Book Reviews/Comptes Rendus

Robert J. Rodini and Salvatore Di Maria. *Ludovico Ariosto: An Annotated Bibliography of Criticism, 1956-1980*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984. Pp. xii, 270. \$32.00.

Rodini and Di Maria have performed a vital service for Ariosto scholarship and for Renaissance studies. To Fatini's *Bibliografia della critica ariostea, 1510-1956* with its 3,624 items, they have added 928 new ones – sufficient evidence of the need for their labours and of a resurgence of scholarly interest in Ariosto over the past twenty-five years. Moreover, they have provided the comprehensive bibliography deserved by an author of international stature. Items abound concerning Ariosto's influence on literatures besides Italian. Comparatists and Spenserians will be among Renaissance scholars aided the most by this volume, which will play a major role, not only in shaping future Ariosto criticism, but in bringing Ariosto into the centre of Renaissance studies side by side with Castiglione and Machiavelli. Thanks to Rodini and Di Maria, students of Renaissance culture can approach Ariosto with greater confidence than ever before, the crucial scholarship of the past quarter of a century scrupulously recorded and described in this volume.

I have not been able to catch the authors in a single noteworthy omission, nor can I take very much issue with their annotations. Instead, I was humbled as I discovered on page after page items with which I was unfamiliar, and I found myself wishing that this bibliography had been available much sooner. For the most part, the annotations give accurate and interesting accounts of the criticism. If the authors err at all, it is in the direction of over-cautiousness now and then about committing themselves to an interpretation of their items. One would, for instance, have expected a greater stress on the *fede* theme in the annotations to Saccone's essays. However, as one reads on from item to item in this readable bibliography, one cannot help but be impressed with the restraint, generosity, and tolerance of the authors. They have waded through some thick morasses to bring us to time and again the nourishing tidbit, and we can only be grateful. Let us hope that Rodini and Di Maria are diligently at work on the 1981-1990 supplement.

PETER DES WIGGINS, *College of William and Mary*