pleasure to read, though it hardly gives us an inkling of Petrarch's masterful adaptation of Ciceronian style. In the twenty-three pages of commentary plus nine pages of notes that follow the Latin text and facing page Italian translation, Maura Formica and Michael Jakob deal with the much debated question of truth versus fiction in the interpretation of *Familiarium rerum libri IV, 1*. After reviewing the different critical stances from Carducci ("Petrarca alpinista") and Burckhardt ("scoperta del paesaggio," "primo uomo moderno") to the more recent and varied exegetical theses about the letter as Augustinian "conversio," and as "allegoria della vita umana" (Courcelle, Billanovich, Martinelli), Formica and Jakob launch an extensive and convincing discussion of why this brief letter deserves so much critical attention (33). Starting from the philological proofs given by Billanovich that Petrarch didn't start planning his literary epistolary until 1345 and that, therefore, the date Petrarch gives to his letter, 26 April 1336, is an "adjusted," fictional one for the real date of composition that critics now agree to be 1353 (39), the two authors of the commentary show how there are various other elements of the letter whose veracity could and should be questioned. These include the "chance" opening of Augustine's *Confessions* to the significant passage, the identity of Petrarch's interlocutor(s), the ascent of a real Mt. Ventoux, and both the exteriority and the interiority of the view. In discussing the various contemporary critical viewpoints on veracity, allegory, and conversion in the Ventoso letter that this speculation provokes, we are grateful to Formica and Jakob for taking into account, in addition to Italian critics, both the German (Kabitz, Groh, Stierle, et al.) and the American (Durling, Robbins, O'Connell, et al.) schools. One need only peruse the six pages of Bibliography (69-75) to be convinced of the breadth of preparation with which the commentary was prepared.

Scholars, students and general readers alike will all find this edition of Petrarch's "Ventoso Letter," *Familiarium rerum libri IV, 1*, pleasing in format and affordability, as well as reliable for the Latin text, the Italian translation, and the commentary. They have achieved their goal of positioning this quintessential Petrarchan text in all of its "straordinaria novità" (56).

DENNIS MCAULIFFE

University of Toronto

Alberto Casadei. *La fine degli incanti: vicende del poema epico-cavalleresco nel Rinascimento*. Milano: Franco Angeli, 1997. Pp. 190.

The present volume is a collection of previously published and unpublished work on the evolution of chivalric literature during the Renaissance. As the author explains in the preface (7), the essays treat divergent topics but are unified by a common attention to philological problems and by the importance given to the cultural context within which the chivalric epic/romance developed. In the introduction (9-21), Casadei situates his collection within current scholarship in the field, placing particular emphasis on historical studies devoted to courtly culture and to the book market and on the relatively recent use of the methods of Anglo-American bibliography in the philological study of Italian texts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Drawing on this scholarship and on his

own research, Casadei proposes a reconsideration of several important aspects of the genre.

The collection is divided into two parts. The four essays collected in the first part examine and redefine the successive phases in the development of the chivalric tradition in the Cinquecento. In "Riusi (e rifiuti) del modello dell'Innamorato tra il 1520 e il 1530" (25-44), the author takes issue with the standard accounts of the history of chivalric literature, which claim that in the first two decades of the sixteenth century the genre entered a crisis that was poorly handled by Niccolò degli Agostini and the other *continuatori* of Boiardo but brilliantly resolved by Ariosto. On the basis of a close reading of chivalric romances written and published at the time, Casadei argues that the *Innamorato* was the primary model for these texts until about 1521; that the "moda boiardesca", although in competition with the "moda ariostesca", remained popular between 1521 and 1532; and that it was only after the appearance of the third and definitive *Furioso* in 1532, followed in short order by a marked shift from a "moda ariostesca" to the "modello ariostesco", that Boiardo ceased to be a significant influence on the chivalric literature.

Casadei extends his revisionary reading in a previously unpublished essay, "Il 'Rinaldo' e il genere cavalleresco alla metà del Cinquecento" (45-60). Here he contends that Tasso's early work, published in 1562, distinguishes itself from contemporary works such as his father's *Amadigi* and Danese Cattaneo's *Amor di Marfisa* – both tied in fundamental ways to the *Furioso*, still the dominant model – by moving away from Ariosto's poem and enacting a recovery of the old romances predating it. This recovery consists in a highly stylised use of "tutto il bagaglio tecnico-retorico e situazionale del genere cavalleresco" (47), since Tasso's purpose was to reduce "la funzione modellizzante del poema ariostesco" (50). The *Rinaldo*, therefore, represents a crucial passage in Tasso's poetic development. It is also "una chiusura di conti" (58), in that the poet's manipulation of the old romances, which Casadei considers "un esercizio ormai *alla maniera del romanzo antico pre-ariostesco*" (17), constitutes their final demise.

