Antonio Gramsci
PRISON NOTEBOOKS

VOLUME II

Edited and translated by
Joseph A. Buttigieg

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS NEW YORK

European Perspectives
A Series in Social Thought and Cultural Criticism

Lawrence D. Kritzman, Editor

European Perspectives presents English translations of books by leading European thinkers. With both classic and outstanding contemporary works, the series aims to shape the major intellectual controversies of our day and to facilitate the tasks of historical understanding.

Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*
Theodor W. Adorno, *Notes to Literature*, vols. 1 and 2
Richard Wolin, editor, *The Heidegger Controversy*
Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, vol. 1
Jacques LeGoff, *History and Memory*
Alain Finkielkraut, *Remembering in Vain: The Klaus Barbie Trial and Crimes Against Humanity*
Julia Kristeva, *Nations Without Nationalism*
Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*
Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Assassins of Memory: Essays on the Denial of the Holocaust*
Hugo Ball, *Critique of the German Intelligentsia*
Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?*
Karl Heinz Bohrer, *Suddenness: On the Moment of Aesthetic Appearance*
Alain Finkielkraut, *The Defeat of the Mind*
Elisabeth Badinter, *XY: On Masculine Identity*
Karl Löwith, *Martin Heidegger and European Nihilism*
Gilles Deleuze, *Negotiations, 1972–1990*
Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *The Jews: History, Memory, and the Present*

Antonio Gramsci
PRISON NOTEBOOKS

VOLUME II

Edited and translated by
Joseph A. Buttigieg

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS NEW YORK

The *Quaderni del carcere* of Antonio Gramsci were kept by Raffaele Mattioli in the vaults of the Banca Commerciale Italiana from July 6, 1937, after Gramsci's death that spring, until they were safely transported abroad a year later. Known and respected by Gramsci, Mattioli was chief executive officer of the Banca Commerciale Italiana from 1933 to 1960, when he became chairman of the board until his retirement in 1972. Columbia University Press is grateful to the Banca Commerciale Italiana for its gift in support of the costs of publishing the *Quaderni del carcere* in English.

Columbia University Press
New York Chichester, West Sussex
Copyright © 1975 Giulio Einaudi Editore, S.p.a., Torino, Seconda edizione.

Translation copyright © 1996 Columbia University Press
All rights reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Gramsci, Antonio, 1891–1937.
[Quaderni del carcere. English]
Prison notebooks / Antonio Gramsci.
p. cm.—(European perspectives)
Translation of: Quaderni del carcere.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0–231–06082–3 (v. 1)
ISBN 0–231–10592–4 (v. 2)
I. Title II. Series.
DG575.G69A5 1991
335.43'092—dc20
[B]
91–22910
CIP

Casebound editions of Columbia University Press books are printed on permanent and durable acid-free paper.

Printed in the United States of America
c 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

In memory of
Tatiana Schucht
and for
Valentino Gerratana
—they helped preserve Gramsci's legacy

CONTENTS

Preface ix

Prison Notebooks

Notebook 3 (1930) 3
Notebook 4 (1930–1932) 135
Notebook 5 (1930–1932) 265

Notes

Notebook 3: Description of the Manuscript 405
Notes to the Text 407
Notebook 4: Description of the Manuscript 523
Notes to the Text 527
Notebook 5: Description of the Manuscript 615
Notes to the Text 617

Sequence of Notes by Title or Opening Phrase 707
Name Index 719

PREFACE

The three notebooks included in this volume of Antonio Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* were all started in 1930, either immediately or soon after the completion of the "First Notebook." This was a period of intense activity for Gramsci who, in spite of the great physical and emotional stress he was under, had practically transformed his prison cell at Turi di Bari into an intellectual workshop: in addition to writing down his reflections on various topics and taking notes from the back issues of periodicals that he had been receiving since his imprisonment in Milan, he was also translating a small anthology of writings by Karl Marx from German into Italian.

In several respects, the general contents of Notebooks 3 and 5 as well as the manner in which they were composed resemble those of the first two notebooks. As in the case of Notebook 2, a large number of entries in both of these notebooks, but especially in Notebook 5, consist of information (in many instances accompanied by Gramsci's own critical observations) extracted from articles in the periodicals that Gramsci was reviewing systematically before consigning them to his brother Carlo or to his sister-in-law Tatiana Schucht. Most of the other diverse notes touch directly or indirectly on the topics listed on the opening page of the "First Notebook" or are thematically related to—and often have titles that are identical to or echo those of—the earlier notes. Although Gramsci did not provide a general title for either of these two notebooks, the rubric "Miscellaneous" that he inscribed at the top of the first page of Notebook 2 would suit them perfectly. Despite the

heterogeneousness of the materials contained in these notebooks, however, certain strands of Gramsci's multidirectional inquiries stand out in sharper relief than others. Especially prominent are the notes that touch on various aspects of the question of the intellectuals, popular culture (above all, literature and journalism), Italian history, Americanism, and the Catholic Church, both as a religious institution and as a formidable politico-ideological force. Affiliated with these main strands are notes on such disparate topics as the Renaissance, the Reformation, language and linguistics, military and diplomatic history, Japanese culture, and Chinese culture and politics, as well as many of the entries that appear under the recurrent heading "Past and present."

The other notebook included in this volume—Notebook 4—represents an important phase in the evolution of Gramsci's project. From the moment he started using this notebook, Gramsci decided to set aside a substantial portion of its pages for two clusters of notes on specific topics. The entire second half of the notebook is devoted to a series entitled "Notes on Philosophy. Materialism and Idealism." (A second and third series of notes on the same topic—which, interestingly, is not among those listed on the opening page of the "First Notebook"—are also grouped under identical general headings in Notebooks 7 and 8, respectively.) Likewise, Gramsci reserved the first twenty pages of this notebook for a distinctive purpose: namely, a set of notes outlining his original contribution to the interpretation of canto 10 of Dante's *Inferno*. (These sections are transposed in the present edition, following Gerratana's precedent. For more on this, see p. 26 of the introduction to volume 1.) The rest of the notebook contains miscellaneous entries, and among these, too, one encounters some especially important segments of text. Particularly noteworthy are the two long consecutive notes entitled "The intellectuals" and "The common school" (49 and 50 in this edition). Gramsci would later take these two notes and a few additional parts of Notebook 4, modify them slightly, and out of them construct the entirety of one of his best-known "special" or thematic notebooks—that is, the relatively short Notebook 12 that he entitled "Notes and Loose Jottings for a Group of Essays on the History of the Intellectuals and of Culture in Italy." (For a more extensive discussion of some of the salient features of Notebook 4, see the introduction to volume 1, especially pp. 27–29.)

The editorial procedures adopted in the preparation and presentation of the text and critical apparatus in this volume are the same as those described in detail in the preface to volume 1. Since the publication of that volume, access to Gramsci's work and thought has been enhanced with the appearance of some new editions. The most important of these is the critical edition in two volumes of the *Letters from Prison* edited by Frank Rosengarten and translated by Raymond Rosenthal (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994). An indispensable companion to the *Prison Notebooks*, this is the most complete edition of Gramsci's prison letters that exists in any language, including Italian; among other things, it includes twenty letters not previously published in any collection of Gramsci's writings. (When quoting passages from Gramsci's letters in the Notes to the Text, I have adopted the translation offered in the Rosengarten edition, except for some rare and minimal modifications.) Portions of Gramsci's notebooks are now available in a thematically organized, annotated anthology, *Further Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, translated and edited by Derek Boothman (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995). The publication of *Pre-Prison Writings*, edited by Richard Bellamy and translated by Virginia Cox (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994) adds significantly to the body of Gramsci's precarceral work available in English. For readers of Italian, valuable material that sheds light on Gramsci's life and work in prison can be found in an edition of letters from Piero Sraffa to Tatiana Schucht that she, in turn, transcribed in her own letters to Gramsci; the volume, edited with an introduction and substantial notes by Valentino Gerratana, is *Lettere a Tania per Gramsci* (Rome: Editori Riuniti, 1991).

The debts of gratitude I have been incurring in the process of preparing this edition of the *Prison Notebooks* continue to mount. From the many friends, colleagues, and Gramsci scholars I named in the previous volume I continue to receive strong encouragement, intelligent advice, and valuable information. To all of them I reiterate my thanks, especially to Valentino Gerratana, Antonio Santucci, and Paul A. Bové, whose generosity has taken many forms; their contributions have been vital to every aspect of this project. I have also benefited from the kindness and practical assistance proferred by individuals whom I have not previously acknowledged, in particular, Derek Boothman, Vittorino Santucci,

Roberto Finelli, Guido Liguori, Benedetto Fontana, and Simonetta Fiori. Walter Adamson kindly read the manuscript and made many suggestions that enabled me to improve my work. I am especially grateful to Frank Rosengarten for his unstinting support, his careful reading of the manuscript, his valuable criticisms, and his friendship. Since the start of this project, I have relied heavily on the sympathetic understanding and professional skills of everyone I encountered at Columbia University Press, especially the president and director, John Moore, the publisher for the humanities, Jennifer Crewe, and the managing editor, Anne McCoy. In the final preparation of the manuscript, Sarah St. Onge's assistance was immensely valuable. The greatest debt of all I owe to J. Anne Montgomery and Peter Paul Buttigieg (who also helped with the compilation of the index of this volume) for the countless ways in which they have enabled me to realize this work.

My work on this project has been made possible, in very large measure, by a generous grant from the National Endowment of the Humanities and by constant support from the Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts at the University of Notre Dame.

Antonio Gramsci

PRISON NOTEBOOKS

VOLUME II

NOTEBOOK 3
1930

§<1>. *The French intellectuals.* In his article "Deux époques littéraires et d'angoisse: 1815–1830 et 1918–1930" in *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* of 12 October 1929,[1] Pierre Mille cites an essay by André Berge, "L'esprit de la littérature moderne," in *Revue des Deux Mondes*,[2] that calls attention to the anxiety[a] of the young generation of French writers: disillusion, malaise, and even despair; they no longer know why they are living, why they are in the world. According to Mille, this mood is similar to the one that engendered romanticism, but with the following difference: that the romantics freed themselves by means of literary effusion, lyricism, "words." (But is this really true? There were also certain events that accompanied romanticism: 1830, 1831, 1848; there was the literary effusion, but it was not the only thing.) Today, however, the young generations no longer believe in literature, lyricism, and verbal effusion, which they abhor; boredom and disgust prevail.

As Mille sees it, what has really changed the world is not so much the war as a social revolution—a "supercapitalism" has been created that, in tacit alliance with the working class and the peasants, crushes the old bourgeoisie. What Mille means is that in France there has been a subsequent development in industry and banking and that the once seemingly dominant and middle and petty bourgeoisie are now in crisis—hence, crisis of the intellectuals. The war and the Russian revolution have accelerated the movement that already existed before August 1914. An economic crisis

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci inserted "malaise" between the lines, directly above "anxiety."

of the middle classes who "n'arrivent même pas à concevoir que vingt-cinq francs ne valent plus que cent sous" and "voudraient que ce soit *comme avant*"; the workers who think: over there, to the east, there is a country where the proletariat is dictator; classes that once were leaders but now lead no more dream about fascist Italy. Mille writes that Emmanuel Berl's call, in *Mort de la pensée bourgeoise*,[3] for writers—who are 90 percent bourgeois—to sympathize with those who want to dispossess them is quite "opportune." It seems to me that some parts of the description are correct and interesting. Old petty bourgeois France is undergoing a very deep crisis, but it is a moral crisis more than an immediate political crisis.

§<2>. *Julien Benda*. His article, "Comment un écrivain sert-il l'universel?" in *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* of 2 November 1929 is a corollary of his book *The Betrayal of the Intellectuals*.[1] He alludes to a recent work, *Esprit und Geist*, by Wechssler, who tries to demonstrate the national character of thought and to explain that the German *Geist* is quite different from the French *Esprit*; he enjoins the Germans not to forget this particularity of their mind, and yet he believes himself to be working for the unity of peoples by virtue of André Gide's notion that the general interest is better served by greater particularity.[2]

Benda recalls the manifesto of fifty-four French writers published in the *Figaro* of 19 July 1919, the "Manifeste du parti de l'Intelligence," which states: "N'est-ce pas en se nationalisant qu'une littérature prend une signification plus universelle, un intérêt plus humainement général?" Benda agrees that the universal is better served by greater particularity. But it is one thing *to be* particular, another thing to *preach* particularism. Herein lies the ambiguity of nationalism, which on the basis of this ambiguity often claims to be the true universalism, the true pacifism. In other words, national is different from nationalist. Goethe was a German "national," Stendhal a French "national," but neither one was a nationalist. An idea is not efficacious unless it is expressed in some way, artistically—that is, in a particular manner. But is a mind particular only in so far as it is national? Nationality is a primary particularity; but a great writer is particularized further among his compatriots, and this latter "particularity" is not the extension of

the former. Renan qua Renan is by no means a *necessary* product of the French spirit; in relation to this spirit, he is an original, arbitrary, *unforeseeable* (as Bergson says) phenomenon. Nevertheless, Renan remains French, just as a human being while yet human remains a mammal; but his value, as in the case of the human being, lies precisely in his difference from the group into which he was born.

This is precisely what the nationalists refuse to accept. For them the value of masters[a] consists in their likeness to the spirit of their group, in their loyalty, in their exact expression of this spirit (which, moreover, is defined as the spirit of the masters,[b] so that in the end one is always right).

Why do many modern writers care so much about the "national soul" that they claim to represent? Those who lack personality find it useful to decree that the essential thing is to be national. Max Nordau writes about one such type who exclaimed: "You say that I am nothing. Yet, I am something: I am a contemporary!" Thus many claim to be the most French of writers, etc. (In this way, a de facto hierarchy and organization are created, and this is the crux of the whole issue: Benda, like Croce, examines the question of the intellectuals leaving out of consideration the class position of the intellectuals themselves and their function, which has become increasingly specific with the very wide dissemination of books and periodicals.)[3] But if one can explain this stance among the mediocre, how does one explain it among the great personalities? (Perhaps the explanation is correlated: the great personalities lead the mediocre ones and share with them, inevitably, certain convenient prejudices that do not harm their works.) Wagner (cf. Nietzsche's *Ecce Homo*)[4] knew what he was doing when he asserted that his art was the expression of the German genius, thus inviting the whole race to applaud itself in his works. But Benda notices that in many cases the explanation lies in the belief that the spirit is (good)[c] to the extent that it adopts a certain *collective* manner of thinking and bad when it seeks to single itself out. When Barrès wrote: "C'est le rôle des maîtres de justifier les habitudes et préjugés qui sont ceux de la France, de manière à préparer

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci inserted the phrase "great intellectuals" between the lines directly above "masters," which is his rendering of Benda's "maîtres."
[b]In the manuscript, "great intellectuals" is inserted between the lines directly above "masters."
[c]The parentheses enclosing "good" appear to have been added by Gramsci at a later date.

pour le mieux nos enfants à prendre leur rang dans la procession nationale,"[5] he meant, precisely, that it was his duty and the duty of French thinkers worthy of the name to join this procession.[6]

This tendency has had disastrous effects in literature (insincerity). In politics, this tendency toward national differentiation has ensured that war, instead of being simply political, has become a war of national spirits characterized by deep passion and ferocity.

Benda concludes with the observation that this entire effort to uphold the nationalization of the spirit means that the European spirit is being born and that the artist must individualize himself within the fold of this European spirit if he wants to serve the universal. (The war, in fact, has shown that these nationalistic attitudes were not accidental or the result of intellectual reasons—logical errors, etc. They were and are linked to a definite historical period in which only the union of all the national elements can be a condition of victory. The intellectual struggle is sterile if it is conducted without a real struggle aimed at overturning this situation. It is true that the European—and not only the European—spirit is being born, but this is precisely what intensifies the national character of the intellectuals, especially those of the highest stratum.)

§<3>. *German intellectuals.*[1] 1. Hans Frank, *Recht ist Unrecht.* Nine stories that are nine examples demonstrating that *summa jus, summa injuria.*[2] Frank is not some young person who wants to create paradoxes: he is fifty years old, and an anthology of his tales of German history has been published for the schools. A man of strong convictions. He opposes Roman law, the *dura lex,* and not just some instance or another of inhuman and antiquated law but the very notion of a juridical norm, the notion of an abstract justice that generalizes and codifies, defines crime and decrees punishment.

Hans Frank is not a singular case: he is the symptom of a state of mind. A defender of the West may see in this the revolt of "German disorder" against Latin order, of sentimental anarchy against the rule of intelligence. But German writers conceive it, rather, as the restoration of a *natural* order over the ruins of an *artificial* order. Once again, personal analysis sets itself against the principle of authority, which is attacked in all its forms: religious dogma, monarchic power, official teaching, military state, marital ties, paternal

authority, and above all the law that protects these frail institutions and is nothing other than coercion, restriction, the arbitrary deformation of public life and of human nature. Man is unhappy and wicked as long as he is chained by law, custom, and received ideas. He needs to be freed in order to be saved. The creative power of destruction has become an article of faith.

Stefan Zweig, H. Mann, Remarque, Glaeser, Leonhard Frank . . .

2. Leonhard Frank, *Die Ursache*: the hero murders his former teacher because he had deformed his soul; the author upholds the innocence of the murderer.[3]

3. Franz Werfel: in one of his novels he maintains that the victim, not the murderer, is the guilty party; there is nothing of Quincey in him, there is a moral act.[4] A father, an imperious and brutal general, ruins the life of his son by making him a soldier against his inclination: does he not commit a crime against human dignity? He must be immolated as a double usurper: as ruler and as father.

This is what gives rise to the motive of *parricide* and its apology, the absolution of Orestes, not in the name of pity for the tragic flaw but by reason of a categorical imperative, a monstrous moral postulate.

Freud's theory, the Oedipus complex, hatred of the father—master, model, rival, supreme expression of the principle of authority—given a place in the natural order of things. Freud's influence on German literature is immeasurable: it is at the roots of a new revolutionary (!) ethics. Freud has put the conflict between fathers and sons in a new light. The emancipation of sons from paternal guardianship is the fashionable thesis among current novelists. The fathers abdicate this "patriarchy" and make honorable amends to their sons, whose ingenuous moral sense is capable only of tearing up the tyrannical and perverse social contract, of abolishing the constrictions of a false duty (cf. Hauptmann, *Michael Kramer*;[5] Jakob Wassermann's short story, "A Father").[6]

4. Wassermann, *Der Fall Maurizius*: typical against justice.[7]

§<4>. *Emmanuel Berl.* He wrote a book, *Mort de la pensée bourgeoise*, that seems to have caused a bit of a stir.[1] In 1929 he delivered a speech at Zola's house in Médan on the occasion of the annual pilgrimage (I believe) by the "friends of Zola" (democrats,

Jeunesses laïques et républicaines, etc.).[2] "After the death of Zola and Jaurès there is no longer anyone who knows how to talk to the people about the people, and our 'literature of aesthetes' is dying of its own egocentrism." Zola in literature and Jaurès in politics were the last representatives of the people.[3]

Pierre Hamp deals with the people, but his books are read by littérateurs.[4] V. Margueritte is read by the people but does not deal with the people.[5] The only French book in the tradition of Zola is Barbusse's *Le feu*, because the war had rekindled a certain sense of fraternity in France.[6] Today, the popular novel (what does he mean by popular novel?) is increasingly distancing itself from literature, in the proper sense of the term, which has become a literature of aesthetes. Separated from the people, literature withers; the proletariat, cut off from spiritual life (!), loses its dignity [*n'est plus fondé en dignité*].[a] (It is true that literature is distancing itself from the people and becoming a caste phenomenon, but this leads to a greater dignity of the people; the traditional "fraternity" has been nothing more than the expression of French literary *bohème*, a certain moment of French culture around 1848 that lasted until 1870; it had a certain revival with Zola.) "Et autour de nous, nous sentons croître cette famine du peuple qui nous interroge sans que nous puissions lui répondre, qui nous presse sans que nous puissions le satisfaire, qui réclame une justification de sa peine sans que nous puissions la lui donner. On dirait que les usines géantes déterminent une zone de silence de laquelle l'ouvrier ne peut plus sortir et où l'intellectuel ne peut plus entrer. Tellement séparés que l'intellectuel, issu du milieu ouvrier, n'en retrouve point l'accès."[7] "La fidélité difficile, écrit Jean Guéhenno. Peut-être la fidélité impossible. Le boursier n'établit nullement, comme on pouvait l'espérer, un pont entre le prolétariat et la bourgeoisie. Un bourgeois de plus, et c'est bien. Mais ses frères cessent de le reconnaître. Ils ne voient plus en lui un des leurs. Comme le peuple ne participe nullement aux modes d'expression des intellectuels, il faut, ou bien qu'il s'oppose à eux, qu'il constitue une sorte de nationalité avec son langage propre, ou bien qu'il n'ait pas de langage du tout et s'enlise dans une sorte de barbarie."[8] The intellectuals are to blame, they became conformists whereas Zola was revolutionary (!); stylistically refined and precious, authors of personal journals, whereas Zola was epical. But the world has changed, too. Zola knew a people that

[a]In the manuscript, the French phrase is inserted between the lines directly above "loses its dignity."

no longer exists or at least no longer has the same importance. Advanced capitalism—the Taylorized worker—replaces the people of old who were not yet clearly distinguishable from the petty bourgeoisie and who appear in Zola, as in Proudhon, in V. Hugo, in Sand, in E. Sue. Zola describes industry in its earliest stages. But if the task of the writer is now more difficult, that is no reason for neglecting it. Therefore I return to Zola, I return to the people. "Avec Zola donc ou avec rien, la fraternité ou la mort. Telle est notre devise. Tel notre drame. Et telle notre loi."[9]

§<5>. *America*. Are Central and South America Latin? And what does this Latinity consist of? Great fragmentation, which is not accidental. The United States is concentrated, and through its immigration policy it seeks not only to maintain but to increase this concentration (which is an economic and political necessity, as has been demonstrated by the internal struggle among the different nationalities to influence the direction of the government's war policy and by the influence of the national element in the trade-union and political organization of workers, etc.). It exercises great authority in order to preserve the fragmentation on which it seeks to superimpose a network of organizations and movements that it itself controls: (1) Pan-American union (politics of state); (2) missionary movement to replace Catholicism with Protestantism; (3) opposition to the Federation of Labor in Amsterdam and an effort to create a Pan-American labor union (check whether there are also other movements and initiatives of this sort); (4) organization of banking, industry, and credit extending all across America. [The latter is the first element.]

Characteristics of South and Central America: (1) a considerable number of Indians who, albeit passively, exercise an influence on the state: it would be useful to have information on the social status of these Indians, on their economic importance, on their role in land ownership and industrial production; (2) the white races that dominate Central and South America cannot reconnect themselves to European fatherlands—Portugal, Spain, (Italy)[a]—with a large economic and political role comparable to that of the United States; in many countries, the white races represent a semifeudal and Jesuitical phase, so that one might say that all the countries of

[a]In the manuscript, the parentheses seem to have been inserted by Gramsci at a later time.

Central and South America (with the possible exception of Argentina) must go through the Kulturkampf phase and experience the advent of the modern secular state (Mexico's struggle against clericalism exemplifies this phase). The dissemination of French culture is related to this phase: this is the masonic-enlightenment culture that has given rise to the so-called "*positivist churches*," many members of which are also workers who even call themselves anarchic syndicalists. The contribution of various cultures: Portugal, France, Spain, Italy. The question of names: Latin or Iberian or Hispanic America? The French and Italians use "Latin," the Portuguese "Iberian," the Spaniards "Hispanic." In reality, France is the most influential; the other three Latin nations have little influence in spite of the language, because these American nations rose against Spain and Portugal and they want to create a nationalism and culture of their own. Italian influence, defined by the social character of Italian immigration; on the other hand, the Italians are not the hegemonic race in any American country.

An article by Lamberti Sorrentino, "Latinità dell'America," in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 22 December 1929.[1] "The South American republics are Latin for three major reasons: the Spanish language, the prevalence of French culture, the predominance (!) of the Italian ethnic contribution. Of the three, the last one is the most profound and significant because it actually endows the newly formed race with a Latin character (!); and in appearance (!) it is the most fleeting because with the first generation comes the loss of what is original and distinctive (this whole thing is a lovely conundrum!), and the spontaneous (!) adaptation to the new geographical and social environment." According to Sorrentino, the Spaniards, French, and Italians share a common interest in preserving (!) the Spanish language to enable the formation of a deep Latin consciousness capable of resisting the deviations (!) that push South Americans toward confusion (!) and chaos. The editor of an ultranationalist literary periodical in Argentina (the most European and Latin country in America) has declared that the Argentine man "will establish his predominant Latin–Anglo-Saxon type." The same writer who defines himself as "one hundred percent Argentine" has stated, even more explicitly: "As for the North Americans, whose country has given us a *constitutional and educational foundation*,[2] it is worth saying clearly that we feel closer to them in education, tastes,

and lifestyle than to the Europeans and the Afro-European Spaniards, as the latter like to call themselves; and we have never feared the whip of the United States." (He is referring to the Spanish tendency to consider the Pyrenees as a cultural barrier between Europe and the Iberian world—Spain, Portugal, Central and South America, and Morocco. Theory of Iberianism—Ibero-Americanism; culmination of Hispanism—Hispano-Americanism.) Iberianism is anti-Latin: the American republics should take their bearings only from Spain and Portugal. (Mere prating of the kind practiced by intellectuals and those who have lost their power but will not be persuaded that they do not count for much any more.) Spain is trying very hard to reconquer South America in all sectors: cultural, commercial, industrial, artistic. (But with what results?) French cultural hegemony is threatened by the Anglo-Saxons. There is an Argentine Institute of English Culture and an Argentine Institute of North American Culture; rich and active organizations: they teach the English language, providing the students, whose numbers are rising constantly, with a high level of support and reliable university and scientific exchange programs. Italian and Spanish immigration is stagnant; Polish and Slavic immigration is growing. Sorrentino would like a French-Italian-Iberian united front to preserve Latin culture.

§<6>. *What do the young think?* In *L'Italia Letteraria* of 22 December 1929, M. Missiroli ("Filosofia della rivoluzione")[1] discusses the work that Prof. Giorgio Del Vecchio[2] assigns to his students at the University of Rome. In 1928–29 the topic of these assignments was "the philosophy of Revolution"; the results have been published under the title "Esercitazioni di filosofia del diritto" in the *Rivista Internazionale di Filosofia del Diritto* of (November) 1929. Missiroli observes that most of these young people lean toward the doctrines of historicism, although there are also advocates of traditional spiritualism and even echoes of old natural law. No trace of positivism and individualism: the principles of authority vigorously affirmed. The extracts quoted by Missiroli are really interesting, and the collection may serve as a demonstration of the intellectual crisis that, in my view, is bound to lead to a revival of historical materialism. (The elements for showing how

historical materialism has penetrated deeply into modern culture abound in these exercises.)

§<7>. The people (oh!), the public (oh!). Political adventurists ask with the scowl of those who know what's what: "The people! But what is this people? But who knows them? But who has ever defined them?" And in the meantime they do nothing but contrive trick upon trick to obtain electoral majorities. (How many notices have been issued in Italy between 1924 and 1929 announcing new changes in the electoral law? How many proposals for new electoral laws have been presented and withdrawn? The catalog would be interesting in itself.)[1] The pure literati say the same thing: "Calling on the public to be the judge is a vice carried over from romantic ideas. Who is the public? Who is this? Where is this great omniscient mind, this exquisite taste, this absolute probity, this pearl?" (G. Ungaretti, *Il Resto del Carlino*, 23 October 1929).[2] But in the meantime they ask for a protectionist law against translations from foreign languages, and when they sell a thousand copies of a book they have the bells of their hometowns rung. [The "people," however, has provided the title for many important newspapers—the same newspapers, in fact, of those who are now asking "What is this people?" in the very newspapers that are named after the people.][3]

§<8>. *Father Bresciani's progeny.* Bacchelli's *Il diavolo al Pontelungo.*[1] The novel has been translated into English by Orlo Williams, whose introduction to the translation appears in *La Fiera Letteraria* of 27 January 1929.[2] Williams observes that *Il diavolo al Pontelungo* is "one of the few true novels as we in England understand novels," but he fails to point out (even though he talks about Bacchelli's other book, *Lo sa il tonno*)[3] that Bacchelli is one of the few Italian writers who may be called "moralists" in the English and French sense. (Remember that Bacchelli used to write for *La Voce* and was even its editor for a while, as Prezzolini's substitute.)[4] Instead, he calls him *raisonneur, learned poet*: *raisonneur* in the sense that too often he interrupts the dramatic action by commentary on the springs of human action in general. (*Lo sa il tonno* is Bacchelli's typical "moral" novel.) Bacchelli provided the following information about *Il diavolo* in a letter to Williams:

In its main lines the material is strictly historical, both in the first and in the second part. The principal characters (Bakunin, Cafiero, Andrea Costa)[5] are historical. In the interpretation of the epoch, of the ideas and of the facts, I have tried to be historical in the strict sense: cosmopolitan revolutionarism, beginning of political life in the Kingdom of Italy, the quality of Italian Socialism in its early days, the political psychology of the Italian people, its ironical good sense, its instinctive and realistic Machiavellism (I would say, rather, Guicciardinism, in De Sanctis's sense of the Guicciardinian man),[6] etc. My sources have been experience of political life gained at Bologna, politically the most sensitive and subtle in Italy (my father was a politician, a liberal-conservative deputy), the memories of some last survivors of that time and of the anarchist International (I knew one man who met and mixed with Bakunin at Bologna in '74), and, so far as books are concerned, above all, what is told by Professor Ettore Zoccoli in a book upon anarchy now out of print,[7] and some notebooks of Bakunin's reproduced in a very rare biography by Nettlau, an Austrian historian of anarchy, of which very few copies were issued.[8] James Guillaume, the French historian (he was Swiss),[9] also deals with Bakunin and Cafiero in a book on the International[10] which I do not know, but from which, I believe, I have departed in various important particulars. This book is part of a posthumous polemic about La Baronata and Locarno[11] in which I took no interest. It deals with trivial things, and questions of money. I think that Herzen, in his memoirs,[12] has written the most just and humane things about the changeable, restless, and confused personality of Bakunin. Marx, as often, was only caustic and insulting. In conclusion, I think I can assure you that the book rests upon a fundamentally historical conceptual basis. How and in what artistic sense I have developed this European and representative material is a matter which it is not for me to judge.[13]

Cf. Notebook 23, §33.

§<9>. *The academy of Ten.* See C. Malaparte's article "Una specie di Accademia" in *La Fiera Letteraria* of 3 June 1928.[1] *Il Lavoro d'Italia* is said to have paid 150,000 lire for the novel *Lo zar non è morto*, written cooperatively by the Ten. "Members of the confederation, the overwhelming majority of whom are workers, have had to pay a good 150,000 lire for the 'Novel by the Ten.' Why? For the surprising reason that there are ten authors and included among the Ten, besides the president and the general secretary of *Il Raduno*, are the national secretary and two members of the executive board of the Authors' and Writers' Union! . . . What a feast, the

intellectual trade unionism of Giacomo Di Giacomo."[2] Malaparte continues: "*If those leaders* to whom we are referring *were fascists*, whether of old or recent vintage, we would have chosen *another way* to denounce the squandering of money and the *camorras*: in other words, we would have turned to the secretary of the N<ational> F<ascist> P<arty>. But since we are dealing with people without party membership cards, some of whom are tainted politically and badly compromised, while others have slipped into the unions only at an opportune time, we have preferred to settle the issue *without scandal* (!), with these few words spoken in public."[3] This piece is priceless. The article also contains a spirited attack against Bodrero, then undersecretary of public education, and against Fedele, the minister.[4] In *La Fiera Letteraria* of 17 June, Malaparte published a second article, "Coda di un'Accademia," in which he slyly intensifies the attack against Bodrero and Fedele.[5] (Fedele had sent a letter on the subject of Salgari, who was the "star" of the "Writers' Union," and had everyone laughing.)[6]

§<10>. *Proudhon and the Italian literati (Raimondi, Jahier).* Giuseppe Raimondi's article "Rione Bolognina" in *La Fiera Letteraria* of 17 June 1928—Proudhon's motto: "La pauvreté est bonne, et nous devons la considérer comme le principe de notre allégresse."[1] Autobiographical remarks that culminate in the following words: "Like every worker and every worker's son, I have always had a clear sense of the division of social classes. Unfortunately (!) I will remain among those who work. On the other hand, there are those whom I can respect and toward whom I can also feel sincere gratitude; but something prevents me from weeping with them, and I cannot bring myself to hug them spontaneously. Either they make me feel uneasy, or I despise them."[2]

> Revolutions have always been made in the suburbs; and nowhere are the people as young, as uprooted from every tradition, as disposed to follow a sudden impulse of collective passion as in the suburbs, which are no longer the city and are not yet the country. <. . .> From here a new civilization will ultimately be born and a new history that will have that sense of rebellion and secular restoration proper to the people, whose worthiness has gained recognition only because of the morality of the modern age. It will be talked about in the same way as the Italian Risorgimento and American Independence are talked about today. The worker has simple tastes: he educates himself through the weekly installments of the Discoveries of Science and the History of the

> Crusades. He will always retain the somewhat atheistic, Garibaldian mentality of the suburban clubs and the popular universities. <. . .> Allow them their flaws, spare them your ironies. The people are unable to joke. Their modesty is real, like their confidence in the future.

(In short, among the hundred ways of setting oneself apart and playing the snob, there is also Raimondi's way of doing it.)[3]

Cf. Notebook 23, §34.

§<11>. *Americanism.* Pirandello, in an interview conducted by Corrado Alvaro (*L'Italia Letteraria,* 14 April 1929): "Americanism is overwhelming us. I believe that a new beacon of civilization has been lit over there." "The money that circles the globe is American, and the way of life and culture run right behind the money. Does America have a culture? It has books and customs. Its customs are its new literature, which breaks through the most well-fortified and protected doors. In Berlin you do not feel the disjunction between the old and the new Europe, because the structure of the city itself offers no resistances. In Paris, where there exists a historical and artistic structure and where the evidence of an indigenous civilization is present, Americanism is jarring, like the makeup on the face of an old strumpet."[1]

The problem is not whether a new civilization, a new culture, exists in America and whether this new civilization and culture is invading Europe. If the problem were to be posed in this manner, the answer would be easy: no, it does not exist, etc., and indeed all they do in America is remasticate the old European culture. The problem is this: whether America, with the implacable preponderance of its economic production, will force or is already forcing Europe to undergo an upheaval of its socioeconomic alignment, which would have happened anyway, but at a slow pace—whereas now it looms as a repercussion of American "overbearingness." In other words, whether a transformation of the material bases of civilization is taking place that in the long run (and not very long, because in our time everything is quicker than in past epochs) will bring about the overthrow of existing civilization itself and the birth of a new one.

The elements of life that are now being disseminated under the American label are just the first, groping efforts, and they are due not to the "order" born out of this new alignment, which has yet to take shape, but to the initiatives of those who have been déclassés by the earliest operations of this new alignment. What is called Americanism nowadays is for the most part a phenomenon of social panic, disintegration, despair

among the old strata that will in fact be crushed by the new order: to a large extent these are an unconscious "reaction" and not a reconstruction. Reconstruction cannot be expected from the strata "condemned" by the new order but from the class that creates the material bases of this new order and has to discover the way of life that turns into "freedom" what today is "necessity." This principle, it seems to me, is extremely important: that the first intellectual and moral reactions to the establishment of a new mode of production are due more to the debris of the old disintegrating classes than to the new classes whose destiny is tied to the new methods.

Furthermore, this issue is not about a new civilization because it does not change the character of the fundamental classes; it is about the extension and intensification of European civilization, which, however, has assumed certain peculiarities in the American climate. In fact, Pirandello's observation about the opposition that Americanism encounters in Paris and the immediate welcome that, by contrast, it finds in Berlin, demonstrates a difference of degree, not quality. In Berlin, the middle classes had already been wrecked by the war and by inflation, and German industry was more advanced than the French. The French middle classes, on the other hand, suffered neither (occasional) crises like the inflation in Germany nor an organic crisis that is much more accelerated than normal because of the introduction and (sudden) spread of a new mode of production. Hence it is true that in Paris Americanism is like makeup, a superficial foreign fashion.

Cf. Notebook 22, §15.

§<12>. *David Lazzaretti.* An article by Domenico Bulferetti, "David Lazzaretti e due milanesi" in *La Fiera Letteraria* of 26 August 1926, mentions some elements of David Lazzaretti's life and formation;[1] Andrea Verga, *David Lazzaretti e la pazzia sensoria* (Milan: Rechiedei, 1880); Cesare Lombroso, *Pazzi e anormali* (this was the custom of the time: instead of studying the origins of a historical event, one would find the protagonist to be a madman); *Storia di David Lazzaretti, profeta di Arcidosso* was published in Siena in 1905 by one of Lazzaretti's major disciples, the former friar of the order of St. Philip Neri, Filippo Imperiuzzi (other apologetic writings exist, but according to Bulferetti, this one is the most noteworthy); the books by Giacomo Barzellotti, first and second editions: *David Lazzaretti,* published by Zanichelli, and *Monte Amiata e il suo profeta* (Treves), which is a substantially modified version of the former.[2]

In Bulferetti's opinion, Barzellotti's assertion that the causes of the Lazzarettist movement were "all particular and attributable solely to the

state of mind and the culture of those people over there" stems "partly from his natural affection for the beautiful birthplaces (!) and partly from the influence of the theories of Hippolyte Taine."[3] It seems to me that Barzellotti's book, which has shaped public opinion on Lazzaretti, is nothing more than a manifestation of the "patriotic" (for love of country!) tendency that spawned the efforts to conceal the causes of the general discontent that existed in Italy by providing narrow, individual, pathologic, etc., explanations of single explosive incidents. The same thing happened with Davide Lazzaretti as did with the "brigandage" of the South and Sicily. The politicians have not concerned themselves with the fact that the killing of Lazzaretti was savage in its cruelty and coldly premeditated (it would be interesting to know what instructions the government sent to the local authorities). In spite of the fact that Lazzaretti died exalting the republic (the republicanism of Lazzaretti's movement must have had a special impact on the government's determination to assassinate him), even the republicans ignored the issue—maybe because the republicanism of Lazzaretti's movement had religious and prophetic ingredients. Nevertheless, in my view, this is precisely the main distinctive feature of the Lazzaretti incident, which was politically related to the Vatican's *non expedit*[4] and revealed the kind of subversive-popular-rudimentary tendency that could arise out of the abstentionism of the priests. (In any case, one needs to find out whether those who were in the opposition at the time adopted a stance on the issue: one must bear in mind that it was a government of the left that had just come into power, and this may also help explain the lack of enthusiasm for supporting a struggle against the government inspired by the criminal murder of someone who could be portrayed as a reactionary, a supporter of the papacy, a clericalist, etc.)

Bulferetti observes that Barzellotti did not conduct research on the formation of the culture he refers to. He would have noticed that an abundance of leaflets, pamphlets, and popular books printed in Milan was reaching even Monte Amiata at that time (! but how does Bulferetti know this?). Lazzaretti was an insatiable reader of these materials, which his occupation as a carter enabled him to procure. Davide was born in Arcidosso on 6 November 1834 and worked at his father's occupation until 1868, when he converted from his blasphemous ways and went into seclusion to do penance in a cave in Sabina where he "saw" the ghost of a warrior who "revealed" himself to be Lazzaretti's ancestral father, Manfredo Pallavicino, the illegitimate son of a French king, etc. Doctor Emilio Rasmussen, from Denmark, discovered that Manfredo Pallavicino is the main character in a historical novel by Giuseppe Rovani entitled, precisely, *Manfredo Pallavicino*.[5] The plot and episodes of the novel are transmitted intact in the "revelation" in the cave, and out of these revelations comes the beginning of Lazzaretti's religious propaganda. Barzellotti, how-

ever, had thought that Lazzaretti was influenced by legends from the fourteenth century (the adventures of the Sienese king Giannino), and Rasmussen's discovery persuaded him only to insert in the last edition of his book a vague allusion to Lazzaretti's reading—but without mentioning Rasmussen and leaving untouched the section of the book devoted to King Giannino. Nevertheless, Barzellotti examines the subsequent development of Lazzaretti's mind, his travels in France, and the influence exercised on him by the Milanese priest Onorio Taramelli, a man of fine intelligence and wide learning who had been arrested in Milan—and later escaped to France—for having written against the monarchy. Davide got his republican impulse from Taramelli. Davide's flag was red, with the inscription "The republic and the Kingdom of God." During the procession in which he was killed, on 18 August 1878, David asked his followers whether they wanted the republic. To their loud yes, he responded: "The republic begins from this time forth in the world, but it will not be the republic of 1848; it will be the Kingdom of God, the law of Justice that has succeeded the law of Grace." (David's response contains some interesting elements that must be connected to his memory of Taramelli's words: his desire to differentiate himself from 1848, which had not left good memories among the peasants in Tuscany; the distinction between Justice and Grace, etc. Remember that the priests and peasants involved with Malatesta in the trial of the gangs of Benevento had somewhat similar ideas.[6] At any rate, in the case of Lazzaretti, literary impressionism should be replaced by some political analysis.)

Cf. Notebook 25, §1.

§<13>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Alfredo Panzini:* Vita di Cavour. Panzini's *Vita di Cavour* was published by *L'Italia Letteraria* in its weekly issues between 9 June and 13 October 1929. As of this date (30 May 1930) it has not been published in book form.[1] On 30 June, *L'Italia Letteraria* published, under the title "Chiarimento," a short letter dated 27 June 1929 that Panzini had sent to the editor of *Il Resto del Carlino*. In a very irritated style, Panzini complains about a very biting comment published by the Bologna newspaper on the first two installments of his *Vita di Cavour*, which was deemed "a pleasant little amusement" and a "light piece." Panzini writes: "I have no intention of writing a biography in the French novelistic mode. My intention is to write in a pleasant and dramatic style, while at the same time documenting everything (Nigra-Cavour correspondence)." Panzini alludes to certain things that are hard to understand; one needs to know the com-

ments of *Il Resto del Carlino* to which he is responding.[2] The incident matters because some people are starting to recognize that these writings by Panzini have become tedious and all too obvious: Panzini's historical stupidity is incommensurable; his is a mere game of words that under the guise of irony creates the impression of containing who knows what profundities; in reality there is nothing but words; it is a new Stenterellism putting on the airs of Machiavellism.[3] I have read, in *La Nuova Italia*, another gibe that is certainly aimed at Panzini; it talks about lives of Cavour and other works written like the life of Pinocchio.[4]

In fact, Panzini's style is not "pleasant and dramatic"; he presents history as a "pleasantry"; his "dramatizing" consists in representing serious matters as if they were drugstore chatter, with Panzini as the druggist and another Panzini as the customer.

Panzini's *Vita di Cavour* will serve me to compile a collection of platitudes about the Risorgimento (Panzini is a whole mine of commonplaces) and to derive evidence of his literary Jesuitism.

Cf. Notebook 23, §32.

§<14>. *History of the dominant class and history of the subaltern classes*. The history of the subaltern classes is necessarily fragmented and episodic; in the activity of these classes there is a tendency toward unification, albeit in provisional stages, but this is the least conspicuous aspect, and it manifests itself only when victory is secured. Subaltern classes are subject to the initiatives of the dominant class, even when they rebel; they are in a state of anxious defense. Every trace of autonomous initiative is therefore of inestimable value. In any case, the monograph is the most suitable form for this history, which requires a very large accumulation of fragmentary materials.

Cf. Notebook 25, §2.

§<15>. *Ettore Ciccotti*. His book *Confronti storici* (Biblioteca della *Nuova Rivista Storica*, n. 10, Società editr. Dante Alighieri, 1929, xxxix+ 262 pp.) has been reviewed favorably by Guido De Ruggiero in *La Critica* of January 1930 but very warily and ultimately unfavorably by Mario de Bernardi in *La Riforma Sociale* (which I do not have with me right now).[1] I have read a chapter of Ciccotti's book (perhaps it is the general introduction); it was published in the *Rivista d'Italia* of 15 June and 15 July 1927:

"Elementi di 'verità' e di 'certezza' nella tradizione storica romana."[2] Ciccotti examines and assails a series of professional distortions of Roman historiography, and many of his negative observations are correct; it is in the positive part that doubts arise, and one needs to be cautious. Ciccotti's theoretical error, it seems to me, consists in the erroneous interpretation of Vico's principle of the "certain" and the "true": history cannot be other than "certainty" or at least the search for "certainty." The conversion of "certain" into "true" gives rise to a philosophical construction [of eternal history] but not to the construction of "effectual" history; history, however, cannot be other than "effectual": its "certainty" must, first of all, be the "certainty" of historical documents (even though history does not exhaust itself *wholly* in historical documents). The sophistical side of Ciccotti's methodology appears clearly in an example: he says that history is drama, but this does not mean that every dramatic representation of a given historical period would be the "effectual" one, even if it were vivid, artistically perfect, etc. Ciccotti's sophism leads to the excessive valuation of historical "belletrism" as a reaction to pedantic and overbearing erudition.

In a study of Ciccotti's theoretical work, this book has to be taken into account. Ciccotti's "historical materialism" very superficial: that of Ferrero and Barbagallo.[3] A very positivistic sociology; a positivist interpretation of Vico. Ciccotti's methodology gives rise precisely to Ferrero's types of histories and to Barbagallo's "exaggerations"; it ends up losing the concept of distinction [and of "individual" concreteness] and arriving at the conclusion that "it is the same the whole world over" and "the more things change, the more they are the same."

Cf. Notebook 11, §9.

§<16>. *Political development of the popular class in the medieval commune.* In the essay mentioned above ("Elementi di 'verità' e di 'certezza' . . ."),[1] Ettore Ciccotti makes some references to the historical development of the popular class in the communes; these references merit special attention and separate treatment. The wars among the communes created the need to assemble stronger and bigger military forces, allowing as many people as possible to bear arms. This gave commoners an awareness of their own power and consolidated their ranks (in other words, it helped stimulate the formation of parties). The fighting men remained united even in peacetime, which enabled them to make their services available and later, as their solidarity intensified, to pursue their own goals as well. We have the statutes of the "Societies of Arms" that were established in Bologna apparently around 1230; the nature of their union and their mode of organization start to become clear. Toward the middle of the thirteenth century, there were already twenty-four of them, located in the

various districts where they lived. Their purpose was not only to perform the political function of defending the commune against external threats but also to provide all commoners with the protection they needed and to shield them from the aggressions of the nobles and the powerful. The chapters of their statutes—for example, those of the Society of Lions, as it was called—have such titles as "De adiutorio dando hominibus dicte societatis" and "Quod molestati iniuste debeant adiuvari ab hominibus dicte societatis." Religious requirements were attached to their civic and social obligations; besides an oath, these included communal attendance at mass and at formal prayers. Other communal obligations, similar to those of the religious confraternities—assisting the poor, burying the dead, etc.—rendered these unions increasingly steadfast and tightly knit. In order to be able to carry out their work, these societies then created councils and appointed officers (in Bologna, for ex., four or eight *ministeriales* modeled on the organizational plan of the Association of Guilds or on the older commune system); over time their importance extended beyond the confines of the societies themselves and they became constitutive parts of the commune. At first, *milites* joined these societies on an equal footing with the *pedites*—nobles as well as commoners—though in smaller numbers. Little by little, however, the *milites*—i.e., the nobles—tended to set themselves apart, as they did in Siena or, in certain circumstances, they were expelled, as in Bologna in 1270. As the movement of emancipation gained ground, however, going beyond the boundaries and structures of these societies, the people started demanding and obtaining participation in the major public offices. Increasingly, the people formed themselves into a real political party, and in order to improve the efficacy and cohesion of their actions they gave themselves a leader: "the captain of the people, " an office that Siena seems to have derived from Pisa and that in name as well as function betrays both its military and its political origins and purposes. The people, who had already from time to time gathered together, organized themselves, and taken up distinct positions of their own, but only sporadically, now started constituting themselves as a separate body that gave itself its own laws. They used their own bell to call meetings: "cum campana Communis non bene audiatur." They clashed with the *podestà*,[2] whose right to make public proclamations they challenged and with whom the captain of the people stipulated "peaces." When the people failed to obtain desired reforms from the commune authorities, they seceded, with the support of prominent individuals from the commune, and after forming an independent assembly they began to create their own magistracies similar to the general systems of the commune, to award jurisdiction to the captain of the people, and to make decisions on their own authority, giving rise (from 1255) to a whole legislative organization. (These dates pertain to the commune of Siena.) The people succeeded, at first in practice and later formally, in forcing the inclusion into the general

statutes of the commune of provisions that previously applied only internally to those registered as "People." The people, then, came to dominate the commune, overwhelming the previous ruling class, as they did in Siena after 1270, in Bologna with the *Sacrati* and *Sacratissimi* Codes, in Florence with the "Codes of Justice." (Provenzan Salvani was a nobleman in Siena who placed himself at the head of the people.)

Cf. Notebook 25, §4.

§<17>. *1917*. For the causes that provoked the terrible crisis of food provisions in Turin in July–August 1917, see the book by R. Bachi, *L'alimentazione e la politica annonaria in Italia*, in the series "Pubblicazioni della Fondazione Carnegie" (Bari: Laterza), and the book by Umberto Ricci, *Il fallimento della politica annonaria* (Florence: Ed. La Voce, 1921).[1]

§<18>. *History of the subaltern classes*. Most of the problems of Roman history pointed out by Ciccotti in his study "Elementi di 'verità' e di 'certezza' . . ." [1] (apart from the verification of "personal" episodes, Tanaquil,[2] etc.) are related to the experiences and institutions of the subaltern classes (tribunes of the plebs,[3] etc.). In this respect, the method of "analogy" affirmed and theorized by Ciccotti could produce some presumptive results: since the subaltern class lacks political autonomy, its "defensive" initiatives are constrained by their own laws of necessity, which are more complex and politically restrictive than the laws of historical necessity that govern the initiatives of the ruling class. (The question of the importance of women in Roman history is similar to the question of the subaltern classes, but up to a certain point: "masculinity" can be compared to class domination only in a certain sense; it therefore has greater importance for the history of customs than for political and social history.) Another extremely important observation must be made about the inherent dangers of the method of historical analogy as a criterion of interpretation: in the ancient and medieval state, both territorial and social (the one is but a function of the other) centralization were minimal; in a certain sense, the state was a "federation" of classes: the subaltern classes had a separate life, their own institutions, etc. (thus the phenomenon of "two governments" became extremely conspicuous during times of crisis). The only class excluded from having a life of its own was that of the slaves in the classical world and that of the proletarians in the medieval world. Nevertheless, even though in many respects the slaves of antiquity and medieval proletarians found themselves in similar condi-

tions, their situations were not identical: the uprising of the Ciompi[4] certainly did not evoke the same sensation that a similar uprising of the slaves would have produced in Rome (Spartacus, who demands governmental power with the patricians, etc.) Whereas in the Middle Ages it was possible to have an alliance between the proletariat and the people and, even more, proletarian support for the dictatorship of a prince, there was nothing of the sort in the classical world. The modern state abolishes many autonomies of the subaltern classes—it abolishes the state as a federation of classes—but certain forms of the internal life of the subaltern classes are reborn as parties, trade unions, cultural associations. The modern dictatorship abolishes these forms of class autonomy as well, and it tries hard to incorporate them into the activity of the state: in other words, the centralization of the whole life of the nation in the hands of the ruling class becomes frenetic and all-consuming.

Cf. Notebook 25, §4.

§<19>. *The problem of the young.* "The fascists have lived contemporary history too much to have the obligation to know past history perfectly" (Mussolini, preface to *Gli Accordi del Laterano. Discorsi al Parlamento*, Rome: Libreria del Littorio, 1929).[1]

§<20>. *Documents of the times.* A very important and interesting document is the report of the commission of inquiry on the polar expedition of the airship *Italia*, printed by the publishing house of the *Rivista Marittima* in Rome by order of the Ministry of the Navy[1] ("Caporetto").[2]

§<21>. *Italian diplomacy before 1914.* A very interesting and strange document on this topic is Alessandro De Bosdari's book *Delle guerre balcaniche, della grande guerra e di alcuni fatti precedenti ad esse* (Mondadori). *La Nuova Antologia* of 1 September 1927 published one of its chapters, "Lo scoppio della guerra balcanica visto da Sofia," in which one reads pleasantries of the following kind:

> I cannot deny that the firm belief in the Austrian position—the steady and constant guide of the Bulgarian czar in his entire foreign policy—that I had embraced since the final months of 1911, pre-

> vented me from having a clear view of the Balkan League and the imminence of war against Turkey. After so many years, I cannot reprimand myself too much (!) for this, for if I failed to foresee an accessory (?!) and, as it were (!), episodic (!) fact of Bulgarian politics, it was only because I had too clear a view (and he states this seriously!) of the main line of the policy. It was like a case of political far-sightedness, and in politics far-sightedness is better than myopia; so, my view was undoubtedly better than the total blindness that—I must say in my own defense (!)—many of my colleagues showed on that and many subsequent occasions.[1]

The passage is interesting not only from the specific point of view of evaluating Italian diplomacy but from other perspectives as well. De Bosdari's amusing candor leads him to state clearly what others also think but do not say with such openness when justifying their mistakes. Is there such a thing as a policy line that is not made up of "accessory facts" and "episodes" as De Bosdari says? And doesn't understanding a policy line mean that one is able to understand and therefore to foresee and make sense of this chain of accessory facts? Whoever talks about a policy line in this sense is really talking about a "sociological category," or an "abstraction." But doesn't he guess right sometimes? It is true, but in that case one could cite Guicciardini's views on "obstinacy."[2]

§<22>. *Lorianism.* In a note on Alberto Lumbroso, I wrote that he did not inherit from his father the qualities of a sober, careful, disciplined scholar.[1] Giacomo Lumbroso, who died in 1927 (I think), was a historian of the Hellenistic age, an expert on papyri, a lexicographer of Alexandrian Hellenism.[2] (Cf. V. Scialoja article, "Giacomo Lumbroso," in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 September 1927.)[3] [Was he also professor of modern history before Fedele?][4]

§<23>. *Loria.* His memoirs, published in 1927 by N. Zanichelli, Bologna, are entitled *Ricordi di uno studente settuagenario*, L. 10.[1]

§<24>. *Risorgimento motifs. Sicilian separatism.* A book by Luigi Natoli, *Rivendicazioni (attraverso le rivoluzioni siciliani del 1848–1860)*,

Treviso: Cattedra Italiana di Pubblicità, 1927, L. 14. "Natoli wants to counter the tendency, which persists even to this day, of scholarship and scholars to devalue—either because of a poor grasp of the evidence or because of the residues of old political prejudices—the contribution of Sicily to the history of unification during the Risorgimento. The author is especially critical of B. Croce, who considers the Sicilian revolution of 1848 a 'separatist rebellion,' harmful to the Italian cause," etc., etc.[1] What is particularly interesting about this type of Sicilian literature—whether it be journalistic or scholarly—is its extremely polemical and angry tone. Now, from the historical point of view, the question should be simple: separatism either existed, or it did not exist; or else it was only a tendency, the strength or weakness of which should be determined by the methods of historiography, setting aside all polemical considerations of party, faction, or ideology. If separatism did indeed exist, it would not be historically "censurable" or "immoral" or "antipatriotic" but rather a phenomenon that should be explained and reconstructed historically. The fact that the polemic keeps going on relentlessly means that "present interests" and not just old ones are at play; it means, in other words, that these same publications themselves confirm precisely what they seek to negate. Natoli seems to maintain that the charge of separatism hinges on the willful misunderstanding of the federalist program—a program initially regarded by certain prominent men of the island and their representatives as the solution that was most in keeping with local political traditions, etc. In any case, the fact that the federalist program had stronger supporters and lasted longer in Sicily has its own significance.

Cf. Notebook 19, §40.

§<25>. *The role of Catholics in Italy (Catholic Action).* In the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 November 1927, G. Suardi published a note, "Quando e come i cattolici poterono partecipare alle elezioni politiche," that is very interesting and should be remembered as a record of the activities and role of Catholic Action in Italy.[1] Toward the end of September 1904, after the general strike, Suardi was called to Milan by a telegram from Tommaso Tittoni, the foreign minister in Giolitti's government.[2] [Tittoni was staying at his villa in Desio at the time of the strike, and, with Milan in imminent danger of being isolated by a breakdown in communications, it seemed that he would have to assume special personal responsibilities; Suardi's reference to this, it seems to me, indicates that the local reactionaries had already thought of a course of action in agreement

with Tittoni.) Tittoni informed him that the cabinet had decided to announce elections immediately[3] and that it was necessary to unite all the liberal and conservative forces in an effort to block the path of the extremist parties. Suardi, a liberal representative from Bergamo, had succeeded in working out an agreement with the Catholics in his city for the local administrative elections;[4] it was now necessary to do the same for the national elections by persuading the Catholics that the *non expedit* was of no use to their side: it damaged religion and seriously harmed the nation, leaving the road open for socialism. Suardi accepted the assignment. In Bergamo he talked about it with the lawyer Paolo Bonomi and managed to convince him to go to Rome, present himself to the pope, and add the importunings of the Catholics of Bergamo to those of Bonomelli[5] and other authoritative persons so that the *non expedit* would be revoked. Pius X at first refused to revoke the *non expedit*, but he was terrorized by the picture Bonomi painted for him of the catastrophic consequences that would ensue in Bergamo from a rupture between the Catholics and Suardi's group, and "with a slow and sonorous voice, he uttered: 'Follow the dictates of your conscience.' " (Bonomi:) "Have we understood correctly, Holiness? Can we interpret it as a *yes*?" (Pope:) "I repeat. Follow the dictates of your conscience." (Immediately afterwards) Suardi had a meeting with Cardinal Agliardi (of liberal tendencies),[6] who informed him of what had happened at the Vatican after the audience that the pope had granted Bonomi. (Agliardi agreed with Bonomelli that the *non expedit* should be revoked.) The day after the audience, a semi-official newspaper of the Vatican had published an article denying the rumors about the audience and about changes concerning the *non expedit*; the article firmly asserted that nothing had changed on the issue. Agliardi immediately requested an audience, and in response to his questions the pope repeated his formula: "I have told (the people from Bergamo) to follow the dictates of their conscience." Agliardi had an article published in a Roman newspaper stating that the recipients of the pope's views on the forthcoming elections were the lawyer Bonomi and Professor Rezzara and that they were the ones to whom Catholic organizations should refer. Thus Catholics presented themselves as electoral candidates (Cornaggia in Milan, Cameroni in Treviglio, etc.), and in Bergamo citizens who until that time had been abstentionists brought out manifestos supporting political candidates.[7]

For Suardi, this event marks the end of the *non expedit* and represents the attainment of the moral unification of Italy, but he does exaggerate somewhat, even though the event per se is important.

§<26>. *America and Europe.* In 1927 the International Labor Office in Geneva published the results of a study on the relations between employers and workers in the United States, *Les rélations industrielles aux Etats Unis.* According to Gompers, the ultimate goal of American trade unionism consists in the progressive establishment of joint control, extending from the single workshop to the industrial complex and crowned by a kind of organic parliament.[1] (See what form the workers' drive toward industrial autonomy assumes in the words of Gompers and Co.)

§<27>. *Prince Karl Rohan.* In 1924 he founded the Federation of the Unions of Intellectuals, and he edits a periodical (*Europäische Gesprache*?). Italians participate in the work of this federation; its 1925 congress was held in Milan. The president of the Italian union is H. E. the Hon. Vittorio Scialoja.[1] In 1927 Rohan published a book on Russia (*Moskau: Ein Skizzenbuch aus Sowietrussland*, Verlag G. Braun, in Karlsruhe), where he had journeyed. The book should be interesting, given the social position of the author. He concludes that Russia "seinen Weg gefunden hat."[2]

§<28>. *Types of periodicals.* A periodical like Croce's *La Critica* or Coppola and Rocco's *Politica*[1] must have from the outset a staff of specialized editors capable of providing a knowledgeable selection of materials on a regular basis; it can therefore be anticipated by a "yearbook." Naturally, such a yearbook should bear no resemblance to an ordinary popular "almanac" (the compilation of which is qualitatively linked to the daily newspapers and is carried out with an eye to the average newspaper reader); nor should it be an occasional anthology of writings that are too long to be published in another type of periodical. Instead, it should be prepared organically, according to a general plan comprising several years (five years, for example) in such a way as to draft in advance the development of a definite program. It could be devoted to a single topic or divided into sections that deal with a series of basic issues (the constitution of the state, international politics, the agrarian question, etc.). Each yearbook

should be complete in itself (it should not contain writings that are to be continued), and it should be furnished with analytical indexes, etc., etc.[2]

Cf. Notebook 24, §5.

§<29>. *Catalogo dei cataloghi del libro italiano*, published by the Società Generale delle Messaggiere Italiane of Bologna in 1926 (I believe that supplements were published subsequently), is a publication to be kept in mind for bibliographical research. This inventory contains data on 65,000 volumes (in addition to the publisher's own volume), classified in eighteen divisions, and two alphabetical indexes—an index of authors, editors, and translators and a subject index—each with cross-references to the divisions and the numbered items.[1]

Cf. Notebook 26, §1.

§<30>. *Another bibliographical publication* to bear in mind is the *Catalogo metodico degli scritti contenuti nelle pubblicazioni periodiche italiane e straniere*, published by the library of the Chamber of Deputies.[1]

Cf. Notebook 26, §1.

§<31>. *Types of periodicals.* For a general description of the principal types of periodicals, one should remember the journalistic activity of Carlo Cattaneo: the *Archivio triennale* and the *Politecnico*. The *Politecnico* is a type of periodical that should be studied carefully (and alongside it, Rignano's periodical, *Scientia*).[1]

On Antonio Labriola:[2] an objective, systematic summary account of his publications on historical materialism to replace the volumes that are out of print and that the family does not reprint; this work would be the beginning of an effort to put back into circulation Labriola's philosophical views, which are little known outside a restricted circle.

In his memoirs, Leon Davidovich speaks of Labriola's "dilettantism": astonishing![3] This is an incomprehensible opinion; it is inexplicable, except as an "unconscious" reflection of a Russian social democratic tradition and especially of Plekhanov's views. In reality, Labriola, who asserts that the philosophy of Marxism is contained within Marxism itself, is the only one who has sought to provide historical materialism with a scientific foundation. The dominant tendency has produced two currents: (1) The tendency represented by Plekhanov (cf. *Fundamental Problems of Marxism*),[4] which relapses into vulgar materialism after having tried hard

to solve the problem of the origins of Marx's thought without knowing how to formulate the question. The study of Marx's philosophical culture (or of the "sources" of his philosophy) is certainly necessary, but only as an introduction to the much more important study of his own philosophy, which is not encompassed by the "sources" or his personal "culture." This work reveals the classic positivist method followed by Plekhanov and his poor speculative ability. (2) This tendency has created its opposite, namely, the tendency to connect Marxism with Kantianism, and therefore, in the final analysis, it has led to the opportunistic conclusion—expressed by Otto Bauer in his recent little volume *Socialism and Religion*—that Marxism can be "supported" or "integrated" by any philosophy, hence also by the so-called perennial philosophy of religion.[5] I posit the latter as a second tendency because with its agnosticism it embraces all the minor tendencies that are not "vulgar materialist"—including even the Freudian tendency of De Man.[6] Why did Labriola have no standing in the popular writings of the social democrats? One can say about the philosophy of Marxism what Luxemburg says about the economic theory: in the romantic period of struggle, of popular Sturm und Drang, all the interest is focused on the most immediate weapons or on problems of political tactics.[7] But as soon as a new type of state comes into existence, it gives rise [concretely] to the problem of a new civilization and hence to the need to elaborate more general concepts, the most refined and decisive weapons. This is why Labriola should be put back into circulation and why his formulation of the philosophical question should be made to prevail. This is a struggle for a superior culture, the positive side of the cultural struggle that manifests itself in a negative and polemical form with the alpha privative and the "anti-" (anticlericalism, atheism, etc.). This is the modern form of traditional secularism that is the basis of the new type of state.

The analytical and systematic treatment of Labriola's thought could constitute the philosophical section of periodicals modeled on *La Voce*, *Leonardo*, (*O.<rdine> N.<uovo>*), and it could provide material for the regular sections for at least six months or a year. An "international" bibliography on Labriola (*Neue Zeit*, etc.) also needs to be compiled.

[*Cultural topics.*] On Andrea Costa: a collection of his proclamations and manifestos from the early period of his activity in Romagna—a critical collection, with historical and political annotations and commentary.[8]

Cf. Notebook 24, §6, and Notebook 11, §70.

§<32>. "*Rendre la vie impossible.*" "Il y a deux façons de tuer: une, que l'on désigne franchement par le verbe *tuer*; l'autre, celle qui

reste sous-entendue d'habitude derrière cet euphémisme délicat: 'rendre la vie impossible.' C'est le mode d'assassinat, lent et obscur, qui consomme une foule d'invisibles complices. C'est un 'auto-da-fé' sans '*coroza*' et sans flammes, perpétré par une Inquisition sans juge ni sentence . . ." Eugène D'Ors, *La vie de Goya*, Gallimard, p. 41.[1] Elsewhere he calls it "widespread Inquisition."[2]

§<33>. *Some causes of error.* A government or a politician or a social group puts a political or economic tendency into practice. This tendency leads, much too easily, to certain general conclusions when present reality is interpreted and future developments are predicted. Not enough attention is paid to the fact that the tendency that is put into practice, the initiative that is promoted, etc., may be based on an error of calculation and hence does not represent any "concrete historical activity." In historical life, as in biological life, there are stillbirths alongside live births. History and politics are closely connected; indeed, they are the same thing. Yet distinctions must be made when evaluating historical events on the one hand and political events and actions on the other. In history—because of its broad perspective toward the past and because the outcomes of initiatives are themselves evidence of historical vitality—fewer errors are committed than in the evaluation of current political events and actions. Therefore the great politician has to be "very learned," that is, he should have maximum "knowledge" of the components of contemporary life; he should know them not "bookishly," as "erudition," but in a "living" way, as the concrete substance of political "intuition" (nevertheless, if they are to become the living substance of his "intuition," he also needs to learn them "bookishly").

§<34>. *Past and present.* The aspect of the modern crisis that is deplored as a "wave of materialism" is related to the so-called "crisis of authority." If the ruling class has lost consensus, that is, if it no longer "leads" but only "rules"—it possesses sheer coercive power—this actually means that the great masses have become detached from traditional ideologies, they no longer believe what they previously used to believe, etc. The crisis consists precisely in the fact

that the old is dying and the new cannot be born: in this interregnum, morbid phenomena of the most varied kind come to pass.

This paragraph should be connected to some earlier observations about the so-called "question of the young"[1]—a question that arises because of the "crisis of authority" of the old generation of leaders and because those capable of leadership are automatically barred from carrying out their mission. The problem is this: can such a serious rupture as the one that occurred after the war between the popular masses and the dominant ideologies be "healed" by the simple exercise of force that prevents the new ideologies from becoming popular? Will the interregnum, the crisis whose historically normal solution is blocked in this manner, necessarily be resolved in favor of a restoration of the old? Given the character of ideologies, such an outcome can be ruled out—but not in an absolute sense. Meanwhile, physical dejection will lead, in the long run, to widespread skepticism, giving rise to a new "arrangement" in which, for ex., Catholicism will become even more an unadulterated Jesuitism, etc. One can also infer from this that very favorable conditions are being created for an unprecedented expansion of historical materialism. The initial poverty of historical materialism—unavoidable in a theory disseminated among the masses—will enable it to expand. The death of the old ideologies manifests itself as skepticism toward all theories and general formulas; as the single-minded pursuit of the pure economic fact (profit, etc.) and of a politics that is not only de facto realistic (as it always is) but cynical in its immediate manifestation. (Remember the story of the "Preludio al Machiavelli,"[2] written perhaps under the influence of Prof. Rensi who at one time—in 1921 or 1922—extolled slavery as a modern instrument of economic policy.)[3] But this reduction to economics and to politics signifies precisely the reduction of the highest superstructures to what is closest to the structure; in other words, a possibility [and necessity] of creating a new culture.

§<35>. *Giuseppe Rensi.* His whole political-intellectual career should be examined. He used to write for *Critica Sociale* (perhaps he was also an émigré in Switzerland after 1894 or 1898).[1] His current "moralistic" attitude (see his articles in *Nuova Rivista Storica*)[2] should be compared to his

literary and journalistic output of 1921-1922-1923 (articles in *Il Popolo d'Italia*).[3] Remember his polemic with Gentile in *Il Popolo d'Italia* after the philosophers' congress[4] held in Milan in 1926.[a]

Notebook 11, §10.

§<36>. *Cultural matters.* The Salgari episode—the minister Fedele intervened, comparing Salgari to Jules Verne; hilarious campaigns in *Il Raduno*, organ of the Artists' and Writers' Union, etc.[1] It should be placed alongside the performance of the farce *Un'avventura galante ai bagni di Cernobbio* staged on 13 October 1928 in Alfonsine for the celebration of the first centenary of Vincenzo Monti's death. This farce, published in 1858 as a supplement to a play by Giovanni De Castro, was written by a certain Vincenzo Monti, a teacher in Como around that time. (Merely by reading it one sees the impossibility of the attribution to Monti.) But it was "discovered," attributed to Monti, and performed in Alfonsine in the presence of the authorities, at an official celebration, on Monti's centenary.[2] (Check the newspapers of the time, just in case, for the man who made the wondrous discovery and the official bigwigs who believed the whole thing.)

§<37>. *Father Bresciani's progeny.* Very few Catholic "writers" in Italy, especially in poetry and the novel. Gallarati-Scotti (to whom I referred in another note when pointing out a characteristic feature of *Storie dell'amor sacro e dell'amor profano*[1] but who nonetheless has a certain dignity). Paolo Arcari (better known as a literary and political essayist).[2] Luciano Gennari (who has written extensively in French).[3] It is not possible to compare the Italian Catholic writers with the French (Bourget, Bazin, Mauriac, Bernanos).[4] Crispolti has written a novel of propaganda, *Il Duello*.[5] As a matter of fact, Italian Catholicism is sterile in the literary field, as in the other fields of culture (cf. Missiroli).[6] (Maria di Borio.)[7]

Cf. Notebook 23, §35.

§<38>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. A. Panzini:* Vita di Cavour. "An English writer has described the history of the unification of Italy as the

[a] In the manuscript, "1925."

most romantic story of modern times."[1] (Panzini, besides creating clichés for the topics he addresses, busies himself no end collecting all the clichés that have been written on the same topics by other authors, especially foreign ones. He must have a special card index of clichés with which to season all his writings when the opportunity presents itself.) "King Vittorio was born with the sword and without fear: two fearful moustaches, a great goatee. He liked beautiful women and the music of cannon. A great King!"[2] This cliché should be combined with the other one on the military and aristocratic "tradition" of Piedmont; actually, a military "tradition"—that is, a "continuity" of first-rate military personnel—is exactly what Piedmont lacked, and this became evident in the wars of the Risorgimento, during which no important personality came to the fore, but many internal deficiencies surfaced instead. Piedmont had a population that was fit to bear arms and from which one could build a good army, and from time to time military talents of the highest caliber emerged, such as Emanuele Filiberto, Carlo Emanuele, etc.;[3] but there was an absence, precisely, of tradition, of continuity in the aristocracy, in the upper echelons of the officers corps: see what happened in 1848 when they did not know whom to grab to provide the army with a commander, and they stumbled on a common Polish simpleton. Vittorio Emanuele II's qualities as a warrior only consisted in a certain personal courage, which must be thought to be very rare in Italy if it is insisted on so much. It is somewhat like the question of "manly honor": in Italy one must think that the overwhelming majority is made up of rascals since "man of honor" is elevated to a title of distinction.[4] Apropos of Vittorio Emanuele II, remember an anecdote mentioned by Ferdinando Martini in his posthumous book of memoirs: he relates, roughly (check), that after the capture of Rome, Vittorio Emanuele said he regretted that there was nothing else left to seize; to the person who recounted the anecdote, this seemed to prove that no king has ever been more of a conqueror than Vittorio Emanuele.[5] The anecdote can be interpreted in many other—and not very witty—ways. Remember M. D'Azeglio's correspondence published by Bollea in the *Bollettino Storico Subalpino*;[6] problems between Vittorio Emanuele and Quintino Sella.[7]

What has always amazed me is that publications aimed at making Vittorio Emanuele a popular figure dwell so much on amorous anecdotes about high-ranking functionaries and officers visiting families to convince the parents to let their daughters go into the king's bed, for money. It is astonishing, when one thinks about it, that these things should be published in the belief that they reinforce the people's affection. ". . . Piedmont . . . has a warlike tradition, it has a warlike nobility. . . ." It could be noted that Napoleon III, given the "[warlike] tradition" of his family, devoted himself to military science and wrote books that do not seem to have been too bad for his time. "Women? Women, of course. On this sub-

ject he (Cavour) got along very well with his king, although there were some differences on this as well.[8] King Vittorio was very easy to please, as the beautiful Rosina, later the countess of Mirafiori, could have attested"—and the tone degenerates to the point of recalling that the gallant designs of the king at the court of the Tuglierí (*sic*) were so bold "that all the ladies remained amiably frightened by him. That strong, magnificent mountain King!" "Cavour was much more refined. Both of them, however, were chivalrous and, I would dare say, romantic (!!!)." "Massimo D'Azeglio . . . delicate gentleman that he was . . ."

On p. 10, I referred to an allusion made by Panzini that I could not understand unless I read the comment published in *Il Resto del Carlino*;[9] but now, after rereading the second installment of *Vita di Cavour* (*L'Italia Letteraria* of 16 June), I understand. The following passage: "He had no need to assume specific attitudes. But on certain occasions he had to appear marvelous and fearful. The mien of human greatness was such as to inspire obedience and terror in others, and this was a more powerful dictatorship than the one that takes over many ministerial portfolios." It is incredible that such a phrase could have escaped Panzini, and it is natural that *Il Resto del Carlino* picked it up. In his letter, Panzini writes: "As for certain barbs against the dictatorship, perhaps I was wrong to rely on the reader's historical knowledge. In 1859 Cavour demanded dictatorial powers, and he took over various portfolios, including the war portfolio, causing great scandal to the quasi-virginal constitutionality of the time. It was not this material form of dictatorship that inspired obedience, but the dictatorship of Cavour's greatness as a human being."

". . . The war of the Orient, a somewhat complicated matter which is omitted in the interests of clarity." (It is asserted that Cavour was a very great politician, etc., but the assertion never becomes concrete historical representation: it "is omitted in the interests of clarity." The significance of the Crimean expedition and of the political skill of Cavour who wanted it—this is omitted for "clarity.") The profile of Napoleon III is priceless for its coarseness, but there is no explanation as to why Napoleon collaborated with Cavour. Too many quotations would be needed, but ultimately it is not quite worth the effort. If I were to write on this subject, however, it would be necessary to reexamine the book (if it is ever published) or the year's run of *L'Italia Letteraria*.

"At the Napoleonic museum in Rome there is a valuable dagger with a blade that can go through the heart" (it is no ordinary dagger, apparently!). "Could this dagger serve as a document? I have no familiarity with daggers, but I have heard it said that this one is a Carbonarist dagger that used to be entrusted to those who joined the mysterious sect, etc." (Panzini must have always been obsessed with daggers: remember the "livid blade" in *La lanterna di Diogene*.[10] He must have accidentally found himself in

the midst of some disturbance in Romagna and seen a pair of wicked eyes glaring at him suspiciously, whence the "livid blades" that can go through the heart, etc.)

"And whoever wants to see how the Carbonarist sect could assume the appearance of Beelzebub should read Antonio Bresciani's novel, *L'ebreo di Verona;*[11] he would enjoy it immensely (! *sic*) because, in spite of what the moderns say about it, the Jesuit father was a powerful narrator." (This passage could be used as an epigraph for the essay on Father Bresciani's progeny—it is in the third installment of the *Vita di Cavour* in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 23 June 1929.)

The *Vita di Cavour* is entirely a historical hoax. If the current fashion in entertaining literature is the biographical novel as typified by Alexandre Dumas, then Panzini is the new Ponson du Terrail.[12] Panzini wants to show so ostentatiously that he "knows what's what" about human behavior and that he is such an extremely shrewd realist that reading him makes one want to seek refuge in Condorcet or in Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, who at least were not so philistine.[13] Panzini focuses on a personality without reconstructing the historical connections; history is a succession of entertaining little stories linked neither by personalities nor by other social forces. It really is a new form of Jesuitism, much more pronounced than I myself imagined when reading the *Vita* in installments. The cliché "the nobility of warriors not of the antechamber" could be contrasted with the views that are expressed every so often, and sometimes in unconsciously scornful language, about the individual generals: La Marmora, Della Rocca.[14] "Della Rocca was a warrior. He did not distinguish himself for great courage at Custozza in 1866, but he was a stubborn warrior and therefore he refused to yield on the bulletins." (This is really the kind of sentence that belongs in funny papers like *L'Asino*. Della Rocca refused to continue sending the bulletins of the General Staff to Cavour, who had taken note of the bad literary quality of their composition, in which the king participated.) (Other allusions of this sort to La Marmora and Cialdini—even though Cialdini was not from Piedmont; there is no mention of any Piedmontese general who distinguished himself; another reference to Persano.)[15]

It is impossible to figure out just what Panzini wanted to produce with this *Vita di Cavour;* it is certainly not a life of Cavour: neither a biography of Cavour the man, nor a reconstruction of Cavour the politician. The Cavour that emerges out of Panzini's book is really a very paltry and much diminished figure, a figure of no real stature except in the pious utterances repeated intermittently by Panzini: hero, magnificent, genius, etc. But since these pious utterances are unsubstantiated (which is why they are pious utterances) they sometimes seem fraudulent, unless one realizes that the measure by which Panzini judges heroism, greatness, genius, etc.,

is his very own measure of the brilliance, greatness, heroism, etc., of Mr. Panzini, Alfredo. Furthermore, Panzini exaggerates, detecting the finger of god, fate, providence in so many events: this is, after all, the concept of the lucky star of Italy, couched in the language of Greek tragedies or of Jesuit priests—which, however, does not make it any less trivial and banal. To insist too much on the "providential" element is to diminish the function of the Italian effort, which certainly played its part. Besides, what does the miraculousness of the Italian revolution mean in this case? It means that between the national and the international elements of the event, it is the international one that counted most. Is this the case? One must say so, and perhaps Cavour's greatness would be brought further into relief and his personal role, his "heroism," would become much more praiseworthy. But Panzini wants to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, and he does not know what a revolution is and who the revolutionaries are. They were all great, and they were all revolutionaries.

L'Italia Letteraria of 2 June 1929 published an interview with Panzini by Antonio Bruers, "Come e perché Alfredo Panzini ha scritto una *Vita di Cavour.*"[16] In it, Bruers {it seems that Bruers translated Paléologue's *Cavour*}[17] says that he himself persuaded Panzini to write the book "in such a way that the public could finally have an Italian 'Cavour' after having had a German one, an English one, and a French one." In the interview, Panzini says that his *Vita* "is not a monograph in the historical-scientific sense of the term; it is a profile meant not for the learned, the 'specialists,' but for the general public." Panzini believes that his book contains some original features, specifically the importance he attributes to Orsini's assassination attempt in explaining Napoleon III's attitude.[18] According to Panzini, the young Napoleon III joined the society of Carbonari, "which bound the future French sovereign by the pledge of honor"; Orsini, an emissary of the Carbonari, reminded Napoleon of his pledge, and therefore, etc. {Exactly like a Ponson du Terrail novel. Orsini had to have forgotten about the Carbonari many years before his assassination attempt, and his repressive actions in Marche in 1848 were actually directed against old Carbonari.} The reasons for Napoleon's leniency toward Orsini {or, rather, toward some of his attitudes, because Orsini was guillotined anyway} perhaps have a banal explanation, such as fear of the accomplice who escaped and could repeat the attempt; certainly, also, the great seriousness of Orsini, who was not just an ordinary fanatic, had to be respected. Panzini forgets that the Crimean War took place, and he forgets that Napoleon was generally pro-Italian—so much so that Napoleon regarded Orsini's assassination attempt as a disruption of preestablished plans. Panzini's entire "hypothesis," after all, is based on the famous dagger, which did not necessarily belong to the Carbonari. It is really a novel à la Ponson.

Cf. Notebook 23, §32.

§<39>. *Past and present.* The problem of the capital: Rome-Milan. Function and position of the largest cities: Turin-Trieste-Genoa-Bologna-Florence-Naples-Palermo-Bari-Ancona, etc. Do the industrial statistics of 1927 and the publications that interpreted the results provide a breakdown of these data by city or by industrial center in general?[1] (The textile industry appears in industrial zones without large cities, such as Biellese, Comasco, Vicentino, etc.) Social and political importance of the Italian city.

This problem goes hand in hand with that of the "hundred cities"[2]: namely, the clustering of the rural bourgeoisie in burgs (cities) and the clustering of great masses of agricultural day laborers and landless peasants from areas with extensive landed estates (Apulia, Sicily) in peasant market towns. It is also connected to the question of which social group exercises political and intellectual leadership over the great masses: leadership of the first degree and of the second degree. (The intellectuals often exercise a leadership of the second degree because they themselves are under the influence of the great landowners and these, in turn, are led directly or indirectly, partly or wholly, by the upper bourgeoisie, especially the financiers.)

§<40>. *Reformation and Renaissance.* The scattered observations on the differing historical significances of the Protestant Reformation and the Italian Renaissance, of the French Revolution and the Risorgimento (the Reformation is to the Renaissance as the French Revolution is to the Risorgimento) can be collected in a single essay, possibly even under the title "Reformation and Renaissance." The essay could take for its point of departure the publications that appeared between 1920 and 1925 on this very subject—"on the need for Italy to undergo an intellectual and moral reform"—a topic related to the critique by Gobetti, Missiroli, and Dorso of the Risorgimento as a "royal conquest" as opposed to a popular movement.[1] (Remember Ansaldo's article in *Il Lavoro* of Genoa against Dorso and against me.)[2] Why did this problem arise at the time? It arose out of the events . . . (Comic episode: articles by Mazzali in Gangale's *Conscientia*, in which he went back to Engels.)[3] A historical precedent in Masaryk's study of Russia (translated into Italian by Lo Gatto in 1925): Masaryk attributed the political weakness of

the Russian people to the fact that a religious reformation never took place in Russia.[4]

§<41>. *Father Bresciani's progeny.* It would certainly be unjust to expect the literature of a country to have a *Promessi sposi* or a *Sepolcri* every year or even every ten years.[1] But precisely for this reason, the criticism that one can produce about these periods is a criticism of "culture," a criticism of "trends." It is true that in certain periods the solving of practical problems absorbs all intellects (in a sense, all human energies become focused on structural work, and one cannot yet talk of superstructures: according to what Cambon writes in his preface to the French translation of Ford's autobiography,[2] the Americans have actually created a theory out of this), so that the only kind of "poetry"—that is, "creation"—would be the economical-practical; but this is precisely the issue: that it is, in any case, a creation. Besides, one could ask how it is that this economical-practical "creative" work, which rouses the vital forces, energies, wills, enthusiasms, does not also assume literary forms that celebrate it. This does not really happen: the forces are not expansive but purely repressive and, mark these words, purely and totally repressive—forces that repress not only their adversaries, which would be natural, but their own side, which is precisely what typifies these forces and gives them their repressive character. Every innovation is repressive for its adversaries, but it unleashes latent forces in society, it empowers and exalts them, and hence it is expansive. Restorations are universally repressive: they create, precisely, the "Father Brescianis," literature in the manner of Father Bresciani. The psychology behind these innovations is "panic," a cosmic fear that cannot be understood and cannot be controlled. The memory of this "panic" lasts a long time and controls people's wills and feelings. Creative freedom disappears; what remains is rancor, the spirit of revenge, blind stupidity. Everything becomes practical; unconsciously, everything is "propaganda," controversy, negation, but in a mean, narrow form that is, precisely, Jesuitical.

When judging a writer solely on the basis of his first book, the judgment takes the writer's "age" into account because it is a cultural judgment: the green fruit of a young writer is a withered plum if it comes from an old one.

Cf. Notebook 23, §36.

§<42>. *Past and present.* The fable of the beaver (the beaver, pursued by hunters who want his testicles for the extraction of medicinal substances, tears off his own testicles to save his life). Why was there no defense? The parties lacked a sense of human and

political dignity, but these factors are not facts of nature—they are not deficiencies inherent in a people as permanent characteristics. They are "historical facts" that have their explanation in history and in current social conditions.[1]

Apparent contradictions: a fatalistic and mechanistic conception of history prevailed (Florence 1917, accusation of Bergsonianism),[2] yet crude, superficial, and formalistic voluntarist positions were adopted: for ex., the plan of 1920 to establish in Bologna an urban council made up exclusively of members of existing organizations;[3] in other words, to replace[a] a historical organism rooted in the masses, such as the chamber of labor,[4] with a purely abstract and bookish organism. Was there at least the political goal of giving hegemony to the urban element, which with the establishment of the council would have acquired an urban center of its own since the chamber of labor was a provincial body? There was absolutely no such intention, and, besides, the plan was never carried out.

Treves's "expiation" speech: this speech, it seems to me, is fundamental for understanding the political confusion and polemical dilettantism of the leaders.[5] Behind these polemics lurks the fear of concrete responsibilities, and behind this fear lies a total absence of unity with the represented class, a total lack of understanding of its basic needs, its aspirations, its latent energies: paternalistic party of petty bourgeois with a ridiculous sense of self-importance.[6] Why no defense? The notion of war psychosis and the notion that a civilized country cannot "permit" certain barbaric events to take place. These generalities were themselves masks for other, deeper motives (besides, they contradicted the assertion reiterated after every massacre: We have always said that the ruling class is reactionary), which always boil down to separation from the class, that is, to the "two classes." They could not understand what would happen if reaction triumphed because they did not experience the real struggle, only the struggle as a "bookish principle."

Another contradiction concerning voluntarism: if one is against voluntarism, one should appreciate "spontaneity." But not in this case: what was "spontaneous" was deemed inferior, not worth considering, not even worth analyzing. In reality, the "spontaneous" was the most devastating proof of the party's ineptitude because it revealed the gulf between the grandiloquent programs and the pal-

[a]In the manuscript, the phrase "to create a useless copy" is inserted between the lines above "replace."

try deeds. But in the meantime "spontaneous" events did occur (1919–20), and they were injurious to certain interests, they upset acquired positions, they aroused dreadful hatreds even among peaceful people, they brought out of their passivity social strata that were stagnating in putridity: precisely because of their spontaneity and because they were repudiated, they created the general "panic," the "great fear" that could only result in the coalescence of the repressive forces that would mercilessly smother them.[7]

Extraordinary proof of this gulf between represented and representatives is provided by the so-called pact of alliance between the confederation and the party,[8] which can be compared to a concordat between state and church. The party that is an embryonic state structure cannot allow any division of its political powers; it cannot allow some of its members to arrogate unto themselves equivalent rights with the party itself and to pose as allies of the "whole"—just as a state cannot allow a part of its subjects to go over and above the general laws and through a foreign power make with the state to which they belong a special contract of cohabitation with the state itself. To allow such a situation would imply the de facto and legal subordination of the state and of the party to the so-called "majority" of the represented—in reality to a group that posits itself as antistate and antiparty and ends up exercising power indirectly. In the case of the pact of alliance, it was clear that the power did not lie with the party.

The strange ties between the party and the parliamentary group corresponded to the pact of alliance, for they, too, were ties of alliance and equivalent rights. This system of relations meant that the party did not exist concretely, as an independent organism, but only as a constitutive element of a more complex organism that had all the characteristics of a labor party, lacking a center, a unitary will, etc. Must the unions, then, be subordinated to the party? This is the wrong way to pose the question. The issue should be formulated as follows: every member of the party, no matter what position or office he might occupy, remains a member of the party and subordinated to its leadership. There cannot be subordination between trade union and party; if the union has voluntarily chosen a member of the party to be its leader, it means that the union [freely] accepts the directions of the party and therefore freely accepts (indeed desires) the party's control over its officials.

This issue was not formulated correctly in 1919, even though there existed the great, instructive precedent of June 1914,[9] for, in reality, the factions had no policy: that is, the party had no policy.

§<43>. *Past and present.* The relations of the reformists with the plutocracy produced a rather obscure, not to say suspicious, episode: *Critica Sociale,* administered by Bemporad, that is, by the Banca Commerciale (Bemporad was also the publisher of Nitti's political books);[1] the engineer Omodeo's entry into Turati's circle; Turati's speech about "Rebuilding Italy"(!) on the basis of the electric industry and the mountain basins, a speech prompted by and perhaps written in collaboration with Omodeo.[2]

§<44>. *Past and present.* The observations I wrote elsewhere on the strange "types" who moved around in party circles and in the workers movement—Ciccotti-Scozzese, Gatto-Roissard, etc.—should be part of this essay.[1] No internal party policy, no organizational policy, no control over individuals. Still, a great deal of demagogy was directed against interventionists, including those who were interventionists only in their early youth. The motion by which it was decided that interventionists could not be admitted into the party was just an instrument of blackmail and individual intimidation, as well as a demagogic declaration. In fact, it did not hinder Nenni[2] from being admitted, in spite of his shady past (the same with Francesco Rèpaci),[3] whereas it served to falsify the political position of the party [which should not have made antiinterventionism the pivot of its actions] and to unleash hatred and personal persecutions against particular petty bourgeois groups. (Rèpaci became the newspaper's Turin correspondent, just as Nenni became its editor, so these were not people who entered on the sly.)

Treves's "expiation" speech[4] and the fixation with interventionism are closely related: they constitute a policy of avoiding the fundamental problem, the problem of power; of diverting the attention and the passions of the masses to secondary objectives; of hypocritically concealing the historical-political responsibility of the ruling class, channeling the people's rage against the material and frequently unconscious instruments of ruling class policies. In essence, this was a continuation of Giolitti's politics. Italo Toscani's

article "Carabinieri reali" is part of the same trend: the dog that bites the stone and not the hand that throws it.[5] Toscani ended up as a right-wing Catholic writer for the *Corriere d'Italia*. It was evident that the war, with the enormous economic and psychological confusion it caused, especially among minor intellectuals and the petty bourgeois, would have radicalized those strata. Instead of making them its allies, the party turned them gratuitously into enemies; that is, it drove them back to the ruling class.

In other countries the war had an effect on the selection of the leaders of the workers' movement and was a factor in the rapid collapse of rightist tendencies. In Italy, this was not brought about by the war (Giolittism), but it happened afterward, much more catastrophically, with phenomena of mass betrayal and desertion not witnessed in any other country.

§<45>. *Past and present*. The theoretical weakness, the total lack of historical depth and continuity in the leftist movement were among the causes of the catastrophe. As an indication of the cultural level one could refer to the case of Abbo at the Livorno Congress:[1] in the absence of cultural activity by the party, individuals practice the culture they are capable of, and this contributes to the vagueness of the concept of the subversive; what happens is, precisely, that someone like Abbo would memorize the stupidities of an anarchist.

§<46>. *Past and present*. The characteristically Italian concept of "subversive" can be explained thus: a negative rather than positive class position; the "people" feel that they have enemies and identify them only empirically as the so-called *signori*.[1] (The concept of "*signore*" contains much of the old antipathy of the country toward the city, and dress is a basic element of distinction. There is also a dislike for the bureaucracy, which is their sole perception of the state. The peasant, as well as the small landowner, hates the "bureaucrat"—not the state, which he does not comprehend—and regards him as the "*signore*," even though the peasant is better off economically; hence the apparent contradiction whereby the peasant often considers the *signore* a "starveling.")[2] This is not so much a modern as a semifeudal kind of "generic"

hatred, and it cannot be advanced as evidence of class consciousness: it is barely its first glimmer; indeed, it is only the negative and hostile rudimentary position. Not only do the "people" have no precise consciousness of their own historical identity, but neither are they conscious of the historical identity and exact limits of their enemy. (The lower classes, being historically on the defensive, cannot acquire self-consciousness except through negations, through a consciousness of the identity and class boundaries of their enemy, but it is precisely this process that has yet to dawn, at least on a national scale.)

In order to understand the concept of "subversive," one also needs to take into account the stratum of what are commonly called the "starvelings." The "starvelings" are not a homogeneous stratum; identifying them abstractly could lead to serious errors. In the village and in the small urban centers of certain rural regions, there exist two distinct strata of "starvelings": one is made up of agricultural day laborers and the other of petty intellectuals. The basic characteristic of these day laborers is not their economic situation but their intellectual-moral condition: they are drunkards, incapable of sustained labor, spendthrifts, and hence biologically deficient, either because of chronic malnutrition or because of mental retardation and stupidity. The typical peasant of these regions is the small landowner or the primitive sharecropper (who pays his rent with a third, a half, or even two-thirds of his harvest, depending on the fertility and location of the property) who owns some farming implements, a yoke of oxen, and a small house that, in many cases, he has built himself on days when he is not working and for which he obtained the necessary capital either by emigrating for a few years, or by going to work in the "mines," or by doing a stint of service in the carabinieri, etc., or by spending some years as a servant for a big landowner: in other words, by "contriving" and saving. The day laborer, however, has been unable or unwilling to contrive and owns nothing; he is a "starveling" because day labor is scarce and irregular; he is a halfway beggar with a makeshift life on the edges of the rural underworld.

The petty bourgeois "starveling" has his roots in the rural bourgeoisie. The property of large families gets broken up into small pieces until there is nothing left, but the members of this class refuse manual labor; this results in the formation of a famished stratum of aspirants to minor municipal jobs as clerks, messengers, etc.,

etc. This stratum is a troublesome element in rural life, always eager for new developments (elections, etc.) and acting as the local "subversive," and since it is fairly widespread, it has a certain importance: it allies itself primarily with the rural bourgeoisie against the peasants while also organizing the "starveling" day laborers to its own advantage. These strata are found in every region, and they have also branched out into the cities, where they merge with the entrenched criminal circles and the shifting underworld. Many minor employees in the cities come from these social strata, and they retain the arrogant mentality of the impoverished nobleman, of the landowner who is forced to suffer working. The "subversiveness" of these strata has two faces: one turned toward the left and the other toward the right, but the left face is a means of blackmail—at decisive moments they always go to the right and their miserable "courage" always prefers to have the carabinieri as their allies.

Another thing one has to consider is the so-called "internationalism" of the Italian people. It is correlated to the concept of "subversiveness." This really has to do with a certain vague "cosmopolitanism" that is linked to specifiable historical phenomena: to medieval and Catholic cosmopolitanism and universalism, which had their headquarters in Italy and were preserved thanks to the absence of an Italian "political and national history." A weak sense of nation and state as understood in modern terms. I have pointed out elsewhere,[3] however, that a certain Italian chauvinism has existed and exists now that is more widespread than one might think. The two observations are not contradictory: in Italy, political, territorial, and national unity have a short tradition (or perhaps no tradition at all), because prior to 1870 Italy was never a unified entity and even the name Italy—which in Roman times referred to southern and central Italy up to the Magra and the Rubicon—lost ground to the name Longobard during the Middle Ages (see C. Cipolla's study on the name Italy published in the *Atti dell'Accademia di Torino*).[4]

However, Italy did have [and preserved] a cultural tradition that goes back not to classical antiquity but to the period of 1300 to 1700, which was reconnected to the classical age by humanism and the Renaissance. This cultural unity was the—admittedly, very weak—basis of the Risorgimento and unification; it served to center the most active and intelligent strata of the population around the bourgeoisie, and it is still the substratum of popular national-

ism. Missing from this sentiment are the politico-military and the politico-economic element—that is, those elements that are at the basis of the French, German, or American nationalist mentality; as a result, many so-called "subversives" and "internationalists" are "chauvinists" in this sense, without being aware of their contradictory position.

In order to understand the virulence that this cultural chauvinism sometimes assumes, one has to take note of the following: in Italy, a major scientific, artistic, and literary efflorescence coincided with a period of political, military, and state decadence (sixteenth-seventeenth centuries). (Explain this phenomenon: aristocrats, courtly culture; that is, the period when the bourgeoisie of the Communes was decaying, and productive wealth had given way to usury, with concentrations of "luxury"—a prelude to total economic decline.)

The concepts of revolutionary and of internationalist, in the modern sense, are correlated to the precise concept of state and of class: a poor understanding of the state means a poor consciousness of class (understanding of the state exists not only when one defends it but also when one attacks it in order to overthrow it); hence the parties' low level of effectiveness, etc. Bands of gypsies or political nomadism[5] are not dangerous things, and for that reason Italian subversiveness and internationalism were not dangerous.

Naturally, all these observations cannot be categorical and absolute: they serve the purpose of describing certain aspects of a situation in order to get a better assessment of the activity that was carried out (or the nonactivity: that is, the failure to understand one's own tasks) so that it could be changed and of giving greater prominence to those groups who distinguished themselves in this situation because they understood it and modified it within their milieu. [Popular "subversiveness" is correlated to "subversiveness" from above; in other words, it is related to the fact that there has never existed a "rule of law" but only a politics of arbitrary power and of personal cliques or groups.][a]

§<47>. *Political science and the positivists.* Politics is nothing more than a [particular] "phenomenology" of criminality; it is "sec-

[a]Added at a later time.

tarian criminality": this, it seems to me, is the gist of Scipio Sighele's book *Morale privata e morale politica* (Milan: Treves, 1913), which is a new edition of *La delinquenza settaria* revised and expanded by the author (with the pamphlet *Contro il parlamentarismo* reprinted as an appendix).[1] It could serve as a "source" to see how the positivists understood "politics," even though it is superficial, prolix, and disjointed. The bibliography is compiled unmethodically, inaccurately, and needlessly (if an author is cited in the text for some incidental remark, the book from which the remark is quoted is listed in the bibliography). The book may be useful as an element for understanding the relations that existed in the decade 1890–1900 between socialist intellectuals and the positivists of Lombroso's school who were so obsessed with the problem of criminality that they constructed a worldview out of it, or they almost did.[2] (They fell into a strange form of abstract "moralism," because good and evil were something transcendent and dogmatic concretely identical to the morals of the "people" or "common sense.") Sighele's book must have been reviewed by Guglielmo Ferrero because the bibliography cites an article by Ferrero, "Morale individuale e morale politica," in *La Riforma Sociale*, I, xi–xii.[3] Ferri's book: *Socialismo e criminalità*; Turati's: *Il delitto e la questione sociale*.[4] Check bibliographies of Lombroso, Ferri, Garofalo (antisocialist),[5] Ferrero, and others that have to be examined.

The pamphlet against parliamentarianism is also extremely superficial and pointless; it could be cited as a curiosity, given the time of its composition. It all hinges on the idea that large legislative assemblies and colleges are *technically* inferior organisms in comparison to command by a single person or by a few—as if this were the main issue. And to think that Sighele was a democrat and that, for precisely that reason, at a certain point he left the nationalist movement.[6] [In any case, perhaps Sighele's pamphlet should be connected to Comte's "organic" concepts.][a]

§<48>. *Past and present. Spontaneity and conscious leadership.* The word "spontaneity" can be variously defined because it refers to a multifaceted phenomenon. One needs to point out, however, that "pure" spontaneity does not exist in history: it would be the

[a]Added at a later time.

same thing as "pure" mechanicity. The elements of "conscious leadership" in the "most spontaneous" of movements cannot be ascertained, simply because they have left no verifiable document. One may say that the element of spontaneity is therefore characteristic of the "history of subaltern classes" and, especially, of the most marginal and peripheral elements of these classes, who have not attained a consciousness of the class per se and who consequently do not even suspect that their history might possibly have any importance or that it might be of any value to leave documentary evidence of it.

In these movements, then, there exists a "multiplicity" of elements of "conscious leadership," but none of them predominates or goes beyond the level of "popular science"—"common sense," that is, the [traditional] conception of the world—of a given social stratum.

This is precisely the element that De Man empirically sets in opposition to Marxism[1] without realizing (it seems) that he ends up in the same position as those who, having described folklore, witchcraft, etc., and having demonstrated that these ways of thinking have strong historical roots and are tenaciously bound to the psychology of specific popular strata, believe that they have "surpassed" modern science while accepting every little article in popular scientific journals and serial publications as "modern science." This a real case of intellectual teratology, of which there are other examples: specifically, admirers of folklore who advocate its preservation; the "occultists" associated with Maeterlinck,[2] who believe that in order to return science to a more fruitful path of discovery it is necessary to recuperate the thread of alchemy and sorcery that was severed by violence; etc. Nonetheless, De Man has an incidental merit: he demonstrates the need to study and work out the elements of popular psychology, historically and not sociologically, actively (that is, in order to transform them by means of education into a modern mentality) and not descriptively, as he does—a necessity that was at least implicit (and perhaps also explicitly stated) in Ilyich's[3] doctrine, of which De Man is totally ignorant.

The presence of a rudimentary element of conscious leadership, of discipline, in every "spontaneous" movement is indirectly demonstrated by the fact that there exist currents and groups that uphold spontaneity as a method. In this regard, one must distinguish between purely "ideological" elements and elements of prac-

tical activity, between scholars who maintain that spontaneity is the immanent [and objective] "method" of the historical process and political adventurers who uphold spontaneity as the political "method." In the case of the former, one is dealing with an erroneous concept, but the latter case has to do with a [vulgar and immediate] contradiction that betrays its own obvious practical origin: namely, the [immediate] intent to replace a given leadership with another one. Among scholars, too, the error has a practical origin but not an immediate one, as in the latter case. The apolitical posture of the French trade unionists before the war contained both these elements: it was a theoretical error and a contradiction (there were the "Sorelian" element and the element of rivalry between the anarcho-syndicalist political tendency and the socialist current). It was the lingering aftermath of the terrible events of 1871 in Paris: the continuation, with new methods and a brilliant theory, of the French workers' thirty years (1870–1900) of passivity. The purely "economic" struggle did not displease the ruling class, not in the least. The same can be said about the Catalan movement[4] that "displeased" the Spanish ruling class, if at all, only because it objectively reinforced Catalan republican separatism, giving rise to a real republican industrial bloc against the big landowners, the petty bourgeoisie, and the army—all of them monarchists.

