

Ecdotica

*Fondata da Francisco Rico,
con Gian Mario Anselmi
ed Emilio Pasquini*

Ecdotica

21
(2024)

**Alma Mater Studiorum. Università di Bologna
Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Italianistica**

 **Carocci editore**

Comitato direttivo

Bárbara Bordalejo (University of Saskatchewan), Loredana Chines (Università di Bologna), Paola Italia (Università di Bologna), Andrea Severi (Università di Bologna)

Comitato scientifico

Edoardo Barbieri (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore), Francesco Bausi (Università della Calabria), Dario Brancato (Concordia University), Pedro M. Cátedra (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona), Roger Chartier (College de France), Inés Fernández-Ordóñez (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), Domenico Fiormonte (Università di Roma Tre), Francesca Florimbii (Università di Bologna), Hans-Walter Gabler (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München), Neil Harris (Università di Udine), Lotte Hellinga (British Library), Mario Mancini (Università di Bologna), Marco Presotto (Università di Trento), Roland Reuß (Universität Heidelberg), Peter Robinson (University of Saskatchewan), Antonio Sorella (Università G. D'Annunzio di Chieti-Pescara), Pasquale Stoppelli (Università di Roma La Sapienza), Alfredo Stussi (Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa), Maria Gioia Tavoni (Università di Bologna), Paolo Tinti (Università di Bologna), Paolo Trovato (Università di Ferrara), Marco Veglia (Università di Bologna)

Responsabili di redazione

Roberta Priore (Università di Bologna)
Giacomo Ventura (Università di Bologna)

Redazione

Veronica Bernardi (Università di Bologna), Ilaria Burattini (Università di Pavia), Federico Della Corte (Università Ecampus), Marcello Dani (Università di Bologna), Sara Fazion (Università di Bologna), Rosamaria Laruccia (Università di Bologna), Alessandra Mantovani (Università di Bologna), Beatrice Nava (Università di Vienna), Jacopo Pesaresi (Università di Bologna), Stefano Scioli (Università di Bologna), Alessandro Vuzzo (Università di Padova)

Redazione web

Dante Antonelli (Università di Bologna)

Ecdotica is a Peer reviewed Journal

Anvur: A

Ecdotica garantisce e risponde del valore e del rigore dei contributi che si pubblicano sulla rivista, pur non condividendone sempre e necessariamente prospettive e punti di vista.

Online: <https://site.unibo.it/ecdotica/it>



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

DEPARTMENT
OF CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY
AND ITALIAN STUDIES

Alma Mater Studiorum. Università di Bologna,
Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Italianistica,
Via Zamboni 32, 40126 Bologna
filclit.ecdotica@unibo.it

Iniziativa dipartimenti di Eccellenza MUR (2023-2027)



Carocci editore · Viale di Villa Massimo, 47 00161 Roma · tel. 06.42818417

INDICE

LOREDANA CHINES, PAOLA ITALIA, « <i>Rigore e audacia</i> » di un maestro. <i>Francisco Rico a Bologna</i>	9
BARBARA BORDALEJO, <i>A humble account and little homage for Paco</i>	24
Saggi / Essays. Filologia italiana e digital culture. A cura di Igor Candido / <i>Italian philology and digital culture. Edited by Igor Candido.</i>	
IGOR CANDIDO, <i>Rethinking Italian Philology: Textual Criticism and Digital Practice</i>	27
NADIA CANNATA, <i>Memory and loss: digital tools and the writing of history. A few considerations</i>	37
ATTILIO CICHELLA, <i>Browsing through the search engines and digital archives of Accademia della Crusca: chapters of the history of indirect tradition</i>	51
GAIA TOMAZZOLI, <i>Digital resources for Dante studies: a critical survey</i>	77
IGOR CANDIDO, <i>Notes Serving the Critical Edition of Petrarch's De vita solitaria</i>	113
ISABELLA MAGNI, <i>From Codex to <Code>: Digital Perspectives in the Study of the Materiality of Medieval Texts</i>	159
WAYNE STOREY, <i>The Bifolium, the Fascicle, Petrarch's «Rerum Vulgarium Fragmenta» and the «Petrarchive»'s Fascicler</i>	187
BRENDAN O'CONNELL, <i>The Afterlives of Adam Scriveyn: Chaucer's Scribe in Dantes's Inferno</i>	231
Foro / Meeting. Postille d'autore. Tipologie e criteri di edizione / <i>Authorial annotations. Types and editorial criteria.</i>	
MAURIZIO FIORILLA, <i>Il sistema di annotazione di Boccaccio: tipologie di glosse e questioni ecdotiche (con una proposta per il Decameron) / On Boccaccio's marginalia: glossing procedures and ecdotic issues (with a proposal for the Decameron)</i>	247
ERMINIA ARDISSINO, <i>Le postille del Tasso a Plotino: tipologia e struttura / Tasso's annotations to Plotinus: types and structure</i>	269

CHRISTIAN DEL VENTO, Per una tassonomia delle postille: il caso di Alfieri / <i>For a taxonomy of authorial annotations: the case of Alfieri</i>	299
PAOLO D'IORIO, L'edizione della biblioteca e delle letture di Nietzsche / <i>The edition of Nietzsche's library and readings</i>	336

