traditional means, namely manuscripts. These too must be studied, he stresses.

This synthetic work is a model in its class: it is a successful attempt to quantify and to qualify bibliographical data. It is a handy tool for scholars since it shows whose books were published in Naples, by whom, and also for whom. Yet the author is ever conscious of the need to consider the larger context. By referring to it repeatedly, he makes his work even more significant.

OLGA Z. PUGLIESE

University of Toronto

Giorgio Tagliacozzo, Donald Phillip Verene and Vanessa Rumble. *A Bibliography of Vico in English, 1884–1984*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Philosophy Documentation Center, 1986. Pp. xii+ 150.

The time of Benedetto Croce's stern words to foreign scholars for having obstinately ignored Vico's contribution to the tradition of western thought is now long gone. Since Croce's authoritative call to intellectual responsibility, Vico's fame has steadily gained territory, and his name now frequently appears in contexts that would have been unimaginable only two decades ago. In particular the English speaking world has been very hospitable to his works as well as to original explorations of his philosophy, and this has largely catalyzed his belated international recognition as one of the major thinkers of western culture. The celebrated Bergin and Fisch translations of the *Autobiography* and *New Science* have enabled scholars working outside the mainstream of Italian studies to discover the magnetism of his ideas and to come to the realization that many a contemporary discipline has much to gain from seriously reflecting on the modern implications of his teaching. In the last few years scholars working under the aegis of the Institute for Vico Studies have inextricably linked him with a constellation of twentieth-century thinkers in a concerted search for reciprocal illumination by way of analogy, and his philosophy has for them consequently acquired the character of a plexus of thought vessels running through the entire body of contemporary culture and susceptible of elaboration in harmony with its generating principles in the *New Science*. The need has now arisen to chart out the precise extent of Vico's Anglo-American fame and to assess the degree to which his ideas have penetrated other conceptual systems. *A Bibliography of Vico in English, 1884–1984* is the first systematic answer to this need, and it has come—predictably enough—from the Institute for Vico Studies, which has been the principal source of the momentum that the field currently enjoys in English-speaking countries. Advocating as they do that the task of modern Vico studies includes the study of Vico as well as the practice of Vichianism, the director and the associate director of the Institute, respectively Giorgio Tagliacozzo and Donald Phillip Verene, with the collaboration of Vanessa Rumble, have compiled a distinctly "American" bibliography. For this is a work intended not only to aid Vico scholars in their examination of his ideas, but also to suggest to the non-specialists, by means of abundant examples, that they may learn from Vico effective ways of carrying out research in their professional fields, and finally

to point out to readers concerned with the current status of the humanities those works whose authors have seen fit to bring Vico—as a teacher of method and philosophical attitude—into their discussion. It is in short a work of scholarship produced in service to the conviction that contemporary culture can and should orient its future course in a clearly Vichian direction.

Now all of this makes the present work a highly innovative and controversial contribution to the field of Vico bibliography, whether we compare it with recent compilations—which in general present themselves as neutral study aids—or with the well known archetype by Croce and Nicolini, which was a tendentiously selective and interpretive discussion of Vico's fortunes. For while on the one hand it offers itself as a research tool to students of Vico, systematically gathering the critical literature available in English, on the other hand it makes an explicitly polemical statement on the character of contemporary culture, circumscribing with graphic clarity the limits of its awareness of Vico's relevance to its self-understanding. And in this regard it speaks forcefully by means of a bibliography of quotations from or references to Vico's works and a detailed index of names that concludes the compilation in apparent interpretive innocence. It suggests such questions as the following: When in his career does a given author first have recourse to Vico? How frequently does he refer to him after that date? How much space does he devote to Vico in his works? And how do the answers to these questions compare in the case of various seminal thinkers of more or less equal authority in a given field, as, for example, Harold Bloom, Paul de Man, Frederic Jameson, Edward Said and Northrop Frye in literary theory? The tacitly imparted lesson is, of course, that it is inherently useful and desirable to appraise the Vichian aspect of contemporary culture. But the bibliography is even less innocent than this, since it points out, by simple exclusion, those thinkers who, for whatever reason, have not reckoned with Vico in their research. Why is it, for example, that Levi-Strauss does not refer to Vico? That there are suggestive parallels between his and Vico's anthropologies has been made clear by studies duly included in the bibliography. One wonders then what was the bibliographical base of his reflections and how deeply rooted these were in European intellectual history. Similar questions are suggested for a host of other luminaries. The census of those who do not cite Vico is at least as interesting as that of the ones who do. The polemical implication seems to be that all philologically responsible research in the humanities must sooner or later come to terms with Vico's several claims to consequential discoveries in different fields: Vico belongs to that small group of original thinkers who cannot be ignored in the pursuit of knowledge.