The Turin movement was accused simultaneously of being "spontaneist" and "voluntarist," or Bergsonian (!).[5] The contradictory accusation, if one were to think about it, testifies to the creativity and soundness of the leadership that the movement acquired. This was not an "abstract" leadership; it did not consist in the mechanical repetition of scientific or theoretical formulas; it did not confuse politics—real action—with theoretical disquisition. It devoted itself to real people in specific historical relations, with specific sentiments, ways of life, fragments of worldviews, etc., that were outcomes of the "spontaneous" combinations of a given environment of material production with the "fortuitous" gathering of disparate social elements within that same environment. This element of "spontaneity" was not neglected, much less disdained: it was *educated*, it was given a direction, it was cleansed of everything extraneous that could contaminate it, in order to unify it by means of modern theory but in a living, historically effective manner. The leaders themselves spoke of the "spontaneity" of the movement, and they were right to talk about it: this

assertion was a stimulus, a tonic, an element of unification in depth; it was, above all, a denial that anything having to do with the movement might be reckless, fake [or not historically necessary]. It gave the masses a "theoretical" consciousness of themselves as creators of historical and institutional values, as founders of states.

This unity of "spontaneity" and "conscious leadership," or "discipline," is precisely the real political action of the subaltern classes, insofar as it is mass politics and not a mere adventure by groups that appeal to the masses. In this regard, a fundamental theoretical question arises: can modern theory be in opposition to the "spontaneous" sentiments of the masses? ["Spontaneous" in the sense that they are not due to the systematic educational activity of an already conscious leadership but have been formed through everyday experience in the light of "common sense," that is, the traditional popular conception of the world: what is very tritely called "instinct," which is itself a rudimentary and basic historical acquisition.] It cannot be in opposition: there is, between the two, a "quantitative" difference—of degree not of quality; it should be possible to have a reciprocal "reduction," so to speak, a passage from one to the other and vice versa. [Remember that I. Kant considered it important for his philosophical theories to be in agreement with common sense; the same is true of Croce. Remember Marx's assertion in *The Holy Family* that the political formulas of the French Revolution are reducible to the principles of classical German philosophy.][6]

Ignoring and, even worse, disdaining so-called "spontaneous" movements—that is, declining to give them a conscious leadership and raise them to a higher level by inserting them into politics—may often have very bad and serious consequences. It is almost always the case that a "spontaneous" movement of the subaltern classes is matched by a reactionary movement of the right wing of the dominant class, for concomitant reasons: an economic crisis, for example, produces, on the one hand, discontent among the subaltern classes and spontaneous mass movements and, on the other, conspiracies by reactionary groups, who take advantage of the objective enfeeblement of the government to attempt coups d'état. Among the efficient causes of these coups d'état, one must include the failure of the responsible groups to give conscious leadership to spontaneous rebellions and thus enable them to become a positive political factor. The example of the Sicilian Vespers and the dis-

cussion among historians to determine whether it was a spontaneous or a planned movement. In my view, the Sicilian Vespers combined both elements: a spontaneous uprising of the Sicilian people against the Provençals—caused by the oppression that had become unbearable throughout the nation—that spread so quickly it created the impression of simultaneity and therefore of prior planning, combined with the conscious element of varying importance and effectiveness in which Giovanni da Procida's conspiracy with the Aragonese prevailed.[7] Other examples can be drawn from all the past revolutions in which various subaltern classes took part and were ranked according to their economic position and homogeneity. The "spontaneous" movements of the broadest popular strata make it possible for the most advanced subaltern class to come to power because of the objective enfeeblement of the state. Again, this is a "progressive" example, but, in the modern world, the regressive examples are more frequent.

The scholastic and academic historico-political conception: the only authentic and worthy movement is one that is one hundred percent conscious and that, furthermore, is governed by a preestablished, minutely detailed plan or (and this amounts to the same thing) corresponds to abstract theory. But reality is teeming with the most bizarre coincidences, and it is the theoretician's task to find in this bizarreness new evidence for his theory, to "translate" the elements of historical life into theoretical language, but not vice versa, making reality conform to an abstract scheme. Reality will never conform to an abstract scheme, and therefore this conception is nothing but an expression of passivity. (Leonardo knew how to discover number in all the manifestations of cosmic life, even when the eyes of the ignorant saw only chance and disorder.)

§<49>. *Cultural topics.*[a] *Ideological material.* A study of how the ideological structure of a ruling class is actually organized: that is, the material organization meant to preserve, defend, and develop the theoretical or ideological "front." Its most notable and dynamic part is the press in general: publishing houses (which have an implicit and explicit program and support a particular current); political newspapers; reviews of every kind—scientific, literary,

[a]In the manuscript, the title "Cultural topics" appears above the canceled original title, "Types of periodicals."

philological, popular, etc.; various periodicals, including even parish bulletins. Such a study would be gigantic if conducted on a national scale; therefore, one could do it for a single city or do a series of studies for a number of cities. The news editor of a daily paper should have such a study as a general outline for his work, indeed, he should compile one for his own purposes—so many wonderful leading articles could be written on the subject!

The press is the most dynamic part of the ideological structure, but not the only one. Everything that directly or indirectly influences or could influence public opinion belongs to it: libraries, schools, associations and clubs of various kinds, even architecture, the layout of streets and their names. The position that the church has maintained in the modern world cannot be explained without knowledge of the incessant and patient efforts it makes to ensure the continuous development of its particular sector of this material structure of ideology. Such a study, conducted seriously, would be quite important: besides providing a living historical model of such a structure, it would inculcate the habit of assessing the forces of agency in society with greater caution and precision. What can an innovative class set against the formidable complex of trenches and fortifications of the ruling class? The spirit of cleavage[1]—that is, the progressive acquisition of the consciousness of one's historical identity—a spirit of cleavage that must aim to extend itself from the protagonist class to the classes that are its potential allies: all of this requires complex ideological work, the first condition of which is an exact knowledge of the field that must be cleared of its element of human mass.

§<50>. *Concordat*. In his book *Esame critico degli ordini rappresentativi*, Father L. Taparelli defines concordats as follows: "... they are agreements between two authorities ruling over the same Catholic nation."[1] When an agreement is established, the interpretations of that agreement by the two parties have at least equal weight.

§<51>. *Past and present*. The opening of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*: the saying by Hegel that in history all events occur twice; Marx's correction that the first time the event occurs as tragedy and the second time as farce.[1] This idea was

already foreshadowed in the *Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law*: "The gods of Greece, already tragically wounded to death in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, had to re-die a comic death in Lucian's *Dialogues*. Why this course of history? So that humanity should part with its past cheerfully." ("This cheerful historical destiny is what we vindicate for the political authorities of Germany," etc.)[2]

§<52>. *The pillories of virtue.* Could become a wonderful regular column of reportage (or commentary), if done with grace, wit, and a light touch. Connect it to the "criminal" theories expounded in *Les Mystères de Paris* by Eugène Sue,[1] for whom punitive justice and all its concrete expressions need to be completed by its counterpart, remunerative justice. "Immediately opposite the scaffold of the criminal a *pedestal* is erected on which the *grand homme de bien* stands. A pillory of virtue." (Cf. *The Holy Family*.)[2]

§<53>. *Past and present. Influence of the romanticism of French serials.* I have referred many times to this "source of culture" to explain certain kinds of behavior by subaltern intellectuals. (Recall the man of the English lavatories and mechanical toilet covers.)[1] The argument could be developed more fully with a wider range of reference. Eugène Sue's socioeconomic "propositions" are related to certain tendencies of Saint-Simonism that also have a connection with the theories of the organic state and philosophical positivism. Saint-Simonism has been disseminated on the popular level in Italy as well, directly (there are many relevant publications that should be consulted) and indirectly through popular novels that picked up opinions linked more or less to Saint-Simon by way of Louis Blanc,[2] etc.—Eugène Sue's novels, for example.

This also helps to demonstrate how the political and intellectual situation of the country was so backward that the same problems were being raised as in the France of 1848 and these problems were being raised by individuals bearing a very close social resemblance to the French of that time: bohemians, petty intellectuals from the provinces, etc. (Cf. always the chapters "Revelation of Political Economic Mysteries" in *The Holy Family*.)[3] Prince Rodolphe is

once again appointed the regulator of society,[4] but it is a Prince Rodolphe who comes from the people—which makes him even more romantic.[a] (Besides, nobody knows whether in the dim past there may not have been a princely ancestor in his pedigree.)

§<54>. *Emilio Bodrero.* Aristocratic or nationalist branch of Lorianism. Bodrero, I believe, is a university professor of philosophy,[a] even though he is certainly no philosopher; he is not even a philologist, and neither is he knowledgeable about philosophy.[1] He belonged to Ardigò's group.[2] Undersecretary of public education under Fedele, that is, in an administration of Minerva that has been heavily criticized even by the most fanatical members of the party in power.[3] Bodrero specifically is the author of a circular asserting that religious education is the pinnacle of public education; the clericals have used the circular to start a systematic siege of the school system, and it became their propagandists' decisive polemical argument (expounded in a pamphlet by Ignotus, who, however, must hypocritically refrain from mentioning that the concordat contains the same assertion).[4] Bodrero's article, "Itaca Italia" in the *Gerarchia* of June 1930: amazing.[5] For Bodrero, the *Odyssey* is "the poem of the counterrevolution": a parallel between the aftermath of the Trojan-Greek war and the postwar period of 1919–20 worthy of a latter-day Bertoldo.[6] The suitors are . . . draft dodgers. Penelope is . . . liberal democracy. The fact that the suitors plunder Ulysses's goods, rape his maidservants, and try to take his wife is a . . . revolution. Ulysses is the . . . fighting spirit.[7] The Phaeacians are the neutral countries, such as Holland or Spain, that enrich themselves through the sacrifices of others, etc. There are also some statements on philological method: anyone who has fought in the war and experienced its aftermath cannot maintain [with certainty] that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are written by the same author or that they have a totally unified structure (this too is a variation of the theory that ancestral voices are the source [and means] of knowledge). [One might point out, humorously, that Ulysses himself is the type who dodges the draft and pretends to be mad.][8]

[a]In the manuscript, this is followed by two words that Gramsci canceled to the point of illegibility.
[a]The phrase "(history of philosophy)" is inserted between the lines.

§<55>. *Past and present. Otto Kahn.* His European journey in 1924. His statements about the Italian government and MacDonald's government in England. Analogous statements by Paul Warburg (Otto Kahn and Paul Warburg both belong to the big American company Kuhn-Loeb and Co.), by Judge Gary, by the delegates of the American Chamber of Commerce, and by other important financiers. International high finance favorably disposed toward the English and Italian governments.[1] The meaning of this within the framework of the expansionist global policy of the United States. The security of American capital abroad: in the meantime, not stocks but bonds. Other political, rather than commercial, guarantees for the debt agreement concluded by Volpi (check the acts of parliament, because the newspapers did not publish certain "details") and for the Morgan loan.[2] The attitude of Caillaux and France toward the debt and the reason behind Caillaux's refusal to conclude the agreement. Nevertheless, Caillaux, too, represents high finance, but French high finance, which is itself seeking hegemony or, at least, a certain position of superiority (in any case, it does not want to be in a subordinate position). Caillaux's book *Où va la France? Où va l'Europe?*, which clearly expounds the politico-social program of high finance and explains the sympathy toward the labor movement.[3] Real similarities between the political regimes of the United States and Italy, also noted elsewhere.[4]

§<56>. *The concept of organic centralism and the priestly caste.* If the constitutive element of an organism resides in a rigidly and strictly formulated doctrinaire system, one gets a caste and priestly type of leadership. But does the "guarantee" of immutability still exist? It does not exist. One must not think of "ideology" or doctrine as something artificial and mechanically superimposed (like a garment over the skin, as opposed to the skin, which is organically produced by a creature's entire biological organism) but rather as something historically produced, as a ceaseless struggle. Organic centralism imagines that it can forge an organism once and for all, something already objectively perfect. An illusion that can be disastrous because it would drown a movement in a quagmire of *personal* academic disputes.[1] (Three elements: doctrine; the "physical" composition of the organization of a specific, his-

torically determined personnel; *real historical movement*. The first and second elements fall under the control of the combined and deliberative will. The third element reacts continuously with the other two and produces an incessant theoretical and practical struggle to raise the organism to increasingly higher and more refined levels of collective consciousness.) Constitutionalist fetishism. (History of the constitutions approved during the French Revolution: the constitution passed in 1793 by the Convention was deposited on the premises of the assembly in an ark made of cedar, and its implementation was suspended until the end of the war; even the most radical constitution could have been exploited by the enemies of the Revolution and hence the need for the dictatorship, namely, a power that was not restricted by fixed, written laws.)

§<57>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Papini.* Note how he is the darling of the writers of *La Civiltà Cattolica*; they pamper him, coddle him, and defend him against every charge of unorthodoxy.[1] Phrases drawn from Papini's book on St. Augustine that reveal his penchant for baroque ornateness (the Jesuits were prominent exponents of the baroque style): "when he was struggling to escape from the cellars of pride and breathe the divine air of the absolute"; "to rise from the dunghill to the stars"; etc.[2] It is obvious that Papini has converted neither to Christianity nor to Catholicism but really to Jesuitism. (Jesuitism can be said to be the most recent phase of Catholic Christianity.)

Cf. Notebook 23, §37.

§<58>. *Types of periodicals. The* Voce-Leonardo *type.* Made up of original essays. Resist the habit of filling periodicals with translations. If foreigners contribute, their contributions should be original. But translations of essays by foreign writers have their cultural importance as a reaction against provincialism and narrow-mindedness. Supplements made up entirely of translations—an issue every two months, in the same format as the typical periodical, but with a different title (Supplement, etc.), and separate pagination—these issues would contain a critical-informative selection from foreign theoretical publications. (Like *Rassegna delle Riviste Estere*,[1] published for some time by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.)

Cf. Notebook 24, §7.

§<59>. *Past and present. The intellectual influence of France.* Have we really freed ourselves, or are we indeed striving to free ourselves from French influence? It seems to me that, in a certain sense, French influence has been growing in recent years and that it will continue to grow further. In the previous period, French influence reached Italy in a disorderly way, as a ferment that enabled something that was still amorphous and primitive to start boiling: the consequences were original, in a certain way. Even though it received its stimulus from the outside, the movement headed in an original direction because it sprang from a component of the revived indigenous forces. Now, however, there is an effort to restrict or actually wipe out this "disorderly" influence that used to make itself felt spontaneously and informally; French influence has been brought into the system itself, to the center of the very same power mechanisms that would like to restrict it and wipe it out. France has become a negative model, but since this negative model is a mere apparition, a straw man of polemical debate, the real France is the positive model. The "Roman spirit" itself, insofar as it contains some element of efficiency, becomes a French model, for, as Sorel rightly points out (in letters to Michels published in *Nuovi Studi di Politica Economia Diritto*), the Roman tradition of the state has been especially preserved in French monarchic centralism and in the national state spirit of the French people.[1] One can find curious linguistic evidence of this imitation: the "*marescialli*" after the war; the title of the director of the Banca d'Italia changed to "*governatore*," etc. Underlying French-Italian friction there is a great admiration for France and for its real structure, and this admiration begets a real influence, enormously stronger than in the previous period. (Italian nationalism copied from French nationalism, etc.: it was the sign that this real influence had already arisen in the previous period and was much more significant than the mimicry of democracy.)

§<60>. *Past and present.* The *starvelings*[1] and the *underworld of professional criminals.* Bohemian, *scapigliatura*,[2] frivolous, etc. In his book *La scapigliatura milanese* (Milan: "Famiglia Meneghina" Editrice, 1930, 16°, pp. 267, L. 15), Pietro Madini tries to reconstruct the general background of the *scapigliatura* literary movement (precursors and derivations), including the representatives of popu-

lar *scapigliature*, such as the "Compagnia della Teppa" (around 1817), which is believed to have been a somewhat corrupt offspring of Carbonarism and was disbanded by the Austrians when they started to fear the patriotic activity of Bichinkommer.[3] Nowadays, "*teppa*" has become synonymous with criminality and even with a specific kind of criminality, but this derivation is not without significance for understanding the attitude of the old "Compagnia."[4]

In *L'homme qui rit*, Victor Hugo writes about the acts of defiance that used to be committed by young English aristocrats;[5] this was a form of "*teppa*." This phenomenon left its mark everywhere during a certain historical period (dandies, Vehmgericht,[6] etc.), but it lasted longer in Italy. Recall the incident at Terlizzi reported by Rerum Scriptor's newspaper in 1912 or 1913.[7] The so-called hocuses that provided so much material to story writers from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century also fit into this framework. The youth of an economically and politically idle class become "hooligans."

§<61>. *The struggle between generations*. The fact that the old generation fails to guide the younger generation is also partly an expression of the crisis of the institution of the family and of the new situation of women in society. The education of children is entrusted increasingly to the state or to private educational enterprises and this causes a "sentimental" impoverishment with respect to the past, as well as a mechanization of life. The most serious problem is that in certain situations the old generation relinquishes its educational duty on the basis of theories that are misunderstood or else are applied to situations different from those of which the theories were the expressions. There is also a lapse into forms of state worship: actually, every homogeneous social element is "state" or represents the state insofar as it adheres to its program; if not, the state becomes confused with the state bureaucracy. Every citizen is a "functionary" if he is active in social life along the lines outlined by the state-government, and the more he adheres to the state program and carries it out intelligently, the more he is its "functionary."

§<62>. *Past and present*. The intellectual influence of France. The incredible success of Léon Daudet's extremely superficial book

on the "stupid nineteenth century";[1] the formula of the stupid century has become a veritable refrain repeated at random without any understanding of its purport. Within the ideological system of the French monarchists this formula is understandable and justified: they are creating or want to create the myth of the ancien régime (only in the past is truth, only in the past is beauty),[2] and they programmatically disparage the entire "parenthesis" between 1789 and the aftermath of the Restoration—including, among other things, the creation of Italy as a unified state. But what is the significance of the formula for Italians? Do they want to restore pre-Risorgimento conditions? Is the nineteenth century stupid because it gave expression to the forces that have unified Italy?

Ideology of subterfuges: there is a current—very stupid in its manifestations—that is actually seeking to rehabilitate the old regimes, especially the Bourbons, and this is even done with apologetic intent (alongside historical studies that try to reconstruct the facts objectively). But all of this, it seems to me, expresses the discomfort of those who want to have a tradition that they cannot have (a flashy tradition, such as the French tradition of Louis XIV or Napoleon), or else they are forced to go back too many centuries, and they realize that the real tradition of the country contains too many negative polemical issues. It is precisely for this reason that the success of Daudet's phrase is a typical example of subjection to French intellectual currents.

This issue, however, has a very interesting general aspect: what should be the position of an innovative political group vis-à-vis the past, especially the most recent past? Naturally, it should be an essentially "political" position determined by practical necessities, but the question consists precisely in how to determine the "limits" of such a position. A realistic politics must not concern itself solely with immediate success (for certain political groups, however, immediate success is everything: these are purely repressive movements that are primarily concerned with dealing their immediate enemies a heavy blow, terrorizing their enemies' sympathizers, and thus acquiring the necessary breathing space to reorganize and reinforce the repressive machinery of the state with the appropriate institutions); it must also create and safeguard those conditions that are necessary for future activity—and one of those conditions is the education of the people. This is the issue. The higher the cultural level and the greater the development of the critical

spirit, the more "impartial"—that is, the more historically "objective"—one's position will be. Wholesale condemnation of the past occurs when there is a failure to differentiate it or, at least, when the differentiations are of a minor character and therefore go no further than rhetorical bombast. Besides, there is no doubt that one can find whatever one wants in the past by manipulating points of view and the system of yardsticks and values.

In the political order, the nineteenth century meant a representative and parliamentary system. Is it true that this system was imported into Italy mechanically? It was attained by means of a struggle in which the great masses of the population were not asked to participate; it adapted itself to these conditions, assuming very specific, Italian forms quite distinct from those in other countries. In the Italian tradition, therefore, one finds a variety of currents: fierce resistance, struggle, opportunism, and the tendency to make ad hoc arrangements (which is the official tradition). Each group can appeal to one of these traditional currents, discriminating between real facts and ideologies, between real struggles and verbal struggles, etc., etc.; a group could also uphold the idea of starting a new tradition, valorizing certain elements that in the past existed only in a molecular and unorganized form; by their very nature, these elements are not compromising, that is, they cannot give rise to an organic ideological elaboration set in opposition to the current one, etc.

§<63>. *Father Bresciani's progeny.* Popular literature. A note in *Critica Fascista* of 1 August 1930 laments the fact that two major newspapers, one in Rome and the other in Naples, are starting the serial publication of the following novels: *The Count of Monte Cristo* and *Joseph Balsamo*, by A. Dumas, and *A Mother's Calvary*, by Paul Fontenay. *Critica* writes: "The French nineteenth century was undoubtedly a golden age for the serial novel; but those newspapers that reprint novels of a century ago—as if taste, interest, and literary experience had not changed at all between then and now—must have a very poor notion of their readers. Moreover <. . .> why not pay attention to the fact that there is such a thing as a modern Italian novel, contrary opinion notwithstanding? And to think that these people are wont to shed tears of ink over the sorry state of our nation's literature."[1] *Critica* confuses two issues: that of (so-called) artistic literature and that of popular literature (for this is the way the issue is raised in the history of culture, even though it is clear that in theory nothing prevents

the existence or the possible existence of an artistic popular literature; this will come true when there is an identity of class between the "people" and the writers and artists, that is, when the sentiments of the people are lived by the artists as their own—but when that happens everything will be changed, so one will be able to talk of popular literature only metaphorically). *Critica* does not raise the third issue: why does an artistic popular literature not exist? Newspapers do not plan on disseminating belles lettres: they are politico-financial entities. The serial novel is used to gain circulation among the popular classes that translates into political and commercial success. Therefore the newspaper looks for the novel, the type of novel that will compel people to continue purchasing the paper. The average person buys only one newspaper, if he buys any; his choice is not purely personal but depends on his family group. The women have a strong influence on the choice, and they press for the nice, interesting novel (this does not mean that the men do not read the novel; the women just have a greater say). This is the reason why purely political or opinionated newspapers have never been able to gain a large circulation; they are bought by unmarried people, men and women who have a strong interest in politics, and by a small number of families who do not even share the general opinion of the newspaper they read. (Recall certain popular newspapers, like *Il Secolo* during a certain period, which used to publish as many as three serial novels.) Why must the Italian newspapers of 1930 publish serial novels from a century ago if they want to increase their circulation? And why serial novels of a particular type? And why is there no "national" literature of this type in Italy?

Note the fact that in many languages "national" and "popular" are almost synonymous (in Russian; in German, "*völkisch*" has an almost [even] deeper sense of race; in the Slavic languages in general; in French it has the same, but politically more developed, meaning because it is linked to the idea of "sovereignty"—national sovereignty and popular sovereignty have, or have had, the same import).[2] In Italy the intellectuals are distant from the people, that is, from the "nation," and they are bound to a caste tradition, a "bookish" and abstract tradition that has never been broken by a powerful popular or national political movement.

Cf. Umberto Fracchia's articles in *L'Italia Letteraria* of July 1930 and Ugo Ojetti's "Lettera a Umberto Fracchia sulla critica" in the *Pègaso* of August 1930.[3] Fracchia's complaints are of the same kind as those in *Critica Fascista*. So-called "artistic" ["national"] literature is not popular in Italy. Whose fault is it? Is it the fault of the public, which does not read? Is it the fault of criticism, which is unable to present and exalt literary values to the public? Is it the fault of the newspapers, which instead of serializing the "modern Italian novel" publish the old *Count of Monte Cristo*? But why does the public not read in Italy, as it does in other countries? But

is it true that it does not read? Would it not be more accurate to ask: why does the Italian public read popular and nonpopular foreign literature and not read Italian literature instead? Has Fracchia himself not published ultimatums, threatening government measures against those who publish (and therefore, by association, those who sell) foreign works? And have these measures not been taken in part through the actions of Michele Bianchi, the undersecretary of internal affairs?[4] What is the significance of the fact that Italians prefer to read foreign authors? It means that they *undergo* the hegemony of foreign intellectuals, that they feel more closely linked to foreign intellectuals than to national ones, that Italy does not have a moral and intellectual national bloc. The intellectuals do not come from the people, they do not know the people's needs, aspirations, and widely felt sentiments; instead, they are something detached, cut off from reality—a caste, that is. The question must be extended to take into account the whole of popular or national culture and not just the novel or literature: the theater, scientific literature in general (the sciences in the strict sense, history, etc.). Why are there no writers like Flammarion[5] in Italy?—French popularizing literature, in general. These foreign books are read and sought after in translation. Thus the entire educated class, with its intellectual activity, is detached from the people, from the nation, not because the "people-nation" has not shown or does not show its interest in these intellectual activities at all levels, from the lowest (horrid serial novels) to the highest (in fact, it seeks out foreign books), but because in relation to this people-nation the indigenous intellectual element is more foreign than the foreigners. This is not a new issue: it has been raised since the founding of the Italian state—R. Bonghi's book is evidence of it.[6] The question of the language posed by Manzoni also reflects this problem;[7] the problem of the moral unity of the nation and the state sought in linguistic unity. But language is an external—and not exclusively necessary—instrument[a] of unity; in any case, it is an effect not a cause. F. Martini's writings on the theater:[8] a whole body of literature.

The popular book, whether it be the novel or any other genre, has been missing in Italy. In poetry, writers like Béranger or all the popular French chansonniers.[9] There have been individual writers of this kind, however, and they have been successful. Guerrazzi has been successful, and his books were still being published until very recently.[10] Carolina Invernizio has been read, even though she is not on the same level as the Ponsons and Montépins.[11] Mastriani has been read.[12] (I remember an article by Papini on Invernizio, published, I think, in 1916, during the war, in *Il Resto del Carlino*: I do not know if it has been reprinted in some book-compilation.[13] Papini, I believe, wrote something interesting about this honest

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci inserted "means" between the lines, above "instrument."

but lightweight literary figure, pointing out precisely that she got herself read by the people. For the date of this article and other information, one might check some Papini bibliography; perhaps the bibliography published in Palmieri's essay.)[14] The people read or they are interested in literary production in a different way. The widespread popularity of the *Reali di Francia* and the *Guerrin meschino*,[15] especially in southern Italy and the mountain regions. The May Day festivals in Tuscany: the subjects treated in the May Day festivals are taken from books and stories of a popular character: Pia dei Tolomei, etc.[16] (there must be some publication on the May Day festivals and a more or less reliable record of the subjects they treat).

The secular elements have failed to satisfy the intellectual needs of the people, precisely because, in my view, they have failed to embody a secular culture; because they have been incapable of creating a new humanism suited to the needs of the modern world; because they have represented a world that is abstract, narrow-minded, excessively individualistic, and egotistical. French popular literature, for example, which is also widespread in Italy, does represent to a greater or lesser degree and in a more or less attractive way this "new humanism," this secularism. Guerrazzi, Mastriani, etc. represented it.

Still, if the secular elements have failed, the Catholics have not fared any better. It appears that light and amusing Catholic books are widely read, for they are printed in substantial quantities; in the majority of these cases, however, these are *things* given away at ceremonies, and they are not read except as a form of punishment or out of desperation. It is striking that the Catholics have not had a superior literature and greater success in the field of adventure novels and narratives, yet they possess an inexhaustible source in the voyages and adventurous lives of missionaries. Even during the period when the geographical adventure novel was at its height, Catholic literature of this kind was of poor quality; the books by Ugo Mioni (a Jesuit priest, I believe) and Cardinal Massaja's adventures in Abyssinia must be the ones that have had the best reception.[17] In scientific literature (popular scientific literature) as well, the Catholics do not have much to show, even though they have had great astronomers like Father Secchi (Jesuit)[18] and astronomy is the science that interests people the most. This Catholic literature is much too suffused with Jesuitic apologetics, and its narrow-mindedness is sickening. The lack of success of Catholic popular literature indicates that a deep rift now exists between religion and the people, who are in an extreme state of indifference, devoid of spiritual life; religion is only a superstition, but it has not been replaced by a new secular and humanistic morality because of the impotence of the lay intellectuals. (Religion has been neither replaced nor deeply transformed and nationalized as in other countries, as Jesuitism itself has been

in America; as a people, Italy is still in the general conditions created by the Counter-Reformation.)

(Religion has merged with pagan folklore and has remained at that stage. Cf. the notes on folklore.)[19]

Cf. Notebook 21, §5.

§<64>. *Father Bresciani's progeny.* Mario Puccini, *Cola o ritratto dell'italiano* (Aquila: Casa Editrice Vecchioni, 1927). Cola is a Tuscan peasant, a noncombatant during the war; through him Puccini would like to represent the "old Italian," etc. "Cola's character <. . .> placid and dispassionate, capable of fulfilling his duty and of performing some meritorious acts but only out of obedience or necessity and with a tender respect for his own skin; not convinced either way about the war but totally unaware of heroic values <. . .> the type of conscience that, if not completely deaf, is certainly passive to the exigencies of ideals, balanced between bigotry and laziness; he is loath to look beyond 'government orders' and the modest functions of individual life; in short, he is happy with his existence in the plains and has no ambition to reach for the heights" (from the review published in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 March 1928, p. 270).[1]

Cf. Notebook 23, §38.

§<65>. Massimo Lelj, *Il Risorgimento dello spirito italiano: 1725–1861*, Milan: L'Esame—Edizioni di Storia Moderna, 1928; L. 15. (What is it?)[1]

Cf. Notebook 19, §41.

§<66>. *Lorianism and the baroque style. Paolo Orano.* An article by P. Orano on Ibsen in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 April 1928. An aphorism pregnant with vacuity: "The authentic (!—that is, the reinforced correlative of the much discredited "true") modern effort of dramatic art has consisted in scenically (!) resolving the absurdities (!) of conscious (!) life. Apart from this, the theater can be a very beautiful consoling (!) game, a pleasant pastime, nothing else." Another aphorism like the above: "With him and through him (Ibsen) we have begun to believe in the eternity of the instant, because the instant is thought, and in the absolute value of the individual personality, which is agent and judge outside of time and space, beyond

the regrets of time and the nothingness of space, moment and duration unattainable by the criteria of science and religion."[1]

§<67>. *Gerrymandering.* (I do not know what "mandering" means.) "Gerry," an American, who is said to have used for the first time the electoral trick of assembling districts arbitrarily to obtain sham majorities. (This trick is especially common in single-member constituencies that are created in such a way that a few voters are all that is needed to elect right-wing deputies; see the French elections of 1928 and compare the number of votes and the elected members of Marin's party with those of Cachin's group. This trick is also used in plebiscites on national questions by extending a district with a homogeneous minority into larger zones, etc.) (Check who "Gerry" was, etc.)[1]

§<68>. *Americanism.* Recall Guglielmo Ferrero's book *Fra i due mondi*: how many of Ferrero's clichés about America have entered into circulation and continue to be used without remembering the coinage and the mint? (Quantity versus quality, for example.) *Fra i due mondi* predates the war, but even afterward Ferrero has continued to hammer on the same keys.[1] Check.

On Americanism, see Etienne Fournol's "L'America nella letteratura francese" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 April 1928,[2] which is convenient because in it one can find recorded the most blatant clichés on the subject. It discusses the book by Siegfried and the one by Romier (*Qui sera le maître?*),[3] and it refers to a book by André Tardieu (*Devant l'obstacle: L'Amérique et nous*, Paris: Librairie Emil Paul) and to two books by Luc Durtain that seem interesting: a novel, *Hollywood dépassée*, and a collection of short stories, *Quarantième étage*, both published by N.R.F.[4]

With regard to Prof. Siegfried, note the following contradiction: on p. 350 of his book, *Les Etats-Unis d'aujourd'hui*, he recognized in American life "the aspect of a truly collectivist society, which is desired by the elite classes and happily (*sic*) accepted by the masses";[5] later he writes the preface to Philip's book on the American workers' movement, where he praises it,[6] even though Philip's book does not exactly show this "happiness" or the absence of class struggle in America—quite to the contrary, it shows the existence of the most unbridled and fierce struggle of one side against the other. The same comparison should be made between Romier's book and Philip's. Why is it, then, that this cliché about the United States being free of class conflict, etc., has been so easily accepted

(and so skillfully disseminated) in Europe? Americanism is opposed because of those aspects of it that subvert the stagnant European society, but the cliché of the homogeneity of American society is created for propaganda purposes and as [an ideological] premise of emergency laws.

Cf. Notebook 22, §16.

§<69>. *Utopias and philosophical novels* and their relation to the development of political criticism, but especially their relation to the most basic and profound aspirations of the masses. Examine whether there is a rhythm to the appearances of these literary products: do they coincide with distinct periods or with the symptoms of profound historical changes? Compile a list of these works: utopias in the strict sense, philosophical novels, books that attribute to distant and unknown [but real] countries particular customs and institutions that are meant to be contrasted with those of one's own country. T. More's *Utopia*, Bacon's *New Atlantis*, Fénelon's *The Island of Delights* and *Salento* (but also the *Telemachus*),[1] Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, etc.

Cf. Notebook 25, §7.

§<70>. *Frère Vedremo.*[1] This phrase is used by Joseph De Maistre in a memorandum of 6 July 1814 (written from Petersburg, where he was ambassador) and published in the *Oeuvres complètes*, Lyons, 1886, volume 1, *Correspondance diplomatique*. He writes, apropos of Piedmontese politics: "Notre système, timide, neutre, suspensif, tâtonnant, est mortel dans cet état des choses. . . . Il faut avoir l'oeil bien ouvert et prendre garde à l'ennemi des grands coups, lequel s'appelle *Frère-Vedremo*."[2] (A paragraph on "Frère Vedremo" in the "Past and Present" series.)

§<71>. *Utopias and philosophical novels.* In his article on "Federico Cesi linceo" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 August 1930, Giuseppe Gabrieli[1] establishes a historico-ideological connection among the Counter-Reformation (which, in opposition to the individualism stimulated by humanism and unleashed by Protestantism, posited the Roman spirit of collegiality, discipline, corporation, and hierarchy for the reconstruction of society), the academies (like the Lincei started by Cesi,[2] that is, the collegial work of scientists, quite different from that of the university centers, which remained medieval in their methods and structures), and the ideas

and boldness of the great theories, the palingenetic reforms, or the utopian reconstructions of human coexistence (the *Città del sole*, the *New Atlantis*, etc.)[3]

This connection, it seems to me, is too forced; instead, one needs to find out whether these initiatives were not the only form in which "modernity" could survive in the environment of the Counter-Reformation. Like all restorations, the Counter-Reformation had to be a compromise and a substantial, if not formal, arrangement between the old and the new, etc. (However, one must keep in mind the scientific discoveries of the time, the spread of the "scientistic" spirit: a certain "rationalism" *avant la lettre*, etc.)

Cf. Notebook 25, §7.

§<72>. *Science columns*. The type of daily newspaper published in Italy is determined by the ensemble of the cultural conditions of the country: absence of popular literature, paucity of widely circulated popular periodicals. The newspaper reader therefore expects to find [reflected] in his paper all aspects of the complex social life of a modern nation. It is remarkable that Italian newspapers, which are relatively better produced than those of other countries, have always ignored scientific information, whereas they have had a distinguished corps of journalist-economists (Einaudi, Cabiati, etc.)[1] and of journalists in literature or general culture (Borgese, Cecchi, Ojetti, Bellonci, etc.).[2] Even in the important periodicals (such as *Nuova Antologia* and the *Rivista d'Italia*) the coverage of science is very inferior to that of other subjects (Bertarelli and Dr. Ry are exceptions, relatively speaking).[3] I have never seen *L'Arduo*, the philosophy of science review that used to be published in Bologna under the editorship of Sebastiano Timpanaro (Mario Pant).[4]

In any case, scientific information should be an integral part of Italian daily newspapers, both in the form of scientific-technological news reports and in the form of critical presentations of the most important scientific hypotheses and opinions (health should be covered in a separate column within the general section on science). A popular newspaper, more than any other, should have such a section in order to guide the learning of its readers and "deprovincialize" current notions. The difficulty of finding specialists capable of writing for a popular audience: one could conduct a systematic survey of general periodicals, reviews of professional culture, the proceedings of the academies, and foreign publications, and through a careful [and intelligent] selection of materials compile extracts and summaries in special appendices or in a special page (section) of the newspaper.

Cf. Notebook 24, §8.

§<73>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Luigi Capuana.* From an article by Luigi Tonelli, "Il carattere e l'opera di Luigi Capuana" in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 May 1928:

> *Re Bracalone* (a fairytale novel: by the power of magic, the twentieth century is created in a matter of days in a "once upon a time" epoch, but after having a bitter experience of it, the king destroys it, preferring to return to primitive times) interests us from an ideological standpoint as well. For, in a period of socialistic internationalist infatuation (!), the author had the courage to stigmatize (!) "the stupid sentimentalities of universal peace and disarmament and the no less stupid sentimentalities of economic equality and communal property," to express the urgent need "to curtail the agitation that has already created a state within the state, an irresponsible government," and to declare the necessity of a national consciousness: "We lack national dignity; there is a need to create the noble pride of national dignity and push it even to excess. It is the only case in which excess causes no harm."[1]

Tonelli is an idiot, but Capuana, armed with the jargon of a provincial newspaper, is not joking either. One must also understand what his ideology of "once upon a time" and of primitive patriarchalism means.

Capuana's dialect plays and his views on the language of the theater should be recalled in conjunction with the question of language in Italian literature.[2] Some of Capuana's plays (such as *Giacinta, Malía, Il cavalier pedagna*) were originally written in Italian and later turned into dialect: they were only successful in dialect. Tonelli, who understands nothing, writes that Capuana was induced to write plays in dialect "not only by the conviction that 'one must go through the dialectal theaters in order to arrive at an Italian national theater' <. . .> but also, and above all, by the particular character of his dramatic creations, which are exquisitely dialectal and find their most natural and pure expression in dialect." The explanation of the fact resides in the fact itself; in other words, it is not explained. Examine Pirandello's dramatic works, the plays in Italian and those in dialect. The language does not have mass "historicity"; it is not a national fact. *Liolà* in Italian has no value, although *Il fu Mattia Pascal*, from which it is derived, is quite interesting.[3]

The dramatist who writes in Italian is not in tune with the public; he lacks the perspective of the historicity of the language when the characters want to be "concretely" Italian. For in Italy there are two languages—Italian and the regional dialect—and in informal life, the dialect is used; to a large extent, Italian is an Esperanto, that is, a partial language, etc.[4]

When one affirms the great expressive richness of Italian, one lapses into equivocation: the expressive resources recorded in the dictionary or

lying dormant in printed literature are confused with the individual resources available for use by each individual. The latter is what counts, especially in certain cases: for example, when measuring the degree of national linguistic unity, which is not provided by the dictionary but by the living spoken language of the people. The importance of this factor is obvious in dramatic dialogue: the dialogue on the stage must convey living images in their full historical concreteness; most frequently, however, it conveys bookish images. To the spectator, the words of an informal conversation <on the stage> echo words read in books or newspapers or looked up in the dictionary—like French heard in the theater by someone who has learned French from books, without a teacher. The word is ossified, it lacks the suggestiveness of nuance; one cannot grasp its exact meaning, which is supplied by the whole sentence, etc. One feels clumsy or thinks that others are. Observe how many errors of pronunciation the average person makes in spoken Italian—"profúgo," "rosèo," etc.—which mean that he has read the Italian words but not heard them or has not heard them repeatedly: that is, he has not heard them placed in different sentences, for each sentence would have brought out the sparkle of a different facet of the polyhedron, which is what every word is.

Cf. Notebook 23, §39.

§<74>. *Giulio Bertoni and linguistics*. One should write a severe critique of Bertoni as a linguist for the positions he has taken recently in the *Manualetto di linguistica* and in the small volume published by Petrini (see the passage published in *La Nuova Italia* of August 1930).[1] I think one can show that Bertoni has failed both to provide a general theory of Bartoli's innovations in linguistics[2] and to understand the substance as well as the practical and theoretical importance of these innovations.

Moreover, in the article on linguistic studies in Italy that he published some years ago in *Leonardo*,[3] he fails to distinguish Bartoli in any way from the mainstream; indeed, through the ploy of subtle contrasts he relegates Bartoli to the second rank—unlike Casella, who, in his recent article in *Il Marzocco* on the Ascoli *Miscellanea*, highlights Bartoli's originality.[4] It should be noted that in Bertoni's article in *Leonardo*, Campus is actually made to look superior to Bartoli, in spite of the fact that Campus's studies on the Aryo-European velars are nothing more than short essays containing a straightforward application of Bartoli's general method and are indebted to Bartoli's own suggestions.[5] It is Bartoli who unselfishly

drew attention to Campus and always sought to bring him to the fore. In an article such as the one in *Leonardo*, where he must have counted practically every word he devoted to each scholar, Bertoni, perhaps not without academic malice, contrived to place Bartoli in an obscure corner. Bartoli was wrong to collaborate with Bertoni on the compilation of the *Manualetto*; it was definitely a mistake, and he bears scientific responsibility. Bartoli is valued for his concrete studies. By leaving it to Bertoni to write the theoretical section he misleads students and sets them on an erroneous course: in this case, modesty and unselfishness become[a] a fault.

Furthermore, not only has Bertoni failed to understand Bartoli, he has also failed to understand Croce's aesthetics in the sense that he has been unable to derive from Crocean aesthetics rules for the research and construction of the science of language. He has done nothing but paraphrase, exalt, and wax eloquent about certain impressions; he is essentially a positivist who swoons at the sight of idealism because it is more fashionable and provides the occasion for flights of rhetoric. It is amazing that Croce has praised the *Manualetto* without noticing or pointing out Bertoni's incongruities;[6] it seems to me that, more than anything else, Croce wanted to give favorable notice to the fact that in this branch of studies, where positivism reigns, there was an attempt to pursue a new idealist approach. I do not perceive any direct relationship of dependence between Bartoli's method and Croce's theories; Bartoli's relationship is with historicism in general, not with a particular form of historicism. Bartoli's originality consists precisely in this: that he took linguistics, narrowly conceived as a natural science, and transformed it into a historical science rooted in "space and time" and not in the physiology of the vocal apparatus.

The severe critique of Bertoni should not be limited to this field. I have always found his scholarly persona intellectually repugnant; there is something false about it, something insincere in the literal sense, in addition to his prolixity and his lack of "perspective" regarding historical and literary values.

In "linguistics" Vossler is Crocean, but what relationship is there between Bartoli and Vossler?[7] And between Vossler and what is generally called "linguistics"? In this regard, remember Croce's

[a]In the manuscript, "become" is inserted between the lines, above "are."

article "Questa tavola rotonda è quadrata" [in *Problemi di estetica*];[8] a critique of this essay should be the starting point for establishing the exact concepts involved in this question.

§<75>. *Utopias and philosophical novels.* Ezio Chiòrboli's article on Anton Francesco Doni in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 May 1928: an interesting profile of Doni, a sixteenth-century publicist, witty, caustic, with a modern attitude.[1] Doni dealt with innumerable issues of all kinds, anticipating many scientific innovations; an extremely popular writer. A materialist: he mentions the importance of the facial angle and the specific signs of criminality two centuries before Camper,[2] and he discussed the functions of the intellect and the parts of the brain delegated to them two and a half centuries before Lavater and Gall.[3]

He wrote a utopia, *Mondo pazzo o savio*[4]—"an imaginative social reconstruction that is painted with many of the iridescences and anxieties that are red-hot in the socialism of our time"[5]—which he may have derived from Thomas More's *Utopia*. He knew the *Utopia*; he published it himself in Lando's translation. "Yet the invention is no longer the same, just as it is not the same as that of Plato in the *Republic*, or of any other obscure or unknown writer; he made it himself, changed it, refashioned it for his own purpose, so that he has actually given life to something different that is truly his own—and he is so gripped by it that it shows forth here and there in some detail or in some sentiment both in the *Marmi* and, with increasing frequency, in subsequent major and minor writings."[6] For a bibliography on Doni, cf. Chiòrboli's edition of *I Marmi*, published by Laterza in the "Scrittori d'Italia" series.[7]

Cf. Notebook 25, §7.

§<76>. *The question of the language and the Italian intellectual classes.* Toward the development of the concept that Italy embodies the paradox of a country that is simultaneously very young and very old (like Lao-tzu who was eighty years old at birth).[1]

The relations between the intellectuals and the people-nation in terms of the language written by the intellectuals and used among themselves and in terms of the function that Italian intellectuals had in the medieval cosmopolis as a result of the papacy having its seat in Italy (the use of Latin as a learned language is linked to Catholic cosmopolitanism).

Literary Latin and vernacular Latin. The Latin vernacular gives rise to the development of Neo-Latin dialects not only in Italy but throughout Romanized Europe. Literary Latin crystallizes into the Latin of the learned, of the intellectuals—so-called Middle Latin (cf. Filippo Ermini's article in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 May 1928).[2] Middle Latin cannot be compared in any way to a spoken, national, historically living language, but neither should it be mistaken for a jargon or an artificial language such as Esperanto.[3] In any case, there is a split between the people and the intellectuals, between the people and culture. (Even) religious books are written in Middle Latin, so even religious discussion is inaccessible to the people, although religion is the dominant element of culture; the people *watch* religious *rites* and *hear* exhortatory sermons, but they cannot follow discussions and ideological developments, which are the monopoly of a caste.

Vernaculars are written when the people regain importance. The Strasbourg oaths (following the battle of Fontaneto between Charlemagne's successors) have survived because the soldiers could not take an oath in a language they did not know, or the oath would have been invalid.[4] In Italy as well, the earliest traces of the vernacular are oaths or certifications of people's testimonies for establishing the ownership of monastic lands (Montecassino).[5] At any rate, one can say that from 600 A.D., when it can be assumed that the people no longer understood the Latin of the learned, until 1250, when the vernacular starts to blossom—that is, for more than six hundred years—the people in Italy could not understand books or participate in the world of culture. The growth of the communes propelled the development of the vernaculars, and the intellectual hegemony of Florence consolidated it; that is, it created an illustrious vernacular.[6] But what is this illustrious vernacular? It is the Florentine <dialect> developed by the intellectuals of the old tradition: the *vocabulary* as well as the *phonetics* are Florentine, but the syntax is Latin. The victory of the vernacular over Latin was not easy, however: with the exception of poets and artists in general, learned Italians wrote for Christian Europe not for Italy; they were a compact group of cosmopolitan and not national intellectuals. The fall of the communes and the advent of the principality, the creation of a governing caste detached from the people, crystallized this vernacular in the same way literary Latin had been crystallized. Italian became, once again, a written and not a spoken lan-

guage, belonging to the learned, not to the nation. In Italy, there were two erudite languages, Latin and Italian; the latter prevailed in the end, and it triumphed completely with the split between the secular and the ecclesiastical intellectuals in the nineteenth century[7] (to this day the clergy continue to write in Latin, but nowadays even the Vatican is making more frequent use of Italian when dealing with Italian affairs, and it will end up doing the same for other countries, in keeping with its current policy on nationalities). In any case, I believe the following point should be established: the crystallization of the illustrious vernacular cannot be detached from the tradition of Middle Latin, and it represents an analogous phenomenon. After a brief interval (the freedom of the communes) during which intellectuals of popular (bourgeois) class origins flourished, the intellectual function was reabsorbed into the traditional caste where the individual members came from the people but where the character of the caste prevailed over their origins. In other words, it is not the case that an entire stratum of the population creates its own intellectuals when it attains power (which is what happened in the fourteenth century); rather, a traditionally selected body assimilates single individuals into its cadres (the typical example of this is the ecclesiastical structure).

For a comprehensive analysis, other elements have to be considered. I believe that there are many questions about which the national rhetoric of the past century and the prejudices it embodied failed to stimulate even the most preliminary research. For instance: across what area, exactly, was Tuscan spoken? I think that in Venice, for example, the Italian that was introduced had already been developed by the scholars along the same lines as Latin, and so Venice never experienced the penetration of original Florentine—in the sense that Florentine merchants did not make spoken Florentine heard in Venice as they did in Rome and Naples—and the language of government remained Venetian. The same applies to the other centers (Genoa, I believe). There is still no history of the Italian language along these lines; historical grammar is anything but historical. Histories of this kind exist for the French language (Brunot's [—and Littré's—] may belong to the type I am thinking of, but I do not recall).[8] It seems to me that if language is understood as an element of culture, and hence as an element of general history, and as a primary manifestation of the "nationality" and "popularity" of the intellectuals, then this study would not be

idle or merely erudite. [Ermini's article is published in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 May 1928.]

Ermini's article is interesting as a source of information on the importance that the study of Middle Latin has acquired (the term "Middle Latin," which, I believe, should mean medieval Latin, seems rather inappropriate and may be a source of errors among nonspecialists), and I could return to it and to other writings by Ermini (who is a Middle Latin specialist) for an initial bibliography. Ermini asserts that, on the basis of his research, "the theory of two separate worlds—that of Latin, which belongs solely to the learned and dies out, and that of Neo-Latin, which arises and gains vitality—should be replaced by the theory of the unity of Latin and the perennial continuity of the classical tradition." This can only mean that the new Neo-Latin culture was strongly influenced by the preceding culture and not that there had been a "popular-national" unity of culture.

But perhaps for Ermini Middle Latin has quite simply a literal meaning: namely, the Latin that stands halfway between classical and humanistic Latin. The latter undoubtedly marks a return to the classical, whereas Middle Latin has its very own unmistakable characteristics. Ermini has Middle Latin starting around the middle of the fourth century with the alliance between classical culture (!) and Christian religion, when "a noble pleiad of writers, leaving behind them the schools of rhetoric and poetics, are enlivened by the desire to link the new faith with ancient beauty (!) and thus give life to the first Christian poetry." (It seems to me correct to trace Middle Latin back to the first blooming of Christian Latin literature, but Ermini's interpretation of its genesis, in my view, is vague and arbitrary—cf. Marchesi's history of Latin literature on this point).[9] <Middle Latin, then, would have existed between the middle of the fourth century> and the end of the fourteenth century, between the beginnings of Christian inspiration and the spread of humanism. Ermini subdivides these thousand years as follows: *first age—origins*, from the death of Constantine to the fall of the empire in the west (337–476); *second age*—that of barbarian literature, from 476 to 799, that is, up to Charlemagne's restoration of the empire, truly a time of transition in the continuous and progressive latinization of the barbarians (exaggerated: it was the period of formation of a stratum of Germanic intellectuals who wrote in Latin); *a third age*—the Carolingian renaissance, from 799

to 888, up to the death of Charles le Gros; *a fourth*—that of *feudal literature*, from 888 to 1,000, up to the pontificate of Sylvester II, when feudalism, a slow transformation of preexisting systems, opened a new era; a *fifth*—that of scholastic literature, which continues until the end of the twelfth century, when knowledge is gathered into the great schools, and philosophical thought and method fertilize all the sciences; and a *sixth*—that of *erudite literature*, from the beginning of the thirteenth to the end of the fourteenth century, which is already showing symptoms of decline.

§<77>. *The clergy, church property, and analogous forms of personal or real property*. The clergy, as a type of social stratification, should always be taken into account when analyzing the composition of the propertied and ruling classes. National liberalism has destroyed church property in a number of countries, but it has been powerless to prevent the formation of analogous and even more parasitic forms of ownership because its exponents did not perform and still do not perform the [social] functions that the clergy used to perform: charity, popular culture, relief services, etc. The cost of these services was certainly enormous, yet they were not entirely a liability. The new social stratifications are an even greater liability, because one cannot say that it is normal to function as follows: in order to set aside 1,000 lire a year in savings, a family of "producers of savings" consumes 10,000 lire, forcing starvation on ten or more peasant families from whom it extorts ground rent and other usurious profits. One should examine whether these 11,000 lire, if they were put into the land, would not generate a larger accumulation of savings, in addition to raising the peasants' standard of living and therefore their intellectual and productive-technical level of development.

To what extent is church property, in the strict sense of the term, being created in the United States, in addition to the formation of an ecclesiastical type of ownership?—and this notwithstanding the new forms of savings and capital accumulation made possible by the new industrial structure.

§<78>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Popular serial novels*. Diversity of these novels: the Victor Hugo–Sue type [*Les misérables, Les mystères de*

Paris),[1] with a markedly ideological-political character, democratic leanings, linked to the ideologies of 1848; the sentimental-popular type (Richebourg, Decourcelle, etc.);[2] the pure intrigue type with a conservative ideological content (Montépin).[3] The historical novel. Dumas–Ponson du Terrail, etc.[4] The detective novel and its companions (Lecocq—Rocambole—Sherlock Holmes—Arsène Lupin).[5] The Gothic novel (ghosts, etc.—Radcliffe, etc.).[6] The scientific novel of adventure or of mere intrigue (Verne—Boussenard).[7]

Each one of these categories has many varieties; they differ by country (in America, the adventure novel is a novel about the pioneers, etc.). One can see how in the overall production of a country there is an implicit national sentiment that is not rhetorical but skillfully insinuated into the narrative (in Verne and the French, the anti-English sentiment, linked to the loss of the colonies and to the lingering pain of naval defeats, etc.)

In Italy none of these types has had practitioners of notable merit (not literary merit but the commercial value of inventiveness and the practical construction of plots that, while complicated, are worked out with a certain rationality). Even the detective novel, which has become international, has no practitioners in Italy.

The curious thing is that many novels, especially historical novels, have derived their subject matter from Italy. Thus Venice with its Council of Ten and its police-tribunal system has provided and continues to provide subject matter for popular novels. The same applies to the brigands, setting aside the most pathetic, worthless popular books.

The last type of popular book is the biographical novel, which anyway represents something superior to Dumas: this literature, too, has no practitioners in Italy (Mazzucchelli?—I have not read anything of his),[8] or at least they are not so numerous, or so prolific, or so talented in providing literary pleasure as to be comparable to the French, the Germans, and the English. The Italian litterateur would not write a biographical novel on Masaniello or Cola di Rienzo without cramming it with tiresome rhetorical props, lest somebody might suspect . . . might think . . . etc., etc.[9] As a result, these biographies get written by foreigners (see Bianca Capello).[10] It is true that many biographical book series have been launched during these last few years, but these books are to the biographical novel what *La monaca di Monza* is to *The Count of Monte Cristo*.[11] It is the same old kind of biographical formula that at best might attract a few thousand readers but cannot become popular.

It should be observed that some types of popular novel have their counterparts in the theater and in film. I must have noted elsewhere how in the theater Niccodemi has been able to take his cue from popular ideas—*Scampolo, L'aigrette, La volata*, etc.—which accounts for his great success.[12] Forzano, too, must have done something similar in the field of his-

tory—episodes from the French Revolution, etc.—but with greater pedantry and provincialism.[13] Apropos of the theater, one might point out how Ibsen is very well liked by the general public for some of his plays, such as *A Doll's House*, because they represent sentiments and inclinations that find resonance in the popular psyche.[14] And what, after all, should the so-called *theater of ideas* be if not this: the representation of passions connected to modern customs, with solutions that reflect the historical process, etc.? These passions and these solutions, however, must be represented; they must not be a thesis, a propaganda speech: in other words, the author must live in the real modern world and not just assimilate bookish sentiments.

Cf. Notebook 21, §6.

§<79>. *The question of the language.* Ettore Veo, in his article "Roma nei suoi fogli dialettali" in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 June 1928, observes that for a long time the Roman dialect remained confined to the popular milieu, overwhelmed by Latin.[1] "But it so happens that in revolutionary movements the populace tries to move—or is moved—to the forefront."[2] The Sack of Rome and especially the French Revolution have been taken up by dialect writers. (This, in effect, marks the beginning of the fortunes of "written" Roman dialect and the blossoming of dialects that culminated during the liberal period of Pius IX, lasting until the fall of the Roman republic.)[3] From 1847 to 1849 the liberals make use of dialect as a weapon; after 1870 the clericals do.

§<80>. *The particular chauvinism of the Italians* finds one of its expressions in the literature that lays claim to inventions and scientific discoveries. I am talking about the "spirit" in which these claims are made, not about the phenomenon itself: in short, this is not about contributions . . . to the history of technology and science but about journalistic "pieces" of a chauvinistic hue. I believe that many claims are . . . pointless, in the sense that it is not enough to have an idea; one must also be able to draw from it all the consequences and practical applications. Otherwise one would arrive at the conclusion that nothing has ever been invented, because . . . the Chinese already knew everything. These specialists (like Savorgnan di Brazzà)[1] in national glories do not realize that with many of their claims they make Italy perform the role of China.

All the literature on Christopher Columbus's native country could be linked to this idea. This literature, in my view, is totally pointless and idle. The question should be posed as follows: why did no Italian state help Columbus, and why didn't Columbus seek support from any Italian state? What, then, does the "national" element of the discovery of America consist in? Columbus's birth on one particular spot of Europe rather than another has the value of a fortuitous incident, since he himself did not feel any tie to an Italian state. The question, as I see it, should be defined historically, establishing that for many centuries Italy had an international-European function. Italian intellectuals and specialists were cosmopolites and not Italians, not national. Italian statesmen, captains, admirals, scientists, navigators did not have a national character but a cosmopolitan one. I do not see why this should detract from their greatness or diminish Italian history, which has been what it has been and not the fantasy of poets or the bombast of orators; to have a European function, this is the character of the Italian "genius" from the fifteenth century to the French Revolution.

§<81>. *Federico Confalonieri.* Confalonieri's attitude [of indolence] during his sojourn abroad, following his release from the Spielberg, created a painful impression among the Italian exiles.[1] In order to understand this, one should consider a passage from the letter Mazzini wrote to Filippo Ugoni on 15 November 1838, which is published by Ugo Da Como ["Lettera inedita di Giuseppe Mazzini"] in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 June 1928:

> Confalonieri's return surprises me. When you talk to me about the conflict that thoughts of my mother, my father, and my remaining sister would provoke in my heart, you speak the truth. But as for Confalonieri, what overwhelming love recalls him to Italy? After the death of Teresa, his wife? For me, life has no meaning unless it is consecrated to duty or to love, which is itself a duty as well. I can understand and I would not pass judgment on the individual who relinquishes the struggle for the true and the good when faced with the happiness or unhappiness of persons who are dear and sacred to him. I do not understand someone who relinquishes it in order to live, as they say, quietly. Eight or ten years of a life of individualism, of transitory sensations that produce nothing for others, brought to an end by death—that, it seems to me, is a contemptible thing for someone who does not believe in the afterlife, and perhaps worse than a contemptible crime for someone who does believe in it. Confalonieri, alone, advanced in years, without heavy duties tying

him to a family of loved ones, in my view should be fed up with everything except the idea of contributing to the emancipation of his country and the crusade against Austria.[2]

In his introductory comment on Mazzini's letter, Da Como writes:

So this letter even contains a sorrowful thought for Confalonieri. He had passed through London a year earlier, on his way to France. Mazzini had known that he was depressed and silent, but, according to him, these sufferings should not have changed the nature of his soul. He followed him with trepidation because he wanted him always to be a towering, upright figure, an example. He believed that if he himself had come out of the Spielberg and found himself all alone, his only thought would have been to devise another attempt on behalf of the old idea and to end it there. He did not want someone who had suffered for fifteen years without losing heart and without any signs of changing to make humble petitions, to desire and obtain permission to return. He wanted him always to be a new Farinata degli Uberti, which is how he was portrayed by his prison companion Gabriele Rosa, who remained his affectionate and constant admirer to the end.[3]

Da Como is totally off course; Mazzini's words, far from being sorrowful, are bitter and harsh. Hagiography blinds one to history.

(Are there any other references to Confalonieri in Mazzini's letters? And in the letters of the other exiles? In fact, the real assessment should be sought in these private letters, because it is most unlikely that the exiles would have wanted to cast shadows over Confalonieri in writings meant for the public. It would also be interesting to look into the writings of the Austrian agents provocateurs.)

Cf. Notebook 19, §42.

§<82>. *French and Italian historical culture.* The very complexity and diversity of French political history during the last 150 years has enabled the historical culture and the general culture of France to develop and become "popular-national." The dynastic tendency has been broken up by the succession of three dynasties—the legitimist, the liberal-conservative, the military-plebiscite—that were radically antagonistic toward one another and by the succession of republican governments—the Jacobin, the radical social-

ist, and the current one—that were also markedly different from one another. A unilinear national "hagiography" is impossible, and any effort to produce one appears immediately sectarian, contrived, utopian, and antinational because it has to erase [or to undervalue] indelible pages of the nation's history (see the current Maurras tendency and Bainville's miserable history of France).[1] For this reason, the permanent element of these political variations, the people-nation, has become the protagonist of French history: hence a type of political and cultural nationalism that breaks through the limits of the strictly nationalistic parties and impregnates the whole culture, and hence, also, an interdependence and close connection between people-nation and intellectuals.

Nothing of the sort in Italy, where one must go searching with a lantern for national sentiment in the past, and in the process one must distinguish, interpret, pass over in silence, etc. If Ferrucci is praised, Maramaldo must be explained; if Florence is extolled, Clement VII and the papacy must be justified; if Milan and the league are exalted, Como and the cities that supported Barbarossa must be explained; if Venice is praised, Julius II must be explained, etc.[2] The preconception that Italy has always been a nation complicates the entire history and requires antihistorical intellectual acrobatics. There could not have been national unity in the history of the nineteenth century since the permanent element, the people-nation, was missing. The dynastic tendency had to prevail, given the support it received from the state apparatus, whereas the most strongly opposed political tendencies could not agree on a minimum of objectivity. History was propaganda; it sought to create national unity—that is, the nation—from the outside, going against tradition and basing itself on literature; it was a "wanting to be" rather than something that must be because the de facto conditions already exist. Precisely because they adopted this position, the intellectuals had to distinguish themselves from the people, set themselves apart, create or reinforce among themselves the caste spirit, and deep down they had to *distrust* the people, feel estranged from them, fear them, because, in reality, the people were an unknown quantity, a mysterious hydra with countless heads.

I thought that some conditions existed in the present for overcoming this state of affairs, but they have not been exploited properly, and rhetoric has regained the upper hand (the uncertain positions surrounding the interpretation of Caporetto exemplify the

current state of affairs, as does the polemic on the Risorgimento and, most recently, on the concordat). However, one must not deny that many advances have been made in all respects; otherwise one would fall into an opposite rhetoric. Indeed, many intellectual movements, especially before the war, were interested in rejuvenating culture, stripping it of its rhetoric, and drawing it closer to the people; in other words, nationalizing it. (The two trends could be called nation-people and nation-rhetoric.)

(On the latter subject, cf. Volpe, *L'Italia in cammino*,[3] which contains many factual inaccuracies and distortions and points out the emergence of a new rhetoric; Croce's *Storia d'Italia*,[4] which has flaws of a different kind but is not any less dangerous, because it makes history vanish into conceptual abstractions; and Prezzolini's books on Italian culture.)[5]

§<83>. *Past and present.* Ermanno Amicucci, "Scuola di giornalismo" in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 July 1928.[1] I believe this article was later collected with others in a volume.

The article is interesting for the information and ideas it provides. The problem in Italy is more complicated than one might think from reading Amicucci, and I believe that the educational initiatives will not yield very good results. Still, the principle of teaching journalism and not leaving the journalist on his own to learn through practice is vital and will continue to spread as journalism gradually becomes a complex industry and a more responsible institution. The problem in Italy is conditioned by the fact that large concentrations of journalists do not exist because the country is decentralized and has few newspapers. The corps of journalists is small, and therefore personnel is normally recruited through the institutional hierarchy: the less important newspapers serve as schools for the more important newspapers and vice versa. An editor from the lower ranks of the *Corriere* becomes the director or the editor-in-chief of a provincial newspaper; an editor of the highest rank at a provincial newspaper becomes a lower-rank editor for an important newspaper, etc. In Italy there are no centers like Paris, London, Berlin, etc., which host thousands of journalists who constitute a real, economically important professional category. And in Italy the average pay is very low. Furthermore, in Germany the number of newspapers published in the entire country is impressive, and the concentration in Berlin is matched by a wide stratification across the country.

I believe that in the case of certain types of newspapers the problem should be solved within the editorial offices themselves by transforming

the regular staff meetings into an organic school of journalism. The classes should be open to outsiders—young people and students—so that it will acquire the character of a real politico-journalistic school with general classes (on history, economics, constitutional law) entrusted to competent outsiders capable of addressing the needs of the newspaper. Everyone at the newspaper, from the editors to the reporters, should be given the skills to produce every aspect of the newspaper, just as every editor should be able, in no time, to become a reporter, that is, to devote his whole life to the newspaper, etc.

Cf. Notebook 24, §9.

§<84>. *The death of Vittorio Emanuele II.* In a letter by Guido Baccelli to Paulo Fambri dated 12 August (perhaps 1880—the year is missing, and 1880 is a hypothesis by Guidi) published by Angelo Flavio Guidi ("L'Archivio inedito di Paulo Fambri," *Nuova Antologia*, 16 June 1928), one reads: "The heart of all Italy still bleeds at the memory of the death of the glorious Vittorio Emanuele: that enormous misfortune, however, could have been a hundred times worse had several hours of life not been gained by means of the respiration of oxygen."[1] (Followed by dots, which are supplied by the editor Guidi, since they fill the rest of the line; in other words, they are not the usual dots of an ellipsis.) What does it mean?

Cf. Notebook 19, §43.

§<85>. *Arturo Graf.* Should the occasion arise to write on Giovanni Cena and his social program, it will necessary to recall Graf and the spiritual crisis that brought him back to religion or, at least, to theism.[1] (Cf. O. M. Barbano, "Per una fede: Da lettere inedite di Arturo Graf," in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 July 1928.[2] Barbano was Graf's student and friend, and from the letters Graf wrote to him he publishes those passages that deal with Graf's crisis and with his little book, *Per una fede*,[3] which made little impact outside his immediate circle.) These letters contain some interesting references to Graf's relations with modernism (with which he became familiar through the periodical *Il Rinnovamento*).[4] This might permit one to say, perhaps, that Graf's crisis is related to the general crisis of the period that manifested itself in certain intellectual groups who were dissatisfied with both "science" and the official religion.

§<86>. *Lorianism. Alfredo Trombetti.*[1] There are many sides to him that justify placing him within Lorianism, with the proviso, however, that this does not amount to a comprehensive judgment on all his work but simply a judgment on the imbalance between "logicality" and the concrete contents of his studies. Trombetti was a formidable polyglot but not a linguist, or at least his linguistics was separable from his polyglotism: his material knowledge of countless languages runs away with him to the detriment of scientific method. Besides, he was one of the illuminati: the theory of the monogenesis of language was proof of the monogenesis of humanity, with Adam and Eve as the forebears. For this reason the Catholics applauded him, and he became popular; in other words, he was "bound" to his theory by an ideological and not a scientific point of honor. In recent years he received many official recognitions, and the daily newspapers hailed him as a national glory, primarily because of the announcement made at the International Linguistics Congress (at the Hague, in early 1928) that he had deciphered Etruscan. I believe, however, that Etruscan remains undeciphered as before and that it all boils down to another failed effort.

Pericle Ducati, in his article "Il primo Congresso Internazionale Etrusco" [27 April–3 May 1928], published in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 July 1928, writes in a very strange but up-to-date way about Trombetti's "discovery."[2] On p. 199 he mentions about the "successful decipherment" of Etruscan, "thanks, above all, to the efforts of an Italian, Alfredo Trombetti." On p. 204, however, the "successful decipherment" is reduced to "a giant step in the interpretation of Etruscan." Trombetti's thesis, which is the same one he had asserted at the National Etruscan Convention of 1926, is this: Etruscan, like pre-Hellenic languages and the languages of Asia Minor, is an intermediate language between the Caucasian group and the Aryo-European group, with stronger affinities to the latter; therefore, as the two inscriptions on the famous stele show, the language of Lemnos and Etruscan are almost identical. This thesis falls within the framework of Trombetti's general system, which presupposes that monogenesis is a proven fact; consequently, it has a very fragile foundation. It also presupposes that the transmarine origin of the Etruscans is a proven fact, whereas this opinion is not universally endorsed, even if it is the most widespread; Gaetano De Sanctis and Luigi Pareti posit a transalpine origin, and they are two scholars who cannot be scoffed at.[3] At the International Etruscan Congress,

Trombetti proceeded to give the most precise articulation of grammar and textual hermeneutics—an abstract from his book *La lingua etrusca, that was published shortly afterward.*[4] It was a great success. Ducati notes that his opponents did not come from among the foreigners but from among the Italians, who nevertheless opposed him "gracefully, paying homage to Trombetti's exceptional abilities." "A young and now brave linguist, Giacomo Devoto, was concerned with method; methodological rigor, it seemed to him, was impaired by Trombetti's inquiries and results."[5] At this point, Ducati enunciates a series of truly astonishing considerations on the method of linguistics and against Devoto and concludes: "Let us look at Trombetti's results and not split hairs." One has seen what he means by not splitting hairs. In the sciences in general, method is the most important thing; moreover, in certain sciences that must necessarily be based on a limited, nonhomogeneous supply of positive data, questions of method are even more important, if they are not actually everything. With a little imagination, it is not difficult to construct one hypothesis on top of another and give a doctrine the appearance of brilliant logicality, but the criticism of these hypotheses brings down the whole paper castle and reveals the hollowness under the brilliance. Has Trombetti discovered a new method? This is the question. Does this new method contribute more to the advancement of science than the old one does? Does it interpret better, etc.? It does none of this. Even here one sees how nationalism introduces harmful deviations into scientific appraisal and therefore into the practical conditions of scientific work. Bartoli has discovered a new method, but he cannot make a lot of noise by interpreting Etruscan.[6] Trombetti, however, declares that he has deciphered Etruscan and thus solved one of the greatest and most fascinating enigmas of history: applause, popularity, economic support, etc. Ducati repeats approvingly what a "very distinguished" linguist told him at the convention: "Trombetti is an exception; he soars high above us, and what to us seems improper to attempt he can accomplish." He also appends the very profound comments of the paleontologist Ugo Antonielli. According to Antonielli, Trombetti is a "benevolent giant who points out a straight and unerring path." And, as the same Antonielli shrewdly (!) adds, "given the servile character of certain people," if our unmistakably Italian Trombetti "were called 'Von Trombetting' or 'Trombetty' . . ." Since the question was posed in these terms, one must admit that Devoto and the

opponents were heroes and that there is a sane element in Italian science. Ducati supports this nationalistic tendency in science without being aware of the contradictions he falls into: if Trombetti pointed out a straight and unerring path, he would have, in fact, renewed, or developed, or perfected the methodology, in which case it would be proper for all other scholars to attempt what he has done. Either one or the other: either Trombetti stands above science because of his special gift of intuition, or he points out the path for everybody. "A strange case! Among the linguists gathered in Florence, Trombetti received the most unrestrained applause from among the foreigners." So why does Ducati bring up "Von Trombetting"? Doesn't this indicate, rather, that linguistics in Italy is more serious and advanced than elsewhere? This could very well happen to scientific nationalism: that it would be unaware of the true national "glories" and that it would be itself the slave, the servile lackey of foreigners.

§<87>. *Regarding the formation of the Italian intellectual classes in the early Middle Ages*, one must consider not only language (the question of Middle Latin) but also and especially law.[1] The collapse of Roman law after the invasion by the barbarians and its reduction to private and consuetudinary law in comparison with Longobard law; the emergence of canon law, which started as the special legal system of a group and rose to become state law; the resurgence of Roman law and its spread through the agency of the universities. These phenomena did not happen suddenly and simultaneously but were related to the general historical development (the merging of the barbarians with the local populations, etc.). The growth of canon law and the importance it assumed in the juridical structures of the new states, the formation of the medieval imperial-cosmopolitan frame of mind, the development of Roman law adapted and interpreted to deal with new ways of life: these factors led to the emergence and stratification of Italian cosmopolitan intellectuals.

There is a period, however—that of the hegemony of Germanic law—during which the language, Middle Latin, is virtually the only remaining link between the old and the new. The problem of this interruption has elicited the interest of scholars, and, importantly, it has also interested intellectuals such as Manzoni (see his

writings on the relations between the Romans and the Longobards apropos of *Adelchi*);[2] in other words, in the early nineteenth century this problem elicited the interest of those who, in order to construct a new national consciousness, concerned themselves with the continuity of the Italian tradition since the times of ancient Rome.

On the general subject of the decline and revival of Roman law and the emergence of canon law, cf. Francesco Brandileone's "I 'due diritti' e il loro odierno insegnamento in Italia" (*Nuova Antologia* of 16 July 1928) in order to obtain some general ideas, but also check, obviously, the important histories of law.[3]

Outline extracted from Brandileone's essay:

The schools of the Roman Empire in Rome, Constantinople, and Berytus only taught Roman law in the two *positiones* of *jus publicum* and *jus privatum*. The *jus privatum* included the pagan *jus sacrum*, since paganism was the religion of both the state and its subjects. When Christianity appeared and organized itself during centuries of persecution and toleration as a separate society, different from political society, it gave rise to a new *jus sacrum*. After Christianity was first recognized and later elevated by the state to sole religion of the empire, the new *jus sacrum* was certainly supported and acknowledged by secular lawgivers, but it did not enjoy the same high esteem as the old one. Since Christianity had separated itself from political social life, it also cut itself off from the *jus publicum*, and the schools did not concern themselves with its code; the new *jus sacrum* became the special concern of the schools that belonged specifically to *religious society*. (This is a very important fact in the history of the Roman state, and it has many serious consequences because it introduces a dualism of power that developed in the Middle Ages. Brandileone, however, does not explain it; he supposes it to be a logical consequence of the original separation of Christianity from political society. Well and good. But since Christianity became the state religion—as paganism had been—was there not a reestablishment of the formal unity of politics and religion? This is the issue.)

During the early centuries of the Middle Ages, the new *jus sacrum*, also called *jus canonicum* or *ius ecclesiasticum*, and the *ius romanum* were taught in different schools, which, in terms of numbers, distribution, and activities, were not of equal importance. In the West, the special schools in the Roman tradition, both

the ones that had descended from the ancient schools and the new ones, were only to be found in Italy. Even though outside Italy there were the *Scholae liberalium artium* that (like their Italian counterparts) imparted basic notions of secular (especially Roman) law, the activities they carried out were of little value, as evidenced by the scanty, fragmentary, irregular, and usually clumsy productions that came out of them and reached us. By contrast, the ecclesiastical schools dedicated to the study of religious dogma and canon law were very numerous, not only in Italy but in all the countries that had become Christian or Catholic. Every monastery and every cathedral church of some stature had its own school; proof of this activity is the richness of the collections of canonical works, uninterrupted from the sixth to the eleventh century, in Italy, Africa, Spain, France, Germany, England, Ireland. The explanation of this vigor of canonical law as compared to Roman law is related to the fact that while Roman law, as it was applied in the West and in Italy, had become reduced to private law, the same did not happen to canon law.

The reduction of Roman law to private law meant that it could not command the degree of respect owed the popular laws, or *Volksrechte*, that were in force in the territory of the Western Empire. And the preservation and modification of these laws was not, or at least not solely, the responsibility of the sovereign, royal, or imperial power but also and primarily of the assemblies of the peoples to whom they applied. However, Roman subjects in the Germanic kingdoms and, later, in the empire were not treated as a separate independent group but as single individuals, and therefore they did not have their own assembly authorized to express its collective will concerning the preservation and modification of its own nation's law. Thus Roman law was reduced to mere consuetudinary law.

In Longobard Italy, Roman principles and institutions were accepted by the victors, but the position of Roman law did not change.

The renewal of the Roman Empire by Charlemagne did not pull Roman law out of its inferior position; its position was enhanced, but only later and for other reasons. Overall in Italy, Roman law remained private law until the eleventh century. The new laws enacted by the new emperors until the end of the eleventh century were not appended to the Justinian Code but to the Longobard

Edict, and therefore they were not regarded as universally binding general laws but as private laws pertaining to those who lived under Longobard law.

Canon law, on the other hand, was never reduced to private law because it was the law of a society different and distinct from political society, with a membership that was not based on nationality—a society with its own legislative power residing in the councils and the popes. However, it did have a sphere of restricted obligatoriness. Something became obligatory either because it was spontaneously accepted or because it was incorporated into the laws of the state.

The position of Roman law did go through a radical change in Italy as the empire, following the accession of the Ottos, came to be conceived more clearly and explicitly as the continuation of the old one. It was the school of Pavia that made itself the expositor of this and proclaimed Roman law *omnium generalis*, thus preparing the environment for the rise and blossoming of the school of Bologna; moreover, the Swabian emperors regarded Justinian's code as their own and made additions to it. This reaffirmation of Roman law is not attributable to personal factors: it is related to the revival of economic life, industry, commerce, and shipping after the year 1000. Germanic law did not lend itself to the juridical regulation of the new phenomena and the new relations.

After the year 1000 canon law, too, underwent a change.

With the alliance between the Carolingians and the papacy came the idea of a universal monarchy embracing all of humanity, under the joint rule of the emperor (in the temporal sphere) and the pope (in the spiritual sphere). But this idea could not draw a priori the boundaries of the terrain that fell under each power, and it gave the emperor great latitude to intervene in ecclesiastical affairs. When—already under the Carolingians but increasingly so afterward—the goals of the empire were manifestly at odds with those of the church and the state revealed its intention to absorb the ecclesiastical hierarchy into the state, a struggle arose that came to an end early in the twelfth century with the victory of the papacy. The primacy of the spiritual (sun-moon) was proclaimed, and the church regained its freedom of legislative action, etc., etc. This theocratic conception was opposed theoretically and practically; nevertheless, in its genuine or in its attenuated form, it remained dominant for centuries and centuries. Thus there were two tribunals, the sacra-

mental and the nonsacramental, and thus the two laws were wedded, *utrumque ius*, etc.

§<88>. *The study of the historical formation of the Italian intellectuals* thus leads one back to the times of the Roman Empire when Italy, by virtue of having Rome on its territory, becomes the melting pot of the cultured classes from all the imperial territories. The ruling personnel becomes increasingly imperial and decreasingly Latin; it becomes cosmopolitan: even the emperors are not Latin, etc.

There is, then, a unitary line in the development of the Italian (operating on Italian territory) intellectual classes, but this line of development is anything but national. This fact causes an internal imbalance in the composition of the population living in Italy, etc.

The problem of what the intellectuals are can be shown in all of its complexity through this study.[1]

§<89>. *Lorianism*. A famous controversy that should be associated with this current is the one about the lost books of Livy supposedly discovered in Naples some years ago by a professor who acquired a few moments of perhaps unwanted fame for his discovery. In my view, the roots of the scandal are to be found in the intrigues of Prof. Francesco Ribezzo and in the weakness of the said professor, whose name I do not recall. This professor used to publish a journal, and Prof. Ribezzo used to publish a rival journal; both were useless or almost useless (I was familiar with Ribezzo's journal for many years, and I have known Ribezzo, for what he's worth): the two of them were competing for a professorship at the University of Naples. It was Ribezzo who published in his journal the announcement of his colleague's discovery (!). As a result the professor found himself at the center of the newspapers' and the public's curiosity, and he was professionally and morally wiped out.[1] Ribezzo has no scholarly skills: when I knew him in 1910–11 he had forgotten Greek and Latin almost completely, and he was a "specialist" in Aryo-European comparative linguistics. Ribezzo's ignorance stood out so obviously that he often clashed violently with students. At the lycée in Palermo he was implicated in a scandal surrounding the murder of a professor by a student (in 1908 or

1909, I believe). As punishment he was sent to Cagliari, where he came into conflict with the students, a conflict that turned bitter in 1912, with polemics in the newspapers, death threats, etc., against Ribezzo, who was compelled to move to Naples. Ribezzo must have been strongly supported by the Neapolitan university cabal (Cocchia et al.). He applied for the professorship in linguistics at the University of Turin; when Bartoli was appointed, he made a ridiculous public display, etc.[2]

§<90>. *History of the subaltern classes* (cf. notes on pp. 10 and 12).[1] The historical unity of the ruling classes is found in the state, and their history is essentially the history of states and of groups of states. This unity must be concrete, hence it is the outcome of the relations between the state and "civil society." For the subaltern classes, the unification does not occur; their history is intertwined with the history of "civil society"; it is a disjointed segment of that history. One must study: (1) the objective formation of the subaltern classes through the developments and changes that took place in the economic sphere; the extent of their diffusion; and their descent from other classes that preceded them; (2) their passive or active adherence to the dominant political formations; that is, their efforts to influence the programs of these formations with demands of their own; (3) the birth of new parties of the ruling class to maintain control of the subaltern classes; (4) the formations of the subaltern classes themselves, formations of a limited and partial character; (5)[a] the political formations that assert the autonomy of the subaltern classes, but within the old framework; (6)[b] the political formations that assert complete autonomy, etc. These phases can be listed in even greater detail, with intermediate phases or combinations of several phases. The historian records the development, starting from the most primitive phases, toward complete autonomy. Therefore the history of a political party of these classes is also very complex because it must include the repercussions of the party's activities across the entire terrain of the subaltern classes as a whole. Among these classes, one will exercise a hegemony; this must be established by studying the developments of all the other parties as well, insofar as they include elements of the hegemonic class or of the other subaltern classes that are subject to its hegemony. A criterion of historical research can be constructed by studying the history of the bourgeoisie in this manner (these observations are associated with the notes on the Risorgimento): the bourgeoisie came into power by

[a]In the manuscript, "(4)"—probably repeated by mistake.
[b]In the manuscript, "(5)."

struggling against certain social forces with the help of other specific forces; in order to consolidate itself in the state, it had to eliminate the former and obtain the active or passive consent of the latter. The study of the bourgeoisie as the development of a subaltern class must therefore examine the phases through which it acquired autonomy from the future enemies it had to defeat and the phases through which it acquired the support of those forces that have actively or passively helped it; without this support it would not have been able to consolidate itself in the state. The level of consciousness attained by the bourgeoisie in the various phases is, in fact, measured by both these yardsticks, not only by the yardstick of its separation from the class that used to dominate it. Usually the latter is the only yardstick employed, and the result is a one-sided history or, at times, a failure to understand anything, as in the case of the history of Italy since the time of the communes. The Italian bourgeoisie proved incapable of uniting the people, and this was one of the causes of its defeats and the interruptions in its development. In the Risorgimento, too, this narrow "egoism" prevented a quick and vigorous revolution like the French one.

This is one of the most important problems and one of the causes of difficulties in producing the history of the subaltern classes.

Cf. Notebook 25, §5.

§<91>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. The book fair.* Since people do not go to the book, the book will go to the people. We owe this initiative to *La Fiera Letteraria* and to its editor at the time, Umberto Fracchia, who launched it and carried it out in 1927, in Milan.[1] The initiative itself is not bad, and it might have some small effect. The problem, however, has not changed: the book must become thoroughly national-popular in order to reach the people, and not merely in the sense of reaching the people "materially" through bookstalls and hawkers, etc.

Cf. Notebook 23, §41.

§<92>. *Federico Confalonieri.* Confalonieri stopped in Vienna before going to the Spielberg and again before going to the prison of Gradisca to be deported after his release. Check whether he had contacts with Austrian political figures also during his second stay in Vienna which was for health reasons.[1]

Cf. Notebook 19, §44.

§<93>. *Giovanni Cena.* On the activities carried out by Cena on behalf of the schools for peasants in Agro Romano, cf. the publications of Alessandro Marcucci.[1]

Cf. Notebook 23, §43.

§<94>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Polifilo.* (Luca Beltrami). In order to find the Brescianist writings of Beltrami (*I populari di Casate Olona*, etc., published in *Il Romanzo Mensile, La Lettura*, etc.),[1] check the *Bibliografia degli scritti di Luca Beltrami* (from March 1881 to March 1930), edited by Fortunato Pintor, honorary librarian of the senate, with an introduction by Guido Mazzoni.[2] A bibliographic note published in *Il Marzocco* of 11 May 1930 suggests that Beltrami's writings on the fictional "Casate Olona" number as many as *thirty-five* (I have only read three or four of them).[3] Beltrami has annotated the *Bibliografia*, and apropos of "Casate Olona," *Il Marzocco* writes: "The bibliography of the thirty-five texts on the fictional 'Casate Olona' has given him the idea of assembling his statements, proposals, and arguments of a social-political nature into a single work. His views were out of tune with a democratic-parliamentary regime, and in a certain respect they should be considered portentous: someone other than Beltrami could have boasted of being a foreseeing precursor (!?)."[4] Since even *Il Marzocco* has given itself over to this kind of scurrilousness, it would be interesting to recall the position taken by this Florentine publication on the issue of F. Ferrer's execution by firing squad.[5]

Cf. Notebook 23, §42.

§<95>. *Father Bresciani's progeny.* Serial novels and popular theater (arena drama, or arena grand drama, etc.). (Why, exactly, is popular drama called arena drama? Because of the popular arenas, like the Arena del Sole in Bologna? See what Edoardo Boutet wrote about the performances for washerwomen that the Permanent Theater Company of Rome, under Boutet's direction, used to give at the Arena del Sole of Bologna on Mondays: washerwomen's day. I read this chapter of Boutet's theater memoirs in Monicelli's paper *Il Viandante*, published in Milan in 1908–9.)[1] *Il Marzocco* of 17 November 1929 published a very striking note by Gaio (Adolfo Orvieto), "*Danton*, il melodrama e il 'romanzo nella vita.' "[2] It opens thus: "A recently 'formed' theatrical company has put together a repertory of great popular plays—from *The Count of Monte Cristo* to *Les deux orphelines*[3]—with the reasonable hope of attracting some people to the theater. It has seen its hopes fulfilled, in Florence, with a new play

about the French Revolution, *Danton*, written by a Hungarian." The play is by De Pekar,[4] and it is a "pure pathetic fable that takes extreme liberties with the imagination of facts" (for ex., Robespierre and Saint-Just are present at Danton's trial and argue with him). "But it is a cleverly crafted fable that takes advantage of the old infallible methods of popular theater, without dangerous modernistic deviations. Everything is simple, controlled, and clean-cut. The sensational and uproarious elements alternate with well-timed moments of softness, so that the audience relaxes and goes along, showing its enthusiasm and pleasure. Is this the best way to bring the public back to the theater?" Orvieto's conclusion is significant. Thus in 1929 one must perform *The Count of Monte Cristo* and *Les deux orphelines* in order to attract the public to the theater, and in 1930 one must serialize *The Count of Monte Cristo* and *Joseph Balsamo* in order to get people to read newspapers.

Cf. Notebook 21, §7.

§<96>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Popular novels.* Statistical research: how many Italian novels have the most widely circulated popular periodicals published? *Il Romanzo Mensile, La Domenica del Corriere, La Tribuna Illustrata, Il Mattino Illustrato*? It may be that of the approximately eighty to ninety novels published by *La Domenica del Corriere* during its entire existence (thirty-second year in 1930) not a single one was an Italian novel. I believe that *La Tribuna Illustrata* has published some, but it should be noted that *La Tribuna Illustrata* is much less popular than the *Domenica* and it has its own type of novel. It would also be interesting to check the nationality of the authors and the type of adventure novels published. *Il Romanzo Mensile* and *La Domenica* publish many English novels and detective stories (they published Sherlock Holmes), but also German, Hungarian (Baroness Orczy, who seems to be Hungarian,[1] has become very popular, and her novels on the French Revolution have been reprinted a number of times in *Il Romanzo Mensile*, which also must have a respectable circulation—I think it has reached twenty-five thousand copies), and even Australian novels (by Guy Boothby,[2] which have also been reprinted a number of times). Similarly, in *Il Romanzo Mensile* and *La Domenica* adventure-detective types of stories certainly predominate. It would be interesting to know who was in charge of the selections at *Il Corriere* and what criteria he used. Although it comes out in Naples, *Il Mattino Illustrato* publishes the same type of novels as *La Domenica*, which means that it is a very popular type. In relative and perhaps even in absolute terms, the administration of *Il Corriere della Sera* is the biggest propagator of these popu-

lar novels: it publishes at least fifteen a year and has an extremely high circulation. The Sonzogno publishing house must be the second biggest (perhaps there were years when Sonzogno published many more than *Il Corriere*). A study of Sonzogno's publishing activity over a number of years would provide a picture of the variations that have occurred in the popular taste of the public; such a study would be interesting but difficult to conduct because Sonzogno does not print the year of publication and often does not number its editions. Perhaps an examination of the catalog would yield some results. A comparison of current catalogs with those of forty or fifty years ago would itself be interesting. The sentimental tear-jerking novel must have fallen entirely into oblivion, except for some "masterpieces" of the genre, which must still survive (like *Capinera del mulino* by Richebourg,[3] I believe). Thus it is interesting to follow the publication of these novels in serial form.

A certain number of Italian popular novels must have been published by Perino and recently by Nerbini, all of which have an anticlerical background and draw on the tradition of Guerrazzi.[4] A list of the publishers of this material would also be interesting.

Cf. Notebook 21, §8.

§<97>. *The concordat*. A provision attached to the Law of Papal Guarantees[1] decreed that if the Vatican refused to accept the allotted indemnity within five years from the promulgation of the law, it would forfeit its entitlement to the indemnity. It appears, however, that the payment of the indemnity to the pope is an item included in every budget up to 1928. How come? Was the 1871 provision attached to the Law of Papal Guarantees modified perhaps? If so, when and for what reasons? This is a very important question.

§<98>. *Spartacus*. A casual observation by Caesar (*Bello Gallico*, I, 40, 5) reveals that the Cimbri prisoners of war formed the nucleus of the slave revolt led by Spartacus. These rebels were annihilated. (cf. Tenney Frank, *Storia economica di Roma*, Italian trans., Ed. Vallecchi, p. 153.)[1] (Check this same chapter in Frank's book for observations or conjectures on the different destinies of slaves of various nationalities and on their likelihood of survival: whether they were destroyed, or whether they merged with or even replaced the indigenous population.)

Cf. Notebook 25, §6.

§<99>. *The law of numbers* (the psychological basis of public displays: processions, mass meetings, etc.). At Rome slaves could not be recognized as such. When a senator once proposed that slaves be given a distinctive dress, the senate defeated the measure, fearing that the slaves might become dangerous if they came to realize their great number. Seneca, *De Clem.*, I. 24. Cf. Tacitus, *Annali*, 4, 27.[1]

Cf. Notebook 25, §6.

§<100>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Popular literature.* Out of the 111 items in the series "Tolle et lege" brought out by the publishing house of the Pious Society of St. Paul in Alba-Roma, 65 are books written by the Jesuit Ugo Mioni. Yet these cannot be all of this author's books; besides, he has not written exclusively novels of adventure or Christian apologetics; he has also written a huge treatise on "Missionology," for example.[1]

Cf. Notebook 21, §9.

§<101>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. The antipopular or nonpopular-national character of Italian literature.* Check whether some modern litterateur has written on this topic. Adriano Tilgher, as well as Gino Saviotti, must have written something.[1] In *L'Italia Letteraria* of 24 August 1930, I have found the following passage quoted from an article by Saviotti on Parini that was published in *Ambrosiano* of 15 August: "Wonderful Parini, one can see why you stirred up Italian poetry in your time. You imparted to it the seriousness it lacked, you transfused into its arid veins your good popular blood. May you be thanked even today, a hundred and thirty-one years after your death. Our so-called poetry of today needs another man like you."[2]

Cf. Notebook 23, §44.

§<102>. *Past and present. School of journalism* (cf. pp. 48v–49).[1] The number of Italian journalists. "Notizie sindacali" published in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 24 August 1930 reproduces the results of a census conducted by the Secretariat of the National Union of Journalists: as of 30 June, 1960 journalists belonged to the union, of whom 800 were members of the Fascist Party; the figures are broken down as follows: Bari 30 and 26; Bologna 108 and 40; Florence 108 and 43; Genoa 113 and 39; Milan 348 and

143; Naples 106 and 45; Palermo 50 and 17; Rome 716 and 259; Turin 144 and 59; Trieste 90 and 62; Venice 147 and 59.[2]

Cf. Notebook 24, §9.

§<103>. *The Risorgimento and the revolutionary classes.* In the Laterza edition of the *Memorie storiche del regno di Napoli dal 1790 al 1815*, by Francesco Pignatelli, prince of Strongoli[a] (Nino Cortese, *Memorie di un generale della Repubblica e dell'Impero*, 2 vols., in 8°, cccxxv+136 pp., 312 pp., L. 60) Cortese provides an introductory essay, "Stato e ideali politici nell'Italia meridionale nel settecento e l'esperienza di una rivoluzione,"[1] in which he confronts the problem, how is it that in the Italian South the aristocracy takes the side of the revolutionaries and is then ferociously persecuted by the reaction, whereas in France the aristocracy and the monarchy are united against the revolutionary menace? Cortese goes back to the times of Charles of Bourbon to locate the connection between the thinking of the aristocratic innovators and the thinking of the bourgeoisie. For the former, freedom and the necessary reforms had to be guaranteed primarily by an aristocratic parliament, although they were willing to accept the collaboration of the best members of the bourgeoisie. For the latter, control had to be exercised and freedom guaranteed by the aristocracy of the intellect, of knowledge, of skill, etc., whatever its origins. For both, the state had to be governed by the king, surrounded, enlightened, and controlled by an aristocracy. In 1799, after the king's flight, the nobles made the first effort to establish an aristocratic republic, and then came the effort of the bourgeois innovators in the Neapolitan republic that followed.

I do not believe that the events of Naples can be contrasted with those in France. In France, too, there was a split between the nobles and the monarchy, as well as an alliance among the monarchy, the nobles and the upper bourgeoisie. In France, however, the Revolution was also propelled by the popular classes, who prevented it from stalling in its early stages; this did not happen in southern Italy or, subsequently, during the entire Risorgimento. Cortese's book should be checked.

Cf. Notebook 19, §45.

§<104>. *Popular literature. An anthology of writings by American workers* published in 1930 by the Editions "Les Revues" (*Poèmes d'ouvri-*

[a]In the manuscript, "Stromboli."

ers américains, traduit par N. Guterman et P. Morhange, 9 Francs; it has been very well received by French critics, as can be seen from the quotes in the publisher's prospectus).[1]

In 1925 the Editions Aujourd'hui published an *Anthologie des écrivains ouvriers*, compiled by Gaston Depresle, with an introduction by Henri Barbusse; it was supposed to be in two volumes, but only the first volume has been published.[2] (It publishes writings by, among others, Marguerite Andoux, Pierre Hamp, etc.)

In 1930 the Librairie Valois—place du Panthéon (V°) 7—published: Henry Poulaille, *Nouvel âge littéraire*;[3] its advertisement lists the names of Charles Louis Philippe, Charles Péguy, Georges Sorel, L. et M. Bonneff, Marcel Martinet, Charles Vildrac, etc. (One cannot tell whether it is an anthology or a collection of critical essays by Poulaille: published by Valois with well-known names like Sorel, etc.)

Cf. Notebook 23, §53.

§<105>. *Lorianism. American peanuts and oil.* In a note on Lorianism I mentioned the proposal by some colonel to cultivate fifty thousand square kilometers of peanuts in order to satisfy Italy's fuel oil requirements.[1] The person in question is the engineer Barberis, a colonel in the corps of naval engineers, who discussed the proposal in a presentation, "Il combustibile liquido e il suo avvenire," at the science congress held in Perugia in October 1927. (Cf. Manfredi Gravina, "Olii, petroli, e benzina," in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 January 1928,[a] note on p. 71.)[2]

§<106>. *Prof. H. de Vries de Heekelingen* teaches (taught?) paleography and diplomatics at the Catholic University of Nijmegen (Holland). In 1927 he founded the International Center of Studies on Fascism at Lausanne. He has written for *Critica Fascista*. (On the organization of this center, see the information published in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 January 1928.) The center provides information services to anyone on any topic that might be related to fascism.[1]

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci erroneously wrote "1927."

§<107>. *The social classes in the Risorgimento.* See the book by Niccolò Rodolico, *Il popolo agli inizi del Risorgimento*, Florence: Le Monnier, 8°, 312 pp. The statute of the Esperia Society, created by the Bandiera brothers, states: "There will be no close association with the common people, unless it is done with the utmost circumspection, because they are almost always by nature imprudent and by necessity corrupt. Preferably, one should turn to the rich, the powerful, and the learned, ignoring the poor, the weak, the ignorant."[1]

There is a need to collect all the observations from the early period of the Risorgimento (before 1848) that refer to this topic and to find out the origins of this mistrust: the trials of 1821 in Piedmont, the different attitudes of the soldiers and the officers (the soldiers either turned into traitors or showed great weakness during the preliminary proceedings of the trials).[2]

Mazzini's attitude before and after 1853: see his instructions to Crispi on the creation of Action Party sections in Portugal, recommending the inclusion of workers in the committees.[3]

Cf. Notebook 19, §46.

§<108>. *The personal equation.* The calculations of the movements of the stars are distorted by what scientists call "the personal equation," which has to be corrected. Check how exactly this error is verified and by what criteria. In any case, the notion of "personal equation" can be useful in other fields as well.

Cf. Notebook 26, §2.

§<109>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Italo Svevo and Italian littérateurs.* Italo Svevo was "revealed" by James Joyce.[1] In its commemoration of Svevo, *La Fiera Letteraria*[a] maintained that this revelation was preceded by the Italian "discovery" of him: "In recent days a part of the Italian press has repeated the error of the 'French discovery'; it seems that even the major newspapers ignore what has been duly said and repeated. It is therefore necessary to write yet one more time that cultured Italians were the first to know about Svevo's work, and, thanks to Eugenio Montale, who wrote about him in the journals *L'Esame* and *Il Quindicinale*, the writer from Trieste received his first and deserved recognition in Italy. This is not to deprive the foreigners of their due; it only seems fair to us that no shadow should darken the sincerity and, we

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci erroneously wrote "*Italia Letteraria*."

must also say, the pride (!!!) of our homage to our deceased friend" (*La Fiera Letteraria*[b] of 23 September 1928—Svevo died on 15 September—in a brief editorial note introducing an article by Montale, "Ultimo addio," and another by Giovanni Comisso, "Colloquio").[2] This little piece of unctuous and Jesuitical prose contradicts the assertions made by Carlo Linati in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 February 1928 ("Italo Svevo, romanziere"). Linati writes: "Two years ago I happened to attend an evening party at an intellectual club in Milan. I remember that at a certain point a young writer came in who had just arrived from Paris. After he had talked to us at length about a dinner at the Pen Club hosted by Parisian litterateurs in honor of Pirandello, he added that at the end of the dinner, the famous Irish novelist James Joyce was chatting with him about modern Italian literature and told him: 'But you Italians have a great prose writer, and perhaps you don't even know it.' 'Who?' 'Italo Svevo of Trieste.' "[3] Linati states that no one, including the young writer who had conversed with Joyce, was familiar with that name. Montale finally managed to "discover" a copy of *Senilità* and wrote about it in *L'Esame*. This is how the Italian litterateurs "discovered" Svevo. Is this an isolated case? As for *La Fiera Letteraria*,[c] recall two other cases: that of Moravia's novel and that of Nino Savarese's *Malagigi*, which was discussed only after it had won an award in a competition or something of the sort, even though the novel had appeared in *Nuova Antologia* in 1928.[4] Actually, these people could not care less about literature, culture, etc. They practice the profession of literary sextons and nothing else.

(In the field of children's literature, however, Vamba's *Il Giornalino della Domenica* and all his initiatives and organizations, as well as the contributions of Father Pistelli, must get an honorable mention. Cf. the article by Lea Nissim, "Omero Redi e le 'Pistole,' " in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 February 1928.)[5]

Cf. Notebook 23, §45 and §46.

§<110>. *Equipping the nation.* When studying economic conditions and the structure of the Italian economy, use the concept of "equipping the nation" as a framework. Define this concept clearly, etc.

§<111>. *Lorianism.* For some succinct information on Luigi Valli's "sectarian" interpretations of Dante's *Divine Comedy* and

[b]In the manuscript, "*Italia Letteraria.*"
[c]In the manuscript, "*Italia Letteraria.*"

the *dolce stil nuovo*, cf. Benedetto Migliore's "Una nuova interpretazione delle rime di Dante e del 'dolce stil novo' " in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 February 1928.[1]

§<112>. *Corrado Barbagallo.* His book *L'oro e il fuoco* should be very carefully examined while bearing in mind that the author deliberately set out to find in antiquity what is essentially modern, such as capitalism and the phenomena related to it.[1] Special attention must be given to his studies and conclusions on professional associations and their functions; they should be compared with the opinions of classical and medieval scholars. Check on the disagreement between Mommsen and Marquardt on the *collegia opificum et artificum*: according to Marquardt, these "collegia" were fiscal institutions that served the economy and state finance and had little or nothing to do with social institutions (cf. the Russian *mir*).[2] Not to mention the observation that modern trade unionism must, in any case, have a parallel in the slaves' institutions in the classical world. What characterizes the modern world is that below the workers there is no other unorganized class; this has never been the case, not even in the medieval corporations. (Even the Roman artisan could make use of slaves as laborers, and they did not belong to the "collegia"; besides, one suspects that among the same people there were categories—not necessarily slaves—excluded from the "collegia.")

Cf. Notebook 11, §11.

§<113>. *Utopias.* Shakespeare's *Tempest.* (The opposition between Caliban and Prospero, etc., but the utopian nature of Gonzalo's speeches is more obvious.) Cf. A. Loria, "Pensieri e soggetti economici in Shakespeare" (*Nuova Antologia* of 1 August 1928), which can be used for the chapter on Lorianism. On *The Tempest*, see Renan's *Caliban* and *L'eau de jouvence.* This article by Loria, however, is interesting as an anthology of those passages in Shakespeare that are of a social nature: it can be used as indirect evidence of the way the common people of the time thought.[1]

Cf. Notebook 25, §7.

§<114>. *Past and present.* "When wealthy rogues need the poor rogues, the latter can exact from the former the highest price they want," Shakespeare (in *Timon of Athens*) (?).[1]

§<115>. *International function of the Italian educated classes.* Perhaps the decline of the cosmopolitan function of the Italian intellectuals can be seen to coincide with the thriving of adventurers in the eighteenth century. At a certain point Italy stops providing Europe with technical experts, either because the other nations have already developed their own educated class or because Italy ceases to produce talent as the sixteenth century gradually recedes. The traditional paths of "making one's fortune" abroad are crisscrossed by swindlers who exploit the tradition. Should be checked and articulated in precise terms.