Questioni / Issues

BEATRICE NAVA, Edizioni a sistema? Il percorso editoriale dei <i>Promessi sposi</i> dal progetto di Isella all'orizzonte digitale / <i>Editions as a System? The Editorial Journey of I Promessi Sposi from Isella's Project to the Digital Horizon</i>	363
---	-----

Rassegne / Reviews

Elena Gatti, *Francesco Zambrini tra filologia e bibliografia* (A. ANTONELLI), p. 383 · Robert Darnton, *Editori e pirati* (F. FORMIGARI), p. 387 · Maria Gioia Tavoni, «Libri all'antica». *Le Edizioni dell'Elefante nel panorama dell'editoria italiana (1964-2011)* (M. ZACCARELLO), p. 397 · Pasquale Stoppelli, *L'arte del filologo* (V. BRIGATTI), p. 402 · Alberto Cadioli, *Il testo in tipografia. Lo studio filologico delle edizioni a stampa* (P. STOPPELLI), p. 410 · Anne Baillot, *From Handwriting to Footprinting. Text and Heritage in the Age of Climate Crisis* (R. PRIORE), p. 412 · Dirk Van Hulle & Mark Nixon (ed.), *Write, cut, rewrite. The cutting-room Floor of Modern Literature* (P. ITALIA), p. 420 · Ilaria Burattini, *Il copialettere di Francesco Guicciardini. Una fonte per la «Storia d'Italia»* (M. FANTACCI), p. 428 · Dirk Van Hulle (ed.), *Genetic Narratology: Analysing Narrative across Versions* (E. SPADINI), p. 434 · Nathalie Ferrand, *Dans l'atelier de Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Genèse et interprétation* (M. MORSELLI), p. 437

Cronache / Chronicles

JESSICA TASSELLI, Textkritik, Metrik, und Paläographie im Leben und Werk von Paul Maas (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, 19 novembre 2024)	441
FILIPPO PELACCI, Genesis Bologna 2024: Costants and Variants in Genetic Criticism (University of Bologna-Ariostea Library, Ferrara, 9-11 May 2024)	444
LUCIA GIAGNOLINI, MARIANGELA GIGLIO, Il Futuro della Memoria: Dove, Come, Cosa Salvare (Milano, 5 novembre 2024)	458

Saggi

FILOLOGIA ITALIANA E DIGITAL CULTURE

A CURA DI IGOR CANDIDO

Rethinking Italian Philology: Textual Criticism and Digital Practice

ABSTRACT

In Italy the word ‘philology’ identifies a research method that is broad and specific at the same time, in a cultural context in which the academic philological tradition is alive and thriving. This special issue aims to examine current theories of Italian philology in light of the new digital practice. Editors of medieval Italian texts, whose expertise includes history, visual arts, philosophy, history of ideas, and palaeography, are invited to share innovative ideas which can bridge old and new techniques of textual criticism. If one of the major changes digital humanities brought about is undoubtedly a much easier access to manuscripts located in libraries worldwide, its impact on textual criticism needs to be explored theoretically. Today’s philology shows a new research potential but requires new scholarly skills and techniques to express it. One of the key questions explored in the volume is how all scholars today can study medieval authors reading them exactly “as they used to.” This is a major contribution through which digital culture can help fulfill the philologist’s tasks. Another relevant aspect is to investigate whether digital editions can provide a better understanding of medieval manuscripts as cultural artifacts as well as of the joint practice of reading and writing in medieval culture. Lines of inquiry, among many others, through which the volume aims to shed light on the contemporary and future identity of Italian philology. Given the long, strong and conservative Italian philological tradition, nowhere else the transition between old and new methods and techniques of textual criticism looks more interesting and is more worth examining.

In Italy the word ‘philology’ identifies a historical discipline and a research method that are both broad and specific, employed within a cultural context in which the academic philological tradition is still alive and thriving. Given the long, strong and conservative Italian philological legacy, nowhere else – I believe – does the transition between old

and new methods and techniques of textual criticism appear more interesting and worthy of examination. Therefore, Italian philology, which is well known for its vitality, represents a unique standpoint for understanding how the digital revolution may change the work of philologists, both in terms of training, methodologies, and finally the objectives which scholars now set for themselves as they rely on new tools made available by pioneering knowledge and technological advances. With these new aspects contributing to changes in the discipline of philology, a theoretical perspective may be of use: some aspects, such as easier access to the manuscript tradition through the digitisation of specific textual witnesses, are an inherent element of the current shift to digital culture; others, including ecdotal methods, require a somewhat different approach to ensure that historical philology's hard-won capital of knowledge is not forever lost. Today's philology (without adjectives) offers great research potential but requires new scholarly skills and techniques to make full use of this potential. One of the key questions explored in this special issue is, in fact, quite old, one that touches the very core of the discipline itself: how can today's scholars study medieval authors by reading their texts exactly "as those authors used to do", or in other words as they wished their future readers to do? I believe that digital culture can help solve this long-standing and evergreen philological conundrum, while also fulfilling the philologist's new goals. Another relevant query is whether born-digital editions allow for a better understanding of medieval manuscripts as cultural artifacts, and enable a more seamless investigation of the joint practice of reading and writing in medieval culture. Last but not least, it will be important for philologists to establish with certainty whether digitalised works can provide equally or perhaps even more faithful editions of premodern texts. As I note in my chapter contribution here, preliminary evidence shows that a digital edition indeed possesses the same features as a premodern edition as conceived from antiquity up to the invention of the printing press. Still in late medieval and early modern world, the writer kept the handwritten original for himself and continued to elaborate upon it, so that when asked for a copy, this original could be transcribed, edited, or partially rewritten. The clear distinction between published and unpublished texts did not exist in the premodern world, but developed gradually over a long period of time, until the invention of the printing press made it absolute. Thanks to born-digital editions, the philologist can now fully account for all of the changes that authors made to their texts.

