said, "he could live without writing books, memoirs, articles; without teaching, he could not" (Perrotta 1943). Few teachers have been so well loved and influential; few have managed to merge their own school and academic teaching practice with a theoretical reflection on university and school (and on the library, a fundamental tool for both).[49] According to Pasquali, the teacher is "a fertilized fertilizer", who knows how to join doctrine to kindness and – it could be added – because of this proves to be an effective writer. In fact, the great care that he put into being comprehensible to a large readership, and not just to the professionals, is a kindness rather than just tactical intelligence, and the success enjoyed by his *Pagine stravaganti* famously proves it.

As has been authoritatively put, at some point it will certainly be necessary to concretely assess whether and how much "what was not under his influence still is unmistakeably backward" in the scope of Italian philology (Canfora 2003b, 93). There are some errors of judgement, including serious ones (such as the ungenerous and poorly informed condemnation of Byzantium), and some important gaps in perspective (such as the disregard of eastern and Jewish influences in his interpretation of Hellenism) which cannot be denied and have caused delays in the Italian tradition.[50] And yet – even with its omissions, errors, and gaps – Pasquali's philology was the most fruitful injection of method, pragmatism, and originality experienced by classical studies in Italy during the first half of the twentieth century. It represented the noblest form of teaching and the most self-aware definition of a philology that, without losing its formal values, was becoming a historical science. "I know very well that, when studying classical antiquity, there is but a subtle difference between the philologist and the historian", Pasquali wrote, thinking of his most important model, namely, Wilamowitz, "and that one cannot be a great philologist without being a historian and vice versa" (Pasquali 1994, I, 74).

It is not by chance that as many as four of his books have the word 'history' in their titles: *Filologia e storia*; *Storia della tradizione*; *Preistoria della poesia*

48 Contini (1972, 24); cf. De Martino (1994; on the relationship with Italian studies, also 1999 and 2014).

49 Alongside the pages collected in *Pagine stravaganti*, his contributions on scholastic policy are collected in Pasquali (1978).

50 See Bossina (2017a).

romana; and *Storia dello spirito tedesco*. The ones that do not have it in their title carry it in every other page instead.

References

Arrighetti, G. *et al*., (2014), *Giorgio Pasquali sessant'anni dopo* (2014), Atti della giornata di studio (Firenze, 1° ottobre 2012), Firenze.

Baldi, G.D./Moscadi, A. (2006), *Filologi e antifilologi. Le polemiche negli studi classici in Italia tra Ottocento e Novecento*, Firenze.

Baldo, G. (2012), *Gli studi di latino nell'Italia postunitaria. Dalla legge Casati alla scuola media unificata*, in: L. Canfora/U. Cardinale (eds.), *Disegnare il futuro con intelligenza antica. L'insegnamento del latino e del greco antico in Italia e nel mondo*, Bologna, 171–191.

Bollack, M./Wismann, H. (eds.) (1983), *Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol. II, Göttingen.

Bornmann, F. (ed.) (1988), *Giorgio Pasquali e la filologia classica del Novecento*, Firenze.

Bossina, L. (2010), '"Textkritik". Lettere inedite di Paul Maas a Giorgio Pasquali', in: *Quaderni di storia* 72, 257–306.

Bossina, L. (2012), *Stoa, Ellenismo e catastrofe tedesca*, Bari.

Bossina, L. (2014), *Pasquali e Pascoli*, in: *Giorgio Pasquali sessant'anni dopo*, Atti della giornata di studio (Firenze, 1° ottobre 2012), Firenze, 59–96.

Bossina, L. (2017a), 'Giorgio Pasquali: un silenzio, un errore, una lacuna', in: *Humanitas* 72, 928–943.

Bossina, L. (2017b), 'I rapporti tra Italia e Germania nella filologia classica (1920–1940)', in: *Die akademische 'Achse Berlin-Rom'? Der wissenschaftlich-kulturelle Austausch zwischen Italien und Deutschland 1920 bis 1945*, ed. by A. Albrecht/L. Danneberg/S. De Angelis, Berlin, 229–304.