§<116>. *International function of the Italian educated classes.* In the war of Flanders fought by the Spaniards toward the end of the sixteenth century, a large proportion of the military and engineering technical experts were Italian: renowned military commanders like Alessandro Farnese, the duke of Parma, Ranuccio Farnese, Ambrogio Spinola, Paciotto da Urbino, Giorgio Basta, Giambattista del Monte, Pompeo Giustiniano, Cristoforo Mondragone, and many other lesser figures. The city of Namur had been fortified by two Italian engineers: Gabrio Serbelloni and Scipione Campi, etc. Cf. Eugenio Barbarich's "Un generale di cavalleria italo-albanese: Giorgio Basta" in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 August 1928.[1]

In this study on the cosmopolitan function of the Italian educated classes, the role of military engineers must be given special consideration because of the more strictly "national" value that has always been attached to military service. The issue is related to other inquiries: how were these military skills developed? In the communes, the bourgeoisie had also had a military origin in the sense that its class organization was also a military organization and through its military function it was able to seize power. This military tradition was broken after the attainment of power, that is, after the aristocratic commune had become a bourgeois commune. How and why? How did the mercenary troops come into being and what necessitated them? What was the social situation of the condottieri generally? I believe they were minor noblemen. But of which nobility: the feudal or the mercantile nobility? Etc. How were these military leaders of the late sixteenth century and of the following centuries formed? etc.

Naturally, the very strong participation of Italians in the wars of the Counter-Reformation has a particular significance, but did they also participate in the defense of the Protestants? The contribution of these military technical experts must not be confused with the role played by the Swiss, for example, as international mercenaries, or by the German cavalrymen in France (*reîtres*), or by the Scottish bowmen, also in France: precisely because the Italians did not provide just military technical experts but also experts in engineering, politics, diplomacy, etc.

Barbarich (who, I believe, is now a general) concludes his article on Basta as follows: "The long experience of forty years of campaigns in the harsh wars of Flanders, France, and Transylvania provided Giorgio Basta with a truly extraordinary practical validation of his lucid and renowned theory, which was subsequently renewed by Montecuccoli. To recall the two of them today is a dutiful act of historical vindication, of salutary promotion of attention to our traditions, which affirm the undisputed and shining primacy of Italian military art among the great modern armies."[2] But can one talk about Italian military art in this case? From the point of view of cultural history it might be interesting to know that Farnese was an Italian, or Napoleon a Corsican, or Rothschild a Jew, but historically their individual activity has been incorporated into the state in whose service they were engaged or into the society in which they functioned. The example of the Jews could provide a point of reference for assessing the activity of these Italians, but only up to a certain point: actually, the Jews have had a stronger national character than these Italians, in the sense that in their activities they had concerns of a national character, which these Italians lacked. One can talk of national tradition when an individual talent is incorporated actively—that is, practically and socially—within the nation from which the individual has emerged (the studies on Judaism and its international role may provide many elements of a theoretical nature for this inquiry), when it transforms its own people, when it sets the people in motion—which is, precisely, what forms tradition. In this regard, where is the continuity between Farnese and today? The transformations, the renovations, the innovations brought about by these military engineers in their art have been incorporated in the French, or Spanish, or Austrian tradition; in Italy they have become items in a bibliography.

§<117>. *Italian emigration and the cosmopolitan function of the Italian educated classes.* Before the French Revolution, that is, before a national leading class was organically formed, there was an emigration of Italians possessing technical expertise and leadership abilities, whose contributions enriched the European states. After the formation of a national bourgeoisie and after the advent of capitalism, the emigration of working people got under way, which has helped increase the surplus value of foreign capitalisms: thus the national weakness of the leading class has always had a negative effect. It has not given the people national discipline, it has not made them abandon provincialism in order to attain a higher level of unity [it has not created the economic conditions to reabsorb the labor force that emigrated], so that for the most part these elements have been wasted, and they have become incorporated in foreign nationalities in a subaltern role.

§<118>. *National history and the history of culture (European or international).* The activity of the leading elements that have operated abroad, just like the activity of modern emigration, cannot be incorporated into the national history, whereas this should be the case with, for example, the activity of similar elements in other conditions. A class from one country may work in another country while at the same time maintaining its ties with its nation and state of origin; this would be an expression of the political influence of the country of origin. During a certain period, because of the state ties between France and the Vatican, the missionaries or the clergy extended French influence in the Orient, even though French citizens constituted only a part of this clergy. A general staff organizing the armed forces of another country entrusts the work to military technical experts from its group; these by no means lose their nationality. The intellectuals of one country influence the culture of another country and lead it, etc. Workers emigrate, and they colonize a country under the direct or indirect leadership of their own economic and political leading class. The expansive power, the historical influence of a country cannot be measured by the intervention of single individuals but by the fact that these individuals are a conscious and organic expression of a national social bloc. If this is not the case, then one should only talk of phenomena that have a certain cultural impact as part of much more

complex historical phenomena; this was the case in Italy, which for many years was the "territorial" origin of cosmopolitan leading elements and, to some extent, still is, given that the upper echelons of the Catholic hierarchy are mostly Italian. Historically, this international function has been the cause of the weakness of the nation and the state: the development of skills was not spurred by national needs but by international ones. Therefore, from the national point of view, the process of the technical specialization of the intellectuals has proceeded along an abnormal path, because it has helped create the equilibrium of activities or branches of activity not of a national community but of a much broader community that wanted to "integrate" its national cadres, etc. (This point should be developed well, with precision and clarity.)

§<119>. *Past and present. Agitation and propaganda.* The weakness of Italian political parties ever since they became active, from the Risorgimento onward (with the partial exception of the Nationalist Party), has consisted in what could be called an imbalance between agitation and propaganda; in other terms, this is called lack of principle, opportunism, absence of organic continuity, imbalance between tactics and strategy, etc. The main reason for this mode of existence of the parties is to be found in the deliquescence of the economic classes, in the gelatinous economic and social structure of the country, but this explanation is somewhat fatalistic. In fact, if it is true that the parties are nothing other than the nomenclature of the classes, it is also true that the parties are not merely mechanical and passive expressions of the classes themselves but also react energetically with the classes to develop them, solidify them, and universalize them. This is precisely what did not happen in Italy, and, in fact, this "omission" manifests itself in this imbalance between agitation and propaganda, or in whatever terms one might choose to put it.

The government-state has a certain responsibility for this state of affairs (it can be called a responsibility because it has hindered the strengthening of the state itself; in other words, it has shown that the government-state was not a national factor); the government, in fact, has functioned as a "party": it has placed itself above the parties not in order to harmonize their interests and activities within the permanent framework of the life and interests of nation and state but

rather in order to disunite them, to separate them from the great masses, and to gain "a force of nonpartisans who are attached to the government by paternalistic bonds of a Bonapartist-Caesarist type." This is how one should analyze the so-called *dictatorships* of Depretis, Crispi, and Giolitti, as well as the parliamentary phenomenon of *transformism*.[1] Classes give voice to the parties, and the parties produce statesmen and government officials, the leaders of civil society and political society. There should be a useful and fruitful relation in these expressions and functions. Leaders cannot be formed in the absence of theoretical, doctrinal activity by the parties, in the absence of systematic inquiry and study on the raison d'être and development of the class that is represented. Hence scarcity of statesmen and government leaders, impoverishment of parliamentary life, the aptitude for disuniting the parties by corrupting them and absorbing their few indispensable individuals. Hence impoverishment of cultural life and the petty narrow-mindedness of high culture: sterile erudition in place of political history, superstition instead of religion, the daily newspaper and the scandal sheet instead of books and great periodicals. Ordinary everyday fractiousness and personal conflicts instead of serious politics. The universities and all the institutions that developed intellectual and technical skills were impervious to the life of the parties and the living reality of national life, and they created apolitical national cadres with a purely rhetorical and non-national mental formation. Thus the bureaucracy estranged itself from the people, and through its administrative positions it became a true political party, the worst of all, because the bureaucratic hierarchy replaced the intellectual and political hierarchy: the bureaucracy became precisely the state-Bonapartist party.

See the books that after 1919 criticized a "similar" state of affairs (but one in which the life of civil society was much richer) in Kaiser Wilhelm's Germany; for example, Max Weber's *Parlamento e governo nel nuovo ordinamento della Germania: Criticia politica della burocrazia e della vita dei partiti*, translation and preface by Enrico Ruta, xvi + 200 pp., L. 10. (The translation is very flawed and imprecise.)[2]

§<120>. *Antonio Fradeletto*. Formerly a radical Freemason, he converted to Catholicism. A rhetorical-sentimental journalist, an orator for great occasions.[1] He belongs to a type of Italian culture that is now vanishing. A writer on literary, artistic, and "patriotic" subjects. I think the

"type" consists precisely in this: the fact that "patriotism" was not a very widespread sentiment, not the mood of a national stratum, but the *speciality* of a set of writers (Cian, for example),[2] a professional qualification, so to speak. (Not to be confused with the nationalists, even though Corradini belongs to this type and is different in this respect from Coppola and Federzoni; D'Annunzio does not fit into this category, either. In France, perhaps Barrès belongs to this type, but not identically.)[3]

Cf. Notebook 23, §48.

§<121>. *Father Bresciani's progeny.* Arturo Calza writes, in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 October 1928:

> One must realize that from 1914 to the present, literature has lost not only the public that sustained it but also the one that provided it with subject matter. In other words, in our European society, which is now going through one of the most acute and tumultuous moments of that moral and spiritual crisis that paves the way for a great renewal, the philosopher and therefore also, necessarily, the poet, the novelist, and the playwright see around them a society "in the making" rather than a society settled and consolidated in a definitive (!) scheme of moral and intellectual life; somewhat vague and ever-changing aspects of customs and ways of life rather than firmly established and organized ways of life and customs; seeds and shoots rather than blossoms and ripe fruit. And so—as the distinguished editor of *La Tribuna* (Roberto Forges Davanzati) has recently written, and as other newspapers have repeated and even "intensified"—"we live in the greatest artistic absurdity, in the midst of all the styles and all the new endeavors, *no longer able to constitute an epoch.*"[1]

So much twaddle between Calza and Forges Davanzati. Is this, perhaps, the only period that has had a social crisis? And isn't it rather the case that precisely during periods of social crisis, passions, interests, and sentiments become more intense, and one gets romanticism in literature? The arguments limp and turn against the arguer: how is it that Forges Davanzati is unaware that "the inability to constitute an epoch" cannot be limited to art but invests all of life?

Cf. Notebook 23, §47.

§<122>. *Italian diplomacy. Costantino Nigra and the Treaty of Wuchali.*[1] In his article "Lettere inedite di Costantino Nigra," in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 November 1928, Carlo Richelmy repro-

duces a letter (or passages from a letter) by Nigra [dated 28 August 1896] to a "dear friend."[2] Richelmy believes that he can identify the "dear friend" as Marquis Visconti-Venosta,[3] since the marquis and Nigra had exchanged telegrams on the same topic and at about the same time as the letter. Nigra writes that Prince Lobanov (perhaps the Russian ambassador in Vienna when Nigra himself was ambassador) told him about certain negotiations that had taken place between the Emperor Menelik and the czar. Menelik informed the czar of his willingness to accept Russian mediation in order to reach a peace settlement with Italy, etc. Nigra concludes: "One thing is clear to me. After the business of the Treaty of Wuchali, the emperor distrusts us; he is always harboring the suspicion that our plenipotentiary will alter the clauses that have been agreed upon. This insurmountable distrust has induced the emperor to request that negotiations be carried out through Russia so that he would have a suitable and powerful witness. This is a hard blow to our self-esteem, but our country should now accept the fact that it cannot expect much when it uses diplomats like Antonelli, generals like Baratieri, or ministers like Mocenni."[4] ("Empty but dirty hands"—the Machiavellianism of used goods dealers, etc.)

§<123>. *The pitiful Italian.* "Latin is a compulsory subject in all North American high schools. All the schools teach Roman history, and their teaching *rivals, if it does not surpass,* what goes on in Italian grammar schools and lyceés, *because* in the American schools the classic history of ancient Rome *is faithfully translated* from Tacitus and Caesar, from Sallust and Livy, whereas in Italy there is an *excessively frequent and servile reliance* on the deformed (*sic*) Leipzig *translations.*" Filippo Virgilii, "L'espansione della cultura italiana," *Nuova Antologia,* 1 December 1928 (the passage is on p. 346).[1] (Nor can this be a printing error, given the sense of the whole sentence! And Virgilii is a university professor and had a classical education!)

§<124>. *Emigration.* Enrico Ferri made his voyage to South America in 1908–9 (but his speech in parliament was actually in 1911, I believe).[1] In 1911 a commission made up of representatives from the workers' organizations of cooperation and resistance went

to Brazil to conduct an inquiry on socioeconomic conditions; it published a report in Bologna in 1912 (*Emigrazione agricola al Brasile*, Commission Report, Bologna, 1912). (These very imprecise data are taken from Virgilii's article cited in the previous note.)[2] One of the members of the commission was Prof. Gaetano Pieraccini, who seems to have written the report.

Apropos of Enrico Corradini's ideas on the proletarian nation and on emigration,[3] it would be interesting to know whether he was influenced by Ferruccio Macola's book, *L'Europa alla conquista dell'America latina*, Venice, 1894, from which Virgilii quotes the following passage: "The old Europe needs to understand that the colonies established on the new continent by its proletariat should no longer be seen as a means of production benefiting the predatory and depraved descendants of Spanish and Portuguese adventurers but rather as the vanguard of its occupation."[4] (Macola's book must be very long—the quoted passage is on p. 421—and very amusing, as well as symptomatic of the mentality of Crispi's followers.)[5]

§<125>. *Luigi Castellazzo, the Mantua trial, and the other trials under Austrian rule.* In order to demonstrate a characteristic trait of Italian life during the second half of the last century (but more exactly after 1876, that is, after the Left came to power) it is worth examining the campaign conducted by the Moderates (with Alessandro Luzio at their head) against Luigi Castellazzo because of his behavior and confessions at the Mantua trial, which led to the hanging of Don Tazzoli, Carlo Poma, Tito Speri, Montanari, and Frattini.[1] The campaign was purely political; the accusations against Castellazzo were not directed against others who during the trials behaved no differently from, or even worse than, Castellazzo. But Castellazzo was a Republican, a Freemason, and even sympathized with the Paris Commune. Did Castellazzo behave any worse than Giorgio Pallavicino did at Confalonieri's trial?[2] It is true that the Mantua trial resulted in death penalties, which was not the case with Confalonieri and his comrades, but were the executions the result of Castellazzo's confession, or were they rather the swift response to the insurrection of February 3, 1853? And were they not encouraged by the cowardice of the Milanese nobles, who groveled at the feet of Franz Josef on the eve of the executions?[3] See how Luzio personally extricates himself from these problems. The Moderates certainly tried in an indecent way to attenuate the responsibility of these nobles (cf. Bonfadini's books).[4]

See how Luzio gets out of the questions surrounding Confalonieri's depositions and Confalonieri's behavior after his release.[5] On the Castellazzo question, cf. Luzio: *I martiri di Belfiore*, in various editions (the fourth edition came out in 1924); *I processi politici di Milano e di Mantova restituiti dall'Austria*, Milan: Cogliati, 1919 (this little book should discuss the Confalonieri depositions "discovered" in the Viennese archives by Senator Salata);[6] *La Massoneria e il Risorgimento italiano*, 2 vols., Bocca (it seems that this work has reached its fourth edition in an extremely short time, which is quite amazing);[7] cf. P. L. Rambaldi, "Luci ed ombre nei processi di Mantova," *Archivio Storico Italiano*, v. XLIII, pp. 257–331;[8] and Giuseppe Fatini, "Le elezioni di Grosseto e la Massoneria," *Nuova Antologia* of 16 December 1928 (discusses Castellazzo's election as a deputy in September 1883 and the campaign it unleashed: Carducci supported Castellazzo and described the campaign against him as a "pharisaic rage of the Moderates").[9] What did [and do] the moderate historians and journalists intend to achieve with their unremitting, extremely shrewd, and very well organized—one gets such a strong sense of method that there seems to be a control center for this work, a Freemasonry of Moderates—work of propaganda? They want to "prove" that Italy's unification is first and foremost the achievement of the Moderates (that is, of the dynasty) and to legitimize their monopoly of power historically—and, by means of this "proof," ideologically to dismantle democracy, absorb its individual elements, and educate the new generations under their aegis with their slogans and programs. They are unscrupulous in their propaganda, whereas the Action Party is full of patriotic, national, and other scruples. The Moderates do not acknowledge the agency of a collective force—apart from the dynasty and the Moderates—in the Risorgimento; they only recognize single individuals, who are either exalted so that they can be appropriated or slandered in order to rupture collective ties. Actually, the Action Party was totally incapable of effectively countering this propaganda: their complaints and outbursts were so blatantly sectarian that they could not have an impact on the man in the street; that is, they could not convince the new generations. Thus the Action Party was broken up, and bourgeois democracy was never able to have a national base.[10] During a certain period, all the democratic forces formed an alliance, and Freemasonry became the linchpin of this alliance: this is a very specific period in the history of Freemasonry that culminated in the development of workers' power. The Moderates made Freemasonry their target, and by so doing they clearly hoped to win over a segment of the Catholic forces, especially the younger ones. The Moderates, in fact, exploited the Catholic forces controlled by the Vatican, and as a result the formation of the Italian state and the secular national consciousness suf-

fered severe repercussions, as became evident later. (Study this set of observations carefully.)

Cf. Notebook 19, §53.

§<126>. *The formation of the Italian educated classes and their cosmopolitan function.* Study the origin, formation, development, raison d'être, etc., of the so-called "lingua franca" in the eastern Mediterranean.[1]

§<127>. *The Risorgimento.* According to Amerigo Scarlatti (*L'Italia Che Scrive*, February 1928), the image of Italy as an artichoke whose leaves are eaten one by one, which has been attributed to Vittorio Emanuele II (an attribution, moreover, that is consonant with his character), in fact comes from Vittorio Amedeo II; the proof is found in Misson's *Voyage d'Italie*, printed at The Hague in 1703.[1] (Recall Vittorio Emanuele II's statement cited by Martini.)[2]

Cf. Notebook 19, §47.

§<128>. *Machiavelli and Emanuele Filiberto.* In the miscellany on *Emanuele Filiberto* published in 1928 by Lattes, Turin (477 pp., in 8°), the generals Maravigna and Brancaccio examine the military activity of Emanuele Filiberto as a strategist and as organizer of the Piedmontese army.[1]

§<129>. *Italian diplomacy.* For a very long period of time, some form of prior censorship or pledge must have prevented Italian diplomats and statesmen in general from writing their memoirs, since literature of this kind is so scarce. From 1919 onward it became relatively abundant, but its quality is very shoddy. (Salandra's memoirs are "inconceivable" in such vulgar form.)[1] According to a brief notice by P. Silva in *L'Italia Che Scrive* of April 1928, Alessandro De Bosdari's book *Delle guerre balcaniche e della grande guerra e di alcuni fatti precedenti ad esse* (Milan: Mondadori, 1927, 225 pp., L. 15) is of no importance because the author dwells excessively on trivial personal matters

and is unable to represent his own activity organically by describing events in such a way as to shed some useful light on them.[2] (A chapter of this book was published by *Nuova Antologia*, and I wrote a note about Bosdari's views on Italian diplomacy.)[3]

§<130>. *Italian culture.* Check the cultural activity of the Doxa publishing house of Rome; I think it has Protestant leanings. Similarly, the activity of *Bilychnis*.[1] It is also necessary to arrive at a correct understanding of the intellectual activity of Italian Jews insofar as it is organized and centralized: periodicals like *Vessillo Israelitico* and *Israel*, publications of specialized publishing houses, etc.; the most important centers of culture. In what way has the new Zionist movement, born after the Balfour[a] Declaration, influenced Italian Jews?

§<131>. *Italian diplomacy.* Salandra's book *La neutralità italiana* is reviewed in the *I<talia> C<he> S<crive>* of May 1928 by Giuseppe A. Andriulli,[1] who refers to the fact that even before Sonnino took over foreign affairs, the minister San Giuliano had already started negotiations with the Triple Entente and that these negotiations, according to San Giuliano's collaborators, were based on an approach quite different from Sonnino's, especially with regard to the colonial issue.[2] Why were these negotiations interrupted by Sonnino and negotiations opened with Austria instead? Salandra still does not explain the reasons behind the May 1915 agreement with Germany on private properties (an agreement that the Germans immediately made public through the Swiss newspaper, *Bund*); nor does he explain the reasons for the delayed declaration of war against Germany (which made the Entente wary of Italy, much to the pleasure of Sisto di Borbone).[3]

§<132>. *Lorianism. Paolo Orano.* Apropos of the relations between Italian trade union intellectuals and Sorel, one should make a comparison between the opinions Sorel published about

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci wrote "Baldwin."

them in his reviews of their books (in *Mouvement Socialiste* and elsewhere) and those he expressed in his letters to Croce. The latter cast the former in a frequently ironic or qualified light: cf. the judgment on P. Orano's *Cristo e Quirino* published in the *Mouvement Socialiste* of April 1908 and the one in the letter to Croce dated 29 December 1907; clearly, the publicly expressed judgment was ironic and reserved, but Orano quotes it as if it were praise in the edition published by Campitelli in Foligno, 1928.[1]

§<133>. Carlo Flumiani, *I gruppi sociali: Fondamenti di scienza politica*, Milan, Istituto Editoriale Scientifico, 1928, 126 pp., L. 20.[1] (Obtain the catalog of this publishing house, which has brought out other books of political science.)

§<134>. Piero Pieri, *Il regno di Napoli dal luglio 1799 al marzo 1806*, Naples, Ricciardi, 1928, 314 pp., L. 25. It examines the policy of the Bourbons after the first restoration and the reasons it collapsed in 1806 even though no active force was opposing it from within and at a time when the French army was still far away. It examines the difficult class system in the South and the birth of liberal thought, which replaced the old Jacobinism of 1799.[1] Should be very interesting.

Another book that should be interesting for understanding class orientation in the South is A. Zazo's *L'istruzione pubblica e privata nel Napolitano (1767–1860)*, Città di Castello, "Il Solco," 1927, 328 pp., L. 15.[2] (The imbalance between public and private education occurred after 1821: the private schools flourish while the public system decays. This leads to the formation of a cultural aristocracy, leaving the people in a wasteland; the separation between the educated class and the people grows. This topic, I believe, should be developed.)

Cf. Notebook 19, §48.

§<135>. *History and antihistory.* From Mario Missiroli's review (*I<talia> <Che> S<crive>*, January 1929) of the book by Tilgher, *Saggi di etica e di filosofia del diritto*, Turin, Bocca, 1928, in 8°, xiv +218 pp., it appears that the fundamental thesis of the booklet *Storia e antistoria* occupies a very important place in Tilgher's philosophical system (!).[1] Missiroli writes:

It is said, justifiably, that Italian idealism, spearheaded by Croce and Gentile, ends up being mere phenomenalism. There is no place in it for personality. With this volume, Adriano Tilgher reacts vigorously against this trend. Returning to the tradition of classical philosophy, particularly to Fichte, Tilgher energetically reasserts the doctrine of freedom and of the "must be." Where there is no freedom of choice, there is "nature." It is impossible to elude fatalism. Life and history lose all meaning, and the perennial questions of consciousness find no answers. Without reference to a quid that transcends empirical reality, one cannot talk of morality, of good and evil. An old thesis. Tilgher's originality resides in the fact that he has been the first to extend this exigency to logic. The "must be" is no less necessary to logic than it is to morals. Hence the indissolubility of logic and morals, which the old scholars liked to keep separate. Once freedom is posited as a necessary premise, what follows is a theory of free will as absolute freedom of choice between good and evil. Thus punishment (the pages on criminal law are very perspicacious) is based not only on responsibility (the classical view) but on the pure and simple fact that the individual can commit evil while recognizing it as such. Causality can take the place of responsibility. Determinism applied to the person who commits a crime is the same as the determinism applied to the person who metes out punishment. Very well. But this energetic return to the "must be," to antihistory, that creates history: does it not logically restore dualism and transcendence? One cannot consider transcendence a "moment" without falling back into immanentism. There is no coming to terms with Plato.

§<136>. *Father Bresciani's progeny.* For the "technically" Jesuit writers to be included in this survey, cf. Monsignor Giovanni Casati, *Scrittori cattolici italiani viventi.* Bio-bibliographical dictionary and analytic index of works with a preface by F. Meda; viii + 112 pp., in 8°.[1]

Cf. Notebook 23, §49.

§<137>. *The formation of the Italian intellectual class.* The effect of the socialist workers' movement on the creation of important sectors of the ruling class. The phenomenon in Italy is objectively different from that in other countries in this respect: in other countries the workers' and socialist movement produced individual political personalities, whereas in Italy it produced whole

groups of intellectuals who crossed over as groups to the other class. I think that the cause of the Italian phenomenon is to be found in the following: the absence of relations between the upper classes and the people. In the struggle between generations, the young get closer to the people, but when crises reach the turning point, the young people return to their class (this happened in the cases of the nationalist-syndicalists and the Fascists). Deep down, it is the same general phenomenon of transformism in a different context. "Classic" transformism is the phenomenon that brought the parties together in the Risorgimento; this transformism brings into sharp relief the contrast between culture, ideology, etc., and class power. The bourgeoisie is unable to educate its youth (generational struggle); the young allow themselves to be culturally attracted by the workers, and they even become [or try to become] their leaders (an "unconscious" desire to make themselves the bearers of the hegemony of their own class over the people), but during historical crises they return to the fold. This "group" phenomenon is certainly not exclusively Italian; other countries with analogous conditions also had analogous phenomena: the national[a] socialisms of the Slavic countries (or social revolutionaries,[b] or Narodniks, etc.).[1]

§<138>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Alfredo Panzini.* I have already observed in another note that F. Palazzi, in his review of Panzini's book *I giorni del sole e del grano*, points out that Panzini's mentality makes him more like a slave driver than a detached and candid pastoralist.[1] This acute observation does not apply solely to Panzini, who typifies a whole epoch. But Palazzi makes another observation about custom that is strictly connected with Panzini and is related to other observations of mine (apropos of Panzini's obsession with the "livid blade," etc.).[2] Palazzi writes (*I<talia> C<he> S<crive>*, June 1929):

> If one looks closely at Panzini as he half-heartedly eulogizes the frugal meal eaten on a patch of grass, one notices him curling his mouth and wondering in his heart how one could possibly survive on onions and a Spartan dark broth when God put truffles under the ground and oysters on the bottom of the sea. <. . .> "Once," he confesses, "I was even brought

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci wrote "nations."
[b]In the manuscript, Gramsci wrote "social revolutions."

to tears." But those tears, unlike Tolstoy's, do not flow from his eyes because of the poverty that stares him in the face, or because of the beauty glimpsed in some humble expressions, or out of genuine sympathy for the meek and the distressed found among the rugged workers of the fields. Oh no! He cries because he hears mentioned certain forgotten words for household objects and he remembers when his mother also used to call them by the same names; and he sees himself as a child again, which makes him think of the ineluctable brevity of life, of the rapid approach of looming death. "Reverend Archpriest, please: not too much earth over the coffin." In short, Panzini cries because he feels sorry for himself. He cries for himself and his mortality, not for others. He passes by a peasant's heart without noticing it. He sees external appearances, he hears what has just come out of his mouth, and he wonders whether property for the peasant may not be synonymous with "thievery."[3]

Cf. Notebook 23, §50.

§<139>. *Past and present.* Before assembling the remarks under this rubric, reread Francesco Guicciardini's *Ricordi politici e civili.* They contain a wealth of sarcastic but apt moral thoughts. For ex.: "Pray to God that you be always on the winning side, for you will get credit even for things in which you had no part. If, on the contrary, you are a loser, you will be blamed for an infinite number of things of which you are entirely innocent."

Recall Arturo Labriola's statement (*ait latro . . .*) about how morally repulsive it is to hear the masses reproached by their old leaders, who have changed sides, for having done what those same leaders had ordered them to do.

For Guicciardini's *Ricordi,* see the edition published by the Soc. Editrice "Rinascimento del Libro," 1929, with a preface by Pietro Pancrazi.[1]

§<140>. *Catholicism and secularism. Religion and science,* etc. Read the booklet by Edmondo Cione, *Il dramma religioso dello spirito moderno e la Rinascenza,* Naples, Mazzoni, 1929, 132 pp. It develops the following idea: "the church, strong in its authority but lacking science and philosophy, feels the void swirling in its head; Thought, strong in its potency, but yearning in vain for popularity and the authority of tradition."[1] Why "in vain"? Meanwhile, the contrast between the church and Thought is not accurate; or, at

least, hiding in the clumsiness of the language there is an entirely erroneous way of thinking and, especially, acting. Thought can be contrasted to Religion, of which the church is the militant organization. Our idealists, secularists, immanentists, etc. have transformed Thought into a pure abstraction, which the church has nicely ignored while securing favorable state laws for itself and control over education. In order for "Thought" to be powerful (and it will be able to establish a tradition only if it is powerful), it must create an organization that cannot be the state because the state, somehow or another, has renounced this ethical function, however loudly it might proclaim it; it must, therefore, come into existence within civil society. These people, who were anti-Masonic, will end up acknowledging the necessity of Freemasonry. The problem of "Reformation and Renaissance" mentioned elsewhere.[2] The position of Croce (Cione is a Crocean), who does not know how to (and cannot) make himself accessible to the people; in other words, a "new Renaissance," etc.

§<141>. *The international function of Italian intellectuals.* In the column "Libri da fare," in *I<talia> C<he> S<crive>* of October 1929, Dino Provenzal proposes that a book be written entitled: *A History of Italian Expatriates.* He writes: "Cesare Balbo suggested it many years ago, as Croce recalls in his recent *Storia della età barocca in Italia.* If someone were to collect substantial, solid, documented information about the work of our exiled or simply emigrant compatriots, he would reveal a hitherto ignored aspect of the attitude that Italians have always had about disseminating ideas and producing works in every part of the world. Recalling Balbo's idea, Croce states that this would not be Italian history. It depends on one's understanding: it would certainly be a history of Italian thought and work."[1]

Neither Croce nor Provenzal understand what such a study could be. Check and study this aspect of Croce, who, it seems to me, considers the phenomenon connected (or exclusively connected) with the Counter-Reformation and the situation in seventeenth-century Italy. In fact, however, it had to be precisely the Counter-Reformation that automatically emphasized the cosmopolitan character of Italian intellectuals and their separation from national life. Botero, Campanella, etc., were "European" politicians, etc.[2]

§<142>. *The limits of state activity*. See the discussion of this topic in the last few years: it is the most important discussion on political doctrine, and it serves to draw the boundaries between the liberals and the nonliberals. A useful point of reference may be found in the booklet by Carlo Alberto Biggini, *Il fondamento dei limiti all'attività dello Stato*, Città di Castello: Casa Ed. "Il Solco," 150 pp., L. 10. Biggini states that tyranny exists only when one seeks to rule without observing "the constitutive rules of the social structure"; this statement can be elaborated in ways that are quite different from what Biggini has in mind. For "constitutive rules" do not mean—nor, it seems, does Biggini understand them to mean—the articles of constitutions (I take my cue from a review by Alfredo Poggi in *I<talia> C<he> S<crive>* of October 1929).[1] (The state is sovereign, in that the state is organized society itself. It cannot have a juridical limit: it cannot have a limit in subjective public laws, nor can it be said to be self-limiting. Positive law cannot limit the state because it can be modified by the state at any time in the name of new social exigencies, etc.)[2] Poggi responds by stating that he agrees and that this is already implicit in the doctrine of juridical limitation: that is, as long as a juridical system is in place, the state is constrained by it; if the state wants to change the juridical system, it will have to replace it with another system. In other words, the state cannot act except juridically (but since everything the state does is for this reason itself juridical, one could go on like this interminably). Find out to what extent Biggini's ideas are Marxism disguised and made abstract.

A booklet that I think should be interesting with regard to the historical development of these two concepts of the state is Widar Cesarini Sforza's *"Jus" et "directum": Note sull'origine storica dell'idea di diritto*, in 8°, Bologna: Stab. Tipogr. Riuniti, 1930, 90 pp. The Romans fashioned the word *jus* to signify law as a power of will, and they understood the juridical order as a system of powers not contained in their reciprocal sphere by objective and rational norms; all the expressions of *aequitas, justitia, recta,* or *naturalis ratio* used by the Romans must be understood within the framework of this basic meaning. Christianity, bent on subordinating will to the norm and on transforming power into duty, elaborated the concept of *directum* more than the concept of *jus*. The concept of law as power is ascribed only to God, whose will becomes the norm of conduct inspired by the principle of equality.

Justitia is no longer distinguishable from *aequitas*, and both imply *rectitudo*, which is a subjective quality of wanting to abide by what is right and just. I derive these thoughts from a review (in the *Leonardo* of August 1930) by G. Solari, who sketches his objections to Cesarini Sforza.[3]

§<143>. *1914*. On the events of June 1914,[1] remember the extremely interesting essay by Papini in *Lacerba* (this essay should be remembered for other reasons as well),[2] and the writings of Rerum Scriptor.[3]

§<144>. *Renaissance*. How does one explain the fact that the Italian Renaissance has attracted the interest of extremely large numbers of scholars and popular writers abroad while there is not a single comprehensive book on the subject written by an Italian? I think that the Renaissance is the modern high point of the "international function of Italian intellectuals," and for this reason it has had no resonance in the national consciousness, which has been dominated and continues to be dominated by the Counter-Reformation. The Renaissance is alive [in people's consciousness], where it has created new currents of culture and ways of life, where it has been operative in a profound manner, but not where it has been totally smothered except for some rhetorical and verbal traces and where therefore it has become the object of "mere erudition," that is, of irrelevant curiosity.

§<145>. *Italian and French culture and the academies*. One can compare Italian and French cultures through a comparison of the Accademia della Crusca and the Académie Française.[1] They are both rooted in the study of language; the Crusca, however, has the viewpoint of a nitpicking grammarian, of someone who is always watching how he speaks. The French point of view is that of "language" as a conception of the world, as the basic foundation—popular-national—of the unity of French culture. Therefore the French Academy has a national role in the organization of high culture, whereas the Crusca . . . [what is the current status of the Crusca? It has certainly changed its character—it publishes critical texts,

etc.—but what is the current status of the dictionary among its activities?).

§<146>. *Kipling.* Kipling's work could be used to criticize a certain society that pretends to be something without having elaborated within itself the corresponding civil morals, a society whose mode of existence even contradicts the goals that it sets for itself in its rhetoric. Moreover, Kipling's moral vision is imperialist only insofar as it is closely connected to a very specific historical reality; from it, one can extract poignantly direct images for every social group that struggles for political power. The "ability to burn inside with your mouth shut"[1] has a value that is not limited to English imperialists, etc.

§<147>. *Italian intellectuals. Carducci.* Mrs. Foscarina Trabaudi Foscarini De Ferrari has compiled *Il pensiero del Carducci* (Bologna: Zanichelli), a two-volume analytic-systematic index of the names and subjects treated in all the writings contained in the twenty volumes of Carducci's complete works. It is indispensable for the study of Carducci's general views and his concept of life. (Cf. the article by Guido Mazzoni, "Il pensiero del Carducci attraverso gli indici delle sue opere," in *Il Marzocco* of 3 November 1929.)[1]

§<148>. *The negative popular-national character of Italian literature. Il Marzocco* of 11 November 1928 has an article by Adolfo Faggi, "Fede e dramma," which contains some points germane to this topic.[1] Faggi provides the elements for setting up a comparison between Tolstoy's conception of the world and Manzoni's; Faggi, though, arbitrarily asserts that "*I promessi sposi* corresponds perfectly to his (Tolstoy's) concept of religious art" expounded in his critical study on Shakespeare: "Art in general, and dramatic art in particular, was always religious; that is, its aim was always to explain to men their relations with God, according to the understanding of these relations that had been attained in every age by the most eminent men—men who were thus destined to guide others. . . . Then art underwent a deviation that enslaved it to amusement and entertainment, a deviation that occurred also in Christian art."[2] Faggi points out that in *War and Peace* the two characters with the greatest religious importance are Platon Karatayev and Pierre Bezukhov; the former is a man of the peo-

ple whose ingenuous and instinctive mind strongly influences Pierre Bezukhov's *conception of life.* It is quite characteristic of Tolstoy that the ingenuous and instinctive wisdom of the people, expressed even in a casual word, is illuminating and causes a crisis of conscience in the educated man. This, in fact, is characteristic of Tolstoy's religion, for he understands the gospel "democratically," in keeping with its initial and original spirit. Manzoni, by contrast, has undergone the Counter-Reformation and his Christianity is Jesuitism. Faggi notes that "in *I promessi sposi* it is the superior minds, like Fra Cristoforo and Cardinal Borromeo, who act on the inferior ones and always find the right word to enlighten and guide them." It should also be pointed out that in *I promessi sposi* every single character from the lower echelons is made fun of: Don Abbondio, Fra Galdino, the tailor, Gervasio, Agnese, Perpetua, Renzo, Lucia—they are represented as, at best, pitiful beings lacking an inner life. Only people of high social status have an inner life: Fra Cristoforo, Borromeo, the Unnamed. According to Don Abbondio, Perpetua had said more or less the same thing as Borromeo, but it is noteworthy that this is treated as a source of humor. In fact, one can find notable traces of Brescianism even in Manzoni (thus the fact that Renzo's view on the value of Lucia's vow of virginity coincides with Fra Cristoforo's view or the importance of Lucia's words in disturbing the Unnamed and causing his moral crisis is quite different in nature from the people's role in Tolstoy, where they are the source of moral and religious life).

Cf. Notebook 23, §51.

§<149>. *Popular literature. Verne and the literature of marvelous adventures.* Verne's adventures do not contain anything that is completely impossible: the "possibilities" available to Verne's heroes are greater than those that really exist at the time, but not too much greater, and, most importantly, they are not "out of line" with the successful scientific developments of the period. The play of imagination is not entirely "arbitrary." Wells and Poe are different precisely because the "arbitrary," to a very large extent, predominates in their work, even though the point of departure may be logical and grafted onto a concrete scientific reality.[1] This characteristic (not to mention his low artistic value) limits Verne's success and popularity: science has overtaken Verne, and his books are no longer psychological "stimulants." The same can be said of the detective stories of, for example, Conan Doyle: they "were exciting in their time" but decreasingly so today, for various reasons—because the world of detective work is better known, whereas Conan Doyle was to a large extent revealing it, and because the techniques have become more sophisticated. What

still generates interest is the individual achievement of the hero, the psychic apparatus of the investigator; therefore, Poe is more interesting, and Chesterton even more so, etc.

In *Il Marzocco* of 19 February 1928, Adolfo Faggi ("Impressioni di Giulio Verne") writes that the anti-English character of many of Verne's novels has its roots in the period of French-English rivalry that culminated in the Fashoda Incident.[2] The assertion is wrong and, I think, anachronistic as well: actually, anti-British sentiment is a fundamental part of the French popular psyche, and it may be more deep-seated than anti-German feeling because it has quite a different historical tradition. Anti-German sentiment is relatively recent, and, in fact, it does not go further back than the French Revolution; it is connected, primarily, to the defeat of 1870 and the painful impression that France was no longer politically and militarily the strongest nation in Western Europe because Germany, alone and without allies, had defeated France. Anti-English sentiment, however, goes back at least to the Hundred Years War, it is linked to the popular image of Joan of Arc, and it was reinforced in modern times by the French Revolution and maybe by the Fashoda episode. This is not something peculiar to Verne but is found in all French popular literature (cf. Sand, etc.), both recent and old.

Cf. Notebook 21, §10.

§<150>. *Popular literature. Emilio De Marchi.* Why is De Marchi not read much? Yet his books have many of the features of "popularity." He should be reread, and these features analyzed, especially in *Demetrio Pianelli* and in *Giacomo l'idealista*.[1]

Cf. Notebook 21, §11.

§<151>. *Negative popular-national character of Italian literature.* (Cf. earlier note under the same title, two pages back.)[1] In an article published in *Il Marzocco* of 9 September 1928, Adolfo Faggi ("Tolstoi e Shakespeare") examines Tolstoy's pamphlet on Shakespeare, which he mentioned in the article (which I have already looked at) on Tolstoy and Manzoni. (Leo N. Tolstoi, *Shakespeare, eine kritische Studie*, Hanover, 1906; the small book also contains an article by Ernest Crosby on Shakespeare's attitude toward the working class and a short letter by Bernard Shaw on Shakespeare's philosophy.)[2] Tolstoy demolishes Shakespeare from the point of view of his own Christian ideology; his critique is not artistic but moral and religious. Crosby's article—from which Tolstoy takes his cue—demonstrates that, contrary to what many eminent Englishmen believe, in Shakespeare's

entire work there is hardly a word of sympathy for the people and the working masses. Conforming to the tendencies of his time, Shakespeare openly sides with the upper classes of society; his drama is essentially aristocratic. Almost every time he introduces bourgeois or common people onto the stage, he presents them in a contemptuous or repugnant manner and makes them the object or topic of laughter. (Which is what Manzoni does to a lesser degree but always with the same tendency, as manifested in his adherence to an aristocratic Christianity.) Shaw's letter is aimed against Shakespeare the "thinker," not against Shakespeare the artist. In literature, according to Shaw, the highest rank must be accorded to those writers who have surpassed the morality of their time and foreseen the new needs of the future: Shakespeare was not "morally" superior to his time, etc.[3]

In my treatment I must avoid the appearance of being entangled in moralistic biases like Tolstoy's, or even like Shaw's. For me, this study is about cultural history and not artistic criticism, except indirectly (show that I am not the one demanding an "extrinsic" moral content; rather, it is the authors under consideration who introduce an extrinsic moral content, that is, they make propaganda and not art): to establish not why a book is "beautiful" but why it is "read," "popular," "sought after."

Cf. Notebook 23, §51.

§<152>. *"Spectator" = Mario Missiroli.* The proof that "Spectator"—the author of some articles in *Nuova Antologia* and *Il Resto del Carlino*—is Mario Missiroli comes not only from internal evidence (style, mode of posing the issues, references to Sorel and to Sorel's unpublished letters, etc.) but also from the fact that some anonymous reviews published by *Nuova Antologia* in 1929 have appeared—for ex., in *L'Italia Letteraria*—with Missiroli's signature.[1]

§<153>. *Popular literature. Notes on the detective novel.* The detective novel came into existence on the margins of "causes célèbres" literature (which in turn is related to novels like *The Count of Monte Cristo*, etc.: are these not also typical "causes célèbres" that encapsulate the popular ideology surrounding the administration of justice, especially if it is intertwined with political passion? Is not Rodin, in *Le juif errant*, also a type of "organizer" of criminal intrigues, and is not Prince Rodolphe the organizer of "friends of the people"?[1] The transition from these novels to adventure novels proceeds as a process of "fixing" the scheme of the plot, but, above all, it signals a cleansing of the petty bourgeois and democratic ideological

element: no longer the struggle between the people who are good, generous, etc., and the mysterious forces of tyranny—Jesuits, etc.—but the struggle between criminal and policeman on the basis of the written law).

The famous French series of "causes célèbres" had its equivalent in England and Germany (and in Italy? I think that at least part—the world-famous trials—of the French series was translated). A new "judicial" kind of literature is born: the great criminal is portrayed as standing above justice (the judicial apparatus); romanticism = Schiller's *Die Räuber*.[2] The tales of Hoffmann, Ann Radcliffe, Balzac, Vautrin.[3] Victor Hugo's Javert marks the beginning of the rehabilitation of the policeman; not that Javert is portrayed sympathetically, but he appears as a "man of character," "the law personified."[4] Rocambole and Ponson du Terrail. Gaboriau rehabilitates the policeman; Lecocq prepares the ground for Sherlock Holmes.[5] (It is not true that in this literature the Anglo-Saxons represent the "defense of the law" while the French represent the exaltation of the criminal; in the United States, perhaps, the representation of the great criminal prevails, etc.) In this literature, a "mechanical" aspect and an "artistic" aspect. Poe and Chesterton, the artistic aspect.[6]

Cf. Notebook 21, §12.

§<154>. *The negative national-popular aspect of Italian literature.* Alfredo Gargiulo writes on "Bruno Cicognani" in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 24 August 1930 (chapter xix of *1900–1930*):[1] "The man and the artist are one and the same in Cicognani, yet one immediately feels the need to declare, almost confidentially (!), the sympathy that the man inspires. The exceedingly human Cicognani! Sometimes he lapses, though ever so slightly, into humanitarianism of the romantic or Slavic kind: what does it matter? Everyone will be inclined to pardon him for it, in honor of his authentic (!) fundamental humanity." From what follows one cannot really understand what Gargiulo means: Is it some kind of "aberration" that the man and the artist are one? And what does "authentic fundamental humanity" mean? ("Authentic" replaces what was once called "truth," which is also discredited.) As I have said elsewhere,[2] one has to read Gargiulo's entire description; to me, authentic, fundamental "humanity" can mean only one thing: "historicity," that is, the "national-popular" character of the writer, also in the broad sense of the "sociality" of the writer, and even in the case of the "aristocratic" writer, as long as the social group to which the writer gives voice is historically alive and the social "connection" is of a "historical-moral" and not of a "practical-political" or moralistic sermonizing kind.

Cf. Notebook 23, §52.

§<155>. *The new architecture.* The special objective character of architecture. In reality, the "work of art" is the "project" (the ensemble of designs, plans, and calculations with which people other than the architect—the "artist-project designer"—can produce the building, etc.): an architect can be judged a great artist on the basis of his plans, even if he has never materially built anything. The project stands in relation to the building as the "manuscript" stands in relation to the printed book: the building is the social externalization of art, its "dissemination"—just like the printed book, it gives the public the chance to participate in its beauty (when it is beautiful).

Tilgher's objection to Croce apropos of "memory" as the cause of the externalization of art collapses: the architect does not need the building to "remember" but the plan.[1] Further, this only applies to Crocean "memory" as something that relatively approximates what it is that makes the painter paint, the writer write, etc., instead of being satisfied with constructing phantasms for his own use and consumption; one must also bear in mind that every architectural project is by its nature more "approximate" than the manuscript, the painting, etc. The writer, too, introduces innovations in every edition of his book (or makes changes when correcting proofs, etc.; see Manzoni). In architecture the question is more complicated because the building per se is never [entirely] completed but [must be adapted] in keeping with the "panorama" in which it is inserted, etc. (and one cannot make second editions of it as easily as one can with a book). But the most important point that needs to be noted now is the following: in a rapidly developing civilization, in which the urban "panorama" must be very "elastic," a great architectural art cannot be born because it is more difficult to conceive buildings for "eternity." In America it is estimated that a skyscraper should not last more than twenty-five years, because of the supposition that in twenty-five years the entire physiognomy of the city "might" change, etc. In my view, a great architectural art can be born only after a transitory phase of a "practical" nature, during which all efforts are directed at fully providing the people with their basic needs and the greatest number of conveniences—not simply in terms of the single building, or the individual dwelling place, or the single assembly hall for large masses, but in the broader sense of an architectural complex with streets, squares, gardens, parks, etc.

§<156>. *Lorianism. Trombetti and the monogenesis of language. Nuova Antologia* published an article by Pericle Ducati (which I noted earlier)[1] praising Trombetti's work on the interpretation of Etruscan, but in the issue of 1 March 1929 it published a note by V. Pisani, "Divagazioni etrusche," which is a total demolition.[2] Pisani brings to bear against Trombetti some basic criteria for the critical study of linguistics:

1. The purely etymological method lacks scientific solidity: language is not just the lexicon—a very crude and most widespread misconception. Single words picked abstractly, even if they are very similar to each other in a specific historical phase, may: (a) have come into existence independently of one another; the classic example, *mysterion*, has the same meaning in Greek and Hebrew, but in Greek the meaning is provided by *myst-* and *-erion* is the suffix for abstract nouns, whereas in Hebrew the reverse is the case: *-erion* (or *terion*) is the basic root and *mysti-* (or *mys-*) is the generic prefix;[3] similarly, *haben* in German does not have the same origin as the Latin *habere*; nor does the English *to call* have the same source as the Greek χαλεω or the Latin *calare* (to call); nor can the German *ähnlich* be connected to the Greek αναλογος, etc. Littmann published a list of these apparent similarities in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, LXXVI, pp. 270ff., to demonstrate the absurdity of unscientific etymology; (b) have been imported by one language from another in—relatively speaking—prehistoric epochs; for example: America was "discovered" by Christopher Columbus "only" from the point of view of European civilization as a whole; that is, Columbus brought America into the sphere of influence of European civilization, of European history, but this by no means excludes the possibility that people from Europe or other countries could have gone to America, even in relatively sizable groups, and left "words," that is, lexical forms of greater or lesser significance; the same could be true of Australia or any other part of the world. How is it possible, then, to declare—as Trombetti does—on the basis of a relatively small number (thirty to forty) of lexical forms that such forms are evidence of monogenesis?

2. The lexical forms and their meanings must be compared throughout the homogeneous historical phases of the respective languages, and therefore one must not only "produce" the phonological history but also the semantic history of each form and com-

pare the oldest meanings. Trombetti does not adhere to any of these rudimentary criteria: (a) in his comparisons he is satisfied with the most generic kindred, and not so kindred, meanings (which are sometimes stretched ridiculously: I remember a very strange case in which an Aryo-European verb of motion is compared with a word from an Asian dialect meaning, approximately, "navel"; according to Trombetti, the words were related by virtue of the fact that the navel "moves" continuously because of respiration!); (b) it is enough for him that words being compared contain a succession of consonant sounds that resemble one another, such as *k, th, d, dh, s,* etc., or else *p, ph, f, b, bh, v, w,* etc.; he gets rid of the other consonants by designating them as prefixes, suffixes, or infixes.

3. The kinship of two languages cannot be proven through the comparison, however well grounded, of a number (even a very large number) of words, unless one has proofs of a phonetic, morphological (and, to a lesser extent, syntactical) character. Example: English is a Germanic language even though its vocabulary is markedly Neo-Latin; Romanian is Neo-Latin in spite of many Slavic words;[4] Albanian is Illyrian although the vocabulary is Greek, Latin, Slavic, Turkish, Italian; Armenian, which contains a lot of Iranian: Arabized Persian but still Aryo-European, etc.

Why did Trombetti become so famous? (1) Naturally, he has certain merits; above all, he is a great polyglot. (2) Because the monogenesis thesis is supported by the Catholics, who regard Trombetti as "a great scientist in agreement with the Bible," and therefore they exalt him. (3) The conceit of nations. But Trombetti is more highly esteemed by laymen than by his professional colleagues. To be sure, monogenesis cannot be dismissed a priori, but it cannot be proven either, or at least Trombetti has failed to prove it. Recall Voltaire's epigrams against the notorious etymologist Ménage (Gilles, 1613–92)[5] on the etymology of *alfana* > *equa*, for example.

Obviously, Trombetti's uncritical method could not yield reliable results when applied to Etruscan. His interpretation can be added to a whole series of others that have been proffered: it could be true "by accident," but its truth cannot be demonstrated. (Check what the method that Trombetti calls "combinatorial" consists of. I have no materials; it seems to mean this: the juxtaposition of an unfamiliar Etruscan term with a familiar term from a reputedly kindred language must be checked with known terms from other kindred languages that resemble each other phoneti-

cally but do not have the same meanings, etc.—but perhaps this is not what it means.)

§<157>. *Separation between leaders and led.* It acquires different aspects according to circumstances and general conditions. Reciprocal distrust: the leader suspects that the "led" would deceive him by exaggerating the positive factors favoring action, and therefore in his calculations he must bear in mind this unknown factor, which complicates the equation. The "led" doubts the leader's vigor and spirit of resolve, and therefore he is inclined, even unconsciously, to exaggerate positive information while concealing or playing down the negative. There is reciprocal deception, the source of new waverings, distrust, personal issues, etc. When this happens, it means that: (1) there is a crisis of command; (2) the organization, the group in question, has not yet had the time to become tightly knit by creating mutual understanding, mutual *loyalty*; (3) but there is a third element: the inability of the "led" to carry out his task, which in turn means that the "leader" is not capable of choosing, controlling, leading his personnel.

Practical examples: an ambassador might deceive his government: (1) because he wants to deceive it for personal advantage: a case of disloyalty through a betrayal of the nation or the state—the ambassador is or becomes the agent of a government other than the one he represents; (2) because he opposes his government's policy and supports the governmental policies of another party within his own country; therefore, he wants to deceive the government because he would prefer to have his country governed by one party rather than another: a case of disloyalty that in the final analysis may end up being just as serious as the former case, even though it could be accompanied by attenuating circumstances, as would be the case when a government fails to establish a national policy and the ambassador has peremptory proof, in which case, this would be an instance of disloyalty to [transitory] individuals in order to be loyal toward the immanent state—a terrible problem because the justification has been used by morally unworthy individuals (Fouché, Talleyrand, and, less so, Napoleon's marshals); (3) because he does not know how to deceive it, since he is incapable, incompetent, or dissolute (neglects duty), etc. In this case, the government's responsibility must be evaluated according to whether: (a) it has the possibility of making a suitable choice, and therefore its

poor choice is attributable to extrinsic reasons (nepotism, corruption, curbs on expenditures for important services, which is why capable individuals are passed over and the "rich" or "nobles" are chosen for diplomatic service, etc.); (b) it does not have the possibility of choice (a new state, like Italy in 1861–70) and does not create the general conditions to remedy the deficiency and garner for itself the possibility of choice.

§<158>. *The historical conjuncture of 1848–49.* Check and analyze in detail the succession of governments and of party combinations in the Piedmontese government from the time of the preparation for war to the proclamation of Moncalieri; from Cesare Balbo to Massimo D'Azeglio. The roles of Gioberti and Rattazzi. What exactly did the Cavour-Rattazzi "marriage" consist of? Was it the first step in the fragmentation of democratic forces? But to what extent can Rattazzi be called a democrat?[1]

Cf. Notebook 19, §49.

§<159>. *Risorgimento.* History as national "biography." This form of history begins with the birth of national sentiment. It is assumed that what is desired always existed but could not manifest itself because of the intervention of extraneous forces or because the most deep-seated virtues lay dormant.[1] It is oleographic history: Italy is really conceived as something abstract, like the beautiful woman in paintings, etc., whose "sons," etc., the Italians are. One constructs its biography by contrasting it to the degenerate, deviant, etc., sons. It is understandable that practical, propagandistic reasons give rise to this history. By why continue in this tradition? Today it is doubly antihistorical: it contradicts reality, and it impedes a fair appraisal of the Risorgimento effort by diminishing the stature and originality of its protagonists.

Cf. Notebook 19, §50.

§<160>. *The economic structure of Italy.* In his article "La economia, la finanza, il denaro d'Italia" in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 March 1929, Giuseppe Paratore writes that Italy has "a dual economic structure (capitalist industry in the north, an agrarian-savings economy in the south)," and he points out how this situation made it difficult to stabilize the lira in 1926–27.[1] It was not advisable, etc., at the time to follow the simplest and most direct method,

which calls for swiftly consolidating the devaluation of the currency by immediately establishing a new parity—following the prescriptions of Kemmerer, Keynes, Cassel, etc.

It would be interesting to find out which of the two elements ended up better protected—whether it was the economy of the North or that of the South—and this is interesting because actually the stabilization was carried out after much hesitation and in the panic of a very sudden collapse (the rise in the exchange rate of the dollar in 1928: January: 477.93; February: 479.93; March: 480.03; April: 479.63; May: 500.28; June: 527.72; July: 575.41). One must also bear in mind that the South was more homogeneous than the North in its claims, and it had the solidarity of everyone with savings in the country; in the North the capitalists were divided, the exporters favoring inflation because of the internal market etc., etc. Furthermore, stabilization at a low rate would have provoked a social-political and not just an economic crisis because it would have altered the social position of millions of citizens.

§<161>. *Leo XIII.* On his limited and narrow-minded personality, cf. Piero Misciatelli, "Un libro di ricordi e di preghiere del papa Leone XIII," *Nuova Antologia*, 1 March 1929.[1]

§<162>. *The historical conjuncture of 1848–49.* An article in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 March 1929: Carlo Pagani, "Dopo Custoza e Volta nel 1848."[1] It reproduces some unpublished documents from the Casati Archive of Milan—not essential but significant for an examination of the political crisis of that time, a political crisis that was one of the principal reasons for the military disaster: absence of political unity and of a well established political course, wavering, irresponsible actions by reactionary cabals, lack of attention to the needs of the army as a mass of humans, etc.

It seems that England was opposed to the [military] intervention of France on Piedmont's side—Palmerston declared that French intervention would unleash a European war because England would not tolerate it—while it only gave Piedmont weak support through diplomacy in order to prevent a ruinous defeat and territorial changes excessively favorable to Austria.

The article should be reread when reconstructing the events of 1848–49, in order to look for elements that are in agreement with or substantiate other documents. For a bibliography on this topic: on the vicissitudes of the Casati-Gioberti government (July–August 1848),[2] cf.

Gioberti's letter to Giuseppe Massari,[3] published by Senator Matteo Mazziotti (with a prefatory note) in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 June 1918; on Carlo d'Adda's mission in France and England undertaken on behalf of the provisional government of Milan, cf. Pagani, *Resoconto del Congresso Storico di Trento*, 1926 (Pagani's lecture, "Il governo provvisorio di Milano nel 1848 e il Trentino," delivered at the conference); Carlo Pagani, *Uomini e cose in Milano dal marzo all'agosto del 1848*, Milan: Editore Cogliati (with documents from the Historical Museum of the Italian Risorgimento in Milan and especially from the archives of Casati, d'Adda, Arese, Giulini-Crivelli, Restelli).[4]

Cf. Notebook 19, §51.

§<163>. *Alessandro Luzio's "history" of the Risorgimento.* It is noteworthy that A. Luzio's approach to writing the history of the Risorgimento has been praised by the Jesuits of *Civiltà Cattolica*. Agreement between Luzio and the Jesuits is not always possible, I imagine, but it is more frequent than one would think. Cf. pp. 216–17 of the article, "Processo politico e condanna dell'abbate Gioberti nell'anno 1833," in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 4 August 1928.[1] Luzio is compelled to defend Carlo Alberto's policies (in the book *Mazzini carbonaro*, p. 498),[2] and like the Jesuits he does not hesitate to pronounce a very harsh judgment on Gioberti's attitude during the trial for the events of 1831[3] (it should be noted that from the articles on Gioberti's trial published by *Civiltà Cattolica* in 1928 one gathers that documents in the Vatican archives reveal that the pope had already given—in Jesuitical form—his prior "*placet*" to Gioberti's death sentence and execution, whereas in 1821 a Piedmontese churchman had his death sentence commuted to a life sentence through Vatican intervention).[4]

Cf. Notebook 19, §53.

§<164>. *Notes on the religious movement. The editorial staff of* La Civiltà Cattolica. All the articles in *La Civiltà Cattolica* are written by priests of the Society of Jesus, and normally they are unsigned. Sometimes one can find out who the authors are their names appear (though not always) in the abstracts. Thus, for ex., labor issues are regularly covered by Father Angelo Brucculeri, who must also be the Italian representative at the International Center in Malines, where the *Codice sociale* was compiled.[1]

One would need to get hold of the catalog of publications sold by *Civiltà Cattolica* in order to find out which extracts dealing with which issues they put up for sale: it is an indicator of the degree of

importance attached to the issues themselves. Recall that in 1929 (or early in 1930) *L'Amico delle Famiglie* announced that Father Rosa had left the editorship of *La Civiltà Cattolica* and had been sent by the pope on a mission to Spain after receiving a gold medal in recognition of services rendered to the Vatican. *L'Amico delle Famiglie* is a Catholic weekly published in Genoa, and it must have reproduced the news from the Catholic and non-Catholic daily press.[2] Why? In fact, Father Rosa did go to Spain and did receive his medal, but he continued as editor-in-chief of *La Civiltà Cattolica*. Evidently, there were those who wished to see Father Rosa go because of the positions he had taken—sometimes quite harsh—vis-à-vis the implementation of the concordat, but the pope did not see fit to fulfill that pious wish because Father Rosa's line was the Vatican's line, and the pope deemed it important to let him know as much.

Every so often *La Civiltà Cattolica* publishes analytic indexes for its year's issues; the most recent covers the years 1911 to 1925, compiled by Chev. Giuseppe Del Chiaro, the editorial secretary.[3] These indexes have to be checked on all the important issues because Jesuit publications and commentaries have a certain importance and may provide ideas for research—especially on questions concerning the history of the Risorgimento. Recall the question concerning Federico Confalonieri's depositions.[4] Similarly, with the problem of banditry between 1860 and 1870, recall the question concerning the La Gala brothers, who boarded a French boat at Civitavecchia and were arrested by the Piedmontese in Genoa, resulting in a diplomatic protest by the pope and by France, the return of the La Galas, and their extradition, etc.[5] Also important are the historical articles in *La Civiltà Cattolica* on Catholic-liberal movements, as well as the Jesuits' hatred for Gioberti, who even today is subjected to nonsensical vituperation whenever the occasion arises.[6]

Pan-Christian movements. Nathan Söderblom, the Lutheran archbishop of Uppsala in Sweden, promotes an *evangelical Catholicism* consisting in a direct attachment to Christ (Prof. Friedrich Heiler, formerly a Roman Catholic, author of the book *Der Katholizismus, seine Idee und seine Erscheinung*, Munich, 1923, belongs to the same trend, which means that the pan-Christians have had some success).[7]

Catholicism in India. Upadhyaya Brahmabandhav, the famous Catholic *Sannyasi* (?) who wanted to convert India to Catholicism

through the Hindus themselves, by Christianizing those elements of Hinduism capable of being absorbed; the Vatican disapproved because of his nationalistic *excesses*. (When was Upadhyaya doing his preaching? I think the Vatican would be more tolerant today.) On the question of Christianity in India, look into the phenomenon of Sadhu Sundar Singh: cf. *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 7 and 21 July 1928.[8]

§<165>. *Italo Toscani*. Italo Toscani's *Vita di S. Luigi Gonzaga*, Rome: Libreria Fr. Ferrari, in 16°, 254 pp., L. 5.50, was published in 1928 and praised in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 21 July 1928.[1] Toscani was already writing in the *Corriere d'Italia* in 1926. Recall his war experiences. His behavior at the front (the military command published picture postcards with his occasional verse). His articles in 1919, especially the ones against the carabinieri: a repulsive man from every point of view.[2] Sentenced to six or seven years by the Rome Tribunal in 1917, for antimilitary activity, he was pardoned because of the poems he wrote at the front; he inflicted a wound on himself: he "nursed" his eyes so blatantly that it was astonishing how the regiment let him get away with it. "Oddities" of military life during the war. How is it that Toscani, who was fairly well known, received so many permits to spend his nights away from the barracks? (He had a furnished room at the Canelli; tragicomic episode of the false Calabresi.)[3]

§<166>. *Past and present*. In order to compile this series of notes accurately, to get ideas, and to aid one's memory, it is necessary to examine closely certain collections of periodicals: for example, Formiggini's *L'Italia Che Scrive*, which has certain regular sections that provide a general picture of concrete developments in intellectual life—the creation of new periodicals, competitions, cultural associations, etc. (review of reviews); *La Civiltà Cattolica*, to understand certain positions it takes and to find out about the initiatives and declarations of religious entities (for ex., in 1920 the Lombard episcopate pronounced its views on the economic crisis, asserting that capitalists rather than workers should be the first ones to suffer its consequences).[1] *La Civiltà Cattolica* publishes the occasional very interesting and symptomatic article on Marxism.

NOTEBOOK 4
1930–1932

NOTES ON PHILOSOPHY. MATERIALISM AND IDEALISM. FIRST SERIES

§<1>. If one wants to study a conception of the world that has never been systematically expounded by its author-thinker, detailed work is required, and it has to be conducted with the most scrupulous accuracy and scientific honesty. It is necessary, first of all, to trace the process of the thinker's intellectual development in order to reconstruct it in accordance with those elements that become stable and permanent—that is, those elements really adopted by the author as his own thought, distinct and superior to the "material" that he had studied earlier and that, at a certain time, he may have found attractive, even to the point of having accepted it provisionally and used it in his critical work or in his work of historical or scientific reconstruction. This precaution is essential, particularly when dealing with a nonsystematic thinker, with a personality in whom theoretical and practical activity are indissolubly intertwined, and with an intellect that is therefore in continuous creation and perpetual movement. Hence: (1) *biography* in great detail, and (2) *exposition* of all the works, even the most negligible, in chronological order, sorted according to the different phases: intellectual formation, maturity, the grasp of a new way of thinking, and its confident application. The search for the leitmotiv, the rhythm of the thought, more important than single, isolated quotations.

This initial research should be the foundation of one's work. Moreover, among the works of the same author, one must distinguish those that he himself completed and published from those that were not published because unfinished. The content of the latter must be treated with great discretion and caution: it must be regarded as not definitive, at least in that given form; it must be regarded as material still in the process of elaboration, still provisional.

In the case of Marx, the writings can be divided into the following categories: (1) works published under the direct responsibility of the author: among these one should take into account, generally, not only those works handed over physically to the printers but also those writings that, even though not printed, were meant to have an immediate function, such as letters, circulars, manifestos, etc. (typical example: the *Notes on the Gotha Program* and the correspondence);[1] (2) the works that were printed not under the direct responsibility of the author but by others after his death: for these it would be good to have a diplomatic text—that is, a text that has not already been rearranged by the editor—or, at least, a minute description of the original text that adheres to the criteria of diplomatics.

Both categories should be subdivided into chronological-critical periods, so that valid comparisons—not merely mechanical and arbitrary ones—can be established.

One should also study and analyze the work of elaboration that the author performed on the material of the works he subsequently published; at the very least, such a study would provide clues for the critical evaluation of the reliability of the versions of the unpublished works edited by others. The further removed the preparatory material for the published works is from the definitive text composed by the author himself, the less reliable is the version of that kind of material edited by a different person. Indeed, a work cannot be identified with the raw material gathered for its composition; the choice, the disposition of parts, the greater or lesser weight given to the elements collected during the preparatory phase—these are precisely what constitute the actual work.

The study of correspondence should also be conducted with certain precautions: something flatly stated in a letter would perhaps not be repeated in a book. The stylistic liveliness of the letters, although often artistically more effective than the measured and circumspect style of a book, can sometimes result in flaws of exposition: in letters, as in speeches and conversation, *logical errors* occur more frequently; the rapidity of thought comes at the expense of its solidity.

In the study of an original and distinctive body of thought, supporting evidence contributed by other persons should only be taken up secondarily. In the case of Marx: Engels. Naturally, Engels's contribution should not be underestimated, but neither should Engels be identified with Marx; nor must one think that everything Engels attributed to Marx is authentic in an absolute sense. There is no doubt that Engels has evinced a disinterestedness and a lack of personal vanity unique in the history of literature; there should not be the slightest doubt about his absolute personal loyalty. But the fact is that Engels is not Marx, and if one wants to know Marx, one

must look for him *above all* in his authentic works, published under his own personal direction.

Certain precautions concerning method and some directions for related research ensue from these considerations. What is the value of Mondolfo's book, *Il materialismo storico di Federico Engels*?[2] Sorel (in one of his letters to B. Croce) questions the *possibility* of studying this topic, given Engels's limitations as an original thinker.[3] Setting aside the question of merit raised by Sorel, I think that for the very reason that Engels is supposed to have been lacking in theoretical skills (or at least occupies a subaltern position in relation to Marx), it is indispensable to inquire into the differences between what I would call the authentic Marx and Engels in order to be able to see what is not Marxian in Engels's presentations of his friend's thought; actually, in the cultural world, this distinction is never made and Engels's relatively systematic expositions (especially the *Anti-Dühring*)[4] are taken to be an authentic source, and often the only authentic source. Therefore, I think that Mondolfo's book is very useful as an indication of one way to proceed, apart from its intrinsic value, which presently I do not recall.

Cf. Notebook 16, §2.

§<2>. *De Man's book*. An announcement by B. Croce in *La Critica* in 1928;[1] a review by G. De Ruggiero in *La Critica* in 1929;[2] reviews in *La Civiltà Cattolica* and *Leonardo* in 1929;[3] citation by G. Zibordi in his book on Prampolini;[4] advertisement by the Laterza publishing house;[5] articles in *I Problemi del Lavoro* reproducing the theses omitted in Schiavi's translation;[6] Schiavi's preface.[7] *L'Italia Letteraria* of 11 August 1929 published a review of it by Umberto Barbaro.[8] Barbaro writes: "a critique of Marxism that, even though it makes use of earlier 'revisions' of an economic nature, is generally based on a tactical (!) question concerning the psychology of the working masses."[9]

> Of the many attempts to go "au de là" of Marxism (the translator, the well-known lawyer Alessandro Schiavi, alters the title slightly to "surpassing" in the Crocean sense, and justifiably so, since De Man himself considers his own position as an antithesis that is necessary for a superior synthesis), this is certainly not among the most powerful and is less systematic than most. One of the reasons is that this critique is based primarily on that mysterious and ephemeral, albeit fascinating, pseudoscience that is psychology. With regard to the "movement," this book is rather defeatist, and at times it actually supplies arguments in favor of the tendencies it wants to combat: favoring fascism there is a series of

observations on the emotional states and "complexes" (in the Freudian sense) of workers that gives rise to ideas about "joy in work" and "craftsmanship"; favoring both communism and fascism there is the weakness of the arguments in defense of democracy and reformism.

Cf. Notebook 11, §66.

§<3>. *Two aspects of Marxism.* Marxism has been a moment of modern culture; to a certain extent it has determined and enriched certain cultural currents. Study of this very important and significant phenomenon has been neglected or actually ignored by the "official" Marxists for the following reason: its vehicle has been idealist philosophy, which to those Marxists who are essentially bound to a particular cultural current of the last quarter of the last century (positivism, scientism) seems an absurdity. For this reason, I believe, Antonio Labriola's position should be reevaluated.[1] Why? Marxism has undergone a double revision; that is, it has given rise to a double combination. On the one hand, some of its elements have been explicitly or implicitly absorbed by certain idealist currents (Croce, Sorel, Bergson, etc., the pragmatists, etc.); on the other hand, the "official" Marxists, anxious to find a philosophy that comprised Marxism, have found it in the modern derivations of vulgar philosophical materialism or even in idealist currents like Kantianism (Max Adler).[2] Labriola is differentiated from both of these currents by his affirmation that Marxism is itself an independent and original philosophy. This is the direction in which one must work, resuming and developing Labriola's position. The work is very complex and delicate. Why has Marxism, in some of its elements, ended up seeming assimilable to both the idealists and the vulgar materialists? One must study the documentary evidence of this affirmation, which means tracing the history of modern culture after Marx and Engels.

For the idealists, see which elements of Marxism have been absorbed "explicitly," that is, avowedly. For example, historical materialism as an empirical canon of historical research by Croce, who has introduced this concept of his into modern culture even among the Catholics (cf. Olgiati) in Italy and abroad;[3] the value of ideologies, etc. But the most difficult and delicate part is the investigation of the "implicit," unacknowledged absorptions that have occurred precisely because Marxism has been a moment of culture, a widespread climate that has modified the old ways of thinking through actions and reactions that are not apparent or not immediate. Studying Sorel can provide many clues in this regard. However, it is necessary to study, above all, Bergson's philosophy and pragmatism to find out to what extent certain positions of theirs would have been

inconceivable without the historical link of Marxism; similarly for Croce and Gentile, etc.

Another aspect of this issue is the practical lesson that Marxism has imparted to those very same parties that opposed it on principle, just as the Jesuits opposed Machiavelli while applying his principles. (In one of the "Opinioni" published by *La Stampa* in 1925 or 1926, Missiroli writes, more or less: "It would be worth finding out whether in their heart of hearts the most intelligent industrialists are not convinced that Marx understood their affairs very well"—or something along those lines.)[4] This is natural, for if Marx has analyzed reality accurately, he has done nothing other than rationally systematize what the historical agents of that reality feel in a confused and instinctive way.

The other side of the question is even more interesting. Why is it that even the official Marxists have "combined" Marxism with a non-Marxist philosophy? Cf. R. Luxemburg's booklet on Marx.[5] I think that in the sphere of philosophy the historical reason is to be found in the fact that Marxism has had to ally itself with extraneous tendencies in order to combat the residues of the precapitalist world among the popular masses, and especially in the domain of religion. Sorel's observation on Clemenceau and Marxism in the letter to Missiroli.[6] Marxism had two tasks: to combat modern ideologies in their most refined form; and to enlighten the minds of the popular masses, whose culture was medieval. This second task, which was fundamental, has absorbed all its energies, not only "quantitatively" but also "qualitatively." For "didactic" reasons, Marxism became mixed with a form of culture that was somewhat superior to the popular mentality but inadequate to combat the other ideologies of the educated classes; yet, at its inception, Marxism actually superseded the highest cultural manifestation of the time, classical German philosophy. What has come emerged is a "Marxism" in "combination," which is good for the kind of literature mentioned by Sorel but inadequate for creating a broad cultural movement that embraces the whole of man, whatever his age or his social conditions, and that brings about the moral unification of society. This phenomenon can be observed in all modern cultures, in the sense that modern philosophy fails to elaborate an educational program in keeping with its view of the world and fails to elaborate a popular culture; instead, it remains the culture of an intellectual aristocracy. This issue is connected to the question of the so-called reform in non-Protestant countries. In his book *Storia dell'età barocca in Italia,* Croce writes, on p. 11: "The Renaissance movement remained aristocratic, the movement of elite circles, and even in Italy—its mother and nurse—it never spilled out of the courtly circles, it did not filter all the way to the people, it did not become custom or 'prejudice' or, rather, collective persuasion and faith. The Reformation, however, *did indeed have this capacity of popular pen-*

etration, but it paid for it with a delay in its intrinsic development, with the slow and oftentimes discontinuous maturation of its vital germ."[7] On p. 8:

> And Luther, like those humanists, deprecates melancholy and celebrates joyfulness, he condemns sloth and prescribes work; but, on the other hand, he is driven to suspicion and hostility toward letters and scholarship, so that Erasmus could say, "*ubicumque regnat lutheranismus, ibi literarum est interitus.*" And, certainly, German Protestantism—although not just as a result of the aversion developed by its founder—was virtually sterile in scholarship, criticism, and philosophy for a couple of centuries. The Italian reformers, however, particularly those who belonged to the circle of Juan de Valdés and their friends,[8] had no difficulty reconciling humanism with mysticism, veneration for scholarship with moral austerity. Calvinism, with its harsh conception of Grace and its austere discipline, did not encourage free inquiry and the cult of beauty either; instead, through its interpretation, development, and adaptation of the concepts of Grace and vocation, it ended up promoting energetically economic life, production, and the accumulation of wealth.

The Lutheran Reformation and Calvinism created a popular culture, and only in later periods did they create a higher culture; the Italian reformers were sterile in terms of great historical achievements. Modern philosophy is a continuation of the Renaissance and of the advanced phase of the Reformation, but its methods are those of the Renaissance; they are bereft of the popular incubation of the Reformation, which created the solid foundations of the modern state in the Protestant nations. Because of its popular development, the Reformation was able to resist the armed assault of the Catholic coalition, and thus the German nation was founded. A comparison can be drawn between this movement and the French "political" Enlightenment that preceded and accompanied the Revolution of 1789: the latter, too, was an intellectual and moral reform of the French people, and it, too, was unaccompanied by a higher culture. (Recall here as well Marx's distillation—in *The Holy Family*—of the French political terms, "*fraternité*, etc.," into the language of German philosophy.)[9] Renaissance-Reformation—German philosophy—French Revolution—secularism [liberalism]—historicism—modern philosophy—historical materialism. Historical materialism, in its dialectic of popular culture–high culture, is the crowning point of this entire movement of intellectual and moral reform. It corresponds to Reformation + French Revolution, universality + politics; it is still going through its popular phase, it has also become "prejudice" and "superstition." Historical mate-

rialism, in its present state, is the popular aspect of modern historicism. In the history of culture, which is much broader than the history of philosophy, every time popular culture has come to the surface—because a phase of social upheaval was under way, and the metal of a new class was emerging out of the gangue of the people—"materialism" has flourished; conversely, the traditional classes have clung to spiritualism. Hegel, straddling the French Revolution and the Restoration, joined the two moments of philosophical life, materialism and spiritualism, dialectically. Hegel's successors destroyed this unity, returning to the old materialism with Feuerbach and to the spiritualism of the Hegelian right.[a] In his youth, Marx relived this whole experience: Hegelian, Feuerbachian materialist, Marxist; in other words, he reforged the destroyed unity into a new philosophical construction: this new construction of his, this new philosophy is already clearly evident in the theses on Feuerbach. Many historical materialists have done to Marx what had already been done to Hegel; in other words, they have gone from dialectical unity back to crude materialism, while, as has already been said, modern vulgar idealist high culture has tried to incorporate those elements of Marxism that it needed—also because this modern philosophy has itself sought, in its own way, to join materialism and spiritualism dialectically, just as Hegel had tried to do and as Marx really did. "Politically," materialism is close to the people, to popular beliefs, prejudices, and even superstitions (cf. the witchcraft of the spiritists, Maeterlinck, etc.).[10] This can be seen in Catholicism and among the Eastern Orthodox. Popular religion is crassly materialistic, and the official religion tries not to distance itself too much, lest it cut itself off from the masses and become the ideology of restricted groups. Modern neo-Scholastics are, in fact, attempting to incorporate positivism into Catholicism (the school of Louvain, etc.).

Many heretical movements are attempts to achieve purely spiritualist reforms of religion, but the nature-spirit dualism serves the church very well to retain its ties with the people and at the same time to allow a certain aristocratic selection (Platonism and Aristotelianism in the Catholic religion).

In the history of cultural developments, one must pay great attention to the organization of culture and the people who shape it. Cf. Erasmus's attitude toward the Reformation (see De Ruggiero's article in *La Nuova Italia* and his book on the Reformation)[11] and the attitude of other intellectuals: they submit in the face of persecution and the stake. The historical bearers of the Reformation are the German people, not the intellectuals. But this "cowardice" of the intellectuals explains the "sterility" of the Reformation in high culture, until a new group of intellectuals surfaced slowly from

[a]In the manuscript "Feuerbach" is crossed out.

within the reformed popular masses—and then came the German philosophy of 1700–1800. Something similar occurs in the case of Marxism as well: it does not create a high culture, because the great intellectuals formed on its terrain do not emerge from within the popular classes but from the traditional classes, to which they return during the "turning points" of history, or, if they remain with the popular classes, it is to prevent their autonomous development. The affirmation that Marxism is a new, independent philosophy is the affirmation of the independence and originality of a new culture in incubation that will develop with the development of social relations. What exists is a "combination" of old and new, a temporary equilibrium corresponding to the equilibrium of social relations. Only when a state is created does the creation of a high culture become necessary. In any case, the attitude should always be critical and never dogmatic; in a certain sense, it should be a romantic attitude, but of the kind of romanticism that consciously seeks for its own serene classical quality.

Cf. Notebook 16, §9.

§<4>. *Machiavellianism and Marxism.* Two interpretations of Machiavelli: by tyrannical men of state who want to preserve and extend their dominion; and by those with liberal tendencies who want to modify the forms of government. The latter tendency finds its expression in Foscolo's lines: "even as he tempers the scepter of the rulers, strips them of their laurels and lets the people see," etc.[1] Croce writes that this proves the *objective validity* of Machiavelli's views, and this is absolutely true.[2]

§<5>. *Historical materialism and practical criteria or canons of historical and political interpretation.* [(Cf. p. 50 bis.)][1] Comparison with what Bernheim did for the historical method. Bernheim's book is not a treatise on the philosophy of historicism or modern philosophy, but it is implicitly linked to it.[2] "Marxist sociology" (cf. the *Popular Manual*)[3] should stand in relation to Marxism as Bernheim's book stands in relation to historicism: a systematic collection of practical criteria of research and interpretation, one of the aspects of the general "philological method." From certain perspectives, there should be a critique of certain tendencies (perhaps the most widespread ones) of historical materialism—the same critique that historicism has made of the old historical method and of the old philology, which had led to ingenuous new forms of dogmatism and replaced interpretation with the more or less accurate external description of phenomena and, above all, with the incessant repetition of "we adhere to the historical method!"

[*Literature.*] The artistic relation, even in historical materialism, reveals with greater poignancy the ingenuousness of parrots. Two writers represent the same social moment, but one is an artist and the other is not. If the treatment of the question amounts to a description of what the writers represent—that is, to a more or less reliable summary of the characteristics of a special social milieu—it means that the artistic question has not been broached. This can even be useful, indeed it certainly is, but in a different field: it belongs to the criticism of customs, the struggle to destroy certain currents of feelings or beliefs or points of view in order to create and promote different ones; but this is not criticism of art, nor can it be presented as such. It is a struggle for a new culture. In a certain sense, then, it is also criticism of art, because a new art will be born out of the new culture, and perhaps, in Italian history, this is the meaning one should attach to the De Sanctis–Croce[4] relationship and the controversies over form and content. De Sanctis's criticism is militant not frigidly aesthetic: it belongs to a period of cultural struggle. The analyses of content, the criticism of the "structure" of works[5]—that is, the logical and living-historical coherence of the mass of represented sentiments—these are connected to the cultural struggle. This, in my view, is what constitutes the profound humanity and humanism of De Sanctis, making him attractive even today. It is pleasing to feel in him the impassioned fervor of a committed person who has firm moral and political convictions and does not hide them or even try to. Croce manages to take De Sanctis's multiple activities and separate their various aspects, which in De Sanctis were unified and fused. In Croce, one senses the same culture as De Sanctis's, but at a time when that culture is ascendant and triumphant: it is a struggle for a refinement of culture, not for its right to exist; romantic passion and fervor have settled into a superior serenity and an indulgence full of bonhomie. But even in Croce this position is not permanent: a new phase takes over in which the serenity and indulgence start cracking while acrimony and repressed anger surface; it is a defensive, not an aggressive and impassioned phase, and therefore it cannot be compared with De Sanctis's.

In short, the type of literary criticism suitable to historical materialism is offered by De Sanctis, not by Croce or by anyone else (least of all by Carducci):[6] a struggle for culture, that is, for a new humanism, a criticism of customs and sentiments, impassioned fervor, even in the form of sarcasm.

The De Sanctis phase has had a more recent counterpart in the phase of *La Voce,*[7] albeit on an inferior level. De Sanctis struggled for the creation, ex novo, of a national high culture in Italy, in opposition to various kinds of old rubbish, rhetoric, and Jesuitism. *La Voce* was engaged, rather, in the struggle to disseminate the same culture at an intermediate level, opposing provincialism, etc., etc. Nevertheless, it had a function: its work was substantive, and it gave rise to a number of artists (to the

extent, of course, that one can give rise to artists: it helped some to rediscover themselves and develop, it generated a need for inwardness and its expression, etc.). This problem finds it confirmation, absurdly, in an article by Alfredo Gargiulo, "Dalla cultura alla letteratura," in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 6 April 1930 (part six of a study entitled "1900–1930" that should be kept in mind for "Father Bresciani's progeny").[8] In this series of articles, Gargiulo displays his total intellectual bankruptcy (another young man lacking "maturity"); he has become an integral part of the gang at *L'Italia Letteraria*. In the above-mentioned article, he takes the following idea articulated by G. B. Angioletti—in his preface to the anthology *Scrittori nuovi* compiled by Falqui and Vittorini—and makes it his own:

> The writers in this anthology, then, are new not because they have discovered new forms or because they have celebrated new *subjects*—this is not the case at all; they are new because they conceive art differently from the writers who preceded them. Or, to come directly to the point, they are new because they believe in art, whereas their predecessors believed in many other things that had nothing to do with art. This novelty therefore can accommodate traditional form and old content, but it cannot allow deviations from the essential idea of art. This is not the place to repeat what this idea might be. Allow me to recall, however, that by carrying out a revolution (!) that will not be less memorable (!) for having been silent (!), these new writers intend to be artists first and foremost, whereas their predecessors were content to be moralists, preachers, aesthetes, psychologists, hedonists, etc.[9]

This is not a very clear and well-organized argument, but if it amounts to anything, it is nothing other than a programmatic preciosity. This conception of the artist is a new "watch your language when speaking," a new mode of constructing "conceits." And certain poets extolled by, for example, the "gang" of G. Ungaretti[10] (who also writes in a quite unsuitable and Frenchified language) are mere constructors of little conceits, not of images. It is obvious that the *Voce* movement could not create artists; but the struggle for a new culture can also produce new artists. The *Voce* movement was concerned with life, and in life there is also art. The "silent revolution" mentioned by Angioletti was simply a series of café confabulations and mediocre articles of the kind found in mass-produced newspapers and little provincial periodicals. It has produced a sense of self-satisfaction and haughtiness, but it has not changed ideas; we will see new "high priests of art" under the regime of the concordat and of monopoly. (This section should be integrated with those on "Father Bresciani's prog-

eny," which could become an incursion into the territory of literature and could also be made to include the "theoretical" themes concerning historical materialism in the field of art.)

Cf. Notebook 16, §3, and Notebook 23, §3.

§<6>. *Roberto Ardigò*. His *Scritti vari*, collected and arranged by Giovanni Marchesini, Florence: Le Monnier, 1922.[1] It brings together some of the miscellaneous writings that Ardigò himself had put in order and prepared for publication. They are interesting for Ardigò's biography and for determining his political leanings. Taken by themselves, they are worthless, badly written trash. The book is divided into various sections. Among the polemics (section 1), the one against Freemasonry written in 1903 is noteworthy. Among the correspondence (section 4): Ardigò's letter (of 29 November 1883) to the *Gazzetta di Mantova* concerning the pilgrimage to the tomb of Vittorio Emanuele.[2] Ardigò had agreed to serve on a committee to promote a pilgrimage to the tomb of Vittorio Emanuele in Rome. "The pilgrimage, however, did not sit well with many feverish revolutionaries, who imagined that I shared their views and that therefore I was renouncing my political-social beliefs by serving on the committee. So they directed their fiercest invective against me, privately and publicly."[3] Ardigò's letters are pompous and turgid. In his letter of 29 November 1883 one reads: "Yesterday, it was to their advantage to pass me off as one of them—which I have never been (as they should and do know)—and therefore they proclaimed me their master with praise that I found loathsome; and this without turning my meaning or intent upside down. Today, they find that I am unwilling to prostitute myself to their patricidal designs, and so they want to force me to listen to and learn the lesson that they (very naively) have taken it upon themselves to teach me. Oh! I have every reason to say, as Horace did: *Odi profanum vulgus et arceo*!"[4] In a subsequent letter, of 4 December 1883, to *Bacchiglione*, a democratic newspaper in Padova, he wrote:

> As you know, I was Alberto Mario's friend; I revere his memory and wholeheartedly support the ideas and sentiments we had in common. Therefore, I do not hesitate to oppose the vile antisocial, anarchic factions. . . . I have always expressed this opposition with the utmost resoluteness. Some years ago at a meeting of the Society for Social Equality in Mantova, I said: *The synthesis of your inclinations is hate, the synthesis of mine is love; therefore, I am not on your side*. . . . But they persisted in imparting the belief that I adhered to the antisocial socialism of Mantua. So, I felt obliged to protest, etc.[5]

The letter was reprinted (on 10 December 1883) in the *Gazzetta di Mantova* (edited by Luzio), with a new and very violent conclusion, because his opponents had reminded him of his sinecure, etc.[6]

Ardigò was a lukewarm democrat, and in July 1884 he wrote to Luzio that "nothing prevents me from accepting" the proposal to join the Moderate slate for the municipal elections of Mantua. He also wrote that he considered Luzio "more radical than many self-proclaimed democrats. Many of those who call themselves democrats are nothing more than stupid bunglers."[7] In June–August 1883, however, he used the socialist newspaper of Imola, *Il Moto*, to respond to a series of anonymous articles published by the liberal newspaper of Bologna, *Gazzetta dell'Emilia*; these articles maintained that Ardigò was a latter-day liberal and taunted him quite brilliantly, albeit with much polemical bad faith. Naturally, *Il Moto* defended Ardigò aggressively and praised him, while Ardigò made no effort to dissociate himself.[8]

Among his quite banal and hackneyed reflections, those on "Historical Materialism" (p. 271) stand out and should certainly be included in the series of "Lorianisms." I quote:

> The "Materialist Conception of History" attempts to explain a natural (!) formation that depends on it (*sic*) only partially and only indirectly, while ignoring other essential factors. I will explain.
>
> The animal cannot live unless it has its nourishment. It can procure this nourishment because of the sensation of hunger that arises within it and drives it to search for food. But in addition to hunger, the animal is subject to many other sensations related to other functions that likewise drive it to action. Nourishment sustains a particular organism with specific attitudes, depending on the species. A flow of water moves a mill to produce flour and a loom to produce cloth. In addition to the flow of water, then, the mill requires grain to grind, and the loom requires threads to weave together. While the organism sustains itself by movement, the environment introduces other kinds (!) of factors and thus determines, as we have said, many operations that are not directly dependent on nourishment but rather on the special structure of the functioning mechanism as well as on the action or the impingement of the environment. Therefore, a human being, for example, is moved in many directions. And in all cases, irresistibly. He is driven by the sensation of hunger, and he is driven by other sensations produced by his particular structure and by the sensations and ideas roused in him by external action, by the training he received, etc., etc. (*sic*). He must obey the first drive, BUT HE MUST ALSO OBEY THE OTHERS, whether he wants to or not. And the equilibriums that are established between the first impulse and the others through the resulting action turn out to be very diverse, depending on innumerable circumstances that make the drive of one

sentiment stronger than the others. In a herd of pigs, the sensation of hunger remains prevalent, but things are quite different with a human population, because humans care for other things besides getting fat. In the human being, the equilibrium varies according to the tendencies that have been formed within him, and therefore the sentiment of hunger leads the thief to steal whereas it leads the gentleman to work; the avaricious person who has all that he needs to satisfy his hunger even pursues what is not necessary, and the philosopher makes do and devotes his work to knowledge. However, the conflict can be such that sentiments other than that of hunger gain dominance, even to the point of rendering the human being completely passive and of making him endure death, etc., etc., etc. (*sic*).

The force that gives rise to the animal and its actions is the force of nature; it takes hold of the animal and compels it to act in different ways, making its organism undergo various transformations. We submit that the materialist conception of history should be reduced to the light of the sun rather than to economic explanation—the light of the sun understood in such a way that even the impulsive ideality of man can be referred back to it.[9]

(The end.)

This passage, it seems, appeared in a special issue of the *Giornale d'Italia* published in January 1915 to raise funds for the Red Cross. It is interesting not only as documentary evidence that Ardigò did not even know the basic elements of historical materialism and had only read (and badly misunderstood) some provincial newspaper articles, but also because it helps one trace the origin (and the genesis) of certain widespread views, such as the one about the "belly." Why is this strange interpretation found only in Italy? It is obvious that from the beginning the movement has been related to hunger, and the accusation directed against the obsession with one's belly is more humiliating for those who left a country in such conditions, etc., etc. In any case, this "piece" would fit very nicely in the Lorian anthology; nevertheless, Ardigò was not the first.

Cf. Notebook 16, §8.

§<7>. *Superstructures and science.* To posit science as the foundation of life, to make science a conception of the world, means to relapse into the idea that historical materialism needs to derive additional support from outside itself. Science, too, is a superstructure. In the study of superstructures, however, science occupies a special place because its reaction on the structure is more extensive in character and grows continually,

especially since the eighteenth century, when science was assigned a special place in general esteem. That science is a superstructure is demonstrated by the fact that it has been eclipsed for entire periods, driven out by the dominant ideology and above all by religion: the science and technical knowledge of the Arabs looked like witchcraft to the Christians. Science never presents itself as a naked objective notion—it always appears clothed by an ideology—and, concretely, science is the union of objective fact and hypothesis or a system of hypotheses that go beyond the mere objective fact. In this field, however, it has become relatively easy to separate the objective fact from the system of hypotheses—appropriating the former and rejecting the latter—by means of a process of abstraction that is inherent to scientific methodology itself. In this manner, a class can appropriate the science of another class without accepting its ideology (the ideology of progress has been created by scientific progress), and Sorel's (as well as Missiroli's) observations on this issue collapse.[1]

Cf. Notebook 11, §38.

§<8>. *Machiavelli and Marx.* In his introduction to *Le machiavélisme*, part one: *Avant Machiavel* (Paris: Plon, 1907), Charles Benoist writes:

> Machiavellianism is not all the same: there is a true Machiavellianism and a false Machiavellianism; there is a Machiavellianism that belongs to Machiavelli, and a Machiavellianism that belongs sometimes to the disciples and more often to the enemies of Machiavelli. Thus there are two or, rather, three Machiavellianisms: Machiavelli's, the Machiavellians', and the anti-Machiavellians.' But here is a fourth: the Machiavellianism of those who never read a sentence by Machiavelli but make erroneous use of the verbs, nouns, and adjectives derived from his name. Therefore, Machiavelli should not be held responsible for what all those who came after him have been pleased to attribute to him.[1]

The basic innovation introduced by Marx into the science of politics and of history, in comparison with that of Machiavelli, is the demonstration that "human nature," fixed and immutable, does not exist and that therefore, the concrete content (as well as the logical formulation?) of political science must be conceived as a historically developing organism. In Machiavelli, two basic elements have to be considered: (1) the affirmation that politics is an independent and autonomous activity that has its own principles and laws, different from those of morality and religion in general (this position of Machiavelli's is of great philosophical significance, because it implicitly alters the conception of morality and religion; it alters the whole conception of the world); (2) the practical and immedi-

ate content of the art of politics, which is studied and articulated with realistic objectivity, in accordance with the first affirmation.

The historical and intellectual importance of Machiavelli's discoveries can be measured by the fact that they are still debated and opposed even to this today. This means that the intellectual and moral revolution contained embryonically in Machiavelli's ideas has not yet taken place "openly," as a "public" form of the national culture. This does not mean that Machiavelli's thought has remained—or that it was even in his own day—a purely "bookish" matter, the legacy of some solitary thinker. If that were the case, then Machiavelli would have been a utopian, just a ratiocinator. As Foscolo said, "Machiavelli revealed" something real; he theorized a practice. How did it happen? Was Machiavelli himself, then, a poor Machiavellian politician, since his norms "are to be applied but not expressed"? Foscolo's assertion implies a historical-political judgment that goes beyond Croce's observation (which is, per se, very true) of the fact that since Machiavellianism is a science, it has been as useful to reactionaries as to democrats.[2] Machiavelli himself points out that he was writing about things that are practiced and have always been practiced; therefore, he is not trying to advise those who are already in the know, nor should one think of finding in him a pure "scientific activity," which would have been miraculous in that field during his time, when even today he encounters considerable resistance. Machiavelli, therefore, was thinking of "those who are not in the know," those who are not born into the tradition of statesmen; in the case of someone born within that tradition, the entire complex of de facto education combines with family interest (dynastic or patrimonial) to produce the character of a realistic politician. And who is not in the know? The revolutionary class of the time, the Italian people and nation, the democracy that gave birth to the likes of Pier Soderini rather than Valentino.[3] Machiavelli wanted to educate this class, which needed to produce a "chief" who knew what to do and a people who knew that the chief's actions were also in their interest even though those actions might conflict with the widely accepted ideology (morality and religion). This position of Machiavelli's recurs in Marx: Marx's thought, too, has been useful not only to the class explicitly addressed by Marx (who, in this respect, is different from and superior to Machiavelli) but also to the conservative classes, whose leading personnel in many cases had its political apprenticeship in Marxism.

Cf. Notebook 13, §20.

§<9>. *A repertory of Marxism* [cf. p. 45 bis].[1] It would be extremely useful to have a critical "inventory" of all the questions that have been raised

by Marxism: materials, hypotheses, attempted solutions, etc. The material is so vast, so disparate, and varies so much in quality that a compilation of this kind would be of considerable importance in the field of education and basic instruction, and it would be a prime instrument for disseminating the study of Marxism and consolidating it into a scientific discipline, putting an end to half-baked learning and journalistic amateurism.

Cf. Notebook 16, §3.

§<10>. *Marx and Machiavelli.* This topic could give rise to a twofold task: a study of the real connections between the two as theoreticians of militant politics, of action; and a book that extracts from Marxist thought an orderly system of actual politics along the lines of *The Prince*. The topic would be the political party in its relations with the classes and with the state—not the party as a sociological category but the party that wants to establish the state. In fact, if one looks closely, in dictatorial states the traditional function of the institution of the crown is performed by the parties: they are the ones who, while representing a class, and only one class, nevertheless maintain an equilibrium with the other allied, unhostile classes and ensure that the development of the represented class takes place with the consent and assistance of the allied classes. But the protagonist of this "new prince" should not be the party in the abstract, a class in the abstract, a state in the abstract but rather a determinate historical party operating in a precise historical environment, with a particular tradition, in a distinctive and quite specific combination of social forces. In short, the point is not to compile an organic repertory of political maxims but rather to write a book that is, in a certain sense, "dramatic," an unfolding historical drama in which political maxims are presented as a specific necessity and not as scientific principles.

Cf. Notebook 13, §21.

§<11>. *Fundamental problems of Marxism.* Marx's personal philosophical culture—namely, the philosophical currents and the great philosophers that Marx studied—is (usually) confused with the origins or the constitutive parts of historical materialism, and so the philosophical basis of historical materialism is mistakenly reduced to some system or another. It is certainly interesting [and necessary] to search for and closely examine the components of Marx's philosophical culture, but one must bear in mind that neither Spinozism, nor Hegelianism, nor French materialism is an essential part of historical materialism. Rather, the essential part of historical materialism is precisely that which none of those cur-

rents contained except in embryonic form and which Marx either developed or for the development of which provided the basic principles. The essential part of Marxism consists in its surpassing of the old philosophies and also in its way of conceiving philosophy—and this is what must be systematically demonstrated and developed. In the realm of theory, Marxism is not to be confused with or reduced to any other philosophy; it is original not only because it surpasses previous philosophies but also, and above all, because it opens up a completely new road: in other words, it renews from top to bottom the whole way of conceiving philosophy. Within the context of historical research, one should examine what elements occasioned Marx's philosophical work and which of them he incorporated, making them homogeneous, etc.; then one should acknowledge that out of these "originative" elements Hegelianism is, relatively speaking, the most important, especially because of its effort to go beyond the traditional conceptions of "idealism" and "materialism." When one says that Marx uses the term "immanence" in a metaphoric sense,[1] one is saying nothing; in reality, Marx attached a specific meaning to the term "immanence"—in other words, he is not a "pantheist" in the traditional metaphysical sense; rather he is a "Marxist" or a "historical materialist." As for this expression "historical materialism," greater stress is placed on the second word, whereas it should be placed on the first: Marx is fundamentally a "historicist," etc.

Cf. Notebook 11, §27.

§<12>. *Structure and superstructure.* The meaning of the concepts of structure and of superstructure, as well as the meaning of "technical instrument," etc., must be clearly established, otherwise disastrous and ridiculous confusions arise. The complexity of the question is evident in the following: Are libraries structure or superstructure? And what about the testing laboratories of scientists? Or the musical instruments of an orchestra? etc. Structure is confused with "material structure" in general, and "technical instrument" is confused with every material instrument, etc., so that in the end the development of a particular art is attributed to the development of those specific instruments through which whole artistic expressions enter the public domain and can be reproduced. One cannot deny that a certain relationship does exist, but it is not direct or immediate. In reality, certain forms of technical instrument have a dual phenomenology: they are both structure and superstructure. The printing industry itself, which has acquired unprecedented importance within this particular sector of the "technical instrument," partakes of this dual nature. It is an object of property and hence of class division and struggle, but it is also an inseparable element of an ideological activity or of several

ideological activities: science, literature, religion, politics, etc. Certain superstructures have a "material structure" but retain the character of superstructure; their development is not "immanent" in their particular "material structure" but in the "material structure" of society. A class is formed on the basis of its function in the world of production: the growth of power, the struggle for power, and the struggle to preserve power create the superstructures that determine the formation of a "special material structure" for the diffusion, etc., of those same superstructures. Scientific thought is a superstructure that creates "the scientific instruments"; music is a superstructure that creates the musical instruments. Logically as well as chronologically there are social structure—superstructure—material structure of the superstructure.[1]

Cf. Notebook 11, §29.

§<13>. *Notes and critical observations on the* Popular Manual. The first thing to point out is that the title of the book does not correspond to its content.[1] *Theory of Historical Materialism* ought to mean a logical, systematic presentation of the philosophical concepts that are known under the title of historical materialism. The first chapter or a general introduction should have dealt with the questions: What is philosophy? Is a conception of the world a philosophy? How has philosophy been conceived until now? Does historical materialism alter that conception? What are the relationships among ideologies, conceptions of the world, and philosophies? The answers to this series of questions constitute the "theory" of historical materialism. The *Popular Manual* contains no justification of the premise—implicit in the exposition (with many affirmations, although not always logically coherent) and explicitly brought up in various instances—that the philosophy of historical materialism is philosophical materialism. What does this assertion really mean? If it were true, then the theory of historical materialism would be philosophical materialism. But in that case what would historical materialism itself be? The answers to these questions are missing, too.

The connection between the general title, *Theory*, etc., and the subtitle, *Popular Manual of Marxist Sociology*, is not justified, either. The subtitle is more accurate, provided that one attaches a narrow definition to the term "sociology." In fact, the question arises: What was and what is "sociology"? Is it not an embryo of an undeveloped philosophy? Has not "sociology" tried to do something similar to "historical materialism"? But one must be clear about this: historical materialism was born in the form of practical criteria (at least for the most part) by pure chance, because Marx devoted his intellectual powers to other problems; but implicit in these practical criteria is an entire conception of the world, a philosophy.

Sociology is the attempt to create a historical-political methodology dependent on an already elaborated philosophical system, against which sociology reacted, but only partially. Sociology has therefore become a tendency on its own, it has become the philosophy of nonphilosophers,[a] an attempt to classify and describe historical and political facts schematically, according to criteria constructed on the model of the sciences, or of certain sciences. In any case, every sociology presupposes a philosophy, a conception of the world of which it is itself a subordinate part. Nor should the particular internal "logic" that gives the various sociologies their mechanical coherence be confused with general "theory" or "philosophy."