These are only some examples of the ways which this special issue will shed light on the contemporary and future identity of Italian philology. This volume aims to examine current theories and textual criticism in light of new digital practices. Philologists and editors of medieval Italian texts, whose expertise comprises history, philosophy, philology, history of ideas, palaeography, literary criticism, and the visual arts, have been invited to share their innovative ideas here, as a means to bridge the intellectual gap between old and new methods and techniques of textual criticism.

The first two essays collected here take a more theoretical approach and serve as a general introduction to current research being conducted in Italy. Interestingly enough, in both it is the key notion of history – without which the notion of philology would be unthinkable – that comes to the fore. The following five essays also contain both theoretical and methodological reflections, with more specific case studies dedicated to great authors of the Italian literary canon and beyond (Dante, Petrarch, Chaucer).

In Nadia Cannata's *Memory and loss: digital tools and the writing of history. A few considerations*, the author addresses the question of what historical narrative can be told through the wealth of data which the digital revolution has to offer historians with its new methods and wider corpus of texts. It is a difficult question indeed, as Cannata points out, due to issues relating to the technical and economical sustainability of the digital means through which such knowledge circulates, and because of the kind of enquiries which digital publications allow. What historical narrative is currently being written? What facts emerge or indeed remain hidden or lost? Cannata explores the nature, role, and use of a number of gigantic digital portals funded by public institutions in the US and Europe: are «any of these new portals which present themselves as digital archives, indeed, a gigantic historical archive? Hardly [...]. However they can and they do add a new and extraordinary philological 4th dimension, as it were, to the task of preserving historical records and disseminating knowledge relating to, or issuing from, them» (p. 48). While the advantages of this additional resource are undoubtedly clear, the most troubling concern for both institutions and scholars is that most digital publications have a life expectancy of a decade or less. The question of money indeed looms over all of these mammoth projects into which enormous amounts of public funding have already been poured. The answer that institutions might offer will define the historical narrative being written today for tomorrow's gener-

ation: «Once that money dries out what is going to happen? And, more to the point, beyond our lifespan, in 20, 30, 50, 100 years what will become of the enormous amount of work poured into such supposed archives? This is the challenge that we must address, and it is upon us to ensure that this exciting revolution does not result in the implosion of memory and the loss of the very history it should supposedly help preserve» (p. 49).

Another contribution focused on theory, this time stemming from a specific case study, is Attilio Cicchella's *Browsing Through the Search Engines and Digital Archives of Accademia della Crusca: Chapters of the History of Indirect Tradition*. The Accademia della Crusca has, in recent years, opened its archives to scholars thanks to the launch of two new tools: the digitalisation of the five editions of the *Vocabolario della Crusca* and the creation of a searchable database. These online resources allow researchers to analyse over thirty "allegazioni" (quotations) of the *Actus Apostolorum*, which the preacher friar Domenico Cavalca from Vicopisano translated into the vernacular around 1330 and included in the first edition of the *Vocabolario* (1612). Only one of these quotations refers directly to the official translation by Cavalca, whereas the remaining are excerpts from a lost manuscript which would appear to be the friar's oldest translation, most likely copied down during his lifetime. Other excerpts of this manuscript do not appear in the *Vocabolario*, but can be found in the so-called *Quaderno Riccardiano* – a collection of texts heavily cited in the first edition of the *Vocabolario* – and in Pier Francesco Cambi's anthology. In the second part of his essay, Cicchella examines a number of quotations taken from a lost commentary on the *Evangelii* written by the first secretary of the Accademia della Crusca and one of its founders, Bastiano de' Rossi, also known as 'Inferigno'. The quotations from Cavalca's translation of the *Actus Apostolorum* contained in de' Rossi's commentary and attached to entries in the *Vocabolario*, may themselves be quotations from another source. The digital resources of the Accademia della Crusca reveal the existence of a secondary, indirect tradition within the official, indirect tradition. Moreover, in the 1490 edition of the comments to the *Evangelii* digitized by Google Books, the excerpts of the *Actus Apostolorum* appear to be identical to those in Cavalca's work. Cicchella's demonstration and comparative study required in-depth knowledge of Domenico Cavalca's text as well as the Latin model from which he translated; in other words, they required the careful work of an experienced philologist able to parse these newly available digital resources.

