PETER BONDANELLA and JULIA CONAWAY BONDANELLA, eds. *Dictionary of Italian Literature*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979. pp. xxviii, 621.

The editors, both teaching at Indiana University, state in their preface that "although this dictionary is not designed solely for those who know little or no Italian, it is most probable that a majority of its users will fall into this category" and that the dictionary "aims . . . to be the most useful initial reference tool for the general public and the specialist." Excluding the question of its usefulness to the specialist for the moment, one can say at the outset that this dictionary, the first in English and published in England as *The Macmillan Dictionary of Italian Literature*, does indeed fulfil the editors' objectives. It is a useful and thorough dictionary of Italian literature for a general academic audience. But it attempts to be more: it tries to record the whole of Italian cultural and intellectual history. For instance, there are articles on Vico, Croce, Gentile and Gramsci, all legitimate entries because of their importance in the field of literary esthetics, but there are also articles on philosophers like Pomponazzi and Gioberti, political scientists and social reformers like Botero, Filangieri, and Beccaria, artists like Leonardo, historians like Giannone, and soldiers like Garibaldi, who wrote "one of the most memorable autobiographies of nineteenth-century Italian literature," and two, one imagines, forgettable novels.

The thoroughness of the *Dictionary* is further evidenced by the inclusion of many writers usually designated by literary historians as "minori" like Baretta, Beniveni, Bonagiunta da Lucca, Camillo Boito (Arrigo's brother) and Borsieri, to limit oneself to the letter "B." There are also entries on the major metric forms, poetic genres, literary movements and cultural periods, as well as a timetable of cultural events in Italy and the Western world from the twelfth century to 1978 and a useful list of basic reference and bibliographical sources. An index allows one to look up writers who don't have articles of their own but are dealt with elsewhere in the *Dictionary*: Camerana, Dossi, and Rovana are all found under Scapigliatura, for example. The references in the index to a major author, one hundred and three in the case of Dante, amount to a veritable compendium of critical reaction through the centuries. Also, since literary reviews do not have separate entries (a major shortcoming to my mind) the index allows one to find out about the role played by famous periodicals such as *Il Caffè*, *Lacerba*, *La Voce*, *Il Politecnico*, and others in the cultural life of Italy.

Unfortunately, the *Dictionary* cannot be called a major reference work, and it does not make an outstanding contribution to Italian studies in the English language. Although it was not the principal aim of the editors to produce a dictionary for scholars and specialists, this one, I believe, had the potential to become much more valuable both to the educated public and to the specialist. To achieve this the editors should have followed the same editorial policies and have exercised the same editorial control as that which produced a really outstanding reference book, the *Dictionary of Irish Literature*, published in 1979 by the same press.

The Italian dictionary has two editors and thirty-five contributors, all from North American institutions, while the Irish one has an editor-in-chief (Robert Hogan), five advisory or associate editors and sixty-six

contributors from both sides of the Atlantic. Although about half the contributors in the Italian dictionary are among the best scholars on the continent, the number of contributors is too small to do full justice to one of the world's major literatures. Moreover, even the articles on major writers are limited to about six or seven pages, thus making a rigorous study of these authors impossible. In the *Irish Dictionary*, on the other hand, writers such as Joyce, Yeats and Shaw are given an average of nineteen pages. These two restrictions, in the number of contributors and in the length of articles, can only produce an unevenness in the critical quality of the signed articles.

Nonetheless, some of the articles are indeed very good, or even excellent. I would point out, among others, the one on Leopardi, by Nicolas J. Perella, in which the poet's philosophy is rightly discussed at some length; the one on Montale, by Glauco Cambon, in which the two seminal works of modern Italian poetry, *Ossi di seppie* (1925) and Ungaretti's *Il porto sepolto* (1916) are interestingly compared and contrasted; and the one on Morante, by Joy Hambuechen Potter, in which the interest of *La Storia* is said to reside in the "passionate ideology" of the author because the overall literary worth of the novel is "minimal." The articles on Croce and Machiavelli, by Ernesto G. Caserta and Fredi Chiappelli respectively, are also good. In the case of Machiavelli, however, we can see how a lack of editorial control can produce an unbalanced article. Surely an article on Machiavelli in a "literary" dictionary should devote more than a paragraph to his literary works and say more about *La Mandragola*'s style than simply "incisive." Chiappelli is certainly well qualified to do so since in the bibliography he cites three of his own books on Machiavelli's style and language. Insufficient attention to problems of style is also evident in such otherwise competent articles as those on major writers like Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio, written by Musa, Bernardo and Scaglione respectively. Since these writers expressed their personal visions through a conscious and original exploitation of the possibilities of the Italian language, it is precisely because of their stylistic accomplishments, that they are among the first great European writers. Tibor Wlassic's article on Campanella is also competent, but it fails to bring into focus the dominant tone of Campanella's lyrics. The article on Federico Della Valle (ca. 1560-ca.1628) amounts to little more than critical synopses of his plays. Finally, the articles on the Baroque and the Enlightenment could have been critical rather than preponderantly historical.