All these problems are "theoretical" problems unlike the ones posed as such by the author of the *Manual*. The questions he poses are of an immediate political and ideological order—with "ideology" understood as an intermediate phase between general theory and immediate practice or politics. [They are reflections on disconnected and casual individual historico-political facts.] From the very beginning the author is faced with a "theoretical" question when he mentions that tendency that denies the possibility of constructing a Marxist "sociology" and that maintains that Marxism can only find its expression in concrete historical works. The author does not resolve this very important objection except through a play of words.[2] Certainly, Marxism is realized through the concrete study of past history and the present activity of creating new history. But one can always produce a theory of past history and present politics, because while facts are unique and always mutable in the flux of the movement of history, concepts can be theorized.

The failure to pose the question of "theory" also prevents a correct posing of the question What is religion? and a proper evaluation of past philosophies, which are reduced to mere delirium and folly. There is a lapse into dogmatism, etc., etc. {Study carefully the question of "sociology" and its relations with Marxism.} [Cf. p. 58.][3]

Cf. Notebook 11, §26.

§<14>. *The concept of "orthodoxy."* In light of what was stated above, the concept of "orthodoxy" should be renewed and brought back to its genuine origins. Orthodoxy is not to be looked for in this or that disciple of Marx, in this or that tendency connected with currents extraneous to Marxism, but rather in the concept that Marxism is sufficient unto itself and contains in itself all the fundamental elements not only for constructing a whole conception of the world, an entire philosophy, but also

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci wrote "*non filosofici.*" The phrase could therefore be translated thus: "the philosophy of the nonphilosophical."

for giving life to a complete practical organization of society, that is, for becoming an integral, complete civilization. Thus renewed, this concept of orthodoxy helps to define better the attribute "revolutionary" attached to a conception of the world or to a theory. Christianity was revolutionary in comparison with paganism because it was an element of total cleavage between the supporters of the old and the new world. A theory is revolutionary precisely to the extent that it is an element of total separation into two camps, to the extent that it is a peak inaccessible to the enemies. To maintain that historical materialism is not a completely autonomous structure of thought really means that the ties to the old world have not been completely severed. As a matter of fact, historical materialism has no need for extraneous support: it is itself so robust that the old world turns to it to supply its own arsenal with some more effective weapons. This means that while historical materialism is not subjected to hegemonies, it has itself started to exercise a hegemony over the old intellectual world. This happens in reciprocal ways, naturally, but that is precisely what needs to be thwarted. The old world, while rendering homage to historical materialism, seeks to reduce it to a body of subordinate, secondary criteria that can be incorporated into its idealist or materialist general theory. Whoever reduces historical materialism to a similar role within this theoretical terrain is implicitly capitulating before the enemy.

Cf. Notebook 11, §27.

§<15>. *Croce and Marx.* One should study Croce's references to Marx in the different phases of his scholarly and practical activities. He draws near to Marx in his youth, when he wants to reconcile "the democratic leanings <. . .> that have always been natural to *his* heart" with his hatred of positivism. "My stomach refused to digest it (democracy) as long as it did not acquire some seasoning from Marxist socialism, which, as is very well known by now, is imbued with classic German philosophy" (cf. *Cultura e vita morale,* second edit., p. 45).[1] He distances himself from Marx during the periods of democracy, until 1914. He returns to Marx during the war (cf. especially the 1917 preface to *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica* and his opinion, reported by De Ruggiero, that the war was the war of historical materialism).[2] However, he distances himself increasingly during the postwar period, when much of his critical and practical activity is aimed at undermining historical materialism, because he feels and expects that historical materialism is bound to reassert itself extremely strongly following the intoxication of the formal and official philosophies with pompous abstractions and above all as a result of the practical situation and state interventionism. (With regard to this preoc-

cupation, see Croce's letters concerning ethico-political history printed in *Nuova Rivista Storica* in 1928–29.)[3]

The most interesting point to examine concerns "ideologies" and their value: point out the contradictions Croce falls into with respect to this matter. In his booklet *Elementi di politica*, Croce writes that for Marx the "superstructures" were an appearance or an illusion, and he wrongly faults Marx for this (check the formulation of this issue carefully).[4] But is this true? The source of Croce's theory on ideologies—recently repeated in his review of Malagodi's booklet in *La Critica*[5]—is obviously Marxist: ideologies are practical constructs, they are instruments of political leadership. Croce's theory, however, reproduces only one part, the critical-destructive part, of Marxist theory. For Marx, "ideologies" are anything but appearances and illusions: they are an objective and operative reality; they just are not the mainspring of history, that's all. It is not ideologies that create social reality but social reality, in its productive structure, that creates ideologies.[6] How could Marx have thought that superstructures are appearance and illusion? Even his theories are a superstructure. Marx explicitly states that humans become conscious of their tasks on the ideological terrain of the superstructures,[7] which is hardly a minor affirmation of "reality," and the aim of his theory is also, precisely, to make a specific social group "become conscious" of its own tasks, its own power, its own coming-into-being. But he destroys the "ideologies" of the hostile social groups; those "ideologies" are in fact practical instruments of political domination over the rest of society, and Marx shows how they are meaningless because they are in contradiction with actual reality. Intellectually, Croce is in a bad position. In the 1917 preface to *Materialismo storico . . .*, he wrote: "we were grateful to him (Marx) for helping us to become immune to the Alcina-like <. . .> seductions of Goddess Justice and Goddess Humanity."[8] Now he must take many steps backward and give the appearance of buxom youthfulness to another decrepit, toothless witch—liberalism—which has been virtually deified.

This topic of the concrete value of superstructures in Marx should be studied thoroughly. Recall Sorel's concept of the "historical bloc."[9] If humans become conscious of their task on the terrain of superstructures, it means that there is a necessary and vital connection between structure and superstructures, just as there is between the skin and the skeleton in the human body. It would be silly to say that a person stands erect on his skin rather than his skeleton, and yet this does not mean that the skin is merely an appearance and an illusion—so much so that the condition of a flayed person is not very pleasant. Similarly, it would be silly to say that the color of the cheeks causes good health rather than the other way around, etc. (The comparison with the human body may serve as an apt metaphor to give these concepts a popular formulation.) One does not fall

in love with a woman because of the shape of her skeleton, and yet that shape, too, is an element of sexual attraction since it contributes to the general harmony of external shapes and even to the disposition of the skin. This is a simple metaphor because history registers radical changes in social structures whereas in the case of animals one can only talk, at best, of extremely slow evolutions.

Cf. Notebook 10, II, §41 (xi and xii).

§<16>. *The teleology of the* Popular Manual. A general observation: all philosophical theories are presented as equally trivial and banal, leaving the reader with the impression that the previous culture was all a phantasmagoria of delirious revelers. The method is reprehensible from several points of view: a serious reader who goes on to broaden his knowledge and to study more deeply will believe that he is being fooled and will reject the whole system. It is easy to impart the impression of having transcended a certain position by demeaning it, but this amounts to mere verbal sophistry: the transcendence has taken place only on paper, and the scholar will face the difficulty again in a frightening form. Superficiality is not a good pedagogical method. To present the issues in this manner might make sense in someone like Voltaire, but not everyone can be a Voltaire; in other words, not everyone is a great artist.

The question of teleology: the *Popular Manual* presents teleology in its most preposterous and infantile forms and forgets about the solution provided by Kant.[1] It should be possible to demonstrate, then, that the *Manual* inadvertently contains many "teleological" solutions: for example, it seems to me that the chapter on "The Equilibrium Between Society and Nature" is conceived precisely along the lines of Kantian teleology.[2] (Look over this argument carefully. In general, remember that all these notes are provisional and written as they flow from the pen: they must be reviewed and checked in detail because they undoubtedly contain imprecisions, anachronisms, wrong approaches, etc., that do not imply wrongdoing because the notes have solely the function of quick memoranda.)[3]

Cf. Notebook 11, §35, and the prefatory statement on the first page of that notebook.

§<17>. *Immanence and the* Popular Manual. What has been said about "teleology" can be repeated about "immanence." In the *Popular Manual* it is pointed out that Marx employs the term "immanence" or "immanent," and it is said that this use is evidently "metaphorical."[1] Very well. But does this explain what the term "immanence" means metaphorically in Marx? Why does Marx keep using this term? Is it just because of an

abhorrence of the creation of new words? When one conception gives way to another, the earlier language persists, but it is used metaphorically. All of language has become a metaphor, and the history of semantics is also an aspect of the history of culture: language is a living thing and simultaneously a museum of fossils of past life. When I use the word "disaster" no one can accuse me of believing in astrology, and when I say "by Jove" no one can suppose that I adore pagan deities. Yet these expressions demonstrate that modern civilization is also a development of paganism and astrology. The term "immanence" in Marx has a precise meaning, and this should have been defined; in fact, such a definition would really have been "theory." Marx continues the philosophy of immanence, but he rids it of its whole metaphysical apparatus and brings it to the concrete terrain of history. The use is metaphorical only in the sense that the conception has been superseded, developed, etc. Besides, is Marx's immanence something entirely new? Or does one find traces of it in previous philosophy? I think that in Giordano Bruno, for example, one finds inklings of a conception of this kind.[2] Was Marx familiar with Bruno? Or did these elements of Bruno pass into classical German philosophy? All these are problems to be examined concretely.

Cf. Notebook 11, §28.

§<18>. *The technique of thinking*. Cf. F. Engels, preface to *Anti-Dühring* (3d edition, Stuttgart, 1894, p. xix): that "the art of working with concepts is not something inborn or given with ordinary consciousness; it is, rather, a technical labor of thought that has a long history, not more and not less than the empirical research of the natural sciences" (cited by Croce, *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, 4th ed., 1921, p. 31).[1] I have referred to this concept of Engels in various notes.[2] Check Engels's original text, which is paraphrased by Croce, who observes parenthetically that this concept is not "singular"—in other words, that it had already become common sense before Engels. The issue, for me, is not the greater or lesser originality of Engels's statement, but rather its importance and the place it occupies in historical materialism. I think one has to turn to it in order to understand what Engels meant when he wrote that, after Marx, one of the things that remains from the old philosophy is *formal logic*. Croce, in his essay on Hegel, reproduces this statement *with an exclamation mark*.[3] Croce's *astonishment* at the "rehabilitation" of formal logic implicit in Engels's statement should be related to his theory of *technique* in art, for example; but in this case such a comparison would be utterly misleading. Although there might be some artist who is totally unaware of past technical developments, the same cannot be true in the realm of science and of thought, in which there is progress and in which there must be method-

ological and technical progress just as in the empirical sciences. The question that emerges concerns the site that this technique should occupy within the framework of the science of thought: if one takes dialectics, for example, the importance of this site becomes immediately clear. The dialectic is also a technique—and it is precisely as a technique that many philosophers have difficulty accepting it—but it is also a new thought, a new philosophy. Can one separate the technical from the philosophical? Croce's *La Critica* has published many reviews that demonstrate this failure to understand dialectical technique and the new mode of thinking.

I think I have noted elsewhere the importance of the *technique* of thinking in the construction of a pedagogical program;[4] here, again, one cannot make a comparison between the technique of thinking and the old rhetorics. The old rhetorics did not produce artists, nor did they create taste, nor did they supply criteria for the appreciation of beauty; they were useless in themselves, and if they had some effect, it was due to the active work of the teacher. The technique of thought will certainly not produce a great philosophy, but it will provide criteria for judgment, and it will correct the deformities of the modes of thinking of common sense. It would be interesting to compare the *technique* of common sense—i.e., of the philosophy of the man in the street—with the technique of the most advanced modern thought. In this respect, it is also worth taking into account Macaulay's observation on the logical weaknesses of a culture formed by oratory and declamation.[5] This topic should be studied thoroughly after gathering all the available material about it. (Check also the pragmatists' theories on language as a cause of error—Prezzolini's booklet—and the questions raised by Pareto on the same issue.)[6] This is partly a propaedeutic issue (but not exclusively so, because the image of technical "instrument" can be misleading, and there are more similarities between "technique" and "thinking in action" than there are in science between "material instruments" and science properly so called). An astronomer who is incapable of using his instruments would not be an astronomer, even though the connections between "astronomical instruments" and astronomy are external and mechanical. A poet may not be able to read and write; in a certain sense, even a thinker can have someone read to him whatever interests him in the works of others, and he can have someone write down for him everything that he has thought. Reading and writing have to do with memory; they are an aid to memory. The technique of thinking cannot be compared to these things, which is why one can say that it is as important to teach this technique as it is to teach reading and writing—and this does not concern philosophy, just as reading and writing do not interest the poet as such.

Cf. Notebook 11, §44.

§<19>. *The "technical instrument" in the* Popular Manual. I have already made some notes on this topic before.[1] However, one has to examine not only the most obviously erroneous affirmations (such as the one about the technical instrument and music)[2] but also the general conception of "technical instrument,"[3] which is wrong in its entirety. In his essay on Loria, Croce points out that it was the bold Achille himself who [arbitrarily] replaced Marx's phrase "material forces of production" with "technical instrument."[4] (On pp. 39–40 of *Materialismo storico e critica marxistica*, the passage from the preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, which expounds the principles of historical materialism, is compared to a passage from the opening section of Loria's book *La terra e il sistema sociale*—Verona: Drucker, 1892—in which the substitution is made in the most ridiculous manner.)[5] This Lorian method later had its crowning moment in the article on "Le influenze sociali dell' aeroplano," which, I believe, actually opens with a repetition of these general statements on the fundamental importance of the technical instrument.[6]

Croce points out that Marx frequently stressed the historical importance of technical inventions and invoked a history of technique (*Capital*, I, 143n, 335–6n.—but he does not indicate which edition, although it must be Kautsky's) but he never dreamt of making out of the "technical instrument" the sole and supreme *cause* of economic development. The passage from *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* contains the phrases "level of development of the material forces of production," "mode of production of material life," "economic conditions of production," and the like, which certainly affirm that economic development is determined by material conditions but do not reduce all the conditions to a mere "metamorphosis of the technical instrument." Croce then goes on to say that Marx never meant this inquiry to be about the *ultimate cause* of economic life. "His philosophy was not that cheap. He had not 'flirted' with Hegel's dialectic in vain, to then go searching for 'ultimate causes.' "[7] (A whole series of topics to study.)

Cf. Notebook 11, §29.

§<20>. *Croce and Marx.* The value of ideologies (see the notes above). In *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, p. 93: "A similar concept (to natural law, state of nature, etc., in the eighteenth cent.) is dealt no more than an oblique blow by the criticism of Marx, who when analyzing the concept of *nature* showed that it was the ideological complement of the historical development of the bourgeoisie—an extremely powerful weapon of which this class availed itself against the privileges and oppressions that it intended to overthrow. This concept may well have

originated as a practical instrument for occasional use and yet be intrinsically true," etc.[1]

Here, too, one sees the prejudice against the *intrinsic* value of ideologies, or the prejudice that Marx denied this value; in reality, what was *intrinsic* was its historical character of being useful to a class and hence it was very real and of *great value* (reexamine the passage by Croce in this regard).

Cf. Notebook 10, II, §41(xii).

§<21>. *The technique of thinking.* "The mental and moral instruments at man's disposal are always the same: observation, experiment, inductive and deductive reason, manual skill, and the creative imagination. The way in which these tools are used determines whether human activity has an empirical or a scientific orientation, with the following difference between the two: that the latter is much faster and much more productive" (Mario Camis, "L'aeronautica e le scienze biologiche," in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 March 1928).[1]

Simplistic reasoning. Examples of this mode of reasoning, which, judging by the common view of things, is how the great majority of people reason (sentiment or immediate interest cloud the logical process). An example of Babbitt's reasoning on trade union organizations: "A good labor union is of value because it keeps out radical unions, which would destroy property. No one ought to be forced to belong to a union, however. All labor agitators who try to force men to join a union should be hanged. In fact, just between ourselves, there oughtn't to be any unions allowed at all; and as it's the best way of fighting the unions, every business man ought to belong to an employers' association and to the Chamber of Commerce. In union there is strength. So any selfish hog who doesn't join the Chamber of Commerce ought to be forced to." (cf. *Babbitt*, by Sinclair Lewis, Stock edit., 1930).[2]

Don Ferrante's reasoning is formally impeccable, but it is misguided in its factual premises and in the presumption of the reasoner—whence comes the humorous aspect.[3]

Ilyich's mode of reasoning in Tolstoy's story *The Death of Iván Ilyich.* (Men are mortal, Caius is a man, Caius is mortal, but I am not Caius, etc.)[4]

Cf. Notebook 11, §44.

§<22>. *Croce and Marx. The value of ideologies.* The phenomena of the current decomposition of parliamentarianism may provide an example for the discussion on the value of superstructures and on the morphology

of society (the question of the crisis of authority, etc.: check the scattered notes).[1]

Cf. Notebook 10, II, §40.

§<23>. *The* Popular Manual *and sociological laws.* The so-called laws of sociology, presumed to be causal, in fact have no causative significance: they are nothing other than duplicates of the very same facts that are observed. A fact or a series of facts is described; through a process of abstract generalization, a relationship of similitude is extrapolated from this description; the relationship is called a law; and then this so-called law assumes the function of a cause. But what has been discovered that is new, really? Absolutely nothing: this is merely the assignment of new names to old things, but the name is not a cause.[1]

Cf. Notebook 11, §26.

§<24>. *The Restoration and historicism.* The Restoration period[1] elaborated "historicism" along two lines of development: in actual reality and ideologically. In actual reality: in the sense that it "preserved" a large number of the conquests of the previous period; that is, it acknowledged the supremacy of the upper bourgeoisie and implemented its "civil" program. Ideologically: in that, for this very same reason, it had to develop a political philosophy of its own that would justify its position while criticizing the "petty bourgeois" program of the revolution; that is, the ensemble of "practical instruments" that had made possible the attainment of popular unity around the bourgeoisie itself (that is to say, that ensemble of ideological principles that are most characteristic of French political rationalism and of the so-called principles of 1789). The sociopolitical hierarchy that placed the petty bourgeois intellectuals at the apex of the popular government was replaced by another hierarchy, in which the government was in the hands of the aristocracy and the assimilated intellectuals: the [direct] consensus of the popular classes was replaced by indirect consensus or rather by political passivity (universal suffrage—suffrage based on the census). The ideological struggle on this terrain generated the historicist conception; the theoreticians of the ancien régime were in a good position to notice the abstract, ahistorical character of the petty bourgeois ideologies. However, they gave rise to their opposite: namely, a "popular" historicism that is critical of both the petty bourgeois ideology and the "aristocratic" ideology while explaining both of them as well as explaining "itself." This represents the greatest "historicism," the total liberation

from any "ideologism," the real conquest of the historical world: that is, the beginning of a new civilization. All these currents of thought must be studied in their concrete manifestations: (1) as a philosophical current; (2) as a current of historiography; (3) as a political current. Within the philosophical current one has to include not just the systematic philosophers but all the writers who explicitly or implicitly affirmed "historicism" in any branch of the sciences: [besides historiography], economics, ethics, political science, etc. In the current of historiography: the historians who are "historicist" in their concrete studies. In the political current (certainly the most complex because all the great politicians have been implicitly "historicist" in their actions, even when they have justified their initiatives in terms of the widespread ideologies of their time): all the affirmations of "historicism" and the widespread ideologies contradicting them, as well as the efforts to explain the latter in terms of the former.

Cf. Notebook 16, §9.

§<25>. *Notes on the* Popular Manual. What does the *Popular Manual* mean by "matter"? A popular manual, even more than a book for "learned" persons, must provide precise definitions not only of the fundamental concepts but of the entire terminology in order to avoid giving rise to the kinds of errors produced by popular and vulgar usages of the terms. It is clear that in historical materialism, "matter" should be understood neither in the meaning it has derived from the natural sciences (physics, chemistry, mechanics, etc.—examine these meanings and their historical developments) nor in the meaning it has derived from the various materialist metaphysics. Historical materialism takes the physical (chemical, mechanical, etc.) properties of matter into account, of course, but only insofar as they become an "economic factor" of production. The issue, then, is not matter as such but how it is socially and historically organized for production, as a *human relation*. Historical materialism does not study a machine in order to establish the physical-chemical-mechanical structure of its natural components; it studies it as an object of production and property, as the crystallization of a social relation that itself coincides with a particular historical period. The ensemble of the material forces of production is the *least variable* element in historical development; it is what can be measured at any time with mathematical exactitude and can therefore give rise to an empirical history of science in the quite specific sense in which one can use "empirical" when dealing with history. The *variability* of the ensemble of the [material] forces of production can be measured as well, and one can establish rather accurately the point at which its quantitative development becomes qualitative. The ensemble of

the material forces of production is simultaneously a "crystallization of all past history" and the basis of present and future history; it is a document and an actual active force. But the concept of the *activity* of these material forces is not to be confused with the concept of activity in the physical or the metaphysical sense. Electricity is *historically* active, not merely as a natural force but as a productive element dominated by man and incorporated into the ensemble of the material forces of production, an object of property. As a natural force, electricity existed before it was turned into a productive force, but it did not play a part in history, it was not an element of history, of human history (but it is an element of natural history, and hence it is also, to a certain extent, an element of human history, insofar as human history is a part of natural history).

These observations help one understand how the use of the element of causality taken from the natural sciences in order to explain history constitutes a return to the old ideological historiography (idealist and materialist). To maintain, as the *Popular Manual* does, that the new atomic theory destroys individuals (Robinsonades) is to fall precisely into this deviation.[1] What, in fact, is the meaning of this juxtaposition of politics and natural science? Does it mean that science explains history? Does it mean that the laws of a particular natural science are identical with the laws of history? Or does it mean that since the whole complex of scientific ideas constitutes a unity, one can reduce one science to another? If that were the case, why must this [particular] element of physics rather than another be the one that is reducible to the unity of the conception of the world?

In fact, this is just one of the many aspects of the *Popular Manual* that reveal the superficiality of its formulation of the problem of historical materialism and its failure to give to this conception its own scientific autonomy and its proper status vis-à-vis the natural sciences—or [more importantly] vis-à-vis that vague concept of "science" in general that is typical of vulgar popular thought. Is modern atomic theory a "definitive" theory, established once and for all? Or is it simply a scientific hypothesis that may be superseded—in other words, absorbed into a larger, more comprehensive theory? Then why should reference to this theory be definitive and put an end to questions of individualism and Robinsonades? (Apart from the fact that Robinsonades are simply practical schemes constructed to point out a tendency and provide demonstrations per absurdum.) But there are further questions. If atomic theory is what the *Popular Manual* assumes it to be, and given that society has undergone change in the course of its development: to what period does the explanation that is associated with this theory apply? To all periods, without distinction? In that case, history would have always been the same, and humans would have always been grouped in the same way. Or does this theory, rather, justify a law of tendency? But what would that mean? Atomic theory is valid for all times and in all places,

as far as its object—atoms—is concerned. But is a theory derived from atomic theory equally applicable in history to all times and places? Cannot the reverse be considered, instead: namely, that atomic theory has been influenced by human history, that it is, in other words, a superstructure?

Cf. Notebook 11, §30.

§<26>. *The* Popular Manual *and the "ultimate cause."* An erroneous interpretation of historical materialism that is made into a dogma and its quest is identified with the quest for the ultimate or single cause, etc. The history of this problem in the development of culture: the problem of ultimate causes is, in fact, dispelled by dialectics. Engels had warned against this dogmatism in some of the things he wrote during his final years (cf. Engels's two letters on historical materialism translated into Italian).[1]

Cf. Notebook 11, §31.

§<27>. *Teleology*. From Goethe's *Xenien*: "The Teleologist": "The world's good Creator we adore, who when/The cork tree he created, he invented the cork as well" (B. Croce's trans.).

Croce—in his book on *Goethe*, p. 262—annotates: "Opposes the extrinsic finalism widely accepted in the eighteenth century and criticized around that same time by Kant, who replaced it with a more profound concept of finality."[1]

Cf. Notebook 11, §35.

§<28>. Antonino Lovecchio, *Filosofia della prassi e filosofia dello spirito*, Palmi: Zappone, 1928, 112 pp., L. 7. The following information is extracted from Giuseppe Tarozzi's review of this book in *I<talia> C<he> S<crive>* (June 1928):[1] The book comprises two parts, one on historical materialism and the other on the thought of B. Croce, which are tied together by virtue of Croce's contribution to the critique of Marxism: the concluding section is entitled "Marx and Croce." It discusses primarily Antonio Labriola's, Croce's, Gentile's, Rodolfo Mondolfo's, Adelchi Baratono's, and Alfredo Poggi's theses [on Marxism].[2] He is a Crocean. The booklet is a sketch with many serious formal flaws. Try to acquire it.

Cf. Notebook 11, §8.

§<29>. *Machiavelli.* In a review by Giuseppe Tarozzi of the first volume of Mario Sertoli's *Costituzione russa* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1928, in

8°, 435 pp., L. 50), I came across a reference, devoid of further information, to a book by Vorländer, *Von Machiavelli bis Lenin*.[1] I do not know who Vorländer is or what value his book might have (cf. the survey on Machiavelli published by *Nuovi Studi* in 1929).[2]

Cf. Notebook 13, §22.

§<30>. *De Man's book*. A review by Paolo Milano in *I<talia> C<he> S<crive>* of September 1929.[1] He perceives a twofold contribution in De Man's book: <1> the body of psychological observations on the stages of development, the deviations, the contradictory reactions of the workers' and socialist movement in recent years—in short, a shrewd collection of social *data* and *documents* (according to Milano, the analysis of the reformist evolution of the working masses on the one hand and of the groups of private owners on the other is rich and satisfactory); and <2> the theoretical discussion that should lead to the "supersedure of Marxism" (which for De Man is precisely the "repudiation" of Marxism).[2] According to De Man, the conception of historical materialism, at bottom mechanistic and rationalist, is superseded by the latest researches, which have assigned to the concatenations of rational thought just another place, and not the most important one, in the set of motives of human actions. Modern science (!) has victoriously (!) replaced the *mechanical reaction* (!) of Marxist dialectics with a *psychological reaction*, the intensity of which is not proportional to the agent cause.[3] For Milano: "It is clear by now that any critique of the Marxist conception of history automatically leads one to set up the contrast between the materialist and the idealist interpretations of the world and, in short, to assign priority to either being or knowing." De Man avoids this problem, or rather he stops halfway, by endorsing a conception of human events as generated by "*psychological motives*" and social "*complexes*"; in other words, De Man is influenced by Freudian psychology and especially by its applications to social theories attempted by Adler (Max Adler? In which writings?).[4] Milano observes:

> Moreover, one knows what an ephemeral field psychology is when it comes to historical investigation; it is all the more questionable in the kind of inquiry discussed here. In fact, psychological phenomena lend themselves to being labeled now as tendencies of the will and at other times as material facts: De Man, too, oscillates between these two interpretations and thus avoids taking a position on the crucial point of the contrast. However, what the shrewd reader will find to be truly psychological is the source of De Man's work: it is the product of a crisis in confidence and of the estimate that the integral theories of Marxism are insufficient for explaining those phenomena that came to the author's

attention in the course of his trivial work in politics. Very good intentions notwithstanding, the contents of the book do not go beyond proving and proposing this estimate and fail to produce a theoretical refutation of adequate caliber and requisite strength.

He concludes: "The proof is in the final chapter, where the discussion should end with a recommendation for a practical political stance. While avoiding the two extremes—tactics for seizing power or exclusively idealistic preaching—he calls for a general education of the masses, and thus he situates himself outside socialism; and yet throughout the book he declares himself a faithful and enlightened follower of that same socialism." The review is noteworthy and acute, given the character of the author, who, from what I gather, is quite well read.

Cf. Notebook 11, §66.

§<31>. *By Georges Sorel* [see p. 78].[1] A long article (from p. 289 to p. 307) published by *Nuova Antologia* of 1 December 1928 under the title "Ultime meditazioni (Scritto postumo inedito)."[2] It is an essay written in 1920 that was meant to serve as a preface to a collection of articles published in Italian newspapers between 1910 and 1920; the collection has still not been published. (In 1929 it seemed that this collection, edited by Mario Missiroli, was about to be published by the Casa Ed. "Corbaccio" of Milan, but to this day—September 1930—nothing has been done, and probably nothing more will be done about it, because, in Italy, Sorel's fame—based on a series of rather fortuitous misunderstandings—has declined significantly, and there already exists an anti-Sorelian literature.)[3]

The essay epitomizes all of Sorel's merits and all his flaws: he is tortuous, rambling, incoherent, superficial, profound, etc., but he provides or suggests original viewpoints, he discovers unthought-of connections, he compels one to think and to probe. What is the true meaning of the conclusion of Sorel's essay?[4] The meaning emerges clearly from the whole article, but the short introductory note of *Nuova Antologia*, which ends with the following words, is ridiculous: ". . . a writer who attributed to postwar Italy intellectual and political primacy in Europe." To which Italy? Missiroli may have something to say [explicitly] about this, or there may be something in Sorel's private letters to Missiroli (which, according to the announcements that have been made, should be published—but they will not be, or not in their entirety).[5]

I will only take some cues from this essay by Sorel while jotting down some notes as a reminder of its great importance for understanding Sorel

and his postwar attitude. (I believe that one cannot understand Sorel as a "revolutionary intellectual" figure unless one thinks of post-1870 France. In 1870–71 France experienced two terrible defeats: the national defeat that weighed upon the bourgeois intellectuals and upon the politicians, bringing forth individuals like Clemenceau, the quintessence of French Jacobinism; and the defeat of the Parisian people of the Commune, which weighed upon the revolutionary intellectuals and brought forth the anti-Jacobin Sorel. Sorel's strange anti-Jacobinism—sectarian, mean, antihistorical—is a product of the bloodletting of the people in 1871; it is anti-Thiersism.[6] 1871 destroyed the umbilical cord between the new people and the tradition of 1793. Sorel would have liked to be the representative of this tendency, but he failed, etc.)

1. Bernstein has maintained (*Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie*, French trans., pp. 53–54)[7] that a superstitious respect for Hegel's dialectic led Marx to prefer revolutionary theses with close affinities to the Jacobin tradition of Babeuf and Blanqui over the constructs of the *utopians*; but if that were the case, one could not make sense of the fact that in the *Manifesto* there is no discussion of the Babouvist literature with which Marx was certainly familiar. Andler believes (vol. 2 of the *Manifesto*, p. 191)[8] that Marx was making a very disparaging reference to the Conspiracy of Equals when he talked about the universal and crude asceticism that can be detected in the earliest proletarian demands after the French Revolution.[9]

2. It seems that Marx was never able to free himself from the Hegelian notion of history, according to which humanity goes through a succession of epochs in keeping with the sequence of development of the spirit, which aims at the perfect realization of universal reason. To the theory of his master Marx adds the theory of class struggle: even though men are only conscious of the social wars into which they are thrown by their economic hostilities, they unconsciously cooperate in an activity that only the metaphysician imagines.[10] This hypothesis of Sorel's is extremely rash, and he does not justify it, but it is clearly very dear to him, both because of its exaltation of Russia and because of its prediction of Italy's civil function. (Apropos of the juxtaposition of Russia-Italy, one should take note of D'Annunzio's behavior at about the same time. D'Annunzio's position, in fact, was published in the spring of 1920, although I do not think it is quite a publication but rather a manuscript that was circulated.[11] Was Sorel aware of D'Annunzio's attitude? Only Missiroli can provide an answer.) According to Sorel,

> Marx was so confident that history is subordinated to the laws of the development of the spirit that he taught that, after the fall of capitalism, the evolution toward *perfect communism* would come about without it

being provoked by class struggle (*Critique of the Gotha Program*). Marx seems to have believed, as Hegel did, that different moments of the evolution manifest themselves in different countries, each of which is particularly well suited for each of these moments. (See the preface of 21 January 1882 to a Russian translation of the *Manifesto*.) Marx never produced an explicit exposition of his theory; for this reason many Marxists are convinced that all the phases of capitalist evolution must occur in the same form among every modern people. These Marxists are not sufficiently Hegelian.[12]

3. The question: before or after 1848? Sorel does not understand the importance of this problem, and he refers to the "curious" change that took place in Marx's mind at the end of 1850. In March he had signed a manifesto of the rev.<olutionary>[a] refugees in London.[13] The manifesto outlined the program of rev. agitation that had to be undertaken in view of a new, impending social upheaval; Bernstein found it worthy as the first to come from club rev. (*Die Voraussetzungen*, etc. p. 51), whereas later he became convinced that the revol. generated by the crisis of 1847 came to an end with that crisis. Now the years following 1848 were years of unequaled prosperity; therefore, the first of the necessary conditions for the projected rev., namely, a prol. reduced to idleness and inclined to struggle, was missing (cf. Andler, *Manifesto*, I, pp. 55–56—but of which edition?). This gave rise to the notion among Marxists that poverty was on the rise, which should have helped scare the workers and induced them to struggle in anticipation of a probable deterioration even in conditions of prosperity (—an infantile explanation that is also contradicted by the facts, even though it is true that the theory of growing poverty was instrumentalized in this manner—but arbitrarily? I do not think so.)[14]

4. On Proudhon: "Proudhon belonged to the segment of the bourgeoisie that was closest to the prol.: hence the Marxists could accuse him of being bourgeois, while the wisest writers regard him as an admirable prototype of our (French) peasants and artisans (cf. Daniel Halévy in *Débats* of 3 January 1913)."[15] I think this is acceptable. From this point of view, Sorel also explains Proudhon's "legalism": "Because of their moderate resources, the peasants, the owners of the smallest factories, the small merchants are compelled to defend their interests fiercely at the law courts. A socialism that proposes to protect the groups on the lowest rungs of the economy is obviously bound to attach great importance to the *security of law*; such a disposition is especially strong among those writers who, like Proudhon, are full of memories of rural life."[16] Sorel also pro-

[a]Gramsci uses "rev." in place of Sorel's "communist." In the rest of this note, Gramsci employs the abbreviation "rev." or "revol." for "revolution," "revolutionary," etc. He also writes "prol." for "proletariat."

vides other arguments to bolster this analysis. The strange thing is that, in spite of being convinced that Proudhon had these social leanings, Sorel extols him and proposes him as a model or as a source of principles for the modern prol. Given the origins of Proudhon's legalistic inclinations, why should workers concern themselves with this issue? At this point, one gets the impression that Sorel's essay is mutilated and is actually missing a section on the Italian movement in the factories. From the published version it is possible to imagine that Sorel may have found an equivalent to the exigencies of the peasants as seen in Proudhon; he may have found this equivalent in the movement of internal commissions concerned with factory regulations and with the general internal "legislation" of the factory, which is entirely under the control of the sovereign and unchecked will of the entrepreneur. In its published form the essay is incoherent and incomplete; the conclusion about Italy ("For many reasons, and for a long time, I have assumed that today one has to turn to Italy for what a Hegelian would call the *Weltgeist*. Thanks to Italy the light of the new era will not be extinguished")[17] is completely unsupported; it is not even supported by references in Sorel's usual manner. The final note mentions the workers' and peasants' councils in Germany, "which I regarded as conforming to the spirit of Proudhon," and it refers the reader to *Matériaux d'une théorie du prolétariat* (pp. 164 and 394).[18] It would be interesting to know whether the essay has really been mutilated and by whom: whether by Missiroli himself or by others.

Sorel's postwar writings are of particular importance for the history of Western culture. Sorel attributes a whole series of institutions and ideological attitudes from this period to Proudhon's thought. What enabled Sorel to do this? Is his mode of assessment completely arbitrary? Since Sorel's acumen as a historian of ideas does not permit, as least for the most part, such arbitrariness, what cultural experiences did Sorel take for his point of departure? And is not all of this very important for a comprehensive evaluation of Sorel's work? From this point of view one should set Sorel beside De Man—but what a difference between the two! De Man entangles himself absurdly in the history of ideas and is dazzled by superficial appearances, but if Sorel were to be criticized, it would be for exactly the opposite reason: namely, for analyzing the substance of ideas much too minutely and for losing his sense of proportion. Sorel finds that postwar "facts" are of a Proudhonian nature; Croce finds that De Man marks a return to Proudhon,[19] but De Man typically fails to understand the postwar "facts" pointed out by Sorel. "Proudhonian," for Sorel, means "spontaneous" creation of the people, and "orthodox Marxist" means whatever is bureaucratic, because Sorel is always obsessively looking at the example of Germany, on the one hand, and literary Jacobinism on the other: the phenomenon of centralism-bureaucracy. De Man, in reality, remains a

pedantic specimen of the Belgian laborite bureaucracy: everything in him is pedantic, even enthusiasm. He thinks he made great discoveries because he repeats the description of empirical facts as if it were a scientific formula: a typical case of positivism that reduplicates the fact by first describing it and formulating it synthetically and then making the formulation of the fact into the law of the fact. For Sorel, as can be seen from this essay, what matters in Proudhon is the psychological orientation rather than the concrete practical attitude, about which, in fact, he makes no explicit statement. This psychological orientation consists in "mingling" with the popular sentiments springing concretely out of the real situation created for the people by the arrangement of the economic world; it consists in "lowering oneself" to the people in order to understand them and to give expression to them in a juridical, rational form. This or that interpretation and even the whole ensemble of interpretations may be wrong, or bizarre, or even ridiculous, but the general attitude produces the greatest number of positive results. De Man's attitude is different: he bends down toward the people not to understand them from a detached viewpoint but to "theorize" their sentiments, to construct pseudoscientific schemes but not to be in unison with them and derive juridical-educational principles ("scientific" laws in De Man—"juridical" expressions in Proudhon). [Cf. p. 78.][20]

Cf. Notebook 11, §66.

§<32>. *The* Popular Manual. In the *Popular Manual* it is said (I write "it is said" because the statement is not justified or weighed and does not express a fruitful concept; instead, it is casual and has no connection with what precedes or follows it) that every society is something more than the mere sum of its parts.[1] This observation should have been connected to another observation, by Engels, that quantity becomes quality, and it should have led to a concrete analysis of a characteristic feature of historical materialism: If every social aggregate is, in fact, something more than the sum of its parts, this means that the law explaining social aggregates is not a "physical law" in the strict sense of the term: in physics one does not leave the domain of quantity except metaphorically. In historical materialism, however, quality is closely connected to quantity; indeed, its most fruitful and original element resides in this connection. Idealism hypostatizes this "something"; it makes it into an entity unto itself, the spirit, just as religion had done with divinity. But if what religion and idealism produce is a "hypostasis"—that is, an arbitrary abstraction rather than a procedure of analytic distinction that is practically convenient for teaching purposes—then the "deification" of matter, etc., by vulgar mate-

rialism is also a "hypostasis." Compare this point of view to the conception of the state as it is expounded by the actual idealists;[2] the state ends up being precisely "this something" superior to individuals. For ex., a man of good sense who is called up by the army could respond by stating that they should take from him the "something" with which he contributes to the creation of the "total something" that is the state and that they should let him keep the concrete and material physical person. Remember the story of Saladin settling the dispute between the innkeeper who wants to be paid for the consumption of the [aromatic] fumes produced by his cooking and the beggar who refuses to pay: Saladin clinks[a] a coin and tells the innkeeper to pocket the sound just as the beggar ate the fumes.[3]

Cf. Notebook 11, §32.

§<33>. The passage from *knowing* to *understanding* to *feeling* and vice versa from feeling to understanding to knowing. The popular element "feels" but does not understand or know; the intellectual element "knows" but does not understand and, above all, does not feel. The two extremes, therefore, are pedantry and philistinism on the one hand and blind passion and sectarianism on the other. This does not mean that the pedant cannot be impassioned; not at all. Impassioned pedantry is just as ridiculous and dangerous as sectarianism or impassioned demagoguery. The error of the intellectual consists in believing that one can *know* without understanding and, above all, without feeling or being impassioned: in other words, that the intellectual can be an intellectual if he is distinct and detached from the people. One cannot make history-politics without passion, that is, without being emotionally tied to the people, without feeling the rudimentary passions of the people, understanding them, and hence explaining [and justifying] them in the specific historical situation and linking them dialectically to the laws of history, that is, to a scientifically elaborated superior conception of the world: namely, "knowledge." If the intellectual does not understand and does not feel, his relations with the people-masses are—or, are reduced to—purely bureaucratic, formal relations; the intellectuals become a caste or a priesthood (organic centralism). Only if the relationship between intellectuals and people-masses, between the leaders and the led, between the rulers and the ruled is based on an organic attachment in which impassioned sentiment becomes understanding and hence knowledge (not mechanically but in a living manner), only then is the relationship one of representation, and only then does one get an exchange of individual elements between the rulers and the ruled,

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci inserted "jingles" between the lines as a variant.

the leaders and the led; in other words, only then does a life of connectedness, which alone is a social force, become a reality, and the "historical bloc" come into being. *De Man* studies the sentiments of the people;[1] he does not empathize with them to guide them and lead them to a catharsis of modern civilization: his stance is that of the folklore scholar who is always afraid that modernity will destroy the object of his study. On the other hand, his book does reflect, pedantically, a real need: the need to get to know the sentiments of the people and not to regard them as something negligible and inert within the movement of history.

Cf. Notebook 11, §67.

§<34>. *Apropos of the appellation of "historical materialism."* Chapter XI of *I Bonaparte a Roma*—published in *Il Marzocco* of 2 October 1927—written by Diego Angeli and dedicated to Princess Charlotte Napoleon (daughter of King Joseph and wife of Napoleon III's brother, Napoléon-Louis, who died in the rebellion of 1831 in Romagna), reproduces the text of a letter from Pietro Giordani to Princess Charlotte in which Giordani writes down his personal reminiscences of Napoleon I.[1] In Bologna, Napoleon went to visit [in 1805] the "Institute" (the Bologna Academy) and talked at length with its scientists (among them, Volta). Among other things, he said, "I believe that when something new is discovered in the sciences, one must adopt an entirely new term for it so that the idea remains precise and clear. If you give new meaning to an old term—no matter how strongly you profess that the old idea attached to the term has nothing in common with the idea newly assigned to it—human minds can never be expected to refrain entirely from thinking that there is some resemblance or connection between the old idea and the new one. This confuses science and leads to useless controversies." Giordani's undated letter, according to Angeli, can be assumed to have been written in the spring of 1831 (which leads one to think that Giordani would have remembered the content of the conversation with Napoleon but not its exact form). [Check whether Giordani expounds his thoughts on this subject in his books on language.]

Cf. Notebook 11, §27.

§<35>. *On the origin of the concept of "ideology."* "Ideology" is an aspect of "sensationalism," that is, of eighteenth-century French materialism. It used to mean "science of ideas," and since analysis was the only method recognized and applied by science, it meant "analysis of ideas," that is, also, "search for the origin of ideas." Ideas had to be broken down

into their [original] "elements," which could be nothing other than "sensations": ideas come from sensations. But, without too much difficulty, sensationalism could go hand in hand with the deepest faith in the power of the spirit and its "immortal destinies"; thus Manzoni, even after his conversion and return to Catholicism, even when he was writing the *Inni sacri*, retained his general belief in sensationalism, until he became familiar with Rosmini's philosophy.[1]

As a literary propagator of ideology, Destutt de Tracy (1754–1836) among the most renowned and popular, because of the ease of his exposition. Cabanis (besides Condillac and Helvétius, who are more strictly philosophers), with his *Rapports du physique et du moral*. Link between Catholicism and Ideology: Manzoni-Cabanis-Bourget-Taine (Taine is the leading figure for Maurras and others with a Catholic orientation); the "psychological novel" (Stendhal and de Tracy, etc.). Destutt de Tracy's *Eléments d'idéologie* (Paris, 1817–18), more complete in the Italian translation, *Elementi di ideologia del conte Destutt de Tracy*, translated by Compagnoni; Milan: Stamperia di Giambattista Sonzogno, 1819.[2]

How did the meaning of "ideology" change from "science of ideas" and the search for the origin of ideas to "system of ideas"? In logical terms, the process is easy to understand, but how did it come about historically?

See whether De Man (and Freud) could be said to be the last of the "ideologues," which would make Croce's and the Croceans' "enthusiasm" for him even stranger if there were not a "political" explanation for it.[3] Examine how the *Popular Manual* remains trapped in Ideology[4] whereas Historical Materialism represents a distinct advance and historically is precisely in opposition to Ideology. Moreover, the meaning that Marx gave to the term "ideology" implicitly contains a value judgment and excludes the possibility that, for Marx, the origin of ideas should be searched for in sensations and therefore, in the final analysis, in physiology. This "ideology" itself should be analyzed historically, as a superstructure.

Cf. Notebook 11, §63.

§<36>. *Criteria of "literary" judgment*. A work may be valuable: (1) because it expounds a new discovery that advances a particular scientific activity. But absolute "originality" is not the only value. It is also possible: (2) that already known facts and arguments are chosen and arranged on the basis of a criterion that is more adequate than previous criteria. The structure (the order) of a scientific work can be "original." (3) Already known facts and arguments could have given rise to "new" considerations that are no less important for being subordinate.

Furthermore, a work must be judged according to the goals it sets itself: scientific creation and reorganization, or the dissemination of known facts

and arguments among a certain cultural group at a particular cultural level, etc. A "technique" of dissemination does exist, and if it does not exist, it needs to be created. Dissemination is a strictly practical act in which one must evaluate the appropriateness of the means (technique in the most general sense) to the end.

However, the study [and the evaluation] of the "original" fact or argumentation—or, rather, the "originality" of the facts (concepts—intersections of ideas) and arguments—is also very difficult and complicated and requires the most extensive historical knowledge. Cf. the chapter on Loria in Croce's *Materialismo storico*. Croce states: "It is one thing to put forth an incidental observation that is then dropped without development, and another thing to establish a principle whose fruitful consequences have been discerned; it is one thing to enunciate a general and abstract idea and quite another to think it in real and concrete terms; finally, it is one thing to invent and quite another to repeat at second or third hand."[1]

There are the extreme cases: those who find that there is never anything new under the sun and that even in the sphere of ideas the world is the same everywhere; and those who, to the contrary, find "originality" everywhere and claim that new saliva makes remastication original.

Cf. Notebook 23, §5.

§<37>. *Idealism-positivism. ["Objectivity" of knowledge.]* For Catholics: ". . . all idealist theory is based on the negation of the objectivity of everything we know and on the idealistic monism of 'Spirit' (which, qua monism, is equivalent to the positivistic monism of 'Matter'); according to this theory, then, the very foundation of religion, God, does not exist objectively outside of us but is rather a creation of the intellect. Thus idealism, no less than materialism, is radically opposed to religion" (Father Mario Barbera in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 1 June 1929).[1]

When dealing with the question of the "objectivity" of knowledge from the point of view of historical materialism, the point of departure should be the affirmation by M.<arx> (a well-known passage in the introduction to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*) that "men become conscious (of this conflict) on the ideological level" of juridical, political, religious, artistic, or philosophical forms.[2] But is this consciousness limited solely to the conflict between the material forces of production and the relations of production—as Marx's text literally states—or does it apply to all consciousness, that is, to all knowledge? This is the problem that can be worked out with the whole ensemble of the philosophical theory of the value of ideological superstructures. How is "monism" to be understood in this context? It is obviously neither ideal-

istic nor materialistic "monism," neither "Matter" nor "Spirit," but rather "*historical materialism*," that is to say, concrete human activity (history):[a] namely, activity concerning a certain organized "matter" (material forces of production) and the transformed "nature" of man. Philosophy of the act (praxis), not of the "pure act"[3] but rather of the "impure"—that is, the real—act, in the most secular sense of the word.

Cf. Notebook 11, §64.

§<38>. *Relations between structure and superstructures.* This is the crucial problem of historical materialism, in my view. Basics for finding one's bearings: (1) the principle that "no society sets itself tasks for the accomplishment of which the necessary and sufficient conditions do not already exist" [or are not in the course of emerging and developing]; and (2) that "no society perishes until it has first developed all the forms of life implicit in its internal relations" (check the exact wording of these principles).[1] Some rules of historical methodology can be derived from these principles. When studying a structure one must distinguish the permanent from the occasional. The occasional gives rise to political criticism, the permanent gives rise to sociohistorical criticism; the occasional helps one assess political groups and personalities, the permanent helps one assess large social groupings. The great importance of this distinction becomes clear when a historical period is studied. A crisis exists, sometimes lasting for decades. This means that incurable contradictions have come to light within the structure and that the political forces positively working to preserve the structure itself are nevertheless striving to heal these contradictions, within certain limits. These insistent and persistent efforts (since no social formation ever wants to admit that it has been superseded) form the terrain of the "occasional," wherein one gets the organization of those forces that "strive" to demonstrate (in the final analysis through their own triumph, but in immediate terms through ideological, religious, philosophical, political, juridical, etc., polemics) that "the necessary and sufficient conditions already exist to render the accomplishment of certain tasks historically possible and therefore obligatory."

A frequent error in historical analysis consists in the inability to find the relation between the "permanent" and the "occasional"; as a result, remote causes are presented as if they were the direct causes, or else direct causes are said to be the only efficient causes. On the one hand there is an excess of "economism,"[2] and on the other an excess of "ideologism"; one side overrates mechanical causes, and the other overrates the "voluntary"

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci inserted "spirit" between the lines, above "history."

and individual element. The dialectical nexus between the two types of inquiry is not established precisely. Obviously, if this is a serious error in historiography, it becomes even more serious in political journalism, where the issue is not the reconstruction of past history but the construction of present and future history. One's own desires take the place of impartial analysis, and this happens not as a "means" for stimulation but as self-deception: the snake bites the snake charmer; that is to say, the demagogue is the first victim of his own demagoguery.

These methodological criteria can acquire their full significance only if they are applied to the analysis of concrete historical studies. This might be usefully done for the events that took place in France between 1789 and 1870. I think that for greater clarity of exposition it is really necessary to grasp this period in its entirety. In fact, it was only in 1870–71, with the attempt of the Commune, that all the seeds that sprouted in 1789 were historically exhausted: that is, when the new class struggling for power defeated not only the representatives of the old society that refused to admit it had been definitively superseded but also the representatives of the latter-day groups who maintained that the new structure created by the 1789 revolution was itself superseded; thus the new class demonstrated its vitality in contrast to both the old and the very new.

Moreover, historians do not agree much (and it is impossible that they should) when it comes to establishing the limits of what is commonly known as the "French Revolution." For some (for ex., Salvemini),[3] the Revolution was completed at Valmy: France had created a new state and found the politico-military strength to assert and defend its territorial sovereignty. For others, the Revolution continues until Thermidor, and they even find it necessary to speak of several revolutions (10 August is regarded as a separate revolution, etc.): such is the case with Mathiez in his compendium published by Colin in its series.[4] There are others, however, for whom Napoleon, too, should be included in the Revolution and regarded as one of its protagonists, in which case, it is possible to end up in 1830, 1848, or 1870. There is some truth in all these points of view. In reality, the internal contradictions in the French social structure that took shape after 1789 were resolved, relatively speaking, only with the Third Republic, and France now has sixty years of stable political life after eighty years of progressively longer waves of upheaval: 1789–94, 1794–1815, 1815–30, 1830–48, 1848–70. It is precisely the careful study of these fluctuating "waves" of varying duration that makes it possible to determine the relations on the one hand between structure and superstructure and on the other between what one might call the permanent and the "occasional" elements of the structure. In the meantime, one might say that the dialectical mediation between the two principles of historical materialism mentioned at the beginning of this note is the concept of permanent revolution.

Another aspect of the same problem is the question of the relations of forces, as it is called. In these historical narratives one often reads the generic expression: favorable or unfavorable "relation of forces." Thus, abstractly, this expression explains nothing or almost nothing; commonly, the fact that needs to be explained is merely repeated, a tautology is produced. The theoretical error consists in presenting a principle of research and interpretation as a "historical cause." However, when using the expression "relation of forces" one must distinguish various moments or levels, of which three fundamental ones, I think, can be singled out:

1. There is a relation of social forces that is closely linked to the structure; this is an objective relation, a "naturalistic" fact that can be measured within the systems of the exact or mathematical sciences. The various social groups are formed on the basis of the level of development of the material forces of production, and each one of these groups represents a function and a position within production itself. This fundamental alignment of social forces makes it possible to examine whether the sufficient and necessary conditions exist in a society for its transformation; it makes it possible to check the degree of realism and feasibility of the various ideologies that are born on its own terrain, on the terrain of the contradictions to which it gave rise in the course of its development.

2. A subsequent moment is the political "relation of forces": that is, the assessment of the degree of homogeneity and self-consciousness attained by the various social groups. This "moment," in turn, can itself be divided into various moments corresponding to the different levels of political consciousness as they have manifested themselves in history up to now. The first and the most rudimentary is the primitive economic moment: a merchant feels himself in solidarity with another merchant, a manufacturer with another manufacturer, etc., but the merchant does not yet feel solidarity with the manufacturer; in other words, there is an awareness of the homogeneous unity of the professional group, but there is no such awareness yet of the social group. A second moment is the one in which there is an attainment of consciousness of the solidarity of interests among all the members of the social group—but still in the purely economic sphere. During this politico-economic phase, the question of the state is posed, but only in terms of rudimentary political equality: there is a claim of the right to participate in, modify, and reform administration and legislation within the existing general framework. A third moment is that in which one becomes conscious of the fact that one's own "corporate" interests, in their present and future development, go beyond the "corporate" confines—that is, they go beyond the confines of the economic group—and they can and must become the interests of other subordinate groups. This is the most patently "political" phase, which marks the clear-cut transition from the structure to complex superstructures; it

is the phase in which previously germinated ideologies come into contact and confrontation with one another, until only one of them—or, at least, a single combination of them—tends to prevail, to dominate, to spread across the entire field, bringing about, in addition to economic and political unity, intellectual and moral unity, not on a corporate but on a universal level: the hegemony of a fundamental social group over the subordinate groups. The state-government is seen as a group's own organism for creating the favorable terrain for the maximum expansion of the group itself. But this development and this expansion are also viewed concretely as universal; that is, they are viewed as being tied to the interests of the subordinate groups, as a development of unstable equilibriums between the interests of fundamental groups and the interests of the subordinate groups in which the interests of the fundamental group prevail—but only up to a certain point; that is, without going quite as far as corporate economic selfishness. In real history, these moments become entangled with one another, horizontally and vertically; that is, through economic activity (horizontally) and territory (vertically) combining and diverging in various ways. And each of these combinations may be represented by its own organized economic and political expression. It is also necessary to bear in mind that international relations become intertwined with these internal relations of a nation-state, and this, in turn, creates peculiar and historically concrete combinations. An ideology born in a highly developed country is disseminated in a less developed country and has an effect on the local interplay of combinations. (Religion, for example, has always been a source of such national-international ideological-political combinations, and, alongside religion, the other international formations, such as the "intellectuals" in general, Freemasonry, the Rotary Club, the Jews, and international diplomacy, which proposes or tries to impose political solutions in certain countries, etc. Religion, Freemasonry, Rotary, Jews may be included in the same general category of "intellectuals," whose main function, on an international scale, has been to mediate the extremes, to find compromises on the middle ground between the most extreme solutions.) This relation between international and national forces is further complicated by the fact that frequently within each nation there are a number of national territorial sectors with different structures and diverse relations of force at all levels (thus, in France, the Vendée was allied with international reactionary forces and represented them in the heart of French territorial unity; similarly, Lyons represented a node of particular relations, etc.).

3. The third moment is that of the "relation of military forces," which from time to time is immediately decisive. Historical development oscillates continually between the first and the third moment, with the mediation of the second. This third moment of the relation of forces is not

undifferentiated either, and it cannot be defined straightforwardly in a schematic form. I think that it is possible to distinguish two of its moments: the "military" moment in the strict technical sense of the word and what one might call the "politico-military" moment. In the course of European and world history these two moments have appeared in a number of different combinations. A typical example, which can serve as the ultimate illustration, is the relation that entails the military oppression of a nation—that is, when a militarily well-organized state oppresses the territories of another nation and subordinates the dominant social group of the nation it oppresses to the interests of its own dominant social group. In this case, too, the relation is not purely military but politico-military, and in the struggle for independence the forces of the oppressed nation should not be purely military but military and politico-military. Many observations on this issue are found in the notes already written on the Italian Risorgimento.[5] In the meantime, in the case of national oppression: if the oppressed nation had to delay launching its struggle for independence until the hegemonic state allowed it to organize its own military force in the strict and technical sense of the term, then it would be in for a long wait. Therefore, the oppressed nation will at first oppose the hegemonic military force with a force that is only "politico-military," namely, elements of political action that have consequences in the following sense: (1) they are capable of breaking down [internally] the military efficiency of the hegemonic nation; (2) they compel the hegemonic military force to spread itself out over a large territory, thus diluting its strength and canceling much of its effectiveness in waging war. In the notes on the Risorgimento, in fact, note has been taken of the absence of politico-military leadership, especially in the Action Party (through congenital incapacity) but also in the Piedmontese party both before and after 1848.[6] In the case of the latter, however, the reason was not congenital incapacity but "politico-economic neo-Malthusianism," in other words, the refusal even to hint at the possibility of agrarian reform and the refusal to convene a national constituent assembly; they wanted the Piedmontese monarchy to extend its reach over all of Italy and have it ratified only by regional plebiscites, without any conditions or limitations generated by the people.

Another question connected with the problem discussed under this rubric is the following: whether fundamental historical events are determined by economic malaise or by economic prosperity. It seems to me that a close analysis of European and world history would forbid any peremptory answer to this question along these lines; instead, it should lead one closer to a somewhat general answer of a political and intellectual rather than directly economic character. In his survey of the history of the French Revolution, Mathiez goes against vulgar traditional history and asserts that around 1789 the immediate economic situation was rather healthy, so

that one cannot say that the collapse of the existing equilibrium was due to a crisis of impoverishment (check Mathiez's exact statements).[7] Naturally, one must be specific; the state was in the throes of an extremely severe financial crisis, and the question was posed thus: which of the three estates should bear the sacrifices necessary for putting the finances of the state and the monarchy back in order? Furthermore, if the bourgeoisie was thriving, the situation was undoubtedly bad for artisans and workers and especially for the peasants, who were either serfs or else were subjected to other feudalistic exploitations and burdens. In any case, the equilibrium collapsed not because of the impoverishment of the social group that had an interest in breaking, and in fact did break, the equilibrium. Rather, it collapsed because of a larger conflict, a conflict of group "prestige," in a certain sense: because of the intensification of the group's own feeling of independence, etc. In short, the specific question of prosperity or economic malaise as cause of fundamental ruptures in the historical equilibrium is only a partial aspect of the question of the "relations of force" at different levels. A rupture can occur either because a prosperous situation is threatened or because the economic malaise has become unbearable and the old society seems bereft of any force capable of mitigating it. Therefore, one may say that these elements belong to the "occasional fluctuations" of the situations on whose terrain the social relation of forces becomes a political relation of force, culminating in the decisive military relation. If this process of development in the relation of forces from one moment to the next is missing, the situation remains inert, and various outcomes are possible: victory by the old society, which obtains for itself some "breathing space" by physically destroying the enemy's elite and terrorizing its reserves, or even reciprocal destruction of the conflicting forces and the establishment of a peace that is as quiet as a graveyard, under the watchful eye of a foreign guard.

There is a connection between this general issue and the question of so-called economism, which assumes various forms and presents itself in a variety of concrete ways. The category of economism includes the theoretical movement for free trade as well as theoretical syndicalism.[8] The significance of these two tendencies is very different. The former belongs to a dominant group, the latter to a subaltern group. The former speculates ignorantly (because of a theoretical error whose sophism is not hard to identify) on the distinction between political society and civil society and maintains that economic activity belongs to civil society and that political society must not intervene in its regulation. But, in reality, the distinction is purely methodological and not organic; in concrete historical life, political society and civil society are a single entity. Moreover, laissez-faire liberalism, too, must be introduced by law, through the intervention of political power: it is an act of will, not the spontaneous, automatic

expression of economic facts. The case of theoretical syndicalism is different because it has to do with a subaltern group that is prevented by this theory from ever becoming dominant: prevented, that is, from leaving behind the economic-corporate phase in order to advance to the phase of politico-intellectual hegemony in civil society and become dominant in political society. In the case of theoretical laissez-faire liberalism, a fraction of the dominant group wants to modify political society, it wants to reform the existing laws concerning commercial policy and, indirectly, those concerning industrial policy (it is undeniable that protectionism, especially in countries with a poor and restricted market, limits, at least partially, the freedom of industrial enterprise and favors the unhealthy creation of monopolies). This question has to do with the rotation in governmental power of different fractions from the same dominant group; it is not about the foundation and organization of a new political society, much less of a new type of civil society.[a]

In the case of theoretical syndicalism, the matter is more complicated: it is undeniable that in it, the independence and autonomy of the subaltern group that it claims to give voice to are in fact sacrificed to the intellectual hegemony of the dominant group, since theoretical syndicalism is an aspect of laissez-faire liberalism justified with some statements derived from historical materialism. Why and how does this "sacrifice" take place? It takes place because the transformation of the subordinate group into a dominant one is excluded, either by not raising the issue at all (Fabianism, De Man,[9] an important segment of the labor movement), or by raising it in an incongruous and ineffective form (social democracy), or by asserting that one can jump directly from a social system of group divisions to a society of perfect equality (theoretical syndicalism in the strict sense). The attitude of economism toward political will, action, and initiative is, to say the least, strange: as if these were not themselves an expression, and even the effective expression of the economy. It is likewise strange that posing concretely the question of hegemony should be interpreted as something that subordinates the hegemonic group. Obviously, the fact of hegemony presupposes that the interests and tendencies of those groups over whom hegemony is exercised have been taken into account and that a certain equilibrium is established. It presupposes, in other words, that the hegemonic group should make sacrifices of an economic-corporate kind; these sacrifices, however, cannot touch the essential; since hegemony is political but also and above all economic, it has its material base in the decisive function exercised by the hegemonic group in the decisive core of economic activity.

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci wrote "political society." The general drift of the argument and the second version of the passage (i.e., the C text; see Notebook 13, §18) indicate that this was a slip of the pen and that he meant to write "civil society."

Economism manifests itself in many other forms besides theoretical laissez-faire and theoretical syndicalism. Economism embraces all forms of electoral abstentionism (for example, the abstentionism of the Italian clericals from 1870 to 1919, which grew weaker and weaker after 1900 until it disappeared completely),[10] and these forms can be extremely diverse, so that there can be 50 percent abstentionism, 25 percent abstentionism, etc. Economism is not always opposed to [political] action and to the political party, although the latter is seen as an educational organism similar to the trade union. So-called intransigence is a form of economism: hence the formula "the worse it gets, the better, etc."

Another point of reference for understanding the relations between structure and superstructure is found in *The Poverty of Philosophy*, where it says that an important phase in the development of a social group born on the terrain of industry is the phase in which the individual members of an economic-corporate organization no longer struggle solely for their own corporate economic interests but for the development of the organization itself, per se. (Check the exact formulation in *The Poverty of Philosophy*,[11] which contains fundamental statements concerning the relationship between the structure and the superstructures and concerning the concept of dialectics specific to historical materialism. From a theoretical point of view, *The Poverty of Philosophy* can be seen as the application and development of the *Theses on Feuerbach*, whereas *The Holy Family* is an intermediate and still vague phase, as one can see from the passages referring to Proudhon and especially to French materialism.[12] Besides, the passage on French materialism is more of a foray into the history of culture than a theoretical passage, as it has been most often interpreted, and as "history of culture" it is admirable and definitive.) In this context, one should recall Engels's statement (in the two letters on historical materialism that have also been published in Italian)[13] that the economy is "in the final analysis" the mainspring of history; this statement is directly connected to the well-known passage in the preface to the *Critique of Political Economy* that says that it is on the terrain of ideologies that men "become conscious" of the conflict between form and content in the world of production.[14] This connection must be recalled when dealing with the thesis, proposed in various notes in different notebooks,[15] that in the modern period historical materialism is more widespread than it is perceived to be; however, it manifests itself in the form of "historical economism"[16] (in this respect, the new name used by Loria to define his nebulous theories is correct, and it can be said that the historical materialism that I believe to be more widespread than people generally think is Loria's version of it and not Marx's original version). This interpretation is connected to the methodological error (which I mentioned earlier) of failing to draw a distinction between what is "relatively permanent" and what is an "occasional fluc-

tuation" when analyzing economic situations and social structures, a distinction that, to a certain extent, corresponds to the distinction between state and government, between strategy and tactics. Some aspects of "historical economism" are: (1) the doctrine that reduces economic development to changes in technical instruments, whereas Marx always talks about "material forces of production" in general and also includes the "physical power" of humans among these forces (Loria has produced a most brilliant display of this doctrine in his article on the social influence of the airplane in *Rassegna Contemporanea* of 1912);[17] (2) the doctrine according to which economic and historical development is directly dependent on changes in some important factor of production, brought about by the introduction of a new fuel that requires the application of new methods [in the construction and operation] of mechanical instruments. (For example, petroleum; on this topic, see Antonio Laviosa's article on petroleum in *Nuova Antologia* of 1929,[18] which points out the changes in the construction of transportation and especially military vehicles brought about by the widespread availability of oil and gasoline but exaggerates the political consequences arising out of this: it talks about an era of petroleum in contrast to an era of coal, etc. Someone else would have written the same thing about electricity, etc. To be sure, these discoveries of new fuels and new sources of energy are historically important because they can change the relative stature of nations, but they do not determine the movement of history.) Frequently, people attack historical economism in the belief that they are attacking historical materialism. Such is the case, for instance, with an article in the Parisian periodical *Avenir* of 10 October 1930 (reproduced in *Rassegna Settimanale della Stampa Estera*, 21 October 1930, pp. 2303–4):

> We have been told for a long time, but especially since the war, that questions of self-interest control nations and move the world forward. This thesis was invented by the Marxists, under the somewhat doctrinaire name of "historical materialism." In pure Marxism, humans as a mass obey economic necessity, not their passions. Politics are a passion. Patriotism is a passion. The role played in history by these two exigent passions is said to be merely a mirage, because in reality the life of nations over the centuries is to be explained by a changing and constantly renewed interplay of material causes. Economics is everything. Many "bourgeois" philosophers and economists have been repeating this refrain. They haughtily take it on themselves to explain high international politics to us by the movements in the price of grain, oil, or rubber. They use their ingenuity to prove to us that diplomacy is entirely governed by questions of customs tariffs and cost prices. These explanations enjoy great favor. They seem to be somewhat scientific, and they emanate from a sort of superior skepticism that would like to pass for

> supreme elegance. Passion in foreign policy? Sentiments in national affairs? Come on! This is the stuff one feeds the common people. The great minds, those with experience, know that everything is governed by debit and credit. Now this is an absolute pseudotruth. It is completely untrue that peoples do not allow any other consideration besides self-interest to guide them, and it is completely true that, more than ever, they follow their sentiments. Historical materialism is really nonsense. Nations respond, above all, to considerations dictated by a desire for, and an ardent belief in, prestige. Whoever fails to understand this, understands nothing.[19]

The rest of the article (entitled "La mania del prestigio") uses German and Italian politics to illustrate what is meant by a politics of "prestige" that is not dictated by material interests. The passage is interesting, and if an essay were to be composed it should be analyzed in detail: it opposes exaggerated "historical economism" of the Lorian sort. The author does not know modern philosophy, and furthermore he does not understand that "passions" are, precisely, economic facts.

Once it degenerates into historical economism, historical materialism loses much of its potential for cultural growth among intelligent persons, however much it may gain among lazy intellectuals, among those who always want to give the impression of being very clever, etc. As Engels wrote, it makes many people believe that they can have, at little cost and with no effort, all of history and all political wisdom in their pockets.[20] It is forgotten that Marx's thesis—that men become conscious of fundamental conflicts on the terrain of ideology—has an organic value; it is an epistemological rather than a psychological or moral thesis. This forgetting results in a frame of mind that looks on politics and all of history as a *marché de dupes*, a matter of conjuring tricks and sleight of hand. All cultural activity is thus reduced to "exposing" tricks, provoking scandals, and prying into the private affairs of political figures. Obviously, the errors of interpretation have been gross at times, and as a result they have had a negative effect on the prestige of the original theory. For this reason, economism must be fought not only in the theory of historiography but also in the theory and practice of politics. In the latter case, the struggle should be conducted on the terrain of the concept of hegemony, in the same way it was conducted on the practical level in the development of the theory of the political party[21] and in the practical development of the life of certain political parties.

It is possible to produce a historical study [on the judgments that have been pronounced] on the development of certain political parties. The Boulangist movement (from 1886 to 1890, approximately)[22] or even, per-

haps, Napoleon III's coup d'état of 2 December[23] could be used as an archetype. One might find that the stereotyped reasoning of historical economism is usually very simplistic: Who profits *directly*? A certain fraction of the dominant group—and, lest there be any mistake, the fraction that is picked is the one that, in keeping with a general theory, has an obvious progressive function. As a historical judgment this is almost infallible because, in reality, if the given political movement attains power, the progressive fraction of the dominant group will *in the final analysis* end up controlling it and making of it an instrument for turning the state apparatus to its own benefit. I say *almost* infallible for a reason: interpretation is [only] a possible and perhaps even probable historical hypothesis, [but] when it comes to political judgment it acquires a moralistic tinge. Herein lies the theoretical and practical error. When movement of the kind we are talking about is formed, the analysis should be conducted along the following lines: (1) the social content of the movement; (2) the demands that are laid down by the leaders and that gain consent within particular social strata; (3) the objective needs that such demands reflect; (4) an examination of how the means that are employed correspond to the proposed goal; and (5) only in the final analysis does one put forward the hypothesis—presented in political not moralistic terms—that such a movement will necessarily be perverted and will serve goals that are quite different from what the masses of followers have in mind. Instead, this hypothesis is asserted in advance when no concrete element (by which I mean something that appears as real evidence and is not the product of [esoteric] "scientific" analysis) yet exists to support it, and this makes the hypothesis seem like a moral accusation of duplicity, bad faith, etc., or of naïveté and stupidity. Politics becomes a series of personal affairs. Naturally, until these movements have attained power, it always possible to think that they are failing, and some of them, in fact, have failed (Boulangism itself—Valois-Gajda):[24] the study must therefore be aimed at discovering their innermost strengths and weaknesses. The "economistic" hypothesis does nothing other than merely state that there is an element of strength: the availability of some direct or indirect financial support (a newspaper endorsing the movement constitutes indirect financial support). This is most inadequate. As I have said, the study must therefore be conducted within the ambit of the concept of hegemony.

In view of what was stated above—namely, that the value of Marx's assertion—that men become conscious of economic conflicts on the terrain of ideology—is epistemological and not psychological or moral; it follows that the value of the concept of hegemony, too, is epistemological. This concept, then, should be regarded as Ilyich's[25] greatest contribution to Marxist philosophy, to historical materialism: an original and creative contribution. In this respect, Ilyich advanced Marxism not only in politi-

cal theory and economics but also in philosophy (that is, by advancing political theory, he also advanced philosophy).

Cf. Notebook 13, §17 and §18; Notebook 10, II, §12.

§<39>. *On the* Popular Manual. A systematic treatment of historical materialism cannot ignore any of the constituent parts of Marxism. But in what sense? It should deal with the general philosophical part in its entirety, and furthermore it should also be a theory of history, a theory of philosophy, a theory of economics. This has to be done in the form of a general outline that must concretely assume a living, not a schematic form. It will be said: Isn't historical materialism specifically a theory of history? This is true, but politics and economics cannot be separated from history, even in the specialized areas of the science-art of politics and economic science. In other words: after having <completed the main task>[1] in the general philosophical part—which is really and truly historical materialism, wherein the general concepts of history, politics, and economics are tied together in an organic unity—it would be useful, in a popular manual, to provide a general idea of each constituent part insofar as it is an independent and distinct science. This means that after having studied the general philosophy [namely, the organic nexus of history-philosophy-economics] one would study how history and politics are reflected in economics, how economics and politics are reflected in history, how history and economics are reflected in politics.

Cf. Notebook 11, §33.

§<40>. *Philosophy and ideology*. As a philosophy, historical materialism asserts theoretically that every "truth" thought to be eternal and absolute has practical origins and has represented or represents a provisional value. But the difficulty lies in making people understand what it means "in practice" to interpret historical materialism itself in this light. Such an interpretation is foreshadowed by Engels when he talks about a transition from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom.[1] Absolute idealism, or at least certain aspects of it, would be a philosophical utopia in the realm of necessity but could become "truth" after the transition from one realm to the other. As long as society is divided into groups, one cannot talk of the "spirit" without necessarily concluding that one is dealing with the "spirit" of a particular group. (This is implicitly recognized when, following in Schopenhauer's footsteps, it is said—as Gentile does in his book *Modernismo*—that religion is the philosophy of the multitude, whereas philosophy is the religion of the elect: that is, of the great

intellectuals.][2] But it will be possible to talk of "spirit" once society has been unified.

In practice, as I was saying, even historical materialism tends to become an ideology in the pejorative sense: that is, an absolute and eternal truth. This happens especially when, as in the *Popular Manual,* historical materialism is confused with vulgar materialism or with the metaphysics of "matter," which is bound to be eternal and absolute.

Along these lines, it is necessary to elaborate Engels's statement on the transition from necessity to freedom: obviously, this transition occurs among men not in nature (even though it will have certain effects on the way nature is perceived and on scientific views), hence it is not possible to talk about the natural history of mankind and to compare human events with natural events, other than metaphorically.

Cf. Notebook 11, §62.

§<41>. *Science.* Definitions of science: (1) The study of phenomena and of their laws of resemblance (regularity), coexistence (coordination), and succession (causality). (2) Another approach takes into account the most convenient set of relations that science establishes among phenomena in order to be better able to exercise mastery of thought over the phenomena and control them for the purposes of action; in this case, science is defined as the most economical description of reality.

The most important question concerning science is the question of the objective existence of reality. As far as common sense is concerned, the question does not even exist. But what is it that provides common sense with such certitude? It is essentially religion (at least Western religions, above all Christianity): it is therefore an ideology, the most widespread and deeply rooted ideology. I believe it is a mistake to demand that science as such prove the objectivity of the real; that is a conception of the world, a philosophy, not a scientific datum. What can science provide along these lines? Science makes a selection from among sense perceptions, from among the most basic elements of knowledge; it regards certain sensations as fleeting, illusory, and deceptive because they depend solely on special individual circumstances, and it regards other sensations as lasting, permanent, and transcending special individual conditions. Scientific work has two facets: one is tirelessly rectifying the method of knowledge, and it rectifies or reinforces the organs of sensation; the other applies this method and these increasingly refined organs in order to establish what is fundamentally present in the sensations as opposed to what is arbitrary and transitory. Thus one establishes what is common to all humans, what all humans can see and feel in the same manner, provided that they adhere to the scientific conditions of verification. Insofar as this objectivity is

established, it is affirmed. What is affirmed is being in itself, permanent being, the being that is common to all humans, being that is independent of all merely particular viewpoints. But this, too, is a conception of the world; it is an ideology.

Historical materialism accepts this point of view and not that of common sense, which nevertheless is materially the same. Common sense affirms the objectivity of the real in that this objectivity was created by God; it is therefore an expression of the religious conception of the world. Moreover, in its account of this objectivity, common sense commits the grossest errors—for the most part it is at the stage of Ptolemaic astronomy, it is unable to establish the real connections between cause and effects, etc.—in other words it is not, in fact, really "objective" because it cannot conceive of objective "truth." For common sense, it is "true" that the world stands still while the sun and the whole firmament turn around it, etc. Yet it makes the philosophical affirmation of the objectivity of the real. But what about all that science affirms to be "objectively true"? Definitively? Is not all this, rather, a struggle for knowledge of the objectivity of the real; for an increasingly refined rectification of the methods of inquiry, of the organs of observation, and of the logical instruments of selection and discrimination? If this is the case, then what matters most is not the objectivity of the real but the human being who elaborates these methods, these material instruments that rectify the sensory organs, these logical instruments of discrimination—in other words, culture, the conception of the world, the relation between man and reality. Thus to look for reality outside of man appears to be a paradox, just as for religion it is a paradox [sin]to look for it outside of God.

I remember a statement by Bertrand Russell: one can imagine on earth, even in the absence of man, not Glasgow or London but two points on the surface of the earth, one of which is farther north and the other farther south (or something similar; it is to be found in a short philosophical work by Russell, translated as part of the small scientific series published by Sonzogno).[1] But, in the absence of man, what would be the meaning of north and south, and "point," and "surface," and "earth"? Aren't these words necessarily linked to man, his needs, his life, his activity? In the absence of human activity, which creates all values, including scientific values, what would "objectivity" be? Chaos, or nothingness, emptiness—if one can even say this much, for if one were really to imagine that man did not exist, it would be impossible to imagine language and thought. In historical materialism thought cannot be separated from being, man from nature, activity (history) from matter, subject from object: such a separation would be a fall into empty talk, meaningless abstraction.

Cf. Notebook 11, §37.

§<42>. *Giovanni Vailati and scientific language.* Several times I have referred to the passage in *The Holy Family* where Marx shows how the French political language used by Proudhon corresponds to and can be translated into the language of classical German philosophy.[1] This statement, it seemed to me, is very important for understanding the innermost value of historical materialism, for finding the way to resolve many apparent contradictions in the unfolding of history, and for responding to certain superficial objections to this theory of historiography. The September–October 1932 issue of *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia, Politica* published an open letter from Luigi Einaudi to Rodolfo Benini ("Se esista, storicamente, la pretesa repugnanza degli economisti verso il concetto dello Stato produttore");[2] a note on p. 303 reads as follows:

> If I possessed that marvelous skill, in which my late lamented friend Vailati excelled,[3] of translating any theory from the language of geometry to that of algebra, from the language of hedonism to that of Kantian ethics, from the normative terminology of pure economics to preceptive terminology of applied economics, then I would be able to retranslate the passage by Spirito into your mode of formulation,[4] that is, into the discourse of classical economics. It would be a fruitful exercise, similar to the ones described by Loria who performed them in his youth:[5] namely, the exercise of making successive presentations of a given economic theory, first in the language of Adam Smith, and then in the language of Ricardo, and after that in the language of Marx, of Stuart Mill, and of Cairnes. But, once completed, these exercises end up being deposited in the drawer, which is what Loria did with his. They serve to teach every one of us to be humble when we are momentarily under the illusion that we have perceived something new. For if this new insight could have been stated in the words of the old masters and included within the framework of their thought, then, it is a sign that the new thing was already contained in their thought. But this neither could nor should prevent each generation from using the language that is best suited to its way of thinking and of understanding the world. History is rewritten; why shouldn't economic science be rewritten, first in terms of costs of production, then in terms of utility, and after that in terms of static equilibrium, and then in terms of dynamic equilibrium?

Einaudi's "methodological" intentions are much more circumscribed than those that are implicit in Marx's statement, but they belong to the same set. Einaudi reattaches himself to the current represented by the Italian pragmatists and by Vilfredo Pareto, a current that found its expression, in some sense, in Prezzolini's booklet *Il linguaggio come causa di*

errore.[6] Einaudi wants to give Spirito a lesson in modesty. Very often, in Spirito, the novelty of ideas, of methods, and of the formulation of issues is purely and simply a matter of terminology and words. But, as I was saying, this is the ground level of the problem that is implicit, in all its dimensions, in the passage by Marx. Just as two individuals produced by the same basic culture believe that their opinions differ simply because they use different terminologies, so also in the international sphere, two cultures, expressions of two fundamentally similar civilizations, believe that they are antagonistic, different, each one superior to the other, because they use different ideological, philosophical terms or because one has a more strictly practical, political character (France) while the other is more philosophical, doctrinal, theoretical. In reality, to the historian, they are *interchangeable*: each one is reducible to the other; they are mutually translatable.

To be sure, this "translatability" is not perfect in all details (including important ones); but "deep down" it is. One is really superior to the other, but not always in the way that their representatives and anointed fanatics believe. If it were not so, real progress would not take place, for progress also occurs through "national" thrusts.

In the contemporary world, Gentile's philosophy, more than any other, makes an issue out of "words" and "terminology" and puts forward every grammatical change of expression as a new "creation." Therefore Einaudi's brief note is an extremely poisonous arrow against Spirito, and Spirito's own brief note circles around it in exasperation.[7] (In this note, however, I do not want to deal with the merits of the case in the polemic.) I just want to point out the need to study this aspect of Italian pragmatism (above all, in Vailati) and of Pareto concerning scientific language.

Cf. Notebook 11, §48.

§<43>. *The "objectivity of the real" and Prof. Lukács* (cf. earlier note, "Science," on p. 75).[1] Prof. Lukács' position vis-à-vis historical materialism should be studied. Lukács (whose theories I only know very vaguely), I believe, asserts that one can speak of the dialectic only with regard to human history and not with regard to nature.[2] He might be wrong and he might be right. If his assertion presupposes a dualism between man and nature, he is wrong because he falls into a conception of nature that belongs to religion and also to idealism, a conception that, in reality, fails to unify and relate man to nature, except verbally. But if human history is also, through the history of science, the history of nature, then how can the dialectic be separated from nature? I think that Lukács, displeased with the theories of the *Popular Manual*,[3] may have fallen into the oppo-

site error. Every time historical materialism is converted into or equated with vulgar materialism, the opposite error is bound to occur: namely, the conversion of historical materialism into idealism or even into religion.

Cf. Notebook 11, §34.

§<44>. *Sorel.* In an article on Clemenceau published in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 December 1929 and in another article published in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 15 December (the former signed "Spectator" and the latter signed with name and surname),[1] Mario Missiroli publishes two important passages from letters sent to him by Sorel concerning Clemenceau: "He (Clemenceau) considers the philosophy of Marx, which constitutes the basic framework of contemporary socialism, to be an obscure theory befitting the barbarians of Germany; this is how it has always appeared to quick and brilliant minds who are used to facile interpretations. Lightweight minds like his fail to understand what Renan understood so well, namely, that things of great historical value may appear alongside literary productions of obvious mediocrity—as mediocre, in fact, as the socialist literature that is offered to the people."

I think that if Clemenceau, for a long time, had a low opinion of socialism, he must have had an even lower opinion of it when he saw Jaurès become the idol of the socialist parties. Jaurès's eloquent oratory embittered him. In his "extreme lightness"—the characterization is Joseph Reinach's—he deemed socialism incapable of containing anything serious since a university professor, a recognized leader of the new doctrine, could find nothing but hot air in it. He did not care to know whether the masses, once they became upset by the vacuous declamations of the people in command, were capable of finding in their own midst leaders who could guide them in directions unthought of by the chiefs of democracy. Clemenceau does not believe in the existence of a class that works hard to form its own consciousness of a great historical mission that has to be fulfilled, a mission whose goal is the total renewal of our civilization. He believes that the duty of democracies is to come to the aid of the disinherited who assure the production of material wealth, which no one can do without. During difficult times an intelligent power must enact laws that burden the rich with sacrifices that are meant to save national solidarity. A well-ordered evolution that leads to a relatively pleasant life: this is all that people would demand in the name of science if they had good mentors. In his view, the socialists are bad shepherds when they introduce the idea of revolution into the politics of a democratic country. Like all men of his generation, Clemenceau has preserved a vivid memory of the Commune. I firmly believe that he has still not forgiven

the people of Paris for the brutality with which the rebellious national guards chased him out of the Commune of Montmartre.

The two passages are printed as an organic whole in *Nuova Antologia*; in *L'Italia Letteraria* they are distinct: between the first and the second passage Missiroli writes, "And elsewhere," which makes it stylistically easier to understand the context.[2]

[Sorel.] The two passages further reinforce the idea that Sorel needs to be reexamined in order to select what is most fundamental and perdurable in him underneath the parasitic encrustations deposited on his thought by admiring dilettantes and intellectuals. One must bear in mind that the intellectual and moral "austerity" and seriousness of Sorel have been somewhat exaggerated. His correspondence with Croce reveals that he was not always able to overcome the promptings of a certain vanity. This comes out in the very awkward tone of the letter in which he wants to explain to Croce his (albeit Platonic) membership in Valois's "Proudhon Circle" and his flirtations with youthful members of the monarchist and clerical tendency.[3] Furthermore, there was a certain dilettantism in Sorel's "political" attitudes, which were never purely political but rather "cultural-political," "intellectual-political," "au dessus de la mêlée." Some of the accusations contained in the pamphlet of a disciple of his, *Les méfaits des intellectuels*, could also be directed against him.[4] He himself was a "pure" intellectual, and therefore it is necessary to conduct a careful analysis of his work to separate what is superficial, clever, incidental, and bound to the contingencies of extemporaneous polemics from what is "meaty" and substantial and, thus characterized, let him take his place within the ambit of modern culture.

Cf. Notebook 10, II, §41 (xiii), and Notebook 11, §66.

§<45>. *Structure and superstructures.* That historical materialism conceives of itself as a transitory phase in philosophical thought should be clear from Engels's assertion that historical development will, at a certain point, be characterized by the transition from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom.[1] All hitherto-existing philosophy has been the product and the expression of the inner contradictions of society. But no philosophical system, taken separately, is the conscious expression of these contradictions, since this expression can only be provided by the ensemble of philosophical systems. Every philosopher is, and cannot but be, convinced that he expresses the unity of the human spirit, that is, the unity of history and nature. Otherwise, men would not act, they would not create

new history; in other words, philosophies could not become "ideologies," they could not, in practice, acquire the fanatical granite solidity of "popular beliefs," which have the equivalence of "material forces."[2] In the history of philosophical thought, Hegel plays a separate role, because in his system, in one way or another, even if only in the form of a "philosophical romance," it is possible to understand what reality is; in other words, in a single system and in a single philosopher one gets that consciousness of contradictions that previously could be obtained only from the ensemble of systems, from the ensemble of philosophers struggling with and contradicting each other. In a certain sense, then, historical materialism is a reform and a development of Hegelianism: it is philosophy freed from every unilateral and fanatical ideological element; it is the full consciousness of contradictions, the consciousness wherein the philosopher himself, understood both as an individual and as a social group, not only understands contradictions but posits himself as an element of the contradiction and raises this element to a principle of politics and action. "Man in general" is negated, and all immutably "unitary" concepts are derided and destroyed insofar as they express the concept of "man in general" or of "human nature" immanent in every man. But even historical materialism is an expression of historical contradictions; indeed, it is the perfect, complete expression of such contradictions: it is therefore an expression of necessity and not of freedom, which does not and cannot exist. However, if it is demonstrated that contradictions will disappear, then it is implicitly demonstrated that historical materialism, too, will disappear and that the realm of necessity will give way to the realm of freedom, that is, to a period in which "thought" or ideas are no longer born on the terrain of contradictions. The philosopher today can affirm this, but he can go no further: in fact, he cannot evade the present terrain of contradictions; he cannot affirm—other than generically—a world free of contradictions without immediately creating a utopia. This does not mean that utopia is devoid of philosophical value, for it has a political value, and every politics is implicitly a philosophy. Religion is the most "colossal" utopia—that is, the most "colossal" metaphysics—history has ever known; it is the most grandiose attempt to reconcile, in mythological form, the contradictions of history. It really affirms that humans have the same "nature," that there is such a thing as man in general; that man is created in the likeness of God and is therefore the brother of other men, equal to other men, and free among other men; and that he can conceive himself as such, mirrored in God, the "self-consciousness" of humanity—but it also affirms that all of this pertains not to this world but to another (utopia). In the meantime, however, ideas of equality, liberty, and fraternity ferment among men—men who are not equal, nor brothers of other men, and who do not see themselves as free among other men. And what

happens in the course of history is that every general agitation of the multitude gives rise to these demands in one way or another, in particular forms and with particular ideologies. At this point, an element brought forward by Ilyich comes in: the April 1917 program, in the section that discusses the common school—to be exact, in its brief explanatory note (I am referring to the Geneva edition of 1918)—asserts that the chemist and pedagogist Lavoisier, guillotined during the Terror, had supported the concept of the common school and had done so in keeping with the popular sentiments of his time, which saw in the democratic movement of 1789 not an ideology but a developing reality from which they drew concrete egalitarian consequences.[3] In Lavoisier this is a utopian feature (a feature that shows up more or less in all cultural currents that presuppose the oneness of human nature; cf. B. Croce in a chapter of *Cultura e vita morale* where he quotes a sentence in Latin from a German dissertation that states that, among the sciences, philosophy is the most democratic because its object is the faculty of reasoning, which is shared by all men—or something of the sort),[4] but Ilyich employs it as a demonstrative, theoretical feature of a political principle.

Cf. Notebook 11, §62.

§<46>. *Philosophy—politics—economics*. If these are constitutive elements of a single conception of the world, there must necessarily be, in the theoretical principles, convertibility from one to the others, a reciprocal translation into the specific language of each constitutive part: each element is implicit in the others and all of them together form a homogeneous circle (cf. the earlier note on "Giovanni Vailati and scientific language").[1] For the historian of culture and of ideas, this proposition leads to some very important principles of research and criticism:

A great personality may happen to express his most creative thought not in what would seem to be, from an external classificatory point of view, the most "logical" context but in another place where it would appear to be extraneous (Croce, I believe, has made this critical observation quite often in different places). A politician writes about philosophy; it could be that one should look for his "true" philosophy in his political writings instead. In every personality there is one dominant and predominant activity; it is in this activity that one must look for his thought, which, in most cases, is *implicit* and sometimes in contradiction with what is stated *ex professo*. To be sure, this criterion of historical judgment entails many pitfalls of dilettantism, and it must be applied with great caution, but that does not negate the fact that the criterion is pregnant with truth.

It is really very difficult for the occasional "philosopher" to know how to make abstractions from the prevailing currents of his time or from interpretations of a certain conception of the world that have become dogmatic, etc. On the other hand, however, as a political scientist, he feels himself free from the *idols* of the age; he deals with the same conception of the world more directly; he penetrates it to the core and develops it in an original way. Still useful and stimulating, in this regard, is the thought expressed by Rosa about the impossibility of dealing with certain questions of historical materialism insofar as they have not yet become *actual* for the course of history in general or for the history of a particular social group.[2] The corporate phase, the phase of hegemony (or struggle for hegemony) in civil society, and the phase of state power have corresponding specific intellectual activities that cannot be improvised arbitrarily. The science of politics is developed in the phase of struggle for hegemony; in the phase of state power, all the superstructures must be developed, or else the state will fall apart.

Cf. Notebook 11, §65.

§<47>. *The objectivity of the real and Engels.* At a certain point (in the *Anti-Dühring*, I believe) Engels asserts, more or less, that the objectivity of the physical world is proven by the successive studies of scientists (cf. the exact text).[1] In my view, this assertion by Engels should be analyzed and rendered more precise. Does science mean theoretical activity or the practical-experimental activity of scientists? I think that it should be taken to mean the latter and that Engels wanted to affirm the typical way in which the unitary process of the real is established: namely, by means of practical activity, which is the dialectical mediation between man and nature, the elementary "historical" cell. Engels is referring to the revolution that the rise of the experimental method brought about in the scientific world in general as well as in practical activity: the rise of the experimental method that really separates two historical worlds and that initiates the dissolution of theology and metaphysics and the birth of modern thought, of which historical materialism is the final and perfected philosophical expression. The scientific "experience" is the first cell of the new method of work, of the new form of active union between man and nature: the scientist-experimenter is a "worker," an industrial and agricultural producer—he is not pure mind—he is also, or rather he is the first instance of, a man whom the historical process has freed from the position of walking on his head in order to let him walk on his feet.

Cf. Notebook 11, §34.

§<48>. *Henri De Man's book*. The article "Per la pace sociale" (by Fr. Brucculeri), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 7 September 1929, which discusses the famous arbitration decision pronounced by the Congregation of the Council on the conflict between Catholic workers and industrialists in the Roubaix-Tourcoing region, contains the following passage: "Marxism—as De Man has shown in his finest pages—is a current that has been turning the contemporary working world to materialism."[1] In other words, all of De Man's pages are fine, but some of them are finer yet. (This may explain why Giuseppe Prezzolini, referring to Philip's book on the "American workers' movement" in *Pègaso* of September[a] 1930, characterizes Philip as a "Christian democrat" even though nothing in the book suggests this.)[2]

A very long-winded essay on De Man's book has been published in the *Civiltà Cattolica* issues of 5 October and 16 November 1929.[3] De Man's work is considered "notwithstanding its shortcomings, the most important and, we would go so far as to say, the most brilliant thus far in the body of anti-Marxist literature."[4] Toward the end of the essay there is the following "overall impression":

> Although the author (De Man) has overcome a crisis of thought by repudiating Marxism with a magnanimous gesture, he nonetheless wavers, and his intelligence, thirsting for truth, is not fully satisfied. He struggles on the threshold of truth, he picks up some rays, but he does not push himself forward to plunge into the light. —It is our wish that De Man, having reached the end of his crisis, will be able to rise, like the great bishop of Tagaste (Augustine), from the reflection of the divine, which is the moral law of the soul, to the infinite divine, to the eternally shining source of all *that which is dispersed in leaves throughout the universe*.[5b]

Cf. Notebook 11, §66

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci erroneously wrote "October."
[b]This concludes the "Notes on Philosophy. Materialism and Idealism. First Series."

§<49>. *The intellectuals.*[a] First question: are intellectuals an autonomous social group, or does every social group have its own category of intellectuals? The problem is complex, because up to the present time the historical process of formation of the different categories of intellectuals has assumed a variety of forms. The most important of these forms are two:

1. Every social group coming into existence on the primal basis of an essential function in the world of economic production creates together with itself, organically, a rank or several ranks of intellectuals who give it homogeneity and a consciousness of its own function in the economic sphere: the capitalist entrepreneur creates along with himself the economist, the scientist of political economy. Moreover, it is the case that every entrepreneur is also an intellectual in the sense that he must possess a certain technical capacity, not only in the narrowly defined field of economics but in other fields as well—at least those fields closest to economic production (he must be an organizer of masses of men; he must be an organizer of the "confidence" of the investors in his business, of the buyers of his products, etc.). If not all the entrepreneurs, at least an elite among them must have the technical capacity (of an intellectual nature) to be organizers of society in general, including its whole complex body of services right up to the state, in order to obtain the most favorable conditions for the expansion of their own group or at least the capacity to choose the "underlings" who are specialists in this activity of organizing general relations beyond the ambit of the business.

Even the feudal lords possessed a capacity of a particular kind—military capacity—and, in fact, the crisis of feudalism begins at the very moment when the aristocracy loses its monopoly of military technical capacity.

2. But every social group emerging into history out of the economic structure finds or has found—at least in all of past history—preexisting categories of intellectuals that moreover seemed to represent a historical continuity uninterrupted even by the most complicated changes in social and political forms. The most typical of these categories of intellectuals is that of the ecclesiastics, who for a long time monopolized a number of important services (religious ideology, schools and education, and "theory" in general with regard to science, philosophy, morals, justice, etc., as well as charity and good works, etc.). However, there are several other categories that in the feudal regime were, to some extent at least, juridically on a par with the aristocracy: the learned "theorists," the nonecclesiastical philosophers, etc. (The clergy, in fact, exercised the feudal ownership

[a]In the manuscript, the title of this note, "*Gli intellettuali,*" is written in cursive like all the other titles, but the size of the lettering is distinctly larger than in other titles of individual notes. Furthermore, the note begins on a fresh page (p. 11r) in the manuscript; Gramsci left the last two lines of the previous page (p. 10v) blank.

of land in the same way as the nobility, and it was economically on a par with the nobility; but there was also, for example, an aristocracy of the gown, in addition to an aristocracy of the sword, etc. To the economists who come into existence with the entrepreneurs, mentioned in the earlier paragraph, one must add the industrial technicians and "applied" scientists, a category of intellectuals that is closely[a] linked to the social group of the entrepreneurs, etc.) Since these categories experience the continuity of their intellectual title through an "esprit de corps" (Croce feels as if he is linked to Aristotle more than to Agnelli,[1] etc.), they thus appear to have a certain autonomy from the dominant social group, and taken as a whole they may seem like an independent social group with its own characteristics, etc.

Second question: what are the utmost limits of the meaning of the term "intellectual"? It is difficult to find a single criterion that characterizes equally well all the disparate activities of intellectuals and, at the same time, distinguishes them in an essential way from the activities of other social groups. The most widespread methodological error, it seems to me, has been to look for the essential characteristic in the intrinsic nature of intellectual activity rather than in the system of relations wherein this activity (and the group that personifies it) is located within the general ensemble of social relations. Indeed: (1) The worker is not specifically characterized by his manual or instrumental work but by his working in specific conditions and within specific social relations (apart from the consideration that purely physical labor does not exist and that even Taylor's term "trained gorilla"[2] is a metaphor to indicate how far one can go in a certain direction: in any physical work, no matter how mechanical and degraded, there is a minimum of technical skill, that is, a minimum of creative intellectual activity). (2) It has already been pointed out that, to some extent, the entrepreneur, by virtue of his very function, must possess a certain number of skills of an intellectual nature, even though his social position is not determined by these skills but by the general social relations, which are characterized by the position of the entrepreneur within industry.

These distinctions having been made, it is possible to conclude, for now, that: the relationship between the intellectuals and production is not direct, as in the case of the fundamental social groups, but mediated, and it is mediated by two types of social organization: (a) by civil society, that is, by the ensemble of private organizations in society; (b) by the state. The intellectuals have a function in the "hegemony" that is exercised throughout society by the dominant group and in the "domination" over society that is embodied by the state, and this function is precisely "organizational" or connective. The intellectuals have the function of organizing

[a]In the manuscript, above the word "closely," Gramsci inserted "organically."

the social hegemony of a group and that group's domination of the state; in other words, they have the function of organizing the consent that comes from the prestige attached to the function in the world of production and the apparatus of coercion for those groups who do not "consent" either actively or passively or for those moments of crisis of command and leadership when spontaneous consent undergoes a crisis. As a result of this analysis, the concept of intellectuals is broadened very extensively, but this seems to me the only possible way to arrive at a concrete approximation of reality.

The greatest difficulty in accepting this way of posing the question, it seems to me, arises out of the following: that the function of organizing social hegemony and state domination has various levels and among these levels some are purely manual and instrumental—carrying out orders rather than having responsibility, being an agent rather than a bureaucrat or an official, etc.; obviously, however, nothing prevents one from making this kind of distinction (nurses and doctors in a hospital, sacristans-caretakers and priests in a church, janitors and teachers in a school, etc., etc.).

From an intrinsic point of view, intellectual activity can be differentiated by levels that in moments of extreme opposition become a genuine difference in quality—on the highest rung, we find the "creators" of the various sciences, philosophy, poetry, etc.; on the lowest, the most humble "administrators and disseminators" of the intellectual wealth of the tradition—but taken as a whole, they all have a sense of solidarity. It is even the case that the lowest strata have a stronger sense of this corps solidarity, from which they derive a certain "conceitedness"[3] that frequently renders them vulnerable to taunts and jokes.

It should be noted that in the modern world the category of intellectuals, in this sense, has undergone an expansion of unprecedented proportions. Mass formation has standardized individuals both in terms of technical ability and psychologically, giving rise to the same phenomena as in all other standardized masses: competition among individuals that creates unemployment, the need for protective professional organizations, etc.

The different positions of the urban and the rural type of intellectuals.[4] Intellectuals of the urban type are rather closely tied to industry. They have the same function as subaltern officers in the army: they establish the relationship between the entrepreneur and the instrumental masses, they execute the production plan drawn by the general staff of industry. The urban intellectuals are, on average, very standardized, while the top intellectuals are increasingly mistaken for the real, "organic" general staff of the upper industrial class.

Intellectuals of the rural type bring the peasant masses into contact with the local or state administration (lawyers, notaries, etc.), and because of this function they are of greater political importance: this professional

mediation, in fact, is hard to separate from political mediation. Furthermore: in the country, the intellectual (priest, lawyer, teacher, notary, doctor, etc.) represents a social model for the average peasant, who aspires to escape from his condition in order to improve himself. The peasant always thinks that at least one of his sons could become an intellectual (especially a priest), which means becoming a gentleman, thus raising the social level of the family and facilitating its economic life through the connections he is bound to have with other gentlemen. The attitude of the peasant toward the intellectual is twofold: he admires the social position of the intellectual and, in general, the position of the state employee, but he sometimes feigns to disdain it; in other words, his instinctive admiration is interlaced with elements of envy and burning anger. It is impossible to understand anything about the peasants without taking into consideration their effective subordination to the intellectuals and without grasping the fact that every development of the peasant masses to a certain extent is linked to and depends on the movements of the intellectuals.

Urban intellectuals are a different matter. Factory technicians do not exercise any political influence on the instrumental masses, or at least that phase has already been superseded. Sometimes precisely the reverse takes place: the instrumental masses—at least, through their own organic intellectuals—exercise an influence over the technicians.

The crux of the issue, however, remains the distinction between intellectuals as an organic category of every social group and intellectuals as a traditional category, a distinction that opens up a whole series of problems and possible historical studies. The most interesting problem is that which has to do with the analysis of the political party from this point of view. What becomes of the political party in relation to the problem of the intellectuals? The political party, it seems to me, can be said to be precisely the mechanism that carries out in civil society the same function that the state carries out, to a greater extent, in political society. In other words, it secures the bonding of the organic intellectuals of a social group with traditional intellectuals, a function it can carry out as part of its basic function, which is to lift the "economic" members of a social group to the level of "political intellectuals," that is, organizers of all the functions intrinsic to the organic development of an integral civil and political society. Indeed, one might say that within its own sphere, the political party fulfills its function more organically than the state does in its broader sphere. An intellectual who joins the political party of a particular social group blends with the organic intellectuals of that same group and binds himself closely to that group, something that does not come about through participation in the life of the state other than poorly, if at all. Indeed, it is the case that many intellectuals think they are themselves the state, a belief that, given the magnitude of the category, sometimes

has important consequences and leads to unpleasant complications for the economic social group that really is the state. All members of a political party should be regarded as intellectuals; this is an affirmation that can lend itself to ridicule, and yet, on reflection, nothing could be truer. One must make distinctions of gradation: a party may comprise a larger or smaller number from the higher or lower grades. But this is not what matters; what matters is the function, which is to educate and lead: namely, an intellectual function. A businessman does not join a political party in order to do business, nor an industrialist in order to increase and improve his production, nor a farmer in order to learn new methods of cultivation, even though some aspects of these needs of the businessman, the industrialist, and the farmer may be satisfied in the party. (The general view runs counter to this; it holds that the "politicking" businessman, industrialist, or farmer stands to lose rather than gain, which is debatable.) The professional unions exist to address these goals, within certain limits; in them, the economic-corporate function of the businessman, the industrialist, or the farmer finds its most appropriate framework. In the political party, the elements of an economic social group go beyond this moment of their historical development and become agents of general activities that are national and international in character (cf. the note on "Relations between structure and superstructure" on p. 67).[5] This function of the political party should come much more clearly into view from a concrete historical analysis of how the categories of organic intellectuals and traditional intellectuals have evolved both on the terrain of various national developments and on the terrain of the development of the most important diverse social groups within the context of different nations, especially those groups whose economic activity has been primarily instrumental. The formation of traditional intellectuals is the most interesting historical question. It is definitely related to slavery in the classical world and to the status of freedmen from Greece and the Orient within the social organization of the Roman Empire. This social, but also national and racial, separation between sizable bodies of intellectuals and the ruling class of the Roman Empire reproduces itself, after the fall of Rome, in the separation between Germanic warriors and intellectuals of Latin origins, successors of the freedmen-intellectuals. This phenomenon is intertwined with the emergence and development of Catholicism and ecclesiastical organization, which for many centuries absorbed most intellectual activity and exercised a monopoly of intellectual administration, including penal sanctions against those who sought to oppose or even elude the monopoly.