Another privileged standpoint from which to observe the evolution of digital philology is the field of Dante studies. Gaia Tomazzoli's *Digital resources for Dante studies: a critical survey* provides a comprehensive perspective on the multifaceted world of Dante digital resources. Due to the complexity of Dante's *Commedia*, from its language and manifold textual interpretations to its rich and varied manuscript tradition with more than eight hundred witnesses, even from the earliest stages of print culture Dante scholarship has developed various reading tools designed for a more organized and complete understanding of the poem. It is therefore no surprise that Dante studies offer an opportunity to test the full potential of digital philology, and Dante scholars have quickly become pioneers in the field of digital humanities. Interestingly enough, the complexity of Dante's poem has also proved to be a stumbling block for digital philology. As Tomazzoli points out, if «the most advanced digital tools for Dante studies achieve complex representations and models of data, which would not have been otherwise possible, [...] it is very hard, by contrast, to reproduce the complexity of a poetic text or of its exegesis within a formal representation. It is hoped that latest and future developments of the Semantic Web will pave the way to more layered, multifaceted, and nuanced descriptions of Dante's meanings» (p. 79). It is therefore no coincidence that most of the digital resources developed by Dante scholars provide a wide array of perspectives to account for such complexity. While their hermeneutical aim aligns with tradition, their means of achieving it is quite innovative. «Paratexts and collateral resources have always accompanied Dante's text. Moreover, as it was recently written by Celotto and Mazzucchi, online texts share with medieval manuscript traditions several crucial features, such as their instability, openness towards multimediality, and problematic authoriality.⁹⁷ Such similarities are stimulating and need to be acknowledged in order to go beyond the fast revolution and appreciate how the digital environment is offering unprecedented possibilities, both in the traditional field of philology and textual studies, and for an interdisciplinary approach involving anthropology, art and book history, history of music, and gender studies» (pp. 111-112).

Next the volume offers three essays focused on the theory and practice of editing Petrarch. In preparation for a new edition of Petrarch's *De vita solitaria* (Toronto UP), my *Notes Serving the Critical Edition of Petrarch's "De vita solitaria"* aims to reconsider what classical philology can teach us when we edit medieval texts written in Latin with the intent to publish born-digital editions. I argue that only a digital edition can

fully account for and restore the textual complexity of Petrarch's treatise, which is a unique case study for evaluating different philological approaches. Petrarch laboured on his text for more than twenty years, making changes and introducing new content to his now-lost autograph copy of the work. Only a digital edition can enable the reader to visualize Petrarch's various interventions occurring over time, while providing the opportunity to see such changes in the two most important witnesses of the manuscript tradition. As noted above, a born-digital edition possesses the same features as a premodern edition. The authorial process of writing, transcribing, editing and rewriting continued unchanged from antiquity, through the Middle Ages, and up to the Renaissance. Digital publishing has now ushered in a return to the same conditions at play before the invention of the printing press, conditions whereby the distinction between published and unpublished writing was quite ambivalent before it became absolute with the advent of printed editions.

A study of the material aspects of autographs and other witnesses of Petrarch's *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* offers the chance to compare the notion and function of the medieval codex with those of digital code in Isabella Magni's *From Codex to <Code>: Digital Perspectives in the Study of the Materiality of Medieval Texts*. Even if they might be understood like complete opposites, the hand-written manuscript and the segment of digital code have remarkable interconnections. Indeed, if we often refer to "code" both in terms of material production (*codex*) and of the series of alphanumeric instructions used to represent a text on the web (<code>), material philology and digital encoding share the basic task of representing texts, both on a theoretical and a pragmatic level. Magni's essay investigates digital-philological trends and gives concrete examples that reveal how such trends allow editors not only to set medieval texts in their original visual contexts, but also to re-think the way we interpret them today. Encoding a manuscript enables to translate and display textual components including scribal errors, erasures, marginalia and palimpsests, along with material and visual components such as *mise en page*, space and visual dynamics of the *charte*, at a micro- and a macro-text level. By doing so, today's editors are able to discover features which their predecessors have traditionally overlooked as well as search for information regarding the textual conditions of medieval works that could not otherwise be retrieved. The case of Petrarch's *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* is representative due to the strict connection existing between the textual-material features of the handwritten

manuscripts and its digital encoding which go far beyond the mere task of reproducing Petrarch's text: only the combination of the tenets of material philology with the benefits of digital code allows to explore the critical and editorial accretions of Petrarch's *Fragmenta* over time, as well as the layered representation of a text previously stripped down by the long centuries of cultural transmission.

