liographers to include textual analysis in their research. Carlo Maria Simonetti’s article on publishing consortia in Venice in the second half of the Cinquecento is based on both bibliographical and archival sources. Neil Harris’ magisterial study of the running-titles in the 1532 edition of the Orlando Furioso reconstructs the process by which the last version of the epic was printed in Ferrara under the personal supervision of Ariosto. Harris builds on earlier work by Fahy and Santorre Debenedetti, and he provides an authoritative example of the results achieved when Italian and Anglo-American methods are integrated.

Italianists will be interested in Marco Villoresi’s study of the library of Michelangelo di Cristofano da Volterra, a fifteenth-century canterino, and in Enzo Bottasso’s article on the 1521 edition of Giovan Giorgio Alione’s Opera Jocunda. Andrea Cuna’s study of the early development of Greek type in Italy will be useful to incunabulists, while print historians will appreciate Giuseppina Zappella’s article on imposition in Naples in the Seicento. The complex question of textual transmission in opera libretti is broached by Giovanna Gronda, who examines the specific cases of Rinuccini’s La Dafne and Da Ponte’s Così fan tutte. Scholars carrying out research on Cinquecento books should be aware of the problems faced in cataloguing Italy’s vast collections, and a pertinent introduction is offered by Rosaria Campioni’s article on Fahy’s influence on the Censimento delle edizioni italiane del XI-XII secolo. The exhaustive list prepared by Harris of Fahy’s publications in the period 1955-1998 is a convenient finding aid.

This collection is a necessary and invaluable resource for scholars working on various aspects of the Italian Renaissance, particularly specialists in philology and textual criticism, literary studies, book history and material culture.

ANTONIO RICCI
The Medici Archive Project, Florence and New York


Reflexivity contains thirteen essays that could be organized into four general historical and/or methodological areas. The first area is composed of three essays on poetics in modern Italian literatures and the second area comprises two essays on the Italian cinema and visual arts. The third area includes three essays about Italian writers in Renaissance England, while a fourth more eclectic group includes articles on Italian politics, linguistics, and an article on bibliographical matters in Italian studies. These four groups are not divided by type in Reflexivity, but when read as essays in dialogue with one another within their respective areas of inquiry or beyond them to other areas represented in the volume the collection emerges as a provocative cross-section of a particular Italian Studies
Department's current work. But are anthologies composed exclusively of the writings of a single academic department representative (by way of a metonymic figuration) of the status of a discipline? This is a matter that assumes different values when an anthology is read as representative of the oscillations taking place within related fields of research. But how does one review such a book: as a collection of individual essays, or through the analysis of the idea of the "anthology" itself? The following review explores each approach and the possible relationships between them.

It is at the level of the individual essay that the metonymic model I have suggested becomes tenuous and, perhaps as a result, even more compelling; it is from the fault lines of an attempt to read the volume as paradigmatic that the problems offered by Reflexivity's more interesting essays shine forth.

The first area of inquiry, as mentioned earlier, falls under the rubric of modern poetics. As such this group constitutes one of the strongest veins of inter- and intra-cultural investigation in the collection. The essays that figure in this group are Emanuela Tandello's "Giacomo Noventa, Heine and the Language of Poetry," Prue Shaw's "The Intentional Fallacy and Benedetto Croce," and Anna Laura Lepschy's "Pirandello's Verga." The respective merits of these three essays might be organized around a single figure: the monumental problems presented to the Italian studies scholar by the work of Benedetto Croce. Shaw's essay is the most intensive of the three in its reading of Croce, and it delineates (as the others do on a smaller scale) the continuous debate over Croce's influence on the study of modern Italian culture. Shaw's essay should have been written in the mid-twentieth century for English readers, as it would have perhaps saved Croce's reputation among American literary critics who, rather than reading Croce in Italian relied upon secondary scholarship by W.K. Wimsatt that misrepresented and decontextualized Croce's ideas on authorship. Whereas Shaw's essay presents Croce as an international figure, Emanuela Tandello's essay on Giacomo Noventa presents Croce in a national context as the target of Noventa's anti-hermetic critique of modernist poetry, thereby transforming Croce into the iconic theoretician of modern aesthetics with which the politically conscious Italian writer must contend. Croce appears once again in a series of paragraphs dedicated to his influence on Pirandello's reading of Verga in Anna Laura Lepschy's article, as a critic of dialectical literature and a proponent of a historical rather than a formalist understanding of certain modern literary movements.

These three essays are relevant to contemporary discussions of the ancillary role played by intellectuals in shaping national and international discussions of modernity in relation to literary production. One has only to turn to Gramsci's extensive writings on Croce to appreciate the formidable theoretical problems Croce presented to the historical understanding of the work of art in contemporary culture and how this understanding betrays broader cultural formations; these questions are treated carefully in both their Italian context (in Tandello and Lepschy) and for their consequences in American literary history (in Shaw). These essays stand are all the more interesting when read in relation to our particular moment in Italian political and cultural history, in which two post-Cold War polit-
ical regimes are engaged in a struggle for power through their definitions and reforms of education and culture, just as the educational reforms that were instituted by Croce while he was Minister of Education (under Giolitti) were swept away by Gentile only two years later (when Gentile was appointed Minister of Education by Mussolini).