In the next two essays, the history of the genre is approached from a different perspective. In "I poeti, i cavalieri, le macchine, gli spazi: scienza e tecnica in Ariosto e Tasso" (61-74), the author examines the representation of contemporary scientific and technological advances by the two poets, paying specific attention to weapons, war machines, and cosmography. The *Furioso* mentions gunpowder weapons – i.e., Ariosto's famous invective against the *archibugio* in *Furioso* XI, 21-28 – but they are not described in great detail, their function being largely to elicit Ariosto's lament on the effects of modern warfare and the decline of chivalric values. In the *Liberata*, however, modern technology has entered "a pieno diritto nell'immaginario del poema, tanto da costituire il nuovo 'meraviglioso' al posto delle armi fatate della tradizione cavalleresca" (65); accordingly, Tasso's descriptions of war machines are highly detailed and exceptionally accurate. Differences are also evident in the two poets' treatment of the discovery of the New World. While both treat the event positively, their representation of geographic space is fundamentally different: "mentre la grande varietà di luoghi descritti nel *Furioso* presuppone ancora una concezione tolemaica dell'universo, il 'picciolo mondo' rappresentato nella *Liberata* costituisce una sorta di microcosmo volutamente ricostruito dopo che quella concezione si è deteriorata" (70). Casadei considers these different responses to *il nuovo* as essential to the evolution of the *poema cavalleresco* and *eroico*, and he extends his analysis to the *poema mitologico*. The essay "Il telescopio, 'ammirabile stromento': variazioni su 'Adone', X.39-47" (75-83), which ap-

appears here for the first time, is a reading of the celebrated passage that Marino dedicates to Galileo's invention. Here, Casadei elaborates on the poet's attempt, by means of the metaphoric value of the telescope, to absorb the new science into a conception of knowledge that is still primarily humanistic and literary. The author's overarching argument in these two essays is that the modes of representing reality imposed on chivalric literature by the new scientific culture were radically different from those it traditionally employed: it was by nature unable to sustain a scientific view of the world, and the inevitable result was "la fine degli incanti" and the eventual transformation of the romance into the novel.

The second part of the volume collects pieces of philological and bibliographical interest. The first of these, "Le ottave di Ariosto 'Per la storia d'Italia'" (87-112), is in effect the introduction to the second appendix, "Stanze 'Per la Storia d'Italia': testo critico e commento" (153-83), a critical edition of 84 stanzas that Ariosto wrote for the *Furioso* but eventually rejected. After a detailed account of the publishing history of these stanzas and a convincing reconstruction of their textual transmission, Casadei sets out the philological criteria for his edition, which includes copious linguistic and historical notes. In addition to the light he throws on the history of Ariosto's posthumous works, Casadei offers a wealth of useful information on the Venetian printing industry during the 1540s, to which he adds in the next essay, "Sulle prime edizioni a stampa delle 'Rime' ariostesche" (113-23). Here, he uses typographical evidence garnered from his examination of extant copies of the 1546 Venetian edition of Ariosto's *Rime*, published by Jacopo Coppa but lacking a printer's name, to propose an attribution to the printers Giovanni Antonio and Pietro dei Nicolini da Sabbio. Bibliographical evidence is also used to examine a hitherto unresolved problem: the three extant copies of the 1547 edition of the same work, also financed by Coppa, present variant colophons: two indicate that the book was printed in Venice on May 20, 1547, the other instead gives Florence as the place of printing and June 6 as the date. Casadei shows that this represents a case of separate issue: the entire edition was printed in Venice, but the colophon was changed in a number of copies, perhaps to facilitate their entry and sale in Florence. The second part is rounded off with a brief note, "Il privilegio dei 'Cinque canti'" (124-26), consisting of a transcription of the privilege granted in 1544 by the Venetian Senate to Paolo Manuzio for the publication of the Cinque Canti and other texts by Ariosto, and a brief consideration of the significance of this document for the complex question of the poet's posthumous editions.