This phenomenon ties in with the other phenomenon of the cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals, on which many notes have been written, scattered in the various notebooks.[6]

There are many noticeable differences between one nation and another in the development of European intellectuals; I will point out the most noteworthy ones, which should be more closely examined (moreover, all the statements contained in this note should be regarded as mere cues and stimuli for memory that need to be checked and probed more deeply):[7]

1. In the case of Italy, the central fact is precisely the international or cosmopolitan function of its intellectuals that is both cause and effect of the fragmented state of the peninsula from the fall of the Roman Empire until 1870.

2. France provides a complete example of a harmonious development of all the nation's energies and, especially, of the categories of intellectuals. When in 1789 a new social group surfaced politically in history, it was already fully equipped for all its social functions, and therefore it fought for total domination of the nation. It did not have to make any essential compromises with the old classes; instead, it subordinated them to itself. The first intellectual cells of the new type emerge alongside the first economic cells; even the ecclesiastical organization is influenced by them (Gallicanism, very early development of struggles between church and state). This massive intellectual establishment explains the intellectual function of France in the second half of the eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth century, an international and cosmopolitan function of irradiation and of an expansion that had the character of organic imperialism, therefore quite different from the intellectual function of Italy, which was characterized by a haphazard personal migration whose effect was to preclude rather than enable the development of the national base.

3. In Russia, several points: the political [commercial] organization was created by the Normans (Varangians) and the religious organization by the Byzantine Greeks; at a later time, the Germans and the French provided the protoplasm of Russian history with a strong skeleton. The national forces were passive, and, perhaps for that very reason, they assimilated foreign influences and even foreigners themselves, Russifying them. In the more recent historical period, the opposite phenomenon takes place: an elite from among the most active, enterprising, and disciplined people emigrates abroad, it assimilates the culture of the most advanced Western countries, and it does so without losing the most essential characteristics of its nationality: that is, without breaking its sentimental and historical ties with its own people. Having thus completed its intellectual apprenticeship, it returns to its country, compelling the people to a forced awakening. The difference between this elite and the German one (of Peter the Great, for example) is to be found in its essentially national-popular character: it could not be assimilated by Russian passivity because it was itself an energetic reaction of Russia against its own historical passivity. On

another terrain and in quite different temporal and spatial conditions, this Russian phenomenon can be compared to the birth of the American nation (the United States): the Anglo-Saxon immigrants in America, too, are an intellectual, but above all a moral, elite. I am referring, of course, to the early immigrants, the pioneers, protagonists of the religious struggles in England, defeated but neither humiliated nor disheartened. Besides moral and strong-willed energy, they brought with them to America a certain level of civilization, a certain stage of European historical evolution that, once transplanted into the virgin soil of America and through the agency of such people, continued to develop the forces implicit in its nature but at an incomparably faster pace than in old Europe, where there is a whole set of restraints (moral and intellectual, incorporated in certain groups of the population) that are inimical to such a fast process and bring every initiative down to the level of mediocrity, diluting it in time and space.

4. In England the development is very different from France. The new social group that came into existence on the basis of modern industrialism has grown remarkably on the economic-corporate level, but in the intellectual-political field it gropes its way in the dark. The organic intellectuals—namely, those who came into existence on the same industrial terrain as the economic group—are very numerous, but at the most advanced stage of development we find that the old class of landowners preserves its quasi-monopolistic position. It loses its economic supremacy but maintains for a long time its political-intellectual supremacy and is assimilated as a stratum of leaders by the new group in power. In other words: the old landed class is joined to the industrialists by a kind of suture similar to the one by which in other countries the dominant classes are joined to the "traditional intellectuals."

5. The English phenomenon appears in Germany as well, aggravated by other complicating phenomena. Germany, too, like Italy, has been the seat of a universalistic, supranational institution and ideology (the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation); it provided the medieval cosmopolis with a certain number of personnel, impoverishing its own national energies, and for a long time this personnel perpetuated the territorial disunity of the Middle Ages. Industrial development took place within a semifeudal framework that remained in place until November 1918, and the landowning Junkers, in alliance with the petty bourgeoisie, retained a political-intellectual supremacy much greater than that of their English counterparts. They were the traditional intellectuals of the German industrialists, but they enjoyed special privileges and had a strong consciousness of themselves as an independent group, based on the fact that they held considerable economic power over the land, which was more "productive" than in England. (The Prussian Junkers resemble a priestly caste that carries on a basically intellectual activity but at the same time has its own economic

base and is not dependent on the liberality of the dominant group. Moreover, it is not hard to see how the different situations of the English and Prussian nobilities were to become comparable with the passage of time, in spite of the fact that Germany's military might on the ground—unlike England's exclusively naval power—provided the Junkers with an organizational base favoring the preservation of their political monopoly.)

Outside Europe there are other distinct instances of the development of the categories of intellectuals to be examined and studied. In the United States one should note the absence of traditional intellectuals and therefore the different equilibrium of the intellectuals in general: a massive formation of all the modern superstructures on an industrial base. The necessity of an equilibrium does not arise out of the need to fuse the organic intellectuals with the traditional intellectuals who, as a category, do not exist; rather, it arises out of the need to fuse together in a single national crucible the different types of culture brought in by immigrants of diverse national origins. The absence of traditional intellectuals explains, at least in part, on the one hand the existence of only two parties that could easily be reduced to just one (cf. with France, and not only in the postwar period when the multiplication of parties became a general phenomenon) and on the other hand the endless proliferation of churches (I think that 213 Protestant sects have been counted; contrast with France and with the fierce struggles that were waged in order to preserve the religious and moral unity of the French people). There are various notes on the American intellectuals scattered in different notebooks.[8]

There is another interesting symptom in America that still has to be examined: the formation of a surprising number of black intellectuals who absorb American culture and technical knowledge. One might look into the indirect influence that these black American intellectuals could exercise on the backward masses in Africa, and even the direct influence they could exercise if either of the following hypotheses became true: (1) if American expansionism used its American blacks as agents to take hold of the African market (something of this sort has already happened, but I do not know to what extent); (2) if racial conflicts in America became exacerbated to such a degree as to cause the exodus and return to Africa of those black intellectual elements who are the most spiritually independent and active and therefore the ones least likely to submit to some possible legislation even more humiliating than the current widespread customs. This raises the question: (1) of language—since the language of American blacks is English, whereas in Africa there are myriad dialects; (2) of whether national sentiment can replace racial sentiment, raising the African continent to the function of common fatherland of all blacks (it would be the first case of an entire continent being regarded as a single nation). American blacks, it seems to me, are bound to have more of a neg-

ative than a positive national and racial spirit; a spirit, in other words, born out of the struggle waged by the whites in order to isolate and dishearten them. But was this not the case with the Jews until the end of the eighteenth century? *Liberia*, already Americanized and with English as its official language, could become the Zion of American blacks, aiming to become all of Africa, to be the Piedmont of Africa.

The study of the question of the intellectuals in South and Central America, in my view, should take into account the following basic conditions: the category of traditional intellectuals does not exist in South and Central America either, but the situation does not present itself in the same terms as in the United States. In fact, at the root of development in these countries we find the Spanish and Portuguese civilization of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, characterized by the Counter-Reformation and by militarism. To this day, the most resistant crystallizations in these countries are the clergy and the army, two categories of intellectuals that, in part, carry on the traditions of the European mother countries. Furthermore, the industrial base is very limited and has not developed complicated superstructures: the majority of intellectuals are of the rural type, and since large estate holdings and extensive property ownership by the church predominate, these intellectuals are linked to the clergy and the big landowners. The problem is complicated by the great masses of Indians, who in some countries constitute the majority of the population. Generally speaking, one can say that South and Central America are still in a situation like that of the Kulturkampf[9] and the Dreyfus trial; that is, a situation in which the secular and civil element has yet to pass through the stage at which the clergy and the military caste are subordinated to secular politics. As a result, Freemasonry and forms of cultural organization such as the "positivist church" constitute a very important opposition to Jesuit influence. Recent events (I am writing in November 1930), from Calles's Mexican Kulturkampf[10] to the popular-military movements in Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Bolivia, show just how true these assertions are. There are notes on South American intellectuals scattered in various notebooks.[11]

Another kind of manifestation of the development of intellectuals can be found in India, China, and Japan. Not that India and China should be confused with Japan. Japan comes close to the English and German type of development—that is, an industrial civilization that develops within a semifeudal framework—but, as far as I can tell, more like the English than the German type. In China there is the problem of the script, an expression of the total separation of the intellectuals from the people. In India and China one encounters the phenomenon of the enormous gap between the religion of the people and the religion of the clergy and the intellectuals; it, too, is related to the separation between the intellectuals and the people. This phenomenon of different beliefs and of the different ways in

which the various strata of society—but especially the clergy on the one hand and the mass of believers on the other—understand and practice the same religion needs to be studied in general, even though its most extreme manifestations occur in Asian countries. I believe that the difference in Protestant countries is relatively slight. It is very noticeable in Catholic countries, but there are differences of degree: lesser in the Catholic parts of Germany and in France; greater in Italy, especially in the South and the islands; and very great on the Iberian peninsula and in Latin American countries. The phenomenon assumes greater proportions in the Orthodox countries where one must take into account three levels of the same religion: that of the high clergy and the monks, that of the secular clergy, and that of the people. It reaches catastrophic proportions in East Asia (not in Japan), where the religion of the people often has nothing to do with the religion found in the books, even though both of them are called by the same name.

The problem of the intellectuals has many other aspects besides those mentioned in the preceding pages. It is necessary to compose these aspects into an organic, systematic, and logical overview. Activities of a predominantly intellectual character; institutions linked with cultural activity; methods and methodological problems of intellectual work; periodicals and newspapers as organizations of intellectual dissemination; academies and various associations as institutions for the collegial elaboration of cultural life. I have written notes on many of these themes here and there in various notebooks under different titles, but especially under the title "Types of periodicals."

One may say, generally, that in modern civilization all practical activities have become so complex and the sciences so intertwined with life that each activity tends to create a school for its own specialists and hence to create a group of intellectual specialists to teach in these schools. Thus, alongside the type of school that may be called "humanistic"—because it is aimed at developing in each individual human being an as-yet-undifferentiated general culture, the fundamental power to think and to find a direction in life—a whole system of specialized schools is being created at various levels, for entire vocational branches or for professions that are already specialized and precisely defined. Indeed, one may say that the educational crisis raging today is linked precisely to the fact that this process of differentiation is taking place chaotically, without a carefully studied plan, without clear and precise principles: the crisis of the school curriculum—that is, of the general orientation of the formative process—is, to a great extent, a complication of the more general crisis. The fundamental division of the middle school into vocational and classical was a rational scheme: the vocational school for the instrumental classes, the classical school for the dominant classes and the intellectuals. However,

the development of the urban as well as agricultural industrial base tended to foster the new type of urban intellectual, and therefore school was divided into classical and technical (vocational but not manual), which called into question the very principle of the pursuit of general culture, of a humanistic orientation, of a general culture based on the classical tradition. This pursuit, once questioned, can be said to be destroyed, since its formative capacity was largely based on the general prestige enjoyed by a particular form of civilization. The tendency today is to abolish every type of school that is "disinterested" (in other words, not motivated by immediate interests) and "formative" or else to leave only a scaled-down specimen of such a school for a tiny elite of rich persons and young ladies who need not bother with preparing themselves for the future. The tendency is to continue propagating specialized vocational schools in which the student's destiny and future activity are predetermined.

The crisis will certainly have a solution, which, logically, should be along the following lines: to start with, a common school of general humanistic culture, with the right balance between development of the ability to work manually (technically, industrially) and development of the ability to think, to work intellectually. From this type of common school, students would move on, by way of vocational orientation, to one of the specialized vocational (in the broad sense) schools, etc.

In any case, one must bear in mind the principle that every practical activity tends to create for itself a special school, just as every intellectual activity tends to create its own "cultural association." As a result, every directive organism will also have to split its activity into two basic parts: the deliberative part, which is its essential activity, and the informative-cultural part, in which questions that require discussion are first discussed "academically," so to speak. This is already happening today, but in a bureaucratic manner: every deliberative body has its own specialized departments of experts who prepare the materials for discussions and deliberations. This is one of the mechanisms by which the bureaucracy ends up in control in democratic parliamentary regimes. It seems to me, in fact, that the question will arise of incorporating within the deliberative and directive bodies themselves the technical capability that is a prerequisite for expertise.

On this topic, check what I have written in one of the notes under the rubric "Types of periodicals."[12] While waiting for the formation of a group of intellectuals who are well trained to engage in regular publishing activity (in the sense of organic books, not of occasional publications or collections of articles) and as a means of encouraging such a formation, a cultural group should be formed around the typical periodical. The group would collectively criticize and elaborate the work of each individual; the work itself is assigned according to a plan and with a regard for questions

of principle (programmatic questions). The resulting work, in its final form—that is, after it has undergone collective critique and revision, and after it has been formulated in a way that is basically consonant with the collective view—should be collected in a yearbook, as I mentioned in the earlier note. Through collective discussion and criticism (made up of suggestions, advice, recommendations on method, and constructive criticism aimed at mutual education), the average level of the members of the group is raised until it is on a par with the caliber and the capability of the best-trained member. After the initial work is done, it should be possible for the chairman's office or the secretariat to have criteria and ideas concerning the assignment of further work and its distribution among the entire personnel, in such a way as to induce the individual members to specialize and to create for themselves the conditions of specialization: indexes, bibliographical surveys, collections of specialized basic works, etc. The method of work should be very strict and rigorous: no improvisation and no bombast. The work, in written form and distributed in advance to the members of the group, should be criticized in writing, in concise notes that list shortcomings, suggestions, points that require elucidation, etc. A fruitful working principle could be introduced: each member of the group who is in charge of some task could choose from among the other members of the group a mentor who would guide him and help him with "maieutic" skill—that is, without taking his place but rather only helping him to work and to develop for himself a working discipline, a method of production that would "Taylorize" him intellectually, so to speak.

Cf. Notebook 12, §1.

§<50>. *The common school.*[1] An important issue that needs to be examined when dealing with the practical organization of the common school is the setting of the various school grades according to the age and intellectual-moral maturity of the young and in keeping with the goals that the school strives for.

The common school, or the school of "humanistic" (broadly understood, and not just in the traditional sense) general culture, should aim to insert young people into active life with some measure of intellectual autonomy, that is, with a certain degree of intellectual and practical creative ability, an independent sense of direction. The fixing of the age for compulsory education varies with different general economic conditions, which, from our perspective of the common school, determine two things: (1) the need to make youngsters work in order to obtain from them, as soon as possible, some immediate productive contribution; (2) the availability of state funds devoted to public education. The funds will have to be rather

substantial because of the expansion the school system would undertake in terms of buildings, teaching materials in the broad sense, the corps of teachers. The corps of teachers, especially, will grow much larger since the lower the ratio between schoolchildren and teachers, the greater and more immediate is the effectiveness of the school. But this raises the problem of training such a corps of teachers, for which there is no easy or quick solution. The problem of buildings is not simple either because this type of school, which also aims at quick results, has to be a boarding school with dormitories, dining halls, specialized libraries, rooms suitable for seminar work, etc. Initially, then, the new type of school will have to be, and cannot but be, for elite groups of youngsters selected through competition or officially recommended by the appropriate private institutions.

If one were to use as a frame of reference the system of classical education as it exists today—(1) elementary school, (2) middle school, (3) lycée, (4) university and professional, theoretical, or practical schools of specialization—then the common school would comprise the first three levels, reorganized not only in terms of content and teaching methods but also in terms of the arrangement of the educational process. The elementary grades should last three to four years; they should teach dogmatically (relatively speaking, of course) the basic elements of the new conception of the world, in opposition to the conception of the world conveyed by the traditional environment (folklore in its full scope), in addition to [imparting], obviously, the fundamental instruments of culture: reading, writing, arithmetic, elements of geography, history, rights and duties (that is, the first notions of the state and society). The middle school could be reduced to four years and the lycée to two, so that a child who started school at the age of six would be able to complete common school by the age of fifteen or sixteen. One may object that such a course of study is too hard because it is too fast paced for it to achieve the same results as the present system of classical education. In response one may say that the new system, taken as a whole, contains within it the general elements that in fact make the present system too slow for certain students. Which elements are these? In a number of families, particularly among the intellectual classes, children find in their family life an extension and integration of school life; they acquire from the "atmosphere," as it were, a whole assortment of notions and aptitudes that facilitate their educational progress in the formal sense. Furthermore, a year or so before entering elementary school, they begin to acquire literary language, that is, a means of expression and of thinking superior to that of the average school population between the ages of six and ten. Thus there is a difference between urban and rural schoolchildren: by the very fact of living in a city, a child between the ages of one and six absorbs a wide assortment of notions and aptitudes that make his progress through school easier, more profitable, and faster.

The essential elements, at least, of these conditions must have a place in the organization of the common school. In the meantime, one must assume that the development of the common school would be paralleled by the development of kindergartens: institutions in which, even before the age of six, children would become accustomed to a certain collective discipline and acquire preschool notions and aptitudes. The same will take place at the subsequent stage, if the common school also provides a boarding-school lifestyle, twenty-four hours a day: a school that is freed from the existing forms of hypocritical and mechanical discipline, and one where students receive assistance not only in class but also during periods of individual study, with the better students lending a helping hand, etc.

The fundamental problem arises during that stage in the existing school system that is now represented by the lycée. As a form of instruction, the lycée of today does not differ in the least from the earlier grades, except for the assumption that, as a result of the experience they have already accumulated, the students are more intellectually and morally mature. In fact, however, between the lycée and the university there is a leap, a real break in continuity, and not a normal transition from quantity (age) to quality (intellectual and moral maturity). There is a shift from an almost purely receptive form of learning to creative education, a shift from the school, where the discipline of studying is imposed and controlled from the outside, to a form of education in which [intellectual] self-discipline and moral independence are theoretically unlimited. And this takes place immediately after the crisis of puberty, when the ardor of instinctive and elemental passions is still struggling against the restraints of character and moral conscience. In Italy, moreover, where the "seminar" system is not widespread in the universities, the shift is all the more brutal and mechanical. For this reason, then, the lycée phase of the common school must be conceived as the most important transitory phase, during which the aim of the school is to create the fundamental values of "humanism": the intellectual self-discipline and moral independence needed for subsequent specialization, whether of an intellectual character (university studies) or of a directly practical-productive character (industry, business administration, civil service, etc.). Study of the scientific method must begin at the lycée and no longer be a monopoly of the university; the lycée must already be a fundamental part of creative—and not just receptive—studies. (I make a distinction between creative school and active school: the common school is entirely an active school, whereas the creative school is a phase, the apex of the active school.[2] Naturally, both active school and creative school must be understood correctly. The active school must move past its romantic phase, in which the elements of struggle against the mechanical and Jesuitical school have been morbidly exaggerated for oppositional and polemical reasons; it must discover and arrive at the clas-

sical phase, which is free from spurious polemics and finds within itself and in the goals it wants to attain both its raison d'être and the impulse to come up with its own forms and methods. Thus "creative school" does not mean a school of "inventors and discoverers" of new facts and proofs in an absolute sense; it is, rather, a school in which "reception" occurs through the student's spontaneous and independent effort and in which the teacher functions primarily as an overseer and friendly guide, something that at present happens or should be happening in the universities. To discover a "truth" by oneself, without external suggestions and promptings, is a "creation," even if the truth is an old one; in any case, it is an entry into the intellectual phase in which new truths may be discovered because one has arrived at knowledge and discovered an old "truth" by oneself.) In the lycée, then, the basic learning activity will take place in seminars, libraries, experimental study rooms, laboratories; the basic elements for a professional orientation will be acquired there.

The advent of the common school will bring about a fundamental change in the existing relations between the universities and the academies. Today these two institutions are independent from one another, and the academies (the great academies, naturally) occupy a place that is hierarchically superior to that of the universities. With the arrival of the common school, the academies will have to become the intellectual organization (for intellectual coordination and creativity) of those individuals who on completion of common school do not attend university but get started immediately in a profession. These individuals should not lapse into intellectual passivity; rather, they should have available to them an organism, specialized in all the industrial and intellectual fields, in which they may collaborate and wherein they will find all the necessary means for the creative work they want to undertake. The whole system of academies will be reorganized and revitalized. Territorially, it will have a hierarchy—a national center that will embrace all the great national academies—regional divisions, and urban as well as rural local units. There will be separate specialized sections, all of which will be fully represented at the national and regional centers but only partially represented on the local level. They will be based on the same principles as the cultural institutes of specific social groups. Traditional academic work—that is, the systematization of knowledge (the Italian type of academy in its present form) and the channeling as well as the stabilization, according to a standard [(standard thought)], of intellectual activities (the French type of academy)—will become [only] one aspect of the new organization, which should engage in creative activity and the dissemination of knowledge and have collective authority. It will oversee industrial meetings, lectures and activities related to the scientific organization of labor, experimental factory laboratories, etc., and it will serve as a selective mechanism for

improving the individual abilities of those who are on the periphery. Each local unit of this organization should have a section devoted to ethics and political science, but at the request of interested individuals it could also form a section of applied science to discuss from a cultural viewpoint issues related to industry, agriculture, and the organization and rationalization of labor in the factory, in farming, and in the bureaucracy. Periodic congresses, to which representatives are elected, will bring the most capable individuals to the attention of directors in the higher echelons, etc. In the regional divisions and at the center, all the different activities should be represented, with laboratories, libraries, etc. Official contacts among the various levels will be maintained by lecturers and overseers. The regional divisions and the center (which may be a replica of the Collège de France in its present form) should periodically invite representatives from the subordinate units to present academic reports; they should also organize competitions and establish prizes (scholarships at home and abroad). It would be useful to have a comprehensive list of all existing academies and of the prevalent themes treated in their published proceedings (for the most part, these are cemeteries of culture).

This organization should collaborate very closely with the universities and with the advanced specialized schools of other branches (military, naval, etc.). With this organization, culture will be centralized and given an impetus of unprecedented proportions across the entire nation. It is possible to start by having the national center and local units with a few sections.

The plan sketched here is meant only as a basic outline of a program that can be pursued gradually. Therefore, this plan must be integrated with the indispensable transitional measures that need to be taken. In any case, the transitional measures, too, should be conceived in the general spirit of this outline, so that the transitional institutions could be absorbed gradually into the basic plan without disruption and crises.

Cf. Notebook 12, §1.

§<51>. *Brains and brawn.* The distinction of the categories of intellectuals from other categories refers to their social function and their professional activity; in other words, it takes into account the fact that mental effort[a] rather than muscular (nervous) effort preponderates most heavily in professional activity. Yet, of course, the relation between the mental and the muscular is not always the same; hence there are different levels of intellectual activity. It must also be recognized that no occupation is ever totally devoid of some kind of intellectual activity, and, finally, that, apart

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci inserted "activity" between the lines, above "effort."

from his own occupation, every individual carries on some intellectual activity: he is a philosopher, he shares a conception of the world and therefore contributes to sustain it or to modify it, that is, to create new conceptions. It is a matter, then, of elaborating this activity that is always developed to a certain degree, modifying its relation to muscular effort into a new equilibrium.

Cf. Notebook 12, §3.

§<52>. *Americanism and Fordism.*[a] The tendency exhibited by Leon Davidovich was related to this problem.[1] Its essential content was based on the "will" to give supremacy to industry and industrial methods, to accelerate the growth of discipline and orderliness in production through coercive means, to adapt customs to the necessities of work. It would have ended up, necessarily, in a form of Bonapartism; hence it was necessary to break it up inexorably. His practical solutions were wrong, but his concerns were correct. The danger inhered in this imbalance between theory and practice. This had already manifested itself earlier, in 1921. The principle of coercion in the sphere of work was correct (the speech against Martov, reproduced in the book on *Terrorism*), but the form it assumed was wrong: the military "model" had become a baneful prejudice, and the labor armies ended in failure.[2]

Leon Davidovich's interest in Americanism. His interest, his articles, his studies on "*byt*" and on literature: these activities were not as disconnected as they might have appeared to be at the time.[3] The new methods of work and the way of life are inseparable: successes in one field are impossible without tangible results in the other.

In America, rationalization and prohibition are undoubtedly related: inquiries by industrialists into the private lives of workers and the inspection services created by some industrialists to control the "morality" of workers are necessities of the new method of work. Those who deride the initiatives and see them merely as a hypocritical manifestation of "puritanism" will never be able to understand the importance, the significance, and the *objective import* of the American phenomenon, which is *also* the biggest collective effort [ever made] to create, with unprecedented speed and a consciousness of purpose unique in history, a new type of worker and of man.

The phrase "consciousness of purpose" might seem hyperbolic, to say the least, to those well-bred souls who recall Taylor's term "trained gorilla."[4] Taylor states the purpose of American society cynically and

[a]In the manuscript, this note was originally titled " 'Animality' and industrialism." Gramsci canceled that title and above it wrote "Americanism and Fordism."

plainly: to develop the worker's mechanical side to the maximum, to sever the old psychophysical nexus of skilled professional work in which the intelligence, initiative, and imagination were required to play some role, and thus to reduce the operations of production solely to the physical aspect. But, in reality, this is not altogether new. It is the most recent phase of a process that began with the emergence of industrialism itself; this most recent phase is more intense than preceding phases and manifests itself in a more brutal form, but it too will be superseded, and a new psychophysical nexus will emerge that will be different from and undoubtedly *superior* to what came before. There will certainly be a forced selection and a part of the old working class will be mercilessly eliminated from the world of production and from the world *tout court*.

This is the point of view from which one must examine the "puritanical" initiatives of American industrialists like Ford. It is obvious that they do not concern themselves with the "humanity" and the "spirituality" of the worker, which are crushed. This humanity, this spirituality, used to be realized, within the sphere of work, in productive "creation"; it reached its highest point in the work of the artisan, wherein the worker's individuality was wholly reflected in the object created and the link between art and labor was still very strong. But this form of humanity and spirituality is precisely what the new industrialism fights against. The "puritanical" initiatives have just this purpose: to preserve a psychophysical equilibrium outside the place of work in order to prevent the new method from leading to the physiological collapse of the worker. This equilibrium is purely external; it is not yet internal. Internal equilibrium can only be established by the worker himself and by his own particular society through appropriate new means. The industrialist is concerned with the continuity of the physical efficiency, the muscular-nervous efficiency, of the worker. It is in the industrialist's interest to put together a stable, skilled work force, a permanently attuned industrial ensemble, because the human ensemble is also a machine that cannot be dismantled too often and renewed cog by cog without serious losses. High wages are one of the features of this necessity, but high wages are a double-edged sword. If the worker is to renew, preserve, and possibly improve his muscular-nervous efficiency and not destroy or impair it, he must spend "rationally." So the struggle against alcoholism, the most dangerous factor in the work force, becomes a function of the state. It is possible for other "puritanical" struggles as well to become functions of the state if the private initiative of the industrialists proves inadequate and if an extremely widespread moral crisis manifests itself among the working masses, as might happen as a result of unemployment crises that are too long and extensive. One issue that may be raised is the sexual question, because the abuse and irregularity of sexual functions is, after alcoholism, the most dangerous enemy of ner-

vous energies. Besides, it is a commonplace and trite observation that "obsessional" work provokes alcoholic and sexual depravation. Ford's initiatives, particularly, are indicative of these tendencies, which are still only private and latent but could become state ideology, inserting themselves naturally into traditional puritanism, that is, presenting themselves as a revival of the morality of the pioneers, or of the "true" American spirit, etc.[5] The most noteworthy fact of the American phenomenon in relation to these manifestations is the increasingly sharp division between the morality-mores of the workers and those of other strata of the population. Prohibition really exemplifies this division. Who consumes the alcohol smuggled into the United States? Alcohol has become a luxury commodity, and not even high wages make it affordable to large segments of the working masses. Those who work fixed hours for a wage do not have the time to chase after alcohol or to indulge in the sport of evading the law. The same can be said about sexuality. "Chasing women" requires too much leisure. The new type of worker will become like the peasants in the villages. The relative stability of marriage among peasants is closely linked to the system of work in the country. The peasant who returns home in the evening after a long tiring day wants the "Venerem facilem parabilemque" of Horace.[6] He has no inclination to go around seducing adventurous women. He loves his dependable, unfailing woman, who is unsentimental and does not need the trappings of seduction or ravishment in order to be possessed. The sexual function becomes "mechanized"; in other words, there is a new kind of sexual rapport without the dazzling color of romantic tinsel displayed by the petty bourgeois and the bohemian idler. The new industrialism requires monogamy; it does not want the workingman to squander his nervous energies in the anxious and unruly search for sexual gratification. The worker who goes to his job after a wild night is not a good worker; excitement of the passions does not go with the timed movement of machines of productive human motions. This brutal pressure on the masses will undoubtedly produce results, and a new form of sexual union will emerge in which monogamy and relative stability will be a fundamental characteristic.

It would be interesting to know the statistical figures of deviation from sexual mores in the United States, broken down by social group. They will show that in general the rate of divorce is especially high among the upper classes.

It seems to me that this moral disjunction between the working class and the increasingly numerous elements of the ruling classes in the United States is a most interesting phenomenon and full of implications. Until recently, the American people were a working people: practical activity was not just an inherent quality of the working classes; it was also a characteristic of the ruling classes. The fact that a billionaire continues to

work unremittingly, even sixteen hours a day, for as long as illness or old age do not force him to take to his bed: this is the typical American phenomenon; this, for the average European, is the most amazing American trait. I have pointed out in a previous note that this difference is the result of the absence of "traditions" in the United States, insofar as tradition also means the passive residue of all the social forms that have faded away in history.[7] It is these passive residues that resist Americanism, because the new industrialism would sweep them away mercilessly. It is true: the old that is not yet buried will be definitively destroyed. But what is happening in America itself? The disjuncture in morality reveals that increasingly wider margins of social passivity are in the making. Women, it seems, have a prevalent role in this phenomenon. The male industrialist continues to work even if he is a millionaire, but his wife is turning more and more into a luxury mammal, and his daughters follow in their mother's footsteps. Beauty contests, the cinema, the stage, etc.; they select the feminine beauty of the world and put it up for auction. The women travel, continually crossing the ocean. They escape prohibition in their own country and contract marriages for a season (recall that ship captains were stripped of their authority to ratify marriages onboard because many young women were getting married just for the duration of the ocean crossing); it is a form of prostitution barely camouflaged by legal formalities.

These phenomena among the upper classes will make it more difficult to coerce the working masses and make them conform to the needs of the new industry. In any case, they will bring about a psychological rift, and it will become obvious that two classes exist and are now crystallized.

On the subject of the split between manual labor and the "human content" of the worker, some useful observations can be made by looking specifically at those occupations that are generally held to be among the most intellectual: the occupations connected with the reproduction of texts for publication or for some other form of dissemination and transmission. The scribes predating the invention of printing, typesetters on hand presses, linotypists, stenographers, typists. These jobs, in fact, are more mechanical than many others. Why? Because in them it is more difficult to reach the *highest* level of professionalism, the level at which the worker should forget the content of what he is reproducing in order to devote his attention exclusively to the calligraphic form of each letter, if he is a scribe; or to be able to break down words into letters-characters and rapidly pick the pieces of lead from their cases; or to be able to break down not just single words but groups of words mechanically clustered together or parts of words mechanically rendered in shorthand symbols; or in order to acquire typing speed. The worker's interest in the content of the text is measured by his mistakes, that is, by his professional deficiencies. His skill is actually commensurate with his psychological disinterest, with

the extent to which he has become mechanized. The medieval copyist changes the spelling, the morphology, and the syntax of the book he is reproducing; he omits things he does not understand; his train of thought unconsciously makes him add words and, sometimes, whole phrases; if his dialect or language differs from that of the text, he introduces the nuances of his own tongue; etc.: he is a bad copyist. The slow pace required by the art of writing in the Middle Ages explains many of these failings. The typesetter is certainly faster; he must keep his hands moving constantly, and this makes his mechanization easier. But if one thinks about it, the effort that these workers must make in order to separate the content—which at times is very interesting (and, in fact, when that is the case, the work is slower and not as good)—from its material rendition into symbols and to concentrate solely on the latter: this is, perhaps, the greatest effort among all the trades. Nevertheless, this is done, and it does not cause the spiritual death of man. Once the process of adaptation has been completed, the brain of the worker, in reality, does not become mummified but rather reaches a state of complete freedom. Physical movement becomes totally mechanical; the memory of the skill, reduced to simple gestures repeated with rhythmic intensity, "makes its home" inside the bundles of muscles and nerves, leaving the brain free for other occupations. One walks without having to reflect on all the movements that are needed to move one's legs and one's whole body in the specific way that walking requires; the same thing has become true for the basic movements of work. One walks and thinks about whatever one wishes.

American industrialists have understood this very well. They realize that the "trained gorilla" still remains a man and that he thinks more, or at least has greater opportunities for thinking, especially after he has overcome the crisis of adaptation. Not only does he think, but the lack of direct satisfaction from work and the fact that, as a worker, he has been reduced to a trained gorilla can lead him into a train of thought that is far from conformist. Concern about these matters is real and reveals itself in a whole series of educational initiatives and other things.

Moreover, it should be obvious that so-called high wages are a transitory form of remuneration. Adaptation to the new methods of work cannot come about solely through coercion: the apparatus of coercion needed to obtain such a result would certainly be more costly than high wages. Coercion is combined with persuasion in forms that are suitable to the society in question: money. However, if the new method takes hold, creating a new type of worker, if the material mechanical apparatus is perfected even further, and if excessive turnover[8] is automatically restricted by widespread unemployment, then wages will decline as well. American industry is still exploiting the benefits of monopoly because it has had the initiative with the new methods and it can pay higher wages, but the

monopoly will necessarily be limited over time and foreign competition on an equal level will make the high wages disappear along with the profits. Besides, it is well known that high wages are connected only with a labor aristocracy; they do not pertain to all American workers.

Cf. Notebook 22, §10, §11, §12, and §13.

§<53>. *Concordats and international treaties.* The capitulation of the modern state taking place through the concordats is being camouflaged by verbally equating concordats with international treaties.[1] A concordat, however, is not an ordinary international treaty; a concordat constitutes, de facto, an interference with sovereignty in the territory of just one state: all the articles of a concordat apply to the citizens of only one state, over whom the sovereign power of a foreign state claims and exercises certain rights and powers of jurisdiction. What powers has Prussia acquired over Vatican City by virtue of the recent concordat?[2] Furthermore, the founding of Vatican City as a state gives a semblance of legitimacy to the legal fiction that the concordat is a bilateral treaty. Yet concordats used to be drawn up even before Vatican City existed, which means that territory is not essential for papal authority. It is a pretense, for while a concordat limits the state authority of one [contracting] party in its own territory and influences and determines its legislation and administration, there is no mention of any limitations concerning the territory of the other party. A concordat, then, is the recognition of a dual sovereignty in just one state territory. It is certainly not the same form of supranational sovereignty that was formally attributed to the pope during the Middle Ages, but it is a compromise derived from it. Besides, even during the height of papal splendor and supranational power, things did not go so smoothly: even though recognized juridically, papal supremacy was de facto strongly resisted, and in the best of circumstances it boiled down to political, economic, and fiscal privileges for the bishoprics of individual countries. In any case, the concordat fundamentally impairs the autonomous character of the sovereignty of the modern state. Does the state gain anything in exchange? It certainly does, but what it obtains pertains only to its own territory with respect to its own citizens. The state gains the following: that the church will not interfere with but rather approve and uphold the exercise of power by the state. The church promises to obtain for the state the consent of a segment of the governed that the state implicitly acknowledges it cannot obtain on its own: thus the capitulation of the state; thus the state places itself under the tutelage of a sovereignty that it acknowledges to be superior. The word concordat is symptomatic. . . . The articles on the concordat published by *Nuovi Studi* are among the most

interesting, and they lend themselves most easily to rebuttal.[3] Recall the "treaty" that Georgia had to make in 1920 following Denikin's defeat.[4]

But even when it comes to the modern world, what is the practical significance of the situation created in a particular state by the stipulations of a concordat? It signifies the public recognition of special political privileges for a *caste* of citizens *of the same state*. The form is no longer the same as in the Middle Ages, but the substance is. In the course of modern history, this caste had seen the monopoly of the social role that explained and justified its existence—the monopoly of culture and education—attacked and destroyed. The concordat recognizes this monopoly once again, albeit in an attenuated and controlled form, since it secures for the caste certain basic positions that it would be unable to maintain if it were to rely solely on its own powers and on the intrinsic ties between its conception of the world and actual reality.

Therefore, the underhanded and sordid struggle of the secular and secularist intellectuals against the caste intellectuals to save their autonomy and their role is understandable. But their intrinsic capitulation and their detachment from the state is undeniable. The intellectual or moral character of the concrete state, of a particular state, is determined by its legislation and not by the abstract polemics of cultural snipers. When the latter declare "we are the state," they are only saying that the so-called unitary state is no longer such and that there is a very serious split within it. And this split is all the more serious because it is affirmed by the legislators and the statesmen themselves, who maintain that the state is two things simultaneously: on the one hand, there is the state made up of the laws that are written and applied, and on the other hand there is the state made up of those minds that deep down do not acknowledge the efficacy of those laws and attempt underhandedly to limit the laws and empty them of their ethical content when they are applied. It is the Machiavellianism of puny political adventurers: the philosophers of actual idealism, especially those in the group of trained parrots associated with *Nuovi Studi*,[5] can be said to be the most notorious victims of Machiavelli. A strange and interesting aspect of this issue is the *division of labor* that is being established between the caste and the secular intellectuals: the intellectual and moral formation of the very young (elementary and secondary schools) is left to the former, and the subsequent development of young people at university is left to the latter.[6] The field of university education, however, is not placed under the same monopolistic regime to which elementary and secondary education is subordinated. In fact, there exists the University of Sacro Cuore, and it will be possible to establish other Catholic universities on an equal footing with the state universities.[7] The consequences are obvious: elementary and secondary schools are the schools of the common people and the petty bourgeoisie, social strata that

in the field of education are entirely monopolized by the caste, since the great majority of individuals from these social strata never make it to the university; in other words, they will not experience modern education in its advanced critical-historical phase; the only education they will know is dogmatic education. The university is the ruling class's own school, and it is the mechanism by means of which the ruling class selects individuals from the other classes to incorporate into its governing, administrative, and managerial personnel. However, with the existence, on equal footing, of Catholic universities, not even the formation of this ruling personnel will be unified and homogeneous any longer. Furthermore, within its own universities, the caste will bring about a concentration of secular-religious culture, the like of which has not been seen for many decades, that will be much better situated, de facto, than the secular concentration. In fact, the organizational efficacy of secular culture is not even remotely comparable to the organizational efficacy of the church, which stands wholly as a block backing and supporting its own university. If the state is no longer, de facto, the organization of secular culture, because its legislation concerning religion is what it is and because its equivocation necessarily favors the church (given the latter's formidable structure and homogeneously organized mass influence), and if the degrees of the two types of universities have equal standing, then obviously the Catholic universities will tend to become themselves the mechanism for selecting the most intelligent and capable individuals from the lower classes to be admitted into the ruling class. This tendency will be fostered by the fact that there is no educational discontinuity between the secondary schools and the Catholic university, whereas such a discontinuity does exist between the secondary schools and the state universities, and by the fact that the church, throughout its whole structure, is already equipped to carry out this selection from below. From this point of view, the church is a perfectly democratic organism: the son of a peasant or an artisan can become a cardinal and a pope if he is intelligent, capable, and sufficiently pliable to let himself be absorbed by the ecclesiastical structure and to have a feeling for its particular esprit de corps, its spirit of conservation, and its present as well as future interests. If the upper echelon of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is less frequently democratic in its origins than is generally believed, this happens for complex reasons that are only partially affected by the pressures exerted by the great Catholic aristocratic families or by reasons of state (international). One very powerful reason is that many seminaries are very poorly equipped and do not bring the best out of intelligent young men. By contrast, the young aristocrat receives from his own family environment, effortlessly, a set of qualities that are of the utmost importance for an ecclesiastical career: the unperturbed confidence of his own dignity and authority and the skill of dealing with and ruling over others.

One reason for the weakness of the clergy in the past was that religion provided very few career possibilities other than an ecclesiastical career: the clergy itself was qualitatively weakened by the "shortage" of vocations or by "vocations" that came only from among intellectually subaltern elements. This crisis was already evident before the war; it was an aspect of the general crisis of fixed-income careers in nearly stagnant and inefficient personnel: in other words, the crisis of the subaltern intellectual stratum (elementary and secondary school teachers, priests, etc.) that was forced to compete with the independent professions linked to the development of industry and private capitalist organization in general (for ex., journalism, which absorbs many teachers, etc.). The invasion of universities and teachers' training colleges by women had already started. Together with women, priests started entering the university, and the curia could not prohibit them from obtaining state-recognized degrees that would enable them to compete for civil service jobs to augment their individual "finances." Many of these priests abandoned the church as soon as they obtained their degrees (during the war, this phenomenon became rather widespread as a result of mobilization). The ecclesiastical organization therefore underwent a constitutional crisis that could have been fatal to its power, if only the state had remained true to its secularist position, which did not even require an active struggle. In the struggle between different ways of life, the church was about to be defeated automatically. The state saved the church. The economic status of the clergy was improved on several occasions, while the general standard of living worsened, especially among the middle strata. The improvement was such that "vocations" have been multiplying marvelously, impressing the pontiff himself, who attributed them precisely to the new economic situation.[8] Thus the base from which suitable candidates for the priesthood are selected has grown, permitting greater rigor and stricter cultural requirements.

The ecclesiastical career, however, is not the sum total of the Vatican's possibilities, even though it is the foundation of its power. The new situation in the schools makes it possible to insert into the secular ruling class cells of lay individuals who owe their position solely to the church, and these cells will increasingly reinforce themselves. On the terrain of this mode of selection, the Church is unbeatable. By controlling the lycées and the other secondary schools through its fiduciaries, the church will pursue with its characteristic tenacity the most capable youngsters of the poorer classes and will help them to continue their studies at Catholic universities. Scholarships, together with boarding facilities set up most economically next to the universities, enable this activity. The church, in its present phase and with the impetus that the current pope has given to Catholic Action,[9] cannot content itself simply with producing priests: it wants to permeate the state [(Bellarmine's indirect government)],[10] and

this action requires laypeople, it requires a concentration of Catholic culture represented by the laity. There are many young people who could become more valuable auxiliaries of the church as university professors rather than as cardinals, etc. The base of "vocations" having been enlarged, this laical-cultural activity has enormous possibilities for extending itself.

The University of Sacro Cuore and the neoscholastic cultural center are just the first cells of this work. In the meantime, the Philosophical Congress of 1929 was symptomatic: a confrontation took place between the absolute idealists and the neoscholastics.[11] The latter participated in the congress animated by a bellicose spirit of conquest. In my view, this is what the group aimed at, namely, to appear bellicose, pugnacious, and therefore interesting to young people. The Catholics are very strong because they could not care less about the "peremptory refutations" of their idealist or materialist adversaries; they reiterate disproven theses unperturbed, ignoring everything. To them, the notion of intellectual "detachment" and intellectual honesty is incomprehensible, or else they see it as a weakness [or naïveté] of their adversaries. They rely on the power of their global organization and on the fact that the great majority of the population is not yet "modern" and, scientifically, still at the Ptolemaic stage. If the state refuses to be the center of its own autonomous culture, the church is bound to triumph. It is even more so when the state not only fails to intervene as an autonomous center but destroys every opponent of the church other than the parrotlike versions of idealism prevailing today.

The consequences of this situation will be extremely significant, but things will not go smoothly for very long. The church is a more implacable Shylock than the Jewish Shylock: it will demand its pound of flesh and not care a hoot about the victim bleeding to death. Disraeli was right: the Christians have been the more intelligent Jews who have conquered the world.[12] The church will not be reduced to its normal strength by philosophical refutations of its theoretical (theological) postulates and by Platonic assertions of the autonomy of the state; what is needed, rather, is practical action, the exaltation of human forces throughout the whole of society.

The question of the finances of the headquarters of religion: the organization of Catholicism in America makes possible the collection of huge amounts of money, in addition to Peter's pence and the regular revenues that have now been guaranteed. Is it possible that, with the state permanently subsidizing the church, international questions will arise about church intervention in the internal affairs of individual countries? This might be a smart question, as they say.

The question of finances renders the problem of the so-called inseparability of the treaty from the concordat, proclaimed by the pope, even more

interesting. Suppose the pope had to resort to this political expedient in order to exert pressure on the state: would it not give rise immediately to the problem of returning the sums of money already received (monies associated specifically with the treaty, not the concordat)?[13] But these sums of money are huge, and, one imagines, they would mostly have been spent during the first few years; therefore their restitution may be regarded as practically impossible. No state—and much less a private entity or a bank—would make such a big loan to the pope just to get him out of an awkward situation. Renunciation of the treaty would unleash such a great crisis in the practical organization of the church that its solvency would be wiped out, albeit in the long run. The financial agreement must therefore be considered as the essential part of the treaty, as the guarantee that makes the possibility of renouncing the treaty—raised for polemical reasons and to exert political pressure—virtually nil.

Cf. Notebook 16, §11.

§<54>. *1918.* "In 1918 there was an important innovation in our law, an innovation that, strangely (but there was censorship in 1918), went generally unnoticed: the state resumed subsidizing the Catholic religion, abandoning the sixty-three-year-old principle of Cavour that had been laid down on the basis of the Sardinian law of 29 May 1855: the state must not subsidize any religion." A. C. Jemolo, "Religione dello Stato e confessioni ammesse," in *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia, Politica,* 1930, p. 30.

The innovation was introduced with the L<aw>. D<ecrees>. of 17 March 1918, n. 396, and 9 May 1918, n. 655. On this topic, Jemolo refers to the note in D. Schiappoli, *I recenti provvedimenti economici a vantaggio del clero* (Naples, 1922), extracted from vol. XLVIII of the *Atti della R. Accademia di Scienze morali e politiche di Napoli.*[1]

Cf. Notebook 16, §11.

§<55>. *The educational principle in elementary and secondary school.* The official introduction of a split in the educational principle separating elementary and secondary school from high school.[1] Previously, a very marked division of this kind existed only between vocational school on the one hand and secondary school and high school on the other. Elementary school was placed in a kind of limbo, because of some of its particular characteristics.

In elementary school there used to be two elements that contributed to the *education* of children: the notions of science and the citizen's right and

duties. "Science" was meant to introduce the child into the *societas rerum*; the rights and duties were meant to introduce him into the "society of men." "Science" clashed with the "magical" conception of the world and of nature that the child absorbs from an environment "imbued" with folklore. Education is a struggle against folklore, in favor of a realistic view that combines two elements: the concept of a law of nature and the concept of active human participation in the life of nature, that is, active participation in the transformation of nature with a purpose, which is the social life of humans. In other words, this conception consolidates itself in work that is based on objective and accurate knowledge of the laws of nature for the purpose of creating human society. In the final analysis, elementary education hinges on the concept and the reality of work, because it is work that grafts the social order (the ensemble of rights and duties) onto the natural order. The concept of equilibrium between the social order and the natural order based on work, on human practical activity, produces the *elementary* view of the world free from all magic and sorcery and provides the ground for the subsequent development of a *historical* conception of the world seen *in constant movement*. It is not entirely true that "instruction" differs from education; the excessive insistence on this distinction has been a serious error and its consequences will become evident.[2] Instruction is quite different from education only if one assumes that the learner is merely passive, which is not only absurd in itself but also denied by the very same fervent supporters of pure education who oppose mere mechanical instruction. The truth is that the instruction-education nexus is enacted by the living work of the teacher, insofar as schooling is the acceleration and disciplining of the child's formation. If the teaching corps is inept, its work would be all the more inept if it were forced to provide education: it will create a superficial, rhetorical school. This is even more evident in the literature and philosophy courses at the secondary level. Previously, students at least left school with a certain baggage of concrete historical notions; now that the teacher is expected to be a philosopher and an aesthete, students ignore concrete notions and fill their heads with meaningless words that are promptly forgotten. The battle against the old school system was justified, but the problem had more to do with people than with programs. In reality, a mediocre teacher may succeed in making his students become better *informed*; he will never be able to make them better educated. He will go through the *mechanical* part of the lessons scrupulously and conscientiously, and if the students have active minds, they will put the "baggage" in order on their own. With the new programs, which coincide with a lowering of standards in the teaching corps, there will be no "baggage," and there will be nothing to put in order. The new programs should have abolished examinations entirely: to sit for an examination now must be a terribly greater "gamble" than

before. Somehow or other, a date is always a date, whoever the examiner might be, and a definition is always a definition. But a judgment? An aesthetic or philosophical analysis?

In my view, the [educational] efficacy of the old Italian secondary school, based on the old Casati law,[3] depended on the totality of its structuration and its programs, rather than on some express wish to be an "educative" school system. On this issue, I believe, one can repeat what Carducci said about the language question: instead of speaking, Italians watch their tongue.[4] One can see how this applies to the school, if one thinks of the activity of the student. The more the new programs—among the theoreticians who planned them and defend them—affirm and theorize the student's activity and his active collaboration with the teacher, the more they actually operate as if the student were merely passive. In the old school, then, the organizational structure itself provided an education. How? The study of Latin and Greek and other languages, together with the study of their respective literatures and political histories, was at the basis of this mode of education. Its educative character came from the fact that these things were not learned for an immediate practical-professional purpose; they did indeed have a purpose, but it was the cultural formation of man—and it cannot be denied that this purpose is an "interest." However, the studying in itself appears to be disinterested. One doesn't learn Latin and Greek in order to speak them, to become a waiter, or an interpreter, or whatever. One learns them in order to know the civilizations of Greece and Rome, whose existence is posited as a foundation of world culture. Latin or Greek is learned by way of grammar, somewhat mechanically; but the charges of mechanistic aridity are greatly exaggerated. This issue concerns children; they should be made to acquire certain habits of diligence, precision, physical composure, mental concentration on particular objects. Would a thirty- or forty-year-old scholar be able to sit at a desk for sixteen hours on end if, as a child, he had not acquired "compulsorily," through "mechanical coercion," the appropriate psychophysical habits?[5] This is where one has to start if one also wants to bring up scholars, and pressure must be applied across the board in order to produce those thousands, or hundreds, or just dozens of first-rate scholars that every civilization requires. (Certainly, there is much that can be improved, but on this basis.)

Latin is learned, and it is analyzed down to its smallest basic units; it is analyzed as a dead thing. This is true, but every analysis carried out by a child is bound to be an analysis of a dead thing. Besides, one must not forget that wherever Latin is studied in these ways, the life of the Romans is a myth that, to a certain extent, has already interested and still interests the child. The language is dead, it is dissected like a cadaver, it is true, but the cadaver comes back to life continually in the examples and the stories. Could one do the same thing with Italian? Impossible. No living language

could be studied in the same way as Latin: it would be or *would seem* absurd. No child knows Latin when he starts to study it with this kind of analytic method. A living language could be known, and it would take just one child who knows it to break the spell: everybody would rush to the Berlitz school. Latin and Greek appear to the imagination like a myth, even for the teacher. One does not study Latin in order to learn Latin; it is studied in order to accustom children to studying, to analyzing a body of history that can be treated as a cadaver but returns continually to life. In the eight years of Latin, the entire language is studied, from Phaedrus, to Ennius, to Lactantius: a historical phenomenon is analyzed from its beginnings to its death in time. One studies the grammar of a certain time, the vocabulary of a given period and of a specific author, and then one discovers that Phaedrus' grammar is not the same as Cicero's, nor is it the same as Plautus', etc., and that the same combination of sounds does not have the same meaning in different periods and in different authors. Latin and Italian are always being compared, but each word is a concept, a figure of speech that takes on various shades of meaning in different periods, in different individuals, and in the two languages under comparison. One studies the history of literature, the history of the books written in that language, the political history, the exploits of the men who spoke that language. The education of the young man is determined by this organic whole, by the fact that he has followed—even if only roughly—that whole itinerary with its various stages, etc., etc. This mode of study *educated* without expressly declaring that it aimed to do so and with minimal intervention on the part of the teacher. Logical, psychological, artistic, etc., experiences were gained unreflectively, but what was gained above all was a great experience of history, of historical development.

Naturally, I do not believe that Greek and Latin have intrinsic thaumaturgical qualities; I am saying that in a given milieu, in a given culture with a given tradition, studying along these lines produced these particular results. Latin and Greek can be replaced, and they will be replaced, but one must be able to deploy the new subject or set of subjects didactically, in such a way as to obtain equivalent results in the general education of the individual from his childhood years to the time he is old enough to choose a career. During this span of time, the course of study, or most of it, must be disinterested; in other words, it must not have immediate or much too immediate practical purposes: it must be formative while being "instructive," that is, rich in concrete information.

In the modern school, I believe, a process of continuing degeneration is taking place: the vocational school, which addresses immediate practical interests, is gaining the upper hand over the "formative" school, which does not have an immediate interest. The greatest paradox is that this type of school appears and is proclaimed to be "democratic," while in fact it is

really designed to perpetuate social differences. How does one explain this paradox? I believe that it stems from an error in historical perspective that confuses quality with quantity. The traditional school was "oligarchic" because it was attended only by children of the upper class who were destined to become rulers, but it was not its mode of teaching that made it "oligarchic." It is not its students' acquisition of leadership skills nor its propensity to form superior individuals that gives a particular type of school its social character. The social character of the school is determined by the fact that every social stratum has its own type of school designed to perpetuate a specific traditional function within that stratum. In order to break this pattern, then, one must not multiply and promote vocational types of school but rather create a unified type of preparatory (elementary-secondary) school that would guide the youngster to the threshold of choosing a career and, in the process, form him as a person capable of thinking, studying, and ruling—or controlling those who rule. The multiplication of types of vocational school, then, tends to perpetuate traditional distinctions, but since it also tends to create new stratifications within these distinctions, it gives the impression of aiming for democracy. Take, for example, the unskilled laborer and the skilled worker, or the peasant and the surveyor or the petty agronomist, etc. But the trend toward democracy, in essence, cannot mean merely that an unskilled laborer can become a skilled worker but rather that every "citizen" can acquire the ability to "govern" and that society places him, even if only "abstractly," in general conditions to make this possible. "Political democracy" aims at removing the difference between those who govern and those who are governed, by ensuring that all those who are governed acquire, more or less gratis, the general "technical" preparation that is needed. But in reality the type of school that now, in practice, predominates demonstrates that this is just a rhetorical illusion. School is being organized increasingly in such a way as to restrict the base of the governing class in possession of technical preparation—a general historical-critical preparation, that is.

Dogmatism and critical history in the elementary and secondary school: the new pedagogy has chosen to attack dogmatism in the schools by focusing on the field of "instruction," in other words, on the learning of concrete information. It has chosen to attack precisely that field in which a certain dogmatism is practically indispensable, a dogmatism that can be absorbed and loosened only in the course of the whole cycle of the program of study (one cannot teach historical grammar in the first year of high school). Yet the new pedagogy has been forced to put up with the introduction of dogmatism par excellence in the field of religious thought and to see the entire history of philosophy described as a succession of wild ideas and delusions.[6]

The teaching of philosophy: I believe that in the secondary school the new method impoverishes learning and, in practice, lowers its level. (Rationally, the new method is very fine and proper, but in practice, given the condition of the schools, it is just a very rational and attractive utopia.) Traditional "descriptive" philosophy, reinforced by a course in the history of philosophy and by the reading, at home, of certain authors, seems to me to be the best thing. But "descriptive and definitional" philosophy, they say, is an abstraction! It may be an abstraction, just like grammar and mathematics, but it is necessary. One equals one is an abstraction, but nobody is led to think that one fly equals one elephant. The instruments of logic, too, are abstractions of the same kind; they are like the grammar of normal thought: they are not innate but acquired historically. The new method *presupposes* possession of the instruments of formal logic; its goal, however, is the education of children who cannot possibly be thought to have already acquired these instruments, thus the new method in effect regards the instruments as innate. Formal logic is like grammar: it is assimilated in a "living" way, even though it is necessarily apprehended schematically. The student is not a gramophone record, a passive receptacle. For example, the child who toils over Barbara, Bàràlipton, etc.:[7] he performs a strenuous task, to be sure, and ways should be found to ensure that he doesn't have to work any harder than is absolutely necessary. It is equally true, however, that he will always have to work hard in order to learn and force himself to control his physical movements; in other words, he has to go through a psychophysical apprenticeship. Studying, too, is a job and a very tiring one, with its own special apprenticeship, not only of the intellect but of the muscular-nervous system as well. It is a process of adaptation, a habit acquired with effort, pain, and tedium. The growth of mass participation in secondary education tends to slacken the discipline of studying; it tends to call for an "easing off." Many even consider the difficulty of study artificial since they are accustomed to think that only manual labor is hard and strenuous work. It is a complex issue. Undoubtedly, the child of a traditionally intellectual family gets through the process of psychophysical adaptation more easily: even as he enters the classroom for the first time, he already has numerous advantages over the other students; he has already learned from his family traditions how to fit in. Similarly, the son of a city worker suffers less when he starts working in a factory than does a peasant's son or a peasant already formed by life in the fields. Even diet has its importance, etc., etc.

This is why many "common people" think the difficulty of study entails some "trick" at their expense. They see the gentleman (for many, especially in the rural areas, "gentleman"[8] means "intellectual") complete, smoothly and with apparent ease, work that costs their sons tears

and blood, and they think there is a "trick." In a new political situation these problems will become very severe, and it will be necessary to resist the tendency to render easy that which cannot become easy without being perverted. If the goal is to produce a new corps of intellectuals, going all the way up to the highest levels, from a social stratum that has not traditionally developed the suitable psychophysical aptitudes, it will be necessary to overcome difficulties of unprecedented proportions.

Cf. Notebook 12, §2.

§<56>. *Machiavelli and the "autonomy" of the phenomenon of politics*. The question of Machiavellianism and anti-Machiavellianism (every true "Machiavellian" begins his political activity with an ostensible refutation of Machiavelli's theories: e.g., the Jesuits and Frederick II of Prussia).[1] The importance of the question of Machiavellianism in the development of political science: in Italy, at least, political science has developed around this theme. Construct a critical bibliography on the topic. What is the significance of Croce's comprehensive demonstration of the autonomy of the political-economic moment? Can one say that Croce would not have arrived at this conclusion were it not for the cultural influence of Marxism and historical materialism? Remember that at one point (check) Croce says he is surprised that no one has ever thought of saying that Marx replicated Machiavelli's accomplishment for a particular modern class.[2] Can one deduce from this passing statement by Croce the unfairness of his reduction of historical materialism to a mere empirical canon of historical methodology?

Other questions: given that politics is autonomous, what kind of dialectical relationship is there between it and the other historical manifestations? Problem of the dialectic in Croce and his postulation of a "dialectic of distincts":[3] is it not a contradiction in terms, an *ignorantia elenchi*? Dialectic should only refer to opposites, negation of the negation, not to an "implicated" relation.

Art, morality, philosophy "serve" politics; that is, they are "implicated" in politics, they may be reduced to a moment of it but not vice versa: politics destroys art, philosophy, morality. Along these lines, it is possible to affirm the priority of the politico-economic fact—that is, the "structure"—as a point of reference and as a nonmechanical dialectical "causation" of the superstructures.

In Croce's philosophy, the point on which one must focus, it seems to me, is precisely the so-called dialectic of distincts: this postulation is really needed, but it is also a contradiction in terms. It is necessary to study these principles in order to develop them critically. Examine the

nonverbalistic objections to Croce's "distincts" by the Gentilians.[4] Go back to Hegel: is the Croce-Gentile reform of Hegelianism "entirely" correct? Have they not rendered Hegel more "abstract"? Have they not lopped off his most realistic, most historicist features, the very same features that [on the other hand] essentially gave birth to Marxism? In other words, is it not the case that Marx's move beyond Hegelianism has been the most fruitful historical development of that philosophy, whereas its reform by Croce-Gentile is just that, a "reform," and not a going-beyond? And was it not Marxism itself that made Croce and Gentile—both of whom began by studying Marx (for political reasons?)—change direction? Vico–B. Spaventa as a link joining Croce and Gentile respectively to Hegelianism: but isn't this a way of pushing Hegel's philosophy back to an earlier phase?[5] Would Hegel be conceivable without the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, that is, without the vital and direct experiences of an extremely intense historical period during which all previous beliefs were peremptorily challenged by the realities of the time? What could Vico and Spaventa offer that was similar? (Spaventa, too, for he participated in historic events whose importance was regional and provincial when compared to the events between 1789 and 1815 that shook the whole civil world of the time and compelled everyone to think in "global" terms, events that set the social "totality," the entire conceivable human race, the whole "spirit" in motion. This is why, in Hegel's eyes, Napoleon could appear to be "the world spirit," on horseback!) What real historic movement is Vico's philosophy a witness to? His brilliance may reside in the fact that, with the help of the unified and cosmopolitan vision of Catholicism, he was able to conceive the vast world from a dead little corner of history, but . . . Herein lies the fundamental difference between Vico and Hegel, between god and Napoleon–world spirit, between pure abstract speculation and the "philosophy of history" that should lead to the identification of philosophy with history, action with thought, and the "German proletariat as the sole inheritor of classical German philosophy."[6]

Cf. Notebook 10, II, §41 (x).

§<57>. *Vincenzo Cuoco and passive revolution.* Vincenzo Cuoco called the revolution that took place in Italy as a repercussion of the Napoleonic wars a passive revolution. The concept of passive revolution, it seems to me, applies not only to Italy but also to those other countries that modernize the state through a series of reforms or national wars without undergoing a political revolution of a radical-Jacobin type. Examine how Cuoco develops the concept with regards to Italy.[1]

§<58>. [*Popular literature.*] Atkinson, N., *Eugène Sue et le roman-feuilleton.* In 8°, 226 pp., Paris, Nizet et Bastard, 40 Fr.[1]

Cf. Notebook 21, §15.

§<59>. [*History of the subaltern classes.*] Rosmini A., *Saggio sul communismo e sul socialismo,* edited with an introduction by A. Canaletti Gaudenti. In 16°, 85 pp., Rome, Signorelli, L. 6.[1] (To be examined together with the pre-1848 papal encyclicals cited in Pius IX's *Syllabus*[2] as an Italian commentary on the opening paragraph of the *Manifesto.*[3] Cf. also the bibliographical chapter in Salvemini's *Mazzini.*)[4]

Cf. Notebook 11, §7.

§<60>. *Cultural topics.*[a] A critical-bibliographical survey on the question of capitalism in ancient times: comparison of the two editions, French and Italian, of Salvioli's book;[1] Barbagallo's articles and books (for ex., *L'oro e il fuoco*) and his polemic with Giovanni Sanna.[2] The "tone" of these writings is typical in Barbagallo; the polemic reminds one of the eighteenth-century controversy about the ancients and the moderns. How important and significant has this eighteenth-century controversy been? It was the expression of the growing awareness that a new historical phase was already under way, a phase that would completely transform all modes of existence and radically upset the past. On this topic, see what Antonio Labriola wrote, in his fragment *Da un secolo all'altro,* on the new calendar installed by the French Revolution (there has not been an equally profound awareness of discontinuity between the ancient world and the Christian world, as can be seen from the history of the calendar discussed by Labriola).[3] What is the significance of the current (modern) debate on ancient capitalism? It is undoubtedly reactionary, and it tends to propagate skepticism and to strip economic phenomena of anything that might be indicative of development and progress. The debate, however, concerns only small, and not very important, circles of professional scholars; it is not an element of culture, unlike the eighteenth-century controversy. Barbagallo's position is typical of Italian so-called historical materialism—for Barbagallo still declares himself a "historical materialist" (cf. his little polemic with Croce in *Nuova Rivista Storica* of 1928–29).[4] Linked to Guglielmo Ferrero and to Lorianism.[5]

[a]In the manuscript, the title of this note, "Cultural topics," appears above the canceled title "Types of periodicals."

A *study* on the global role of London: how it was established historically and how it encountered competition after the war—a technical aspect of Anglo-Saxon economic hegemony and the hegemony of the sterling in the world; the efforts by New York and Paris to supplant London. How much does British capitalism profit from this hegemony? Some of Einaudi's writings touch on this subject in general terms.[6] Mario Borsa's book on London.[7] Angelo Crespi's book on British imperialism.[8]

The subject is discussed by the president of Westminster (Bank) in a speech he delivered at the meeting of 1929: the speaker referred to complaints that the efforts being made to safeguard London's position as an international financial center were imposing excessive sacrifices on industry and commerce, but he pointed out that the revenues generated by London's financial market contribute greatly toward erasing the *deficit* in the balance of trade. According to a study conducted by the Ministry of Trade, that contribution amounted to 65 million pounds sterling in 1928, 63 million pounds in 1927, and 60 million pounds in 1926; the activity of the financial market must therefore be considered as one of England's major export industries. One must bear in mind the important role played by London in the exportation of capital, which yields an annual income of 285 million pounds sterling and facilitates the exportation of English goods because English investments make the cornering of foreign markets easier. Moreover, the mechanism of international finance established in London provides the English exporter with easy access to better banking and exchange services, etc., than are available in any other country. It is obvious, then, that the sacrifices made to preserve London's supremacy in the field of international finance are amply justified by the advantages derived from that supremacy, but in order to preserve that supremacy, it is essential that the English monetary system be based on the free movement of gold. Any measure hampering the free movement of gold would damage London as the international center of transactions in bills payable on demand. The foreign deposits made in London in the form of bills payable on demand represent very substantial sums of money placed at the disposal of the London market. One might think that if these funds were to stop pouring in, the cost of money would perhaps be more stable, but in fact it would certainly be higher.[9]

What economic commercial expressions that can be found in newspapers and economic journals have come into existence because of the role played by London?

Cf. Notebook 16, §6 and §7.

§<61>. *Philosophy-ideology, science-doctrine.* Cf. Gaëtan Pirou, *Doctrines sociales et science économique*, Paris, Librairie du Recueil

Sirey.[1] (Chapters: Science économique et socialisme. Science et doctrines économiques. Nouveaux aspects du coopératisme. L'état actuel de la science économique en France. Fondament de la valeur et lois de l'échange. M. Pantaleoni et la théorie économique.) The author distinguishes those theories that seek to explain economic facts (economic science) from theories aimed at bringing about economic and social change (which he calls social doctrines). He then examines the attempts that are made to establish connections between social doctrines and economic science; he gives special consideration to the claim made by liberalism as well as Marxism that they are adhering to science, whereas in fact they have other concerns. "The truth, it appears, is that the development of science and the development of doctrines do not take place on the same plane and that doctrines are never the simple extension into the future of the evolutionary curve, nor are they ineluctable deductions from the teachings of science." Aligning himself with Sorel, the author also writes that "doctrines must not be studied as truths that have been put in formulas, but as forces that have been put into action." Alfonso De Pietri-Tonelli (in *Rivista di Politica Economica*, 31 March 1930) provides a bibliographical citation, from which I have extracted the lines above, and then refers the reader to his own course on political economy, in which he claims to have made the same distinctions, including that of the "forces that have been put into action," which supposedly corresponds to his theory of impulses.

The question of the relations between science and life: Marxism is not a mere social doctrine according to Pirou's distinction, since it even "claims" to explain "science" itself: that is, it claims to be more of a science than "science." The question of ideology-philosophy = doctrine-science also entails the question of the "primeval" character or the "irreducibility" of the political or practical moment. Ideology = scientific hypothesis that has the power to educate and is verified [and criticized]—i.e., transformed into science (real hypothesis), systematized—by the real development of science.

§<62>. *Military and political craft.* Traditional maxims that correspond to the common sense of the masses: "Generals," Xenophon says, "should surpass other men not in the sumptuousness of their tables and in their pleasures but in skill and hard work." "It is unlikely that soldiers can be persuaded to endure penury and dis-

comfort caused by the ignorance or negligence of their commander, but they are all ready to endure penury and discomfort arising out of necessity." "Boldness at one's own risk is valor; at the risk of others it is arrogance (Pietro Colletta)."[1]

The difference between boldness-daring and courage: the former is instinctive and impulsive; courage, however, is acquired with education and through social customs. Staying for a long time in a trench requires "courage"—that is, perseverance in boldness—which can be produced either by "terror" (certain death if one does not stay) or by the conviction that it is necessary (courage).

§<63>. *The Sorel-Croce correspondence.* Remember that in 1929, following the publication of a letter in which Sorel talked about Oberdan,[1] a number of items appeared in print objecting to certain expressions in Sorel's letters and attacking Sorel himself (a particularly violent publication by Arturo Stanghellini was quoted by *L'Italia Letteraria* at the time).[2] Publication of the correspondence was suspended in the next issue of *La Critica*; it was later resumed without any reference to the incident but with some changes: many names were replaced by initials, and it seemed that certain letters were not published. This marked the beginning of a journalistic reevaluation of Sorel and of his relationship with Italy.

Cf. Notebook 11, §66.

§<64>. *"History and Antihistory."* "There are few who have Thought and the capacity for Action. Thought expands, but lames: Action animates, but narrows." Goethe, *W. Meister* (VIII, 5).[1]

§<65>. *Past and present.* An article by Salvatore di Giacomo (in the *Giornale d'Italia* of 1920) on the "impracticability" of the common streets of Naples for "dreamers" and "poets."[1] Flowerpots used to fall from the windows, crushing the bowlers and straw hats of gentlemen, and even their skulls. Episode of the tomatoes that cost money and the stones that don't. A sense of detachment, of differentiation in a "heated" primitive environment—a sense of near impunity that manifests itself openly. In "normal" times, this same primitive environment is adulatory and servile in a sly way. Episode of the Venetian commoner recounted by Manzoni to Bonghi: the

commoner bowed and doffed his cap most ardently in front of noblemen, whereas in front of churches he bowed moderately. When questioned about his seemingly inferior respect for sacred things, he answered, with a wink: "One does not fool around with saints."[2] How did differentiation manifest itself in a modern city? Examples and episodes.

§<66>. *The military element in politics.* An analysis of the set of social forces that have operated in history and are at work in the political activity of a state structure should give due attention to the military and the bureaucratic element, and this includes not just the military and bureaucratic elements that are actually in place but also the social strata in the particular state structure from which these elements are traditionally recruited. A political movement can be of a military character even if the army as such has not openly participated in it; a government can be military even if it is not made up of military men. In certain situations it may be better not to expose the army, not to have it transgress constitutional limits, not to introduce politics into the ranks, as the saying goes, and thus maintain homogeneity among officers and soldiers on the grounds that the army must appear neutral and rise above "factions." One must not forget that the army reproduces the social structure of the state and that therefore the introduction of politics into the army can reproduce therein the conflicts of the outside world and thus bring about a disintegration of the military formation.[a] None of these observations is absolute; they have to be "relativized" according to the various moments of history and different states.

The first thing to examine is the following: does a given country have an extensive social stratum for which a military or bureaucratic career is an important element in economic life and political self-assertion (effective participation in power, even if only indirectly, by "blackmail")? In modern Europe this stratum can be identified in the medium and small rural bourgeoisie, which is more or less extensive, depending on the development of industrial strength on the one hand and of agrarian reform on the other. Obviously, military and bureaucratic careers cannot be a monopoly of this social stratum. However, there are two important ele-

[a]At this point in the manuscript, Gramsci—apparently at some later time—inserted "(1)" to indicate the addition of a few lines that he placed at the bottom of the page: "(1) Note that an effort is made, through the associations of ex-combatants and furloughed officers, to provide a stable education in society for a segment of the military that is linked to the standing army (that is, to the general staff), that can be mobilized when the occasion arises without the need to mobilize the conscript army, and that retains the function of a reserve in a state of readiness: a segment of the military that is bound to be influenced by these military forces that are not officially in the army."

ments that produce a certain homogeneity and a strong sense of purpose in this stratum, giving it a political advantage and a decisive role in the social ensemble. The two elements are: the social function that it performs and the psychological attitude generated by such a function. This stratum is accustomed to exercising direct command over small groups of men and to commanding "politically" rather than "economically." This stratum has no economic functions in the modern sense of the term; it has an income because it owns some "brutish" land and prevents the peasant from improving his own existence: it lives off the chronic poverty and prolonged labor of the peasant. The merest hint of an (autonomous) organization of peasant labor endangers the living standard and the social position of this social stratum, which is why it resists and counterattacks with such extreme energy. This stratum finds its limits in its social "nonhomogeneity" and in its territorial dispersal. These elements explain other phenomena that are peculiar to this stratum: its volubility, the multiplicity of systems it follows, the bizarre nature of the ideologies it embraces, etc. Its will is directed toward a definite goal, but it lags behind and must undergo a lengthy process to centralize itself organizationally and politically. The process gains momentum when the specific will of this stratum coincides with the general or specific will of the upper class. Then not only does the process gain momentum, but the "military strength" of the stratum becomes manifest, and it sometimes lays down the law to the upper class with regard to a specific solution, or, rather, the "form" of such a solution. The laws pertaining to the relations between city and country (noted elsewhere)[1] are at work here, too: power in the city automatically becomes power in the country, but in the country, conflicts immediately assume an acute and personal form because of the absence of economic margins and because of the greater repression "normally" exercised from the top downward; this is why reactions in the country have to be more rapid and decisive. This stratum understands and sees that the source of its troubles is in the cities, in the power of cities; it therefore understands that it "must" dictate a solution to the urban upper classes in order to stifle the hotbed of unrest, even if this does not immediately suit the urban upper classes either because it is too costly or because it is dangerous in the long run (these classes are more sophisticated, and they see long cycles of events, not just the immediate "tangible" interests). The leading function of this stratum must not be taken to be absolute; rather, it has to be understood in the sense described here. Even so, it is no small thing.

In a number of countries, then, the influence of the military element in politics does not mean simply the influence and weight of the military in the technical sense but the influence and weight of the social stratum that is the primary source of the technical military element (especially of subaltern officers). This criterion, I believe, is quite useful for analyzing the

most hidden aspect of that specific political form usually known as Caesarism or Bonapartism and for distinguishing it from other political forms in which the technical military element predominates, perhaps in ways that are even more conspicuous and exclusive.

Spain and Greece offer two typical examples, with similarities and differences. In the case of Spain, certain particularities have to be taken into account: the vastness of its territory and the low density of its peasant population. Between the landed aristocracy and the peasants there is no large rural bourgeoisie; the subaltern officer corps, as a force in itself, is of little importance. The military governments are governments of top generals. Passivity of the peasant masses as citizens and as military rank and file. Disunity in the army, if it occurs, is vertical rather than horizontal, the result of rivalries between cliques in the commanding echelons: the soldiers usually follow their respective leaders in the internecine conflict. Military government is a parenthesis between two constitutional governments. The military is the permanent reserve of "order"; it is a permanent political force that acts "publicly." The same is true of Greece, except that the territory of Greece, including the islands, is scattered, and a part of its more energetic and active population is always at sea, which makes military intrigue and conspiracy even easier. The Greek peasant is passive like his Spanish counterpart, but within the framework of the total population—the most energetic and active Greeks being sailors and almost always far from home and from their political center—the general passivity must be analyzed differently, and the solution to the political problem in Greece cannot be the same as in Spain. What is noteworthy is the fact that in these two countries the experience of military government did not create a permanent political and social ideology, whereas that is what does happen in those countries that are, so to speak, "Caesarist." The underlying conditions are the same—an equilibrium of the urban classes struggling with each other that obstructs "normal" democracy, namely, parliamentary government—but the influence of the countryside in this equilibrium varies. In Spain, the countryside, being totally passive, permits the generals of the landed aristocracy to make political use of the army to reestablish order—that is, the supremacy of the upper classes—while giving the transitional military government a deceptively different appearance. In other countries, the countryside is not passive, but its movement is not politically coordinated with the urban movement: the army must remain neutral for as long as possible in order to avoid being broken up horizontally. The "military-bureaucratic class," the rural bourgeoisie, enters the scene and uses military means to stifle the (more immediately dangerous) movement in the countryside. In this struggle it finds a certain political and ideological consolidation; it finds allies among the middle class in the city (the role of students of rural origin living in the cities); it

imposes its own political methods on the upper classes, which must make many concessions to it and permit the passage of specific legislation in its favor. In short, it manages to permeate the state with its interests (up to a point) and to replace the leading personnel, while continuing to keep itself armed during a general disarmament and incessantly threatening civil war between its own armed bands and the national army if the upper class fails to comply with certain demands. This phenomenon always assumes historically specific forms: Caesar represents a different combination of elements from that represented by Napoleon I, and the latter is different from that of Napoleon III, or from Bismarck's, etc. In the modern world, Zivkovic resembles the Spanish type (and Zankov resembles Caesarism?), etc.[2] In other words, these observations are not sociological schemata; they are practical criteria of historical and political interpretation that must always be removed from schematic generalizations and incorporated into a concrete historico-political analysis.

Cf. Notebook 13, §23.

§<67>. *The relative greatness of powerful nations.* Basic factors for calculating the hierarchy of power among states: 1. territorial extension; 2. economic power; 3. military might; (4. the ability of a state to set its activities on an autonomous course so influential that other powers are bound to be affected by it). The fourth factor is a consequence of the first three and the way in which a great power expresses itself as such. The third factor, too, recapitulates the first two: namely, territorial extension (with a relatively high population) and economic power. Geographical position should be considered as part of the territorial factor. In the case of economic power, industrial and agricultural capacity (production) must be distinguished from financial power. An imponderable element is the ideological position that a certain power occupies in the world, insofar as it represents the progressive forces of history.[1]

Cf. Notebook 13, §19.

§<68>. *Il libro di don Chisciotte*[a] by E. Scarfoglio.[1] It is an episode in the struggle to modernize Italian culture and rid it of its provincialism. The book in itself is mediocre. It is valuable for its time and also because it may have been the first effort of its kind.

[a]In the manuscript, directly above "*Il libro di don Chisciotte,*" Gramsci inserted "(Alfredo Oriani)," probably as an alternative title for the note.

Since I have to write on Oriani,[2] the passage that Scarfoglio devotes to him (p. 227 of the Mondadori edition, 1925) is noteworthy. For Scarfoglio (who wrote this around 1884), Oriani was a weak, defeated man who consoled himself by knocking down everything and everyone: "The gentleman from Banzole has his memory stuffed with bits and pieces of hastily read things, misunderstood and poorly digested theories, malformed and lackluster phantasms; and, furthermore, he is not very adept at handling language."[3] There is an interesting quotation, perhaps from *Quartetto*, in which Oriani writes: "Defeated in every battle, insulted as are all losers, I never stooped and will never stoop to the silliness of retaliation or the meanness of lamentation: losers are always at fault."[4] This passage, it seems to me, reveals a fundamental trait of Oriani's character: he had foolish aspirations, he never liked anybody because no one recognized his genius, and, deep down, he abandoned the struggle to succeed; in other words, he had a very odd sense of self-esteem. He was a pseudo-Titan, and although undeniably gifted in certain ways, he was primarily the provincial "misunderstood genius" who dreams of glory, power, and triumph, just as a young lady dreams of Prince Charming.

§<69>. *On political parties*. At a certain point in the course of history, classes become detached from their traditional parties. In other words, the traditional parties in their particular organizational form, with the particular men who constitute and lead them, no longer represent their class or their class fraction. This is an extremely delicate and dangerous crisis because it opens the field to men who are charismatic or claim to be sent by providence.[1] This conflict between the represented and the representatives, which takes place on the terrain of private organizations (parties or trade unions), inevitably has repercussions on the state, reinforcing in a formidable way the power of the bureaucracy (in the broad sense: military and civil). How does this situation of conflict arise in the first place? In every country the process is different, although the content is the same. The crisis is dangerous when it spreads to all the political parties and among all the different classes; in other words, it is dangerous when the rank and file of one or more parties does not very quickly go over to another party that better epitomizes the general interest. The passage from one party to another is an organic [and normal] phenomenon even when it takes place very rapidly by comparison to normal periods; it represents the fusion of a class under a single leadership in order to resolve an over-

whelming problem affecting its existence. When the crisis is not resolved in this organic manner but instead produces the man sent by providence, it means that a static equilibrium exists; it means that no class, neither the conservative nor the progressive class, has the strength to win, but it also means that even the conservative class needs a master.

Cf. Notebook 13, §23.

§<70>. *Sorel, the Jacobins, violence.* Check how Sorel reconciles his hatred for the Jacobins-optimists with his theories of violence. Sorel's phillipics against the Jacobins are incessant. (See his "Lettre à M. Daniel Halévy" in *Mouvement Socialiste*, 16 August and 15 September 1907).[1]

Cf. Notebook 11, §66.

§<71>. *Science.* Alongside the most superficial infatuation with science there exists, in reality, the greatest ignorance about scientific facts and methods, which are and continue to become increasingly difficult because of the growing specialization of new branches of knowledge. Scientific superstition: it brings with it ridiculous illusions and notions that are even more infantile than those of religion. People start to expect something like the Land of Cockaigne where the forces of nature, without much need of human labor, will provide society with an abundance of all that is required to satisfy its needs. This infatuation, the ideological dangers of which are obvious (superstitious faith in the power of man, paradoxically, leads to the impotence of the very bases of this power), must be opposed in diverse ways, and the most important of these has to be a better understanding of the basic principles of science. Science should be disseminated by scientists and serious scholars and no longer by omniscient journalists and know-it-all autodidacts.

People expect "too much" from science, and therefore they are unable to appreciate what science really has to offer.

Cf. Notebook 11, §39.

§<72>. *The new intellectual.* The traditional type of intellectual: the man of letters, the philosopher, the poet. As a result, the vulgar journalist who considers himself a man of letters, a philosopher, or an artist believes that he is the "true" intellectual.

In the modern world, technical education, implicitly related to industrial labor even of the most primitive (unskilled) type, forms the basis of

the "new intellectual": it is on this basis that one must work to develop the "new intellectualism." This was the policy of *L'Ordine Nuovo* (remember this point for the chapter on "Past and Present"). The lawyer and the clerk typify the intellectual of today, the intellectual who believes himself to be endowed with great social dignity; his mode of existence is "eloquence" that stirs the emotions. New intellectual-constructor, organizer, "permanent persuader" but also superior to the abstract mathematical spirit: from technique-as-work one moves on to technique-as-science and to the "humanistic-historical" concept, without which one remains a "specialist" and does not become a "leader" (specialist in politics).

Cf. Notebook 11, §3.

§<73>. *Lorianism.* Have I already mentioned the need to include Corso Bovio within the framework of Lorianism?[1] He must be placed there, while remembering to keep one's distance in order to achieve perspective. Corso Bovio enters the picture in the following sense: just as certain Flemish painters (Téniers, I believe) always include a lapdog in paintings of a certain genre, so does Corso Bovio have his place in the portrayal of Lorianism. But perhaps even the lapdog is too big an animal; a cockroach would more than suffice to represent him.

Cf. Notebook 28, §15.

§<74>. *G. B. Angioletti. L'Italia Letteraria* of 18 May 1930 reproduced a number of formal declarations emanating from a quarrel between Angioletti and Guglielmo Danzi.[1] The latter, from what one could gather, had attacked Angioletti for his political past, in the newspaper *La Quarta Roma* of 30 April 1930. Angioletti delivered to his backers, Nosari and Ungaretti,[2] a note containing the essential data concerning his military service and his political and journalistic positions. Angioletti claims to have participated in the events at Milan on 15 April 1919[3] and to have coedited *La Scure* of Piacenza in 1923, with Barbiellini.[4]

§<75>. *Past and present.* Lutheran Reformation—English Calvinism—in France, eighteenth-century rationalism and concrete political thought (action by the masses). In Italy there has

never been an intellectual and moral reform involving the popular masses. The Renaissance, eighteenth-century French philosophy, nineteenth-century German philosophy: these are reforms that touch only the upper classes and often only the intellectuals. Modern idealism, in its Crocean form, is certainly a reform, and it has had a certain efficacy, but it has not touched significant masses of people, and it fell apart at the first counterattack. Therefore historical mat.<erialism> will have or may have this function, which is not only totalitarian as a conception of the world but also in that it will permeate all of society down to its deepest roots.[1] Recall the polemics (Gobetti, Missiroli, etc.) on the need for a reform, understood mechanically.[2]

§<76>. *Vittorio Macchioro and America.* Vittorio Macchioro has written a book, *Roma capta: Saggio intorno alla religione romana* (Messina: Casa Ed. G. Principato), in which the whole argument is based on "the poverty of imagination of the Roman people."[1] In 1930 he went to America and sent some reports to *Il Mattino* of Naples. And behold! the motif appears in his first report (of 7 March): "The American has no imagination, he is unable to create images. I believe that, but for the influence of Europe [(!)], there will never be a great American poet or painter. The American mentality is essentially practical and technical: whence a special feeling for quantity, that is, for numbers. Just as the poet is sensitive to images, or the musician is sensitive to sound, so the American is sensitive to numbers. —This propensity to conceive of life as a technical fact explains American philosophy itself. Pragmatism emanates precisely from this mentality, which does not value or grasp abstraction. James and Dewey, even more, are the most genuine products of this unconscious technical urge; for them, philosophy is replaced by education, and an abstract idea is not valuable in itself but only to the extent that it can be translated into action. ('The poverty of imagination of the Roman people induced the Romans to think of the godhead as an abstract energy that manifests itself only in action'; cf. *Roma capta.*) For this reason America is the typical country of churches and schools, where theoretics are grafted onto life." (Cf. *L'Italia Letteraria* of 16 March 1930.)[2]

It seems that Macchioro's thesis is a cap that fits all heads.

§<77>. *Types of periodicals*. A regular column on scientific developments. But not to popularize scientific ideas. To expound, criticize, and contextualize "scientific ideas" and their repercussions on ideologies and on conceptions of the world,[1] and also to promote the pedagogical-didactic principle of the "history of science and technology as the foundation of the formative-historical education of the new school."

CANTO 10 OF THE INFERNO[1]

§<78>. The question of "structure and poetry" in the *Divine Comedy*[1] according to B. Croce and Luigi Russo.[2] Vincenzo Morello's reading as *corpus vile*.[3] Fedele Romani's interpretation of Farinata.[4] De Sanctis.[5] The question of "indirect representation" and of stage directions[6] in drama: Do stage directions have artistic value? Do they contribute to the representation of the characters? Certainly, since they limit the arbitrary freedom of the actor and depict the given character more concretely. A case in point is Shaw's *Man and Superman* with John Tanner's handbook as an appendix; that appendix is a stage direction from which an intelligent actor can and should derive ideas for his interpretation.[7] The picture at Pompeii of Medea killing the children she had by Jason: Medea is depicted with a blindfold over her face; the painter is unable or unwilling to depict that face.[8] (There is, however, the case of Niobe, but in a work of sculpture: covering her face would have meant removing the actual content from the work.) Farinata and Cavalcante: the father-in-law and the father of Guido.[9] Cavalcante is the one punished in the circle. No one has pointed out that if the drama of Cavalcante is overlooked one does not see the torment of the dead being *enacted* in that circle. Analyses of the *structure* should have led to a more accurate aesthetic evaluation of the canto, since every punishment is shown being enacted. De Sanctis was alerted to the harshness contained in the canto by the fact that Farinata suddenly changes character: first he is *poetry*,

and then he becomes *structure*, acting as Dante's guide, as De Sanctis explains. The poetic representation of Farinata has been admirably revivified by Romani: Farinata is *a series of statues*. Then Farinata acts out a *stage direction*. Isidoro del Lungo's book on Dino Compagni's *Cronica*: it establishes the date of Guido's death.[10] It is strange that scholars did not think earlier of using canto 10 for establishing, approximately, this date (or has someone done it?). But Del Lungo's ascertainment of the date was not even used to interpret the figure of Cavalcante and to explain the function Dante assigns Farinata.

What is the position of Cavalcante? What is his torment? Cavalcante sees into the past and into the future, but he does not see the present: that is, he does not see within a specific zone of the past and the future that comprises the present. In the past Guido is alive; in the future Guido is dead. But in the present? Is he dead or alive? This is Cavalcante's torment, his affliction, his sole dominant thought. When he speaks, he asks about his son; when he hears "he had"—the verb in the past tense—he persists in his questioning. As the answer is delayed, he no longer doubts: his son is dead. He disappears into the fiery tomb.[11]

How does Dante represent this drama? He suggests it to the reader; he does not depict it. He provides the reader with the components for reconstructing the drama, and these components are furnished by the structure. Nevertheless, there is a dramatic part, and it precedes the stage direction. Three cues: Cavalcante appears, not upright and manly like Farinata, but humble, disheartened, perhaps on his knees, and asks uncertainly about his son. Dante's reply is indifferent or almost indifferent, and he uses a verb that refers to Guido in the past tense. Cavalcante seizes on this immediately and cries out in despair. He experiences doubt, uncertainty. He asks for further explanation with three questions in which there is a gradation of emotional states: "Did you say 'he had'?" "Does he not still live?" "Does the sweet light not strike his eyes?" Contained in the third question is all of Cavalcante's paternal affection. Generic human "life" is seen in a concrete condition, in the enjoyment of light, which the damned and the dead have lost. Dante delays in answering, and at that point Cavalcante ceases to doubt. Farinata, however, does not stir. Guido is his daughter's husband, but this emotional tie has no power over him at that moment. Dante stresses Farinata's strength of mind. Cavalcante collapses, *but*

Farinata does not change expression, he does not move his neck, he does not bend down. Cavalcante falls supine; Farinata betrays no sign of dejection. Dante describes Farinata with a series of negatives in order to echo the (three) movements of Cavalcante: the distortion of the face, the lowering of the head, the bending of the back. Nonetheless, there is some change in Farinata as well. When he resumes, he is no longer as haughty as at his first appearance. Dante does not question Farinata just to "acquire information"; he questions him because he has been struck by Cavalcante's disappearance. He wants the problem that prevented him from answering Cavalcante to be resolved; he feels guilty about Cavalcante. The structural passage, then, is not merely structure; it is also poetry, it is a necessary element of the drama that has taken place.

§<79>. *Criticism of the "unexpressed"?* My observations might give rise to the following objection: that this is a criticism of the unexpressed, an account of the nonexistent, an abstract inquiry into plausible intentions that never took the concrete form of poetry, although there are still external traces of them in the mechanism of the structure. Something like the position frequently adopted by Manzoni in *I promessi sposi*, as when Renzo thinks about Lucia's black braid after wandering in search of the river Adda and the border: ". . . and contemplating the image of Lucia—we will not *venture* to describe his feelings; *the reader knows the circumstances, and he can use his own imagination.*"[1] This, too, can be taken as an instance of trying to "picture" a drama on the basis of one's knowledge of the circumstances.

The objection has a semblance of truth. If one cannot imagine Dante imposing limits on his expression out of practical considerations (unlike Manzoni, who, for "Catholic, moral" reasons, deliberately refrained from discussing sexual love and depicting the passions in their fullness),[2] it could still be argued that his restraint was due to the "tradition of poetic language" (Ugolino, Myrrha, etc.)[3]—which, however, Dante did not always adhere to—"reinforced" by his special feelings for Guido. But can one reconstruct and criticize a poem other than in the world of concrete expression, of historically realized language? Thus it was not a "voluntary" factor "of a practical or intellective nature" that *clipped* Dante's wings. He "flew with the wings he had," so to speak, and he did not

forgo anything voluntarily. On the topic of Manzoni's artistic neo-Malthusianism, cf. Croce's little book[4] and the article by Guiseppe Citanna in *La Nuova Italia* of June 1930.[5]

§<80>. Pliny records that when Timanthes of Sicyon painted the scene of the sacrifice of Iphigenia, he portrayed Agamemnon as veiled.[1] Lessing, in *Laocoön*, was the first (?) to attribute this artistic device not to the artist's inability to represent the father's grief but rather to the artist's deep conviction that facial expressions of the most extreme torment would not have enabled him to convey as painful an impression of unfathomable anguish as this veiled figure whose face is covered by his hand.[2] In the painting of the sacrifice of Iphigenia at Pompeii—which differs in its general composition from Timanthes' painting—the figure of Agamemnon is also veiled.

These different representations of the sacrifice of Iphigenia are discussed by Paolo Enrico Arias in the *Bollettino dell'Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico di Siracusa*; the essay is summarized in *Il Marzocco* of 13 July 1930.[3]

Among the paintings at Pompeii there are other examples of veiled figures: e.g., Medea killing her children. Have there been other discussions of this issue since Lessing, whose interpretation is not entirely satisfying?[4]

§<81>. The date of Guido Cavalcanti's death was critically established for the first time by Isidoro Del Lungo in his work *Dino Compagni e la sua Cronica*.[1] The third volume of this work, "containing the historical and philological apparatus for the whole work and the text of the *Cronica* based on Laurentian Ashburnham codex," was published in 1887. Volumes 1 and 2 were completed in 1880 and published soon after. One should check whether Del Lungo, having established the date of Guido's death, related that date to canto 10; I seem to recall that he did not. On the same subject one should check the following works by Del Lungo: *Dante nei tempi di Dante*, Bologna, 1888; *Dal secolo e dal poema di Dante*, Bologna, 1898; and especially *Da Bonifazio VIII ad Arrigo VII: Pagine di storia fiorentina per la vita di Dante*, which is a revised, corrected, and in some instances enhanced edition of part of the work in *Dino Compagni e la sua Cronica*.

§<82>. *Guido's disdain.* The review of Enrico Sicardi's posthumous book *La lingua italiana in Dante* (Casa Ed. Optima, Rome) by G. S. Gargàno ("La lingua nei tempi di Dante e l'interpretazione della poesia," *Il Marzocco*, 14 April 1929), cites Sicardi's interpretation of Guido's "disdain."[1] The passage, writes Sicardi, should be interpreted as follows: "I am not making this journey of my own free will; I am not free to come or not to come. I have been led here by him who is standing there waiting for me and *with whom* your Guido disdained to come here; that is, he disdained to accompany him to this place." Sicardi's interpretation is formal; it has no substance: he does not pause to explain what is "disdained" (whether it is the Latin language, or Virgil's imperialism, or the other things proposed by the interpreters). Dante was bestowed with "grace" from Heaven: how could the same grace have been granted to an atheist? (This is incorrect, because "grace," by its very nature, cannot be limited for any reason.) Sicardi maintains that "*cui*"—in the line "*Forse cui Guido vostro ebbe a disdegno*"[2]—undoubtedly refers to Virgil; yet he also maintains that "*cui*" is not an object complement but one of those pronouns that lack the prepositional particle "*con.*"[3] And the object of "*ebbe a disdegno*"?[4] It is to be found in "*da me stesso non vengo*"[5] and is, let us suppose, either the noun "*venuta*"[6] or, if one prefers, an object clause, "*di venire.*"[7]

At a certain point in his review, Gargàno writes: "Guido's friend tells the poor *disappointed*[8] father that he does not see his son also passing through Hell alive, etc." *Disappointed*? The word is most inadequate: is it Gargàno's, or does he take it from Sicardi? The following question is not raised: Why should Cavalcante actually expect Guido to come with Dante into Hell? "By reason of high genius"?[9] Cavalcante is not moved by "rationality" but by "passion"; there is no reason why Guido should accompany Dante. The simple fact is that Cavalcante wants to know whether at that moment Guido is alive or dead and thus free himself from his torment.

The most important word in the line "Forse cui Guido vostro ebbe a disdegno" is not "cui" or "disdegno" but only "*ebbe.*"[10] The "aesthetic" and "dramatic" accent in this line falls on "ebbe," and it is the source of the drama of Cavalcante, interpreted in the explanatory passages of Farinata. And there is the "catharsis": Dante corrects himself, he relieves Cavalcante of his suffering; in other words, he interrupts the punishment *in action.*[11]

§<83>. Vincenzo Morello. *Dante, Farinata, Cavalcante,* in 8°, 80 pp., Mondadori, 1927. Contains two pieces: (1) "Dante e Farinata. Il canto X dell'Inferno letto nella 'Casa di Dante' in Roma il xxv aprile MCMXXV"; (2) "Cavalcanti e il suo disdegno."[1] The publisher's description of the book states: "Morello's interpretations will generate scholarly debate because they depart completely from traditional views and arrive at new and different conclusions." But did Morello have any scholarly preparation for this kind of study and research? He opens his first essay thus: "The criticism of the last three decades has explored the fountainheads (!) of Dante's work so deeply that the most obscure meanings, the most difficult references, the most abstruse allusions, and even the most recondite particulars of the characters in the three canticles can be said to have been figured out and clarified." A contented mind is a perpetual feast. Moreover, it is very convenient to set out with such a premise: it exempts one from having to undertake the serious and taxing labor of sorting out and probing into the results reached by historical and aesthetic criticism. Morello goes on: "Thus, *after the necessary scholarly preparation,* we can now read and understand the *Divine Comedy* without getting lost ever again in the labyrinths of the old conjectures, labyrinths that incomplete historical information and *lack of intellectual rigor* vied to create and render inescapable." Morello, then, is supposed to have completed the *necessary scholarly preparation* and to be a thoroughly rigorous intellectual; it will not be hard to show that he has read canto 10 superficially and failed to grasp it even at the most obvious literal level. According to Morello, canto 10 is "above all political," and "politics, for Dante, is as sacred as religion"; therefore, canto 10 must be interpreted with the "utmost rigor" so as not to substitute one's own leanings and passions for those of others and give free rein to the oddest aberrations. Morello asserts that canto 10 is primarily political, but he does not and cannot prove it, because it is untrue: canto 10 is political in the same way as all of the *Divine Comedy* is, but it is not political par excellence. This assertion, however, suits Morello just fine because it saves him from tiring his brain cells. Since he regards himself as a great politician and a great political theorist he could easily produce a political interpretation of canto 10 after having thumbed through it in whatever edition happened to be lying around, helping himself to general ideas about Dante's politics that are common currency: every journalist

of Morello's stature is bound to have a smattering of these ideas as well as some index cards about them.

The superficiality of Morello's reading of canto 10 is evident in the pages where he deals with the relations between Farinata and Guido Cavalcanti (p. 35). Morello wants to explain why Farinata remains impassive during "the *episode*" of Cavalcante. He recalls Foscolo's view that Farinata's indifference shows the strong fiber of the man, who "does not allow family affections to distract him from thinking about the new calamities in his native country."[2] Morello also recalls the opinion of De Sanctis, who attributes Farinata's indifference to the fact that "Cavalcante's words enter his ears but not his mind; because his mind is entirely concentrated on that single thought: the badly learned art."[3] Morello believes that "there may be a more convincing explanation." Namely: "If Farinata does not change his expression, nor move his neck, nor bend his side, as the poet puts it, it is, perhaps, not because he is insensitive to or does not care about the sufferings of others, but because *he does not know Guido*, just as he did not know Dante, and because he does not know that Guido has married his daughter. He died in 1264, three years before the Cavalcantis returned to Florence, when Guido was seven years old. Guido was betrothed to Bice when she was nine (1269), five years after Farinata's death. *If it is true that the dead cannot know about the affairs of the living by themselves but only from souls that come near them or from angels and devils*, Farinata can be unaware of his kinship to Guido and remain indifferent to his fortunes if no soul or angel or devil has brought him news about them, *which, it seems, did not happen.*" The passage is astonishing for a variety of reasons, and it reveals how deficient Morello is in intellectual rigor. (1) Farinata himself states, openly and clearly, that the heretics of his group are not unaware of things at all times, but only when things "draw near, or are"; only in the latter case do they remain ignorant "unless others bring word." This, in addition to the fiery tomb, is their specific punishment "for having wanted to see into the future."[4] Morello, then, has not even read the text well. (2) It is typical of the dilettante to go beyond what the text actually states in search of the intentions of the characters in a work of art. Foscolo and De Sanctis (especially De Sanctis) do not depart from critical seriousness; Morello, however, really thinks that Farinata had a concrete life in Hell, independently of Dante's canto and even believes it improba-

ble that, in their spare time, the devils or the angels could have informed Farinata of what he did not know. It is the mentality of the man in the street who, after reading a novel, would like to know what all the characters did later on (whence the success of serialized narratives): it is the mentality of Rosini, who wrote *La monaca di Monza*,[5] and of all the scribblers who write sequels of famous works or develop and amplify partial episodes found in such works.

The fact that there exists a close relationship between Cavalcante and Farinata in Dante's poem is shown by the letter and the structure of the canto. Cavalcante and Farinata are close to each other (some illustrators even depict them as being in the same tomb); their dramas are tightly intertwined, and Farinata is reduced to the structural role of "explicator" in order to make the reader enter deeply into the drama of Cavalcante. Explicitly, after the "*had*," Dante contrasts Farinata and Cavalcante in their physical-statuesque appearances, which express their respective moral position. Cavalcante *falls*, he collapses and never reappears; Farinata, "analytically," does not change his expression, or move his neck, or bend.

