

# Rationes Rerum

Rivista di filologia e storia

22.



# Rationes Rerum

Rivista di filologia e storia

## Direzione

Leopoldo Gamberale («Sapienza» Università di Roma) – Filologia  
Eugenio Lanzillotta (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”) – Storia

## Coordinatore redazionale

Virgilio Costa (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”)

## Comitato di direzione

Maria Accame («Sapienza» Università di Roma); Cinzia Bearzot (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano); Maria Grazia Bonanno (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”); José María Candau Morón (Universidad de Sevilla); Carmen Codoñer Merino (Universidad de Salamanca); Federica Cordano (Università Statale di Milano); Virgilio Costa (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”); Carlo Vittorio Di Giovine (Università della Basilicata); Massimo Di Marco («Sapienza» Università di Roma); Werner Eck (Universität Köln); Maria Rosaria Falivene (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”); Robert A. Kaster (Princeton University); Dominique Lenfant (Université de Strasbourg); Thomas R. Martin (College of the Holy Cross, Worcester MA); Attilio Mastino (Università di Sassari); Salvatore Monda (Università del Molise); Alfredo Mario Morelli (Università di Ferrara); Emore Paoli (Università per Stranieri di Perugia); Marina Passalacqua («Sapienza» Università di Roma); Guido Schepens (Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven); Alfredo Valvo (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Brescia)

## Comitato di redazione

Antonella Amico (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”); Alessandro Campus (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”); Ester Cerbo (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”); Maria Elena De Luna (Università di Bologna); Valeria Foderà (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”); Alessandra Inglese (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”); Giuseppe La Bua («Sapienza» Università di Roma); Silvia Lanzillotta (Edizioni Tored); Francesca Romana Nocchi (Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”); Luca Paretto («Sapienza» Università di Roma); Maria Barbara Savo (Università dell’Aquila)

*Blind Peer Review.* — Tutti i contributi inviati a «Rationes Rerum» sono sottoposti a revisione, secondo la formula del doppio anonimato, da parte di due esperti italiani o stranieri, di cui almeno uno esterno alla Direzione, al Comitato di direzione e al Comitato di redazione della rivista. L’elenco dei revisori viene pubblicato ogni tre anni.



# Rationes Rerum

Rivista di filologia e storia

22.

Luglio - Dicembre 2023

Edizioni TORED s.r.l.

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Tivoli n. 3/15 del 28/9/2015  
Direttore responsabile: Leopoldo Gamberale  
Responsabile grafica e stampa: Massimo Pascucci

\* \* \*

Informazioni ed abbonamenti:

Edizioni TORED s.r.l.  
via Vincenzo Pacifici, 17 - 00019 Tivoli (Roma)  
www.edizionitored.it  
info@edizionitored.it

I pagamenti possono essere effettuati tramite versamento a favore di  
TORED srl - Banca Crédit Agricole - Cariparma  
IBAN: IT 51 N 06230 39455 0000 3008 4001  
oppure online tramite carta di credito

Le Edizioni TORED s.r.l. garantiscono agli abbonati la massima riservatezza dei dati forniti e la facoltà di chiederne la rettifica o la cancellazione. Tali informazioni non saranno in alcuna forma comunicate a soggetti terzi e verranno utilizzate solo a fini gestionali e per segnalare agli abbonati eventuali nuove pubblicazioni della casa editrice.

\* \* \*

Stampato in Italia ~ Printed in Italy

ISBN 978-88-99846-86-2 ~ ISSN 2284-2497

Proprietà riservata ~ All rights reserved  
© Copyright 2013 by Edizioni TORED s.r.l.

Sono vietati la riproduzione, la traduzione e l'adattamento, anche parziali, per qualsiasi uso e con qualsiasi mezzo effettuati, senza la preventiva autorizzazione scritta delle Edizioni TORED s.r.l. Ogni abuso sarà perseguito secondo la legge.

## SOMMARIO

### TRADURRE I CLASSICI

ANDREA BALBO - FABIO PUSTERLA		
<i>Introduzione</i> .....	p.	II
FABIO PUSTERLA		
<i>«Operazioni» e «logiche operative»: appunti sulla traduzione nel Novecento</i> .....	»	13
LEOPOLDO GAMBERALE		
<i>Esperienze di un traduttore involontario</i> .....	»	29
ALESSANDRO FO		
<i>Problemi, prove, progressi e compromessi: tu chiamale, se vuoi, traduzioni...</i> .....	»	49
GUIDO MILANESE		
<i>Traduzioni oraziane: ricognizione e spazi di ricerca</i> .....	»	77
ANDREA BALBO		
<i>Tradurre poeti tardoantichi nel XXI secolo</i> .....	»	87
LAURA CRIPPA		
<i>«Il morto scrittore, di cui è morta la gente e la lingua». Considerazioni su Pascoli e la poesia antica</i> .....	»	105
PIETRO DE MARCHI		
<i>Giorgio Orelli e i classici: echi e citazioni (qualche appunto)</i> .....	»	131

SARA MASSAFRA

- Tra obbedienza e oltraggio: il latino  
nelle IX Ecloghe di Andrea Zanzotto* ..... » 143

## STUDI E RICERCHE

ALESSANDRO CAMPUS

- Per la storia della scrittura alfabetica.  
In margine a un libro recente* ..... » 167

STEFANIA DE VIDO

- Demetrio e gli altri re* ..... » 183

LUIS RIVERO GARCÍA

- Textual Notes on Horace's Epodes* ..... » 215

## RECENSIONI

VIRGILIO COSTA

- rec. di PIETRO ZACCARIA, *FGrHist Continued IV A*,  
Fasc. 5, Leiden - Boston, Brill, 2021;  
STEFAN SCHORN (ed.), *FGrHist Continued IV E*,  
Fasc. 2, Leiden - Boston, Brill, 2022 ..... » 235

LUCA PARETTI

- rec. di *Aspetti della Fortuna dell'Antico nella  
Cultura Europea*, a cura di SERGIO AUDANO,  
Foggia, Il Castello Edizioni, 2023 ..... » 248

- Libri ricevuti* ..... » 261

- Abstracts* ..... » 269

- Indice analitico* (a cura di Carlo Di Giovine) ..... » 273

- Istruzioni per gli autori* ..... » 277

LUIS RIVERO GARCÍA

## TEXTUAL NOTES ON HORACE'S *EPODES*

Editing the text of Horace is no minor task: it has never been and it will not be still for a long time to come. It is not only that a great sensibility and a good *philologicus nasus* are needed to meet the poet's presumable words, but also that a huge amount of useful information still waits to be rescued from manuscripts, editions and critical essays.

We are now preparing a new edition of the *Epodes*, *Odes* and *Secular Hymn* of which the first volume, containing the *Epodes*, is already finished<sup>1</sup>. The distinctive contribution of our work is that it is based on the full collation of all the (89) extant mss. prior to 1150<sup>2</sup>, plus the 8 mss. *recentiores* kept in Spain. To all this we add the testimony of more than 100 editions since the *princeps* of Venice 1471-1472 down to the one prepared by Niklas Holzberg (Berlin - Boston 2018), as well as all the *parerga* and critical papers we know of. This has brought back to light quite a few interesting textual proposals. We could also correct many false attributions that have been transmitted through the last centuries.