Brillante, S. (2019), '"La civiltà è giunta in Etiopia". Giorgio Pasquali e il colonialismo italiano', in: *Quaderni di Storia* 90, 65–81.

Brillante, S./Fizzarotti, L. (2021), '*In usum editorum*. Giorgio Pasquali e l'edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini', in: *History of Classical Scholarship* 3, 141–174.

Cagnetta, M. (1979), *Antichisti e impero fascista*, Bari.

Cagnetta, M. (1998a), 'Croce vs. Pasquali: quale storicismo?', in: *Quaderni di storia* 48, 5–32.

Cagnetta, M. (1998b), *Bimillenario della nascita*, in: S. Mariotti (ed.), *Enciclopedia Oraziana*, Roma, vol. III, 615–640.

Canfora, L. (1980), *Ideologie del classicismo*, Torino.

Canfora, L. (1982), 'Origine della "Stemmatica" di Paul Maas', in: *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 110, 362–379.

Canfora, L. (1983), *Vitelli e le correnti nazionalistiche prima del 1918*, in: M. Bollack/H. Wismann (eds.), *Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol. II, Göttingen, 308–332.

Canfora, L. (2003a), 'Timpanaro ovvero della libertà di pensiero', in: *Sileno* 28–29, 225–234.

Canfora, L. (2003b), *Storici e storia*, Torino.

Canfora, L. (2005), *Il papiro di Dongo*, Milano.

Canfora, L. (2008), *Filologia e libertà. La più eversiva delle discipline, l'indipendenza di pensiero e il diritto alla verità*, Milano.
Canfora, L. (2012), 'Il problema delle "varianti d'autore" come architrave della "Storia della tradizione" di Giorgio Pasquali', in: *Quaderni di storia* 75, 5–29.
Canfora, L. (2014), *Socialisti tedeschi*, in: *Giorgio Pasquali sessant'anni dopo*, Atti della giornata di studio (Firenze, 1° ottobre 2012), Firenze, 29–36.
Canfora, L./Cardinale, U. (eds.) (2012), *Disegnare il futuro con intelligenza antica. L'insegnamento del latino e del greco antico in Italia e nel mondo*, Bologna.
Caretti, L. (1972), *Per Giorgio Pasquali. Studi e testimonianze*, Pisa.
Carlini, A. (1997), *"Recentiores non deteriores", "comburendi non conferendi"*, in: R. Favale/L. Ruggeri (eds.), *Mousa, Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli*, Bologna, 1–9.
Càssola, F. (1988), *Pasquali e la storia antica*, in: F. Bornmann (ed.), *Giorgio Pasquali e la filologia classica del Novecento*, Firenze, 159–177.
Cavarzere, A. (1990), 'Pasquali in tombola', in: *Quaderni di storia* 40, 141–150.
Cavarzere, A./Varanini, G.M. (eds.) (2000), *Giuseppe Fraccaroli (1849–1918). Letteratura, filologia e scuola fra Otto e Novecento*, Trento.
Citroni, M. (2011), *Arte allusiva, Pasquali and onward,* in: B. Acosta-Hughes/L. Lehnus/S. Stephens (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, Leiden/Boston, 566–586.
Classen, C.J. (1988), *L'influsso di Giorgio Pasquali sulla filologia classica in Germania*, in: F. Bornmann (ed.), *Giorgio Pasquali e la filologia classica del Novecento*, Firenze, 135–158.
Classen, C.J. (1993), 'Giorgio Pasquali, un italiano come mediatore della scienza tedesca', in: *Quaderni di storia* 38, 5–23.
Classen, C.J. (2012), 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie. Drei Briefe über Giorgio Pasquali und drei Briefe von Friedrich Solmsen', in: *Eikasmós* 23, 417–434.
Contini, G. (1972), *Una testimonianza*, in: L. Caretti, *Per Giorgio Pasquali. Studi e testimonianze*, Pisa, 20–24.
Dain, A. (1949), *Les manuscrits*, Paris.
Degani, E. (1988), *Gli studi di greco*, in: F. Bornmann (ed.), *Giorgio Pasquali e la filologia classica del Novecento*, Firenze, 203–266.
Degani, E. (2004), *Filologia e storia. Scritti di E. D.*, 2 vols., Hildesheim.
De Martino, D. (1994), '"Come il cane che ha perso il padrone". Corrispondenza Giorgio Pasquali – Gianfranco Contini (1935–1952)', in: *Strumenti critici* 9, 387–439.
De Martino, D. (1995), 'Preistoria editoriale delle Stravaganze di Giorgio Pasquali', in: *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 123, 236–249.
De Martino, D. (1999), *"Il mio migliore amico, il mio Gönner". Lettere di Giacomo Devoto a Giorgio Pasquali (1920–1942)*, in: C.A. Mastrelli/A. Parenti (eds.), *Giacomo Devoto nel centenario della nascita*, Firenze, 153–187.
De Martino, D. (2014), *Pasquali maestro di italianisti: il caso di Lanfranco Caretti*, in: *Giorgio Pasquali sessant'anni dopo*, Atti della giornata di studio (Firenze, 1° ottobre 2012), Firenze, 97–113.
Fraenkel, E. (1964), *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, 2 vols., Roma.
Gabba, E. (1972), 'Il secondo cinquantennio della "Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica"', in: *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 100, 442–488.
Gentili, B. (1988), *Gli studi di Giorgio Pasquali sulla metrica greca e sul saturnio latino*, in: F. Bornmann (ed.), *Giorgio Pasquali e la filologia classica del Novecento*, Firenze, 79–99.
Gercke, A./Norden, E. (1927), *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, Leipzig/Berlin.