Morello also betrays his failure to understand the canto on the literal level when he discusses Cavalcante, pp. 31 ff.: "This canto also depicts the drama of the family caused by the havoc of the civil wars, depicted not by Dante and Farinata, but by Cavalcante." Why "caused by the havoc of the civil wars"? This is a bizarre addition of Morello's. The double element, family-politics, is embodied by Farinata; in fact, politics holds him upright even as he learns of his daughter's family disaster. But in the case of Cavalcante, the sole dramatic factor is paternal love; in fact, he collapses as soon as he knows for sure that his son is dead. According to Morello, Cavalcante "asks Dante *weeping*: 'Why is my son not with you?' Weeping. Cavalcante's weeping can really be called the grief of the civil war." This is a piece of nonsense; it ensues from the affirmation that canto 10 is "political par excellence." And further on: "Guido was alive at the time of the mystical journey, but he was dead when Dante was writing. Therefore, Dante was really writing about a dead man, *even though, because of the chronology of the journey, he had to tell the father the opposite, etc.*" This passage shows how Morello has barely skimmed the dramatic and poetic content of the canto and has literally flitted over the letter of the text.

Morello's superficiality is riddled with contradictions, for he proceeds to dwell on Farinata's prediction without considering that if these heretics can know the future, they must know the past, since the future always becomes past. This does not lead him to reread the text and ascertain its meaning.

But even Morello's so-called political interpretation of canto 10 is extremely superficial. It is nothing more than a repetition of the old question: Was Dante a Guelf or a Ghibelline? For Morello, Dante was essentially a Ghibelline, and Farinata is "his hero"; Dante, however, was a Ghibelline in the same manner as Farinata: in other words, a "politician" more than a "party woman." With this kind of argument one can say whatever one wants. In reality, Dante, as he himself says, "was a party unto himself";[6] he was basically an "intellectual," and his sectarianism and partisanship were more intellectual than political in the immediate sense. Besides, Dante's political position could only be determined by a most detailed analysis not only of all his writings but also of the political divisions of his time, which were very different from what they had been fifty years earlier.[7] Morello is much too entangled in literary rhetoric to be able to have a realistic understanding of the political position of the men of the Middle Ages vis-à-vis the empire, the papacy, and their republican commune.

The amusing thing about Morello is his "disdain" for the commentators, which crops up here and there, as on p. 52 of the essay on "Cavalcanti e il suo disdegno," where he says that "the commentators' prose often changes the meaning of the lines." Look who's talking!

This essay, "Cavalcanti e il suo disdegno," belongs precisely to the body of third-rate literature that surrounds the *Divine Comedy*: useless and cumbersome with its conjectures, quibbles, and flights of fancy by people who believe that just because they have pens in their hands they are entitled to write about anything, giving free rein to the reveries of their minuscule talents.

§<84>. The "renunciations of description" in the *Divine Comedy*. From an article by Luigi Russo, "Per la poesia del 'Paradiso' dantesco" (in *Leonardo* of August 1927),[1] I extract some remarks on Dante's "renunciations of description," which, however, have a different origin and explanation than in the Cavalcante

episode. The subject has been discussed by A. Guzzo ("Il 'Paradiso' e la critica del De Sanctis") in the *Rivista d'Italia* of 15 November 1924, pp. 456—79.[2] Russo writes:

> Guzzo speaks of the frequency of 'renunciations of descriptions' in the *Paradiso*—"Here my memory outstrips my wit"; "Even if all those tongues were to sound now"; etc.[3]—and he considers this a proof that where Dante cannot transfigure the earth into heaven he "forgoes description of the celestial phenomenon rather than overturn, invert, or violate the experience with an abstract and contrived fantasy" (p. 478). Now here, too, Guzzo, like other Dante scholars, falls victim to a psychological appraisal of several verses of this kind that recur in the *Paradiso*. A typical case is Vossler's: he once treated these "renunciations of description" of Dante's as if they were confessions of imaginative impotence, in order to conclude that by the poet's own admission the last canticle is inferior. Recently, however, in his critical reassessment, he referred to the very same renunciations of description to ascribe a religious value to them, almost as if from time to time the poet wanted to remind the reader that this is the realm of the transcendental absolute (*Die Göttliche Komödie*, 1925, Vol. II, pp. 771—72). Now, it seems to me that the poet is never quite as successful in his expression as he is in these confessions of expressive impotence, which, in reality, must be examined not for their content (which is negative) but for their lyrical tone (which is positive, and at times hyperbolically so). This is the poetry of the ineffable, and poetry of the ineffable must not be mistaken for poetic ineffability.[4]

Etc.

According to Russo, one cannot speak of renunciations of description in Dante. These renunciations are, in negative form, full and sufficient expressions of everything that is really astir within the poet.

In a footnote, Russo mentions one of his own essays, "Il Dante del Vossler e l'unità poetica della Commedia" in Vol. XII of *Studi Danteschi*, edited by M. Barbi,[5] but the reference to Vossler must be an allusion to the efforts to produce an artistic hierarchy of the three canticles.

§<85>. One of the "Sotto la Mole" columns, entitled "Il cieco Tiresia," published in 1918, hints at the interpretation of the figure of Cavalcante given in these notes.[1] The short article of 1918 was

prompted by a story in the newspapers about a young girl from a small Italian town who went blind after she had foreseen that the war would end in 1918. The connection is obvious. In the literary tradition and in folklore, the gift of foresight is always related to the actual infirmity of the seer, who, while seeing into the future, does not see the immediate present because he is blind. (Perhaps this is related to the preoccupation with not disturbing the natural order of things. That is why seers, like Cassandra, are not believed. If they were believed, their predictions would not come true, since people, having been warned, would act differently, and events would therefore unfold differently from the prediction, etc.)

§<86>. I am transcribing some passages on the topic of Cavalcante and Farinata from a letter by Prof. U. Cosmo (written in the early months of 1932).[1]

> It seems to me that our friend is right on the mark; I myself have always taught something similar to his interpretation. Alongside the drama of Farinata there is also the drama of Cavalcante, and the critics have been—and are—wrong to relegate it to the shadows. Our friend, then, would do extremely well to throw it into relief. In order to shed light on it, however, one must probe a little deeper into the medieval mind. Farinata and Cavalcante, each undergoes his own drama. But the drama of each one does not touch the other. They are linked by the kinship of their offspring, but they belong to opposing parties. Therefore, they do not meet. Herein lies their power as dramatis personae, and herein lies their guilt as human beings. It is more difficult, in my view, to show that this interpretation substantially damages Croce's thesis on the poetry and structure of the Comedy. Undoubtedly, the structure of the poem, too, has poetic value. With his thesis Croce reduces the poetry of the Comedy to a few passages and misses almost entirely the power of suggestion that emanates from it. In other words, he loses almost all its poetry. The power of great poetry is to suggest more than it states and continually to suggest new things, whence its eternal quality. Therefore, it must be made very clear that this power of suggestion that emanates from the drama of Cavalcante is, in fact, emanating from the structure of the poem (the ability of the damned to see into the future and their ignorance of the present; their existence in that specific cone of shadow, as our friend most aptly puts it; the fact that the two suffering characters are in the same tomb (!?);[2] the fact that they are con-

nected to each other by those particular rules of construction). They are all parts of the structure that become a source of poetry. Remove them, and the poetry vanishes. —In order better to ensure achievement of the desired result, I think it would be a good idea to provide additional confirmation of the thesis with some other examples. When I wrote on the Paradiso, I arrived at the conclusion that when the *construction* is weak, the poetry is weak also. . . . But, perhaps, it would be more effective to look for confirmation in some episode of the Inferno or the Purgatorio that has a sculptural quality. Therefore, I think that our friend, with his rigorous reasoning and his lucid mode of expression, would do very well to develop his thesis. The comparison with the stage directions of actual plays is astute and may shed light on the issue. I'm also sending you some rather simple bibliographical indications. Russo's study is available in its complete form in L. Russo, *Problemi di metodo critico*, Bari, Laterza, 1929. In *La Critica*, it would be useful to look up the article written by Arangio Ruiz (*Critica*, XX, 340—57); Barbi called it "very beautiful." Mario Botti's[a] essay ("Per lo studio della genesi della poesia dantesca. La seconda cantica: poesia e struttura") in *Annali dell'Istruzione Media*, 1930, pp. 432—73, is pretentious in its philosophical ostentation. Barbi deals with the issue—but says nothing new—in "Poesia e struttura nella Divina Commedia," in the latest volume of *Studi Danteschi* (XVI, pp. 47 ff). Barbi also has an essay, "Con Dante e coi suoi interpreti" (*Studi Danteschi*, vol. XV), in which he surveys the most recent interpretations of the Farinata canto. And Barbi, again, published a comment in vol. VIII of *Studi Danteschi*.[3]

There is much that could be said about these notes by Prof. Cosmo.[4]

§<87>. Since one should not care a hoot about the solemn task of advancing Dante criticism or of adding one's own little stone to the edifice of commentaries and elucidations of the divine poem, etc., it seems that the best way to present these observations on canto 10 would be, precisely, in polemical form: to demolish a classic philistine like Rastignac;[1] to demonstrate in a drastic and hard-hitting, albeit demagogic, fashion that the representatives of a subaltern social group can give short shrift to intellectual pimps like Rastignac in matters of science and artistic taste. But Rastignac

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci transcribed the name erroneously as "Mario Rossi."

isn't worth a straw in the official cultural world! It does not take much skill to expose his ineptitude and nullity. Nevertheless, he delivered his lecture at the Casa di Dante in Rome. Who runs this Casa di Dante in the Eternal City? Do the Casa di Dante and those who run it also count for nothing? And if they count for nothing, why does high culture not eliminate them? And what did the Dante scholars think of the lecture? Did Barbi bring it up in his reviews for *Studi Danteschi* to point out its deficiencies, etc.? Moreover, it is nice to be able to seize a man like Rastignac by the scruff of his neck and use him as a ball in a solitary game of soccer.

§<88>. *Shaw and Gordon Craig.* A polemic between the two on the theater. Shaw defends his very long stage directions not as an aid to the performance of the play but to the reading of the text. According to Sorani (*Il Marzocco* of 1 November 1931), Shaw's stage directions "are exactly the opposite of what Gordon Craig wishes to see and calls for as a way of giving life to the imagination of the playwright on the stage, of recreating the atmosphere out of which the work of art was born and which had inspired the author himself."[1a]

[a]This concludes the notes on canto 10 of the *Inferno*.

§<89>. *Cultural topics.* A series of studies on journalism in the most important capital cities of the world, along the following lines: (1) An examination of the daily newspapers that are published in a capital (London, Paris, Madrid, etc.) on a given day, so that one has a uniform basis for comparison; in other words, to see more or less the same events reflected in different ways, in accordance with the parties or the party tendencies that the newspapers represent. However, since one cannot determine the character of a newspaper on the basis of a single day's issue, it will be necessary to obtain copies of a whole week or a span of days in the course of which the newspaper publishes its special columns and supplements; by taking all of these features into account one will be able to understand where the newspaper stands in the eyes of its regular readers, etc. (2) An examination of periodical publications of all kinds (from those devoted to sports, to puzzle magazines, to parish newsletters), which will make the examination of newspapers comprehensive. Information on circulation, staff, management, advertising income.

In short, it is necessary to reconstruct, for each capital city, the ensemble of ideological forces that are incessantly and simultaneously at work in all kinds of periodical publications. [The relation between the newspapers of the capital and those of the provinces in general.] In the case of certain countries, one should bear in mind the existence of other dominant centers besides the capital city, such as Milan in Italy, Barcelona in Spain, Munich in Germany, Manchester in England (and Glasgow), etc.

Cf. Notebook 16, §4.

§<90>. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists.* Monsignor Ugo Mioni, author of cheap adventure stories written in serial form for young readers, was once—but is no longer—a Jesuit.[1] There is no doubt that he has now joined the integralists, as one can see from the review of his book *Manuale di sociologia* (Turin, Marietti, 1932, in 16°, 392 pp., L. 12), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 20 August 1932.[2] The review points out that the *Manuale* "betrays, in various instances, an exaggerated distrust of everything that is new, whether real or imagined. On p. 121 it inveighs against the dissemination of culture: 'What's wrong with having some illiterates? There were countless illiterates in past centuries and they lived quietly, peacefully, and happily! . . . Besides, is the intellectual and scientific cultivation of citizens all that necessary? To cultivate a few or several, that's fine . . . but everyone? No.' " "On p. 135 it states: 'Christian sociology is *hostile* to any form of par-

ticipation by women in public life.' " *La Civiltà Cattolica* refutes this peremptory statement and recalls that "one of the most renowned schools of Christian sociology today (the social weeks of France)[3] is anything but hostile to the kind of participation that so greatly horrifies the author." The review also quotes the Jesuit Ferdinando Cavallera, a professor at the Institute of Toulouse, who wrote, in his *Précis de la doctrine sociale catholique* (Editions Spes, p. 129): "The participation of women in public life does not give rise to any objection from the Catholic point of view."[4] *La Civiltà Cattolica* criticizes Mioni for ignoring the international scene—which "nowadays is of such decisive importance even in social issues"—in his treatise and for making no reference, in his discussion of the white-slave trade, to the recent work of a special commission of the League of Nations in Geneva.

The opposition to Mioni's treatise, then, is radical. This treatise by Mioni can be regarded as one of the most important ideological documents of integralist and ultrareactionary Catholicism.

§<91>. *The cosmopolitan character of Italian intellectuals.* From an article by Arturo Pompeati ("Tre secoli d'italianismo in Europe," *Il Marzocco* of 6 March 1932) on Antero Meozzi's book, *Azione e diffusione della letteratura italiana in Europa (sec. XV—-XVII)*, Pisa, Vallerini, 1932, in 8°, xxxii+304 pp.[1] It is the first volume in a series. The book consists of three long chapters: "Gli Italiani all'estero," "Stranieri in Italia," "Le vie di diffusione dell'italianesimo."[2] Each chapter is methodically subdivided: the different currents, country by country; the groups; the writers and non-writers who migrated from Italy or to Italy; and, in the final chapter, the translators, disseminators, and imitators of our literature, genre by genre and author by author. The book resembles an inventory of names with pertinent matching bibliographies in the notes. Thus it contains the materials of the Italian literary "hegemony" that, in fact, lasted three centuries, from the fifteenth to the seventeenth; after that, the anti-Italian reaction set in, and one can no longer talk of Italian influences in Europe (the term "hegemony" is wrong in this case, because the Italian intellectuals did not exercise influence as a national group but individually, both directly and as a result of mass migration). Pompeati heaps praise on Meozzi's book for its gathering of materials, its research criteria, and its

moderate ideology. It is clear that, in many respects, Meozzi raises nonexistent or rhetorical issues.

Croce, on the other hand, is very severe in *La Critica* of May 1932.[3] In Croce's view, Meozzi's book is a worthless futility, an arid collection of names, devoid of any new or unusual information. "The author derived his compilation from very well known books and articles, and since he never conducted any original research in the different fields he touches on, since he is not an expert in those fields, he has compiled indiscriminately." "Even the accuracy of information and of the citations leaves much to be desired." Croce points out a bundle of very serious factual and methodological errors. Nonetheless, Meozzi's book could be useful as rudimentary material for this survey.

§<92>. *Cultural topics.* The influence of Arab culture in the West. Ezio Levi has collected a series of articles he had published separately in periodicals in a volume entitled *Castelli di Spagna.*[1] They deal with the cultural relations between the Arabs and Europe, which, for the most part, are established through Spain, where Arabic studies are extensive and pursued by many specialists. *Il Marzocco* of 29 May 1932 has a review of the introductory chapter of Angel Gonzalez Palencia's book *L'eredità dell'Islam* (the introduction has been published as a pamphlet, *El Islam y Occidente,* Madrid 1931).[2] It lists a whole series of things that Europe has borrowed from Islam in cuisine—fruit, liqueurs, etc.—in medicine, in chemistry, etc. Gonzalez Palencia's book should be very interesting for the study of European civilization and what the Arabs contributed to it.

Cf. Notebook 16, §5.

§<93>. *Intellectuals. Brief notes on English culture.* In an article ("Libri nuovi e nuove tendenze nella cultura inglese") in *Il Marzocco* (17 April 1932), Guido Ferrando analyzes the organic changes that are taking place in modern English culture and are most evident in publishing and in the overall organization of universities in the United Kingdom.[1] ". . . In England there is a growing trend favoring a technical and scientific form of culture to the detriment of humanistic culture."

"Until the last century, and one could almost say until the World War, the highest educational goal pursued by the best schools in

England was the formation of gentlemen. The word 'gentleman,' as everybody knows, does not correspond to the Italian '*gentiluomo*,' and it cannot be translated precisely into our language. It refers to a person who is not just well mannered but possesses a sense of balance, steady self-control, a moral discipline that enables him to subordinate voluntarily his own selfish interest to the wider interests of the society in which he lives."

> The gentleman is thus a cultured person in the noblest sense of the word, if by culture we mean not simply a wealth of intellectual knowledge but the ability to fulfill one's duty and to understand one's fellow man by treating with respect every principle, every opinion, every faith that is sincerely professed. It is clear, then, that English education aimed not so much at cultivating the mind, at enriching it with wide knowledge, as at developing character, at preparing an aristocratic class whose moral superiority was instinctively recognized and accepted by those of lower rank. Higher or university education, in part because of its cost, was reserved for the few, for the sons of the great aristocratic or wealthy families, without thereby excluding poorer people, provided they were intelligent enough to win a scholarship. The others, the great majority, had to content themselves with an education that, though undoubtedly good, was primarily technical and vocational and prepared them for those nonmanagerial jobs that they would later be called on to take in industry, commerce, and public administration.

Until a few decades ago England had only three major comprehensive universities—Oxford, Cambridge, and London—and one minor one at Durham. To gain admission into Oxford and Cambridge one must come from the so-called public schools, which are anything but public. The most famous of these schools, Eton, was founded in 1440 by Henry VI to accommodate "seventy poor or indigent schoolboys"; it has now become the most aristocratic school in England with over a thousand students. The seventy inside places still exist; they are assigned competitively to the best young scholars, entitling them to free tuition and board and lodging. The others are external and extremely expensive. "The seventy collegians . . . are those who will later pursue a specialization at university and will become the future professors and scientists. The other thousand, who generally study less, receive primarily a moral education and, once they successfully complete university,

will become the ruling class, destined to occupy the highest ranks in the army, the navy, in political life, and in the civil service."

"This conception of education, which has until now prevailed in England, has a humanistic base." At [most] public schools and at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which have maintained the medieval and Renaissance traditions, "knowledge of the major Greek and Latin authors was held to be not only useful but indispensable for the formation of a gentleman and a politician; it helps him acquire that sense of balance and harmony, that refinement of taste that are an integrating element of cultural life." Scientific education is now gaining the upper hand. "Culture is becoming democratized and fatally leveled." In the last thirty or forty years new universities have sprung up in the great industrial centers: Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Sheffield, Leeds, Bristol. Wales wanted its own university and founded one at Bangor, with branches in Cardiff, Swansea, and Aberystwyth. After the war and in recent years, the number of universities continued to grow—Hull, Newcastle, Southampton, Exeter, Reading—and two more are planned for Nottingham and Leicester. In all these centers there is a tendency to give culture a primarily technical character, in order to satisfy the demands of the large student population. The fields that attract the greatest interest, besides the applied sciences—physics, chemistry, etc.—are professional studies: medicine, engineering, political economy, sociology, etc. "Even Oxford and Cambridge have had to make concessions and further the growth of the sciences." They have also established extension courses.

The movement toward this new culture is widespread: evening schools and private institutions for adults are springing up, offering a hybrid education that, however, is basically technical and practical. In the meantime, a whole body of popular scientific literature is emerging. Finally, science is held in such high regard that even young people from the cultured and aristocratic classes consider classical studies an unnecessary waste of time. This is a worldwide phenomenon. But England had resisted it longer than other countries, and now it is turning toward a predominantly technical form of culture. "The gentleman type no longer has a raison d'être; he used to represent the ideal of English education when Great Britain, ruler of the seas and mistress of the great markets of the world, could afford the luxury of a policy of splendid isolation and of a culture that had, in its essence, an undoubtedly aristocratic timbre.

Today, things have changed." Loss of naval and trade supremacy; its very culture is threatened by America. American books, together with American culture, have been commercialized and they are an increasingly competitive threat to English books. British publishers, particularly those with branches in America, have had to adopt American advertising and distribution methods. "In England, books have a considerable formative and educative effect, because they are more widely read than in Italy. They mirror the intellectual life of the nation more faithfully than our books do." This intellectual life is undergoing a change.

Of the books published during the first quarter of 1932 (which are more numerous than in the first quarter of 1931), the novel holds first place; the second place no longer belongs to children's books but has been taken over by pedagogical and educational books in general. There is also a marked increase in historical works and biographies and in technical, scientific, and, above all, popular books.

From the volumes sent to the International Book Fair in Florence "we see that recent books of a cultural nature are more technical than educational; they tend to discuss scientific issues and aspects of social life or to provide practical knowledge rather than form character."

§<94>. *Concordat.* The general director of the Foundation for Religious Worship, Raffaele Jacuzio, has published *Commento della nuova legislazione in materia ecclesiastica*, with a preface by Alfredo Rocco (Turin, Utet, 1932, in 8°, 693 pp., L. 60), in which he gathers together and comments on all the proceedings of the organs of the Italian state and the Vatican concerning the implementation of the concordat. Referring to the question of Catholic Action, Jacuzio writes (p. 203): "Since the concept of politics embraces not only the protection of the legal system of the state but also everything that pertains to the socioeconomic realm, it is very difficult . . . to maintain that Catholic Action is barred, a priori, from all political activity, *when . . . the social and economic activity as well as the spiritual education of young people fall within its purview.*"[1]

Cf. Notebook 16, §14.

§<95>. *History of the subaltern classes.* Pietro Ellero, *La quistione sociale*, Bologna, 1877.[1]

NOTEBOOK 5
1930–1932

§<1>. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists.* The "Catholic integralists"[1] enjoyed a certain success during the papacy of Pius X.[2] They represented a European current of Catholicism, but naturally they were more widespread in certain countries (Italy, France, Belgium; during the invasion of Belgium, the Germans found and published a number of documents that belonged to the "integralists," who had formed a kind of secret society, with ciphers, special agents, underground publications, etc.; the movement was headed by Monsignor Umberto Benigni, and a section of the organization consisted of the "Sodalitium Pianum." "Pianum" was derived from Pius; I think, however, that it did not refer to Pius X but to another, still more intransigent pope).[3] Monsignor Benigni, about whose current relations with the Church I have no information, has written a work of colossal proportions, *La storia sociale della Chiesa*, of which four large volumes, each over six hundred pages long, have been published by Hoepli.[4] The integralists supported the *Action Française* movement in France and opposed *Sillon*;[5] not only were they against every kind of modernism in religion, but they also opposed all forms of political modernism among Catholics. When confronting the Jesuits they adopted a "Jansenist" posture of great moral and religious rigor, opposed to every laxity, opportunism, or centrist position. The Jesuits, naturally, accused them of Jansenism and furthermore of playing into the hands of the modernists: (1) because of their struggle against the Jesuits; and (2) because they broadened the concept of modernism so much and thus enlarged the target so greatly that they provided the modernists with an enormous amount of room in which to maneuver. As it turned out, the integralists and the modernists eventually found themselves objectively sharing the same ground in their common struggle against the Jesuits, and in effect they even collaborated with each other.

What remains of the modernists and the integralists today? It is difficult to specify their objective strength within the church, but surely they

are still functioning as "ferments" insofar as they represent the struggle against the Jesuits and the Jesuits' enormous power, a struggle conducted by elements of the Right as well as the Left. These two internal forces within the church find it convenient to have the two "external" centers, with their publications of periodicals, pamphlets, and books. These external centers and the internal forces have secret contacts through which anger, denunciations, and nasty gossip are channeled, and the struggle against the Jesuits is kept alive. This proves that the cohesive power of the church is weaker than commonly supposed. Above all, the struggle against modernism has demoralized the younger members of the clergy, who have not demurred at taking the antimodernist oath even while remaining modernists. (Remember the milieus of priests and members of religious orders—including the Dominicans—in Turin before the war.)

From an article by Father Rosa ("Risposta ad 'Una polemica senza onestà e senza legge' ") in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 21 July 1928,[6] I extract some observations:

Monsignor Benigni continues to have a remarkable organization: in Paris, Récalde–Luc Verus–Simon (Luc Verus is a collective pseudonym of the "integralists") publish a series entitled *Vérités*.

Rosa quotes from a pamphlet, *Les découvertes du jésuite Rosa, successeur de Von Gerlach* (Paris, Linotypie G. Dosne, 20 rue Turgot, 1928), that he attributes to Benigni, at least as far as its contents are concerned. It accuses the Jesuits of being "friends of the Freemasons and the Jews"; it calls them "demagogues and revolutionaries," etc.

In Rome, Benigni uses the Urbs or Romana Agency, and he signs his publications with his nephew's name, Mataloni. Benigni's Rome newsletter was called *Veritas* (is it still published?) Benigni published (in 1928?) a pamphlet of a few pages, *Di fronte alla calunnia*,[7] that was partially reproduced and defended by two Catholic periodicals, *Fede e Ragione*[8] and *Liguria del Popolo* (of Genoa). At one time Benigni used to publish a review, *Miscellanea* [*di Storia Ecclesiastica*].

Buonaiuti and the modernists.[9] The pamphlet against Father Rosa, *Una polemica senza onestà e senza legge*, was written by Buonaiuti. Father Rosa talks about Buonaiuti's recent book, *Le modernisme catholique*, published by "les editions Rieder" as part of the series "Le Christianisme" edited by P. L. Couchoud (it is n. 21 in the series and costs 12 fr.).[10] This should be an interesting book because in it Buonaiuti is said to have asserted certain facts that he had always denied during the modernist controversy. Buonaiuti was the author of the modernist campaign conducted by the *Giornale d'Italia*. Benigni organized the press service against the modernists at the time of the encyclical *Pascendi*.[11]

In [his] *Ricerche Religiose* (July 1928, p. 335),[12] Buonaiuti recounts a typical episode. In 1909 the modernist professor Antonino De Stefano

(now a defrocked priest and a university professor) was supposed to publish, in Geneva, a *Revue Moderniste Internationale*. Buonaiuti wrote him a letter. A few weeks later, Buonaiuti was summoned to the Holy Office. The man in charge at the time, the Dominican Pasqualigo, challenged his letter to De Stefano word by word. The letter had been stolen in Geneva; an emissary from Rome had "tunneled his way" into De Stefano's house.

Naturally, in Buonaiuti's eyes, Benigni had been an instrument and an accomplice of the Jesuits. (Buonaiuti, however, contributed to Benigni's *Miscellanea* in 1904.)

It is necessary to collect all the material possible and to compile the essential bibliography concerning this topic, *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*: they are the three main divisions of Catholicism in politics, they are the forces contending for hegemony in the Roman Church. (The volumes of *La Civiltà Cattolica* from 1900 onward should be checked.) (Check also the issues of Buonaiuti's *Ricerche Religiose* and of Benigni's *Miscellanea*, as well as the series of occasional pamphlets produced by each of these three currents.)

Cf. Notebook 20, §4.

§<2>. *Rotary Club*. Oppositional attitude, albeit with certain qualifications, of the *Civiltà Cattolica* Jesuits. The church as such has not yet taken a position vis-à-vis the Rotary Club. The Jesuits object to the Rotary's links with Protestantism and Freemasonry; in it they perceive an instrument of Americanism and therefore an anti-Catholic mentality, to say the least. The Rotary, however, does not want to be denominationalist or Masonic; everyone can join it: Masons, Protestants, Catholics. In some places even Catholic archbishops have become members. Its basic problem seems to be the dissemination of a new capitalist spirit: in other words, the idea that industry and trade are a social *service* even prior to being a business and that, indeed, they are or could be a business insofar as they are a "service." The Rotary, in other words, wants to see the "capitalism of plunder" superseded and replaced by a new custom that is more favorable to the development of economic forces. The need expressed by the Rotary has recently revealed itself to be very serious in America; in England, however, the problem had already been tackled with the introduction of a certain degree of "honesty" and "fairness" in business. Why is it precisely the Rotary Club that has spread beyond America? Why not some other one of the many types of associations that are thriving in America and that consti-

tute America's move beyond the old positivist forms of religion? The reason must be sought in America itself; perhaps it is because the Rotary organized the campaign for the Open Shop[1] and therefore for rationalization.

From an article, "Rotary Club e Massoneria" (in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 21 June 1928),[2] I extract some information:

The Rotary, which started as a national institution, established itself as an international association in 1910 with a deposit of invested capital, in compliance with the laws of the State of Illinois.[3] The president of Rotary International is Mr. Harr Rogers. The president of the Italian clubs is Felice Seghezza. *L'Osservatore Romano* and *La Tribuna* raised the issue of whether the Rotary is an offshoot of Freemasonry. Seghezza sent a letter of protest (*La Tribuna*, 16 February 1928) in which he declared that the suspicions were all unfounded. *La Tribuna* appended a note to the letter, stating among other things: "They are <. . .> the uncertainties that attach to all international organizations, which often appear to be perfectly innocuous and legitimate but can also assume quite a different character. The Italian Rotary section may think of itself as perfectly free of Masonry and in strict compliance with the regulations of the Regime. But that does not mean that the Rotary is not different elsewhere. If it is—and there are those who say it is—we neither can nor should ignore it."

The "*Rotarian moral code.*" At the general meeting of 1928 in St. Louis, the following principle was resolved: "The Rotary is fundamentally a philosophy of life that endeavors to reconcile the eternal conflict that exists between the desire for personal gain and the duty as well as the corollary impulse to be of service to one's neighbor. This philosophy is the philosophy of *service*: *To give of oneself before thinking of oneself.* It is based on the moral principle: *Those who serve best gain most.*" At the same general meeting it was resolved that every Rotary member must accept "each in his own way, without any secret oath or dogma or creed, this Rotarian philosophy of *service.*" *La Civiltà Cattolica* quotes the following passage by Comdr. Mercurio from *Il Rotary*, pp. 97–98, but the exact citation of the source is missing (I do not know whether Mercurio is an Italian and whether *Il Rotary* is also an Italian publication like *La Realtà*, edited by Bevione):[4] "Thus honesty has been made into an interest, so to speak. A new type of businessman has been created, one who knows how to associate the common good with his

own self-interest in all professional, industrial, and commercial activities; the common good, after all, is the genuine and lofty goal of all activity, for every honorable hard-working man serves, even if unconsciously, the common good above all."

The primary importance that the Rotary attaches to practical activity is apparent even in the truncated and allusive citations found in *La Civiltà Cattolica*. In the Rotary *Program*: ". . . a Rotary Club is a group of representative businessmen and professionals who, without any secret oath, or dogma, or creed . . . embrace the philosophy of service." An Italian Rotary "Yearbook" is published in Milan by the Soc. An. Coop.: "Il Rotary." At least one "Yearbook"—that of 1927–28—has been published.

In the *Corriere della Sera* of 22 June 1928, Filippo Tajani wrote that the Rotary is one of those "international institutions aimed at solving, albeit amicably, common economic and industrial problems." Of the 2,639 Rotary Clubs in existence (when the article was written), 2,088 were in the United States, 254 in England, 85 in Canada, 18 in Italy, 13 in France, 1 in Germany, 13 in Spain, 10 in Switzerland, 20 in Cuba, 15 in Australia, 19 in Mexico, and fewer in other countries. (The Rotary Club cannot be confused with Freemasonry, and especially not with the Freemasonry of Latin countries. It organically supersedes Freemasonry, and it represents more concrete and precise interests. Freemasonry is basically characterized by petty bourgeois democracy, secularism, anticlericalism, etc. The Rotary is an organization of the upper classes, and it does not address itself to the people, except indirectly. It is an essentially modern organization. It is possible and probable that there is some intermeddling between Freemasonry and the Rotary, but that is not an essential matter. As it grows, the Rotary will seek to dominate all the other organizations, including the Catholic Church, just as in America it certainly dominates all the Protestant churches. Surely, the Catholic Church cannot "officially" look on the Rotary with pleasure, but it seems unlikely that the church would adopt the same attitude toward the Rotary as it does against Freemasonry, for that would entail taking up a position against capitalism, etc. The growth of the Rotary is interesting from many points of view: ideological, practical, organizational, etc. It remains to be seen, however, whether the economic depression in America and the world will deal a blow to the prestige of Americanism and thus to the Rotary.)

§<3>. *Owen, Saint-Simon, and Ferrante Aporti's infant schools.* It is clear from the article "La questione delle scuole infantili e dell'abate Aporti secondo nuovi documenti" (*La Civiltà Cattolica* of 4 August 1928)[1] that in 1836 the Jesuits and the Vatican opposed the opening, in Bologna, of infant schools of the type advocated by F. Aporti[2] because the schools were supported by, among others, "a certain Doctor Rossi," "reputed to be a promoter of Saint-Simonism, which at the time was making a lot of noise in France and was greatly, perhaps excessively, feared even in Italy" (p. 221). The archbishop of Bologna, drawing the attention of the Holy See to the propaganda and pamphlets that were being distributed in support of the infant schools, wrote that "in itself this could be a good institution but that he was very fearful of certain persons at the head of the enterprise and of the great zeal they exhibit . . . that these schools were conceived by a certain Robert Owen, a Protestant, as has been pointed out by Prof. Lambruschini[3] in *Guida dell'Educatore*, which is printed in Florence, no. 2, February 1836, p. 66" (p. 224).

In February 1837 the consultant to the Holy See, Cornelius Everboeck, a Jesuit, delivered his opinion on the infant schools to the officer of the Holy See. It is a study of forty-eight large and densely written pages. It starts by examining the theory and method of the Saint-Simonians and it arrives at the conclusion that the method of the new schools is—or, at least, is very strongly suspected of being—infected by the theories and principles of pantheism and Saint-Simonism. It recommends that the schools be condemned and proposes an encyclical against the Saint-Simonian sect and its theories (p. 227). The author of the *Civiltà Cattolica* article says that the first part of the opinion, which attacks Saint-Simonism in general as a theory, shows "the consultant's studiousness and erudition." However, he does admit that the second part, which was supposed to demonstrate that Saint-Simonism had infiltrated the new types of school, is much shorter and weaker, "obviously influenced and, in part, misled by the information and the conviction" of the informants from Bologna, who perceived and denounced the methods, the spirit, or the danger of French Saint-Simonism in the new schools. The Congregation of the Holy Office did not insist on the danger of Saint-Simonism but banned pamphlets and schools associated with its methods. Four more consultants recommended an encyclical against Saint-Simonism.

§<4>. *Saint-Simonism, Freemasonry, Rotary Club.* It would be interesting to conduct a study on these ideological nexuses: the theories of Americanism and Saint-Simonism have many points of contact, surely. On the other hand, it seems to me that Saint-Simonism has had little influence on Freemasonry—or, at least, on its most important conceptual core. Since positivism is derived from Saint-Simonism, and positivism has been an instance of the spirit of Freemasonry, one might find an indirect connection. Rotarianism would be a modern Saint-Simonism of the right.[1]

§<5>. *Catholic social action.* The report presented by Albert Thomas at the International Labor Conference (the eleventh) of 1928, contains an account of the public speeches made by bishops and other Catholic authorities on the question of labor. It should be interesting as a brief historical summary of this particular kind of Catholic activity. *La Civiltà Cattolica* (4 August 1928) goes into raptures over Thomas in its article (by Brucculeri) "La conferenza internazionale del lavoro."[1]

§<6>. *Past and present.* Articles in 1926 by Count Carlo Lovera di Castiglione in *Il Corriere* of Turin; thunderous rebuttals in *Il Corriere d'Italia* of Rome.[1] It is noteworthy that, although they were very daring, Lovera di Castiglione's articles were not comparable to the contents of the book *Storia di un'idea*.[2] Why did the Catholics not react so vigorously against the book, whereas they attacked Lovera ferociously? Check Lovera's publications: contributor to Gobetti's reviews and to Gorgerino's *Il Davide*;[3] articles in *Il Corriere* of Turin. He is an old aristocrat, a descendant of Solaro della Margarita, I believe.[4] [It is worth noting that he is a friend of the *Civiltà Cattolica* writers and has made Solaro's archive available to them.][5]

§<7>. *On Catholic "social thought"* one can make, I believe, the following preliminary critical observation: it is not an *obligatory* political program for all Catholics, nor are the organized forces that Catholics have at their disposal directed toward its goals. It is purely and simply an "ensemble of polemical argumentations,"

positive and negative, lacking political concreteness. Thus much can be said without entering into questions of merit, that is, without considering the intrinsic value of the economic-social standards that Catholics posit as the basis for such argumentations.

In reality, the church does not want to get involved in practical economic life, and it does not try very hard to implement the social principles that it affirms but that are no longer practiced. Nor does it try hard to defend, preserve, or restore those situations in which some of its principles had once been exercised but have since been destroyed. In order to have a good understanding of the church in the modern world, one must realize that it is prepared to struggle only to defend its particular corporate freedoms (of church as church, an ecclesiastical organization); in other words, the privileges that, it proclaims, are the bequest of its own divine essence. The church does not exclude using any means to defend itself, whether it be armed insurrection, or individual ventures, or calls for foreign invasion. Everything else is relatively unimportant, as long as it has no bearing on its own conditions of existence. "Despotism" for the church does not mean much, other than intervention of the secular authority of the state that limits or suppresses its privileges. It recognizes any de facto power, and it would rather legitimate such a power than have its own privileges touched. If it increases its privileges, it celebrates them and proclaims them to be providential.

Given these premises, the value of Catholic "social thought" is purely academic: it should be studied and analyzed as an ingredient of an ideological opiate aimed at maintaining certain religious kinds of moods of passive expectation; but it should not be studied as a directly active element of political and historical life. It is a political and historical element, of course, but it has an absolutely specific character: it is a *reserve*, not a front-line, element, and therefore it can be practically "forgotten" and "silenced" at any time, but without being totally renounced lest the opportunity should arise for it to be used again. The Catholics are very shrewd, but I think that in this case they are *too* shrewd.

On Catholic "social thought" bear in mind the book by the Jesuit priest Albert Muller, who teaches at the St. Ignatius advanced school of commerce in Antwerp: *Notes d'économie politique*, Premierè Série, "Editions Spes," Paris, 1927, 428 pp., Fr. 8; see its review, "Pensiero e attività sociali" (by A. Brucculeri) in *La Civiltà*

Cattolica of 1 September 1928.[1] Muller, it seems to me, expounds the most radical position that the Jesuits can ever arrive at on this subject (family income, participation, control, workers' representation in management, etc.).

§<8>. *America and the Mediterranean.* A book by Professor G. Frisella Vella, *Il traffico fra l'America e l'Oriente attraverso il Mediterraneo*, Sandron, Palermo, 1928, XV+215 pp., L. 15.[1] Frisella Vella's point of departure is "Sicilian." Since Asia is the most suitable area for American economic expansion, and since America's lines of communication with Asia go across the Pacific as well as across the Mediterranean, Europe must not oppose the transformation of the Mediterranean into a big artery of American-Asian commerce. Sicily would benefit greatly from such traffic by becoming an intermediary of American-Asiatic commerce, etc. Frisella Vella is convinced of the inevitability of American global hegemony, etc.

§<9>. *Lucien Romier and Catholic Action in France.* Romier lectured at the "Semaines Sociales" held in Nancy in 1927.[1] He talked about the "deproletarianization of the masses," a topic that had only an indirect relation to the main theme of that "social week," which was devoted to "Women in Society." Father Danset, for example, talked about "rationalization" from a social and moral perspective.

Is Romier an active member of Catholic Action in France, or was his participation at that meeting merely incidental?

The 1927 meeting of the "Semaines Sociales" in Nancy is very important for the history of the sociopolitical doctrine of Catholic Action. Its results, which favored the greater participation of women in political life, have been approved by Cardinal Gasparri on behalf of Pius XI.[2] Its proceedings were published in 1928 [Semaines Sociales de France, *La femme dans la société*, Paris, Gabalda, 564 pp., in 8°].[3] It is indispensable for the study of political life in France.

§<10>. *Catholic Action in Belgium.* Cf. the pamphlet by the Jesuit E. de Moreau, *Le Catholicisme en Belgique*, Ed. La Pensée

Catholique, Liege (1928). Some figures: at its congress in Liège (for French-speaking youth), the Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Belge brought together 60,000 young people. It is divided into sections (workers, secondary school students, university students, farmers, etc.). The Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne has 18,000 members divided into 374 local sections and sixteen regional federations. The Confédération des Syndicats Ouvriérs de Belgique has 110,000 members. Les Ligues Féminines Ouvrières have 70,000 members. The Alliance Nationale des Fédérations Mutualistes Chrétiennes de Belgique has 250,000 members, and, if one includes their families, it embraces a total of 650,000 persons. The Coopérative Belge Bien-Etre has three hundred cooperative stores. The Banque Centrale Ouvrière, etc. The Boerenbond (an association of Flemish peasants) has 1,175 guilds with 112,686 members (in 1926), all of them heads of households. In addition, there is the women's movement, etc.[1]

§<11>. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists.* Currently, *Fede e Ragione* seems to be the most important periodical of the Catholic integralists.[1] Check its publisher, its editor, and its main contributors. See on what points it situates itself in opposition to the Jesuits: whether it is on questions of faith, morals, and even politics. Is there any religious order that, taken as a whole, has an "integralist" position? Or sympathizes with the integralists in some particular way, etc.? (Check the Dominicans and the Franciscans.)[2]

Cf. Notebook 20, §4.

§<12>. *The Risorgimento. Solaro della Margarita.* Solaro della Margarita's *Memorandum*[1] should be integrated with the article in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 15 September 1928, "Visita del Solaro della Margarita a Pio IX nel 1846,"[2] which contains previously unpublished documents. Knowledge of the political personality of Solaro della Margarita is indispensable for reconstructing the "historical knot of 1848–49." The issue must be laid out properly. Solaro della Margarita was a Piedmontese reactionary with strong ties to the royal family; the accusation that he was an "Austrophile," in the vulgar sense of the word, is totally without foundation. Solaro is said to have wanted Piedmontese hegemony in Italy and the expul-

sion of the Austrians from Italy, but only by normal diplomatic means, without war and, above all, without a popular revolution. [Unlike the liberals, he wanted an alliance with the Austrians—that's clear.] The article in *La Civiltà Cattolica* is also useful for assessing the politics of Pius IX up to 1848. This article also has some bibliographical information on Solaro.

(It must be remembered that the government of Piedmont supplied the Catholics of the insurgent Sonderbund with arms, emptying its arsenals, even though the troubles of 1848 were brewing.[3] Solaro wanted Piedmont to extend its influence into Switzerland; in other words, he wanted to shift the axis of Italian politics.)

§<13>. *Catholic Action. La dottrina sociale cattolica nei documenti di papa Leone XIII*, Rome, Via della Scrofa 70, 1928, in 16°, 348 pp., L. 7.50.[1]

§<14>. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists.* The article "L'equilibrio della verità fra gli estremi dell'errore" in *la Civiltà Cattolica* of 3 November 1928[1] was occasioned by the publication of Nicolas Fontaine's *Saint-Siège, "Action Française," et "catholiques intégraux,"* Paris, Gamber, 1928.[2] A footnote in the article says the following about Fontaine's work: "The author is in the thrall of political and liberal prejudices, nowhere more so than when he sees politics at play in the condemnation of the *Action Française*. On the other hand, the facts and the evidence he cites concerning the famous 'Sodality'[3] have never been refuted."[4] Now (as far as I can remember), Fontaine has not published anything that has never been heard before. Why, then, did the Jesuits not use this same evidence earlier? The question is important, and I think that it can be resolved in the following way. The pope's action against the *Action Française* is only the conspicuous facet of a much broader move aimed at erasing a number of consequences resulting from Pius X's policies.[5] In other words, Pius XI wants to render the "Catholic integralists" totally innocuous without, however, attacking them frontally.[6] The struggle against modernism tilted Catholicism too far to the right; it has become necessary to "center it" anew, around the Jesuits—in other words, to provide it with a flexible politics that is free of doctrinal rigidities, with a lot of room for maneuvering, etc. Pius XI is really the Jesuits' pope.

However, it is much more difficult to fight against the "Catholic integralists" than against the modernists. The struggle against the *Action*

Française offers an excellent battleground: the attack is not directed against the Catholic integralists per se; they are attacked only insofar as they are supporters of Maurras.[7] In other words, they are targeted individually [as persons disobedient to the pope], whereas the movement as a whole is officially ignored, or almost ignored. Herein lies the great importance of Fontaine's book. But how did Fontaine come up with the idea of linking Maurras with the "integralists"? Did he "intuit" it himself, or was it suggested to him by the Jesuits themselves? (Examine Fontaine's book carefully from this perspective—and check whether Fontaine is a specialist in Catholic politics.)

The article in *La Civiltà Cattolica* was certainly written by Father Rosa. It is very cautious in its use of the evidence presented by Fontaine. Its analysis steers clear of those elements that, though discrediting the "integralists," would also cast a shadow of disgrace over the whole church and make it look silly. (The "integralists" had organized a real "conspiracy" that had the features of a thriller.)

I am extracting some points from the *Civiltà Cattolica* article. It alludes to the fact that Maurras has found defenders among Catholics in Italy as well. It talks about "imitators and supporters, both overt and *covert*, all of whom have strayed both in theory and in practice from the fullness of Catholic faith and morals, even though they loudly proclaim and delude themselves that they want to defend Catholic faith and morals *integrally* and better than anyone else."[8] *Action Française* "has hurled against the author of these lines a heap of invective and incredible calumnies (?), including repeated insinuations about *merciless assassinations and executions of confreres*!"[9] (Find out when these accusations were leveled against Father Rosa. Within the Jesuit order there used to be an integralist wing that supported Maurras. Look into the case of Cardinal Billot, a Jesuit who [I think] resigned from office. A resignation of this kind is extremely rare in the history of the church; it reveals both the unyielding stubbornness of Billot and the pope's intransigent will to get rid of any obstacle in his battle against Maurras.)[10]

Abbé Boulin, editor of *Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes*, an "integralist" with ties to Benigni-Mataloni; Boulin uses pseudonyms (Roger Duguet); a fierce anti-Jesuit.[11] *Action Française* and the "integralists" desperately cling to Pius X and claim to remain faithful to his teachings. (The "integralists" want to reglorify the *Syllabus* of Pius IX; the proposal by *Action Française* to have an ecclesiastic appointed to a *Syllabus* professorship in its schools contained a clever provocation.)[12]

The *Civiltà Cattolica* article is really important, and it would have to be read again if a study on this subject were to be sketched. It will be necessary to examine all the nuances of the "distinctions" it makes with regard to Freemasonry, anti-Semitism, nationalism, democracy, etc. In the

case of the modernists, too, it distinguishes between the deluded, etc., and it adopts a stance against the anti-modernism of Benigni, etc.:

> Even more to be feared—and we have not failed to point this out all along to those responsible—was that such methods would have played into the hands of the real modernists, opening the way for serious harm to the church later on. Subsequently, this became evident—and is evident even today—in the malicious spirit of reaction not only of the old but also of the new modernism and liberalism and of integralism itself. At the time, integralism portrayed itself as an opponent of every form and every aspect of modernism; it even presumed to be more papal than the pope, as they say. Now, however, they cause great scandal either by *hypocritically* resisting the pope or by openly struggling against him, as is being done by the vociferous supporters of the *Action Française* in France and by *their silent accomplices in Italy*.[13]

The integralists call the Jesuits "modernizers," and they label the attitude of the Jesuits as "modernization." They divided Catholics into "integralists" and "anti-integralists": that is, into "papal" and "episcopalian" Catholics. [It seems that Benedict XV's encyclical *Ad beatissimi* took note of and censured this tendency to introduce such distinctions among Catholics; distinctions that were injurious to the charity and unity of the faithful. Check the issue of *La Civiltà Cattolica* in which the text of this encyclical is printed.][14]

The "Sapinière" secret society, known to the public as the "Sodality of Pius," organized the struggle against the "modernizing" Jesuits

> in total contradiction of the fundamental idea and the official program put forth by the Holy Pontiff Pius X and approved by the secretary of the Consistory. Of course, this was done to give vent to private animosities, to the denunciation and defamation of totally incorruptible and eminent individuals, bishops, or entire religious orders; our own order, which was attacked by name, had never before been so inundated with such calumnies, not even during the period of its suppression. Lastly, with the war over and long after the "Sodality of Pius" was disbanded—by a decree of the Holy Congregation of the Council: a reproof and a prohibition and most certainly not a commendation—*a well-known* and *very rich financier* from Paris, Simon, together with his large clique sponsored *at their own expense* the publication and widespread free distribution of the most despicable and critically ignorant libels against the Society of Jesus, its saints, its doctors and teachers, its works, and—even though solemnly approved by the church—its constitutions. It is the notorious series of the so-called Récalde,[15] which has grown to more than a dozen libels, some of them consisting of more than one volume; the part played

> by Roman accomplices in this activity is lavishly acknowledged and reciprocated. That series is now being reinforced by the sister publication of the most delirious slanderous leaflets under the antiphrastic general title of *Vérités*, emulators of the twin papers of the "Urbs" or "Romana" Agency, whose articles reappear every now and then, almost word for word, in other "periodical" news sheets.[16]

The "integralists" spread "the worst calumnies" against Benedict XV, as can be seen from an article published when the pope died that appeared in *Vieille France* (edited by Urbain Gohier, I think) and in *La Ronda*[17] (February 1922); "this (periodical), too, is anything but Catholic and moral; yet its pages are graced by the contributions of Umberto Benigni, whose name used to be listed in the company of those reckless young men."

> The same libelous spirit among Catholics, members of religious orders, and regular clergy persisted under the present pope; it is impossible to calculate the moral harm it has caused, how much scandal it has brought with it, and how many souls it has alienated, especially in France. In fact, political passions in France made people more inclined to believe the calumnies that often originated in Rome. The wealthy Simon and other accomplices, with their Gallican and journalistic (*sic*) mentality, financially supported the authors of the calumnies and ensured the free dissemination of their libels—most especially the anti-Jesuit libels mentioned above—in seminaries, rectories, ecclesiastical curias, and wherever there was any chance or likelihood that the libels would take hold. The libels were also spread, with unprecedented prodigality, among the laity and mostly among young people, including even those in the state lycées.[18]

The authors of the libels who are really suspect write anonymously or use pseudonyms. "It is well known, especially among journalists, how totally dishonorable this group is, with its chief instigator, who is extremely clever about hiding himself, also the most guilty and the one with the greatest interest in the intrigue."[19] (Who is he alluding to? Benigni or some other Vatican bigwig?)

According to the author of the article, there was no "arrangement" between the *Action Française* and the "integralists" initially, but it started to take shape after 1926. However, I think this is a cunning assertion meant to exclude any political motivation (the struggle against the ultrareactionaries) from the action taken against the *Action Française*. (A footnote—the last one—states: "Nevertheless, one must not confuse the two parties, as some have done, e.g., Nicolas Fontaine in the above-mentioned work, *Saint-Siège, "Action Française" et "Catholiques intégraux."*

As we have already pointed out, Fontaine is more than liberal; *however, he is extremely well informed* about the less-than-edifying affairs of the above-mentioned secret society, known as 'Sapinière,' and its French and Italian supporters. In this instance, it would be ridiculous to strike back at him with his liberalism. The facts have to be disproven, and we will return to this subject at the appropriate time."[20] The phrase "however, he is extremely well informed" is strange. For, as I have pointed out, Fontaine has made use of documents that are in the public domain (check). To this day (October 1930), Father Rosa has not "returned to the subject" of the "Sapinière" in *La Civiltà Cattolica*.)

The article concludes: "But truth has nothing to fear: for our part, we are quite determined to defend it fearlessly, without trepidation or hesitation, even against internal enemies and even if those enemies are wealthy and powerful ecclesiastics who have misled the laity in order to draw it into their schemes and pursuits."[21] The footnote also mentions some names from the long list of those who were "denounced" by the "Sodality of Pius" (among others, the cardinals Amette of Paris, Piffl of Vienna, Mercier, Van Rossum, etc.).

Then the article recalls Benigni's trip to America (which had been mentioned in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 1927, IV, p. 399),[22] where he distributed anti-Jesuit libels; it claims that tens of thousands of copies of these libels are stored in Rome.

Cf. Notebook 20, §4.

§<15>. *Lucien Romier and Catholic Action in France.* Remember that in 1925 Romier had agreed to join Herriot's cabinet of national unity. Another person who agreed to collaborate with Herriot was the head of the French Catholic parliamentary group, which had been formed a little earlier. Romier was neither an elected member of parliament nor a senator; he was political editor of *Figaro*. Once he agreed to join Herriot's cabinet, Romier had to leave *Figaro*. Romier had made a name for himself with his publications on industrial-social topics. I think he was once the editor of *La Journée Industrielle*, the technical organ of French industrialists.[1]

§<16>. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists.* The *Action Française* had its own editorial staff member in Rome, Havard de la Montagne, who used to be in charge of the French language weekly *Rome*, which was aimed at reaching French Catholics—priests, members of religious orders,

and laity—residing in or passing through Rome.[1] The weekly must have been and may still be the mouthpiece of the "integralists" and of Maurras's followers.[2]

Cf. Notebook 20, §4.

§<17>. *The Pan-Christian movement.* The fifteenth social week[1] held in Milan [September 1928] was devoted to the topic "True Religious Unity," and a volume of the proceedings has been published under the same title by the "Vita e Pensiero" publishing house (Milan, 1928, L. 15).[2] The topic was approached from the Vatican's perspective, following the guidelines provided by the encyclical of January 1928, *Mortalium animos*,[3] and in opposition to the Pan-Christian movement of the Protestants, who want to establish a kind of federation of the different Christian sects, with equal rights for all.

This is a Protestant offensive against Catholicism involving two basic moves: (1) The Protestant churches are trying to halt the trend of disintegration within their ranks (which is continually giving rise to new sects). (2) The Protestant churches are forming an alliance among themselves, and by obtaining some degree of consensus from the Orthodox churches, they lay siege to Catholicism in order to make it renounce its primacy. This also enables them to enter the struggle as an imposing Protestant united front and not as a multitude of churches, sects, and tendencies of varying importance that on their own would find it much more difficult to resist the tenacious and unified missionary initiative of the Catholics. The question of the unity of the Christian churches is a formidable postwar phenomenon that merits maximum attention and careful study.

§<18>. *Catholic social thought.* In order to understand the attitude of the church toward different political-state regimes, it is important to bear in mind the article "Autorità e 'opportunismo politico' " in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 1 December 1928.[1] It could also yield some ideas for the "past and present" survey. It should be compared with the corresponding points in the *Codice sociale*.[2]

The issue arose during the time of Leo XIII, when a segment of the Catholic population rallied behind the republic in France.[3] It

was resolved by the pope, who made the following fundamental points: (1) the established power should be accepted or, rather, recognized; (2) it is owed the respect due to any representative of divinely conferred authority; (3) all the just laws promulgated by such an authority are to be obeyed, whereas unjust laws are to be resisted by a harmonious effort to modify the legislation and Christianize society.

La Civiltà Cattolica does not regard this as "opportunism"; in its view, the only thing that constitutes "opportunism" is a servile attitude that extols all de facto—as opposed to de jure—authority (the term "de jure" has a special meaning for Catholics).

Catholics have to draw a distinction between the "role of authority," which is an inalienable right of society—for a society cannot live without some kind of order—and the "person" who carries out that role and who may be a tyrant, a despot, a usurper, etc. Catholics submit to the "role" not to the person. Yet, following the coup d'état of 2 December, Napoleon III was hailed as a man sent by providence, which means that the political vocabulary of Catholics differs from the normal one.[4]

§<19>. *Catholic Action in Italy.* An indispensable article for the history of Catholic Action in Italy is "Precisazioni," published in *L'Osservatore Romano* of 17 November 1928 and summarized in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 1 December 1928 on p. 468.[1]

§<20>. *Machiavelli and Emanuele Filiberto.* An article ("Emanuele Filiberto di Savoia nel IV centenario della nascita") in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 15 December 1928 opens thus:

> The fact that the death of Machiavelli coincides with the birth of Emanuele Filiberto is not entirely without meaning. The antithesis represented by the two figures is highly significant. The former exits the world scene embittered and disillusioned, while the latter is about to start facing life, still shrouded in mystery, precisely during those years that can be said to demarcate the Renaissance from the Catholic Reformation. Machiavelli and Emanuele Filiberto: who could better personify the two distinct aspects, the two opposite currents that competed for domination in the sixteenth century? Could

> the Florentine secretary have imagined that the very same century for which he had predicted an essentially pagan—in both thought and deed—prince, would instead have the monarch who came closest to the ideal of the perfect Christian prince?[1]

Things are very different from the way the writer for *La Civiltà Cattolica* sees them. The ideas of Machiavelli are continued and realized by Emanuele Filiberto to a greater extent than might seem evident: for example, in the organization of the national armies. Besides, Emanuele Filiberto could refer back to Machiavelli on other matters; he, too, did not shrink from using violence and deception to suppress his enemies.

This *Civiltà Cattolica* article is interesting because of Emanuele Filiberto's relations with the Jesuits and the role played by the Jesuits in the struggle against the Waldenses.

§<21>. *For the history of the Italian workers' movement.* See Agostino Gori, *Ricordo*, with a bibliographical note. Published under the auspices of and with the funds of the town council of Florence. Florence, Tip. M. Ricci, 1927, in 8°, 44 pp. Gori died in 1926; he is the author of some historical essays on the workers' movement. The information might be found in the bibliography of his works compiled by Ersilio Michel for this commemorative publication.[1]

§<22>. *Catholic Action in Germany. Die Katholische Aktion: Materielen und Akten*, von Dr. Erhard Schlund O.P.M.—Verlag Josef Kosel & Friedrich Pustet, München, 1928.

This is a survey of Catholic Action in the major countries and a description of the papal teachings concerning it. In Germany, Catholic Action in its typical form does not exist; instead, the ensemble of Catholic organizations are taken to be Catholic Action. (This means that, in Germany, Catholicism is dominated by Protestantism, which it does not dare to attack with intense propaganda.) This is where one should start searching for an explanation of the political base of the "Center." (Cf. also the book by Monsignor Kaller, *Unser Laienapostolat*, 2d edit., Vol. 1, 320 pp., Leusterdorf am Rhein, Verlag des Johannesbund, 1927.)[1]

Schlund's book seeks to introduce and popularize in Germany Catholic Action of the Italian type, and certainly Pius XI must push in this direction (though cautiously, perhaps, since pushing too hard might reawaken the rancor and battles of old).

§<23>. *Brief notes on Chinese culture.* 1. The position of intellectual groups in China is "determined" by the practical forms that the material organization of culture has historically assumed in that country. First of all, there is the writing system: that is, the ideographic system. The writing system is even more difficult than people commonly suppose, for what makes it difficult is not only the enormous quantity of material signs but also the fact that this quantity is further complicated by the "functions" that each sign has according to where it is placed. Furthermore, the ideogram is not organically tied to a specific language but serves for all the languages spoken by educated Chinese; in other words, the ideogram functions somewhat like Esperanto.[1] It is a "universal" writing system (within a certain cultural world); but one must bear in mind that the Chinese languages have a common source. This phenomenon should be carefully studied because it can be used against "Esperantistic" infatuations; in other words, it can be used to show that insofar as the so-called universal conventional languages are not the historical expression of adequate and necessary conditions, they become an element of social stratification and of the fossilization of certain strata. Given these conditions, China cannot have a very widespread popular culture: oratory and conversation remain the most popular forms of cultural dissemination. At a certain point it will become necessary to introduce the syllabic alphabet. This brings with it a number of problems. First, the choice of the alphabet itself: the Russian or the English alphabet (by "English alphabet" I mean not only the simple notation of the fundamental signs, which is the same in English as in all other languages that use the Latin alphabet, but also the diacritical nexus of consonants and vowels that provide the notation of actual sounds, such as *sh* for *š* or *j* for the Italian *g*, etc.). If a choice were made, the English alphabet would certainly have the advantage, with consequences of international significance: that is, a certain culture will gain the upper hand.

2. The introduction of the syllabic alphabet will have very profound effects on the structure of Chinese culture. With the disap-

pearance of the "universal" writing system, the languages of the people will blossom, and therefore so will new intellectual groups, on the basis of the new situation. In other words, the current "cosmopolitan" type of unity will be broken, and "national" (in the narrow sense of the term) forces will spring to life. In certain respects, the Chinese situation can be compared to that of western and central Europe during the Middle Ages; in other words, it can be compared to "Catholic cosmopolitanism," when "Middle Latin" was the language of the ruling classes and their intellectuals. In China, the function of "Middle Latin" is fulfilled by the "writing system," which belongs to the ruling classes and their intellectuals.[2] The basic difference is this: the danger that kept medieval Europe united—the Muslim danger in general: the Arabs in the south, the Tartars and then the Turks in the east and southeast—cannot be compared, even remotely, to the dangers that threaten the autonomy of China at the present time. The Arabs, Tartars, and Turks were relatively "less" organized and developed than Europe at that time, and the danger was, for the most part, "merely" technico-military. England, America, and Japan, however, are superior to China not only "militarily" but also economically and culturally; in short, they are superior in all areas of society. Only the current "cosmopolitan" unity of hundreds of millions of people with its specific form of nationalism based on "race"—xenophobia—enables the central government of China to have at its disposal the minimal financial and military means with which to resist international pressures and keep its adversaries divided.

The politics of the right-wing successors of Sun Yat-sen[3] should be analyzed from this point of view. The characteristic feature of their politics is reflected in their "unwillingness" to prepare, organize, and convene a *Pan-Chinese Assembly* by popular vote (in keeping with Sun's principles); instead, they want to preserve the bureaucratic-military structure of the state: in other words, they are afraid to abandon the traditional forms of Chinese unity and to rouse the popular masses. One must not forget that the Chinese historical movement is confined to the Pacific coast and the banks of the great rivers that flow into the Pacific; the great mass of people in the hinterland is more or less passive. The convening of a *Pan-Chinese Assembly* would prepare the ground for a great movement of the masses, including those from the hinterland; thanks to the elected deputies, it would enable the burgeoning of the national

configurations (in the narrow sense of the term) that already exist in the Chinese cosmopolis, it would make it difficult for the current ruling groups to maintain their hegemony without implementing a program of popular reforms, and it would compel the search for unity to move in the direction of a federal union rather than the bureaucratic-military apparatus. In any case, this is the line of development. The endless war among the generals is the manifestation in primitive form of the struggle of nationalism against cosmopolitanism, but it will not be superseded—that is, there will be no end to the military-bureaucratic chaos—without the organized intervention of the people in the historic form of a Pan-Chinese Assembly.

(It is necessary to collect and organize a lot of material on the question of Chinese intellectuals, in order to be able to develop a systematic section under the rubric of *intellectuals*: the process of formation of Chinese intellectuals and the way they function in society have specific and unique characteristics that merit a great deal of attention.)

Chinese cultural relations with Europe. The first information on Chinese culture was provided by missionaries—mostly Jesuits—during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Intorcetta, Herdtrich, Rougemont, and Couplet revealed Confucian universalism to the West;[4] du Halde (1736) wrote the *Description de l'empire de la Chine*;[5] Fourmont (1742), da Glemona, Prémare.[6]

In 1815, when the Collège de France established the first professorship in Chinese language and literature, laypeople (whose goals and methods were scientific and not, as in the case of the Jesuits, aimed at spreading Catholicism) started studying Chinese culture. The professorship was held by Abel Rémusat, who is now regarded as the founder of European sinology.[7] One of Rémusat's students was Stanislas Julien, who came to be regarded as the leading sinologist of his time. Julien translated an enormous number of Chinese texts—novels, plays, travel books, and philosophical works—and at the end he summed up his philological knowledge in *Syntaxe nouvelle de la langue chinoise*.[8] The scientific importance of Julien resides in the fact that he was able to gain a thorough understanding of the nature of the Chinese language and of the reasons why Europeans, who are accustomed to inflected languages, find it difficult. The Chinese themselves have greater difficulty studying their language than Europeans have with their own languages. Chinese

requires a double effort, of memory and of intelligence: memory in order to remember the multiple meanings of an ideogram, and intelligence in order to relate these multiple meanings in such a way as to be able to find in each one the connective part, so to speak, that makes it possible to extract a logical and acceptable meaning from the nexus of phrases. The denser and more advanced (that is, the more abstract) the text, the more difficult it is to translate it. Even the most expert Chinese man of letters must always conduct a more or less rapid analysis of the text he is reading before he sets out to interpret it. In Chinese, experience is of greater value than in other languages, wherein the primary basis of understanding is morphology, which does not exist in Chinese. (I find the notion that in Chinese there is absolutely no morphology difficult to accept. One must bear in mind that in European descriptions of the Chinese language, primary importance is given to the "writing system." But does the "writing system" perfectly coincide with the spoken language, which is the "real language"? It is possible that the function of morphology is more closely related to phonetics and syntax, that is, to the tone of the individual sounds and to the musical rhythms of the sentence, which cannot appear in writing except in the form of musical notation; even so, I find it difficult to believe that there is not some kind of autonomous morphological function. It is necessary to check Finck's booklet on the major types of languages.[9] Remember also that, even in inflected languages, the morphological function has its origin in independent words that became suffixes, etc.; perhaps this trace can be used to identify the morphology of Chinese, which may represent a linguistic phase that is older than the oldest languages whose historical record has been preserved. The information that I am summarizing comes from an article by Alberto Castellani, "Prima sinologia" in *Il Marzocco* of 24 February 1929.)[10]

In Chinese, "the more one reads, the more one knows." In fact, since everything boils down to syntax, only extensive experience with the modes or clauses of the language can be of some help in understanding the text. Between the vague meaning of the ideograms and the thorough comprehension of the text there must be an operation of the intelligence that, in comparison with inflected languages, has an almost limitless need for logical adaptation.

A book on Chinese culture. Eduard Erkes, *Chinesische Literatur*, Ferdinand Hirt, Breslau, 1926. It is a short book that, according to

Alberto Castellani, in less than a hundred pages admirably condenses the entire cultural history of China, from the most ancient period to our times.[11] It is impossible to understand contemporary China without knowing its past, without demo-psychological information. This is true, but the way in which it is articulated, at least in the following statement, is hyperbolic: "Knowledge of the past demonstrates that in a Confucian sense the Chinese people have been communist for tens of centuries; so much so that certain recent attempts to make a Euro-Asian graft make us think of carrying coals to Newcastle." This statement can be made about any underdeveloped people confronting modern industrialism, and precisely because the statement can be applied to many different peoples, it has a crude meaning. Nevertheless, it is very important to know the real psychology of the popular masses from this perspective or to know how to reconstruct this psychology through literature. Chinese literature has the genuine imprint of religion and the state. Erkes tries to reconstruct, critically and synthetically, the different moments of Chinese literature by dealing with the most important periods, in order to endow these moments with the superior importance of historical necessity. (In other words, this is a history of culture, not a history of literature in the scholarly and descriptive sense.) He discusses the character and the works of Chu Hsi (1130–1200).[12] Few westerners know that he was the most important figure in China after Confucius; this is because of the calculated silence of the missionaries, who saw in this man who refashioned modern Chinese consciousness the biggest obstacle to their propaganda efforts.

A book by Wiegor, *La Chine à travers les âges*.[13] Erkes's book extends to the recent phase of "Chinese Europeanization" and also provides information on current developments, including those concerning language and education.

Alberto Castellani's article ("Filosofia cinese in veste europea e . . . giapponese") in *Il Marzocco* of 23 October 1927[14] contains information on a book by Alfredo Forke: *Die Gedankenwelt des chinesischen Kulturkreises*, Munich and Berlin, 1927.[15] Forke, a professor of Chinese language and culture at the University of Hamburg, is a renowned specialist in Chinese philosophy. The study of Chinese thought is difficult for a westerner for various reasons: (1) Chinese philosophers did not write down their thought in systematic treatises: it was the followers who gathered the

thoughts of their masters; the masters themselves did not put their ideas in writing for those who might follow them. (2) Philosophy as such was intertwined with and virtually smothered by the three great religious currents, Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. Thus, to the eyes of a European nonspecialist, the Chinese seemed either to lack a real and proper philosophy or else to have three philosophical religions. (However, the fact that philosophy was intertwined with religion is significant from a cultural perspective, and it characterizes the historical position of Chinese intellectuals.)

Forke, in fact, has attempted to present Chinese thought in European form; in other words, he has disentangled the philosophy as such from the hodgepodge of heterogeneous elements. He has thus made it possible to draw some parallels between European and Chinese thought. Ethics is the strongest feature of this reconstruction; logic is less important, "because the Chinese have always had more of an instinctive sense, an intuition of logic, than a precise concept, a science of it." (This point is very important, as an aspect of culture.) Only a few years ago, a Chinese writer, Prof. Hu Shih, in his history of Chinese philosophy (Shanghai, 1919),[16] gave prominence to logic by disinterring it from classical ancient texts: he made a strenuous effort to disclose the teachings of those texts. Perhaps the rapid spread of Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism, which have no interest in problems of logic, may have obstructed its development along scientific lines. "It is a fact that the Chinese have never had a work like Gautama's *Nyàya* or Aristotle's *Organon*." In China, then, there is no philosophical field of study that deals with "knowledge" (*Erkenntnistheorie*). Forke finds no more than a few leanings in this direction.

Forke also examines the branches of Chinese philosophy outside of China, particularly in Japan. Japan derived its forms of high culture, including philosophy, from China, although it gave them its own imprint. The Japanese, unlike the Chinese, do not have metaphysical and speculative tendencies (they are "pragmatist" and empiricist). When translated into Japanese, however, Chinese philosophers acquire greater perspicacity. (This means that the Japanese have extracted from Chinese thought what they found useful for their own culture; somewhat like what the Romans did with the Greeks.)

Castellani has recently published *La dottrina del Tao ricostruita sui testi ed esposta integralmente*, Bologna, Zanichelli, and *La*

regola celeste di Lao-Tse, Florence, Sansoni, 1927.[17] Castellani compares Lao-tzu and Confucius (I do not know in which of these two books):

> Confucius is the Chinese of the North, noble, learned, speculative; Lao-tzu, fifty years older than Confucius, is the Chinese of the South, a man of the people, bold, imaginative. Confucius is a man of the state; Lao-tzu advises against public activity. The former cannot live detached from the government; the latter flees from society and does not participate in its affairs. Confucius is pleased to beckon the rulers and the people to return to the paragons of ancient times; Lao-tzu's dreams go directly back to the era of universal innocence and of nature in its virgin state. The former is a courtier and a man of etiquette; the latter is a solitary man with a *sharp tongue*. For Confucius, who is steeped in forms, rules, and rituals, the human will is an essential factor in the production and determination of the *political phenomenon*. Lao-tzu, on the other hand, believes that everything, without exception, happens on its own, independently of our will; he believes that everything has its own rhythm, unaltered and unalterable by any human intervention. For Lao-tzu nothing is more ridiculous than Confucius's puny man—a busybody and a meddler who attaches an almost specific value to each of his gestures and believes them to be important; nothing is more pathetic than this myopic and presumptuous petty mind—far removed from Taoism—who believes himself to be a leader but, in fact, is led and who believes himself to be in control but is controlled.

(This passage is taken from an article by A. Faggi, "Sapere cinese," in *Il Marzocco*, 12 June 1927.) "To not do" is the principle of Taoism; it is, precisely, the "Tao," the "way."

The Chinese form of the state. Absolute monarchy in China was established in 221 B.C. and lasted until 1912, notwithstanding the changes of dynasties, foreign invasions, etc. This is the interesting point: every new master found the structure ready-made to be taken over by seizing central power. Continuity is thus a deadly and passive phenomenon for the Chinese people. It appears that even after 1912 the situation has remained relatively unchanged, in the sense that the overall apparatus is still virtually intact: the tuchun[18] have replaced the mandarins, and from time to time one of them tries to reestablish the formal unity of the state by seizing the center. The Kuomintang would have played a much more important role if they had genuinely raised the issue of a Pan-

Chinese Convention. But now that the movement is unleashed, it seems that it would be difficult to reestablish a lasting order without a thoroughgoing national revolution by the masses.

§<24>. *Past and present. Respect for the national artistic heritage.* A very interesting article on this topic is Luca Beltrami's "Difesa d'arte in luoghi sacri e profani" in *Il Marzocco* of 15 May 1927.[1] The anecdotes that Beltrami quotes from the daily press are very interesting and instructive. Since this issue is always brought up for polemical purposes in cultural debates, it is worth remembering these episodes of vulgar ostentation among the so-called cultured classes.[2]

§<25>. *Machiavelli and Manzoni.* N. Tommaseo's *Colloqui col Manzoni*—annotated by Teresa Lodi and published for the first time by G. C. Sansoni in Florence in 1929—contains some allusions to Machiavelli by Manzoni.[1] I am copying the following passage from an article by G. S. Gargàno ("Manzoni in Tommaseo") in *Il Marzocco* of 3 February 1929: Manzoni is also said to have believed that Machiavelli's influence has filled the heads of Italians with prejudices and that some people repeated Machiavelli's maxims without daring to put them into practice, while others acted on them but dared not utter them—"and the liberals are the ones who celebrate them, but the kings are the ones who practice them." This last comment may be Tommaseo's, who goes on to say that Manzoni had very little faith in the guarantees of the statutes and in the powers of parliament and that at the time he only wished for a unified and powerful nation, even at the cost of freedom—"even when every mind had a true idea of freedom and every heart had a common sentiment of freedom."[2]

§<26>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Alfredo Panzini.* The translation of Hesiod's *Works and Days* published by Panzini in 1928 (first in *Nuova Antologia* and then in a little volume brought out by Treves)[1] is examined by Angiolo Orvieto ("Da Esiodo al Panzini") in *Il Marzocco* of 3 February 1929.[2] The translation is technically very flawed. For every word in the text, Panzini employs two or

three of his own. It is more of a translation-commentary than a translation, and it lacks "the very particular complexion of the original, except for a certain kind of majestic solemnity which in several instances he managed to preserve." Orvieto mentions some of Panzini's serious errors. Instead of "diseases that bring old age to men," Panzini translates "diseases that old age brings to men." Hesiod talks of the "oak that bears acorns at the top and bees at its center (in the trunk)," which Panzini hilariously translates as "the mountain oaks (!) produce acorns, and the oaks of the valleys (!) host bees in their trunks," distinguishing between two types of oaks, etc. (a grammar school student would have received a failing grade for such a blunder). For Hesiod, the Muses "glorify with song"; for Panzini, they are "glorious in the art of singing." Orvieto provides other examples that show that Panzini's blunders are due not only to his superficial knowledge of Greek but also to his political prejudice (a typical instance of Brescianism), such as when he changes the text to make of Hesiod a supporter of the demographic campaign.[3]

It remains to be seen whether the journals of classical philology have paid any attention to Panzini's translation. In any case, Orvieto's article seems to suffice for my purposes (but it must be looked at again because right now I am missing a section of it).

§<27>. *Father Bresciani's progeny*. Enrico Corradini. Corradini's *Carlotta Corday* was reprinted in the drama series published by Barbera.[1] In 1907 or 1908, when it was written, it had a disastrous reception and was withdrawn from the stage. Corradini published the play with a preface (also reprinted in the Barbera edition) in which he blamed the disaster on an article in *Avanti!* that maintained that Corradini's intent was to defame the French Revolution. Corradini's preface should be interesting, even from a theoretical point of view, for the compilation of this survey of Brescianism, because Corradini seems to make a distinction between "little politics" and "big politics" in the "theses" contained within works of art. Naturally, Corradini believes that since the politics of his own work are "big politics," the accusation of "playing politics" with art cannot be levied against him. But this is not the issue: in works of art one must see whether there is an intrusion of extra-artistic elements, be they of low or high quality;

in other words, one must see whether the work in question is "art" or oratory aimed at a practical goal. All of Corradini's work is of the latter kind: it is not art, and it is even bad politics; in other words, it is merely ideological rhetoric.

§<28>. *Ideology, psychologism, positivism.* Examine this development in the cultural currents of the nineteenth century: sensualism + milieu produce psychologism; the theory of milieu is provided by positivism. Brandes, Taine in literature, etc.[1]

§<29>. *East-West.* In a lecture that was published in his book *L'energie spirituelle* (Paris, 1920), Bergson tries to solve the following problem: what would have happened if humanity had focused its attention and its research on the problems of inner life rather than on the problems of the material world? Matter rather than the spirit, he says, would have been the realm of mystery.[1]

This lecture needs to be read. In reality, "humanity" means the West, because the East has actually remained at the stage of inquiry that is focused solely on the inner world. On studying Bergson's lecture, one should pose the following question: whether it is not, in fact, the study of matter—that is, the great development of the sciences, both in the sense of theory and of industrial application—that has given rise to the view that the spirit is a "mystery," in the sense that the study of matter has set thought in motion at an accelerated pace, thus making one think about what "the future of the spirit" might be (an issue that does not arise when history is stagnant) and therefore making the spirit seem like a mysterious entity that reveals itself somewhat capriciously, etc.

§<30>. *The international function of Italian intellectuals.* In 1929 or early 1930 the *Bollettino Storico Lucchese* published a study by Eugenio Lazzareschi on the relations of the merchants of Lucca with France during the Middle Ages. Since the twelfth century the merchants of Lucca habitually visited the big city markets and the famous fairs of Flanders and France, and thus they became owners of vast holdings, commercial agents or suppliers to the kings of France and Burgundy, officers and contractors in the civil

and financial administrations; they married into renowned families, and they felt so much at home in France that they could claim to belong to two countries: Lucca and France. Thus one of them, Galvano Trenta, wrote to Paolo Guinigi early in 1411 instructing him to ask the new pope, who had just been elected, to request of the king of France that everyone from Lucca be recognized as a "burgher" of Paris.[1]

§<31>. *On the Italian national tradition.* Cf. B. Barbadoro's article in *Il Marzocco* of 26 September 1926.[1] Barbadoro cautions against interpreting and exalting the second Lombard League as the "first effort toward the independence of the race from foreign oppression that paved the way for the glorious deeds of the Risorgimento." He also points out that "the historical character of Frederick II is by no means the same as that of Barbarossa, and the Italian policy of the second Swabian was quite different: since he controlled the Italian South, whose history was disconnected for many centuries from that of the rest of the peninsula, it appeared at a certain moment that the restoration of imperial authority in the Center and in the North would lead, finally, to the formation of a strong national monarchy."[2]

Barbadoro refers back to this statement of his in a note in *Il Marzocco* of 16 December 1928[3] that was occasioned by a long essay by Michelangelo Schipa, published in *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane*, where the issue at stake is fully illustrated.

This trend in scholarship is very important for understanding the historical function of the communes and of the early Italian bourgeoisie that broke up the existing unity while lacking the knowledge or ability to replace it with a new unity of its own. The problem of territorial unity was not even raised or thought of, and this blossoming of the bourgeoisie produced no results: it was cut short by foreign invasions. This is a very interesting problem from the point of view of historical materialism, and I think it can be connected to the question of the international function of Italian intellectuals. Why is it that the bourgeois nuclei formed in Italy that had even attained complete political autonomy lacked the kind of initiative exhibited by the absolutist states in the conquest of America and in the opening of new outlets? It is said that the reasons for the decline of the Italian republics include the Turkish

invasion, which brought commerce with the Levant to a halt or, at least, disrupted it, as well as the shift of the world's historical axis from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic as a result of the discovery of America and the circumnavigation of Africa. But why did Christopher Columbus work for Spain and not for an Italian republic? Why did the great Italian navigators work for other countries? In order to explain all this one must look at Italy itself, not at the Turks or America. The bourgeoisie developed better in absolutist states during this period: that is, when it had indirect power rather than total power. Herein lies the problem, which must be linked to the problem of the intellectuals: the nuclei of the Italian bourgeoisie, the kind found in the communes, were able to develop their own category of immediate intellectuals, but they were unable to assimilate the traditional categories of intellectuals (especially the clergy) who, for their part, retained and reinforced their cosmopolitan character. On the other hand, thanks to the absolutist state, the non-Italian bourgeois groups attained this goal very easily; they even absorbed the Italian intellectuals. Perhaps this historical tradition explains the monarchical character of the modern Italian bourgeoisie, and it may help one to understand the Risorgimento better.

§<32>. *Ugo Foscolo and Italian literary rhetoric.* The *Sepolcri* has to be considered the main "source" of the rhetorical cultural tradition that sees in monuments a motive for exalting the glories of the nation.[1] The "nation" is not the people, nor is it the past that continues in the "people"; it is, rather, the ensemble of material objects that recall the past. This strange distortion may have been understandable in the early nineteenth century, when it had to do with the awakening of latent energies and raising the enthusiasm of the young, but it is a "distortion" precisely because it has become a purely decorative, external, and rhetorical motif. (The inspiration provided by tombs in Foscolo is not the same as in so-called sepulchral poetry: it is a "political" inspiration, as he himself writes in the letter to Guillon.)[2]

§<33>. M. Iskowicz, *La littérature à la lumière du matérialisme historique*, 1929, 30 francs (announced in the bulletin of 1 February 1929, *Nouveautés*, listes mensuelles de la M.L.F.).[1]

§<34>. *Past and present.* On the movement associated with Prezzolini's *La Voce*, which undoubtedly had the distinct character of a campaign for the moral and intellectual renewal of Italian life (in this regard it picked up, with greater maturity, where *Leonardo* had left off, and then it differentiated itself from Papini's *Lacerba*[a] and Salvemini's *Unità*, but more so from *Lacerba*[b] than from *Unità*), cf. Giani Stuparich's book on Scipio Slataper, published in 1922 by the Casa Ed. La Voce.[1]

§<35>. *Risorgimento.* The transfer of the capital city from Turin to Florence and the September massacre.[1] Cf. the volume *Confidenze di Massimo D'Azeglio*, edited by Marcus de Rubris (Milan: Mondadori, 1930); it contains Massimo D'Azeglio's correspondence with Teresa Targioni Tozzetti.[2] It brings D'Azeglio's character into relief, including his malice, his skepticism, his Piedmontism; however, some of his observations on the September events are useful and interesting.

§<36>. *Past and present.* On the impression created by the initial activities of the Italian Academy, cf. "La prima seduta pubblica dell'Academia d'Italia" in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 15 June[a] 1930.[1] An editorial severely criticizes the way in which the Italian Academy has distributed the sum of one million lire that it had at its disposal to support the humanities in the nation to 150 prizewinners: it seems that the distribution of prizes resembled the largesse of a soup kitchen. Another piece, "Cronaca per la storia" by Antonio Aniante, describes the session as if it were the meeting of a town council in the provinces.[2]

§<37>. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals.* "Pour Nietzsche, l'intellectuel est 'chez lui,' non pas là où il est né (la naissance, c'est de l''histoire'), mais là où lui-même engendre et met au monde: *Ubi pater sum, ibi patria*, 'Là où je suis père, où j'engendre, là est ma patrie'; et non pas, où il fut engendré." Stefan Zweig, "Influence du sud sur Nietzsche," *Nouvelles Littéraires*, 19

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci erroneously spelled the title of Papini's journal as "*Acerba.*"
[b]In the manuscript, Gramsci wrote "*Acerba.*"
[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci erroneously wrote "16 June."

July 1930 (it may be a chapter from a book translated by Alzir Hella et Olivier Bournac).[1]

§<38>. *The non-national-popular character of Italian literature*. Orazio Pedrazzi's article "Le tradizioni antiletterarie della burocrazia italiana" in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 4 August 1929.[1] Pedrazzi fails to make certain necessary distinctions. It is not true that the Italian bureaucracy is as "antiliterary," as Pedrazzi makes it out to be, but it is true that the bureaucracy (that is to say, the upper echelons of the bureaucracy) does not write about its own activities. The two things are different; in fact, I believe that the bureaucracy has its own literary mania, but it has to do with "good style," "art," etc. It may turn out to be the case that bureaucrats are responsible for the great mass of literary trash. However, it is true that Italy (unlike France and elsewhere) lacks a body of valuable literature produced by state employees (military and civil) that deals with the activities of diplomats abroad, of officers at the front, etc. The little that exists is mostly "apologetic." "In France, in England, generals and admirals write for their people; in our country, they write only for their superiors." The bureaucracy, in other words, does not have a national character; it has the character of a caste.

§<39>. *Skepticism*. The commonsense objection that one can make against skepticism is the following: that in order to be consistent with himself the skeptic should do nothing else but live like a vegetable, without getting involved in the affairs of ordinary life. If the skeptic intervenes in the debate, it means that he believes that he can convince others; in other words, he is no longer a skeptic but stands for a specific positive opinion, which is usually bad and can only triumph if the community is persuaded that other opinions are even worse, because useless. Skepticism is related to vulgar materialism and positivism. There is an interesting passage in the work of Roberto Ardigò where he says that Bergson should be praised for his voluntarism.[1] But what does this mean? Is it not an admission of the incapacity of one's own philosophy to explain the world if one has to turn to an opposite system to find the element necessary for practical life? Ardigò's point (found in his *Scritti*

vari, collected and edited by G. Marchesini, Florence, Le Monnier, 1922) should be compared with Marx's theses on Feuerbach;[2] and it goes to show precisely how far Marx had gone beyond the philosophical position of vulgar materialism.

§<40>. *Pirandello.* On the conception of the world implicit in Pirandello's plays, one should read Benjamin Crémieux's preface to the French translation of *Enrico IV* (Editions de la N.R.F.).[1]

§<41>. *Vocational guidance.* Cf. Father Brucculeri's study in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 6 October, 3 November, and 17 November 1928: it contains the rudimentary material for an initial general outline of research on this topic.[1] This is a complicated issue to study, because: (1) in the current situation of the social division of roles, the vocational (in a broad sense) choices of certain groups are limited by various considerations, economic (they are unable to wait) and technical (every additional year of schooling modifies the general inclinations of the individual who must make a career choice); (2) one must always take into account the danger that the institutions that are called upon to assess the aptitudes of an individual might determine that an individual is capable of performing a certain job even when that individual is opposed to it. (This kind of situation must be heeded, following the introduction of rationalization, etc.; it is not merely a technical issue but also has to do with wages. To some extent, at least, American industry has used high wages to "select" workers for the rationalized industry. However, other industries may be inclined—through the promotion of these scientific or pseudoscientific schemes—to "force" all the traditional skilled workers to let themselves be rationalized without obtaining for themselves the wage levels adequate to their way of life, which would compensate for their increased expenditure of nervous energy. This could lead to a real social danger: the present wage structure is based primarily on compensation for muscular power. The introduction of rationalization without a corresponding change in the way of life could lead to a rapid deterioration of the nervous system and cause an unprecedented health crisis.) This question must also be examined from the point of view of the common work school.

§<42>. *The tradition of Rome.* Make a list of the various reactions (and their different characteristics) to the ideology that is bound up with the tradition of Rome. Futurism in Italy was one form of this reaction insofar as it opposed traditional and academic rhetoric, which, in Italy, is closely linked to the tradition of Rome. (Giusti's *La terra dei morti*: "*We* were great already, while over there they had yet to come into existence"; Carducci's "everything in the world that is civil/great, majestic, is Roman still": they are indebted to Foscolo's *Sepolcri* as a "modern" instance of this rhetoric.)[1] This reaction has various facets as well as diverse characteristics. For example, it tends to challenge the idea that modern Italy is the heir to the Roman tradition (Lessing's saying about "the worms produced by the decomposition of the carrion of Rome"), or it challenges the importance of the tradition itself.[2] In Wells's *A Short History of the World* (published by Laterza with a polemical note by the translator, Lorizio)[3] this reaction takes on different aspects: (1) it negates the idea that the history of the ancient world becomes unified in the Roman Empire; it does so by enlarging the historical vision of the world through the history of China, India, and the Mongols; (2) it aims to devalue the greatness of the history of Rome as such and of its tradition, both as a political (Holy Roman Empire) and as a cultural (Catholic Church) current. While the first point made in Wells's book is correct, the second one is weakened by the new intrusion of ideological elements, and it is moralistic.

Another aspect that deserves attention is the valorization of a non-Roman factor in the formation of modern nations: the Germanic element in the formation of the Romano-Germanic states. This aspect is nurtured by the Germans, and it remains alive in the debates on the importance of the Reformation as a preliminary stage of modernity. In the formation of Romano-Germanic states, however, a third and sometimes a fourth element is involved, in addition to the Roman and the Germanic element. In France, besides the Roman and the Frankish element, there is the Celtic element provided by the autochthonous Gallic population. In Spain, moreover, there is also the Arabic element with its scientific influence during the Middle Ages. As for the Gallic element in the formation of French civilization, there has always been a whole body of literature of a mixed historical and popular character. A recent work that should be looked at is Camille Jullian's *Histoire de la Gaule.*[4]

In it (vol. VIII, p. 311) one reads that it is high time to get rid of the "obsession with imperial history" and that "we must learn to free ourselves from those modes of feeling and thinking that have been inherited from the Roman Empire. The historian must be able to overcome the almost unsurmountable prejudices that we have acquired as a result of our classical education."[5] From Piero Baroncelli's article "La figura di Roma in uno storico celtista" in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 March 1929, it appears that Jullian has replaced these prejudices with other prejudices (Celtomania). Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that a qualified historian such as Jullian, a member of the academy, has produced such a monumental study in support of his thesis and that he has received the academy's prize. Baroncelli maintains that: "The *jealousy* with which almost everyone nowadays looks at our country is also evident in the favorable reception that foreign countries give to publications that in one way or another try to discredit the name of Rome and Italy. One such work is precisely the *Histoire de la Gaule*, mentioned above, a work that has enjoyed widespread attention, is impressive because of its size, and is authoritative because of the reputation of its author."[6] He adds: "As for the *insults* that are directed these days against the image of ancient Rome, we know only too well that in the eyes of certain individuals there is something seriously wrong with Rome, the mistress and the teacher of peoples: Rome, ever since its beginnings, has always been Italy."[7] Baroncelli, too, substitutes his own prejudices for those he attacks, and, more importantly, he gives his prejudices a political overlay. The topic should be examined dispassionately. What's left of the Roman tradition today that is truly distinctive and unmistakable? Concretely, very little: the most striking modern activities are economic (both theoretical and practical) and scientific, none of which is a continuation of the Roman world. Even when it comes to the field of law: What is the position of the Roman tradition vis-à-vis the Germanic and, more recently, the Anglo-Saxon contributions? And in what geographic area is Roman law most widespread? It should also be noted that the form of Roman law that has become traditional was elaborated in Constantinople, after the fall of Rome. As for the Roman tradition of the state, it is a fact that Italy as such (that is, Italy in its current form) is not a continuation of that tradition (Sorel's observation),[8] etc. Keep track of Ezio Levi's published work on the Arabic tradition in Spain and on its importance for modern civilization.[9]

§<43>. *The episode of the arrest of the La Gala brothers in 1863.* In his article "Ricordi personali di politica interna" (*Nuova Antologia*, 1 April 1929), Tommaso Tittoni provides some previously unpublished details on the arrest of the La Galas in Genoa.[1] The La Galas, who had sought refuge in the Papal States, settled in Oriolo Romano, a small village close to Manziana, which is where Vincenzo Tittoni (Tommaso's father) was born.[2] A friend of Vincenzo who was the Rome correspondent of the National Committee informed the committee that the La Galas had boarded the French steamship *Aunis* at Civitavecchia.[3] The ship was headed for Marseilles by way of Leghorn and Genoa. The committee informed Vincenzo, who was at Leghorn, but by the time the news reached him the *Aunis* had already set sail for Genoa. Tittoni went straight to the prefect and persuaded him to telegraph the prefect of Genoa. The latter, without waiting for instructions from the ministry, took it on himself to arrest the La Galas onboard the *Aunis*. On the La Gala affair, cf. Isaia Ghiron, "Annali d'Italia in continuazione al Muratori e al Coppi," *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento*, 1927, no. 1, and especially *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 1863 (the La Galas were arrested in July 1863).[4]

§<44>. *T. Tittoni*, "Ricordi personali di politica interna," *Nuova Antologia*, 1 April–16 April 1929.[1] Tittoni wrote these memoirs of his soon after the conciliation[2] in order to show how this event corresponded with all the political activity of his career as a moderate liberal or, rather, as a clerical conservative. It is fair to say that this is where all the interest of the "Ricordi" resides: in the effort to reconstruct the history of Italy from 1870[3] to the present as a struggle between clerical conservatives and democracy or demagogy for the reassertion of clerical influence on the life of the nation; it thus brings to the fore the activities of the conservative current, insofar as it is represented by Tittoni. I am taking notes on some of Tittoni's points:

For the history of Catholic Action. In November 1871 the Roman Union is formed to participate in the local elections, with the approval of Pius IX, for whom the participation of Catholics in municipal and provincial administrations was compatible with obedience to the Holy See.[4] Cf. Paolo Campello della Spina, *Ricordi di più che cinquant'anni*, Rome, Loescher, 1910. In it one reads: "Pius IX told the group of visitors who used to attend his morning audi-

ences and sometimes accompanied him on his walks in the gardens: 'But surely, surely, they have not understood, even though I have told them many times, that I would like them to run in the local elections.' "[5] Information concerning the effort made by Roberto Stuart and others to create a conservative Catholic party and then a Catholic parliamentary group, an effort that was cut short by the Vatican (although, it should be noted, the Vatican let this go on for a while).

Positivism and reaction. Tittoni writes:

> For a long time, Auguste Comte's *Cours de philosophie positive* has been my philosophical and political vade mecum.[6] In my view, no one has resolved the supposed conflict between science and religion better than Comte, who assigned science to reason and religion to feeling and who clearly separated the sphere of free inquiry from the one reserved for faith. Comte regarded the papacy as an important element for the conservation of society. Toward the end of his life he dreamed of a religious and social defense league presided over by the pope. His booklet *Catechisme positiviste* belongs to our times.[7] I bought a copy of it from a street vendor of books in Rome, and in it I found the following dedication: "A Monsieur Bex, Général des Jésuites, offert par l'auteur Auguste Comte, Paris le 19 aristote 69." I wrote to Littré,[8] sending him a facsimile of the autograph; he responded, assuring me of its authenticity. Father Bex paid no attention to the volume, for the pages had not even been cut.

(But he may have read a different copy of it.)

Concerning the events of 1898.[9] Electoral systems contrived: from a passage in the Hon. Gianforte Suardi's memoirs quoted by Tittoni one learns that when the Rudiní-Pelloux cabinet changed the electoral law, it came up with the idea of compelling voters to cast their votes in their birthplace "in order to block the vote of artificial (!) groups, such as those found in Turin, where, because of the railway workshops, there was such a large concentration of railwaymen that they constituted a fortuitous (!) artificial majority of workers from Romagna and from other parts of Italy besides Turin." In Tittoni's memoirs one can glean various episodes of this kind of political gerrymandering, at which the reactionaries have always excelled.

Tittoni, prefect of Naples from 1900 to 1903. Idyll: he does not talk about the concrete facts of which he was accused. Cf. the Acts

of Parliament of 1903: during the December 2 session, Tittoni was attacked by Barzilai and Bissolati, who cited the accusations made by *Propaganda*.[10]

The events of 1904. I have already noted the actions of Tittoni in 1904 in my summary of an article by Gianforte Suardi in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 November 1927.[11] Tittoni is more long-winded.

Tittoni and Giolitti. Tittoni does not explain very clearly his political relations with Giolitti, with whom he collaborated very closely; in fact, this collaboration is also important for assessing Giolitti's own politics. Tittoni's references to Sonnino and Rudinì are also awkward and reticent.[12]

The anticlerical wave of 1907. In July 1907 the Fumagalli–don Riva scandal and the events at Alassio.[13] Tittoni on the clerical side.

Tittoni, proponent of civil war. Tittoni was struck by the fact that in order to assemble the police force needed to cope with riots that broke out in one place, one had to remove forces from other regions. During the Red Week of June 1914, the forces of Ravenna were transferred to suppress the riots in Ancona.[14] Later, the prefect of Ravenna, deprived of a police force, had to lock himself up inside the prefecture and abandon the city to the rebels. "On a number of occasions I asked myself, what could the government have done if a wave of rebellion had broken out simultaneously throughout the peninsula." Tittoni proposed that the government recruit "volunteer police forces": veterans under the command of officers on furlough. Tittoni's idea seemed to merit consideration, but nothing came of it.

The Popular Party. Tittoni had high hopes for the Popular Party, and he would have joined it if it were the same as the original Catholic political movement. He was not only against Miglioli but also against Meda and Rodinò.[15]

§<45>. *Enrico Catellani*, "La libertà del mare," *Nuova Antologia* of 1 April 1929.[1]

§<46>. *Claudio Faina*, "Il carburante nazionale," *Nuova Antologia* of 16 April 1929[1] (a continuation of Faina's earlier article published by *Nuova Antologia* and noted elsewhere).[2]

§<47>. *Catholic Action.* Gianforte Suardi in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 May 1929 ("Costantino Nigra e il XX settembre 1870")[1] adds a detail to the account he gave on 1 November 1927[2] of the participation by Catholics in the elections of 1904, with the approval of Pius X—a detail he had omitted out of discretion before the conciliation.[3] When he greeted the group from Bergamo (Paolo Bonomi, etc.), Pius X is said to have added: "Repeat to Rezzara—(who was not present at the audience and who, as is known, was one of the most authoritative leaders of the Catholic organization)—the answer that I have given you, and *tell him that the pope will say nothing.*"[4] The underlined text is precisely the detail previously left out. Wonderful, as one can see, and of great moral purport.

§<48>. *Domenico Spadoni,* "Le società segrete nella rivoluzione milanese dell'aprile 1814," *Nuova Antologia* of 16 May 1929.[1] According to the transcripts of a trial for military conspiracy discovered by Spadoni, the Freemasons intervened in that uprising (which culminated in the murder of the minister Prina).[2] Some new details, but nothing special.

§<49>. *Bernardo Sanvisenti,* "La questione delle Antille," *Nuova Antologia,* 1 June 1929.[1] On the Monroe doctrine; on the relations between the United States and Spanish America, etc. It contains bibliographical references to books on this topic by South American writers; it also carries potentially useful information on cultural movements that are linked to the predominance of the United States.

§<50>. *Brief notes on Japanese culture. Nuova Antologia* of 1 June 1929 published Raffaele Pettazzoni's introduction ("La religione nazionale del Giappone e la politica religiosa dello Stato giapponese") to his book on *La mitologia giapponese,* which has been published by Zanichelli of Bologna in the series "Testi e documenti per la storia della religione."[1] Why did Pettazzoni title his book *Mitologia*? There is a certain difference between "Religion" and "Mythology," and it is important to retain the distinction between the two words. Has religion in Japan become simply a "mythol-

ogy"? In other words, has it become merely an "artistic" or "folkloristic" element? Or does it still have the importance of a living and functioning conception of the world? From the introduction, it appears that Petazzoni ascribes to Japanese religion the importance of a living and functioning conception of the world, hence the title is misleading. I am taking note of some parts of this introduction that might be useful for an attempt to include a "Japanese" paragraph in the survey of the "intellectuals."

The introduction of Buddhism in Japan occurred in 552 A.D. Until then, Japan had known only one religion, its national religion. From 552 to this day, the history of religion in Japan has been determined by the relations and interminglings between this national religion and Buddhism (an extranational and supranational type of religion, like Christianity and Islam). Christianity, introduced into Japan in 1549 by the Jesuits (Francis Xavier), was violently extirpated during the early decades of the seventeenth century; reintroduced by Protestant and Catholic missionaries in the second half of the nineteenth century, it has been of little importance overall. After the introduction of Buddhism, the national religion was called by a Sino-Japanese name, *Shinto*—that is, "the way (Chinese: *tao*) of the gods (Chinese: *Shen*)"—whereas *butsu-do* referred to Buddhism ("do"—way; "butsu"—Buddha). In Japanese, *Shinto* is called *Kami-no-michi* (*Kami*—deities). *Kami* does not mean "god" in the Western sense but, more generically, "divine beings," including deified ancestors. (Not only did China introduce Buddhism into Japan, it also introduced ancestor worship, which appears to have been more thoroughly incorporated into the national religion.) Basically, however, Shintoism is a religion of nature, a worship of the gods (*Kami*) of nature, most important among them, the goddess of the sun, *Amaterasu*; the god of hurricanes, *Susanowo*; the couple Heaven and Earth, namely, *Izanagi* and *Izanami*, etc. It is interesting that Shintoism represents a type of religion that has totally disappeared in the modern Western world but was common among the civilized peoples of antiquity (the national and polytheistic religions of the Egyptians, Babylonians, Indians, Greeks, Romans, etc.). *Amaterasu* is a deity like Osiris, or Apollo, or Artemis; it is interesting that a modern civilized people like the Japanese believes in and worships such a deity. (However, things may not be as simple as they seem.)

Nevertheless, alongside this national religion there is Buddhism, a supranational type of religion; therefore, it is fair to say that Japan, too, has basically gone through the same religious development as the West (with Christianity). Indeed, Christianity and Buddhism spread across their respective areas synchronously. Furthermore, the Christianity propagated in Europe is not the Christianity of Palestine but the Christianity of Rome or Byzantium (with Latin or Greek as the liturgical language). Likewise, the Buddhism propagated in Japan is not the Buddhism of India but the Buddhism of China (with Chinese as the liturgical language). Unlike Christianity, however, Buddhism allowed the preexisting national religions to subsist (whereas in Europe national tendencies have manifested themselves within the embrace of Christianity).