<sup>1</sup> L. RIVERO - J.A. ESTÉVEZ - A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER, *Horacio. Epodos*, Madrid (Colección *Alma Mater*) 2024 (forthcoming). It is a must to thank my colleagues for having shared with me much of the information I offer in this paper, and also both of them and prof. Pere Fàbregas for the drastical improvement of the initial draft of it after their careful revision. In the next pages I will use the *sigla*, the (adapted) apparatus, and (unless otherwise indicated) the text of this edition. The siglum ζ refers to a number of mss. explicitly cited in the *appendix librorum manuscriptorum* at the end of the volume.

<sup>2</sup> The only manuscript we could not achieve (n° 90) is TRIER Stadtbibliothek 2209 (2328), s. xi *in.*, the fragment of a bifolio that contains only two lines: *Epod.* 1, 7 and 1, 10. Cf. VILLA 1993, p. 87.



— *labore / labore*: the unanimous reading *laborem* presents a metrical objection, since it offers a spondee in the fourth foot. A defence of this exceptional metrical feature has been recently offered by H. White (2009, p. 345 n. 1), although it was already made by Antonius Mancinellus (1492, p. clv), who interpreted it as Horace's imitation of comedy (yet he did not explain to what end Horace would have brought such a feature into this opening poem). This was rejected by Fabricius in the *Castigationes* printed as a supplement to his edition of 1571 (1571, *cast.* p. 68), and he followed (p. 143 of the edition) a new wording of the line that is to be found for the first time – as far as we know – in the third *editio Aldina* of 1527 (p. 71r): *roges laborem quid tuum iuuem meo*<sup>4</sup>. This reading was later picked up by Cunningham in his *Animaduersiones* (1721b, p. 374), not in his edition of the same year, was proposed by Baehrens (1880, p. 23), and picked up again by Campbell in his two editions (1945 and 1953, s. pp.). A variation of it is to be found in the edition, replete with conjectures, of Ljungberg (1872, p. 130): *roges laborem quid tuum iuuet meus*.

Obviously, it is much simpler – and hence more credible – to explain *laborem* as the result of assimilation to the preceding *tuum*, or even as a recollection of the same form in l. 9. Thus, nearly all editors after Fabricius (1571), with the already mentioned exception of Campbell, adopted the emendation *labore*, which has been traditionally ascribed to H. Glareanus, as it appears *e.g.* in his edition of 1533 (p. 171). But in reality it is to be found at least as early as in the *editio Parisina* of 1507, and in the second *editio Aldina* (1509).

\* \* \*

— I, 21-22:

ut assidens implumibus pullis auis  
 serpentium allapsus timet  
 magis relictis, non, ut adsit, auxili  
 latura plus praesentibus.

20

<sup>4</sup> I suppose this was also the intended reading of Robertus Stephanus for his edition of 1544 (p. 113), yet this unmetrical line was printed: *roges laborem tuum quid iuuem meo*.

21 ut a(d/s)sit ζ : uti sit V5V9, in quarto Bland. teste Cruquius (1578, p. 252), Bentley (1713), def. Du Quesnay (2002, p. 206 n. 101) : ut sit ζ : sit Cs : adsit Moz

— *ut adsit / uti sit*: Bentley's objection (1711, p. 274) to the redundancy *adsit ... praesentibus* led him, and many editors thereafter, to prefer the minority variant *uti sit* (sc. *sit latura*), while others have tempted to emend *praesentibus* with equally unsuccessful proposals, such as *praesepibus* (Campbell 1945, s.p.), *precantibus* (Shackleton Bailey 1985b, p. 158), and *petentibus* or *poscentibus* (Nisbet 1986, p. 232 = 1995, p. 199). The variant *uti sit* is exclusively present in the aforementioned ms. V5 (VAT. Reg. lat. 1701, s. xi), and in V9 (VAT. lat. 1589, s. xii in.), although Cruquius (1578, p. 252) attests it also in his fourth "Blandinius", most mss. being divided between *ut a(d/s)sit* and the unmetrical *ut sit* (see Keller 1879, pp. 355-356). As for the sense, I take *ut* here as a concessive conjunction (*quamuis adsit*, as Bentley himself paraphrases it; see Hofmann-Szantyr 1972, p. 647<sup>3-4</sup>, Watson 2003, p. 69), a usage which is reinforced here by the concessive nuance also present in the expression *non latura*. As for *adsum* and *praesens*, their meanings are obviously close (cf. e.g. Pl. *Most.* 1075 *adsum praesens*), but this proximity is intended to emphasize the uselessness of the bird's bravery: «though she is not going to be of more help to them, even if she is present, with them in front of her».

\* \* \*

— I, 26:

non ut iuencis illigata pluribus	25
aratra nitantur meis	
pecusue Calabris ante sidus feruidum	
Lucana mutet pascuis,	

26 meis Ω, def. Mankin (1995, pp. 59-60) : mea ζ, D. Heinsius 1612 : *quid Moz<sup>acnl</sup> non liquet* || 28 pascuis Ω : pascua ζ, ed. 1475 : *pascula Bez\** : *pasuis Es2<sup>ac</sup> : quid ante pascuis V6<sup>eml</sup> non liquet*

— *meis / mea*: Bentley's objection (1713, p. 292) that *meis* is intolerable according to the "two-epithet rule" has been duly refuted by Mankin (1995, pp. 59-60), who argues that Horace «seems to 'exempt' possessive

adjectives» from it (cf. e.g. *Carm.* 1, 1, 2 *dulce decus meum*), and that «*mea*, like *laborem* (15n.) and the variants *quem* (10), *pascua* (28), and *superni* (29n.), probably arose from assimilation to the case of the nearest noun». Furthermore, the exquisite hyperbaton *iuuencis* ... | ... *meis* is perfectly balanced in the next couplet with *Calabris* ... | ... *pascuis*, where some copyists also tried *pascua*. Another possible origin of the variant *mea* is to be looked for in a gloss, as e.g. the one kept in ms. **Ld** (LEIDEN, Bibl. der Rijksuniversiteit B.P.L. 28, s. ix<sup>2</sup>), where 's. *mea*' was written over *aratra*<sup>5</sup>. There is no base, then, to quote *meis* as an instance of «significant error» (Courtney 2013, p. 555).

\* \* \*

— 1, 34:

Satis superque me benignitas tua  
ditauit: haud parauero  
quod aut avarus ut Chremes terra premam  
discinctus aut perdam ut nepos.