The second cluster of essays might also be read in terms of its relation to the present. This cluster concerns the cinema and the visual arts, and includes two articles dedicated respectively to each: John Foot’s “la gente e il buon costume”: Luchino Visconti’s Rocco e i suoi Fratelli. Censorship and the Left in Italy” and Robert Lumley’s “American Influences in the Visual Arts in Italy in the 1960’s.” Although this second grouping of essays is perhaps the most meager in quantity, it raises similar questions as those raised by the shared concern with Croce in the previous three articles, and in particular might be read as treatments of how the Italian visual arts and the Italian cinema stand in contrast to one another and in relation to a conception of the work of art as a metonym of the cultural life of the Italian nation-state beyond its own borders: the modern Italian visual arts enjoy a somewhat provincial recognition in twentieth century Italian culture, while the Italian cinema is universally recognized (and how rarely does that occur any longer?) as one of the most influential national cinematic institutions of the last one-hundred years. John Foot’s article on Visconti is especially concise on this matter, using as it does a case history of Visconti’s film to point out contradictory critical tendencies in the Italian political Left’s reception of the film that in turn orients the essay as a study of the paramount importance of class relations in the history of the Italian cinema and the intellectual’s sometimes problematic relation to those class formations.

The third area of research presented in the volume, when regarded as a series of dispersed essays on seemingly unrelated subjects, might be regarded also as the most eclectic, but this eclecticmism reveals multivalent relations to the present moment in Italian Studies that are enacted throughout the book, and as such are one of the anthology’s merits. This final group includes articles on Italian politics, linguistics, Italian intellectuals in Elizabethan England, and an article on bibliographical matters in Italian studies. A secondary cluster might be discerned within this eclectic group consisting of essays on Italian writers in England: “Giovanni Aquilecchia’s “Another Aspect of Bruno’s ‘Poetics’: the Conception of the ‘Poetic Impresa,’” John Took’s “Cino de Pistoia and the Poetics of Sweet Subversion,” and Dilwyn Knox’s “An Arm and a Leg: Giordano Bruno and Alessandro Cioletti in Elizabethan London.” Although they are not all in dialogue across common problems such as literary poetics or the cultural inflections of the visual icon and moving image, these essays nonetheless depict the dynamic pluralism of our present moment in Italian studies as seen through a particular department’s workings.

And so we must return to the question that frames this review: are such anthologies representative, by way of a metonymic figuration, of the status of a discipline? Of the thirteen essays presented in this collection, twelve are written in English and one is written in Italian. This obvious point indicates a pair of organizing principles in this collection of essays. The first principle pertains to
how the imbalance of languages I have noted provides a window of inquiry into the workings of scholars concerned with theorizing certain patterns of intellectual exchange between canons, between writers, and between cultures and doing so, predominantly in English, under the aegis of an Italian publisher. And because the majority of the essays in the volume are concerned with the dialogue of ideas enacted across the intellectual formations of various English speaking nations and the formations of Italian intellectual and cultural history, these exchanges are historically double-voiced, presenting both our own increased speed of access to archives, art and culture and also the seldom-acknowledged differences in such rhythms of exchange during other eras. Whether this dual voicing is implicit or explicit in the volume, I leave to the discretion of its readers.

And yet this curious problem of the ratio between languages and the cultures in contention is the locus of Reflexivity's second organizing principle. The second principle is a result of the book's presentation of a cross-section of the current writings of a Department of Italian Studies (that of University College London) and as a result the book enacts its work at a focused, institutional level. In this sense, the book is singular and portrays a strong image of the diversity of intellectual interests in a single department. This singularity is complicated in the relationship between the organizing principles of the volume - the linguistic and the institutional - that in turn suggest how the essayistic anthology, as an idea and a genre, is both unique and paradigmatic.

The institutional specificity of Reflexivity offers more to consider in this respect than do most anthologies and the collection succeeds where other anthologies of essays on Italian culture have failed. Interestingly enough, the very anthology I had in mind as the example of a failure of disciplinary eclecticism - David Forgac and Robert Lumley's Italian Cultural Studies: An Introduction (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. Pp. 368) is relevant in this case as it pertains to the differing strengths and weaknesses that inflect the idea of the “anthology,” for Dr. Robert Lumley is a member of the department that is the locus of Reflexivity's work as well as an editor of the earlier book to which I refer. Whether or not an anthology is strengthened or weakened according to an anthology's exclusive institutional affiliation (as is the case in this book) forces a dual representation: what ideas are represented in the essays, and what is represented by the anthology? And how might the two overlap?

Henry Veggian
University of Pittsburgh