The present bibliography, in other words, seems to be at once a documentation of and a contribution to the liveliness of North-American Vichianism. It seeks both to inform and to persuade. The fact that it is published by the Philosophy Documentation Center in a series that includes bibliographies of Husserl, Sartre, Paul of Venice, Alfred North Whitehead and Heidegger is further evidence of this. Vico here is in good company; his inclusion in this group indicates that for the editors and publishers alike Vico's science of humanity transcends the national and historical parameters of its formulation. As for the contribution to the further diffusion of Vico and Vichianism, it is sufficient to say that the responsibility of updating the bibliography rests with the Institute, which will

issue yearly supplements in its periodical, *New Vico Studies*, whose policy on Vico and Vichianism is precisely the one that has generated the present work.

DOMENICO PIETROPAOLO

University of Toronto

Ferdinando Gioviale. *La poetica narrativa di Pirandello*. Bologna: Pàtron, 1984. Pp. 215.

Verso la fine degli anni Sessanta si è ricominciato a discutere il romanzo pirandelliano, che in certi casi è stato paragonato a quello di Proust e di Joyce. Il presente lavoro di Gioviale viene ad approfondire questa discussione, benché esso si apra con una lunga analisi sull'opera drammaturgica di Pirandello. Con spigliatezza Gioviale viene a sostenere che la creazione teatrale induce Pirandello a riflettere sul romanzo; che il romanzo è sempre stato al centro della sua strategia letteraria; che l'interesse di Pirandello per il romanzo si rivela innanzitutto nelle recensioni ai romanzi di D'Annunzio, di Ogetti, di Zola, di Tommaseo, di Capuana, di Tozzi, e soprattutto al romanzo *La Fuga* di Rosso di San Secondo, che è la più felice, specie perché Pirandello vede nella *Fuga* il grottesco che nasce dal contrasto della realtà metafisica con quella quotidiana, lo stile ricco di valenze umoristiche, la complessità psicologica, e motivi fondamentali del romanzo contemporaneo quali il viaggio, la "salute/malattia," la sostanza simbolica. Di fatto Gioviale suggerisce che mentre discute la *Fuga*, Pirandello in realtà sta parlando dei suoi romanzi. E sostiene che Pirandello teorizza perspicacemente del romanzo anche nella sua saggistica. In "soggettivismo e oggettivismo nell'arte narrativa" (1908), per esempio, Pirandello mescola liberamente la polemica alla teorizzazione, e lo stesso fa qua e là nel saggio "L'umorismo" (1908). In cui, secondo Gioviale, Pirandello cerca un certo equilibrio tra la narrativa tradizionale e quella radicalmente innovatrice propria dell'umorismo, rifacendosi ai capolavori di Cervantes, di Sterne, di Chamisso, di Dostoevskij.

L'attività romanzesca di Pirandello inizia nel 1893, su incoraggiamento dell'amico Capuana, e si porta fino al 1926. Egli sviluppa molto presto il concetto di narrativa umoristica incentrata sul paradosso e sulla riflessione raziocinante, come è evidente dal *Fu Mattia Pascal*. E sempre, secondo Gioviale, il romanzo umoristico pirandelliano si colloca lungo la tradizione satirico-grottesca, che viene da Cervantes, da Sterne e dai romantici tedeschi. Esso presenta un "racconto scenico," è ricco di teatralità, e tende alla discorsività. Il suo narratore è una voce complessa che assume diverse funzioni: riflette fatti generali e collettivi, o i pensieri del coro dei personaggi, o il mondo intimo del protagonista, o si fa scrittore narcisistico della propria vicenda e cioè protagonista (*Mattia Pascal*, Serafino Gubbio). Il romanzo pirandelliano possiede un'inquietante pluralità compositiva di stili, di tecniche, di toni, di tensioni. Accoglie in sé altri generi letterari: la novella, il saggio, il dramma, la lirica. Per Gioviale è, cioè, un romanzo combinato da una ricca possibilità di elementi, composto di infinite variazioni tematiche e strutturali, concepito come scrittura totale. A volte si rivela una "tribuna dalla