34

34 perdam Ω, schol. Pers., III 31, recte def. Du Quesnay (2002, p. 208 n. 128), Gaskin (2013, pp. 256-259): predam A2G<sup>c</sup>: perdat Städler (1903, p. 26 n. 18), def. Kraggerud (2021, pp. 19-20) || ut nepos Ω, ed. princeps 1471-1472: nepos ζ, ed. Veneta 1490

— *perdam* / *perdat* ... *ut nepos* / *nepos*: as Kraggerud rightly says (2021, p. 19), the first scholar to propose the emendation *perdat* was not Shackleton Bailey but Karl Städler (1903, p. 26 n. 18). Shackleton Bailey based his proposal in the comparison with *Ep.* 2, 2, 191 (... *nec metuam quid de me iudicet heres*, 1985[2001<sup>4</sup>], p. 140 *in app.*), «where the context is too different to prove the point» says Kraggerud (2021, p. 28 n. 22) with all good reason, even if he accepts the emendation. The only further argument Shackleton Bailey gave for his proposal reads thus (1985b, p. 158 = 1997, p. 293): «A man is not likely to pile up riches and then waste them as a dissolute

<sup>5</sup> Prof. Estévez has found an early preference for *mea* in CANTER 1571, p. 344: «quod posterius in antiquo codice melius, ut credo, aliter certe legebatur, *Aratra nitantur mea*».

spendthrift. He leaves that to his heir». This sort of reasoning seems insufficient and perhaps too rational. Delz (1988, p. 497) rightly objected that the parallel antithesis posed by *aut ... aut* would be thus spoiled. From the palaeographic point of view, I cannot see how a genuine *perdat* would have become the more complex *perdam ut* (on which see below).

A good defence of the paradosis is also offered by Du Quesnay (2002, p. 208 n. 128): «It might also be objected that a man with no son, and so no prospect of a grandson, is not likely to decide his course of action out of concern for his *nepos*. Horace's point is that, thanks to Maecenas' earlier generosity, he has no need of material recompense for his *beneficium* and all that he could do with any further riches would be to hoard them or waste them (i.e. spend them on things he neither needs nor really wants). In the context of rejecting riches, wasting them seems neither more nor less illogical than burying them».

Further arguments in this same line have been offered also by Gaskin (2013, pp. 256-259), who rightly reminds the readers that a necessary condition for any good conjecture is that it must offer a *better* reading than that of the paradosis, which is not the case with *perdat* in my view.

Kraggerud (2021, p. 20), for his part, objects that, if we read *discinctus aut perdam nepos*, this noun with that predicative function should be understood with the meaning “spendthrift” (*OLD* s.u., 4, 1170), which would imply a tautology with *discinctus*, that is, he prefers to read “a dissolute grandson/descendant” (i.e. as opposed to those who are not dissolute). I do not find this argument particularly cogent, since we are not dealing with two different words: *nepos* can never be applied to a spendthrift as dissociated from his condition of being grandson. It is his condition of “heir” of an “easy” wealth, of being *natus post* (Maltby 1991, s.u., pp. 408-409; Du Quesnay 2002, p. 209 nn. 136 and 139) that may make a *nepos* behave as a spendthrift.

Be that as it may, there is still something to be said about the text as transmitted. The reading *nepos* appeared in the already mentioned *editio Veneta* from 1490 (Venetiis, Georgius Arrivabene) but was not recovered until the middle of 19<sup>th</sup> c. (1854, Meineke), and from then on it was the preferred reading of editors down to our days. On the other

hand, *ut nepos* was the prevailing reading in the early editions starting from the *princeps* (1471-1472, Venetiis, impr. Basilius), but since 1856 it has appeared in scarcely seven editions down to 1922<sup>6</sup>. However, *ut nepos* is the reading of the vast majority of mss.<sup>7</sup>. I wonder why we should not rescue this majority reading, not necessarily a *lectio faciliior* (as stated by Mankin 1995, p. 62), which reinforces the parallelism *aut ... ut Chremes ... | ... aut ... ut nepos* and provides a closure much of the like of Horace (*Epod.* 6, 16): *inultus ut flebo puer* (see Keller 1879, p. 357).

\* \* \*

— 2, 37-38:

Quis non malarum quas amor curas habet  
haec inter obliuiscitur?

38

37 malarum  $\Omega$ , ed. 1474 : malorum, *Be<sup>ac</sup>Liz Es<sup>ac</sup>(et item o<sup>s</sup>)*, ed. 1471-1472 : *quid P<sup>acnl</sup> non liquet : uarie uiri docti ||* quas amor  $\Omega$ , ed. 1471-1472 : Roma *quas conii. et reic. uir doct. Ow. signans* (1803, p. 522), *conii. Scrinierius* (1887, p. 325) coll. *Serm.* 2, 6, 60-62, *Ep.* 2, 2, 65-66

— Two main objections have been made to this *locus uexatus*, and accordingly two terms of the paradosis have attracted the suspicions of scholars. The first objection has to do with the meaning of the text as transmitted, and it rejects as untimely the reference to the speaker's *curae amoris*. Thus, Lucian Müller, who in his previous editions had printed the text of the mss., in his edition of 1882 (p. 193) wrote *quas ager*, a proposal he himself rejected explicitly in his notes to the 1900 edition (p. 421), where he again adopted (p. 107) the majority text, although he obelized *malarum*. Much more recently, Christes (1998, pp. 284-288) has made a palaeographically easy conjecture with a similar structure: *quas labor*, where *labor* would recall the *negotia* hinted to at ll. 1-8.

<sup>6</sup> RITTER 1856, LINKERUS 1856, ECKSTEIN 1876, SCHÜTZ 1889, GOW 1894, KELLER-HOLDER 1899, HAUPT 1908, GOW 1914, USSANI 1922.

<sup>7</sup> Only 17 out of the 97 hitherto collated ones show an initial reading *nepos*, and even 4 of them correct the reading into *ut nepos* in a second moment: *A<sup>ac</sup>(ut<sup>pes</sup>) BaBe<sub>3</sub>\*Br<sub>2</sub><sup>ac</sup>(ut<sup>pes</sup>)LdLd<sub>3</sub>Li<sub>2</sub>Mo<sub>3</sub>OO<sub>2</sub>(ut O<sub>2</sub><sup>2sp</sup>)PP<sub>3</sub>P<sub>4</sub>SI<sup>ac</sup>V<sub>7</sub>V<sub>I</sub><sub>3</sub><sup>2</sup>(ut<sup>ld</sup>)Va.*

The second objection traditionally made to this text focuses on *malarum*, whose connection to *curas* has been considered grammatically unacceptable (e.g. Müller 1900, p. 421)<sup>8</sup>, and hence many scholars have interpreted that this variant is a corruption created to provide a genitive to the following *obliuiscitur* (e.g. Delz 1993, p. 219). The only variant to it, which I have only found in two 11<sup>th</sup>-c. and one 15<sup>th</sup>-c. mss.<sup>9</sup>, is *malorum*, which was printed as early as in the Venetian *editio princeps* of 1471-1472. It was defended by Bothe (1820, adn. 93, and in recent times by Gärtner 2013, pp. 680-681) as depending on *amor* (i.e. *amor negotiorum*), to which end he makes *obliuiscitur* be constructed with the accus. *curas* (i.e. *obliuiscitur curas, quas amor malorum habet*). Not far from this interpretation is Müller's second thought, which he however did not print but only proposed in his notes (1900, p. 421): *auari* (i.e. *amor auari*). Nisbet was also persuaded that *malarum* was the corrupt term, so he proposed (1986, p. 232 = 1995, p. 199) a synonym to *malorum* and *auari* such as *bonorum* (i.e. "possessions")<sup>10</sup>: «if somebody interpreted this as 'good men' rather than 'possessions', he might well have changed it to *malarum*», a reasoning I do not follow. Considering Nisbet's conjecture, Shackleton Bailey timidly suggests (1990, p. 227) «one might rather expect *habendi*». Delz (1993, pp. 218-219), for his part, replaced the genitives with the conjecture *auarus* (*amor*), through comparison with expressions such as *auara fraus* (*Carm.* 4, 9, 37), *auara spes* (*Carm.* 4, 11, 25-26), *auida libido* (*Varr. Men.* 342), or *auidum faenus* (*Luc.* 1, 181; *Stat. Silu.* 2, 2, 152-153).

