While on the surface one may criticize the economy of the book (a little less than half is dedicated to actual text), this appears to have been a shrewd decision for the format renders it more “user friendly” and enjoyable to read with the knowledge that detailed information is available in the notes and, for those wishing to delve even further, there is an impressive bibliography of primary and secondary sources, rounded out by a proportioned index.

Coming on the heels of studies by David Marsh, Jon Snyder, and Raffaele Girardi, the present study is further proof of the interest generated by, and calibre of scholarship dedicated to the dialogue in recent years. The Renaissance Dialogue may well be considered the measure against which all subsequent work in this field will be evaluated.

ROBERT BURANELLO
University of Toronto


The first edition of Giordano Zocchi’s autobiographic novel was published in 1877, but the edition of 1881, four years after the early death of its author, aroused greater interest. Indeed, he deserves to be better known by the critics of today. In her introduction, Cafisse analyses and summarizes the work and adds lengthy notes to the introduction and the text.

Giordano Zocchi describes why he is so detached from men and defines his condition of detachment not only from men but also from things as “ebetudine”. As Cafisse explains, in the apparent conflict between the empirical man and his literary projection are identified the two aspects of the human personality, namely instinct and rationality, which find a common point of balance in the consciousness of reality. The loss of this contact with reality determines the lack of association which the author finds in the dichotomy of the weak-minded person (“ebete”).

Giordano Zocchi deals with the young child and education. His own education enabled him to know less about reality but to develop his imagination. He also discusses the works of the English Philosophers which helped him recover reality. Later, he criticises the attitude of the masses and compares the Latin race with the English. Inspired by the theories of Taine, he attributes the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race to the mixture of various lineages.

The true mystery of our existent is the origin of thought. Science can discover a part of the unknown but cannot discover the origin of thought. He also criticises political life and the absence of justice. People adopt very iniquitous methods in order to be elected; he identifies some of these methods, which he condemns.

Finally, as Cafisse notes, the faith of the writer in the existence of “<<un manipolo di gente ancora sana, e a spese della quale vivucchia oggi e potrà rivivere domani di


Talbot’s premise is contained in the title where the phrase “mestiere vile” is the one used by Montale himself to characterize the nature of his profession as a translator. Talbot, however, argues that the disparaging term, disparaging particularly in light of contemporary theories of translation, pertains only to the commissioned pieces, rather than to those undertaken out of personal interest: the so-called elective translations. These, according to the working premise, exerted a formative influence on Montale’s own writings by bringing him into intimate contact with masterpieces of Modernism. Most of the critic’s opinions are based on the texts of Quaderno di traduzioni (1948) and La vita della foresta (Green Mansions), translated in the 1940s but published in 1987. In discussing the activities in this area, the author strives to define Montale’s theory of translation, as it pertains to the poetic text, placing its evolution in the context of the translation models proposed by Benjamin and Jacobson: “the interplay between the equivalent effect principle and creative transposition or appropriation” (27).

In chapter one, Talbot is convincing in his attempt to see in Montale’s very first translation of Eliot’s “Song for Simeon” an “element of coherence, between translation and his own work [which] was to become a characteristic of Montale’s procedure” (62) arguing that the infidelities of the Italian in relation to the original (at the metrical, lexical, and morphological level) can be explained in terms of the Ligurian poet’s own cultural background. As Talbot demonstrates, Montale brings to bear in the act of verse translation, his personal “ideolect” and linguistic forms already established in compositions such as “Arsenio” or “Casa sul mare.” The critic is thorough in illustrating that, contrary to Meoli Toulmin’s affirmation of Montale’s fidelity to the original, “He [Montale] translated into his own idiom, both linguistic and thematic” (63). Through his translation, Montale not only imposed his own style on the pieces with which he