At first, Buddhism was welcomed in Japan by the educated classes, along with Chinese civilization (but was Buddhism the only thing that Chinese civilization brought with it?). A religious syncretism took place: Buddhism-Shintoism. Elements of Confucianism. In the eighteenth century there was a reaction against the syncretism in the name of national religion that reached its peak in 1868 with the beginning of modern Japan. <Shintoism> declared the state religion. Persecution of Buddhism. But only for a short time. In 1872 Buddhism was officially recognized and given equal status with Shintoism both in terms of its functions (primarily, among other things, the pedagogical function of inculcating in the people the sentiments and principles of patriotism, civic responsibility, and loyalty) and in terms of its rights (with the abolition of the "Shinto Bureau" and the establishment of a Ministry of Religious Affairs with jurisdiction over both Shintoism and Buddhism). In 1875, however, the government changed its policy once again: the two religions were separated, and increasingly <Shintoism> gained a privileged and unique position. Various bureaucratic measures followed, one after another, culminating in the elevation of Shintoism to the status of a patriotic and national institution, accompanied by an official renunciation of its religious character (it became an institution—it seems to me—similar to the Roman cult of the emperor, except that Shintoism is not a religion in the strict sense of the term and thus even a Christian can practice it). The Japanese can embrace any religion, but they must bow before the image of the emperor. Thus the Shinto of the state sepa-

rated itself from the Shinto of religious sects. This was ratified bureaucratically as well: within the Ministry of Education there is now a "Bureau of Religions" for the various popular churches of Shintoism and for the various Buddhist and Christian churches, and within the Ministry of the Interior there is also a "Bureau of Shrines" for state Shintoism. According to Pettazzoni, this reform came about as a result of the mechanical application of Western constitutions to Japan: in other words, its purpose was to affirm the principle of religious freedom and the equality of all religions in the eyes of the state and to rescue Japan from the inferior status and backwardness to which it was consigned by Shintoism as a religion, in contrast to the type of religion practiced in the West.

Pettazzoni's criticism seems artificial to me (see also what is happening in China with regard to Sun Yat-sen and his Three Principles:[2] a kind of nonreligious cult of the state is taking shape. It seems to me that the image of Sun is worshiped in much the same way as the current emperor of Japan is). Among the people and even among educated persons, however, the consciousness and sentiment of Shintoism as a religion are still alive. (This is natural, but I do not think anyone can deny the importance of the Reform,[4] which consciously or unconsciously leads to the formation of a secular consciousness, no matter how paradoxical its forms.) (This discussion on whether state Shintoism is a religion seems to me to be the most important aspect of the Japanese cultural problem, but, certainly, one cannot discuss Christianity along these lines.)

§<51>. *Brief notes on Chinese culture.* From the article "Il riformatore cinese Suen Uen e le sue teorie politiche e sociali" in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 4 May and 18 May 1929:[1]

> The nationalist party has promulgated one decree after another to honor Sun Yat-sen. The most important of these is the one that prescribes the "Monday ceremony." Every Monday, in all the schools, offices, and military bases and in every institution that is attached in some manner to the nationalist party, everyone gathers in front of the portrait of the "Father of the Nation," and, all together, they bow their heads three times. This is followed by a reading of his "Political Testament," which contains the essence of his teachings, after

which there are three minutes of silent meditation on its great principles. This ceremony is carried out at every important assembly.

The study of the *San Min Chu I* (Three Principles of the People) is obligatory in all schools, including those run by Catholics and by every other religious denomination; it is a conditio sine qua non for their legal existence. The papal legate in China, Monsignor Celso Costantini, expressed his position on these legal obligations in a letter to Father Pasquale D'Elia, S.J., an Italian missionary who is also a member of the Bureau of Sinology at Tusewei.[2] The letter is published in the opening pages of the volume *Le triple démisme de Sun Wen*, traduit, annoté et apprécié par Pascal M. D'Elia, S.J., Bureau Sinologique de Zi-Ka-Wei, Imprimérie de T'ou-Sè-Wè, Shanghai, 1929, in 8°, clviii+530 pp., 4 Chinese dollars.

Costantini does not believe that Sun has been "deified":

Christian schoolchildren should not feel uneasy about bowing before the portrait of Sun Yat-sen. In itself and by its nature, bowing the head has no superstitious significance. According to the intention of the government, this ceremony is nothing more than a simple civic expression of homage to a man who is considered the Father of the Nation. It may be excessive, but it is in no way idolatrous (the government itself is atheist), and it entails no sacrifice. If in some place the practice is abused and sacrifices are offered, then it should be regarded as superstitious, and Christians should refrain from any kind of participation. Our responsibility is not to create erroneous understanding and to enlighten our students whenever certain doubts arise concerning the meaning of such civil ceremonies.

With regard to the obligatory teaching of the Three Principles of the People, Costantini writes:

In my personal judgment, it is legitimate, if not to teach, then at least to explain Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles in the public schools. There is no freedom in this matter; it is imposed by the government as a sine qua non. Several things in the Three Principles are good, or at least they are not bad, and they more or less correspond to or can be reconciled with Catholic sociology (*Rerum novarum, Immortale Dei, Codice sociale*).[3] We must make sure that in our schools the

task of explaining this material is assigned to Catholic teachers who are well versed in Christian doctrine and Christian sociology. Certain things have to be explained and corrected.

The article in *La Civiltà Cattolica* summarizes the Catholic position vis-à-vis the doctrines of Chinese nationalism: an active position, as one can see, because it aims to create a "Catholic nationalistic" trend with a particular interpretation of the doctrines themselves. From a political-historical point of view, it would be worth examining how the Jesuits arrived at this position; this would entail a review of everything published by *La Civiltà Cattolica* from 1925 onward on Chinese events. In his book, Father D'Elia anticipates the objection that could be raised by those of his readers in whose view it would be wiser to remain silent rather than to publicize these new ideas. "D'Elia, quite rightly, responds: 'These questions are not resolved by passing over them in silence. Whether one likes it or not, Chinese Catholics will hear of these questions from tendentious and hostile commentaries. It seems that there would be less danger if we instructed them ourselves by bringing the doctrine of Sun Yat-sen directly to them. We should try hard to show that the Chinese can be good Catholics not only while remaining Chinese but also while taking account of some of theories of Sun Yat-sen.' "

§<52>. *Domenico Meneghini*, "Industrie chimiche italiane," *Nuova Antologia*, 16 June 1929.[1]

§<53>. *Reformation and Renaissance. Nicholas of Cusa*. The *Nuova Antologia* of 16 June 1929 published a note by L. von Bertalanffy, "Un cardinale germanico (Nicolaus Cusanus)"[1] *that* is curious both in itself and because of the editorial comment that follows it. Bertalanffy presents the German-Protestant view of Cusa concisely, without a critical and bibliographical apparatus. The *Nuova Antologia* points out, in a mean spirit, that Bertalanffy failed to mention "the numerous and important studies on Cusa that emanated from Italy during the past few decades," and it provides a list of them, all the way down to Rotta.[2] The only worthwhile remark is found in the last few lines: "Bertalanffy regards

Cusa as a precursor of modern liberal and scientific thought; in Rotta's view, on the other hand, the bishop of Brixen 'is wholly within the orbit of medieval thought, when it comes to the spirit, if not the form, of his speculation.' The truth is never one-sided." What is this supposed to mean?

There is no doubt that Cusa was a reformer of medieval thought and one of the initiators of modern thought. Proof of this is the fact that the church forgot him, and his thought was studied by secular philosophers, who rediscovered him as one of the precursors of modern classical philosophy.

The importance of Cusa's practical activity in the history of the Protestant Reformation. At the Council (of Constance?) he defended the rights of the councils against the pope.[3] He then reconciled himself with the pope. At the Council of Basel he supported church reform.[4] He tried to reconcile Rome with the Hussites and to reunite East and West; he even thought of preparing for the conversion of the Turks by pointing out the common core of the Koran and the Gospels.[5] *Docta ignorantia* and *coincidentia oppositorum*.[6] He was the first to conceive the idea of infinity, anticipating Giordano Bruno and the modern astronomers.

It is fair to say that the Lutheran Reformation broke out because Cusa's reform activity failed: that is, because the church was unable to reform itself from within. His religious tolerance, etc. (Born 1401; died 1464.)

Michele Losacco, "La dialettica del Cusano"—a thirty-eight-page comment that was presented on 17 June at a meeting chaired by Luigi Credaro, at an institution that the *Nuova Antologia* fails to identify (perhaps the Lincei Academy?).[7]

§<54>. *Father Bresciani's progeny*. Popular-national literature. It is necessary to establish clearly what is meant by "interesting" when talking about art in general and about narrative literature and drama in particular. The element that makes something "interesting" changes according to individuals, or social groups, or the crowd in general; it is therefore an element of culture, not of art, etc. But is it therefore something completely extraneous to art and separate from it? At the same time, art itself is interesting; it is interesting in itself, in that it satisfies one of the necessities of life. Furthermore, besides this most basic characteristic of art—that is,

of being interesting in itself—what other elements of "interest" does a work of art (for example, a novel, or a poem, or a play) have to offer? In theory, an infinite number. But the ones that are "interesting" are not infinite: they are, precisely, only those elements that are believed to contribute most directly to the immediate or mediated (of the first degree) "success" of the novel, poem, or play. A grammarian may be interested in a play by Pirandello because he wants to find out how many markedly Sicilian lexical, morphological, and syntactic elements Pirandello has introduced or can introduce into Italian literary language. This is an "interesting" element that does not contribute much to the dissemination of the play in question. Carducci's "barbarous meters" were an "interesting" element for a larger circle of people: namely, for the corporation of professional literary scholars and for those who wanted to become professional literary scholars.[1] Therefore these people constituted an immediate important factor of "success": they contributed to the sale of a few thousand copies of poems written in barbarous meters. These "interesting" elements vary according to the times, the cultural climate, and personal idiosyncrasies.

The most stable element of "interest" is certainly the "moral" interest, positive or negative, irrespective of whether one agrees with it or not. "Stable" in a certain sense: what is meant here is the "moral category," not the concrete moral content. The "technical" element is closely linked to this: "technical" in the particular sense of a means of conveying in the most immediate and dramatic way the moral content, the moral conflict of the novel, poem, or play. Thus we have the coup de théâtre in drama, the dominant "plot" in the novel, etc. Not all of these elements are necessarily "artistic," but neither are they necessarily nonartistic. From the point of view of art they are, in a sense, "indifferent" or extraartistic; they are facts of the history of culture, and they must be evaluated from this point of view.

That this happens, that this is indeed the case, is demonstrated by so-called commercial literature, which is a part of national-popular literature. What makes it "commercial" is the fact that the "interesting" element is not "candid," "spontaneous," intimately fused with the artistic conception;[a] rather, it is sought after from the outside, mechanically, and it is doled out industrially, as a sure element of immediate "success." Still, this means that even com-

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci inserted "intuition" between the lines, directly above "conception."

mercial literature must not be neglected in the history of culture. Indeed, it is extremely valuable, precisely from the point of view of the history of culture, for the success of a work of commercial literature is indicative (and often it is the only existing indicator) of the "philosophy of the age," that is, of the mass of sentiments [and conceptions of the world] prevalent among the "silent" multitude. This literature is a "narcotic" of the people, an "opium."[2] (A. Dumas's *Count of Monte Cristo*, which is perhaps the biggest "opiate" of all popular novels, could be analyzed from this perspective. What man in the street does not believe he has been treated unjustly by the powerful and does not fantasize about the "punishment" to inflict on them? Edmond Dantès offers him a model, "intoxicates" him with excitement, replaces the belief in a transcendental justice, in which he no longer "systematically" believes.)

§<55>. *Romagna and its role in Italian history.* Cf. Luigi Cavina's article, "Fiorentini e Veneziani in Romagna" in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 June 1929.[1] It deals primarily with the period immediately preceding the formation of the League of Cambrai against the Venetians after the death of the Borgia pope, Alexander VI, and the illness of Valentino. Romagna was an essential component of the internal equilibrium of Italy, especially the equilibrium between Venice and Florence and between Venice and the pope. Neither Florence nor the pope could tolerate a Venetian hegemony over Romagna. (Machiavelli and Valentino during their campaign for the conquest of Romagna; Machiavelli and Valentino after the death of Alexander VI, during the conclave, and in the early years of Julius II. Valentino no longer had a base in a state: his political stature and even his politico-military "skill" collapsed completely; he became an ordinary leader of mercenaries, and furthermore he was in financial trouble.)[2]

In his article, Cavina makes a "strange" point. He cites Machiavelli's principle: "No country has ever been united and happy unless it submitted itself wholly to the jurisdiction of a single republic or a single prince, as was the case with France and Spain."[3] Cavina then goes on to say:

> That this was not the case in Italy should, on the basis of empirical judgment, be blamed primarily on the church, which was never strong enough to take over the entire peninsula nor so weak as to allow

> someone else to take it over; it was partly the fault of the other states as well. Above all, however, it was the result of the system of equilibrium among the powers in Italy. Herein lies the historical and national cause for the failed unification of the country, in that it was not the result of any individual's thinking but of an effective universal way of thinking transmitted from generation to generation through the centuries and thus in keeping with the national character.[4]

What does all of this mean? That the "national character" consisted in not being "national"? And was the "system of equilibrium" among the Italian powers not determined, in large measure, by the requirements of existence of the papal state, which was simultaneously a world power and an Italian power?

Great confusion arises when dealing with these issues because of the fact that people set out to discover why a certain historical event (the territorial and political unification of the Italian peninsula) did not occur prior to 1870. If it is difficult to discover and agree on the causes of particular events, it is even more difficult, and almost absurd, to try to discover the reasons why history unfolded in a certain way rather than in another. In reality this is not a problem of history; it is, rather, a sentimental and political type of need. The initial (sentimental and directly political) presupposition is that the Italian nation has always been a nation, with the same geographical configuration as now, and thus the question arises as to why it did not achieve political and territorial unification earlier, as did France, or Spain, etc.

Nevertheless, the problem is not totally absurd, provided that its present political character is clearly understood and carefully circumscribed in order to explain certain historical developments that are related to modern life or as an element for the study of certain methodological criteria. Cavina's reference to an "effective universal way of thinking" would be an interesting point of departure if it were stated precisely and developed along the lines I did in other notes.[5] In other words, Italy, because of its "cosmopolitan" function during the period of the Roman Empire and during the Middle Ages, experienced international relations in a passive way; that is to say, in the course of Italian history, international relations prevailed over national relations. The papacy is, precisely, the expression of this fact: since papal rule has a dual character—it is a universal spiritual monarchy and a temporal principality—there is no

doubt that its earthly power had to be limited. (Machiavelli saw this very clearly as is evident from chapter III of *The Prince* and from his account of what he told the cardinal of Rouen. When Valentino was occupying Romagna, the cardinal of Rouen told Machiavelli that the Italians had no understanding of war. Machiavelli answered that the French had no understanding of the state—of politics—"because if they understood it, then they would not allow the Church to become so powerful," etc., etc.)[6] There is no doubt that had the church held the entire peninsula under its temporal power, the independence of the European states would have been seriously endangered. Spiritual power can be respected, as long as it does not represent a political hegemony, and the entire period of the Middle Ages is full of struggles against the political power of the pope.

It is true, then, that among Italians the Roman and medieval tradition of universality hindered the development of the national (bourgeois) forces, except in the purely economic field on the local level. In other words, the national "forces" did not become a national "force" until after the French Revolution and after changes in the position of the pope in Europe: a position that became irreparably subordinate because it was limited to and challenged in the spiritual arena by triumphant secularism. Nevertheless, these international elements that exercise pressure "passively" on Italian life continued to function until 1914 and even (although increasingly weaker) until the conciliation of 1929.[7] To a certain extent, they continue even to this day, determining the external relations between the Italian state and the pontiff, imposing a certain discourse, etc.

(In order to understand exactly the level of development attained by the national forces in Italy during the period stretching from the emergence of the communes to the advent of foreign domination, one should be able to conduct the type of study carried out by Groethuysen in *Origines de l'esprit bourgeois en France*.[8] One must look for these materials in reports, in correspondences, in books on politics, in the literature written for reading pleasure, and in the works of educators or authors of moral treatises, etc. A very interesting book, for example, is the one by Leon Battista Alberti.[9] For a bibliography, one may check the histories of education in Italy, etc. From B. Castiglione's *Cortegiano* one can already see a new social type, different from the bourgeois of the commune republics,

becoming prevalent as a model, etc.[10] A place should be set aside for the great political writers, such as Machiavelli and Guicciardini.[11] Likewise for religious writings, sermons, treatises, etc.)

§<56>. *Catholic Action.* "La pace industriale" (by A. Brucculeri) in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 5 January 1929.[1] (It takes note of the efforts made in England to achieve industrial peace; the collaborationist tendencies of the BIT;[2] the joint committees in factories; labor legislation; high wages in America, etc.) This series of articles by Brucculeri on industrial issues was subsequently collected in a volume.[3] Brucculeri is (or was) associated with the Office of Malines, which compiled the *Codice sociale.*[4]

§<57>. *Catholic Action in the United States.* An article on "La campagna elettorale degli Stati Uniti e le sue lezioni" in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 5 January 1929.[1] It deals with Smith's presidential candidacy.[2]

La Civiltà Cattolica reports the fierce opposition of the Protestant churches against Smith, and it speaks of a "religious war." It makes no mention of the position adopted by Smith vis-à-vis the pope in his famous letter (cf. Fontaine's book on the Holy See, etc.), which is an element of Catholic Americanism.[3] (The position of the Catholics against prohibition and their support of the farmers.) One notices that every concentrated action taken by the Catholics provokes such a strong reaction that the results do not measure up to the power that the Catholics claim to have, hence the dangers of concentrated action on a national scale. Was it a mistake for the Catholics to rely on a traditional party like the Democratic Party? Was it a mistake to let religion appear to be linked to a particular party? On the other hand, could they, given the present American system, establish their own party? America is an interesting terrain for examining the current state of Catholicism both as a cultural and as a political element.

§<58>. *Catholic Action.* One of the most important measures that the church has devised to strengthen itself in the modern age is the *obligation* imposed on families to have their children receive first communion at *the age of seven.* It is easy to understand the

psychological impact that the ceremonial trappings of first communion must have on seven-year-old children—both as an individual family event and as a collective event—and what a source of terror and therefore of attachment to the church it becomes.[1] It "compromises" the mind of the child as soon it is capable of reflection. It is understandable, then, that this measure has been resisted by families worried about the deleterious effects of this precocious mysticism on a child's mind; one can also see why the church has been fighting to overcome this opposition. (Remember, in Fogazzaro's *Piccolo mondo antico*, the struggle between Franco[a] Maironi and his wife about taking their little daughter on a boat on a stormy night to attend Christmas mass. Franco Maironi wants to make his child have indelible "memories" and decisive "impressions." His wife does not want to disturb the daughter's normal mental development, etc.)[2] The measure was decreed by Pius X in 1910. In 1928 the Pustet publishing house in Rome reprinted the decree with a preface by Cardinal Gasparri and a comment by Monsignor Jorio, which gave rise to a new campaign in the press.[3]

§<59>. *Catholic Action in Germany*. Through the initiative of the episcopate, the German Catholics have established a "German Catholic League for Peace"; it has been in existence since 1919. On this league, on the subsequent initiatives to develop it, and on its program, see *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 19 January[a] 1929.[1]

In the same issue of *La Civiltà Cattolica*, see Pius XI's letter to Cardinal Bertram, archbishop of Breslau, concerning the Catholic Action in Germany.[2] This should be seen as a personal intervention by the pope that is meant to give a major boost to the Catholic Action movement, which does not seem to have found enthusiastic organizers in Germany. The pope's letter is a real theoretical-practical program, and its interest is not limited to Germany. *La Civiltà Cattolica* comments at length on the letter, and it is understood that the comments are meant for other countries as well.

§<60>. "La schiavitù del lavoro indigeno" (by A. Brucculeri) in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 2 February 1929.[1] Recapitulates the ques-

[a]In this note, as elsewhere in the manuscript, Gramsci erroneously reported the first name of Fogazzaro's fictional character Maironi as "Piero" rather than "Franco."
[a]In the manuscript, "19 June."

tions concerning the state of slavery that still exists in several countries (Abyssinia, Nepal, Tibet, Hejaz, etc.); the condition of slavery of women in countries that practice polygamy; *forced labor*, to which indigenous people in many colonies (for ex., French Central Africa) are subjected; the forms of slavery or serfdom caused in many countries by indebtedness and by usury ("peonage" in America; Central and South America; India). (This same thing has also happened, and may happen again, to Italian emigrants in South America: in order to pay the few hundred lire that his voyage cost him, the emigrant has to work gratis for a certain period of time.) In the case of premeditated usury, the debt is never fully repaid, and the state of serfdom is handed down from generation to generation. Women and children working in Chinese factories. The article comes with a kind of bibliography primarily on slavery.

§<61>. *Rotary Club*. See the article "Ancora Rotary Club e Massoneria" in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 16 February 1929.[1] The arguments set forth by the Jesuits to warn against the Masonic character of the Rotary are exhausted in this article. There are two levels of "suspicion": (1) that the Rotary is really and truly an emanation of traditional Freemasonry; 2) that the Rotary is a new type of Freemasonry. These two motifs are interlaced with other motifs of a subordinate character: (1) that whatever the case may be, traditional Freemasonry astutely uses the Rotary, taking advantage of the "ingenuousness" and agnosticism of the Rotarians; (2) the Jesuits regard the "agnostic" character—i.e. the religious indifference or tolerance—of the Rotary as such a fatal flaw that they feel compelled to sound the alarm and to adopt attitudes that are full of suspicion and polemics (a preparatory step that may end up with the condemnation of the Rotary by the church). The latter motif has not yet given rise to a full-fledged campaign (which would be the prelude to an "excommunication") because the Jesuits have to distinguish between countries with a Catholic majority and countries with a non-Catholic majority. In countries where Catholics are not in the majority, the Jesuits demand religious tolerance, without which they themselves cannot increase their presence: their "offensive" position actually depends on the existence of amorphous institutions in which they can insert themselves with

the intention of conquering them. In Catholic countries, on the other hand, the "defensive" position requires an all-out struggle against the amorphous institutions that provide a favorable terrain for non-Catholics in general. In its current phase, the position that has been taken against the Rotary consists of an ideological offensive without any practical sanctions of a universal (excommunication or some other attenuated form of prohibition) or even of a national sort; the only sanctions have come from bishops (in some dioceses—such as one in Spain—bishops have taken up a position against the Rotary).[2] The ideological offensive is based on the following points: (1) the Rotary has Masonic origins; (2) in many countries the Rotary has excellent relations with Freemasonry; (3) in some places the Rotary has adopted an openly hostile attitude toward Catholicism; (4) Rotarian morality is nothing other than the secular Masonic morality in disguise.

The problem of the Jesuits' attitude toward the Rotary is complicated by the situation in Italy. The Rotary is allowed in Italy, whereas Freemasonry is illegal. A peremptory affirmation that the Rotary is Freemasonry in disguise or is a Masonic instrument can have legal consequences. Moreover, the Rotarians started their existence in Italy under the patronage of very eminent individuals: one of the first Rotarians was the crown prince, who is known for his Catholic and devout leanings. In any case, as Rotarians from foreign countries have acknowledged, the Italian Rotary has its own specific character, in keeping with the local situation. *La Civiltà Cattolica* quotes some passages from a report by Stanley Leverton following a visit to Italian clubs on behalf of Rotary International; the report was originally published in *The Rotary Wheel,* the official organ of the British Rotary and reprinted in the August 1928 (p. 317) issue of the Italian organ *Il Rotary*: "One gets the impression that in Italy the Rotary is not in step with us"; "their Rotary is the only Rotary possible in Italy"; "it seems to be somewhat different, more like a first cousin than a brother"; "their current leaders guide their activities with very broadly defined goals ("eh, eh!!!"—exclaims the writer of *La Civiltà Cattolica*), but their ultimate objective is the same as ours"; "although it might seem unusual and different, there is always a good reason for it being the way it is." "In any case, Mr. Leverton has the impression that the Italian Rotarians," insofar as, etc., etc., "are the men who are making Italy modern."

§<62>. The editorial staff of *La Civiltà Cattolica*. The articles on Freemasonry are written by Father Pietro Pirri (therefore it is likely that Father Pirri has written the articles on the Rotary). The articles on art are by Father Carlo Bricarelli (who usually signs his articles). The articles on the unification of churches are by Father Celi; those on natural science (questions of evolutionism and of transformism) by Father Gaya; those on literature (especially on Dante) by Busnelli, etc.[1] Father Brucculeri writes on economic and industrial issues. In a book entitled *Problemi odierni del lavoro* (in 8°; 145 pp.; L. 8) he collected the following articles that had already appeared, unsigned, in *La Civiltà Cattolica*: (1) "L'organizzazione internazionale"; (2) "L'organizzazione scientifica"; (3) "L'orientazione professionale"; (4) "Verso la pace industriale"; (5) "La schiavitù del lavoro indigeno."[2] The publishing house of *La Civiltà Cattolica* has brought out the following works (certainly extracted from the periodical) by Father Brucculeri: (1) *Salariato e compartecipazione*, in 16°, 70 pp., L. 2.50; (2) *Il problema della terra*, 2d ed., in 16°, 162 pp., L. 3.50; (3) *Lo sciopero nella storia, nella morale, nell'economia*, 2d ed., in 16°, 136 pp., L. 5; (4) *La limitazione della giornata di lavoro e il principio delle otto ore*, 2d ed., in 16°, 50 pp., [5 lire]; (5) *Sul problema di Malthus. Rilievi*, L. 7.50.[3]

§<63>. *Father Bresciani's progeny*. "Technically" Brescianist writers. On these writers, one must see Giovanni Casati's *Scrittori cattolici italiani viventi: Dizionario bio-bibliografico ed indice analitico delle opere*, with a preface by Filippo Meda, Milan: Romolo Ghirlanda Editore, Via Unione 7, in 8°, viii+112 pp., L. 15.[1] One must also look at subsequent editions (if any) of this dictionary and compare them with one another to check what additions and deletions are made.

Don Giovanni Casati is the Catholic expert in bio-bibliography. He edits the *Rivista di Letture*, which recommends what books should or should not be [read and] acquired by private individuals and by Catholic libraries. He is compiling a catalog of *Scrittori d'Italia dalle origini fino ai viventi*, arranged alphabetically (according to an article in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 2 March 1929, from which I am extracting this information, A–B has already been published).[2] He is the author of *Saggi di libri letterari condannati dall'Indice*.[3]

Five hundred and ninety-one writers agreed to have their names included in the dictionary *Scrittori cattolici italiani viventi*. Some did not respond to the request. In the case of authors who publish their books with non-Catholic presses, Casati interpreted their silence "as a tacit request to have their names not appear in the dictionary." One needs to find out why they were asked in the first place: because they are "baptized"? Or because their books revealed strictly and avowedly "Catholic" characteristics? *La Civiltà Cattolica* states that the *Dizionario* is missing the names of, for example, Gaetano De Sanctis, Pietro Fedele, and "many other noteworthy university professors and writers."[4] De Sanctis is undoubtedly a "Catholic" writer; he deliberately declares himself Catholic. But Pietro Fedele? If so, he must have become Catholic only recently; he certainly was not a Catholic, at least not until 1924. It appears, then, that the criterion for establishing "Catholicity" has not been very rigorous and that the decision was made to collapse the distinction between "Catholic" writers and writers who happen to be "Catholics."

The *Dizionario* does not include the names of journalists and freelance writers who have not published any books: thus Count Della Torre, the editor-in-chief of *L'Osservatore Romano*, and Calligari (Mikros), the editor-in-chief of the *Unità Cattolica*, do not appear in it. Some excused themselves "out of modesty."

Who are the "converts" included in the *Dizionario*? (Such as Papini, Giuliotti, Mignosi, etc.)[5] According to *La Civiltà Cattolica*: "In the period since the war, one notices a certain reawakening of religious consciousness among contemporary writers, an extraordinary interest in religious problems; increasingly, writers are turning toward the Catholic Church. Much of this is certainly due to the contribution made by converts, including the ones listed in Casati's dictionary."

Of the 591 living Italian Catholic writers, 374 ("errors excepted," writes *La Civiltà Cattolica*) are men of the church: priests and members of religious orders, among them, three cardinals, nine bishops, three or four abbots (not counting Pius XI); 217 are laypersons, including 49 women; of the women, only one is a member of a religious order.

La Civiltà Cattolica points out some errors. There exists a *Katholischer Literaturkalendar* (Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1926) that lists 5,313 German Catholic writers. In France, the *Almanach*

catholique français (published in Paris by Bloud et Gay since 1920) publishes a small dictionary of the "principales personnalités catholiques." In England, *The Catholic Who's Who*, 1928 (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne).

La Civiltà Cattolica hopes that, once the criteria are broadened (to include journalists and freelance writers) and the "modest" ones overcome their shyness, the Italian list will be twice as long—which would still not be much. The strange thing is that *La Civiltà Cattolica* talks of "freeing some people from their own modesty" and mentions the "orientalist, Professor P. S. Rivetta." He may be modest as an "orientalist" and as "Professor P. S. Rivetta," but he is certainly not modest when he writes as "Toddi," the punster of *Il Travaso delle Idee*,[6] and as editor of *Via Vittorio Veneto*, the sheet of the "garçonnes" and the habitués of luxurious cafés and all the snobs.

§<64>. *Church and state in Italy before the conciliation.* On this subject one should take another look at the article "La Conciliazione fra lo Stato italiano e la Chiesa (cenni cronistici)" in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 2 March 1929[1] (the survey is continued in subsequent issues, which should be checked) because of certain interesting allusions (interesting also because of the fact that the allusion to certain events indicates that a certain importance was attached to them when they occurred). Thus, for example, there is a specific allusion to the "Social Week"[2] held in Venice in 1912, chaired by the marquis Sassoli de Bianchi, and to the "Social Week" held in Milan in 1913, at which the "civil liberties of Catholics" were discussed. Why is it that precisely in 1912 and 1913 the Catholics, as a mass organization, discussed the Roman Question and determined which of its fundamental issues needed to be worked out in order for it to be resolved? One need only think of the Libyan war and of the fact that when it is at war the state needs to have the highest degree of moral as well as civil peace and unity.

This article reproduces passages from occasional articles published at the time of the reconciliation. For example, Senator Petrillo (in *Il Popolo d'Italia* of 17 February 1929) reports what happened in Italian parliamentary and government circles when Benedict XV died.[3] (The Bonomi government wanted to avoid commemorating Benedict XV in parliament since that would have com-

pelled the government to participate and it did not want to make any political display favoring one side or the other. Bonomi was supported by the Popular Party, and he had Popular Party ministers in his cabinet.[4] Remember that I was in Rome at the time, and, together with Bombacci, I went to Bevione—the prime minister's undersecretary—to obtain a passport.[5] Bevione was impatient and wanted to make sure that no group would take any initiative that could drag in the other groups and compel the government to intervene. In reality, no one spoke, but Petrillo carefully avoids explaining why no one, absolutely no one, spoke. One may concede that from a certain point of view it would have been appropriate if Salandra spoke.[6] But since Salandra refused to speak, why did no one else speak? And why should Salandra be the only one blamed?)

§<65>. *Risorgimento. The historical conjuncture of 1848–49.* The final paragraph of a long article, "Il P. Saverio Bettinelli e l'abbate Vincenzo Gioberti," in *La Civiltà Cattolica* (2 March–16 March 1929) may provide an interesting cue.[1] *La Civiltà Cattolica*, which is always arguing against Gioberti,[2] says, yet again, that it wants to disprove the assertion that in the nineteenth century the Jesuits not only opposed Italy but even conspired with Austria. According to *La Civiltà Cattolica*: "From Pius IX down to the most humble country priest, no one was against Italian unity. One can also prove <. . .> that in 1848, when Pius IX proposed an Italian league and the political unification of Italy, the only opposition came from the government of Piedmont. The Italian clergy—and this should be beyond the shadow of any doubt for those whose heads are not buried in the sand—was not opposed to unity, but it wanted to achieve it in a different way. This was the view of Pius IX, of the cardinals in the upper echelons of the hierarchy, and even of the old conservative party of Piedmont led by Count Solaro della Margarita."[3] The article defends the Jesuits specifically against the accusation of being antiunification and pro-Austrian, an accusation made by Antonio Bruers in an article published in *La Stirpe* of August 1928.[4] Bruers gives an unfavorable review of the book by Professor U. A. Padovani of the University of Sacro Cuore, *Vincenzo Gioberti e il Cattolicesimo* (Milan: Soc. Ed. Vita e Pensiero, 1927), that attacks Gioberti precisely for his anti-Jesuitism.[5] *La Civiltà Cattolica* writes: "We definitively aver that the Jesuits, like

Pius IX and the Italian clergy in general and the entire lay conservative party (which was substantial), never opposed unification itself but the violent unification as it was being carried out; that is, they opposed the method by which unity, desired by all, was being accomplished. Or is there only one way to love one's country?" The article then goes on to recall that "it was Carlo Alberto himself who had Gioberti's works placed in the Index of Forbidden Books," and it points out, jesuitically, that "King Carlo Alberto thus condemned Gioberti's politics: in other words, his own politics!" Probably, however, since he was calling for church sanctions against Gioberti, Carlo Alberto was following Solaro della Margarita's political line. In any case, it is a most amusing paradox that nowadays the Jesuits can pillage the scribblings of someone like Bruers.

§<66>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Ugo Ojetti and the Jesuits.* U. Ojetti's "Lettera al Rev. Padre Enrico Rosa" was published in *Pégaso* of March 1929 and reprinted in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 6 April 1929 with a long note by Father Rosa himself.[1] Ojetti's letter is subtly jesuitical. It opens thus: "Reverend Father, since 11 February[2] the throng of converts to a fashionable Catholicism of convenience has been so massive that you will permit a Roman who comes from what they used to call a 'papalist' family, who was baptized in Santa Maria in Via, and who received his religious education at St. Ignatius school from you Jesuits yourselves, to spend half an hour with you, to take a rest from the great hubbub, engaging a man like you, upright and judicious, who was yesterday what he is today and what he will be tomorrow." He goes on to recall his first Jesuit teachers: "And those were difficult times, when to the outside world 'Jesuit' meant underhanded power or dark iniquity, whereas inside on the top floor of the Collegio Romano, under the roof (—which is where the Jesuits had their religious school at which Ojetti was educated—),[3] all was order, trust, cheerful good will, and, even in politics, tolerance, with nary a word against Italy and never—unlike what used to take place in the state schools—base homage to the real or imagined supremacy of this or that foreign culture over our own culture." He also mentions that he is "an old subscriber to *La Civiltà Cattolica*" and "a faithful reader of the articles you publish there." And therefore "I, a writer, address you,

a writer, and state to you my matter of conscience." It is all here: the "papalist" family, baptism in the Jesuit church, a Jesuit education, the cultural idyll of the Jesuit schools, the Jesuits alone or almost alone representing the national culture, the reading of *La Civiltà Cattolica*, Father Rosa as Ojetti's old spiritual mentor, Ojetti's present recourse to his mentor on a matter of conscience. Ojetti, then, is not one of today's Catholics, not one of those 11 February Catholics who are Catholic out of convenience or because it is fashionable. Ojetti is a traditional Jesuit; his life is an "example" of the kind used in sermons, etc. Ojetti was never "made in Paris"; he has never dabbled in skepticism or agnosticism; he has never been a Voltairean; he has never been among those who regard Catholicism as, at best, mere sentimental subject matter for the figurative arts. Therefore, 11 February found him prepared to accept the conciliation with "cheerful good will." The thought does not even cross his mind (God forbid) that the conciliation may be an *instrumentum regni*, because he himself has felt "what a powerful force religious fervor is in the minds of the young, and how, once awakened, its warmth suffuses all the other sentiments, from love of one's country and family to devotion to one's leaders, endowing the moral formation of character with a divine sanction and reward." Is this not, in abridged form, the biography or, rather, the autobiography of Ojetti? And yet, an imp, in the guise of "a French poet who is really a poet," asks Ojetti: "And poetry? And art? And critical judgment? And moral judgment? Will you all go back to obeying the Jesuits?" Ojetti's Jesuit schooling was not for naught: he has found a solution to these questions that is exquisitely jesuitical, except for one thing: that he has divulged it and made it public. Ojetti needs to improve the "moral formation" of his character further with divine sanction and reward: these are things that are done but left unsaid. Here, in fact, is Ojetti's solution:

> . . . The Church, steadfast in its dogmas, is capable of being indulgent toward the times, as it clearly demonstrated during the Renaissance (but after the Renaissance came the Reformation, and its champions and representatives were precisely the Jesuits),[4] and Pius XI, a humanist, knows how much air poetry needs in order to breathe; he also knows that for many years now, without waiting for the conciliation, even in Italy, secular culture and religious culture have been collaborating cordially in the fields of science and history. . . .

> Conciliation is not confusion. The papacy will condemn, as is its right; the Italian government will permit, as is its duty. And you, if you deem it opportune, will explain the grounds for the condemnation and will defend the arguments of faith, in *La Civiltà Cattolica*. And we here, without anger, will defend the arguments of art, if we are really convinced of them, for it may be, as has often been the case, from Dante to Manzoni, from Raphael to Canova, that for us, too, faith and beauty seem like two sides of the same face, two rays of the same light. And there will be occasions when it will be a pleasure for us to have polite discussions. For example, is Baudelaire a Catholic poet or not? . . . The fact is that today the practical and historical conflict is resolved. But the other conflict—between the absolute and the relative, between spirit and body, the eternal struggle in the conscience of each of us, which (says Ojetti) led B. Croce and G. Gentile, non-Catholics, to oppose modernism (?) and be happy (?) to see it defeated because (?) it would have been the bad (?) sort of conciliation, turning sly equivocation into sacred doctrine—the inner and eternal conflict (and if it is eternal, how can it be reconciled?), is not and cannot be resolved. And the help that religion can and does give daily to everyone to resolve this conflict, it gave to us Catholics even before. (How can one be Catholic with this "eternal struggle"? At most one can be a Jesuit!) If, in spite of such help, we have been unable to resolve this conflict once and for all (!?), it is because of our insufficiency. But as you know, it is precisely out of the continual resurgence, renewal, and rekindling of this eternal conflict that poetry and art burst forth and sparkle.[5]

A truly amazing document of jesuitism and moral baseness. Ojetti can create a new superjesuitical sect: a jesuitical aestheticist modernism!

Father Rosa's response is less interesting because jesuitically more anodyne. Rosa is very careful not to probe too deeply into the Catholicism of Ojetti and the new converts. It is too soon: it is good that Ojetti and Co. are calling themselves Catholic and fawning on the Jesuits; indeed, perhaps nothing more will be expected of them. Rosa puts it well: "a convenience or fashion that, nevertheless—let us admit it among ourselves confidentially and in passing—may be a lesser evil and therefore a good thing compared with that previous convenience and fashion of futile anticlericalism and narrow-minded materialism because of which many <. . .> distanced themselves from the profession of the faith that they still preserved in the depths of their 'naturally Christian' souls."

§<67>. *Catholic Action.* For a study of the international structure of Catholicism, remember the *Annuario pontificio* published in huge volumes of about 1,000 pp. by the Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana in Rome.[1]

For the Italian Catholic Action in the specific (lay) sense, see the Catholic almanacs now brought out by the publishing house of *Vita e Pensiero*: the most interesting and historically valuable one is the *Almanacco cattolico* for 1922, which describes the Catholic situation during the years immediately after the war.[2]

§<68>. Monsignor Francesco Lanzoni, *Le Diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII (anno 604)*, a critical study, Faenza: Stab. Graf. F. Lega, 1927, "Studi e testi," n. 35, xvi+1,122 pp., L. 125 (in the appendix, "Excursus sui Santi africani venerati in Italia").[1] It is work of fundamental importance for studying the history of local life in Italy during those centuries. It addresses the question: how were religious cultural groups formed during the decline of the Roman Empire and the early Middle Ages? Obviously, the formation of these groups cannot be separated from economic and social life, and it offers clues for the history of the birth of the communes. And for the origins of the mercantile cities. An important episcopal see could not do without certain services, etc. (provision of supplies, military defense, etc.), which gave rise to the grouping of lay individuals around the religious groups. (This "religious" origin of a series of medieval cities is not examined by Pirenne, at least not in the booklet I own; check the bibliography of his complete works.)[2] The choice itself of an episcopal see is a valuable historical indicator, for it implies that the place chosen had an organizational and centralizing function. From Lanzoni's book it will be possible to construct the most important methodological questions in the critical work within this field of research, which is, in part, deductive; it will also be possible to construct a bibliography.

Also important are Duchesne's studies on early Christianity (for Italy: "Les évêches d'Italie et l'invasion Lombarde" and "Le sedi episcopali dell'antico Ducato di Roma")[3] and on the old dioceses of Gaul and Harnack's study on the origins of Christianity, especially *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*.[4] These studies are interesting not only for what concerns the medieval centers of civilization but also for the true history of Christianity, naturally.

§<69>. *Encyclopedic notions.* In the polemic on the functions of the state, the description of the state as "night watchman" (*veilleur de nuit*) corresponds to the Italian expression "state as *carabiniere*": in other words, a state whose functions are limited to ensuring public order and respect for the laws, while civic development is left to the private forces of civil society. It seems that the expression "*veilleur de nuit*," which has more of a sarcastic import than "state as *carabiniere*" or "state as policeman," was coined by Lassalle.[1] Its opposite is the "ethical state" or "interventionist state" in general, but there are differences between the two expressions. "Ethical state" has a philosophical origin (Hegel) and refers rather to the educational and moral activity of the state. "Interventionist state" has an economic origin and is connected with protectionist tendencies or economic nationalism. The two trends tend to merge, but not necessarily. Naturally, the liberals favor the state as *veilleur de nuit*, to a greater or lesser extent: the "economists" are totally for it; the philosophers are for it but with some very important distinctions, because they anticipate the struggle of secularism against the positive religions in civil society. The Catholics are really agnostics: they would like to have the interventionist state on their side; failing that, they want a neutral state because an unfavorable state might support their enemies. In reality, the Catholics want everything to be in their favor.

Cf. Notebook 26, §6.

§<70>. *The state is the church.* In his booklet, *Stato fascista, Chiesa e scuola* (Rome: Libreria del Littorio, 1929), "Ignotus" dwells on a ministerial circular, saying that "many people did not consider it a monument of political prudence, because it expressed itself with excessive zeal, the kind of zeal that Napoleon (he means to say Talleyrand) absolutely disliked, a zeal that would have seemed excessive even if the document were issued by the Church administration itself, rather than by a civilian government ministry."[1] The circular to which "Ignotus" refers was signed by the minister Belluzzo and sent to the local directors of education on 28 March 1929. (Circular no. 54, published in the *Bollettino Ufficiale* of the Ministry of National Education on 16 April 1929; reprinted in its entirety in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 18 May 1929.)[2] According to "Ignotus" this circular made it easier for Catholics to give article 36 of the Concordat a very broad interpretation. But is this true? "Ignotus" writes that with art. 36 of the Concordat, Italy does not *recognize* but just barely (!?) *considers* "the teaching of Christian doctrine in the form handed down by the Catholic tradition as the

foundation and the crowning piece of public instruction."[3] But are the reservations expressed by "Ignotus" and his cavilling interpretation of the verb "to consider" logical? This is undoubtedly a serious issue, and probably those who drew up the documents did not think, before it was too late, of the full consequences of their concessions, hence this abrupt backing-off. (This makes one think that the change in the name of the ministry from "Public Instruction" to "National Education" is connected to this need for a narrow interpretation of article 36 of the Concordat. In other words, the change was made in order to affirm the distinction between, on the one hand, "instruction," which is the "informative" moment, still elementary and preparatory, and on the other hand, "education," which is the "formative" moment, the crowning piece of the educational process, according to Gentile's pedagogy.)[4]

The phrase "foundation and crowning piece" used in the Concordat repeats the expression used in the R.<oyal> Decree of 1 October 1923, no. 2185, "Ordinamento dei gradi scolastici e dei programmi didattici dell'istruzione elementare": "The teaching of Christian doctrine in the form handed down by the Catholic tradition *is set* as the foundation and crowning piece of instruction in all the elementary grades."[5] On 21 March 1929, in what was regarded as a quasi-official article, "L'insegnamento religioso nelle scuole medie," *La Tribuna* wrote: "The Fascist state *has decided* that the Catholic religion, on which the intellectual and moral unity of our people is based, will be taught not only in the schools attended by very young children but also in those attended by adolescents."[6]

The Catholics, naturally, relate all of this to the first article of the statute, which was confirmed in the first article of the treaty with the Holy See.[7] In their interpretation, the state as such *professes the Catholic religion*, which goes beyond what is in fact the case: namely, that when the state, in the course of its activities, has a need for religious ceremonies, it resolves[a] that such ceremonies must be "Catholic." For the Catholic point of view on public schools, see the article (by Father M. Barbera) "Religione e filosofia nelle scuole medie" in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 1 June 1929.[8]

§<71>. *The nature of the concordats.* In his letter of 30 May 1929 to Cardinal Gasparri, Pius XI wrote: "In the Concordat, as

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci inserted "establishes" between the lines, directly above "resolves."

well, there are, *if not two states*, then most certainly two full sovereignties, complete in themselves, each in its own sphere, a sphere necessarily determined by its respective purpose. It is almost superfluous to add that the objective dignity of purposes determines no less objectively and necessarily the absolute superiority of the church."[1]

The position of the church is based on the following grounds, which were accepted, necessarily, with the acceptance of two distinct instruments—the treaty and the concordat—in [establishing] the relations between church and State: the treaty determines the relations between two states; the concordat determines the relations between two sovereignties within the "same state."[2] In other words, it is conceded that within the same state there are two sovereignties, since they deal with each other on equal footing (each within its own sphere). Naturally, the church, too, maintains that there is no confusion of sovereignties, but it does so because it maintains that in the "spiritual" sphere the state *has no competence* to exercise sovereignty, and should it arrogate such a competence unto itself, it would be guilty of usurpation. Furthermore, the church also maintains that there cannot be dual sovereignty within the same sphere of purposes, but it does so precisely because it upholds the distinction between ultimate purposes, and it declares itself the sole sovereign of the spiritual realm.

§<72>. *Past and present.* From an article in *L'Osservatore Romano* of 11–12 March, reprinted (only some passages) by *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 6 April 1929: "Similarly, the word 'revolution' no longer produces in us the same baneful impression that it seems to induce in others, as long as it is meant to indicate a program and a movement that are carried out within the ambit of the basic institutions of the state, leaving the monarch and the monarchy—that is, the highest exponents that best epitomize the political authority of the nation—in their place; in other words, without sedition or insurrection, which until now seemed to be inseparable from the meaning and the methods of revolution."[1]

§<73>. *Politico-military direction of the war.* The *Nuova Antologia* of 16 June 1929 published a short note, "Benes l'immem-

ore," signed by G.S.[1] [(or was it, perhaps, C.S., that is, Cesare Spellanzon?[2] That would be too much!)], that is very strange because it asserts that the "politics of nationality" was deliberately pursued by our shrewdest statesmen, warmly supported and quickly understood by the major interventionist newspapers, and adopted [spontaneously] by the Italian government. G.S., to be sure, states that at the time this politics of nationality was already carefully defined "in its real sense": that is, as especially favorable to Italy. Nevertheless, even in this narrowed sense, it is not true, because the politics of nationality was "imposed" only after October 1917. Now G.S. laments the fact that Benes, in his *Souvenirs de guerre et de révolution* (Paris: Ernest Leroux), tones down the memories of "wartime" friendship and arrives at the conclusion that all of Italy's woes during and after the war are attributable to the lack of clarity and decisiveness of its war policies.[3]

§<74>. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals.* Early Middle Ages (cultural phase of the arrival of Middle Latin).[1] See A. G. Amatucci's *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana* (Bari: Laterza).[2] On pp. 343–44, Amatucci, in the course of discussing Cassiodorus, writes: "... although he made no new discoveries, for he had no talent for discovery, while he was surveying the past, in the midst of which the figure of Jerome stood out like a giant," Cassiodorus "declared that classical culture, which to him meant Roman culture, ought to be the foundation of religious culture and that this should be acquired in the public schools." Pope Agapetus (535–36) would have put this program into effect had he not been prevented from doing so by the wars and factional struggles that were devastating Italy. Cassiodorus made this program known in his two books of *Institutiones*, and he put it into practice at the "Vivarium," the religious community he established in Squillace.[3]

Another point that should be studied is the important role of monasticism in the creation of feudalism. In his book *S. Benedetto e l'Italia del suo tempo* (Bari: Laterza), Luigi Salvatorelli writes (on pp. 170–71):[4]

> A community, especially a religious community guided by the Benedictine spirit, was a much more humane owner than the individual proprietor, with his personal egotism, class pride, and the tra-

> ditions of abuse going back centuries. And the prestige of the monastery, even before it became consolidated in legal privileges, protected the peasants to some extent from the rapaciousness of the tax collectors and from the incursions of legal and illegal armed bands. Away from cities in full decline, in the middle of the pillaged and exploited countryside that was in danger of becoming a desert, the monastery arose as a new social nucleus born out of the new principle of Christianity, untainted by the decrepit world that persisted in calling itself by the great name of Rome. Thus Saint Benedict, without directly planning to do so, carried out the truly creative work of social reform. Even less premeditated was his cultural achievement.

I believe that this passage of Salvatorelli's contains all or almost all the basic elements, negative as well as positive, for explaining feudalism historically.

Less important, for the purposes of my research, is the question of the importance of St. Benedict or of Cassiodorus in the cultural innovation of this period.

On this cluster of issues, besides Salvatorelli, see also Filippo Ermini's small volume *Benedetto da Norcia* in the "Profili" series published by Formiggini, which contains a bibliography on the topic.[5] According to Ermini: ". . . The Benedictine houses truly became a haven of learning, and the monastery, more than the castle, was to become the center of all learning. The monastic libraries were to preserve for posterity the writings of the classical and Christian authors. . . . Benedict's plan was fulfilled; the *orbis latinus*, shattered by the savagery of the invaders, was made whole again, and, thanks primarily to the intellectual and manual labor of Benedict's followers, the marvelous civilization of the Middle Ages was launched."

§<75>. *Maggiorino Ferraris and life in Italy from 1882 to 1926.* The *Nuova Antologia* of 1 July 1929 has a list of the articles by Maggiorino Ferraris *that* it published from January 1882 to 21 April 1926.[1] (Ferraris died in June 1929 and was editor in chief of *Nuova Antologia* from about 1890 until 1926.) Ferraris was a mediocre man of moderate liberal tendencies who disliked the politics of

Giolitti and of Nitti, but precisely for these reasons his articles are, in general, interesting as a symptom. He was a writer who took care to familiarize himself with the technical aspects of the issues he dealt with, which is rather unusual in Italy. He wrote extensively on agrarian [and southern] questions and on other problems of a technical-economic nature (communications—railways, telegraph, shipping; customs duties and tariffs, currency exchange, etc.); in this series of articles there are some that should be reviewed and studied. Ferraris was Piedmontese (from Acqui).

§<76>. *On the crisis of 1898*. By Ferraris, see "Il rincaro del pane" (16 August 1897), "L'ora presente" (16 May 1898), "Il nuovo rincaro del pane" (1 February 1898), "Politica di lavoro" (16. VI. 1898).[1]

§<77>. *Garibaldi's crossing from Sicily to Calabria in 1860*. Recall the question concerning Vittorio Emanuele's attitude at that time and the confidential note he is said to have sent Garibaldi.[1] Ferraris has written an article, "Vittorio Emanuele e Garibaldi ed il passaggio del Faro nel 1860: Da documenti storici," in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 January 1912.[2]

§<78>. *Monasticism and feudalism*. Practical development of the rule of St. Benedict and of the principle of "*ora et labora*." "*Labora*" was already subordinated to "*ora*"; in other words, the primary purpose was, obviously, divine service. And so the peasants substitute for the monks-farmers, so that the monks can be in the convent every hour to perform their religious rites. Inside the convent the monks change "jobs"; industrial (artisan) work and intellectual work (part of which, the copying of manuscripts, is manual). The relationship between the peasants and the convent is feudal, based on leasehold arrangements. This relationship is also connected to the internal development that took place in the work of monks and to the enlargement of the landholdings of the monastery. Another change is brought about by the priesthood: the monks served as priests in their surrounding areas, and they became more specialized—priests, intellectuals concerned with

ideas, copyists, industrial workers-artisans. The convent was the "court" of a feudal territory, protected by the respect for religion more than by arms, etc. It reproduced and developed the regimen of the patrician Roman "villa." One of the principles of the rule[1] was interpreted and developed in order to establish the internal system of the monastery. This principle states that in the election of the abbot, the vote of those who are most esteemed for their wisdom and prudence should prevail. It also states that the abbot should seek the advice of the wisest and most prudent monks when making decisions on matters that are serious but not of such magnitude as to require consultation with the entire congregation. In this manner, a distinction started to grow between the monks-priests who dedicated themselves to tasks directly related to the objectives of the institution and the others who continued to attend to the work of the house.[2]

§<79>. *A. G. Bianchi*, "I clubs rossi durante l'assedio di Parigi," *Nuova Antologia*, 1 July 1929.[1] It summarizes a pamphlet by M. G. Molinari, *Les clubs rouges pendant le siège de Paris*, published in 1871. The pamphlet consists of a collection of reports that had already been published in the *Journal des Débats* on the meetings held by the clubs during the siege. (Perhaps the author of this pamphlet is actually De Molinari, the famous writer who was a proponent of free trade and editor in chief of the *Journal des Débats*; Bianchi, however, describes him as "a modest but diligent journalist.")[2] The pamphlet is interesting because it records all the eccentric proposals put forward by those who used to frequent these popular clubs. For this reason it would be interesting to read it and extract material from it to demonstrate further the need for intellectual order and "moral" sobriety among the people. It could also help one analyze why until 1870 Paris remained enthralled by the political formations created during the revolution of 1789, of which the clubs were the most visible manifestation, etc. (If it is impossible to read Molinari's pamphlet in the original, one can turn to this article by Bianchi.)

§<80>. *Sorel and the Jacobins*. The article mentioned in the preceding note quotes Proudhon's assessment of the Jacobins, as fol-

lows: Jacobinism is "the application of the absolutism of divine right to the sovereignty of the people." "Jacobinism has little concern for the law: it is willing to use violent means, summary executions. For Jacobinism revolution means thunderbolts, plundering, seizures, forced loans, purges, terror. Distrustful, hostile to ideas, it resorts to hypocrisy and Machiavellianism; the Jacobins are the Jesuits of the revolution."[1] These definitions are taken from *La justice dans la révolution*.[2] Sorel's attitude against the Jacobins is derived from Proudhon.

§<81>. *Past and present. Territorial distribution of the Italian population*. According to the 1921 census, out of every 1,000 inhabitants, 258 were living in scattered houses, while 262 were living in centers with populations of less than 2,000 (this can be regarded as the entire rural population); 125 lived in centers of 2,000–5,000 inhabitants; 134 in centers with a population of 5,000–20,000 (small cities); 102 in centers with a population of 20,000–100,000 (medium-sized cities); and 119 in big cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants (cf. Giorgio Mortara, "Natalità e urbanesimo in Italia," in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 July 1929).[1] Examine this in relation to the change in the way populated centers are categorized as a result of the merging of various municipalities after 1927.[2] This change has increased the number of big and medium-sized cities, but without changing their social structure (it may also have increased the number of small cities: possibly more, proportionately). Always according to Mortara, in 1928 the population of the twenty municipalities (*municipalities*, not just *centers*, because this was after the mergers) with more than 100,000 inhabitants was a little over 7 million; in other words, it accounted for 173 per 1,000 of the national population. In France, the proportion is 160 per 1,000; in Germany, 270 per 1,000; in Great Britain, about 400 per 1,000; in Japan, 150 per 1,000. One hundred years ago, 68 out of every 1,000 inhabitants lived in municipalities with populations of over 100,000, about fifty years ago, it was 86 per 1,000, and now it is 173 per thousand.

§<82>. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*. To what extent was the swarming all over Europe of distinguished as

well as mediocre Italian figures (but they also had a certain strength of character) due to the outcome of the internal factional struggles in the communes? In other words, to what extent was it due to political exile? This was an enduring phenomenon after the second half of the thirteenth century: struggles within the communes resulting in the dispersal of the defeated factions, struggles against the principalities, elements of Protestantism, etc., until 1848. In the nineteenth century, the nature of political exile changes, because the exiles are nationalists and do not allow themselves to be absorbed by the host countries. (But there are exceptions: see Antonio Panizzi, who became director of the British Museum and an English baronet.)[1] This factor has to be taken into account, but it is certainly not the dominant aspect of the general phenomenon. Similarly, one should bear in mind that there was a time when Italian princes arranged for their daughters to marry foreign princes. Every new queen of Italian origin not only became the center of attraction on her accession to the throne, but she also brought along with her a number of Italian men of letters, artists, and scientists (in France, with the Medicis; in Spain, with the Farneses; in Hungary, etc.).

All these phenomena should be studied and their importance accurately established in order to be able to determine the real significance of the fundamental fact. In his article "Il Petrarca a Montpellier" in *Nuova Antologia* of 16 July 1929, Carlo Segrè recalls how the notary Petracco, who had been banished from Florence and had settled with his family in Carpentras, wanted his son Francesco to attend the University of Montpellier in order to pursue a career in law.[2] "It turned out to be an excellent choice because at that time in Italy and southern France jurists were much sought after by princes and municipal governments, who employed them as judges, magistrates, ambassadors, and consultants—not to mention the fact that they could also have engaged in private legal practice, which was less prestigious but always profitable to those who were alert."[3] The University of Montpellier was founded in 1160 by the jurisconsult Piacentino, who was trained at Bologna and who had brought the teaching methods of Irnerius to Provence. (But was this Piacentino an Italian? It is always necessary to do some research, because Italian names can be nicknames or Italianizations.)[4] It is certainly the case that many Italians were called by foreign countries to organize universities on the model of Bologna, Pavia, etc.

§<83>. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals.* An article by Ferdinando Nunziante, "Gli italiani in Russia durante il secolo XVIII," in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 July 1929.[1] A mediocre and superficial article that provides no references to its sources of information. Some points and general indications can be extracted from it. Italian intellectuals had already lost their importance, and the era of adventurers was dawning. Nunziante writes the following about eighteenth-century Russia: "Engineers and army generals were coming from Germany; admirals for the navy from England; ballet dancers, hairdressers, and philosophers, chefs and encyclopedists from France; and from Italy, mainly painters, choir masters, and singers."[2] Remember that the family of the counts of Panin descended from the Panini family, originally from Lucca, etc.[3]

§<84>. *Popular literature.* Wells.[1] Cf. the article by Laura Torretta, "L'ultima fase di Wells," in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 July 1929.[2] Interesting and full of useful ideas for the survey of this topic. Wells should be regarded as the writer who invented a new type of adventure novel, different from Verne's. In Verne we generally find ourselves in the realm of the probable, looking ahead. In Wells, the point of departure is improbable, whereas the details are scientifically accurate or, at least, probable. Wells is more imaginative and ingenious; Verne more popular.[3] But Wells is also a popular writer in everything else he produced: he is a "moralistic" writer not only in the normal sense of the term but also in the pejorative sense. However, he cannot be popular in Italy, or in the Latin countries in general, or in Germany: he is too closely bound to the Anglo-Saxon mentality.

§<85>. *Development of the bourgeois spirit in Italy.* Cf. Manilo Torquato Dazzi's article "Nel centenario della morte di Albertino Mussato" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 July 1929.[1] Mussato, according to Dazzi, broke with the theological tradition of history, and more than any other individual of his time he was responsible for the introduction of modern or humanistic history.[2] [See the treatises on the history of historiography by Croce, Lisio, Fueter, Balzani, etc.][3] In Mussato, the passions and utilitarian motives of men appear as motifs of history. The fierce struggles among the fac-

tions in the communes and among the early country squires contributed to this transformation of the conception of the world. The development can be traced all the way back to Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and L. B. Alberti.[4] The Counter-Reformation stifled intellectual development. It seems to me that one can identify two main currents in this development. One current reaches its literary high point in Alberti; it directs its attention toward the "particular," toward the bourgeois as an individual who develops within civil society and who has no conception of political society outside his "particular" sphere. It is tied to Guelfism, which can be said to be a medieval theoretical syndicalism. It is federalist without having a federal center. It entrusts intellectual questions to the church, which is the de facto federal center by virtue of its intellectual as well as political hegemony. One must study the way in which the communes were really constituted: in other words, the concrete attitude adopted by the representatives toward the government of the commune. Power used to last for a very short time (often, just two months), and in those days government members were made to live in seclusion, without women. They were very uncouth people who were stimulated by the immediate interests of their craft. (On the Republic of Florence, see Alfredo[a] Lensi's book on the Palazzo della Signoria, which must contain many anecdotes on those government meetings and on the lives of the gentlemen in seclusion.)[5] The other current reached its high point with Machiavelli and with the formulation of the problem of the church as a deleterious national problem. Dante belonged to this current; he opposed the anarchy of the communes and of feudalism, but he looked for a semimedieval solution. In any case, he posed the question of the church as an international problem, and he pointed out the need to limit its power and its activity. This current is Ghibelline in the broad sense. Dante is really a transition: there is the assertion of secularism but still couched in medieval language.

§<86>. *England.* The structure of England's balance of trade was already undergoing a process of transformation for about fifty years prior to the war. The part made up by the export of goods declined in relative terms, and the balance has been increasingly dependent

[a]In the manuscript, Gramsci erroneously wrote "Giuseppe."

on so-called invisible exports: that is, the interest earned by capital invested abroad, the earnings of the merchant marine, and the profits realized by London as an international center of finance. After the war, as a result of competition from other countries, the importance of invisible exports increased even further. Hence the concern of the chancellor of the exchequer and the Bank of England to restore the gold parity of the sterling and thus reinstate its position as an international currency. That goal was achieved, but it has caused an increase in the costs of industrial production, which suffered a loss of foreign markets.

But has this been the cause of (or at least the most important factor in)the industrial crisis in England? To what extent did the government sacrifice the interests of the industrialists to the interests of the financiers who are the bearers of foreign loans and the organizers of the international financial market in London? At the same time, the reestablishment of the value of the sterling may have preceded the crisis, not caused it. For all countries have undergone or are undergoing a crisis, including those that had a fluctuating currency for some time and have pegged it at a value below the original one. It can be said that, in England, the fact that the crisis was anticipated should have induced the industrialists to be the first to do something about it and therefore to recover from the crisis before other countries and thus regain global hegemony. Besides, the immediate return to gold parity has enabled England to avoid the social crises caused by transfers of property and the sudden decline of the petty bourgeois classes. In a traditionalist, conservative country with an ossified social structure, like England, what would have been the consequences of inflation and of the fluctuation and devaluation of the currency? Surely, they would have been much more serious than in other countries.

In any case, it is necessary to establish accurately the relationship between the export of goods and invisible exports, between industry and finance. This would help explain the relatively minor political importance of workers, the ambiguous character of the Labor Party, and the absence of incentives to make it distinctive and to strengthen it.[1]

§<87>. *Political-military leadership in the war of 1914–18.* See (Colonel) Mario Caracciolo's article "Il comando unico e il comando

italiano nel 1918" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 July 1929.[1] Very interesting and important for the final draft of the survey of this topic. Caracciolo is a very serious writer on military affairs who does not allow himself to be carried away by rhetoric. He has written a book, *Le truppe italiane in Francia*, which is published by Mondadori in its Collezione Gatti.[2] Presently I am interested in a particular detail (which may be placed in the series of notes on "Past and present") that has to do with Caracciolo's repeated assertion of the inadequacy of the Italian industrial apparatus. Around January–February 1918 (cf. the above-mentioned volume by Caracciolo to establish the facts accurately), Italy sent to France sixty thousand men, auxiliary workers "who were available to us because our industry was not yet able to supply us with the necessary weapons to equip them with arms."[3] This fact may suggest certain implications: (1) It may be politically erroneous to consider industrial workers in wartime as "shirkers" of military service. Were they needed and indispensable for fighting the war? Hardly; as it turns out, there were too few "shirkers," so much so that there were sixty thousand men who could not be used in Italy. The propaganda against the pseudoshirkers had deplorable consequences. Even before the armistice, assault groups were sent to Turin, and they immediately started to hunt down "shirkers." At factory exits, and later in the main streets, men who had been exempted from military service were attacked, beaten up, and in many cases had their faces disfigured. The sporadic incidents culminated with the events at Palazzo Siccardi on the night of New Year's Day in 1919. Censorship prohibited any reference to these events.[4]

(2) The opposition between the combat veterans on the one hand and those exempted from service and the shirkers on the other, which at first was a private affair, became a matter of public law. That was the most serious aspect of the question, because it gave rise to the view that those with exemptions were in fact "shirkers" rather than individuals who were indispensable to the war effort and had the approval of the state even though they did not participate in combat. By law, combat veterans must be given preference in employment by factories, etc. (If there were real shirkers in the factories, one should look for them, first of all, among the second-tier technicians. The kind of work they did had been reduced to a minimum by the small quantities of commodities that were being manufactured, by the rudimentary structure of their working

methods, and by mass production; as a result, these technicians no longer functioned as master craftsmen but were reduced to mere supervisors of discipline. At the same time, factories were expanded. This combination of factors gave many people who had never had anything to do with industry the chance to shirk military service. These people were the real shirkers; the jobs they took could have been given to the older employees of the factory itself. Thus one cannot talk of shirkers when referring to the large numbers of peasants who at that time came from the countryside either directly or under military orders and started working in the factories. In Turin, much of the unskilled labor in the factories was performed by peasants who had been pressed into military service.) The regulations governing the hiring of the unemployed ignore even the special case of those who were declared unfit for military service; they are to blame even less than others for not being combat veterans.

Italy has a thorny problem because its industrial apparatus is too limited to meet wartime needs. The metallurgical and machine industry but also to some extent the other industries (chemical, lumber, textiles) must necessarily be mobilized and even expanded since production, theoretically, must be unlimited. Therefore not only must the old skilled workers remain in the factories, but new people have to be hired. As a result, the army will consist, for the most part, of peasants, while the majority of workers or, at least, a substantial proportion of them will have to be used in the production of equipment and munitions. Making out of this necessity an element of demagogic agitation and using it to justify the inferiority of industrial workers can have the following consequence (unless an organic but difficult solution is adopted: rotation between factory and front, etc.): that only the pseudopacificists will really want to remain in the factories, and the problem of production will face a crisis. In other words, the war may be lost in the factories because of lack of production.

§<88>. *On the Italian Risorgimento. Michele Amari and Sicilianism.* See Francesco Brandileone's article on Michele Amari in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 August 1929.[1] It is a long and polemical review of *Le più belle pagine di Michele Amari*, selected by V. E. Orlando,[2] with a preface that is very interesting for understand-

ing the origins of "Sicilianism," even in its present form, of which Orlando is a representative (two-faced: one face turned toward the mainland and covered with the seven veils of national unitarianism; the other face turned toward Sicily and more candid—recall Orlando's speech in Palermo during the local elections of 1925 and his indirect eulogy of the Mafia, which he presented in its Sicilianist guise of possessing every virtue and generosity toward the people).[3]

Amari was born in Palermo in 1806 and grew up in the period between the promulgation of the constitution of 1812 and the revolution of 1820, when the constitution was abolished.[4] Like many other Sicilians of his time, he was convinced that the well-being of the island depended on the reestablishment of the constitution but above all on its autonomy and separation from Naples.

"The aspiration to form a separate state was the dominant sentiment among the islanders at least until 1848," writes Brandileone.[5] Amari, as he himself wrote (cf. Alessandro D'Ancona, *Carteggio di M. Amari raccolto e pubblicato coll'elogio di lui letto nell'Accademia della Crusca*, Turin: 1896–97, in 3 volumes; cf. vol. II, p. 371),[6] felt that he was Italian (culturally), but he regarded Italian national life as nothing more than a beautiful dream. He wanted to recount the events of 1812–20 in order to prepare the hearts of the people for a new revolution, but his research into the nexuses of history impelled him to go further back into the past of the constitutional history of Sicily, and thus he settled on the constitution obtained after the Vespers, which seemed to him to be the most typical ["the clearest form"]. But his study led him even further into the past, all the way back to the Islamic period of Sicilian history.

In his selection, Orlando arranged the extracts in chronological order, in such a way as to provide an abridged but seamless account of five centuries of Sicilian events, from the start of the Arab conquest in 827 to the peace of Caltabellotta in 1302. In his preface (on p. 23), Orlando states that those five centuries "seem to constitute a *monolithic period*, during which history has the dazzle of an epic poem." He also says that they should not be regarded as *particular* or local history but as *universal history*, because "if universal history is the history that refers to humanity as an ideal whole, even though it has its *vital center* in a single specific point in space, such as Athens, Rome, Jerusalem, etc., one cannot deny that during those five centuries Sicily was the *main crossroad* where the dom-

inant forces of the time came into contact with one another, clashed, annulled each other, and recomposed themselves." In Brandileone's view, Orlando allows himself "to be carried a little too far by his love for his birthplace" (this is the commonplace mitigation and canonical interpretation of centrifugal political sentiments). Orlando divides these five centuries into two periods: the first one (Muslim [and Norman-Swabian] rule) he describes as "static," since in it there was only "an elaboration of a specific civilization that constituted an era and culminated in the *creation of the state* and its *highest attainment of power*"; in the "more dynamic" second period, "the state had its historical consecration, that is, the impassioned defense of its independence when it faced it most formidable test."[7]

Brandileone argues subtly with Orlando, and what he has to say is very interesting for the history of Sicily and the South. However, what is pertinent to this series of notes on the Risorgimento is Orlando's point of view, in and of itself, as a reflection of Sicilianism in its intellectual form. In reality, Orlando agrees with Amari; he feels the same intellectual and moral impulse to valorize Sicilian history, to assert that Sicily was a moment of universal history, that at one stage the Sicilian people created a state that must be the expression of a "Sicilian nationality" (although Orlando does not quite want to go so far as to affirm this "Sicilian nationality," just like Amari, who said that he felt himself to be Italian even before 1848).

In opposition to Orlando, Brandileone uses the viewpoint articulated by Croce in the *Storia del Regno di Napoli* when he says: "That story is ours only in small part, practically not at all. . . . It had no indigenous and national character." Croce is actually referring to the Norman and Swabian period in the South, but according to Brandileone his remarks should be applied to Sicily as well.[8] In general terms, Croce's view is correct, but at the time when that history was unfolding, did the people feel that it was their own history? And if so, to what extent? And which segment of the population was creative? In any case, these events set the history of the country on a certain course; they created certain conditions that, to a limited extent, remain operative even to this day.

§<89>. *Gabriele Gabbrielli*, "India ribelle," in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 August 1929.[1] (This gentleman, G.G., has specialized

in the composition of notes and articles for *Nuova Antologia*, and probably for some daily newspaper, attacking the Ispolcom.[2] He makes use of the materials published in Geneva by the "Entente contre la T.I."[3] and especially of its monthly bulletin; he is also generally sympathetic toward Henri Massis's movement for the defense of the West[4]—only "generally sympathetic" because for Massis no other country but France can be the hegemonic power of the Latin-Catholic union, whereas Gabbrielli believes that it should be Italy. Apropos of Massis and the defense of the West, it should be remembered that Father Rosa referred to it very curtly in his response to Ojetti:[5] Rosa sees in it the danger of a deviation, or an outright departure from Roman orthodoxy.]

An area of 4,675,000 square km., a population of 319,000,000, of which 247,000,000 live in the fifteen enormous districts that are administered directly by the English government and constitute half of the total territory; the other half is divided into about 700 tributary states. Five major religions, countless sects, 150 languages and dialects; castes; widespread illiteracy; 80 percent of the population are peasants [slavery of women, pauperism, endemic famine]. During the war, 985,000 Indians were mobilized.

Relations between Gandhi and Tolstoy between 1908 and 1910 [cf. Romain Rolland, "Tolstoi e Gandhi," in the special issue on Tolstoy of the periodical *Europe*, 1928].[6] In the absence of other sources of information, the whole article is interesting.

§<90>. *Brief notes on Islamic culture.* There is no regular clergy to serve as a *trait d'union* between theoretical Islam and popular beliefs. One must carefully study the Islamic type of ecclesiastical organization and the cultural importance of the theological universities [such as the one in Cairo] and the learned men. There must be a great gap between the intellectuals and the people, especially in certain areas of the Muslim world; it would explain why the polytheistic tendencies of folklore reemerge and try to adapt themselves to the general framework of Mohammedan monotheism. Cf. Bruno Ducati's article "I santi nell'Islam" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 August 1929.[1] The phenomenon of saints is specifically North African, but it is somewhat widespread in other areas as well. Its raison d'être is rooted in the people's need [which also exists in Christianity] to find intermediaries between themselves and the

deity. Mohammed, like Christ, was proclaimed—proclaimed himself—the last of the prophets, that is, the last living link between the deity and humans. The intellectuals (priests or learned men) were to have maintained this link through the sacred books, but such form of religious organization tends to become rationalistic and intellectualistic (see Protestantism, which developed along these lines), whereas primitive people lean toward their own mysticism, which is reflected in the union with the deity through the mediation of saints (Protestantism does not have and cannot have saints and miracles). The only link between the intellectuals of Islam and the people became "fanaticism," which is bound to be temporary and limited but stores up a mass of psychic emotions and impulses that persist even in normal times. (Catholicism agonizes for the following reason: it cannot periodically create waves of fanaticism, as it did in the past. In recent years, after the war, it found substitutes: collective eucharistic ceremonies that are performed with fabulous splendor and stir up a certain fanaticism, relatively speaking. Even before the war, similar emotions used to be stirred up—but on a small and very local scale—by the so-called missions, whose activities culminated in the erection of an enormous cross accompanied by violent penitential scenes, etc.) The new Islamic movement is *Sufism.* Muslim saints are privileged beings who, thanks to special favor, are able to enter into contact with God, acquiring an everlasting miraculous power and the ability to resolve theological doubts and problems of reason and conscience. Sufism organized itself into a system and manifested itself in the Sufic schools and in religious confraternities; it developed a regular theory of sainthood and established a hierarchy of saints. Popular hagiography is simpler than Sufic hagiography. In the eyes of the people, the most famous founders or leaders of religious confraternities are saints. But even an unknown, a wayfarer who spends time at some locality practicing asceticism and performing miraculous good works for the inhabitants of the area, can be proclaimed a saint by public opinion. Many saints are reminiscent of the old gods of the religions vanquished by Islam.

Maraboutism is based on a source of Muslim sainthood that is different from Sufism. *Murabit* (marabout) means that it is located in the *rabat,* the fortified frontier post from which, in the holy war, the infidels are raided. Religious observance must have been stricter in the *rabat* because of the role played by the garrison [sol-

diers], who were more fanatical and in many cases were volunteers (the assault units of Islam). What remained, once the military function lost its importance, were a particular religious mode of dress and the "saints," who are even more popular than the Sufic ones. The center of Maraboutism is Morocco; as one moves eastward, the number of marabout tombs declines.

Ducati analyzes this African phenomenon in detail, emphasizing the political importance of the marabouts, who lead anti-European insurrections, perform the function of justices of the peace, and at times were the carriers of an advanced civilization. He concludes: "Because of its social, civilizing, and political consequences, this cult (of saints)[2] deserves to be studied more carefully. It should be watched more closely because the Saints constitute a power, an extraordinary force that may be the biggest obstacle to the spread of Western civilization. On the other hand, if skillfully exploited, it may become a valuable auxiliary of European expansion."

§<91>. *Renaissance and Reformation.* It will be necessary to read Fortunato Rizzi's *L'anima del Cinquecento e la lirica volgare,* which, judging from the reviews I have read, seems more important as a cultural document of our time than for its intrinsic value.[1] (I have written a little note on Rizzi in another notebook—I considered him a "petty Italian"—in connection with his review of a book on romanticism by a French nationalist, a review that revealed Rizzi's total ineptitude for finding his bearings among general ideas and cultural matters.)[2] On Rizzi's book, one should reread Alfredo Galletti's article "La lirica volgare del Cinquecento e l'anima del Rinascimento" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 August 1929.[3] (More information needs to be obtained about Galletti as well. He argued strenuously against Salvemini and Bissolati in support of the war, and he infused his arguments with an anti-Germanic spirit that was quite particular, given his reformist roots.[4] Immediately after the war, and even more so later, Galletti fell into a mood of cultural exasperation, of intellectual moaning and groaning, typical of someone who has had his "ideals smashed." His writings are overflowing with recriminations, with the muted gnashing of teeth, with sterile critical allusions that are comically desperate.) In the criticism of sixteenth-century Italian

poetry, the following opinion prevails: four-fifths of it are artful, conventional, devoid of deep sincerity. "Everyone agrees," Rizzi points out with a lot of good sense,

> that in lyric poetry one finds the purest, liveliest expression of the sentiment of a man, a nation, a historical period. Is it possible that there has been a century—the sixteenth century, precisely—that had the misfortune of being born without a spiritual physiognomy of its own or that was pleased (?!) to convey a false impression of that physiognomy specifically in its lyric poetry? The most intellectually lively, the most spiritually bold, the most cynical of centuries, its many enemies (!!) say, hypocritically dissimulated its true spirit in the contrived harmony of sonnets and songs written in imitation of Petrarch. Or did it enjoy itself mystifying posterity <. . .> by feigning a plaintive Platonic idealism in its verse that is then openly contradicted in the narrative prose, the drama, the satire, and in many other literary expressions of the same period?[5]

The whole problem is utterly falsified by the way he formulates the deepest conflicts and contradictions.

And why couldn't the sixteenth century be full of contradictions? Indeed, was it not the century in which all the major contradictions of Italian life became entangled—contradictions which were not resolved and therefore determined the entire course of national history right up to the end of the eighteenth century? Isn't there a contradiction between Alberti's idea of man and Baldassare Castiglione's,[6] between the upright man and the "courtier"? Between the cynicism and paganism of the great intellectuals and their strenuous fight against the Reformation, in defense of Catholicism? Between the conception of woman in general (which was also Castiglione's type of lady) and the way in which woman in particular—that is, the woman of the people—was treated? The woman in general had become a fetish, a contrived creation, and at least four-fifths of the lyrical, amorous, pseudo-Petrarchan poetry was contrived. This does not mean that the sixteenth century did not have a lyrical, that is, an artistic expression; it did, but not in "lyrical poetry" as such.

Rizzi raises the question of the contradictions of the sixteenth century in the second part of his book, but he fails to understand that the clash of these contradictions could have generated sincere

lyric poetry: it did not happen, and this is just a historical observation. The Counter-Reformation could not and did not overcome this crisis; the crisis was stifled in an authoritarian fashion, mechanically. They were no longer Christian, and they could not be non-Christian: death as well as old age made them tremble. The problems they posed themselves were greater than they, and they degraded themselves; moreover, they were cut off from the people.

§<92>. *Italian diplomacy.* Apropos of the *Carthage* and *Manouba* incident between Italy and France,[1] one should compare the version of its causes that is given by Alberto Lumbroso in the second volume of his book-miscellany *Le origini economiche e diplomatiche della guerra* (in the Collezione Gatti published by Mondadori)[2] with the paragraph that Tittoni ("Veracissimus"!) devotes to the same incident in his article "I documenti diplomatici francesi (1911–1912)" published in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 August 1929 and perhaps reprinted in a book (in the Treves edition of Tittoni's books).[3] Obviously, Tittoni's account is unclear and reticent: he was actually the Italian ambassador in Paris whom Poincaré approached him—according to Lumbroso—assuring him that the *Carthage* and the *Manouba* were not carrying war contraband and asking him to telegraph Rome not to stop the boats. It is strange that Tittoni, who is so sensitive about everything concerning his career, makes no reference to Lumbroso either to deny or to belittle his version. However, one should remember that Tittoni seems to hold Lumbroso's incompetence in disdain; Lumbroso, on the other hand, criticizes Tittoni for ignoring German documents on the war and therefore for being Germanophobic (on the subject of responsibility for the outbreak of the war).

§<93>. *Eighteenth-century Italian morals.* Cf. Alessandro Giulini's article "Una dama avventuriera del Settecento," *Nuova Antologia*, 16 August 1929.[1] (By then Italy was no longer giving Europe great intellectuals, only adventurers and adventuresses. Nor was the moral decadence limited to what was pointed out by Parini's *Il Giorno*[2] and displayed by libertinism: the aristocracy created international scroungers and thieves to go with the Casanovas and the Balsamos[3] of the bourgeoisie.)

§<94>. *The negative popular-national character of Italian literature.* When dealing with this question, but especially when constructing the history of the attitude of a whole set of litterateurs and critics who were aware of the falsity of the tradition, the false ring of its intrinsic rhetoric, and its separateness from historical reality, one must not forget Enrico Thovez and his book *Il pastore, il gregge, la zampogna.*[1] Thovez's reaction was not correct, but what matters in this context is that he did react, that he at least felt something was wrong.

His distinction between poetry of form and poetry of content was theoretically erroneous. The so-called poetry of form is characterized by indifference toward content, that is, by moral indifference; but this, too, is "content," the "historical and moral vacuity of the writer." As an "innovator of culture" in Italy, Thovez was, to a large extent, following in the footsteps of De Sanctis.[2] He should also be regarded, together with *La Voce*, as one of the forces working, albeit chaotically, for a moral and intellectual reform during the prewar period.

One should also look at the polemics Thovez provoked with his positions. Alfonso Ricolfi's article "Enrico Thovez poeta e il problema della formazione artistica" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 August 1929 contains some useful suggestions, but too few.[3] One should find Prezzolini's article "Thovez il precursore."[4]

§<95>. *Fifteenth-century and sixteenth-century man.* It seems to me that Leon Battista Alberti, Baldassare Castiglione, and Machiavelli are the three most important writers for studying life during the Renaissance, its view of "man," and its moral and civil contradictions.[1] Alberti represents the bourgeois (see also Pandolfini);[2] Castiglione represents the aristocratic courtier; Machiavelli represents and tries to reconcile the political inclinations of the bourgeoisie (republics) and of princes, insofar as both want to establish states or increase their territorial and military power.

According to Cian ("Il conte Baldassar Castiglione [1529–1929]," *Nuova Antologia*, 16 August–1 September 1929),[3] Francesco Sansovino, a contemporary, informs us that Charles V read very little, and he goes on to say: "There were only three books he enjoyed reading, and he had them translated into his own language: one, for the institution of civil life, and that was Count Baldesar da

Castiglione's *Il cortegiano*; the other, for matters of state, and that was Machiavelli's *Principe* with the *Discorsi*; and the third, for military organization, and that was the *Historia* and everything else by Polybius."[4] Cian writes: "It is not sufficiently recognized that *Il cortegiano*, a historical document of the greatest importance, demonstrates and illustrates most clearly the evolution of medieval chivalry, which, it is said, did not find much favor in Italy. In reality, chivalry in Italy differed from the transalpine variety from the start; in the Italian climate of the Renaissance it became a new chivalry; it acquired the character of a civil militia fighting under the banner of Mars, but also of Apollo, Venus, and all the Muses. An evolution, I say, and by no means a degeneration or a decay, as De Sanctis believed."[5]

But Cian bases his argument solely on *Il cortegiano*, which is an attempt to organize an aristocracy around the "prince" and to differentiate it from the triumphant morality of the bourgeoisie. The superficiality of this chivalry is demonstrated by *Orlando Furioso*, which predates *Don Quixote* and prepares the ground for it.[6] In any case, Cian's article should get a second look: his philological knowledge of *Il cortegiano* is impeccable, and one should procure his edition of it (3d ed., published by Sansoni).[7]

§<96>. *The negative national-popular character of Italian literature.* In 1892 the publisher Hoepli conducted a referendum on Italian literature and published the results in a book, *I migliori libri italiani consigliati da cento illustri contemporanei*; it should be interesting to look at it for this series of notes, in order to find out which works were most valued, by whom, and for what reasons.[1]

§<97>. *The intellectuals.* In another notebook, under the rubric "Intellectuals," I referred to the academies in Italy and to the usefulness of having a descriptive list of them.[1] In the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 September 1929 (p. 128) a soon-to-be-published book on the Italian academies is announced: E. Salaris, *Attraverso gli istituti culturali italiani*.[2]

§<98>. *Postwar history.* See Giovanni Marietti's article "Il trattato di Versailles e la sua esecuzione" in the *Nuova Antologia*

issues of 16 September and 16 October 1929.[1] It is a careful summary of the main events connected with the implementation of the Versailles Treaty, a schematic account that can be useful for starting an analytic reconstruction or for looking at the match between international and internal events in various countries.

§<99>. *German armament at the time of the armistice.* At the time of the armistice, the standing army handed over 5,000 cannon, 25,000 machine guns, 3,000 mortars, 1,700 airplanes, 5,000 trucks, 5,000 locomotives, 150,000 railway cars. The disarmament commission destroyed, on German soil, 39,600 cannon, 23,061 gun carriages, 4,574,000 rifles and pistols, 88,000 machine guns, 39,254,000 artillery shells, 4,028,000 mortar shells, 500,294,000 cartridges, 11,530,000 hand grenades, 2,131,646 tons of explosives (and many arms were not handed over).[1]

§<100>. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals.* For the Slavic world, see Ettore Lo Gatto, "L'Italia nelle letterature slave," in the 16 September, 1 October, and 16 October issues of *Nuova Antologia*.[1] It not only deals with relations of a purely literary nature, determined by books, but also contains numerous references to the emigration of Italian intellectuals to the various Slavic countries, especially Russia and Poland, and to the importance of their role in the local culture.

Another aspect of the cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals needs to be studied or at least mentioned: namely, what was taking place in Italy itself, where the universities attracted many students and scholars who wanted to specialize. One needs to distinguish between two aspects of the phenomenon of the immigration of foreign intellectuals in Italy. There were those who came to look at Italy as a territory-museum of history; this kind of immigration has always existed and still does, and its proportions vary from epoch to epoch. Then there are those who came to Italy to assimilate its living culture, under the guidance of living Italian intellectuals. It is the latter type of immigration that concerns the present inquiry. How and why did it come about that at a certain point Italians were the ones emigrating abroad rather than foreigners coming to Italy? (Church intellectuals are a relevant exception; their teaching in Italy continues to attract students to this day. In

this regard, one should bear in mind that, by comparison, there has been an increasing internationalization of the center of Rome.) This is an extremely important historical situation: other countries acquire a national consciousness and want to organize a national culture, the medieval cosmopolis erodes, and Italy, as a territory, loses its function as a center of international culture and fails to nationalize itself, while its intellectuals retain their cosmopolitan function, leaving the country and flocking abroad.

§<101>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Filippo Crispolti.* One of Crispolti's most Brescianist texts is his article "La madre di Leopardi" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 September 1929.[1] The fact that some purely erudite scholars—who, like Ferretti,[2] are passionate even about the biographical minutiae of great men—have tried to "rehabilitate" Leopardi's mother, is not surprising.[3] However, the jesuitical flattery that Crispolti heaps on Ferretti's work is sickening. The tone is entirely repugnant, intellectually and morally. Intellectually repugnant, because Crispolti explains Leopardi's psychology by recalling the "great pain" he himself suffered in his youth (the unpublished manuscript of memoirs to which he makes reference is certainly his own) because he was poor, a bad dancer, and a boring conversationalist: a repugnant comparison. Morally repugnant, because the effort to vindicate Leopardi's mother is mean, captious, and jesuitical in the technical sense of the term. Is it really true that all aristocratic mothers of the early nineteenth century were like Adelaide Antici? Large quantities of documents can be found to prove the opposite, and even the example of D'Azeglio does not apply, because the harshness of physical education that is employed to produce soldiers is totally different from moral and emotional aridity.[4] D'Azeglio, as a boy, broke his arm, and his father persuaded him to conceal his injury for an entire night in order not to frighten his mother. Who can fail to notice the underlying layer of familial affection in this episode, which must also have excited the child and bound him more closely to his parents? (This episode from D'Azeglio's life is mentioned in another article in the same issue of *Nuova Antologia*: Alessandro Varaldo's "Pellegrinaggio a Recanati.")[5] The defense of Leopardi's mother is not simply a case of inquisitive erudition; it is a component of ideology, like the rehabilitation of the Bourbons, etc.

§<102>. *Italian literature. The contribution by bureaucrats.* I have already written a note on this topic, pointing out how little is written by Italian officials of all categories about their field of specialization and their specific activities (if they write, they do so for their superiors, not for the people-nation).[1] In the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 September 1929, on p. 267, it is stated that the book *Nazioni e minoranze etniche* (Zanichelli, 2 vols.) was written by "a young Roman gentleman who has adopted the somewhat archaic name of Luca dei Sabelli in order to make sure that his legal and historical scholarship is not confused with his diplomatic functions."[2]

§<103>. *Popular literature. Theater.* "Weepy drama and sentimental comedy have populated the stage with madmen and criminals of all sorts; with the exception of a few occasional works, the French Revolution did not inspire playwrights to produce anything that would signal a new artistic direction and divert the public from mysterious dungeons, perilous forests, lunatic asylums" (Alberto Manzi, "Il conte Giraud, il governo italico e la censura" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 October 1929.)[1]

Manzi reproduces a passage from a pamphlet written by the lawyer Marie Jacques Boïeldieu in 1804:

> In our times the stage has changed: assassins in their dens and madmen in mental hospitals are a common sight. Can't it be left to the courts to punish those monsters who dishonor the name of "man"? And to doctors the task of trying to cure those unfortunate beings whose crimes, even if they are only simulated, inflict pain on humanity? What powerful attraction and what solution can the spectator find in the depiction of the ills that morally and physically devastate the human species and that at any moment, as a result of the slightest shock to our exhausted nervous systems, can afflict us and make us worthy of compassion? What is the point of going to the theater to see *Brigands* (typical play: *Robert chef des brigands* by Lamartelière, who ended up on the payroll of the state and whose enormous success in 1791 was brought about by the phrase "guerre aux châteaux, paix aux chaumières"; the play is derived from Schiller's *The Robbers*),[2] *Madwomen* and *Lovesick* (typical plays: *Nina la pazza per amore, Il cavaliere de la Barre, Il delirio*, etc.).[3]

Etc., etc. Boïeldieu criticizes "the genre that, in reality, seems to me to be dangerous and deplorable."[4]

Manzi's article contains some suggestions about the position taken by Napoleon's censorship against plays of this type, especially when the abnormal cases they depicted touched on the monarchical principle.

§<104>. *The sixteenth century*. The manner of evaluating sixteenth-century literature according to certain stereotyped rules has given rise, in Italy, to strange judgments and to limitations in the practice of criticism. These are important factors for assessing the abstract character of the national-popular reality of our intellectuals. Some things are now changing slowly, but the old guard is reacting. In 1928 Emilio Lovarini published a play in five acts, *La Venexiana: Commedia di ignoto cinquecentesco* (Zanichelli, 1928; the first title in the series "Nuova scelta di curiosità letterarie inedite o rare"),[1] that has been recognized as a very fine work of art (cf. Benedetto Croce in *La Critica* of 1930).[2] Ireneo Sanesi (author of the volume *La commedia*, published by Vallardi in its series on literary genres), in his article "*La Venexiana*" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 October 1929, articulates what he takes to be the critical problem raised by the play: the unknown author of *La Venexiana* is a latecomer, a reactionary, a conservative because he represents the type of comedy that came out of the medieval novella, the realistic, lively type of comedy (even though written in Latin) that derives its themes from the reality of the everyday life of the bourgeoisie or the citizenry; its characters are reproduced from this same reality; its plots are simple, clear, and linear; and it is interesting primarily because of its sobriety and lucidity.[3] Whereas, according to Sanesi, the revolutionary playwrights are those who belonged to the erudite, classicist theater and brought back on the stage the ancient types and motifs dear to Plautus and Terrence. For Sanesi, the writers of the new historical class are reactionaries, and the courtly writers are revolutionary: it is amazing.

What has happened to *La Venexiana* is interesting in view of what had happened not much earlier to the plays of Ruzzante, which were translated from sixteenth-century Paduan dialect into pseudoarchaic French by Alfred Mortier.[4] Ruzzante had been discovered by Maurice Sand (son of George Sand), who proclaimed

him to be greater than not only Ariosto (as a dramatist) and Bibbiena but even Machiavelli and a precursor of Molière and modern French naturalism.[5] Adolfo Orvieto (in *Il Marzocco*, 30 September 1928), too, wrote about *La Venexiana*, saying that it seems to be "the product of a dramatic imagination of our times," and he made reference to Becque.[6]

It is interesting to observe this double vein in the sixteenth century: one truly national-popular (in the dialects but in Latin as well), tied to the earlier narrative forms, and an expression of the bourgeoisie; the other aristocratic, courtly, non-national, but exalted by the rhetoricians.

§<105>. *Americanism*. See Carlo Linati, "Babbitt compra il mondo," in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 October 1929.[1] A mediocre article, but for that very reason significant as an expression of an average opinion. It can be useful, in fact, for establishing what the more intelligent of the petty bourgeoisie think of Americanism. The article is a variation on Edgar Ansel Mowrer's book *This American World*, which Linati deems "truly acute, full of ideas, and written with a pleasing concision that falls somewhere between the classical and the brutal, by a thinker who certainly does not lack in the spirit of observation, or a sense of historical nuance, or range of culture."[2] Mowrer reconstructs the cultural history of the United States up to the breaking of the umbilical cord with Europe and the advent of Americanism.

It would be interesting to analyze the reasons for the great success that *Babbitt* has enjoyed in Europe.[3] It is not a great book: it is constructed schematically, and its mechanism is also too obvious. Its importance is more cultural than artistic: the criticism of manners prevails over art. That there exists in America a criticism of manners is an important cultural fact: it means that self-criticism continues to grow, that a new American civilization is emerging that is conscious of its strengths and its weaknesses. The intellectuals are detaching themselves from the dominant class in order to unite themselves to it more closely, to be a real superstructure and not just an inorganic and indistinct element of the structure-corporation.

European intellectuals have already partially lost this function: they no longer represent cultural self-consciousness, the self-criti-

cism of the dominant class. They have become, once again, the direct agents of the dominant class, or else they have cut themselves from it completely and formed their own separate caste without roots in national-popular life. They laugh at Babbitt and are amused at his mediocrity, his naive stupidity, his routine thinking, his standardized mentality. They do not even ask the question: are there Babbitts in Europe? The problem is that in Europe the standardized petty bourgeois does exist, but his standardization, instead of being national (and of a big nation like the United States), is regional or local. The European Babbitts belong to a historical level inferior to that of the American Babbitt: they are a national weakness, whereas the American one is a national strength; they are more picturesque but also more stupid and ridiculous; their conformism is based on a rotten and debilitating superstition, whereas Babbitt's conformism is naive and spontaneous and based on an energetic and progressive superstition.

For Linati, Babbitt is "the prototype of the modern American industrialist," when, in fact, Babbitt is a petty bourgeois; his most typical obsession is the desire to befriend "modern industrialists," to be their equal, to be able to flaunt their moral and social "superiority." The modern industrialist is the model to emulate, the social type to imitate, whereas for the European Babbitt the model and the type are provided by the canon of the cathedral, the petty nobleman from the provinces, the section head at the ministry. This uncritical attitude of European intellectuals must be pointed out: in the preface to his book on the United States, Siegfried compares the artisan who produces luxury items in Paris to the Taylorized worker in America,[4] as if the former were a common type of worker. European intellectuals, for the most part, think that Babbitt is a purely American type, and they congratulate the old Europe. Anti-Americanism is comical, first of all; it is also stupid.

§<106>. *Luigi Villari*, "Il governo laburista britannico," *Nuova Antologia* of 16 October 1929.[1] It is noteworthy that the *Nuova Antologia*—in spite of the fact that its editor in chief is a former president of the senate who later became president of the academy[2] and that therefore it is expected to exercise a certain degree of discretion—should publish articles such as this one in which members of foreign governments are subjected to judgments of a per-

sonal character that are sectarian, disrespectful, and go beyond political polemics.

§<107>. *Italy and Palestine.* See Romolo Tritonj's article "La riforma del mandato sulla Palestina" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 October 1929.[1] The article expounds Italy's minimal expectations, namely, the *internationalization* of Palestine in accordance with the plan that was agreed on among the powers of the Entente during the war and that was discarded by France and England after the fall of Czarism in Russia, leaving Italy in the lurch, since France had Syria and England had Palestine itself. The article is basically moderate but fiercely opposed to Zionism. It should be checked again in order to reconstruct Italian policy in the East (the Near East).

§<108>. *Sicily. The Sicilian Pantheon of San Domenico.* It is in Palermo, in the church of San Domenico. There are the tombs of, among others, Crispi, Rosolino Pilo, Gen. Giacinto Carini.[1] I do not believe that anything similar exists in the other regions, except for the Pantheon in Rome and Santa Croce in Florence. It would be interesting to have a complete, ordered list of all those buried in the Sicilian Pantheon. The decision to call it "Pantheon" is itself interesting; it is used in the modern sense of a national capital. (When was the term "Pantheon" first employed in Paris?) (After the Revolution: it was a church that was meant to be dedicated to Saint Genevieve, patron saint of Paris; the Revolution gave it the name of Pantheon and designated it to receive the remains of great Frenchmen; under the Restoration it was returned to being a church; under Louis Philippe it was the temple of Glory; under Napoleon III, a church. During the third Republic it resumed its function of national pantheon.) In modern times, then, the name "Pantheon" is related to nationalist movements.

§<109>. *Sicily.* Cf. Romeo Vuoli, "Il generale Giacinto Carini," *Nuova Antologia*, 1 November–16 November 1929: "Carini, when he was still a young man, introduced for the first time in Sicily a steam-powered machine for the processing of sumac. This made him so popular among the farmers in the rural areas around

Palermo that he was in a position to lead the insurrection of 1848."[1] (On this point, cf. Colonna, *I quattro candidati ai collegi di Palermo*, Palermo: Ufficio Tipografico Lo Bianco, 1861.)[2] The first part of the article contains some details about the events of the Sicilian revolution in 1848, the life of political émigrés abroad, and the exploits of the Thousand. The second part is less interesting, except for some episodes.

§<110>. *France and Italy.* In the *Histoire d'un crime*, V. Hugo writes: "Every sensitive man of this century has two motherlands. The *Rome of the past* and the *Paris* of *today*."[1] The association of the motherland of the past with the motherland of today assumes that France is the heir of Rome: this affirmation was not meant—and, above all, is not meant now—to please many people.

§<111>. *The Italian Academy.* The inaugural speeches by the head of government and by Tittoni are published in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 November 1929.[1]

§<112>. *Carlo Schanzer*, "Sovranità e giustizia nei rapporti fra gli Stati," *Nuova Antologia*, 1 November 1929.[1] Moderate in both form and substance. It can be regarded as a document of the quasi-official position of the government vis-à-vis the League of Nations and the foreign policy problems associated with it.

§<113>. *On Henrik Ibsen.* Cf. Guido Manacorda, "Il pensiero religioso di Enrico Ibsen," *Nuova Antologia*, 1 November 1929.[1] Manacorda belongs to the group of intellectuals who are "Catholic integralists" and engage in polemics on behalf of the Roman Church. His article is interesting for understanding Ibsen indirectly, for fully grasping the significance of his ideological views, etc.

§<114>. *Encyclopedia of concepts—political, philosophical, etc. Postulate.* In mathematics, especially, a postulate means a proposition for

which there is no direct proof; its axioms are undemonstrable, and it cannot be satisfactorily proven as a theorem, but it nevertheless possesses such a high degree of probability based on the data of experience that even an adversary would find it acceptable, and therefore certain things can be demonstrated on its basis. In this sense, then, a postulate is a proposition needed for the purposes of scientific construal and demonstration. In common usage, however, *postulate* refers to a mode of existence or of behavior that one would like to see realized, something, in fact, that one would (and in certain cases should) want to be put into effect. A postulate is also supposed or said to be the result of a scientific investigation (history, economics, empirical science, etc.). In that case, the meaning of "postulate" comes close to the meaning of "claim," "desideratum," "exigency," or it rests somewhere in between these notions and the concept of "principle." The postulates of a political party, then, would be its practical "principles," which directly imply claims, etc., of a more immediate and specific nature. (It is true that in this sense, which implies what should be rather than what is, instead of "postulate" one should say "what is called for.")

Cf. Notebook 26, §7.

§<115>. *Niccolò Machiavelli*. The Società Editrice Rinascimento del Libro of Florence has published—in its series of national classics—an edition of Machiavelli's letters, edited, with a preface, by Giuseppe Lesca (the preface appeared in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 November 1929).[1] The letters had already been published in 1883 (by Sansoni of Florence) in Alvisi's volume, which also contains letters written to Machiavelli (Alvisi's book has been brought out in a new edition with a preface by Giovanni Papini).[2]

§<116>. *G.B.*, "La banca dei regolamenti internazionali," *Nuova Antologia*, 16 November 1929.[1]

§<117>. *Argus*, "Il disarmo navale, i sottomarini e gli aeroplani," *Nuova Antologia*, 16 November 1929.[1] Passing references to the early negotiations between the United States and Britain on disarmament and naval parity. It also briefly mentions the innovations adopted by the navy for equipping submarines and planes in such a way as to obtain excellent results at very low cost and further reduce the need for big battleships.

§<118>. *Stresemann.* Cf. Francesco[a] Tommasini's article, "Il pensiero e l'opera di Gustavo Stresemann," in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 November 1929: interesting for studying postwar Germany and the change in the psychology of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois nationalists.[1]

§<119>. *Encyclopedia of concepts—political, philosophical, etc. Middle class.* The meaning of the term "middle class" changes from country to country and often leads to some very strange misunderstandings. The term comes from English political writings, where it refers to the industrial bourgeoisie that is positioned somewhere between the aristocracy and the people: in England the bourgeoisie has never been conceived as being at one with the people but always as separate from the people. In the history of England, in fact, the bourgeoisie did not lead the people or seek its help to defeat feudal privileges; instead, it was the aristocracy that formed a strong party made up of people opposed to unbridled exploitation by the industrial bourgeoisie and to the consequences of industrialism. There is a tradition of popular *Toryism* (Disraeli, etc.). The history of the political parties in Britain reflects this development as well: the *Whigs* were aristocrats who struggled against the privileges of the crown and its abuses of power; the *Tories* were minor aristocrats with a certain popular appeal. The *Whigs* have become the party of the industrialists, of the middle classes; the *Tories*, on the other hand, have become the party of the aristocracy, always maintaining a certain popular appeal. Once the great reforms enacted by the *Whigs* were firmly in place and became irreversible, that is, once industry had made the state comply fully with its interests, there was an interchange of members between the parties, and both of them became interclass parties. The *Tories*, however, always retained a certain popularity, and they still do: when they do not vote for the Labour Party, the workers vote for the Conservatives.

It is harder to talk of the middle class in France because of its political and cultural tradition of the third estate, that is, the bloc of the bourgeoisie and the people. Those who are anglicized use the term in its English sense, but others use it in the Italian sense of "petty bourgeois," and the two usages blend, causing confusion at times.