But the most important conjecture was made by P.J. Scrinierius (1887, p. 325), who rejected the reference to *amor*, accepted the grammatical attraction *quas curas*, and added a further hyperbaton by proposing *quis non malarum, Roma quas curas habet | haec inter obliuiscitur?* He based this reading on the comparison with Horace's own wishes of rural peace

<sup>8</sup> Although not openly impossible, I do not find convincing the resulting word order of the proposal made by WHITE 2009, pp. 346-347: «Amidst these things, who does not forget the cares of evil women (*malarum ... curas*), which passion possesses (*quas amor ... habet*)».

<sup>9</sup> **Be**<sup>ac</sup> (BERN, Burgerbibliothek 21, s. xi); **Li**2 (LEIPZIG, Universitätsbibliothek Rep. I fol. 6, s. xi); **Es**<sup>ac</sup> (EL ESCORIAL, Biblioteca del Monasterio S III 10, s. xv).

<sup>10</sup> This conjecture had already been made by KORCH 1891, p. 124, based on the same alternation at *Serm.* 1, 1, 79.

as expressed in *Serm.* 2, 6, 60-62, and *Epist.* 2, 2, 65-66<sup>11</sup>. This proposal was blessed by Housman (1890, p. 17 = 1972, p. 148) as «absolutely certain», and was adopted by Campbell in his 1945 edition with the substitution of *malarum* with *auara* (Shackleton Bailey 1990, p. 227: «Campbell's *auara Roma quas* is not to be despised»). For me, the most interesting proposal was made by Campbell himself but for his second edition (1953, defended at pp. 148-149): *quis non mala auri quas fames curas habet*, which is strongly backed by comparison with Verg. *Aen.* 3, 57 (*auri sacra fames*), Hor. *Carm.* 3, 16, 17-18 (*crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam | maiorumque fames*), and *Epist.* 1, 18, 23 (*quem tenet argenti sitis importuna famesque*).

Most recently, Kraggerud (2021, pp. 32-34) has shown his liking to Scribnerius' proposal but have also defended that a reference to (love) passions is absolutely not out of place in the poem as heard up to this moment: «To conclude: there has so far been no convincing arguments against line 35 [*sic* for 37] in its transmitted form. *Ceteris paribus, quas amor curas* suits both the poem as a whole and its nearest context better than the conjecture *Roma quas curas*». My two colleagues adhere to this thesis.

Finally, although I do not find the attraction of *curas* to *quas* at odds with Horace's style, I wonder whether this was a copyist's and not Horace's attraction: that is, that a copyist attracted to *quas* a genuine *curarum* from Horace's pen (cf., yet with a more regular structure, *Carm.* 2, 14, 22 *harum quas colis arborum*). The elision in this final position of an iambic trimeter is certainly rare (cf. Soubiran 1966, pp. 542-543, and, for Horace's preference for elisions of *-um*, p. 227), but Horace himself uses it at *Epod.* 9, 17: *bis mille equos*, where we find the same metrical sequence – – (x) u –.

\* \* \*

— 12, 7-13:

Qui sudor vietus et quam malus undique membris  
crescit odor, cum pene soluto

<sup>11</sup> As Prof. Estévez has found out, the conjecture *Roma quas* had already been tentatively proposed by an anonymous reviewer of Doering's Sachsen-Koburg edition from 1803 (see OW. 1803, p. 522), who also conjectured *bruma quas*: once again, *suum cuique*.

indomitam properat rabiem sedare! neque illi  
 iam manet umida creta colorque 10  
 stercore fucatus crocodili iamque subando  
 tenta cubilia tectaque rumpit.  
 vel mea cum saevis agitat fastidia verbis:

(ed. Shackleton Bailey 2001<sup>4</sup>)

— The interpretation of this passage is controversial and has given rise to different proposals, whether through the selection of minor variants or by means of conjecture. Scholars have found difficulties in the transition from 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> and again to 2<sup>nd</sup>-person references, and have thus conjectured *properas ... illis ... rumpunt ... agitas* (*agitas* is attested by ms. OXFORD, Bodl. Library D’Orville 158, s. xi), as defended by Bonfinis (1519, 281r), or else *properant ... illis ... rumpis ... agitas* by Glareanus 1536 (he had edited *properat ... illi ... rumpit ... agitat* in 1533), and Lambinus (1561, p. 454) even affirms that «quidam» read *properas ... illis ... rumpis ... agitas* (see Ramírez de Verger 2021, pp. 264-265).

As far as the structure is concerned, the poem is not a dialogue between the poet and the *uetula* but a soliloquy of the poet (as stated e.g. by Cavarzere 1992, p. 197), who devotes half of the epode to his own voice (ll. 1-13) and the other half to reproduce *uerbatim* the woman’s complain. The poem thus starts (ll. 1-3) with an iambic direct attack against the sexual foe (like epode VIII), and then (ll. 4-6) turns on the main cause for his refusal: the woman’s *δυσοσμία*, an image which in turn leads him to remember with increasing discomfort (ll. 7-13) a sexual – frustrated – experience with the lady, all of which ends with the poet recalling to himself the lady’s bitter reproach (ll. 14-26).

The mental reproduction of the woman’s failed sexual attempt is then expressed logically in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person. “What a smelly sweat was hers” – remembers the poet to himself – “when she tried in vain to appease her sexual excitement”, and the whole process is expressed through the *cum* clauses: she *properat*, *rumpit* and *agitat*, the subject of *manet* being not the woman but her make-up. In fact, it is probably the sequence *iam ... iamque* that have led scholars to read *manet* at the same level as *rumpit*, when in fact it is a paren-

thetical aside intended to do the same dramatic function as the initial hint at the sprout of sweat (*crescit sudor et odor*), that is, to present the lady as ridiculous, as sexually repugnant (an image similar to that proposed by Lucretius 4, 1174-1176 and Ovid *Rem.* 351-356 as an effective *remedium amoris*, on which see Socas 2011): she starts sweating fetidly when she tries to appease herself with my languid penis (and her filthy make-up does not stand any longer, thus showing her in all her old ugliness) and already in heat she destroys the bed, or else when she censures my disdain with these bitter words.

I propose thus this text:

Quis sudor uietis et quam malus undique membris  
 crescit odor, cum pene soluto  
 indomitam properat rabiem sedare (neque illi  
 iam manet umida creta colorque  
 stercore fucatus crocodili) iamque subando  
 tenta cubilia tectaue rumpit,  
 uel mea cum saeuis agitat fastidia uerbis:

9-13 properat ... agitat] properas ... illis ... rumpunt ... agitas *def. Bonfinis* (1519, p. 281r) :  
 properant ... illis ... rumpis ... agitas *Glareanus* 1536 : properas ... illis ... rumpis ... agitas  
 'quidam' test. *Lambinus* (1561, p. 454) || 13 cum] quam *Dacier* (1696, p. 247), 1834<sup>n</sup> ||  
 9-11 sic *distinximus*

\* \* \*

— 15, 17:

At tu, quicumque es felicior atque meo nunc  
 superbus incedis malo,  
 sis pecore et multa diues tellure licebit  
 tibiue Pactolus fluat  
 nec te Pythagorae fallant arcana renati  
 formaue uincas Nirea,  
 heu heu! translatos alio maerebis amores,  
 ast ego uicissim risero.