Wayne Storey offers a closer analysis of the codicological aspects of Petrarch's *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* in *The Bifolium, the Gathering and the Petrarchive's 'Fascicler'*. If the folding of a single sheet of parchment or paper in two *chartae* (four modern "pages") is the fundamental building block of medieval and early modern manuscripts, the construction of often highly complex literary structures – as Storey maintains – often involves the manipulation of gatherings of bifolia at the core of a literary product. Storey's essay studies the problems and the solutions of assembly of gatherings of a single work – Petrarch's *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* – in multiple scribal products, and the literary, historical and cultural implications at the core of their construction in a number of diverse manuscripts such as Laurenziano 41.17 (ca. 1375?), Vaticano Latino 3195 (holograph of the work, unbound at the time of Petrarch's death in 1374), British Library Kings 321 (completed in 1400), and Cornell MS 4648n22 [and 22A] (produced around 1470). The four manuscripts reveal the unique constructions of the work as well as its key structural and authorial strategies as they change in time. By relying on the precious information that the arrangement of bifolia and gatherings can provide about Petrarch's *Fragmenta*, one of the goals of the Petrarchive editions (<http://petrarchive.org>) has been to develop a digital representation and teaching tool capable of communicating the link between concept and material execution of the literary form embedded in the structures of bifolia and their gatherings. A formula typically found in manuscript descriptions and intended solely for specialists (for example, 1⁸, 2⁸, 3⁸, 4⁸, 5⁸, 6⁸, 7⁴, 8⁸, 9⁴, 10⁴, 11⁴, representing the fascicles of Petrarch's partial holograph Vatican Latino 3195) is incapable of capturing the architectural and conceptual complexities of a text's gatherings. Petrarchive attempts to address this complexity by linking the construction of fascicles to the contents of the individual *chartae*. After taking this first step, Storey and his collaborators felt the tool as such was of limited value and decided to build the more visually oriented "fascicler" (http://dcl.slis.indiana.edu/petrarchive/visindex_fascicles.php), which could more accurately contextualize individual *chartae* within their *bifolia* and tie them to the texts they contain, visually explaining their

functions within the gathering and construction of the macrotext itself. The final part of the essay examines and analyses the development of the Petrarchive “fascicler” as a digital tool meant to reclaim the materiality of early works such as Petrarch’s *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*.

The volume’s final essay, Brendan O’Connell’s *The Afterlives of Adam Sciveyn: Chaucer’s Scribe in Dante’s “Inferno”*, takes us to fifteenth-century England where the nascent cult of Dante inspires the harsh infernal punishment for a negligent scribe. In *Adam Sciveyn*, Geoffrey Chaucer curses a negligent scribe with an itchy skin disease, a fitting punishment for a copyist whose many mistakes forced the author to constantly ‘rub and scrape’ his valuable parchment. That this *contrapasso* is indeed Dantean is suggested by a number of details drawn from *Inferno* XXX, the canto of the falsifiers, where two alchemists experience itchy skin diseases quite similar to the punishment that Chaucer inflicts on his scribe. Chaucer’s short poem speaks to several core concerns of philology and it has therefore received renewed attention from textual scholars: not only because of the apparent identification of Adam Pynkhurst as the historical scribe addressed in the poem, but also – and perhaps contradictorily – because other scholars have provided lexical and metrical evidence to assert that the poem cannot be attributed to Chaucer. In this essay, O’Connell draws on digital copies of the *Commedia* and the sole witness of *Adam Sciveyn* to reconstruct Chaucer’s experience of reading Dante’s manuscripts and to consider how it may have shaped his poem about the scribal practice. By exploring the poem in this way O’Connell raises questions that are key to this special issue of *Ecdotica*. While traditional textual criticism remains an invaluable method for any intertextual study, new digital technologies – and our ability to compare many different witnesses simultaneously – allow us to ask different and in some cases more focused questions: how is the experience of reading *Adam Sciveyn* altered when we encounter it in a printed edition, the sole surviving – paper – manuscript, or, for that matter, in its digital copy? What did Chaucer learn from reading his copy of the *Commedia* about the value of good writing practice that would ensure the accurate preservation and dissemination of the author’s works? The case of an early fourteenth-century manuscript of the *Commedia*, BL Egerton MS 943, seems to provide an answer to this question: the partial effacement of an image of the alchemists from parchment turns the visual element of the manuscript into a gloss on the allegory of the falsifiers to which Dante’s earliest readers, including Chaucer, could respond. As this suggests, Chaucer’s brief poem speaks to several core concerns of philol-

ogy and raises important questions about textual criticism offering new insights for assessing the impact of digital scholarship on the field of medieval studies broadly conceived.

In conclusion, the seven different contributions gathered together in this special issue of *Ecdotica* provide a representative image of new approaches and the new frontiers, offers new glimpses into the still uncharted territories beyond the current field of Italian philology, a discipline whose authoritative and influential past and enduring identity inside and outside academia make the intellectual experience of Italy's digital shift an unique case study from which the whole community of scholars can draw invaluable lessons.

Norme editoriali

Sin dalla sua fondazione Ecdotica, proponendosi come punto di incontro di culture e sensibilità filologiche differenti, ha sempre lasciato libertà agli autori di indicare i riferimenti bibliografici secondo la modalità **italiana o anglosassone**. È fondamentale, tuttavia, che vi sia omogeneità di citazione all'interno del contributo.

I testi vanno consegnati, con la minor formattazione possibile (dunque anche senza rientri di paragrafo), in formato Times New Roman, punti 12, interlinea singola. Le citazioni più lunghe di 3 righe vanno in carattere 10, sempre in interlinea singola, separate dal corpo del testo da uno spazio bianco prima e dopo la citazione (nessun rientro).

Il richiamo alla nota è da collocarsi dopo l'eventuale segno di interpunzione (es: sollevò la bocca dal fiero pasto.³). Le note, numerate progressivamente, vanno poste a piè di pagina, e non alla fine dell'articolo.