Gigante, M. (1984), *Nicola Festa e Girolamo Vitelli*, in *Nicola Festa*, Atti del Convegno di studi, Venosa, 61–84.
Gigante, M. (1985), 'Gottinga e Pasquali in dieci sue lettere', in: *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 78, 161–169.
Gomez Gane, Y. (2002), 'Giorgio Pasquali-Angiolo Nosei. Un carteggio privato, ma non solo', in: *Atene & Roma*, n.s. 47, 37–44.
Guida, A. (2017), 'Giorgio Pasquali, un filologo classico fra Berlino e Roma', in: E. Migliaro/L. Polverini (eds.), *Gli Antichisti italiani e la Grande Guerra*, Milano, 69–105.
Jachmann, G. (1941), *Das Problem der Urvarianten in der Antike und die Grundlagen der Ausoniuskritik*, in: *Concordia Decennalis. Deutsche Italienforschungen*, Köln, 47–104.
La Penna, A. (1964), *Pasquali interprete di Orazio*, in: G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico. Studi*, ed. by A. La Penna, Firenze, VII–XXXI.
La Penna, A. (1972), *Lo scrittore 'stravagante'* (1952), in: L. Caretti, *Per Giorgio Pasquali. Studi e testimonianze*, Pisa, 71–89.
La Penna, A. (1983), *L'influenza della filologia classica tedesca sulla filologia classica italiana dall'unificazione d'Italia alla prima guerra mondiale*, in: M. Bollack/H. Wismann (eds.), *Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol. II, Göttingen, 232–274.
La Penna, A. (1988), *Gli 'Scritti Filologici' di Giorgio Pasquali*, in: F. Bornmann (ed.), *Giorgio Pasquali e la filologia classica del Novecento*, Firenze, 15–77.
Maas, P. (1927), *Textkritik*, in *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. by A. Gercke/E. Norden, Leipzig/Berlin.
Maas, P. (1937), Leitfehler und stemmatische Fehler, in: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 37, 289–294.
Maas, P. (1949), *Textual Criticism*, in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford, 888–889.
Maas, P. (1950), *Textkritik*, 2nd improved and enlarged edition, Leipzig/Berlin.
Maas, P. (1952), *Critica del testo*, it. trans. by N. Martinelli, with a *Presentazione* by G. Pasquali, Firenze.
Maas, P. (1956), *Textkritik*, 3rd improved and enlarged edition, Leipzig/Berlin (En. trans. *Textual Criticism*, trans. by B. Flower, Oxford 1958).
Maas, P. (1990), *Critica del testo*, it. trans. by N. Martinelli, with a *Presentazione* by G. Pasquali, with *Sguardo retrospettivo 1956* and a note by L. Canfora, Firenze.
Maas, P. (2017), *La critica del testo*, it. trans. by G. Ziffer, Roma.
Mariotti, S. (2000), *Scritti di filologia classica*, Roma.
Mastromarco, G. (1976), 'Il neutralismo di Pasquali e De Sanctis', in: *Quaderni di storia* 3, 115–137.
Mensching, E. (1987), *Über einen verfolgten deutschen Altphilologe: Paul Maas (1884–1964)*, Berlin.
Momigliano, A. (1969), *Reconsidering B. Croce (1866–1952)*, now in: A. Momigliano, *Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Roma, 95–115.
Momigliano, A. (1984), *Premesse per una discussione su Eduard Schwartz*, now in: A. Momigliano, *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Roma, 233–244.
Montanari, E. (2003), *La critica del testo secondo Paul Maas*, Firenze.
Neri, C. (2012), *"Il greco ai nostri giorni", ovvero: sacrificarsi per Atene o sacrificare Atene?*, in: L. Canfora/U. Cardinale (eds.), *Disegnare il futuro con intelligenza antica. L'insegnamento del latino e del greco antico in Italia e nel mondo*, Bologna, 103–152.
Pagnotta, F. (2019), 'Il concorso di Greco a Palermo del 1899: nuovi documenti', in: *Analecta Papyrologica* 31, 317–333.