17 at C2<sup>2ul</sup>GcLd2Lr4<sup>\*pc</sup>(A')Mp(et Mp<sup>2ul</sup>)NwP12P13RcTa<sup>2ul</sup>V<sup>pc</sup>V8<sup>2ul</sup>V9 Es3Es4Es5Mt, ed.  
*princeps* 1471-1472 : et Ω, ed. *Landinus* (1482) : aut V<sup>ac</sup>

— *et tu / at tu*: l. 17 introduces a change in the addressee. The whole poem has hitherto been devoted to *Neaera*, but now Horace turns on to her current lover (ll. 17-18), whom he announces the same love ills in the future that he is suffering now (l. 23). From the outset, the most suitable word for such a change would be *at* (cf., even if he does not accept it, Cavarzere 1992, p. 216: «in formule di passaggio brusche come questa è assai più frequente *at tu*»). But, as is well known, this conjunction is usually displaced by an invasive *et* (see e.g. Rivero 2018, p. 133 *ad* *Ou. Met.* 13, 202 and p. 249 *ad* 13, 474).

As far as the expression is concerned, *at tu* is usually followed by similar pronouns: *Ou. Rem.* 371-372 *At tu, quicumque es, quem nostra licentia laedit, | si sapis, ad numeros exige quidque suos*; *Ou. Met.* 1, 678-679 *at tu, | quisquis es, hoc poteris mecum considerare saxo*; *Tib.* 2, 3, 33 *At tu, quisquis is est...* (cf. *Ter. Phorm.* 403 *at tu qui sapiens es...*; *Curt.* 7, 8, 19 *At tu, qui te gloriaris...*). Sometimes there is a negative hint contained in the ensuing idea: *Pers.* 6, 41-42 *At tu, meus heres | quisquis eris, paulum a turba seductior audi*; *Sen. Contr.* 2, 3, 19 *at tu quisquis es carnifex, cum strictam sustuleris securem, antequam ferias, patrem respice*; [*Quint.*] *Decl. min.* 315, 25 *At tu, quisquis es in quem transferetur hoc infelix ministerium, suprema audi patris miserrimi uoces*; *Stat. Theb.* 9, 442-445 *at tu, qui tumidus spoliis et sanguine gaudes | insontis pueri, non hoc ex amne potentem | Inachon aut saeuas uictor reuehere Mycenae, | ni mortalis ego et tibi ductus ab aethere sanguis.*

But, more clearly, we also find a similar threat in these passages of Tibullus, which probably owe much to ours (cf. Mankin 1995, p. 241): *Tib.* 1, 2, 89-90 *At tu, qui laetus rides mala nostra, caueto | mox tibi: non uni saeuiet usque deus*; *Tib.* 1, 4, 59-60 *At tu, qui uenerem docuisti uendere primus, | quisquis es, infelix urgeat ossa lapis*; *Tib.* 1, 5, 69 *At tu, qui potior nunc es, mea fata timeto.*

Finally, although the addressee is not the rival but the beloved herself, compare (*maerebis – dolebis*) the admonitory parallel of one of the generally recognized models of this epode (Watson 2003, pp. 461-463): *Catull.* 8, 14 *at tu dolebis cum rogaberis nulla.*

As far as the transmission is concerned, Mankin (1995, p. 241) opposes that *at* is «weakly attested» and adds that it «would jar with the ensuing *ast*». But I do not find this convincing. As for the former argument, suffice it to look at the apparatus for the actual – not few – witnesses of *at*. As for the latter one, it is again Catullus who supports the opposite view, since, within 6 verses, he opens 8, 14 and 8, 19 with *at tu*, in this case addressed to himself: *at tu, Catulle, destinatus obdura!*

\* \* \*

— 17, 17-18:

saetosa duris exuere pelliibus	15
laboriosi remiges Vlīxi	
uolente Circa membra: tunc mens et sonus	
relapsus atque notus in uultus honor.	

17 mens et  $\Omega$  : mentis *E* : quid *Lr*2<sup>acnl</sup>(mens<sup>itr</sup>)*Rc*acnl(mens<sup>r</sup>) || 18 relapsus  $\Omega$  : delapsus *MpP*13, relatus  $\zeta$

— *tunc mens et sonus* | *relapsus*: scholars have traditionally pointed out the odd reference to *mens* in this passage. As is well known, Horace reminds Canidia of this third *exemplum* of mercifulness as granted by an enemy, the two former ones having to do with Achilles' forgiveness vis-à-vis Telephus and Priamus (ll. 8-14). This third instance approaches the poet's goal more closely, since in it the petitioner has to visit the lady's bed (and both of them are witches) in order to succeed (Mankin 1995, p. 277 *ad* 15-18; Watson 2003, p. 551).

Homer (*Od.* 10, 133-574) had Odysseus' crew changed into swines, but they clearly kept their human consciousness, their *mens*, being deprived only of their speech (cf. Hom. *Od.* 10, 239-240: οἱ δὲ συῶν μὲν ἔχον κεφαλὰς φωνήν τε τρίχας τε | καὶ δέμας, αὐτὰρ νοῦς ἦν ἔμπεδος, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ). Significantly enough, the commentators have not been able to offer a convincing explanation to this oddity. Cavarzere (1992, p. 237) interprets that «Qui però *mens* non varrà tanto “intelletto”, quanto la “*facultas recordandi*”, la coscienza della propria identità che essi aveva-

no scordato (cfr. *Odissea* 10, 236)». But it would be abusive to assign this precise nuance to such a general concept as *mens*, which is used by Horace with this exact meaning: *Carm.* 1, 13, 5-6 *tunc nec mens mihi nec color | certa sede manet* (cf. *Carm.* 1, 31, 18-19 *integra | cum mente*). Mankin (1995, p. 278), for his part, skips the problem with an insufficient reference to 5, 75: «‘sanity [5.75] and (human) voice’. The men keep the former in Homer», and suggests (p. 277 *ad* 15-18) that Horace, by having them loose even this, «seems to make their case more like his own», with a further – also insufficient – reference to l. 45. But this is at odds with the very function of mythic *exempla*, which must necessarily be well identified by listeners or readers. Finally, Watson (2003, p. 551) points out the oddity but offers no explanation for it.

The reference to speech is clearly made by Horace’s *sonus* (see *OLD*, s.u., 2-3, esp. 2b, 1792): cf. e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 12, 317 *fugere animus uisusque sonusque*; Verg. *Aen.* 5, 649 (also applied to a metamorphosis) *qui uultus uocisque sonus uel gressus eunti* (cf. Cic. *De or.* 1, 114, 6; 3, 40, 5). The ms. E (EDINBURGH, National Library of Scotland Adv. 18.4.12, s. xi-xii) presents the variant *mentis*, which offers a much more fluid reading of the passage: *tunc mentis sonus | relapsus atque notus in uultus honor*. This *mentis sonus* would be a *callida iunctura* coined by Horace to suggest *sermo* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5, 649 *uocis sonus*, above) and could have even inspired Virgil for his portrait of Aeneas’ phantom (again a metamorphosis) in *Aen.* 10, 639-640: *dat inania uerba, | dat sine mente sonum gressusque effingit euntis*.