Le citazioni inferiori alle 3 righe vanno dentro al corpo del testo tra virgolette basse a caporale «...». Eventuali citazioni dentro citazione vanno tra virgolette alte ad apici doppi: "...". Queste ultime o gli apici semplici ('...') potranno essere utilizzati per le parole e le frasi da evidenziare, le espressioni enfatiche, le parafrasi, le traduzioni di parole straniere. Si eviti quanto più possibile il *corsivo*, da utilizzare solo per i titoli di opere e di riviste (es: *Geografia e storia della letteratura italiana*; *Nuova Rivista di Letteratura Italiana*; *Griseldaonline*) e per parole straniere non ancora entrate nell'uso in italiano.

N.B: Per le sezioni *Saggi*, *Foro* e *Questioni* gli autori\le autrici, in apertura del contributo, segneranno titolo, titolo in inglese, abstract in lingua inglese, 5 parole chiave in lingua inglese.

Si chiede inoltre, agli autori e alle autrici, di inserire alla fine del contributo indirizzo e-mail istituzionale e affiliazione.

Per la sezione *Rassegne*: occorre inserire, in principio, la stringa bibliografica del libro, compresa di collana, numero complessivo di pagine, costo, ISBN.

Indicare, preferibilmente, le pagine e i riferimenti a testo tra parentesi e non in nota.

Nel caso l'autore adotti il **sistema citazionale all'italiana** le norme da seguire sono le seguenti.

La **citazione bibliografica di un volume o di un contributo in volume** deve essere composta come segue:

- Autore in tondo, con l'iniziale del nome puntato;
- **Titolo dell'intero volume** in corsivo; **titolo di un saggio all'interno del volume** (o in catalogo di mostra) tra virgolette basse «...» seguito da "in" e dal titolo del volume in corsivo (se contiene a sua volta un titolo di un'opera, questo va in corsivo);

- eventuale numero del volume (se l'opera è composta da più tomi) in cifra romana;
- eventuale curatore (iniziale del nome puntata, cognome per esteso), in tondo, preceduto dalla dizione 'a cura di';
- luogo di edizione, casa editrice, anno;
- eventuali numeri di pagina, in cifre arabe e/o romane tonde, da indicare con 'p.' o 'pp.', in tondo minuscolo. L'eventuale intervallo di pp. oggetto di particolare attenzione va indicato dopo i due punti (es.: pp. 12-34; 13-15)

In **seconda citazione** si indichino solo il cognome dell'autore, il titolo abbreviato dell'opera seguito, dopo una virgola, dal numero delle pp. interessate (senza "cit.", "op. cit.", "ed. cit." etc...); nei casi in cui si debba ripetere di séguito la citazione della medesima opera, variata in qualche suo elemento – ad esempio con l'aggiunta dei numeri di pagina –, si usi 'ivi' (in tondo); si usi *ibidem* (in corsivo), in forma non abbreviata, quando la citazione è invece ripetuta in maniera identica subito dopo.

Esempi:

A. Monteverchi, *Gli uomini e i tempi. Studi da Machiavelli a Malvezzi*, Bologna, Pàtron, 2016.

A. Benassi, «La teoria e la prassi dell'emblema e dell'impresa», in *Letteratura e arti visive nel Rinascimento*, a cura di G. Genovese, A. Torre, Roma, Carocci, 2019.

S. Petrelli, *La stampa in Occidente. Analisi critica*, IV, Berlino-New York, de Gruyter, 2000⁵, pp. 23-28.

Petrelli, *La stampa in Occidente*, pp. 25-26.

Ivi, p. 25.

Ibidem

La citazione bibliografica di un **articolo pubblicato su un periodico** deve essere composta come segue:

- Autore in tondo, con l'iniziale del nome puntato
- Titolo dell'articolo in tondo tra virgolette basse («...»)
- Titolo della rivista in corsivo
- Eventuale numero di serie in cifra romana tonda;
- Eventuale numero di annata in cifre romane tonde;
- Eventuale numero di fascicolo in cifre arabe o romane tonde, a seconda dell'indicazione fornita sulla copertina della rivista;
- Anno di edizione, in cifre arabe tonde e fra parentesi;
- Intervallo di pp. dell'articolo, eventualmente seguite da due punti e la p. o le pp.

Esempi:

C. De Cesare, «Una corrispondenza corale. Alcune integrazioni al corpus epistolare ariostesco a partire dal carteggio del suo luogotenente», *Bollettino di italianistica*, n.s., a. XIX, 2 (2022), pp. 121-134.

M. Petoletti, «Poesia epigrafica pavese di età longobarda: le iscrizioni sui monumenti», *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, LX (2019), pp. 1-32.

Nel caso che i **nomi degli autori**, curatori, prefatori, traduttori, ecc. siano più di uno, essi si separano con una virgola (ad es.: G.M. Anselmi, L. Chines, C. Varotti) e non con il lineato breve unito.

I **numeri delle pagine** e degli anni vanno indicati per esteso (ad es.: pp. 112-146 e non 112-46; 113-118 e non 113-8; 1953-1964 e non 1953-964 o 1953-64 o 1953-4).

I **siti Internet** vanno citati in tondo minuscolo senza virgolette (« » o < >) qualora si specifichi l'intero indirizzo elettronico (es.: www.griseldaonline.it). Se invece si indica solo il nome, essi vanno in corsivo senza virgolette al pari del titolo di un'opera (es.: *Griseldaonline*).

Se è necessario usare il termine *Idem* per indicare un autore, scriverlo per esteso.