The first appendix includes two review articles, reprinted and updated here to illustrate current critical trends in the field. In "Recenti studi di filologia dei testi a stampa" (129-38), the author traces the contributions made by Anglo-American bibliography since the early 1980s, concentrating on the more significant works, specifically Conor Fahy's *Saggi di bibliografia testuale* (Padova: Antenore, 1988) and *L'Orlando Furioso del 1532. Profilo di una edizione* (Milano, Vita e Pensiero, 1989); Neil Harris's *Bibliografia dell'Orlando Innamorato* (Modena: Panini, 2 volumes, 1988 and 1991); and Paolo Trovato's *Con ogni diligenza corretto. La stampa e le revisioni editoriali dei testi letterari italiani (1470-1570)* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1991). In each case, Casadei summarises the work and discusses its significance for Italianists in general and Italian philologists in particular. His final assessment is a positive one: "gli attuali studi bibliologici costituiranno una premessa indispensabile sia per l'edizione critica di numerosi testi (soprattutto cinquecenteschi), sia per la piena comprensione delle linee secondo cui si sviluppò la letteratura nell'epoca della tipografia" (138). He provides a

similar survey in "Panorama di studi ariosteschi" (139-48), which evaluates developments in Ariosto criticism by examining works considered to be emblematic of significant critical trends and methodologies: Marina Beer's *Romanzi di cavalleria: Il 'Furioso' e il romanzo italiano del primo Cinque-cento* (Roma, Bulzoni, 1987), representative of the research on chivalric literature sponsored by the Istituto di Studi Rinascimenti in Ferrara; Albert Ascoli's *Ariosto's Bitter Harmony. Crisis and Evasion in the Italian Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987), an important example of the North American hermeneutic approach; Mario Santoro's *Ariosto e il Rinascimento* (Napoli: Liguori, 1989), emblematic of post-Crocean criticism interested in the cultural implications of the *Furioso*; and Sergio Zatti's *Il 'Furioso' fra epos e romanzo*, (Lucca: Pacini Fazzi, 1990), which shows the influence of the psychoanalytic theories of Francesco Orlando. The two review essays constitute a useful orientation in the vast field of Ariosto studies. The first appendix includes a brief but significant note, "Il 'Pro bono malum' ariostesco e la Bibbia" (149-51), in which Casadei proposes several Biblical passages as possible sources for the motto, expressive of the theme of human ingratitude, found in the first editions of the *Furioso*.

The essays are all exhaustively annotated, and those which were previously published have been edited and updated. The volume contains a useful index of names.

The author made previous contributions to Ariosto studies in his monographs *La strategia delle varianti: Le correzioni storiche del terzo "Furioso"* (Lucca: Pacini Fazzi, 1988), and *Il percorso del "Furioso": Ricerche intorno alle redazioni del 1516 e del 1521* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1993). This latest volume retains a strong focus on Ariosto, but the scope has been widened considerably. Although it is inevitable that a collection of articles written at different times lack some unity, the volume succeeds in presenting a clear view of questions central to the history of chivalric literature in the Renaissance. Furthermore, in dealing with the variety of issues examined here, Casadei has drawn expertly from a wide range of scholarly work, and he has shown himself to be sensitive to the possibilities offered by methodologies not traditionally applied to chivalric texts. In consequence, the volume also serves as a valuable illustration of the current state of scholarship in the field and of promising directions for future research.

ANTONIO RICCI

University of Toronto

Ezio Bolis. *L'uomo tra peccato, grazia e libertà nell'opera di Paolo Segneri SJ (1624-1694). Emblema di un approccio "pratico-morale" alla teologia*. Roma: Pontificio Seminario Lombardo; Milano: Glossa, 1996 (Dissertatio, Series Romana - 13). Pp. xvii, 255.

Uno dei luoghi comuni nella bibliografia critica segneriana degli ultimi trent'anni è la mancanza di studi sull'illustre gesuita, sia che si pensi a singoli aspetti della sua opera, ignorati o trascurati per il passato, sia che si alluda all'assenza di un lavoro organico e aggiornato. Data per buona una simile premessa, rinnovata puntualmente da don Bolis (5, 7), sarebbe facile dedurre che ogni saggio su Segneri debba diventare per forza di cose il benvenuto, presso quanti si occupano di questo argomento e, in