\* \* \*

— 17, 30:

Quid amplius uis? O mare! O terra! Ardeo	30
quantum neque atro delibutus Hercules	
Nessi cruore nec Sicana feruida	
uirens in Aetna flamma ...	

30 0<sup>2</sup> *GcN Es3 Es5*, ed. Fabricius (1555), def. Bentley (1713, p. 340); cf. *Ter. Ad.* 790, *Plin. Ep.* 1, 9, 6: et o *MLN<sup>spc</sup>O*: et Ω

— *o terra / et terra*: the general reading of the mss. is *et*, and there is even the odd case of a ms., like **Rc** (FIRENZE, Bibl. Riccardiana 585, s. xi-xii), which has *ó* as a gloss written over *et*. But it is obvious that both readings could have stemmed from a gloss of the other, and it is clear too that *et* is the more general word. Among the mss. dated before 1150, **Gc** (GENÈVE-COLOGNY, Bibl. Bodmer 88, s. xi *in*) and **N** (NAPOLI, Biblioteca Nazionale IV F 26, s. xi-xii) present the variant *o* (which I have attested also in **Es3** [EL ESCORIAL, Biblioteca del Monasterio C IV 21, s. xv] and **Es5** [EL ESCORIAL, Biblioteca del Monasterio S III 10, s. xv]), and we even find the unmetrical *et o* in **Ml** (MELK, Stiftsbibliothek lat. 1545, s. xi) and **O** (OXFORD, Bodl. Library D'Orville 158, s. xi), and as a correction by a later hand in **N** (i.e. *et* added).

The interjection *o* is also present in the lemma of Ps-Acro, who duly compares Ter. *Ad.* 790 *o caelum, o terra, o maria Neptuni!* The first editor to adopt the reading *o mare, o terra* was Fabricius (Basel 1555), and the repetition was defended by Bentley ([1711, p. 210] 1713, p. 340) as «*uehementius*», backing it also with the parallel of Plin. *Ep.* 1, 9, 6 *O mare, o litus, uerum secretumque* *μυστήριον*. In our passage the repetition of sounds is highlighted by the metrical ictus in a sort of frame for the syntactical unit of the exclamation: *ó mare, ó terra, (á)rdeó*. No less than twelve other editors adopted this reading during 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>12</sup>, and the most recent one was Campbell (1945 and 1953). Cavarzere (1992, p. 238) also shows his timid liking for it.

## REFERENCES

Bachrens 1880 = *Lectiones Horatianae* scripsit AEMILIUS BAEHRENS, Groningae 1880.

Bentley 1711 = *Q. Horatius Flaccus ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus* RICHARDI BENTLEII, Cantabrigiae 1711.

<sup>12</sup> CUNNINGHAM 1721, SANADON 1728, VALART 1770, WAKEFIELD 1794, FEA 1811, FEA 1820, MEINEKE 1854, LINKERUS 1856, PEERLKAMP 1862, DÜNTZER 1868, LEHRS 1869, DILLENBURGER 1881.

Bentley 1713 = *Q. Horatius Flaccus ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus RICHARDI BENTLEII*. Editio altera, Amstelaedami 1713.

Bonfinis 1519 = *Opera Q. Horatii Flacci*, poetae amoenissimi cum quatuor commentariis Acronis, Porphirionis, Anto. Mancinelli, Iodoci Badii Ascensii accurate repositis cumque adnotationibus MATTHEI BONFINIS et ALDI MANUTII (...), Parisiis 1519.

Bothe 1820 = *uid.* Fea 1820.

Brink 1982 = C.O. BRINK, *Horatian Notes III: despised readings in the manuscripts of the Epodes and a passage of Odes book 3*, «PCPhS» 28, 1982, pp. 30-56.

Campbell 1945 = *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina cum Epodis* edidit, emendavit adnotavit A.Y. CAMPBELL, London 1945.

Campbell 1953 = *Horace. Odes and Epodes*, re-edited with Notes in English supplementary to the Notes of the first edition by A.Y. CAMPBELL, Liverpool 1953.

Canter 1571 = G. CANTER, *Gulielmi Canteri Ultraiectini Novarum Lectionum Libri Octo*, Antuerpiae 1571.

Cavarzere 1992 = *Orazio, Il libro degli Epodi*, a cura di A. CAVARZERE, Venezia 1992.

Christes 1998 = J. CHRISTES, *Beatus ille. Eine Konjektur und ihr Ertrag*, «Philologus» 142, 1998, pp. 279-292.

Courtney 2013 = E. COURTNEY, *The Transmission of the Text of Horace*, in H.-CHR. GÜNTHER (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Horace*, Leiden 2013, pp. 547-560.

Cruquius 1578 = *Q. Horatius Flaccus ex antiquissimis undecim lib. M.S. et schedis aliquot emendatus et plurimis locis cum commentariis antiquis expurgatus et editus opera IACOBI CRUQUII MESSENI (...)*, Antverpiae 1578.

Cuningamius 1721 = *Q. Horatii Flacci Poemata ex antiquis codd. et certis observationibus emendavit variasque scriptorum et impressorum lectiones adjecit ALEXANDER CUNINGAMIUS*, Hagae Comitum 1721.

Cunningham 1721b = A. CUNNINGHAM, *Alexandri Cuningamii Animadversiones in Richardi Bentelii notas et emendationes ad Q. Horatium Flaccum*, Hagae Comitum 1721.

Delz 1988 = J. DELZ, review of *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, by D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, «Gnomon» 60, 1988, pp. 495-501.

Delz 1993 = J. DELZ, *Horatius ex Horatio emendatus (mit einem Anhang zum Gebrauch von plerumque)*, «MH» 50, 1993, pp. 214-222.

Dillenburger 1881 = Q. *Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia*. Recognovit et commentariis in usum scholarum instruxit GUIL. DILLENBURGER, Bonnae 1881<sup>7</sup>.

Du Quesnay 2002 = I.M. LE M. DU QUESNAY, *Amicus certus in re incerta cernitur: Epode 1*, in T. WOODMAN - D.C. FEENEY (eds.), *Traditions and contexts in the poetry of Horace*, Cambridge - New York 2002, pp. 17-37.

Düntzer 1868 = *Des Q. Horatius Flaccus Werke*, Erklärende Schulausgabe von HEINRICH DÜNTZER, I: *Die Oden und Epoden*, Paderborn 1868.

Editio Aldina 1509 = *Quinti Horatii Flacci Poemata*, Venetiis, apud Aldum Romanum mense Martio 1509.

Editio Aldina tertia 1527 = Q. *Horatii Flacci poemata omnia*, Venetiis, in aedibus Aldi et Andreae soceri, mense septembri 1527.

Editio Parisina 1507 = *Ode Horatii fideliter emendate cum breuiusculis argumentis et tabula perfacili qua lex carminis cuiuslibet Odes carissima redditur*, Parisiis 1507.

Editio Veneta 1471-1472 = *Quinti Horatii Flacci opera*, Venetiis 1471-1472 (ca.).