Pagnotta, F./Pintaudi, R. (2015), 'Giuseppe Fraccaroli e Girolamo Vitelli: l'Olimpo in tumulto', in: *Analecta Papyrologica* 27, 231–271.
Pasini, G.F. (1988), *Dossier sulla critica delle fonti, 1896–1909*, Bologna.
Pasquali, G. (1914), 'La "barbarie teutonica"', in: *Giornale d'Italia*, 17 settembre.
Pasquali, G. (1919), *Socialisti tedeschi*, Bari.
Pasquali, G. (1929a), review of P. Maas, *Textkritik*, in: *Gnomon* 5, 417–435; 498–521.
Pasquali, G. (1929b), 'Per la storia del testo dell'"Apologetico" di Tertulliano', in: *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, n.s. 7, 13–57.
Pasquali, G. (1934), *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze (II ed. 1952).
Pasquali, G. (1947), 'Preghiera', in: *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 22, 257.
Pasquali, G. (ed.) (1959), *Gregorii Nysseni Epistulae* (1925), II ed., Leiden.
Pasquali, G. (1964), *Orazio lirico. Studi* (1920), Firenze.
Pasquali, G. (1967), *Le lettere di Platone* (1938), Firenze.
Pasquali, G. (1978), *Scritti sull'università e la scuola*, ed. by Raicich jr., Firenze.
Pasquali, G. (1981), *Preistoria della poesia romana* (1936), Firenze.
Pasquali, G. (1984), 'Ich, Giorgio Federico Guglielmo Ercole Francesco', in: *Belfagor* 39, 686–689 (with a *Nota* by C.F. Russo).
Pasquali, G. (1985), *Lingua nuova e antica*, ed. by G. Folena, Firenze.
Pasquali, G. (1986a), *Scritti filologici*, 2 vols., ed. by F. Bornmann/G. Pascucci/S. Timpanaro, with Introduction by A. La Penna, Firenze.
Pasquali, G. (1986b), *Rapsodia del classico. Contributi all'Enciclopedia Italiana di Giorgio Pasquali*, ed. by F. Bornmann/G. Pascucci/S. Timpanaro, Roma.
Pasquali, G. (1988), *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (1940), with a foreword by D. Pieraccioni, Firenze (II ed. 1952).
Pasquali, G. (1990), 'Il mestiere di un Weltreformer', in: *Belfagor* 45, 402 and 434.
Pasquali, G. (1994), *Pagine stravaganti di un filologo*, 2 vols., ed. by C.F. Russo, Firenze.
Pasquali, G. (1998), *Filologia e storia* (1920), with introduction by F. Giordano, Firenze.
Pasquali, G. (2006), *Giorgio Pasquali nel 'Corriere della Sera'*, ed. by M. Marvulli, with a *Nota* by L. Canfora, Bari.
Pasquali, G. (2013), *Storia dello spirito tedesco nelle memorie d'un contemporaneo*, ed. by M. Romani Mistretta, with an essay by E. Fraenkel, Milano (Firenze 1953).
Perrotta, G. (1943), 'Intelligenza di Giorgio Pasquali', in: *Primato* 4, 1, 1° gennaio, 5–6 (later in *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 50, 1985, 7–12 and in *L'indice dei libri del mese* 4, 1987, 8, 20–21).
Pieraccioni, D. (1985), 'Pasquali sotto concorso', in: *Belfagor* 40, 315–327.
Raicich, M. (1983), 'Pasquali in Accademia, Pintor in casa sua', in: *Belfagor* 38, 207–211.
Raicich, M. (1988), *Pasquali e la politica scolastica e universitaria: momenti e documenti*, in F. Bornmann (ed.), *Giorgio Pasquali e la filologia classica del Novecento*, Firenze, 179–202.
Romagnoli, E. (1917), *Minerva e lo scimmione*, Bologna.
Romani Mistretta, M. (2018), *"Il popolo più alto". Germanofilia e scienza dell'antichità nella Normale di Giorgio Pasquali*, in: M. Pirro (ed.), *'La densità meravigliosa del sapere'. Cultura tedesca in Italia fra Settecento e Novecento*, Milano, 301–319.
Rossi, L.E. (1983), *Grammatica greco-latina e metrica in Italia fra il 1860 e il 1920*, in: M. Bollack/H. Wismann (eds.), *Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol. II, Göttingen, 275–306.
Rossi, V. (ed.) (1933), F. Petrarca, *Le Familiari*, critical edition, I, Firenze.