I **rientri di paragrafo** vanno fatti con un TAB; non vanno fatti nel paragrafo iniziale del contributo.

Nel caso in cui si scelgano **criteri citazionali all'anglosassone**, è possibile rendere sinteticamente le note a piè di pagina con sola indicazione del cognome dell'autore in tondo, data ed, eventualmente, indicazione della pagina da cui proviene la citazione, senza specificare né il volume né il periodico di riferimento, ugualmente si può inserire la fonte direttamente nel corpo del contributo.

La bibliografia finale, da posizionarsi necessariamente al termine di ciascun contributo dovrà essere, invece, compilata per esteso; per i criteri della stessa si rimanda alle indicazioni fornite per il sistema citazionale all'italiana.

Esempi:

• Nel corpo del testo o in nota, valido per ciascun esempio seguente: (Craig 2004).

Nella bibliografia finale: Craig 2004: H. Craig, «Stylistic analysis and authorship studies», in *A companion to Digital Humanities*, a cura di S. Schreibman, R. Siemens, J. Unsworth, Blackwell, Oxford 2004.

• Adams, Barker 1993: T.R. Adams, N. Barker, «A new model for the study of the book» in *A potencie of life. Books in society: The Clark lectures 1986-1987*, London, British Library 1993.

• Avellini et al. 2009: *Prospettive degli Studi culturali*, a cura di L. Avellini et al., Bologna, I Libri di Emil, 2009, pp. 190-19.

• Carriero et al 2020: V.A. Carriero, M. Daquino, A. Gangemi, A.G. Nuzzolese, S. Peroni, V. Presutti, F. Tomasi, «The Landscape of Ontology Reuse Approaches», in *Applications and Practices in Ontology Design, Extraction, and Reasoning*, Amsterdam, IOS Press, 2020, pp. 21-38.

Se si fa riferimento ad una citazione specifica di un'opera, è necessario inserire la pagina:

- (Eggert 1990, pp. 19-40) (nel testo o in nota).

In bibliografia finale: Eggert 1990: Eggert P. «Textual product or textual process: procedures and assumptions of critical editing» in *Editing in Australia*, Sydney, University of New South Wales Press 1990, pp. 19-40.

- In caso di omonimia nel riferimento a testo o in nota specificare l'iniziale del nome dell'autore o autrice.

Referaggio

Tutti i contributi presenti in rivista sono sottoposti preventivamente a processo di *double-blind peer review* (processo di doppio referaggio cieco) e sono, pertanto, esaminati e valutati da revisori anonimi così come anonimo è anche l'autore del saggio in analisi, al fine di rendere limpido e coerente il risultato finale.

Editorial rules

Since its very beginning Ecdotica, intending to favour different philological sensibilities and methods, enables authors to choose between different referencing styles, the Italian and 'Harvard' ones. However, it is fundamental to coherence when choosing one of them.

All the papers must be delivered with the formatting to a minimum (no paragraph indent is permitted), typed in Times New Roman 12 point, single-spaces. All the quotes exceeding 3 lines must be in font size 10, single spaces, separated with a blank space from the text (no paragraph indent). Each footnote number has to be put after the punctuation. All the footnotes will be collocated at the bottom of the page instead of at the end of the article.

All the quotes lesser than 3 lines must be collocated in the body text between quotation marks «...». If there is a quote inside a quote, it has to be written between double quotes "...". The latter or single quotation marks ('..') may be used for words or sentences to be highlighted, emphatic expressions, phrases, and translations. Please keep formatting such as italics to a minimum (to be used just for work and journal titles, e.g. *Contemporary German editorial theory*, *A companion to Digital Humanities*, and for foreign words.

N.B: For all the sections named *Saggi*, *Foro* and *Questioni*, the authors are required, at the beginning of the article, to put the paper's title, an abstract, and 5 keywords, and, at the end of the article, institutional mail address and academic membership.

For the section named *Rassegne*: reviews should begin with the reviewed volume's bibliographic information organized by:

Author (last name in small caps), first name. Date. *Title* (in italics). Place of publication: publisher. ISBN 13. # of pages (and, where appropriate, illustrations/figures/musical examples). Hardcover or softcover. Price (preferably in dollars and/or euros).

In case the author(s) chooses the Italian quoting system, he/she has to respect the following rules.

The bibliographic quotation of a book or of an essay in a book must be composed by:

- Author in Roman type, with the name initial;
- The volume's title in Italics type; the paper's title between quotation marks «...» followed by "in" and the title of the volume (if the title contains another title inside, it must be in Italics);
- The number of the volume, if any, in Roman numbers;
- The name of the editor must be indicated with the name initial and full surname, in Roman type, preceded by 'edited by';
- Place of publishing, name of publisher, year;

- Number of pages in Arab or Roman number preceded by 'p.' or 'pp.', in Roman type. If there is a particular page range to be referred to, it must be indicated as following pp-12-34: 13-15.

If the quotes are repeated after the first time, please indicate just the surname of the author, a short title of the work after a comma, the number of the pages (no "cit.", "op. cit.", "ed. cit." etc.).

Use 'ivi' (Roman type) when citing the same work as previously, but changing the range of pages; use *ibidem* (Italics), in full, when citing the same quotation shortly after.