Editio Veneta 1490 = *Horatii Flacci lyriici poetae opera* a GEORGIO ARRIVABENE MANTUANO diligenter Venetiis impressa hic clauduntur, 1490.

Fabricius 1555 = *Opera Q. Horatii Flacci Venusini* grammaticorum antiquiss. Helenii Acronis et Porphirionis commentariis illustrata admixtis interdum C. Aemilii, Iulii Modesti et Terentii Scauri annotatiunculis, edita auctius et emendatius quam unquam antea per GEORGIUM FABRICIUM CHEMNICENSEM (...), Basileae 1555.

Fabricius 1571 = Q. *Horatii Flacci Poemata* illustrata argumentis et castigationibus GEORGII FABRICII CHEMNICENSIS cum indice Adagiorum, Lipsiae 1571.

Fea 1811 = *Quincti Horatii Flacci Opera* ad mss. codices Vaticanos, Chisianos, Angelicos, Barberinos, Gregorianos, Vallicellanos aliosque plurimis in locis emendavit notisque illustravit praesertim in iis quae Romanas Antiquitates spectant CAROLUS FEA, I, Romae 1811.

Fea 1820 = *Quincti Horatii Flacci Opera* ad mss. codices Vaticanos, Chisianos, Angelicos, Barberinos, Gregorianos, Vallicellanos aliosque plurimis in locis

emendavit notisque illustravit praesertim in iis quae Romanas Antiquitates spectant CAROLUS FEA. Denuo recensuit (...) F.H. BOTHE, I, Heidelbergae et Spiraе 1820.

Gärtner 2013 = TH. GÄRTNER, *Textkritisches zu den lyrischen Gedichten Horazens*, «Latomus» 72, 2013, pp. 676-683.

Gaskin 2013 = R. GASKIN, *Language, Truth, and Literature. A Defence of Literary Humanism*, Oxford 2013.

Glareanus 1533 = *Q. Horatii Flacci Poemata Omnia* studio ac diligentia HENRICI GLAREANI recognita eiusdemque Annotationibus illustrata (...), Friburgi Brisgoiae, apud Iohannem Fabrum Emmeum Iuliacensem, 1533.

Glareanus 1536 = *Q. Horatii Flacci Poemata Omnia* studio ac diligentia HENRICI GLAREANI recognita, eiusdemque Annotationibus illustrata (...) Ad haec, alia nonnulla ipsi auctori non parum lucis adferentia, Friburgi Brisgoiae 1536.

Hofmann-Szantyr 1972 = J.B. HOFMANN - A. SZANTYR, *Lateinische Grammatik*, II: *Syntax und Stilistik*, München 1972.

Housman 1890 = A.E. HOUSMAN, *Horatiana III*, «The Journal of Philology» 18, 1890, pp. 1-35.

Housman 1972 = *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*. Collected and edited by J. DIGGLE and F.R.D. GOODYEAR, Cambridge 1972, I-III.

Keller 1879 = O. KELLER, *Epilegomena zu Horaz*, I, Leipzig 1879.

Korch 1891 = TH. KORCH, *Horatiana*, «Филологическое обозрѣніе: журнал классической филологии и педагогики» 1, 1891, pp. 120-124.

Kraggerud 2021 = E. KRAGGERUD, *Critica. Textual Issues in Horace, Ennius, Vergil and other Authors*, London - New York 2021.

Lambinus 1561 = *Q. Horatius Flaccus* ex fide atque auctoritate decem librorum manu scriptorum, opera DIONYSI LAMBINI MONSTROLIENSIS emendatus ab eodemque commentariis copiosissimis illustratus nunc primum in lucem editus, Lugduni 1561.

Lehrs 1869 = *Q. Horatius Flaccus* mit vorzugsweiser Rücksicht auf die unechten Stellen und Gedichte. Herausgegeben von K. LEHRS, Leipzig 1869.

Linkerus 1856 = *Q. Horatius Flaccus scholarum in usum* edidit GUSTAVUS LINKERUS, Vindobonae 1856.

Ljungberg 1872 = *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina Lyrica* ex intimae artis criticae praeceptis emendata edidit et commentariis criticis exegeticisque instruxit NICOL. GUIL. LJUNGBERG, Carolstadii 1872.

Maltby 1991 = R. MALTBY, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds ("ARCA", 25) 1991.

Mancinellus 1492 = *Horatius* cum commentariis ANT. MANCINELLI, Acronis, Porphyronis, Christophori Landini, Venetiis 1492.

Mankin 1995 = D. MANKIN, *Horace, Epodes*, Cambridge 1995.

Meineke 1854 = *Q. Horatius Flaccus* denuo recognovit et praefatus est AUGUSTUS MEINEKE, Berolini 1854.

Müller 1882 = L. MÜLLER, *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina. Oden und Epoden des Horaz*. Mit Anmerkungen von LUCIAN MÜLLER, Giessen 1882.

Müller 1900 = L. MÜLLER, *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina. Oden und Epoden des Horaz*, I: *Text und Einleitungen*, Saint Petersburg - Leipzig 1900.

Nisbet 1986 = R.G.M. NISBET, *A Rival Teubner Horace*, «CR» 36, 1986, pp. 227-234.

Nisbet 1995 = R.G.M. NISBET, *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*, edited by S.J. HARRISON, Oxford 1995.

Ow. 1803 = *Vir doctus Ow. signans ad Q. Horatii Flacci Opera. Recensuit et illustravit Fridericus G. Doering*, «Neue allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek» 84, 1803, pp. 512-522.

Peerlkamp 1862 = *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina* recensuit P. HOFMAN PEERLKAMP. Editio altera emendata et aucta, Amstelodami 1862.

Ramírez de Verger 2021 = A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER, *Apostillas a las ediciones de los Epodos de Horacio*, «CFC(Lat)» 41, 2021, pp. 259-273.

Ritter 1856 = *Horatii Carmina et Epodi* ad codices saeculi noni decimique exacta, commentario critico et exegetico illustrata edidit FRANCISCUS RITTER, Lipsiae 1856.

Rivero 2018 = L. RIVERO, *Book XIII of Ovid's 'Metamorphoses'. A Textual Commentary*, Berlin - Boston 2018.

Sanadon 1728 = *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina* ad suum ordinem ac nitorem revocata studio et opera N.S. SANADONIS e S.J, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1728.

Scrinierius 1887 = P.J. SCRINERIUS, *Horatius*, «Mnemosyne» 15, 1887, p. 325.

Shackleton Bailey 1985 = *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* edidit D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, Stuttgart 1985.

Shackleton Bailey 1985b = D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Vindiciae Horatianae*, «HSCPh» 89, 1985, pp. 153-170.

Shackleton Bailey 1990 = D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Horatian Aftermath*, «Philologus» 134, 1990, pp. 213-228.

Shackleton Bailey 1997 = D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Selected Classical Papers*, Ann Arbor (MI) 1997.

Shackleton Bailey 2001<sup>4</sup> = *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* edidit D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, Berlin - New York 2004.

Socas 2011 = F. SOCAS, *Remedios de amor*, in R. MORENO SOLDEVILA (ed.), *Diccionario de motivos amoratorios en la literatura latina (siglos III a. C. - II d. C.)*, Huelva 2011, pp. 361-364.