Schwartz, E. (ed.) (1903–1909), *Eusebius Werke*, II/1–3: *Die Kirchengeschichte*, Leipzig.
Seel, O. (1936), review of G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze 1934, in: *Gnomon* 12, 16–30.
Timpanaro, S. (1963), 'Uno scritto polemico di Girolamo Vitelli', in: *Belfagor* 18, 456–464.
Timpanaro, S. (1972a), *Storicismo di Pasquali*, in: L. Caretti, *Per Giorgio Pasquali. Studi e testimonianze*, Pisa, 120–146 (repr. with changes in: *Belfagor* 28, 1973, 183–205).
Timpanaro, S. (1972b), *Il primo cinquantennio della "Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione Classica"*, now in *Sulla linguistica dell'Ottocento*, Bologna 2005, 259–314.
Timpanaro, S. (1981), *Pasquali, la metrica, e la cultura di Roma arcaica*, in G. Pasquali, *Preistoria della poesia romana*, Firenze, 7–80.
Timpanaro, S. (1985), *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann*, Padova (orig. ed. Firenze 1963; En. trans. *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, trans. by G.W. Most, Chicago 2005).
Timpanaro, S. (1994), review of G. Pasquali, *Pagine stravaganti di un filologo*, 2 vols., ed. by C.F. Russo, Firenze 1994, in *L'Indice dei libri del mese*, n. 6.
Valgimigli, M. (1965), *Uomini e scrittori del mio tempo*, Firenze.
Vitelli, G. (1962), *Filologia classica... e romantica*, ed. by T. Lodi, with a forward by U.E. Paoli, Firenze.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1983), *Selected Correspondence 1869–1931*, ed. by W.M. Calder III, Napoli.
Ziffer, G. (2020), 'Prima e dopo gli "Errori guida e tipi stemmatici" (1937). Due inediti maasiani in traduzione italiana, in: *Ecdotica* 17, 221–225.
Ziffer, G. (2021), 'Una voce d'enciclopedia maasiana. "Textual criticism" (1949)', in: *Storia e linguaggi* 1, 75–87.