The two editors are responsible for all the unsigned articles, and the limited number of contributors has forced them to tackle certain writers who required a more extensive treatment than they could provide. Again, a critical unevenness was inevitable. They have done a competent job, for example, in introducing Tozzi and Gadda to the English speaking world, but the untangling of the complex linguistic web of the latter requires more than two pages. The same goes for the article on Campana. Is it enough to say, for instance, that the *Canti orfici* is "a collection of lyrics that are often fragmentary, nihilistic, and intensely personal. At their best they achieve a lucidity of imagery and color and an emotional power unsurpassed among his contemporaries"? The articles on Pavese and Pasolini are indeed good but the one on Rea contains hardly any critical discussion; in comparison, Bernardo Tasso gets a lengthy treatment. Gozzi's "theatre of fantasy and imagination" could perhaps have been elucidated more

fully and Di Giacomo's pervasive and immediate lyricism brought into sharper focus. Not enough is said about the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphily* (1499), a work of enormous influence. Nor can half a page do justice to Landolfi's originality and importance. The article on Cecchi could also have been handled better: surely his view of literature could have been extracted from his practical criticism. The article on Casanova repeats all the clichés and banalities about his life found in previous dictionaries. Finally, in saying that De Amicis' *Cuore* exhibits an "overtly bourgeois ideology" and "often a philistine sentimentality" the editors seem to be guilty of a certain Marxist critical overkill. Perhaps a little more *storicismo* would have been in order.

All in all, the *Dictionary* seems to show a bias for Medieval and Renaissance literature, a bias which may have caused the inexplicable exclusion of such modern writers as Onofri, Bòine, Ojetti, Malerba and Arbasino. To be sure, the *Dictionary* is not indifferent to the contemporary literary scene. Structuralism is duly noted, and there is an article on Eco. Some avantgarde writers like Sanguineti (although there is no article for Il Gruppo 63) are also treated. It would seem to me, however, that the inclusion of younger writers who have proven themselves would have produced more of a "living" *Dictionary of Italian Literature*. I would have liked to see something on Stefano D'Arrigo, whose *Orcynus Orca* was published in 1975. Whatever its ultimate esthetic worth, it was hailed as one of the more fascinatingly complex and linguistically inventive narrative works of recent years. The *Dictionary of Irish Literature*, on the other hand, includes authors who have been favourably received by the literary press, although they may have had only a couple of works published. This gives the Irish dictionary a firm grasp of today's Irish literary scene. The second general shortcoming of the *Dictionary*, (critical unevenness being the first,) is the lack of an editorial policy or control regarding the bibliographical apparatus at the end of each article. If the *Dictionary* were to be a serious reference work, the bibliographies would have had to list: 1) the bibliographies and other reference works on a particular author or subject, 2) the best textual and/or critical edition(s) of an author's work(s) and, 3) a selection of the best secondary material on the subject or author. Oddly, the bibliographies on Dante and Boccaccio do not mention Petrocchi's edition of the *Comedy* or Branca's of the *Decameron*, while the major English translations of both works are noted. There is no mention of an edition of Bruno's *Il Candelaio* or of Bontempelli's dramas. There is no primary bibliography on Manzoni or on Petrarch and only one study in Italian (by U. Bosco) on the latter, while the best studies in English are noted. No work on Machiavelli as a dramatist is cited, nor is any on Alfieri's or Goldoni's dramatic esthetic mentioned. For a minor writer like Baretti, on the other hand, the bibliography is quite complete; practically all the Italian editions of his works are cited.

In contrast, the *Dictionary of Irish Literature* mentions, as far as possible, all the works of an author with a selection of most, if not all, of the studies that count. For Yeats the bibliography alone runs to four pages in small print. In fact the editor can rightly boast that this dictionary represents the most complete and up to date bibliographical tool on the subject. The accent on English translation and on English critical works in the *Dictionary of Italian Literature* is understandable, but the lack of a consistent bibliographical policy can only detract from its overall value. (Another

shortcoming, which I mention only in passing, is the lack of a systematic treatment of "Italian" literature in dialect.) The above criticisms are made in the hope that a second edition will correct what seem to me serious weaknesses so that the *Dictionary* can become an outstanding reference work in English of Italian literature.

FRANK DI TROLIO

Morisset Library

University of Ottawa

ZBIGNIEW FOLEJEWSKI. *Futurism and its Place in the Development of Modern Poetry*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1980. Pp.288.

Futurism lends itself well to comparative analysis. Yet to date few have attempted to study in a single volume the literary aspect of this movement as it manifested itself throughout Europe, the Slavic countries, and South America. Folejewski's work attempts to do exactly this. More precisely, his study seeks primarily to "draw an outline of the development of this movement as it arose and operated in the various local brands of the Avant-Garde" (p.119). The work is aimed at a reading public which has already a working knowledge of the basic principles and practices of futurist poets.

The work is divided into two large Parts: "The Comparative Study" or "Discussion," and the "Selection of Futurist Poetry" which is the longer of the two. Part I, the subject of this review, comprises eight chapters. In the first chapter Folejewski brings into light the paradoxical nature of the movement and the temper of the times in which it was couched: "There is some justification in the claims of Soviet literary criticism that Futurism was doomed at its inception since its socio-philosophical motors were those of anarchism. . . . But whether the element of 'anarchy' in Futurism is only a matter of just another manifestation of 'bourgeois decadence' as many Soviet critics claim, is an open question" (pp.8-9). The writer points out that both in Italy and Russia the Futurists were initially a group of considerable popularity. Later the condemnation of the movement by the ruling class in both countries testified to the "disturbing ability on the part of Futurism to constantly create controversy and stir up emotions" (p.10).

The second chapter deals with the emergence of Futurism, the artistic and personal temperament of Marinetti, and the early manifestoes. The writer puts forth his personal opinion concerning the origins of the movement and the essential import of the manifestoes. However, for the most part his views conform to the views and theories of other respected critics of Futurism. Folejewski brings into sharp focus the innovative and creative abilities of Marinetti calling attention to his "truly 'American' talent for publicity" as well as his "sincere understanding and appreciation of art and true artists" (p.21). What we have in this chapter is a three-dimensional portrayal of Marinetti the innovator, the theorist, the artist. As far as Marinetti the artist is concerned, he is best represented in his *Zang-Tumb-Tuum* which is "probably the best compendium of the central theoretical issues and at the same time it is an excellent 'clinical'