Soubiran 1966 = J. SOUBIRAN, *L'élision dans la poésie latine*, Paris 1966.

Städler 1903 = K. STÄDLER, *Horaz-Kommentar*, Berlin 1903.

Stephanus 1544 = R. STEPHANUS, *Q. Horatii Flacci Poemata*. Ratio mensuum quibus Odae ejusdem poetae tenentur. Centimetrum Marii Servii. Variarum lectiones ex vetustiss. codicibus, ex officina Roberti Stephani typographi Regii, M.D.XLIII.

Ussani 1922<sup>2</sup> = V. USSANI, *Le liriche di Orazio commentate*, I: *Gli Epodi - Il 1° libro delle Odi*, Torino 1922.

Valart 1770 = *Q. Horatii Flacci opera* ad fidem LXXVI codicum (...), curante JOS. VALART, Parisiis 1770.

Wakefield 1794 = *Q. Horatii Flacci quae supersunt* recensuit et notulis instruxit GILBERTUS WAKEFIELD, Volumen prius *Carmina* continens, Londini 1794.

Watson 2003 = L.C. WATSON, *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford 2003.

White 2009 = H. WHITE, *Notes on Horace's Epodes*, «Myrtia» 24, 2009, pp. 345-350.

Zarothus 1474 = *Quinti Horatii Flacci Venusini opera*, ed. ANTONIUS ZAROTHUS Parmensis, Mediolani 1474.

## ABSTRACTS

FABIO PUSTERLA, «Operazioni» e «logiche operative»: appunti sulla traduzione nel Novecento

The author – who has long dealt with translation, with a particular focus on modern and contemporary European poetry – outlines the main theoretical developments on this issue that characterize the debate of the last fifty years and have profoundly redefined the genre of translation. In fact, it is currently customary to speak of “text-translation”. Next, he discusses the specificity of translations from ancient classics, asking whether, and in what way, it is possible to reflect on them similarly as to how we do so on modern ones.

LEOPOLDO GAMBERALE, *Esperienze di un traduttore involontario*

The author presents some of his translations from classical (Catullus) and contemporary (Bandini) Latin poetry. He argues that a poetic translation must follow the original text verse by verse and, for each example, highlights the translator’s often empirical criteria and varying levels of approximation and deviation from the Latin text, corresponding to the structural differences of the source and target languages.

ALESSANDRO FO, *Problemi, prove, progressi e compromessi: tu chiamale, se vuoi, traduzioni...*

The author, who translated the *Aeneid* (2012) and Catullus (2018) for the Turin-based publisher Einaudi, in the first part of the article traces the main problems he encountered in the course of producing these works. In particular, he examines the choice of a rhythmic metric classified as “barbaric”, translation constants (iteration of significant words or authentic “formulas”), as well as specific lexical problems, such as the translation of compounds and diminutives. In the second part, he discusses whether or not it is appropriate

to include in translations of ancient texts allusions to very prominent texts (e.g. Dante's *Commedia*) from later periods, and concludes by examining some problematic passages of Petronius' *Satyricon*, proposing idiosyncratic translations devised – as one might say – “outside the box”.

GUIDO MILANESE, *Traduzioni oraziane: ricognizione e spazi di ricerca*

In the light of the extensive research on Horace's manuscript tradition and translations or adaptations done between the 16th and the 18th century, it is now necessary to study the translations and studies devoted to him in the 19th century. The present study presents a survey of the translations of the *Ars Poetica* in the early 19th century. Although Romanticism diminished attunement with Horace, editorial interest in his works remains considerable, and therefore comprehensive research seems opportune.

ANDREA BALBO, *Tradurre poeti tardoantichi nel XXI secolo*

This article offers some reflections on the translations of late antique Latin texts in the 21st century (with a focus on Ausonius, Claudianus and Rutilius Namatianus) and on the role of machine translation and ChatGPT in translation activity.

LAURA CRIPPA, «*Il morto scrittore, di cui è morta la gente e la lingua*». *Considerazioni su Pascoli e la poesia antica*

This article analyzes Giovanni Pascoli's process of translation from classical into modern language, highlighting that his purpose was to bring a “language of ghosts” to life again. The underlying point of Pascoli's theory is hidden between the lines of his essay *Regole di metrica neoclassica*, following which the author gave up imitating ancient rhythm and chose to create a new poetry “ancient but young” and able once again to open “sealed lips”. The article also shows how Pascoli took possession of an ancient text starting from its literal translation, then worked through the Latin remake of the *Carmina*'s collection, and finally reached the composition in Italian of the *Poemi conviviali*. Lastly, the article gives an example of this procedure comparing two myths about ancient female figures, Helen and Circe, who in 1899 became the symbols of two ways of approaching classical literature: imitation and inspiration.

PIETRO DE MARCHI, *Giorgio Orelli e i classici: echi e citazioni (qualche appunto)*

The author, who has already dealt with Giorgio Orelli's several translations from Lucretius, focuses here on the quotations and echoes of classical texts in Orelli's poetic work. In addition, he pays attention to certain re-actualized classical "situations"; for example, the tale of the return to Ithaca, or the narration of something that happens far away and outside the main scene. Some final remarks are devoted to the question of the translation of classical verse into Italian and to the phono-semantic aspect of the texts, both ancient and modern.

SARA MASSAFRA, *Tra obbedienza e oltraggio: il latino nelle IX Ecloghe di Andrea Zanzotto*

This article examines Andrea Zanzotto's relationship with the classical literary tradition, dwelling on his constant respect for conventions and his daring tendency to break them, especially concerning Latin tradition. In his work, and particularly in the poetic collection *IX Ecloghe* (1962), it is possible to find a direct evocation of Latin language and culture and an explicit use of Latinisms. Mention is also made of the project – never realized – of a multi-voice translation of Virgil's *Aeneid* that Zanzotto had proposed to the publisher Mondadori, as preserved in his correspondence with the publishing house's secretariat.

ALESSANDRO CAMPUS, *Per la storia della scrittura alfabetica. In margine a un libro recente*

The publication of the book *Il dono di Cadmo* by Alessandro Magrini offers an opportunity to revisit two central themes in the history of writing: the definition of "alphabet" and its origins. Taking Magrini's considerations as a starting point, the first attestations of consonantal scripts are considered, describing their respective peculiarities, up to the Greek invention of consonants.

STEFANIA DE VIDO, *Demetrius and other kings*

In a famous anecdote, Plutarch (*Demetr.* 25, 7) states that after Antigonus, when Demetrius Poliorcetes and the other Diadochi had assumed the title of *basileis*, the flatterers of Demetrius addressed Seleucus, Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Agathocles using delimited epithets, to show that only the Antigonids

held the true kingship. The article discusses these epithets, focusing in particular on the one applied to Agathocles, *νησίαρχος*, in order to assess its echoes both in his own time and in Sicily's past history. In the last part of the paper, the hypothesis is advanced that for the entire episode, or at least for the insertion of Agathocles into it, Plutarch may also have used the work of Duris of Samos.

LUIS RIVERO GARCÍA, *Textual Notes on Horace's Epodes*

This article offers fresh discussions and new information on the manuscript and printed transmission of the text of Horace's *Epodes*.