Examples:

A. Montevercchi, *Gli uomini e i tempi. Studi da Machiavelli a Malvezzi*, Bologna, Pàtron, 2016.

A. Benassi, «La teoria e la prassi dell'emblema e dell'impresa», in *Letteratura e arti visive nel Rinascimento*, a cura di G. Genovese, A. Torre, Roma, Carocci, 2019.

S. Petrelli, *La stampa in Occidente. Analisi critica*, ivi, Berlino-New York, de Gruyter, 20005, pp. 23-28.

Petrelli, *La stampa in Occidente*, pp. 25-26.

Ivi, p. 25.

Ibidem

The bibliographic quotation of an article published in a journal or book must be composed by

- Author in Roman type, with the name initial;
- The article's title in Roman type between quotation marks «...» (if the title contains another title inside, it must be in Italics);
- The title of the journal or the book in Italics type;
- The number of the volume, if any, in Roman numbers;
- The year of the journal in Roman number;
- Issue number (if any), in Arabic numbers;
- Year of publication in Arabic number between brackets;
- Number of pages in Arab or Roman number preceded by 'p.' or 'pp.', in Roman type. If there is a particular page range to be referred to, it must be indicated as following pp-12-34: 13-15.

Examples:

C. De Cesare, «Una corrispondenza corale. Alcune integrazioni al corpus epistolare ariostesco a partire del carteggio del suo luogotenente», *Bollettino di italianistica*, n.s., a. XIX, 2 (2022), pp. 121-134.

M. Petoletti, «Poesia epigrafica pavese di età longobarda: le iscrizioni sui monumenti», *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, LX (2019), pp. 1-32.

When authors, editors, prefaces, translators, etc., are more than one, they should be separated by a comma (e.g. G.M. Anselmi, L. Chines, C. Varotti) and not by a hyphen. Page and year numbers should be written in full (e.g. pp. 112-146, not 112-46; 113-118, not 113-8; 1953-1964, not 1953-964 or 1953-64 or 1953-4). Internet sites should be cited in lowercase without quotation marks (« » or < >) if specifying the full web address (e.g. www.griseldaonline.it). If only the name is provided, it should be italicized without quotation marks like a title of a work (e.g. *Griseldaonline*).

If necessary to use the term “Idem” to indicate an author, write it out in full.

Paragraph indentation should be done with a TAB; no indentation should be made in the initial paragraph of the contribution.

In case the Anglo-Saxon citation criteria are chosen, it is possible to make footnotes more concise with only the author’s surname in round brackets, date, and possibly the page number from which the citation is taken, without specifying the volume or periodical reference. Similarly, the source can be directly inserted into the body of the contribution. However, the final bibliography, to be positioned necessarily at the end of each contribution, must be compiled in full; for its criteria, reference is made to the instructions provided for the Italian citation system.

Examples:

- In the body of the text or in a note, valid for each following example: (Craig 2004).

In the final bibliography: Craig 2004: H. Craig, «Stylistic analysis and authorship studies», in *A companion to Digital Humanities*, edited by S. Schreibman, R. Siemens, J. Unsworth, Blackwell, Oxford 2004.

- Adams, Barker 1993: T.R. Adams, N. Barker, «A new model for the study of the book», in *A potencie of life. Books in society: The Clark lectures 1986-1987*, London, British Library, 1993.

- Avellini et al. 2009: *Prospettive degli Studi culturali*, edited by L. Avellini et al., Bologna, I Libri di Emil, 2009, pp. 190-19.

- Carriero et al 2020: V.A. Carriero, M. Daquino, A. Gangemi, A.G. Nuzzolese, S. Peroni, V. Presutti, F. Tomasi, «The Landscape of Ontology Reuse Approaches», in *Applications and Practices in Ontology Design, Extraction, and Reasoning*, Amsterdam, IOS Press, 2020, pp. 21-38.

If referring to a specific citation from a work, it is necessary to include the page number:

- (Eggert 1990, pp. 19-40) (in the text or in a note)

In the final bibliography: Eggert 1990: Eggert P., «Textual product or textual process: procedures and assumptions of critical editing», in *Editing in Australia*, Sydney, University of New South Wales Press 1990, pp. 19-40.

In case of homonymy in reference to a text or in a note, specify the initial of the author's name.

Peer review

All contributions to the journal undergo a double-blind peer review process, whereby they are examined and evaluated by anonymous reviewers, as is the author of the essay under analysis, to ensure clarity and coherence in the final outcome.

Progetto grafico e impaginazione: Carolina Valcárcel

1ª edizione, aprile 2025
© copyright 2025 by
Carocci editore S.p.A., Roma

Finito di stampare nell'aprile 2025
da Grafiche VD Srl, Città di Castello (PG)

ISSN 1825-5361

ISBN 978-88-290-2876-4

Riproduzione vietata ai sensi di legge
(art. 171 della legge 22 aprile 1941, n. 633)

Senza regolare autorizzazione,
è vietato riprodurre questo volume
anche parzialmente e con qualsiasi mezzo,
compresa la fotocopia, anche per uso
interno e didattico.

Il periodico ECDOTICA è stato iscritto
al n. 8591 R.St. in data 06/09/2022 sul registro
stampa periodica del tribunale di Bologna.