In Italy, where the martial aristocracy was destroyed by the communes (physically destroyed, in the persons of the early Ghibellines) and where—except for southern Italy and Sicily—there is no concept of and no such thing as "upper class" (at least, not in common and political parlance), the term "middle class" naturally came to mean "petty and middle bour-

[a]In the manuscript, "Oreste."

geoisie." And, negatively, it came to mean "not the people," in the sense of "nonworkers" and "nonpeasants." Therefore, it also means "intellectuals." In fact, for many people, "middle class" refers precisely to the intellectual ranks, to cultured men (in the broad sense, and therefore it also includes white-collar workers [but primarily professional men]). The concept of "*signore*" in Sardinia, of "*galantuomo*" and of "*civile*" in the South and in Sicily.[1]

Cf. Notebook 26, § 8.

§<120>. *Catholic cultural nationalism.* When reading, say, *La Civiltà Cattolica*, one is most astonished by this tendency. For if it really were to become a [standard] mode of procedure, Catholicism itself would become impossible. Urging Italian philosophers to espouse Thomism because St. Thomas was born in Italy and not because it may provide a better path to the discovery of truth:[1] how can this be of use to the French and the Germans? Won't the logical outcome of this tendency be, rather, to impel each nation to search its own tradition for an archetypal intellectual, a "master" of national religious philosophy? In other words, isn't this conducive to the breaking-up of Catholicism into many national churches? Even if one were to accept the principle, why is St. Thomas chosen as the expression of the nation, instead of Gioberti, or Socini, etc.?[2]

That the Catholics and, even more so, the Jesuits of *La Civiltà Cattolica* have had to (and do) resort to this kind of propaganda is a sign of the times. There was a time when Carlo Pisacane was proclaimed the national figure to be worshiped in place of the foggy German philosophers, and Giuseppe Mazzini even more.[3] In the philosophy of actualism,[4] Gioberti is claimed to be the Italian Hegel, or almost. Religious Catholicism provides the stimulus (or sets the example?) for philosophical and sociopolitical Catholicism.

§<121>. *France.* André Siegfried, *Tableau des partis en France*, Paris, Grasset, 1930.[1]

§<122>. *National-popular.* I have written some notes to point out how the Italian words for "nation" and "national" have a more

restricted meaning than the corresponding words found in the dictionaries of other languages.[1] The most interesting observation can be made in the case of Chinese, and in China, too, the intellectuals are far removed from the people. In order to translate the Chinese expression *San Min Chu I*, which refers to the three principles of Sun Yat-sen's national-popular politics, the Jesuits have come up with the phrase "triple demisme" (coined by the Italian Jesuit D'Elia in his French translation of Sun Yat-sen's book *Le triple demisme de Sun Wen*); cf. *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 4 May and 18 May 1929, where the grammatical composition of the Chinese phrase *San Min Chu I* is analyzed, and various possible translations of it are compared.[2]

§<123>. *Renaissance.* An article by Vittorio Rossi, "Il Rinascimento," in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 November 1929.[1] Very interesting and comprehensive in its brevity. Rossi maintains, correctly, that the resurgence of scholarship centered on classical literature was a secondary factor in the making of the deep essence of the age that is appropriately called the Renaissance; it was only an indication, a symptom, and not even the most remarkable one. "The central and fundamental fact that brought forth everything else was the birth and maturation of a new spiritual world that at that time was introduced onto the stage of *European, not just Italian, history* by the vigorous and coherent creative force unleashed in every sphere of human activity after the year 1000." After 1000, a reaction set in against the feudal regime "that left its imprint on every aspect of life" (through the landed aristocracy and the clergy). During the two or three centuries that followed, the economic, political, and cultural order of society underwent a profound transformation: agriculture regained its strength; industry and commerce were revived, extended, and organized. The bourgeoisie emerged, the new ruling class (this point requires clarification, and Rossi leaves it unclear), ardent with political passion (where? in all of Europe, or only in Italy and Flanders?), and tightly knit in powerful financial corporations; as the spirit of autonomy grew, the communal states[2] were formed.

(This is another point that calls for clarification. One should establish what "state" meant in the communal state: a limited, "corporate" meaning, which prevented it from developing beyond intermediate feudalism, that is, the kind of feudalism that suc-

ceeded absolute feudalism—without a third estate, so to speak—that lasted until the year 1000 and was in turn replaced by absolute monarchy in the fifteenth century, until the French Revolution. In the Low Countries, and only in the Low Countries, there was an organic transition from the commune to a regime that was no longer feudal. In Italy the communes were unable to get out of the corporate phase; feudal anarchy prevailed in forms that matched the new situation, and foreign domination followed. On this topic, see some of the notes on "Italian intellectuals." On the entire development of European society after 1000, to which Rossi refers, Henri Pirenne's book on the origins of cities should be kept in mind.)[3]

Reform movements of the church: religious orders arose that sought to restore the apostolic life. (Were these movements positive or negative symptoms of the new world that was emerging? They certainly appeared as a reaction to the new economic society, even though their demand for church reform was progressive. It is also true, however, that they are indicative of a greater interest in cultural questions on the part of the people and of a greater interest in the people on the part of the major religious figures, that is, the most prominent intellectuals of the age. But they, too, at least in Italy, were either stifled or domesticated by the church, while in the rest of Europe they subsisted as a leaven that would give rise to the Reformation. When discussing cultural trends after the year 1000, one must not forget the contributions made by the Arabs through Spain—cf. Ezio Levi's articles in *Il Marzocco* and *Leonardo*[4]—and, in addition to the Arabs, the Spanish Jews.) "In the philosophical and theological schools of France heated debates were taking place; they were a sign of the rekindled religious spirit and also of the greater demands of reason." (Weren't these controversies caused by the Averroist doctrines that were on their way to conquering the European world? In other words, weren't they the result of the pressure coming from Arab culture?) "The struggle for investitures broke out, caused by the reawakened sense of the imperial Roman spirit (what does he mean? by the reawakened sense within the of wanting to absorb within itself all the activities of its citizens, as in the Roman Empire?) and by the awareness of existing spiritual, political, and economic interests. This struggle stirred up the whole world of the secular and ecclesiastical princes and of the anonymous mass of monks, bourgeois, peasants, and artisans." Heresies (but smothered with fire and sword).

"Chivalry sanctioned and consecrated the individual's possession of moral virtues, while at the same time it nourished a love of human culture and practiced a certain refinement of manners." (But in what way can chivalry be linked with the Renaissance after the year 1000? Rossi does not distinguish the contradictory movements because he fails to take into account the different forms of feudalism and of the local autonomies within the framework of feudalism. On the other hand, one cannot ignore chivalry as a component of the Renaissance proper in 1500, even though *Orlando Furioso* was already bemoaning its disappearance with a mixture of sympathy, caricature, and irony, and *Il cortegiano* embodies its conceitedly philistine, scholastic, and pedantic phase.)[5] The Crusades, the wars of the Christian kings against the Moors in Spain, of the Carpetians against England, of the Italian communes against the Swabian emperors, in which the sense of national unity matures or emerges (an exaggeration). The following statement is strange, coming from such a learned person as Rossi: "In their efforts to renew themselves and construct the conditions of a new life, those men felt the stirring of the deep ferment of their history, and they found congenial souls in the Roman world, so rich in experiences of free and full human spirituality." It seems to me that this whole sentence is a string of vague and meaningless affirmations: (1) because there was always a continuity between the Roman world and the (Middle Latin) period after 1000; (2) because "congenial souls" is a meaningless metaphor, and in any case the phenomenon occurred in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, not in this first phase; (3) because there was nothing Roman about the Renaissance, other than its literary veneer, since it lacked the very thing that was specific to Roman civilization: the unity of the state and hence territorial unity.

Latin culture flourished in the schools of France in the twelfth century with the magnificent vigor of grammatical and rhetorical studies, paralleled later and more modestly in Italy by the productions of Venetian poets and scholars and of the authors of treatises on the art of rhetoric. This culture was a phase of Middle Latin; it was a purely feudal product in the primitive pre-1000 sense. This is equally true of the juridical studies that were reborn out of the need to provide the complex new social and political relations with a legal structure. These juridical studies, it is true, relied on Roman law, but they rapidly degenerated into extremely detailed case stud-

ies, precisely because "pure" Roman law could not forge the complex new relations into an orderly system. In fact, the case studies of the glossarists and postglossarists led to the construction of local legal systems in which might (the nobleman or the bourgeois) was right that were the "only law" that existed. The principles of Roman law were forgotten or subjected to the interpretative gloss, which was in turn interpreted, so that in the end nothing Roman was left, other than the pure and simple principle of property.

Scholasticism "rethought and reordered the truths intuited by Christianity within the forms of ancient philosophy" (which, it should be pointed out, had reentered the orbit of European civilization not because of the "stirrings" of the deep ferments of history but because it was brought in by the Arabs and the Jews).

Romanesque architecture. Rossi is quite right when he states that all these phenomena between 1000 and 1300 were not the fruit of a calculated will to imitate but the spontaneous manifestation of a creative energy that sprang from a deep source and enabled those men to feel and relive antiquity. The last of these propositions, however, is wrong because in reality those men enabled themselves to [feel and] live the present intensely, whereas later a stratum of intellectuals was formed that felt and relived antiquity and increasingly separated itself from the life of the people, because the bourgeoisie [in Italy] declined or was degraded until the end of the eighteenth century.

It is also strange that Rossi is unaware of the contradictions he falls into when he states: "Nevertheless, if the Renaissance means, as I have no doubt it does, the whole multifaceted outburst of human activity from the eleventh to the sixteenth century, then what must be taken for its most conspicuous sign is not the revival of Latin culture but the rise of vernacular literature, which throws into relief one of the most remarkable products of that energy, namely, the breaking-up of medieval unity into different national entities." Rossi has a realistic and historicist view of the Renaissance, but he is unable to abandon completely the old rhetorical and literary conception: herein lies the source of his contradictions and his scholarly orthodoxy. The rise of the vernacular marked a break with antiquity, and one has to explain how this phenomenon came to be accompanied by a revival of literary Latin. Rossi says, correctly, that "the use a people makes of one language instead of another for disinterested intellectual purposes is not an individual

or collective whim; it is, rather, a spontaneous product of a distinctive kind of inner life, bursting forth in the only form that befits it." In other words, every language is an integral conception of the world and not just an outer garment that functions indifferently as a form for any content. Well then? Doesn't this mean that two conceptions of the world were in conflict: a bourgeois-popular conception expressing itself in the vernacular and an aristocratic-feudal conception expressing itself in Latin and harking back to Roman antiquity? And isn't this conflict, rather than the serene creation of a triumphant culture, the characteristic feature of the Renaissance? Rossi cannot explain the fact that the harking-back to antiquity was just a political-instrumental element that could not by itself have created a culture and that the Renaissance therefore could not result in anything other than the Counter-Reformation, that is, in the defeat of the bourgeoisie who came into existence with the communes and in the triumph of the Roman spirit—but in the form of papal power over people's consciences and as an attempt to return to the Holy Roman Empire: a farce after the tragedy.[6]

In France, the literature in *langue d'oc* and *langue d'oïl* blossomed between the end of the first and the beginning of the second century after the year 1000, when the whole country was in ferment as a result of the political, economic, religious, and cultural events already mentioned.

> And if in Italy it took more than another century for the vernacular to acquire the glory of literature, this is because here the great movement needed to establish a new national civilization on the ruins of medieval universalism was more diverse and everywhere more autochthonous and spontaneous, because of the diversity of the history (in many cases, centuries old) of our cities, and there was neither monarchy nor powerful lords to enforce discipline. Therefore, the unitary formation of that new world of the spirit, the most striking aspect of which was the new vernacular literature, took longer and proved more difficult.

Another bundle of contradictions: in Italy, in fact, the innovative movement after 1000 was much more violent than in France, and in economic terms the class at the forefront of that movement expanded earlier and more powerfully than it did in France, and it also managed to overthrow the domination of its enemies; this did

not occur in France. In France history developed differently from the way it did in Italy: this is the truism offered by Rossi, who is unable to point out the real differences of the development and locates them, instead, in a higher or lower degree of spontaneity and autochthony, something that is very difficult or impossible to prove. Even in France, though, the movement was not unitary, because there was a great difference between north and south that, within the sphere of literature, manifests itself in a great epic literature in the north and an absence of epic in the south. The beginning of the divergence between Italian and French history can be witnessed in the Strasbourg oath (about 841),[7] namely, in the fact that the people (the people-army) participated actively in history by becoming guarantors of the observance of the treaties between the descendants of Charlemagne. The people-army gave its guarantee by "swearing in the vernacular"; in other words, the people introduced their language into the history of the nation, assuming a political function of the highest importance, presenting themselves as a collective will, as a component of a national democracy. This "demagogic" event—the Carolingians' appeal to the people in their foreign policy—is very important for understanding the development of French history and the historical function of the monarchy as a national factor. In Italy, the earliest vernacular documents are individual oaths for establishing ownership over certain monastery lands, or else they are documents of an antipopular nature ("Traite, traite, fili de putte").[8] Anything but spontaneity and autochthony! The protective shell of the monarchy, the true continuation of the unity of the Roman state, was more conducive to the growth of the French bourgeoisie than was the complete economic autonomy attained by the Italian bourgeoisie, because the latter were incapable of breaking loose from narrow-minded corporatism and creating an integral state civilization of their own. (One should examine how the Italian communes, by first claiming the feudal rights of the count over the surrounding lands under his jurisdiction and then incorporating them, became a feudal element with power exercised by a corporate committee instead of the count.)

Rossi points out that alongside vernacular literature, "*coeval*" with it, and "*indicative of the same inner activity of our people,*" there were "the communal forms of the so-called prehumanism of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries." This vernacular literature and this prehumanism were followed by the philological

humanism of the late fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries. He concludes: "These three facts, when considered in a purely extrinsic (!) way by contemporaries and their successors, might have seemed antithetical; yet they mark, in the cultural order, stages in the development of the Italian spirit that are progressive and wholly analogous to those stages that, in the political order, are the commune (to which the vernacular literature and certain forms of prehumanism correspond) and the signoria (its literary correlative being philological humanism)."[9] Thus everything is in its place under the general veneer of the "Italian spirit."

With Boniface VIII, the last of the great medieval popes, and with Henry VII, the epic battles between the two highest authorities on earth came to an end. Decline in the political influence of the church: Avignon "servitude" and schism. The empire dies as a municipal political authority (fruitless efforts by Louis the Bavarian and Charles IV).[10] "Life was to be found in the young and industrious bourgeoisie of the communes that was consolidating its power over its external enemies and the common people, and, as it followed its course in history, this bourgeoisie was about to produce, or had already produced, national signorias." What national signorias? The origin of the signorias in Italy is quite different from that in other countries: in Italy they came into existence because it was impossible for the bourgeoisie to maintain a corporate regime, that is, to govern the common people with raw violence. In France, on the other hand, absolutism originated in the struggles between the bourgeoisie and the feudal classes, but, in the case of France, the bourgeoisie was tied to the common people and the peasants (within certain limits, of course). Can one speak of a "national signoria" in Italy? What did "nation" mean at that time?

Rossi continues:

> In the face of these great events, the idea—which seemed to be embodied in the universal perpetuity of the empire, the church, and Roman law and which was still Dante's idea—of a universal continuation into the life of the Middle Ages of universal Roman life gave way to *the idea that a great revolution* had taken place in recent centuries and that *a new historical era had begun*. There arose the sense of an abyss separating the new civilization from the old, and so the legacy of Rome was no longer felt as an immanent force in everyday life. But the Italians started to look at antiquity as their own past, a past of admirable power, freshness, and beauty, to which they had to

redirect their thinking by means of meditation and study in order to obtain a humane education, like children who return to their father after a long absence, not like old people recollecting and mourning their youth.

This is a real historical novel. Where can one find "*the idea that a great revolution had taken place,*" etc.? Rossi takes bookish anecdotes, the humanist's contempt for medieval Latin, and the refined gentleman's haughtiness toward medieval "barbarisms" and expands them into historical fact. Antonio Labriola was right when he wrote, in "Da un secolo all'altro," that only with the French Revolution does one get the feeling of a break with the past, with the whole past, and that this feeling has its ultimate expression in the attempt to renovate the computation of years with the Republican calendar.[11] If Rossi's claims were really true, the transition from the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation would not have been so easy. Rossi is unable to free himself from the rhetorical conception of the Renaissance, and therefore he cannot consider the fact that there were two currents, one progressive and the other regressive, and that in the final analysis the latter triumphed. It did so after the general phenomenon had reached its full splendor in the sixteenth century (not as a national and political fact, though; instead, primarily if not exclusively as a cultural fact), as the phenomenon of an aristocracy cut off from the people-nation, while at the same time among the people the reaction against this splendid parasitism was taking shape in the Protestant Reformation, in Savonarola's movement with its "burning of the vanities," in popular banditry such as that of Re Marcone in Calabria, and in other movements that would be interesting to record and to analyze as, at least, indirect symptoms. Machiavelli's political thought, too, was a reaction to the Renaissance; it drew attention to the political and national need to reestablish ties with the people as the absolute monarchies of France and Spain had done. The popularity of Valentino in Romagna was another symptom, in that he humbled the petty nobles, the condottieri, etc.[12]

According to Rossi, "the awareness of the ideal separation that had occurred in the centuries between antiquity and the new epoch" was already *virtually* present in the spirit of Dante, but it became *actual* and was personified, within the political order, by

Cola di Rienzo,[13] "the heir of Dante's thought who wanted to vindicate the Roman spirit and therefore the spirit of Italy (why "therefore"? Cola di Rienzo was only concerned about the people of Rome, in the material sense), of the empire; he wanted to join all the peoples of Italy into a unified nation, held together by the sacred bond of the Roman spirit. As for popular culture, Petrarch hails Cola as 'our Camillus, our Brutus, our Romulus,' and with patient study he reevokes antiquity, while with his poet's soul he experiences and lives it all over again." (The historical novel continues. What were the results of Cola di Rienzo's efforts? Absolutely nothing. And how can one make history with futile aspirations and pious wishes? And the Camilluses, the Brutuses, the Romuluses grouped together by Petrarch: don't they sound like pure rhetoric?)

Rossi fails to separate Middle Latin from humanistic or philological Latin, as he calls it. He refuses to understand that they are really two languages, because they express two conceptions of the world that, in a sense, are antithetical, even though limited to the category of the intellectuals. He also refuses to understand that prehumanism (Petrarch) is still different from humanism because "quantity has become quality." Petrarch, one might say, is typical of this transition: as a vernacular writer, he is a poet of the bourgeoisie, but as a writer of Latin, as an "orator," as a political figure, he is already an intellectual of the antibourgeois reaction (signoria, papacy). This also explains the sixteenth-century phenomenon of "Petrarchism" and its insincerity: it was a phenomenon that existed only on paper, because the sentiments that had given rise to the poetry of the *dolce stil novo*[14] and of Petrarch himself no longer prevailed in public life, just as the bourgeoisie of the communes no longer prevailed, for it had been pushed back to its stores and its decaying workshops. The dominant political force was an aristocracy made up mostly of parvenus gathered in the court of the nobles and protected by mercenary troops: it produced the culture of the sixteenth century and supported the arts, but it was politically limited and ended up under foreign domination.

Thus Rossi cannot see that vernacular poetry moved from Sicily to Bologna and Tuscany for reasons that have to do with class. He places the Sicilian school of poetry side by side with "the imperial and ecclesiastical prehumanism (in his sense) of Pier delle Vigne and Master Berardo of Naples, so cordially hated by Petrarch" that was "still rooted in the sentiment of the imperial continuation of

antiquity" (in other words, it is still Middle Latin, like the communal "prehumanism" of the Veronese and Paduan philologists and the grammarians and rhetoricians of Bologna).[15] He says that both phenomena would have been sterile because they were both tied to "a political and intellectual world that had already faded." The Sicilian school was not sterile because Bologna and Tuscany enlivened "its hollow technique with the new democratic cultural spirit." But is his interpretation of these connections correct? In Sicily the mercantile bourgeoisie developed under the protective shell of the monarchy. With Frederick II it found itself involved in the question of the Holy Roman Empire of the Germanic nation. Frederick was an absolute monarch in Sicily and in the South, but he was also the medieval emperor. The Sicilian bourgeoisie, like France's, developed more rapidly than the Tuscan bourgeoisie, from a cultural point of view. Frederick himself and his sons wrote poetry in the vernacular, and in this respect they participated in the new thrust of humane activities after the year 1000. But not just in this respect: in reality, the bourgeoisie of Tuscany and of Bologna were ideologically more backward than Frederick II, the medieval emperor. Paradoxes of history. But one must not falsify history, as Rossi does, turning the terms around to make them suit his general thesis. Frederick II failed, but his attempt was by no means similar to Cola di Rienzo's, and he was a quite different man. Bologna and Tuscany welcomed the "hollow Sicilian technique" with a very different historical understanding than Rossi's. They understood that this was "theirs," but they did not understand that Heinz, too, was theirs; even though he carried the flag of the universal empire, they made him die in prison.[16]

Rossi finds that "in the scabrous and at times bizarre Latinity of the prehumanism that flourished in the shadows of the communal signoria"—in contrast to the imperial and ecclesiastical "prehumanism"—

> the reaction to medieval universalism and vague aspirations to national stylistic forms (what does this mean? that the vernacular was disguised in Latin forms?) were smoldering [(!)]. And so the new scholars of the classical world must have perceived in this Latinity the foreshadowing of the kind of Roman imperialism that Cola had yearned for as the center of national unification and that they themselves felt and desired as a form of Italian cultural domination over

> the world. The nationalization (!) of humanism, which in the sixteenth century was to occur throughout the civilized countries of Europe, was born precisely from the universal empire of a culture—our culture—that germinated from the study of antiquity, it is true, but also, at the same time, established itself and spread as a vernacular literature and thus as an Italian national literature.

(This is the rhetorical concept of the Renaissance in its complete form. The fact that the humanists looked forward to Italy's cultural domination of the world signaled, at most, the beginning of "rhetoric" as a national form. This is where the interpretation of the "cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals" enters into the picture. This function is anything but "cultural domination" of a national kind; to the contrary, it is proof of the absence of a national character in the culture.)

The word *humanista* did not appear until the second half of the fifteenth century, and in Italian not until the third decade of the sixteenth century. The word *humanism* is even more recent. At the end of the fourteenth century, the first humanists called their studies *studia humanitatis*, that is, "studies intended for the integral improvement of the human spirit, and thus the only studies truly worthy of man. For them, culture was not just knowledge, it was also life . . . doctrine, morality, and beauty <. . .> mirrored in the unity of the living literary work." Caught in the contradictions stemming from his mechanically unitary conception of the history of the Renaissance, Rossi resorts to imagery to explain how humanistic Latin faded away until the vernacular triumphed in every sphere of literature "and Italian humanism finally had a language of its own, while Latin sank into its tomb." (Not completely, however, because it survived in the church and the sciences until the eighteenth century, a fact that makes clear which social current had always sustained its continuing use. Latin was expelled from the secular arena only by the modern bourgeoisie, leaving various reactionaries to lament its passing.)

> Humanism is not Latinism; it is the affirmation of full humanity, and the humanity of the Italian humanists was, in its historicity, Italian. Thus it could only express itself in the vernacular, which even the humanists spoke in everyday life and which, despite all

> their classicism, boldly forced itself through the gates of their Latin. By withdrawing themselves from life, they could dream their dream, and holding fast to their idea that any literature worthy of the name was bound to be in Latin, they repudiated the new language. But they themselves and their dreaming spirit were the products of a different historical reality, and it was within that reality that they lived their lives, born as they were almost a millennium and a half after the great Roman orator.

What does all this mean? Why this distinction between Latin dream and vernacular-historical reality? And why was Latin not a historical reality? Rossi is unable to explain this bilingualism of the intellectuals; in other words, he does not want to admit that for the humanists the vernacular was like a dialect—that is, it did not have a national character—and that therefore the humanists themselves were not a national element but the continuators of medieval universalism—in other forms, of course. They were a "cosmopolitan caste," for whom Italy represented, perhaps, what the region represents within the framework of the modern nation, but nothing more and nothing better than that. They were apolitical and non-national.

"The goal of the classicism of the humanists was no longer religious morality but rather the integral education of the human spirit; the most important thing was the rehabilitation of the human spirit as the creator of life and of history," etc. Quite right: this is the most interesting aspect of humanism. But does this contradict what I said earlier about the non-national and thus regressive spirit—for Italy—of humanism itself? I don't think so. In Italy, in fact, humanism failed to develop its most original and promising features. In Italy, humanism had the characteristics of a restoration, but like every restoration it assimilated and elaborated, better than the revolutionary class it had politically suffocated, the ideological principles of the defeated class, which had been unable to go beyond its corporate limits and create the superstructures of an integral society. Except that this elaboration was "airy," it remained the patrimony of an intellectual caste, it had no contact with the people-nation. And when the reactionary movement in Italy, to which humanism had been a necessary prelude, developed into the Counter-Reformation, the new ideology was also suffo-

cated, and the humanists (with a few exceptions) abjured their ideas before the stake (cf. the chapter on "Erasmus" published by *La Nuova Italia* from De Ruggiero's book, *Rinascimento, riforma e contrariforma*).[17]

The [ideological] content of the Renaissance was developed outside Italy, in Germany and France, in political and philosophical forms: but in Italy the modern state and modern philosophy were imported because our intellectuals were non-national and cosmopolitan, as they were in the Middle Ages in different forms but in the same general relations.

Rossi's article contains other interesting elements, but they deal with details. It will be necessary to study Rossi's book on *Il Quattrocento* (Coll. Vallardi),[18] Toffanin's book, *Cosa fu l'umanesimo* (Ediz. Sansoni),[19] and De Ruggiero's book cited above, as well as the classical works on the Renaissance by foreign scholars (Burckhardt, Voigt, Symonds, etc.).[20]

§<124>. *Past and present. Certain intellectuals.* The baron *Raffaele Garofalo*: his article on amnesties published in *Nuova Antologia* and noted in another notebook;[1] his lecture published in the volume *L'Italia e gli italiani del secolo XIX*, edited by Jolanda De Blasi.[2]

Giovanni Gentile: his speech in Palermo in 1925 (or 1924? cf. Croce's note in *Cultura e vita morale*).[3]

Antonio Baldini: his lecture on *Carducci, D'Annunzio, Pascoli* in the volume edited by De Blasi.[4]

Garofalo represents the old tradition of the rich southern landowner (recall his efforts in the senate to raise the emphyteusis rents and to preserve cell segregation in the new penal code);[5] Gentile and Baldini belong to a different category of intellectuals, more "freewheeling" than Garofalo.

Recall Gentile's speech to Roman workers, now in his volume on *Fascismo e cultura* (Edizioni Treves).[6]

§<125>. *Types of periodicals. Critical-bibliographical surveys.* An extremely important one on the results of historical criticism applied to the origins of Christianity, the historical personality of Jesus, the Gospels, the differences among the Gospels, the synoptic

Gospels and the Gospel of St. John, the so-called apocryphal gospels, the importance of St. Paul and the apostles, the debates on whether Jesus is the expression of a myth, etc. (Cf. the books by Omodeo, etc.; the series edited by Couchoud and published by Rieder, etc.)[1]

The idea was suggested to me by Alessandro Chiappelli's article "Il culto di Maria e gli errori della recente critica storica" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 December 1929, which attacks A. Drews and his book *Die Marien Mithe*.[2] On these topics one should look at Luigi Salvatorelli's articles (for ex., his article in *Rivista Storica Italiana*, n.s., VII, 1928, on the name and cult of Joshua, a holy man).[4] The notes in Chiappelli's article provide many bibliographical references.

§<126>. *Past and present. The intellectuals: the decline of Mario Missiroli.* Cf. the article by Mario Missiroli (Spectator) on "Clemenceau" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 16 December 1929.[1] Quite an interesting article, because Missiroli has not lost his great journalistic skill of knowing how to construct a striking article by making use of some basic ideas and organizing them around an intelligent selection of facts. But why and how was Clemenceau in touch with France, with the French people, and representing them at the supreme moment? Missiroli is unable to say: he has become a casualty of the antiparliamentary, antidemocratic, "anticontroversial," antiparty, etc., cliché. The question is this: were the multiplicity of parties, the multiplicity of nonindependent newspapers, the multiplicity of parliamentary factions, the sectarianism and the ferocity of politico-parliamentary struggles and of the polemics in the press—were all these phenomena in the France of pre-1914 a sign of the strength of the nation or of its weakness (hegemony of the middle class, or the third estate), a sign of the incessant search for a new, more compact unity, or a sign of disintegration? At the base of the nation, in the minds of the people, there were really only two parties: the Right—that is, the party of the nobles, the high clergy, and one part of the group of generals—and the Center, made up of one great party that was divided into personal factions or political groups that were fundamentally akin; there were also small, politically unorganized minorities on the left periphery, among the proletariat.

The moral division in France was between the Right and the rest of the nation; it reproduced the traditional division that had occurred after 1793, after the terror and the execution of the king, the aristocrats, and the high clergy, who were sentenced by Robespierre's revolutionary tribunal. The internal divisions existed at the upper echelons of the political hierarchy, not at the base, and they were linked to the great many developments that took place in the internal national politics of France between 1789 and 1870. Rather than a disintegration, it was a mechanism for selecting the political figures capable of leadership, a continuing improvement of the nation's political general staff. The strength and weakness of Clemenceau, as well as his role, make sense within this context. This also explains why the diagnoses of the French situation have always been disastrous and contradicted by the real events that followed them. The phenomenon of internal national disintegration (that is, of the disintegration of the political hegemony of the third estate) was much more advanced in the Germany of 1914 than in the France of 1914, except that in Germany the bureaucracy concealed the symptoms under the bright facade of coerced militaristic discipline. The phenomenon of national disintegration, or rather the beginning of the process of disintegration, did not occur in France until after, long after, 1919, much later than in those countries with authoritarian regimes, which are themselves a product of such disintegration.

But Missiroli has become a more or less willing victim of clichés, and his understanding of history and of the way in which ideological relations really work has suffered a catastrophic decline. In one of his articles, "Sorel e Clemenceau," published in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 15 December, Missiroli quotes an opinion of Sorel's on Clemenceau that he does not mention in his *Nuova Antologia* article.[2] In February 1920 Missiroli invited Sorel to write an article on Clemenceau's participation in and withdrawal from the race for the presidency of the republic. Sorel did not want to write the article, but he expressed his opinion in a letter to Missiroli: "As president, Clemenceau would have been much more similar to Casimir Périer than to Loubet and Fallières. He has always fought passionately against those men whose popularity threatened to overshadow him. If Clemenceau had been elected, there would have been a genuine revolution in the institutions of France. His election would have satisfied those who want the president of the republic to be

given more extensive powers, like those of American presidents." Sorel's judgment is perspicacious, but Missiroli was unable to use it in his *Nuova Antologia* article because it contradicted his falsification of French political history.

§<127>. *Machiavelli.* The *Nuova Antologia* of 16 December 1929 published a brief note by a certain M. Azzalini, "La politica, scienza ed arte di stato,"[1] which may be interesting as a demonstration of those elements against which scientific schematism flounders. Azzalini begins by stating that it was Machiavelli's "most resplendent" glory "to have circumscribed the ambit of politics within the state." It is not easy to understand what Azzalini is trying to say. He quotes the following sentence from chapter III of *The Prince*: "When the cardinal of Rouen said to me that the Italians did not understand war, I replied that the French had no understanding of the state." On the basis of this single quotation he asserts that therefore, for Machiavelli, "politics must be understood as a science, and as a science of the state," and that was his glory, etc. (supposedly, prior to Machiavelli, only Marsilius of Padua used the term "science of the state" for "politics," in the proper modern sense).[2] Azzalini is rather lightweight and superficial. Severed from the text, the anecdote of the cardinal of Rouen means nothing. In its context it takes on a meaning that does not lend itself to scientific deductions: it is obviously a witty epigram, a piece of repartee. The cardinal of Rouen had asserted that the Italians had no understanding of war; Machiavelli retorts by saying that the French have no understanding of the state, otherwise they would never have allowed the pope to extend his power in Italy, for that was against the interests of the French state. Machiavelli was very far from suggesting that the French had no understanding of the state; on the contrary, he admired the way in which the monarchy (Louis XI) had made a unitary state out of France, and he used the actions of the French state as a standard of comparison for Italy. In his conversation with the cardinal of Rouen, Machiavelli was engaging in "political action," not in "political science," for, according to him, if the pope's gain in strength was harmful to French "foreign policy," it was even more harmful to the internal politics of Italy.

The strange thing is that, using this incongruous quotation as his point of departure, Azzalini goes on to say that "in spite of the

assertion that this science studies the state, it is defined (!?) in a totally imprecise (!) way, because there is no indication of the criterion by which the object of the inquiry is to be examined. And the imprecision is absolute, since all the juridical sciences in general, and public law[3] in particular, refer directly or indirectly to the state." What does all this mean when it comes to Machiavelli? Less than nothing: mental confusion.

Machiavelli wrote books of "immediate political action"; he did not write a utopia that yearns for a ready-made state, with all its functions and components already in perfect order. In his treatment, in his critique of the present, he articulated some general concepts that are presented in an aphoristic and nonsystematic form. He also articulated a conception of the world that could also be called "philosophy of praxis" or "neohumanism," in that it does not recognize transcendental or immanent (in the metaphysical sense) elements but is based entirely on the concrete action of man, who out of historical necessity works and transforms reality. It is not true, as Azzalini apparently believes, that Machiavelli failed to take "constitutional law" into account, since general principles of constitutional law can be found scattered throughout Machiavelli's work, and, in fact, he quite clearly affirms the need for the state to be ruled by law, by fixed principles that allow upright citizens to carry out their activities secure in the knowledge that they will not be struck down by the arbitrary blows of absolute power. But Machiavelli, rightly, brings everything back to politics, that is, to the art of governing men, of securing their permanent consent, and hence of founding "great states." One must remember that, in Machiavelli's view, neither the commune, nor the republic, nor the communal signoria was a state,[4] since they lacked not only a sizable territory but also a population capable of supporting a military force that would make it possible for them to pursue an autonomous international policy. He felt that the presence of the papacy in Italy created a nonstate situation that was bound to last until religion, too, became a "policy" of the state and ceased to be the pope's policy for preventing the formation of strong states in Italy, a policy that the pope carried out (in the pursuit of interests that were not those of the states themselves and hence were unsettling and disruptive) by intervening in the internal affairs of peoples who were not under his temporal rule.

One could find in Machiavelli the confirmation of what I have noted elsewhere:[5] that the Italian medieval bourgeoisie could not

move beyond the corporate phase and into the political phase because it was unable to free itself completely from the medieval-cosmopolitan conception represented by the pope, the clergy, and also by the secular intellectuals (humanists); in other words, it was unable to create an autonomous state but remained within the feudal and cosmopolitan medieval framework.

Azzalini writes that

> Ulpian's definition or, better still, his examples reproduced in the *Digest*,[6] are sufficient <to reveal> the extrinsic identity (and so what?) of the object of the two sciences: "Ius publicum ad statum rei (publicae) romanae spectat.—Publicum ius, in sacris, in sacerdotibus, in magistratibus consistit." Thus there is an identity of object in public law and in political science, but not a substantive identity, because the criteria with which the two sciences approach the same matter are totally different. In fact, the spheres of the juridical order and the political order are different. Indeed, while the former observes the political organism from a static perspective, as the natural product of a particular historical evolution, the latter observes the same organism from a dynamic perspective, as a product whose virtues and flaws can be evaluated and must then be modified according to new needs and subsequent developments.

Therefore, one may say that "the juridical order is ontological and analytical, since it studies and analyzes the various public institutions as they really are," whereas "the political order is deontological and critical, since it studies the various institutions not as they are but as they ought to be, that is, with evaluative criteria and considerations of expediency that are not, and cannot be, juridical."

And this wiseacre considers himself an admirer and a disciple of Machiavelli; indeed, he even thinks he has improved Machiavelli!

> It follows from this that the formal identity described above is contrasted by a substantive diversity so profound and striking that it perhaps invalidates the opinion expressed by one of the greatest contemporary writers, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to create a political science entirely distinct from constitutional law. That opinion, it seems to us, is true only if the analysis of the juridical and political aspects stops there, but not if one proceeds to define that further area that belongs to the exclusive competence of political science. The latter, in fact, does not confine itself to studying the orga-

nization of the state with a criterion that is deontological, critical, and therefore different from that used by public law for the same object; rather, it extends its sphere to an area that is properly its own, investigating the laws that regulate the rise, growth, and decline of states. It would be wrong to say that such study belongs to history (!) understood in the general sense (!). Even if one were to concede that the search for causes, effects, and the mutual bonds of interdependence of the natural laws governing the existence and growth of states constitutes a historical inquiry—even so, the search for suitable means by which to retain practical control over the general direction of policy will always remain the exclusive province of politics, not of history or jurisprudence. The function proposed and synthesized by Machiavelli when he said, "I will discuss how these principalities can be governed and maintained" (*The Prince*, ch. 2), is such—by virtue of the intrinsic importance of the subject and by definition—that it not only legitimizes the autonomy of politics but also allows, at least from the point of view I have just outlined, even a formal distinction between itself and public law.

So this is what he means by the *autonomy* of politics!

But in addition to a science of politics, Azzalini says, there is also an art of politics.

There are men who draw, or drew, from personal intuition a vision of the needs and interests of the countries they govern and in their governmental activity made their personal intuitive vision a reality in the external world. By this we certainly do not mean to say that intuitive, and hence artistic, activity is the only, or the predominant, activity of the statesman; we only mean to say that practical, economic, and moral activities must also be accompanied by the above-mentioned theoretical activity in the subjective form of intuition as well as in the objective (!) form of articulation: without these essential qualities the politician cannot exist, and much less (!) can the statesman, whose stature is determined precisely by this faculty, which cannot be acquired (?). Thus in the political field, too, in addition to the scientist, in whom cognitive theoretical activity predominates, there is also the artist, in whom intuitive theoretical activity predominates. Nor is that all there is to the sphere of action of the art of politics. For not only can the art of politics be seen in terms of the statesman who, through the practical functions of government, externalizes his intuitive inner vision, but the art of poli-

> tics can also be examined in terms of the writer who realizes in the external world (!) the political truth he intuits; he does so not through the exercise of power but by translating what he intuits into books and other writings. This is the case with the Indian Kamandaki (third century A.D.), with Petrarch in his *Trattatello pei Carraresi*, with Botero in his *Ragion di Stato*, and, in a certain sense, with Machiavelli and Mazzini.[7]

This is really quite a hodgepodge, worthy of . . . Machiavelli, but above all of Tittoni, the editor in chief of *Nuova Antologia*.[8] Azzalini cannot find his bearings either in philosophy or in political science. But I wanted to take all these notes in order to try to disentangle his plot and arrive at clear concepts for my own purposes.

For ex., it is necessary to disentangle what "intuition" might mean in politics from the term "art" of politics, etc. —Remember also some points made by Bergson: "Of life (reality in movement), intelligence offers us only a translation in terms of inertia. It circles around, taking the greatest possible number of external views of the object, which, instead of penetrating, it draws toward itself. But it is intuition which will lead us into the very interior of life: by that I mean instinct which has become disinterested." "Our eye perceives the traits of the living being, but juxtaposed to each other rather than organically related. The purpose of life, the simple movement which runs through the lineaments, which links them together and gives them a meaning, escapes it; and it is this purpose that the artist tends to capture, situating himself within the object by a kind of sympathy, breaking down by an effort of intuition the barrier which space places between him and his model. However, it is true that aesthetic intuition only captures that which is individual." "Intelligence is characterized by a natural incomprehensibility of life, since it represents clearly only the discontinuous and the immobile."[9] In the meantime, political intuition is separate from aesthetic, lyric, or artistic intuition; only by metaphor does one speak of the art of politics. Political intuition does not express itself in the artist but in the "leader," and "intuition" must be understood to mean not "knowledge of men" but swiftness in connecting seemingly unrelated facts, [and in conceiving the means adequate to the ends, in order to be able to discover the interests involved and] rouse the passions of men and direct them toward a particular action. The "expression" of the "leader" is "action" (in a

positive or a negative sense: launching an action or preventing some action from taking place, depending on whether it is consistent or inconsistent with the goal one wants to achieve). However, the "leader in politics" may be an individual but also a more or less numerous political body; in the latter case, unity of purpose will be achieved by an individual or by a small inner group, and within that small group by an individual who may change from time to time even though the group remains united and consistent in its ongoing activity.

If one had to translate the notion "Prince" as it is used in Machiavelli's book into modern political language, one would have to make a series of distinctions: "Prince" could be a head of state or head of government, but "Prince" could also be a political leader who wants to conquer a state or establish a new type of state; in this sense, "Prince" could be translated in modern terms as "political party." In reality, in certain states, the "head of state"—that is, the element that balances the various interests struggling against the predominant but not absolutely exclusivistic interest—is precisely the "political party." With the difference, however, that in terms of traditional constitutional law the political party juridically neither rules nor governs. It has "de facto power," it exercises the hegemonic function, and hence the function of balancing various interests, in "civil society"; however, "civil society" is in fact so thoroughly intertwined with political society that all the citizens feel instead that the party rules and governs. It is not possible to create a constitutional law of the traditional type based on this reality, which is in continuous movement; it is only possible to create a system of principles asserting that the end of the state is its own end, its own disappearance: in other words, the reabsorption of political society into civil society.

§<128>. *Lorianism. Domenico Giuliotti.* Loria's theory of the necessary connection between mysticism and syphilis[1] is countered by Domenico Giuliotti, who, in the introduction to *Profili di Santi*, published by the Casa Ed. Rinascimento del Libro, writes: "Still, either we are edified *solely* by Christ, or we are edified, in other ways, by death. Nietzsche, for example, the last famous anti-Christian: one had better not forget that he ended up syphilitic and mad."[2] It seems that Nietzsche is only one out of a series of examples; in other words, this is a law—an impression rein-

forced by "one had better not forget." In other words: be careful, fellows, not to become anti-Christians, otherwise you will die syphilitic and mad. He really is the perfect anti-Loria. (Giuliotti's preface is reproduced in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 15 December 1929, so the book should have been released in 1930; it seems to be a series of lives of saints translated by Giuliotti.)

Cf. Notebook 28, §16.

§<129>. *Past and present. The Catholics and the state.* Check the very significant article "Tra 'ratifiche' e 'rettifiche' " (by Father Rosa) in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 20 July 1929; it also deals with the 1929 elections.[1] On this article, see also the subsequent issue of *La Civiltà Cattolica* (3 August).[2] Apropos of the *concordat*, it is noteworthy that art. 1 states textually: "Italy, in keeping with the meaning of art. 1 of the treaty, guarantees the Catholic Church the free exercise of *spiritual power*, etc." Why use the term *power*, which has a precise legal meaning, and not "activity," for example, or some other term that is less likely to be interpreted in a political sense? It would be worthwhile to conduct a study that also examines the terminology in the other concordats stipulated by the church and in the literature on the hermeneutics of concordats attributable to Vatican agents.

§<130>. *Encyclopedic notions.* The word "*ufficiale*" or "*officiale.*" This word causes misunderstanding, or at the very least incomprehension and astonishment, especially in translations from foreign languages (above all, English). "*Ufficiale,*" in Italian, has increasingly narrowed its meaning, and now it is likely to refer only to military officers; it has retained its broader meaning only in some expressions that have become idiomatic or in expressions of bureaucratic origin: "*pubblico ufficiale,*" "*ufficiale dello stato civile,*" etc.[1] In English, on the other hand, "official" refers in general to functionaries of all kinds (in the case of the army, "officer" is used, but that, too, denotes a "functionary," generally speaking), not just to functionaries of the state but also to all kinds of nongovernmental positions (a trade union functionary, etc.); it even refers to a simple "employee." (One can conduct a more extensive etymological, legal, and political study of this.)

Cf. Notebook 26, §9.

§<131>. *Types of periodicals. A regular column on grammar and linguistics.* I was struck by the regular column "Querelles de langage" assigned to André Thérive (who is the literary critic of *Temps*) in *Nouvelles Littéraires*, as I was thinking about the usefulness of a similar regular column in Italian newspapers and periodicals. A regular column of this kind would be more difficult to put together in Italy because of the lack of big modern dictionaries and, above all, of great comprehensive works on the history of the language (like the books by Littré, Brunot, and others in France)[1] that could supply an average educated person or a journalist with material for the column itself. The only example of this kind of writing in Italy has been De Amicis's *L'idioma gentile* (and his chapters on vocabulary in *Pagine sparse*), but even that was excessively concerned with correct usage and too rhetorical, to say nothing of its exasperating infatuation with Manzoni.[2] The regular column started (and quickly abandoned) by Alfredo Panzini in the original *Fiera Letteraria*, edited by U. Fracchia, had a pedantic approach to correct usage, and furthermore its mannered style was tiresome.[3] In order for the column to be interesting, it must be very open-minded, and its approach must be predominantly ideological-historical; it must not be overly concerned with correct usage and grammar: language should be treated as a conception of the world, as the expression of a conception of the world. The technical improvement of expression, both quantitative (the acquisition of new modes of expression) and qualitative (the acquisition of the nuances of meaning and of a more complex syntax and style), represents a broadening and deepening of the conception of the world and its history. One could start with some curiosities: the origin of "cretin," the meanings of "villain," the layers of sediment deposited by old ideologies (for example, "disaster" from astrology; "to sanction," to render sacred, from the sacerdotal religious conception of the state, etc.). In this way it should be possible to correct the most common mistakes made by Italians, most of whom learn language from texts (newspapers, primarily) and hence are unable to accent words correctly (for example, "*profúgo*" during the war; I have even heard a man from Milan say "*rosèo*" for "*roseo*," etc.) Some very serious errors of meaning (specific meanings broadened, or vice versa); syntactical and morphological mistakes and confusion (the subjunctives used by Sicilians: "*si accomodasse, venisse*" for "*si accomodi, venga*," etc.).

§<132>. *Past and present. La Civiltà Cattolica* of 20 July 1929 has a report on the first audience granted by Pius XI to the ambassador De Vecchi to present his credentials at the Vatican City. Addressing Pope Pius XI, De Vecchi said (in the second paragraph): "With reference to the newness of the relations that have been so successfully initiated, we wish to say, with special regard to you, sir, that we are glad that these new things have their beginning and their point of departure in what you represent, both in your person and in your work, that is, in what you have already been doing for the good not only of the country but also of our missions."[1]

§<133>. *Catholic Action. The "Workers' Retreats."* See *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 20 July 1929: "Come il popolo torna a Dio: L'opera dei 'Ritiri Operai.' "[1]

The "Retreats" or "closed Spiritual Exercises" were established by St. Ignatius Loyola (whose most widespread work is the *Spiritual Exercises*, edited in 1929 by G. Papini);[2] they inspired the "Workers' Retreats" that were started in 1882 in northern France. The Workers' Retreats Organization began its activities in Italy in 1907 with the first retreat for workers, held in Chieri (cf. *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 1908, vol. IV, p. 61: "I 'Ritiri Operai' in Italia").[3] In 1929 the following book was published: *Come il popolo ritorna a Dio, 1909–1929: L'opera dei Ritiri e le Leghe di Perseveranza in Roma in venti anni di vita*; in 8°, with illustrations, 136 pp., L. 10.[4] (It is sold for the benefit of the organization at the main office of the Workers' Retreats, via degli Astalli, 16–17, Rome.) From the book, it appears that between 1909 and 1929 the organization brought together, in the Leagues of Perseverance of Rome and Lazio, over 20,000 workers, many of them recent converts. In 1928–29 they met with greater success [in Lazio and nearby provinces] than they had in Rome during the preceding eighteen years.

Thus far, 115 closed retreats have been held in Rome, and about 220,000 workers have attended them. *La Civiltà Cattolica* writes: "At every retreat there is always a nucleus of good workers who serve as a leaven and as an example; the others are drawn, in various ways, from among the common people, who are cold, indifferent, or even hostile. Some of them come out of curiosity, some come in order not to turn down their friends' invitation, and more

than a few come to enjoy the luxury of three days of rest and good treatment at no cost."

The article supplies other details concerning various municipalities in Lazio: the Roman League of Perseverance has 8,000 members and thirty-four centers; in Lazio there are twenty-five sections of the league, with 12,000 members. (Monthly communion, whereas the minimum required by the church is one communion per year.) The organization is administered by the Jesuits. (One could devote a paragraph to this topic in the "Past and present" series.)

The Leagues of Perseverance aim at preserving the results obtained through the retreats and extending them among the masses. They create a "public opinion" that actively supports the practice of religion, thus turning around the earlier situation, in which public opinion was negative, or at least passive or skeptical and indifferent.

§<134>. *Religious movements.* One should look into the *pan-Christian movement* and its dependent organization "World Alliance for the Promotion of International Friendship through the Churches." The pan-Christian movement is significant for the following reasons: (1) because the aim of the Protestant churches is not only to unite but also to acquire, through their unification, a proselytizing force; (2) among the Protestant churches, only the American, and to a lesser degree the English, churches have possessed an expansive proselytizing force: this force is being acquired by the pan-Christian movement even though its leadership is composed of continental Europeans, Norwegians and Germans, in particular; (3) unity can arrest the tendency of Protestant churches always to divide themselves; (4) the Orthodox churches will participate in the pan-Christian movement as centers with their own independent leadership.

The Catholic Church is very disturbed by this movement. Its massive organization and centralization and the fact that it has a single command have given it an advantage in the slow but steady operation of absorbing heretics and schismatics. The pan-Christian union upsets this monopoly; Rome finds itself facing a united front. The church, however, cannot agree to join the movement on an equal footing with the other churches, and this favors

pan-Christian propaganda, which can reproach Rome for opposing the unification of all Christians because of its own particular interests, etc.[1]

§<135>. *The Italian Risorgimento. Lamennais.* Lamennais should be studied because of the influence of his ideas on certain cultural currents of the Risorgimento;[1] in particular, his ideas influenced a segment of the clergy to turn toward liberal thought, and they were an ideological component of the social-democratic movements prior to 1848. For Lamennais's struggle against the Jesuits, cf. the article "Il padre Roothaan e il La Mennais" in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 3 August 1929.[2] Father Roothaan became the general of the Society of Jesus around the end of the 1820s, and he died, I believe, in 1853.[3] He is, therefore, the general who presided over the activities of the Jesuits before and after 1848. There are other articles on Lamennais and Father Roothaan in *La Civiltà Cattolica* that can be checked.[4]

§<136>. *Encyclopedic notions.* It is noteworthy that in Italian historico-political discourse there exists a series of expressions that are difficult, and sometimes impossible, to translate into a foreign language: thus we have the group *"Rinascimento," "Rinascita," "Rinascenza"*[1] (the first two are Italian words; the third is a Gallicism); they have now entered into cultural circulation throughout Europe and the world, for even though the phenomenon reached its greatest splendor in Italy, it was not restricted to Italy.

The term "Risorgimento" in its political sense emerged in the nineteenth century, accompanied by *"riscossa nazionale"* and *"riscatto nazionale."*[2] All of these terms express the concept of a return to a condition that had already existed before: that is, the concept of an aggressive *"ripresa"*[3] (*"riscossa"*) of the nation's energies or of a liberation from a state of servitude in order to return to pristine autonomy (*riscatto*). They are difficult to translate precisely because they are very closely connected to the national-literary tradition of imperial Rome or the medieval communes that are regarded as the periods in which the Italian people was *"nato"* or *"sorto"*[4]—hence the revival is called *"rinascimento"* or *"risorgimento."* Thus the term *"riscuotersi"* is linked to the idea of an organism that lapses into lethargy and *"si riscuote,"* etc.

Cf. Notebook 26, §11.

§<137>. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists. The case of Abbé Turmel of Rennes.* In his book *L'Enciclica Pascendi e il modernismo*, Father Rosa devotes some delightful pages to the extraordinary case of Abbé Turmel, a modernist, who wrote modernist books using various pseudonyms and then refuted them in works bearing his real name.[1] It seems that Turmel was playing these games with his pseudonyms from 1908 until 1929, as has been shown by Prof. L. Saltet of the Catholic Institute of Toulouse in a long study published in the *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* (Toulouse, 1929).[2] The case of Turmel is so peculiar that it would be worthwhile to research it further.

Cf. Notebook 20, §4.

§<138>. *Emperor worship.* "L'apoteosi dell'uomo vivente e il cristianesimo," an article by the Jesuit priest G. Messina, was published in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 17 August and 21 September 1929.[1] In the first part, Messina examines emperor worship from its origin until Alexander of Macedon;[2] in the second part, he examines the introduction of emperor worship in Rome, and the resistance by the early Christians, up to Constantine's edict.

Messina writes:

> In the spring of 323, delegates were sent (by Athens and Sparta) to Alexander in Babylon, and they presented themselves before him wearing garlands on their heads, as was the custom when addressing the gods: hence recognizing him as a god. Alexander had satisfied his ambition: he was the sole master of the world, and he was god; his will was the only law. He had set out as a representative of the Greeks in his campaign against the Persians; now he realized that his task was complete. He was no longer anyone's representative: before his person, now elevated to godhood, Greeks and Macedonians, Persians and Egyptians were all the same, subjects and dependents. Differences of nationality and mores, racial prejudices, and specific traditions—they had to disappear, and all peoples had to be made to feel as one in their obedience to a single monarch and in their worship of his person.[3]

In other words, emperor worship is connected to the universal empire and to cosmopolitanism, of which the empire is a necessary expression.

It would be interesting to find out whether there has been an effort to establish a connection between emperor worship and the

position of the pope as the vicar of God on earth. There is no doubt that divine honors are bestowed on the pope, and he is called "our common father," as God is. The papacy made a mixture of the attributes of the "Pontifex Maximus" and the attributes of the deified emperor [(attributes that the populations of the early period must not have perceived as distinct in the emperors themselves)]. Hence the papacy had to be the source of the divine right of kings, which was a reflection of emperor worship. The same necessity moved Japan to the worship of the mikado, which later became a civil—and no longer a religious—ceremony.

What happened in Christianity is the same thing that happens in periods of Restoration in comparison with revolutionary periods: the acceptance, in mitigated and camouflaged forms, of the same principles that had been combated.

§<139>. *Encyclopedic notions.* To the series of Italian terms "*Rinascimento,*" "*Risorgimento,*"[1] etc., one could add "*Restaurazione,*"[2] a word of French origin that refers to a predominantly French phenomenon.

The pair "form" and "reform" is not so obvious, because something formed can be continuously "reformed" even if no "catastrophe" intervenes, whereas the opposite is implicit in "*Rinascimento,*" etc., and in "Restoration." The Roman Church has been reformed from within several times. But in the Protestant "Reformation" there is the idea of a rebirth and a restoration of the early church. The Catholics, too, talk about the "Reformation" of the church brought about by the Council of Trent,[3] but only the Jesuits cling to this terminology; in secular culture, one talks about the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. In other words, people have not been convinced that the church underwent a reformation; all they know is that it reacted against the Lutheran Reformation.

It would be interesting to find out whether this concept was born immediately after the Council of Trent or, if not, when, for it contains an implicit negative judgment.

Cf. Notebook 26, §11.

§<140>. *Americanism.* G. A. Fanelli's *L'artigianato: Sintesi di una economia corporativa* (SPES Editrice, Rome, in 8°, xix+505 pp., L. 30)[1] is, at the very least, a curious book, an expression of the reaction of provincial intellectuals to Americanism. It is reviewed in the article "Problemi sociali" (which must be by Father Brucculeri) in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 17

August 1929.[2] It is strange that the Jesuit priest defends modern civilization (in its industrial manifestation) against Fanelli. I am reproducing some characteristic passages of Fanelli's quoted by *La Civiltà Cattolica*:

> The system (of mechanized industrialization) has the drawback of indirectly reabsorbing, and hence neutralizing, most of the material advantages that it has to offer. Three-fourths of the horsepower installed is used for rapid transportation, which has been rendered indispensable by the need to prevent goods from deteriorating resulting from highly concentrated production. The remaining fourth of the horsepower installed is devoted to highly concentrated production, and half of that is used to produce machines. Thus, in the end, out of the massive development of machines that oppresses the world with the weight of its steel, no more than one-eighth of the horsepower installed is used to manufacture goods and produce foodstuff (p. 205 in the book)[3]

> Italians are, by character, antisystematic, cheerful, creative, and hostile to rationalizations; they cannot adapt themselves to the methodical rhythm of the factory on which the efficiency of mass production is entirely dependent. In fact, for an Italian, the hours of work he puts in will be of purely nominal value because of his low efficiency in systematic work. The Italian, eminently musical, keeps himself company by singing while engaged in unforced labor, and he derives new powers of inspiration from this form of recreation. The Italian has an open mind, a lively character, and a generous heart; when he is led to the workshop . . . he can display his creative powers, and the entire artisan economy is founded on those creative powers. No other people is as temperate as the Italian, who, in his independent existence as an artisan, is capable of any sacrifice or privation in order to satisfy the requirements of art; on the other hand, when unskilled factory work humiliates his creative spirit, he squanders his wages pursuing distractions and joys that will shorten his life. (p. 171 in the book)[4]

From a cultural point of view, Fanelli's book corresponds to the literary activity of those provincial writers who, to this day, continue composing sequels, in *ottava rima*, to *La Gerusalemme liberata* and *Orlando Furioso*, etc.[5] It fully resembles the spirit of the eighteenth century: the state of nature is replaced by "artisanship" and its patriarchalism.

It is strange that writers such as Fanelli who campaign for demographic growth forget that the increase in population during the last century was intimately related to the development of the world market. The reviewer correctly points out that handicraft is now linked to big industry and depends on it: it receives partially processed raw materials and improved tools from big industry.

It may be true that the Italian factory worker is relatively inefficient, but this is due to the fact that, in Italy, industrialism has abused the growing mass of the unemployed (only partially attenuated by emigration); it has always been a rapacious industrialism and has speculated more on wages than on technical improvement. The proverbial "sobriety" of the factories simply means that the nutritional standard of living has not yet been made adequate to the level of energy consumed by the demands of factory work. The stylized characterization of Italians is false on all counts: in the intellectual category, it was the Italians who created "erudition," that is, patient archival work: Muratori, Tiraboschi, Baronio, etc., were Italian not German.[6] Standardized mass production exists in the artisan system "exactly as" in the United States: the difference is one of *scale*. The artisan's production of furniture, plows, gardening tools, knives, small houses for peasants, etc., is standardized, too, but on the scale of the village, or the district, or the surrounding area, or the province, or at most the region. The standard size of American industry is a continent or the whole world. The artisan produces always the same gardening tools, the same carts, the same harnesses, etc., all his life. The number of artisans who are continuously engaged in "individual creation" is so minuscule that it consists exclusively of artists (and even "great" artists) in the strict sense of the term. Fanelli's book could provide a point of departure for notes under different rubrics: "Past and present," "Americanism," "Lorianism."

Cf. Notebook 28, §17.

§<141>. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*. Cf. the article "La lunga crisi dell'*Action Française*" in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 7 September 1929.[1] It praises the book *La trop longue crise de l'Action Française* by Msgr. Sagot du Vauroux, évêque d'Agen, Paris, Ed. Bloud, 1929[2], a work that "will prove most useful even to those foreigners who cannot understand the origins of the *Action Française*, much less the persistence coupled with obstinacy that blinds its Catholic members to the point that they would rather live and die without the sacraments than renounce the loathsome excesses of their party or their skeptical leaders."[3] *La Civiltà Cattolica* excuses itself for not paying attention more often to the controversy of the *Action Française*, and among other things it states: "Besides, the prolonged crisis does not affect Italy except indirectly and as a reverberation of what might be remotely analogous to the general paganizing tendencies of the modern age."[4]

This is precisely the weakness of the Jesuit position against the *Action Française*, and it is one of the causes of the fanatical rage of Maurras and his followers,[5] who believe that the Vatican has treated them as "*in cor-*

pore vili" and thus put them in the position of the little boy that, once upon a time, always accompanied the English crown prince in order to be flogged in place of the prince when the latter misbehaved. As a result, Maurras and Co. have convinced themselves that they have been attacked for purely political reasons, for if the attack were religiously motivated it would have been universal. Nor would it have been merely verbal; it would also have identified or "punished" individuals and groups in other countries who are on the same ideological plane.

Other information on "Catholic integralists": the *Bloc antirévolutionnaire* of Félix Lacointe, "worthy friend of the already mentioned Boulin and his associates"[6] (I have taken note elsewhere of Boulin and his *Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes*).[7] Lacointe is said to have stated publicly that Cardinal Rampolla was a Freemason, or something of the sort.[8] (Rampolla is also blamed for Leo XIII's "*ralliement*" policy.[9] In this regard, remember that Rampolla's election to the papacy was vetoed in the conclave by Austria, but at Zanardelli's request;[10] new information on Rampolla and his position vis-à-vis Italy is provided by Salata in the first volume of his *Documenti diplomatici sulla questione romana*).[11]

A very significant element in the work being carried out by the Jesuit current in France to establish a centrist Catholic-democratic party is the following historical-ideological motif: Who is responsible for the apostasy of the French people? Solely the democratic intellectuals whose authority figure is Rousseau? No. The ones most responsible are the aristocracy and the upper bourgeoisie who have flirted with Voltaire:

> The traditional demands (of the old monarchists) for a return to the old order are even respectable, although they are impracticable under the present circumstances. The fact that they are impracticable is, above all, the fault of a large segment of the French aristocracy and bourgeoisie, for ever since the eighteenth century the apostasy and corruption of this ruling class has been the source of the apostasy and corruption of the French masses, proving even then that *regis ad exemplum totus componitur orbis*. Voltaire was the idol of that segment of the aristocracy that was corrupt and corrupted its own people by proffering scandalous explanations of their faith and virtuousness and by so doing dug its own grave. It is true that when Rousseau came along with his subversive democracy in opposition to the Voltairean aristocracy, the two currents of apostasy entered into theoretical conflict with each other, like two choruses in a Greek tragedy. They were both wrong for opposite reasons, but together they produced the same practical and ruinous result: they swelled the revolutionary torrent.[12]

Etc., etc. The same thing today: Maurras and Co. are against Rousseau's democracy and the "democratic excesses" ("excesses," mind you, only the

"excesses") of *Sillon*,[13] but they are "followers and admirers of Voltaire's writings." (Jacques Bainville has edited a sumptuous edition of Voltaire, and the Jesuits will never forget him.)[14] Apropos of this question on the apostasy of the people in France, *La Civiltà Cattolica* cites an article in *La Croix* of 15–16 August 1929, "L'apostasie navrante de la masse populaire en France," that refers to the book *Pour faire l'avenir* by Father Croizier of the "Action Populaire," published in 1929 by SPES of Paris.[15]

La Civiltà Cattolica (following in the footsteps of the bishop of Agen) identifies four more groups of followers of Maurras and Co., in addition to the *conservatives* and the *monarchists*: (1) the *snobs* (because of the literary skills of Maurras, above all); (2) worshipers of violence or of strong action, "with an excessive emphasis on authority, inclined toward despotism, under the guise of resisting the spirit of insubordination or social subversion of the present age"; (3) the "false mystics," "believers in prophecies of extraordinary restorations, wonderful conversions, and providential missions" destined to be fulfilled by none other than Maurras and Co. Since the times of Pius X, these "undaunted" people have been excusing Maurras's lack of faith by attributing it to an "absence of grace," "almost as if the grace needed to convert were not given to everyone or is not endowed on those who resist falling and persisting in error." Therefore, these people are heretics because, in order to justify Maurras, they repeat Jansenist and Calvinist positions. The fourth group (the most dangerous, according to *La Civiltà Cattolica*) consists of the so-called integralists (*La Civiltà Cattolica* points out that the bishop of Agen also calls them "integrists," "but it is well known that they are not to be confused with the political party of the 'integrists,' as they are called, in Spain"). "Even in Italy," writes *La Civiltà Cattolica*, these "integralists did not fail to support the positivists and nonbelievers of the *Action Française*, simply because they were violently opposed to liberalism and other forms of modernist errors, without realizing that they had gone to opposite extremes, which were equally erroneous, pernicious, etc."

> Thus we have noticed, even in Italy, some publications of theirs make no more than a fleeting reference to the condemnation of the *Action Française*, instead of publishing the documents of the condemnation, explaining its meanings and the reasons for it; on the other hand, they dwell on the condemnation of *Sillon*, reprinting it and commenting on it, almost as if the two movements that are hostile toward each other, but both of which are similar in their opposition to Catholic doctrine, were not equally contemptible. It is noteworthy that almost every issue of such publications (*Fede e Ragione*?)[16] contains some accusation or outburst against Catholic writers, but they seem to lack the space or the energy for an honest and vigorous treatment of the condemnation of the followers of the *Action Française*. Instead, they often repeat the calum-

nies—such as the one about a supposed turn to the Left, or toward liberalism, popularism, false democracy—against those who did not subscribe to their methods.[17]

(In the "Catholic integralist" current one must also include Henri Massis and the movement of the "defenders of the West"[18]; bear in mind Father Rosa's gibes against Massis in his response to Ugo Ojetti's letter.)[19]

This note may provide a suggestion for the "Past and present" series.

Cf. Notebook 20, §4.

§<142>. *Philosophical novels, utopias, etc.* This set of inquiries should include the question of government by the Jesuits in Paraguay and the literature which it inspired.[1] *Il cristianesimo felice nelle missioni dei Padri della Compania di Gesú.*[2] One could find a whole bibliography on this topic in the histories of the Society of Jesus.

The "Colonia di S. Leucio" established by the Bourbons and discussed with such great sympathy by Colletta:[3] was it not the last wave of the popularity of the Jesuits' Paraguayan administrative system?

§<143>. *The international function of Italian intellectuals.* See the article "La politica religiosa di Costantino Magno" in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 7 September 1929.[1] It discusses a book by Jules Maurice, *Constantin le Grand: L'origine de la civilisation chrétienne,* Paris, Ed. SPES (n.d.),[2] which presents some interesting viewpoints on the first official contact between the empire and Christianity that are useful for this survey (historical reasons why Latin became the language of Christianity in the West, giving rise to Middle Latin). See also Salvatorelli's "profile" of Constantine (Ed. Formiggini).[3]

§<144>. *Encyclopedic notions.* How did the concept of "tyranny of the majority" come into existence among the publicists of the restoration? A concept found among the "individualists," such as Nietzsche, but also among the Catholics. According to Maurras,[1] the "tyranny of the majority" is admissible in small countries, such

as Switzerland, since Swiss citizens share more or less the same conditions, but it is disastrous in those countries, like France, where conditions are very disparate.

§<145>. *Past and present. Primitive and nonprimitive Christianity.* An article in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of 21 December 1929: "I novelli B.B. martiri inglesi difensori del primato romano."[1] During Henry VIII's persecutions, "the Blessed Fisher led the resistance, even though *the majority* of the clergy made a show of its culpable and illegitimate submission by promising—in an act that was described as the 'capitulation of the clergy'—to make all ecclesiastical laws subject to the approval of the king" (15 May 1532).[2]

When Henry imposed the "oath of allegiance" and wanted to be recognized as head of the church, "many members of the clergy, *faced with the threat of losing their property* and their lives unfortunately caved in—or at least gave the appearance of doing so—and caused great scandal among the faithful."[3]

§<146>. *Political-military leadership in the war of 1914.* It seems that in certain countries the formation of select assault troops has proven to be catastrophic: the part of the army specializing in combat has been sent forward to be destroyed instead of being held on to as a "structural" component of the morale of the mass of soldiers. According to General Krassnoff (in his notorious novel),[1] that is exactly what happened in Russia in 1915. This observation can be useful as a corrective critique of the opinions recently expressed by the German general von Seeckt on specialized professional armies, which, in his view, would be especially good for offensive purposes.[2]

§<147>. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals.* On the fact that the bourgeoisie of the communes was unable to go beyond the corporative phase and hence cannot be said to have created a state, whereas the church and the empire were really the state: before writing anything on this, it is necessary to read Gioacchino Volpe's *Il Medio Evo*.[1] I am extracting the following passage from Riccardo Bacchelli's article ("Le molte vite") in *La Fiera*

Letteraria of 1 July 1928: "But lest we wander into prehistory and stray away from this book, in *Il Medioevo*, Volpe writes on how the people of the communes emerged and lived in the condition of *sacrificed privilege* constructed for them by the Universal Church and by that idea of the Holy Empire that Italy imposed (!) on Europe as the synonym and equivalent of human civilization and that Europe acknowledged and cultivated; this subsequently obstructed (!?) the most (!) natural historical development of Italy into a modern nation."[2] One should check whether Volpe authorizes these . . . bizarre ideas.

§<148>. *Past and present. Inquiries on youth.* The inquiry "on the new generation" published in *La Fiera Letteraria* between 2 December 1928 and 17 February 1929.[1] Not very interesting. University professors do not know young students well. The most frequent refrain is: the young no longer devote themselves to studying and to learning for its own sake; they seek immediate rewards. Agostino Lanzillo responds:[2] "At the present time, *especially*, we do not know the minds of the young and their feelings. It is difficult to win their minds: they quite *voluntarily* keep silent about cultural, social, and moral problems. Is it *diffidence* or disinterest?" (*La Fiera Letteraria*, 9 December 1928). Lanzillo's is the only sensible observation in the inquiry. Lanzillo also points out: ". . . Concrete and efficient work develops an iron discipline and a condition of inner and outer peace, but it does not allow for the free play of contrary political and moral opinions. The young have no arena where they can give vent to their energies and display their exuberant emotions and inclinations. This gives rise to a cold and taciturn attitude that is a given but also conceals *uncertainties*." Giuseppe Lombardo-Radice's response is in the same issue of *La Fiera Letteraria*:[3]

> Today's youth have little patience for scientific and historical studies; very few tackle work that entails long preparation and difficult research. Generally, they want *to get their studies over with*; their primary goal is to find employment quickly. Their minds are alienated from disinterested study; their aspiration is *to make an income*, and they reject careers that they regard as too slow. In spite of all the "philosophy" that is going around, their interest in speculative thought is lacking; their culture is being constructed out of fragments; they

> rarely engage in discussion; they seldom divide themselves into groups and coteries that represent a philosophical or religious view. Their approach to serious problems is marked by skepticism, or by a totally superficial respect for those who take them seriously, *or by the passive adoption of a doctrinal dictum*. . . . In general, those with the best spiritual disposition are the *poorest* university students," and "the wealthier students are, at best, restless, impatient with the discipline of studying, and always in a hurry. They will not produce a class that is spiritually capable of leading our country.

Lanzillo's and Lombardo-Radice's notes are the only interesting items in the whole inquiry, in which, moreover, the responses come almost exclusively from professors in the humanities. Most of them responded with "acts of faith" instead of objective assessments, or else they admitted that they were unable to respond.

§<149>. *Past and present. Education.* The study of Latin is in full decline. In some articles published in *L'Italia Letteraria* toward the end of 1929, Missiroli presented a "depressing" picture of the study of Latin in Italy.[1] *L'Italia Letteraria* has opened an investigation into this question. In his response, Prof. Giuseppe Modugno (a lycée principal and well-known Greek scholar who is also a follower of Gentile's pedagogy) acknowledges that Latin is indeed declining in the schools and goes on to say: "And what about the Gentile reform?[2] What effect has it had on this state of affairs? . . . I am a thoroughgoing admirer (of the reform),"[3] but ". . . an instrument can be perfect, whereas the person using it may be unsuitable. If, as a result, the instrument does harm and fails to produce the intended results, does it necessarily follow that the instrument was badly designed?"[4] Marvelous! There was a time when entrusting a "perfect" instrument to an unsuitable person used to be called abstractionism, antihistoricism, etc.; it used to be said that there are no such things as perfect instruments per se but instruments that correspond to the purpose, are adequate to the situation, etc. See all that has been written, for example, against . . . parliamentarianism.

§<150>. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals. Risorgimento.* In the Risorgimento, one finds the ultimate reflection of the "historical tendency" of the Italian bourgeoisie to keep

itself within the boundaries of "corporativism"; proof of this is its failure to resolve the agrarian question. The representatives of this tendency are the Moderates: both the neo-Guelfs (in them—Gioberti[1]—one sees the universalist-papal character of the Italian intellectuals, which is posited as the premise of the national element) and the followers of Cavour (or the economistic-practical ones, but in the mode of Guicciardinian man,[2] in other words, concerned only with their own "individuality," whence the character of the Italian monarchy). But the traces of medieval universalism were also present in Mazzini, and they caused his political failure, for, if neo-Guelfism succeeded Cavourianism in the moderate current, no organic political formation superseded Mazzinian universalism in the Action Party; it remained, instead, a catalyst of ideological sectarianism and hence of disintegration.[3]

§<151>. *Linguistics.* Importance of Enrico Sicardi's work, *La lingua italiana in Dante,* published in Rome by Casa Ed. Optima, with a preface by Francesco Orestano. I have read G. S. Gargàno's review of it ("La lingua nei tempi di Dante e l'interpretazione della poesia") in *Il Marzocco* of 14 April 1929.[1] Sicardi insists that the "languages" of various writers must be studied if one wants to interpret their poetic world accurately. I do not know if everything Sicardi wrote is correct, especially whether it is "historically" possible to study the "particular" languages of individual writers, *given that* an essential document is missing: i.e., there exists no extensive evidence about the spoken language of these writers' times. Nevertheless, Sicardi's methodological reminder is correct and necessary (remember Vossler's aesthetic analysis—in his book *Idealismo e positivismo nello studio della lingua*—of La Fontaine's fable about the crow and the fox and the erroneous interpretation of *"son bec" stemming from* his ignorance of the historical value of *"son"*).[2]

§<152>. *Utopias, philosophical novels, etc.* Samuel Butler's *Erewhon,* translated by G. Titta Rosa, Casa Ed. Alberto Corticelli, Milan, 1928. "Erewhon" is an anagram of the English word *nowhere,* that is, "in no place," utopia. The novel was written in 1872; it satirizes contemporary culture: Darwinism, Schopen-

hauerianism, etc. (cf. Adolfo Faggi's review, "*Erewhon*," in *Il Marzocco* of 3 March 1929).[1]

§<153>. *Popular literature.* Ferdinando Russo's folkloristic novels and poems (in Neapolitan dialect).[1]

§<154>. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Cardarelli and* La Ronda. Luigi Russo's note on Cardarelli in *La Nuova Italia* of October 1930.[1] Russo sees in Cardarelli the (modern-fossil) type of what the abbé Vito Fornari of Naples was in comparison with De Sanctis.[2] The Crusca dictionary.[3] Counter-Reformation, academy, reaction, etc.

On *La Ronda* and its references to everyday life in 1919–21, see Lorenzo Montano, *Il perdigiorno*, Edizione dell'Italiano, Bologna, 1928 (this little book is a collection of Montano's [topical] observations published by *La Ronda*).[4]

§<155>. *Father Bresciani's progeny.* In its issue of 9 September 1928, *La Fiera Letteraria* published an announcement, "Per un'unione Letteraria europea,"[1] signed by four literary weeklies: *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* of Paris, *La Fiera Letteraria* of Milan, *Die Literarische Welt* of Berlin, and *La Gaceta Literaria* of Madrid. It heralded some kind of collaboration between the men of letters associated with these four weeklies and their counterparts in other European countries, with annual conventions, etc. It was never mentioned again.

§<156>. *Folklore.* A classification or division of popular songs formulated by Ermolao Rubieri: (1) songs composed by the people and for the people; (2) songs composed for the people but not by the people; <(3)> songs written neither by the people nor for the people that the people have nevertheless adopted because they conform to their way of thinking and feeling.[1]

It seems to me that all popular songs could and should be reduced to the third category, since what distinguishes popular song, within the framework of a nation and its culture, is not its artistic element or its historical origin, but its way of conceiving

the world and life, in contrast with official society; here, and only here, should one look for the "collectivity" of popular song and of the people themselves. Other criteria of folklore research follow from this: that the people themselves are not a homogeneous cultural collectivity but present numerous and variously combined cultural layers that, in their pure form, cannot always be identified within given historical popular collectivities. It is true, however, that some identification of these collectivities becomes possible when one "isolates" them more or less historically.

§<157>. *Sicily.* An essay by Giuseppe Bottai on the politics of Giovanni Verga was published in *Studi Verghiani* (in one of the first few issues), which is edited by Lina Perrone.[1] It seems to me that Bottai's conclusions are generally correct: namely, that contrary to some superficial appearances, Verga was never a socialist, nor a democrat, but broadly speaking a "Crispian"[2] ("Crispian" is my word; it does not appear in the extract from Bottai's article published in *L'Italia Letteraria* of 13 October 1929 which I read); in Sicily, the intellectuals fall into two categories—Crispian-unionists and separatist-democrats—separatist in their tendencies, of course. During Nasi's trial,[3] an article by Verga in the newspaper *Sicilia* of 1 November 1907, "which demonstrated the falsity of the thesis backing the notion that the goal of the 1848 Sicilian revolution was independence not unification" (it is remarkable that in 1907 it was still necessary to oppose this thesis). In 1920 a certain Enrico Messineo founded (or wanted to found?) a newspaper, *La Sicilia Nuova*, "in order to champion Sicilian autonomy"; he invited Verga to collaborate, and Verga wrote to him: "I am, first and foremost, an Italian and hence not an autonomist." (This episode concerning Messineo's newspaper should be verified.)

§<158>. *Lorianism. Altimetry, good morals, and intelligence.* Ludovico Zuccolo's "utopia," *Il Belluzzi* [or *La città felice*]—reprinted in the "Curiosità letterarie" series edited by Amy Bernardy and published by Zanichelli[1]—(which is not really a utopia since it talks about the Republic of San Marino) already foreshadows Loria's theory of the connection between altimetry and people's morals.[2] Zuccolo maintains that "meek or dull-minded people are more likely to get together to discuss common

concerns," which explains the solidity of the ordinances of Venice, Switzerland, and Ragusa. On the other hand, people of a vivacious and intense nature, such as the Florentines, are inclined to be overpowering or to concern themselves with "private interests and to ignore public ones." So how does one explain the fact that the people of San Marino, who are by nature vivacious and intense, have nevertheless maintained a popular government for so many centuries? Because in San Marino the thin air, which makes bodies sturdy and vigorous, also produces "pure and sincere minds." It is true that Zuccolo also talks about economic factors, such as the modest levels of individual wealth that explain why the richest are only "slightly better off" and the poorest lack nothing. This equality is assured by good laws: prohibition of usury, inalienable rights to land, etc.

It seems that Zuccolo also wrote a genuine "utopia," *La Repubblica di Evandria*, set on a peninsula off the antipodes of Italy; according to Gargàno—"Un utopista di senso pratico" (*Il Marzocco*, 2 February 1930)—it is related to T. Moore's *Utopia* and is what led to *Il Belluzzi*.[3]

Cf. Notebook 28, §18.

§<159>. *Risorgimento. The first Italian Jacobins.* Cf. Giulio Natali, *Cultura e poesia in Italia nell'età napoleonica*, Turin, Sten, 1930, in the "Studii e saggi" series. (Lomonaco, author of the *Rapporto a Carnot*, has a special essay that is very interesting.)[1]

§<160>. *Renaissance.* Giuseppe Toffanin's book, *Che cosa fu l'umanesimo: Il Risorgimento dell'antichità classica nella coscienza degli italiani fra i tempi di Dante e la Riforma*, Florence, Sansoni (Biblioteca Storica del Rinascimento), is very important.[1] Toffanin, up to a certain point, grasps the reactionary and medieval character of humanism: "That particular state of mind and culture in Italy between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries called humanism was a *recuperation*,[2] and it represented—for two centuries, at least—a *barrier* against a certain heterodox and romantic restlessness that had already existed in embryonic form in the period of the communes and later acquired the upper hand with the reforms. It was the spontaneous conciliation of discordant ideal elements, an acceptance of limits that was antiphilosophical par excellence. But this antiphilosophy, once it was thought out and embraced, was itself a philosophy as well."[3] Cf. Vittorio Rossi's

article (already analyzed)[4] that endorses a part of Toffanin's thesis but only in order to be in a better position to oppose it. It seems to me that the question of what humanism was cannot be resolved, except within a more comprehensive framework of the history of Italian intellectuals and their function in Europe. Toffanin has also written a book on the *Fine dell'umanesimo*, as well as a volume on *Il Cinquecento* in the Collezione Vallardi.[5]

§<161>. *Encyclopedic notions. "Ascaro."* This is what they used to call the deputies who belonged to the parliamentary majorities and had neither a program nor a defined course of action: that is, deputies always ready to defect.[1] The word is connected to the early encounters with indigenous mercenary troops in Eritrea. Similarly, the word "*crumiro*" is connected to the French occupation of Tunisia that was carried out under the pretext of driving back the Krumiri tribe that was raiding Algeria from Tunisia to commit plunder. It would be interesting to find out who introduced the word into the vocabulary of trade unionists.[2]

Cf. Notebook 26, §10.

NOTES

NOTEBOOK 3 (1930)

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

A ruled school notebook (14.7×19.8 cm) with hard black covers and a red spine. A label on the front cover carries the imprint of the stationer: "Gius. Laterza e figli, Bari." Inside the blank space of the label, Gramsci's prison number (7047) is written in a blue pencil. (The label is not signed by the prison warden.) After Gramsci's death, Tatiana Schucht glued another label on the upper right-hand corner of the cover; on it she wrote "Completo XX da pg. 1 a 160" ("Complete XX from pp. 1 to 160"). The Roman numerals indicate the number that Schucht assigned to the notebook according to the cataloging system she had devised when organizing Gramsci's papers soon after his death.

The notebook consists of seventy-nine leaves with twenty-one lines on each side and unlined endpapers in front and back. The recto sides of the leaves are numbered (1–79) in green ink and stamped with the prison seal: "Casa penale speciale di Turi" (Special prison of Turi). The recto side of the endpaper inside the back cover is numbered "80" but not stamped with the prison seal; it is otherwise blank. Gramsci wrote on both sides of the lined leaves, filling all of them with his notes; this notebook thus contains 158 manuscript pages. In all, the notebook comprises 166 notes or sections. Of these, 71 notes were crossed out but remain perfectly legible (following V. Gerratana's denomination these entries are called A texts), and Gramsci incorporated all but two of them in other notebooks. The two exceptions are §126 ("The formation of the Italian educated classes and their cosmopolitan function") and §152 (" 'Spectator' =

Mario Missiroli"). The other 95 notes are B texts, that is, they were neither crossed out nor used again in subsequent notebooks.

Most of the entries in this notebook are directly related to Gramsci's systematic review of the periodicals he was able to receive in prison. The first two notes are based on articles that appeared in *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* of October 12 and November 2, 1929; most probably, however, the notebook was not started until sometime in April or May 1930. In §13 (on p. 9v of the manuscript), Gramsci, in the course of discussing Alfredo Panzini's biography of Cavour, which had been serialized by *L'Italia Letteraria* in its weekly issues between June 9 and October 13, 1929, makes the following observation: "As of this date (30 May 1930) it has not been published in book form." It is also extremely likely that §19, §20, and §21 (pp. 13r–13v in the manuscript) were written prior to June 15, 1930, since they contain detailed references to publications (Mussolini's *Gli accordi del Laterano*, a report by the commission of inquiry on the polar expedition of the airship *Italia*, and the *Nuova Antologia* of September 1, 1927) that Gramsci himself listed among the "Books Delivered to Tatiana" on that date (see Notebook 2, Description of the Manuscript, 1:528–29). On the other hand, the entries from p. 57r to the end of the manuscript could not have been written before late August 1930: §101 (p. 57r) refers to an article published in *L'Italia Letteraria* of August 24, 1930. By the time he completed this notebook, Gramsci had already started—and was well into—Notebook 4. (During this same period he was also still writing in Notebook 2.) In fact, in §154 of Notebook 3 (p. 74r in the manuscript) Gramsci refers to an observation he had made in §5 of Notebook 4 (p. 46v in the manuscript).

In *L'officina gramsciana: Ipotesi sulla struttura dei "Quaderni del carcere"* (Naples: Bibliopolis, 1984), pp. 140–41, Gianni Francioni offers the following chronology of the composition of Notebook 3:

§§ 1–13: between May 20 and May 30, 1930
14–27: June 1930 (before June 15)
28–56: between June and July 1930
57–60: July 1930
61–62: between July and August 1930
63–104: August 1930
105–42: between August and September 1930 (before October 2)
143–62: between September and October 1930
163–66: October 1930

NOTES TO THE TEXT

§1. *The French intellectuals*

1. Pierre Mille, "Deux époques littéraires et d'angoisse: 1815–1830 et 1918–1930," *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* 8, no. 365 (October 12, 1929.

2. André Berge, "L'Esprit de la littérature moderne," *Revue des Deux Mondes* (October 1929).

3. Emmanuel Berl, *Mort de la pensée bourgeoise* (Paris: Grasset, 1929). This book attacks the central point made by Julien Benda in his *La trahison des clercs* (brought up by Gramsci in the next note). Whereas Benda accused the intellectuals of pandering to political passions and popular prejudices, Berl maintained that the political thinking of the intellectuals was too far removed from political reality.

§2. *Julien Benda*

1. Julien Benda, "Libres opinions: Comment un écrivain sert-il l'universel?" in *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* 8, no. 368 (November 2, 1929). In this note, Gramsci summarizes, and in some instances reproduces word for word, the contents of this article. He inserts his own comments within parentheses. Benda's best-known book, *La trahison des clercs* (Paris: Grasset, 1927)—of which Gramsci owned a copy in prison—was translated into English by Richard Aldington and published under different titles in Britain and the United States: *The Great Betrayal* (London: Routledge, 1928), *The Treason of the Intellectuals* (New York: Morrow, 1928), and *The Betrayal of the Intellectuals* (Boston: Beacon, 1955).

Julien Benda (1867–1956), a philosopher and novelist, was among the severest critics of the currents of romanticism in French culture. In two of his earliest books, he staged a vigorous attack against Henri Bergson's philosophical espousal of intuitionism. Charles Maurras and Maurice Barrès were among his most prominent targets in *La trahison des clercs*. Benda berated many of the intellectuals of his time for abandoning critical integrity and succumbing to racial prejudice, blind nationalism, and political convenience.

2. Eduard Wechssler, *Esprit und Geist: Versuch einer Wesenskunde des Deutschen und des Franzosen* (Bielefeld: Velhagen and Klasing, 1927).

3. For other comparisons between Benda and Croce, see Notebook 10, II, §41(iv) and §47.

4. Here and throughout, although "cf." almost certainly means "see," Gramsci's usage is ambiguous, so I have chosen to follow his practice without interpreting his meaning.

5. "It is the role of the masters to justify the habits and prejudices proper to France, so as to prepare our children in the best possible way to take their place in the national procession."

6. Benda makes the same point in a note in *The Betrayal of the Intellectuals* (Boston: Beacon, 1955): "What Barrès wrote: 'The part of the masters is to justify the habits and prejudices of France, so as best to prepare our children to take their place in the national procession,' he certainly meant that he and his colleagues were to walk in this procession" (183).

Maurice Barrès (1862–1923), novelist, polemicist, and politician, was a fervent propagandist of intransigent French nationalism, which he combined with a celebration of a peculiar brand of individualism. He shared many of the same views as Charles Maurras, although he was not himself a monarchist. In 1906 he was elected to the Académie Française and to the French parliament.

§3. *German intellectuals*

1. This note is partly a summary and partly a literal translation of André Levinson's article "Jacob Wassermann et le procès de la justice," *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* 8, no. 366 (October 19, 1929). Gramsci's only comment appears in the form of a parenthetical exclamation point in the penultimate paragraph of the note.

2. Hans Frank, *Recht ist Unrecht: Neun Novellen um eine Wahrheit* (Leipzig: Haessel, 1928).

3. Leonhard Frank, *Die Ursache* (Munich, 1916). Leonhard Frank (1882–1961), a novelist and playwright, was born in Germany but started his writing career in Switzerland, from whence he was compelled to flee because of his pacifist convictions. His works embody an extensive criticism of bourgeois institutions and of many different aspects of bourgeois culture. He was elected to the German Academy of Letters in 1927 but was forced into exile in 1933, when the Nazis banned his books. *Die Ursache*, an attack on the educational system, was first published in Switzerland in 1915; it has been translated into English as *The Cause of the Crime* (London: P. Davies, 1928).

4. Franz Werfel (1890–1945), a German poet, playwright, and novelist born in Prague, became a staunch antimilitarist after his war experience on the front. He achieved his first success as a playwright in 1916, with an adaptation of Euripides' *Trojan Women*. His first major novel, *Verdi, Roman der Oper*, was published in 1924 and translated into English as *Verdi: A Novel of the Opera* (1925). Werfel, a Jew, fled Nazi Germany and spent some years in France before emigrating to the United States.

"Quincey" is, most probably, a misspelling meant to refer to the lawyer Josiah Quincy (1744–75) who, together with John Adams, successfully defended the British soldiers responsible for the Boston Massacre of 1770.

5. Gerhart Hauptmann (1862–1946), a German playwright who won the Nobel Prize in 1912, wrote *Michael Kramer*, a play in four acts, in 1900.

6. Gramsci gives the title of Jakob Wassermann's short story as "Un padre," a direct translation of "Un père," as it appears in Levinson's article, which gives no indication of the original title of the story in German.

7. Jakob Wassermann, *Der Fall Maurizius* (Berlin, 1928). Gramsci is referring to the following passage in Levinson's article: "Or, l'*Affaire Mauritzius* expose et discute une situation particulière; il ne s'agit pas des mobiles d'un crime, mais des vices d'un verdict; c'est le juge qui est sur la sellette, ou, en l'espèce, l'avocat général, et, avec lui, la justice. De cette situation renversée, la scène des assises dans *Résurrection* de Tolstoï, où le juré est appelé à juger la fille perdue, déchue par sa faute, est le modèle saisissant."

Jakob Wassermann (1873–1934), a novelist whose moral intensity has been likened to Dostoyevsky's, reached the height of his popularity in Europe in the 1920s and early 1930s. *Der Fall Maurizius*, generally regarded as his best novel, has been translated into English; see *The Maurizius Case*, trans. C. Newton (New York: Liveright, 1929).

§4. *Emmanuel Berl*

1. In *Mort de la pensée bourgeoise*, already cited in the first note of Notebook 3, Berl offers Zola as an example of the "revolutionary" writer capable of producing a literature that is in touch with political reality and accessible to the people. These views are reiterated in his speech on Zola, which Gramsci summarizes in this note.

2. Gramsci summarizes and quotes from the text of Berl's speech as it was published (together with an account of the commemoration held at Zola's house in Médan) in *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* 8, no. 36 (October 12, 1929). He inserts his own comments in parentheses.

3. Emile Zola died in 1902. On Jean Jaurès, see Notebook 2, §75, n. 4.

4. Pierre Hamp (1876–1962) is said to "deal with the people" because of the industrial setting of his novels.

5. Victor Margueritte (1866–1942) wrote mostly historical novels, many of them in collaboration with his elder brother, Paul Margueritte (1860–1918), who in 1887 joined four other novelists and signed the "Manifesto of the Five" strongly denouncing Zola's novel *La terre* and his theories of naturalism.

6. Henri Barbusse (1873–1935) wrote some symbolist poetry and a novel in the naturalist mold before volunteering for the infantry and experiencing combat in World War I. In 1916 he published *Le feu*—in English, *Under Fire* (London: Dent, 1917)—which won him the Prix Goncourt. An antiwar novel, *Le feu* poignantly describes the horrors faced by ordinary soldiers in the trenches. Barbusse became a pacifist and

then a communist. After the publication of *Clarté* in 1919 (translated into English by F. Wray the same year; see *Light* [New York: Dutton, 1919]) his writings and activities became more explicitly political and militant. In 1928 he established the periodical *Monde* with the backing of the French Communist Party. Toward the end of his life he moved to the Soviet Union, where he died. Gramsci met Henri Barbusse in December 1920, when the latter delivered a lecture on the Clarté movement at the Casa del Popolo in Turin.

7. "And all around us we sense the growth of this hunger among the people; they question us and we are unable to answer, they press us and we are not able to respond, they call for a justification of their pain and we are unable to give them one. One might say that the giant factories create a zone of silence from which the worker can no longer escape and which the intellectual can no longer enter. The two are so separated that the intellectual who has emerged out of a working-class milieu can no longer find access to that milieu."

8. "Difficult loyalty, Jean Guéhenno writes. Perhaps an impossible loyalty. The scholarship student, contrary to what one might hope, contributes nothing at all to the construction of a bridge between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. He is just one more bourgeois, and that's all. But his brothers cease to recognize him; they no longer see him as one of their own. Since the people do not participate in any way in the discourse of the intellectuals, they must either oppose the intellectuals and construct a sort of nationality with a language of its own or else have no language at all and sink into a sort of barbarism."

9. "With Zola, then, or with nothing; fraternity or death. This is our motto. This is our drama. And this is our law."

§5. *America*

1. Lamberti Sorrentino, "Latinità dell'America" (The Latinity of America), *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 38 (December 22, 1929). The rest of this note summarizes and quotes from Sorrentino's article. Gramsci encloses his own observations in parentheses.

2. Emphasis added by Gramsci.

§6. *What do the young think?*

1. Mario Missiroli, "Filosofia della rivoluzione" (Philosophy of revolution), *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 38 (December 22, 1929). In this article, Missiroli discusses the results of the work by Professor Del Vecchio's students, which, as he indicates, were published under the title "Esercitazioni di filosofia del diritto" (Exercises in legal philosophy). Missiroli con-

tinued his discussion a week later in another article: "Opinioni di giovani" (The opinions of young people), *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 39 (December 29, 1929). On Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

2. On Giorgio Del Vecchio, see Notebook 2, §25, n. 1.

§7. The people (oh!), the public (oh!)

1. In 1923 Mussolini managed to secure enough votes in parliament to pass the hotly contested Acerbo Electoral Law (named after the undersecretary of state, Giacomo Acerbo, who drafted it). The law guaranteed the party that received the largest number of votes (provided it was over 25 percent of the total) in national elections two-thirds of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies (i.e., the lower house of parliament). On passage of the bill, Mussolini dissolved parliament, and parliamentary elections were held in April 1924. Thanks to the electoral reform the Fascists and their allies secured 374 out of the 535 seats, which effectively enabled them to establish their dictatorship. The law was modified again in May 1928. This time, the number of parliamentary seats was reduced to 400, and the new law stipulated that a single list of candidates selected by the Fascist Grand Council (from among a thousand names supplied to it by the employers' and workers' confederations) would be submitted to the electorate for approval in a plebiscite. The complex provisions of the new law also reduced the total number of eligible voters by about three million. A plebiscite under this law was held in March 1929.

2. Gramsci did not have access to Giuseppe Ungaretti's article in *Il Resto del Carlino*; the quotation is extracted from an unsigned article, "Molti critici" (Many critics), in the "Rassegna della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 31 (November 3, 1929).

Giuseppe Ungaretti (1888–1970), a poet, spent some years studying in France prior to World War I and was attracted to the symbolists and other exponents of the literary and artistic avant-garde. He also established links with the Italian futurists and published some of his early poems in the futurist journal *Lacerba*. His war experience in the trenches helped shape his first two volumes of poetry. The obscurity and difficulty of his verse led some critics to label him a hermeticist. Gramsci expresses his dislike of Ungaretti in several notes; see especially Notebook 9, §2, and Notebook 17, §44.

3. *Il Popolo d'Italia* was one such newspaper. Founded by Mussolini in 1914, it was in its early years an organ for advocates of intervention in the World War. Mussolini retained personal control of *Il Popolo d'Italia* until he became prime minister in 1922. *Il Popolo d'Italia* then became the quasi-official newspaper of the Fascist regime. It ceased publication in 1943.

§8. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. Riccardo Bacchelli, *Il diavolo al Pontelungo*, 2 vols. (Milan: Ceschina, 1927). Gramsci owned a copy of this novel. It is among the "Books to Be Delivered to Tatiana: 13 March 1930" that Gramsci listed in Notebook 1 (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:371). In an April 7, 1930, letter to Tatiana Schucht, Gramsci discusses this novel in relation to the Italian novelistic tradition:

> *Il diavolo al Pontelungo* is quite "historical" in the sense that the experiment of Baronata and the episode in Bologna in 1874 really took place. Like all historical novels that exist, the general framework is historical, but not the individual characters and events, one by one. What makes this novel interesting, apart from its considerable artistic qualities, is the almost complete absence of sectarian acerbity on the author's part. In Italian literature, apart from Manzoni's historical novel, there exists an essentially sectarian tradition in this sort of work, which goes back to the period between 1848 and 1860; on one side stands the founder Guerrazzi, on the other Bresciani, the Jesuit priest. For Bresciani, all patriots were scoundrels, cowards, assassins, etc., while the defenders of the throne and the altar, as one used to say in those days, were all little angels descended on earth to display miracles. For Guerrazzi, obviously, the roles were reversed; the Papists were all of them dipped in the blackest pitch, while the supporters of national unity and independence were all the purest heroes of legend. This tradition has been preserved until recently by the two traditional opponents in pulp serial novels; in the so-called artistic and cultivated literature, the Jesuit side has held the monopoly. In *Il diavolo al Pontelungo*, Bacchelli proves to be independent, or almost; his humor rarely becomes partisan, it resides in the things themselves, rather than in the writer's extraartistic partisanship.

For more on Riccardo Bacchelli, see Notebook 1, §32, n. 9.

2. Riccardo Bacchelli, *The Devil at Long Bridge*, trans. and intro. Orlo Williams (New York: Longmans, 1929). Williams's introductory essay (pp. ix–xvi) was published in Italian translation under the title "Il Bacchelli sul Tamigi" (Bacchelli on the Thames) in *La Fiera Letteraria* 5, no. 4 (January 27, 1929).

3. On Bacchelli's *Lo sa il tonno* (to which Gramsci also alludes in Notebook 1, §32), Orlo Williams writes: "In *Lo sa il tonno*, in which a young and well-brought-up fish sets out to see the world of fishes, meets adventures, wins a wife, and, in the end returns too wise a fish to rub along

comfortably with his congeners, Bacchelli exploits [his] philosophic faculty to the full. The society painted is Italian in type and sentiment, Italian the satirical, pungent, and rather contemptuous wit with which Bacchelli caricatures it" (Bacchelli, *The Devil at Long Bridge*, pp. xiii–xiv).

4. Bacchelli did indeed write for *La Voce*, but he never edited it. Gramsci may be confusing Bacchelli with Scipio Slataper, who twice served as acting editor of *La Voce*—in March 1910, while the regular editor, Giuseppe Prezzolini, was in Paris, and from December 1911 to March 1912. There was also a short period (April to October 1912) when Giovanni Papini substituted for Giuseppe Prezzolini as editor of *La Voce*.

5. Carlo Cafiero (1846–92), born of a wealthy noble family, was groomed for a diplomatic career that he abandoned early in favor of revolutionary politics. He joined the First International, came to know Marx and Engels in London, and helped reorganize the Neapolitan section of the International; he also published an abridged version of *Capital*—the *Compendio del Capitale* (1879). Before long, however, Cafiero shifted his allegiance to the anarchist movement. he became one of Mikhail Bakunin's close associates and, together with Errico Malatesta and Andrea Costa, a leading exponent of anarchism in Italy. He played an active role in a number of anarchist ventures, including the insurrection of 1874 in Bologna. In the end, Cafiero went insane, but by then he had left the anarchist movement to make common cause with the parliamentary socialists.

Andrea Costa (1851–1910), one of the most important founders of the socialist movement in Italy, was at first a fervent follower of Bakunin. While still in his twenties he launched two anarchist publications, *Fascio Operaio* and *Il Martello*. In 1874 he helped plan the uprising in Bologna; two years later he was imprisoned for his revolutionary activities. He moved to Paris in 1876; there he met Anna Kulischoff who, it is generally believed, persuaded him to abandon anarchism and pursue the path of socialism. (She herself had broken off with Bakunin's anarchist movement and converted to Marxism.) On his return to Italy in 1880, he started publication of the *Rivista Internazionale del Socialismo*, and a year later he founded the weekly *Avanti!* In 1882 he became the first socialist to be elected to parliament in Italy. In 1892 Costa was responsible for convening the Congress of Genoa that established the Partito dei Lavoratori Italiani, which in its third congress changed its name formally to become the Italian Socialist Party (PSI).

6. This parenthetical remark is Gramsci's interpolation. He is referring to Francesco De Sanctis's essay "L'uomo del Guicciardini" (The Guicciardinian man) in his *Saggi Critici*, ed. P. Arcari (Milan: Treves, 1924), 3:28–49. This three-volume edition of De Sanctis's critical essays was among the books Gramsci had with him in prison.

7. Ettore Zoccoli, *L'anarchia: Gli agitatori, le idee, i fatti* (Turin: Bocca, 1907).

8. Max Nettlau, *Mikhail Bakunin, eine Biographie*, 2 vols. (London, 1896–1900).

9. The parenthetical correction is Gramsci's. James Guillaume was one of the most active Swiss anarchists from the French-speaking Jura. Among other things, he was editor of the *Bulletin of the Jurassian Federation*.

10. James Guillaume, *L'Internationale: Documents et souvenirs (1860–1878)*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1905–10).

11. In 1873 Cafiero purchased Baronata—a house and some land in the vicinity of Locarno—for Bakunin and his family to live in. The place was also used as a refuge by the anarchists, and arms were stored there. Because of bad management, however, it proved too expensive to maintain; in 1874 Bakunin had to move out, and he went to live in Lugano, where he spent the last two years of his life.

12. Alexander Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts*, 6 vols., trans. Constance Garnett (New York: Knopf, 1922–27). Knopf released a revised four-volume edition of this work in 1968.

Alexander Herzen (1812–70) was born in Moscow, the illegitimate son of a wealthy nobleman. A man of great learning and superb literary skills, he is best known as a progenitor of revolutionary socialism in Russia. His early political thought consisted of an amalgam of idealism and Saint-Simon's utopian socialism. In 1834 he was arrested for his subversive political views, and he spent the following eight years in internal exile. The experience served to radicalize him even further. His political philosophy had become more left-Hegelian by the time he returned to Moscow in 1842, and in the next few years he drew closer to anarchism and the theories of Proudhon. In 1847 Herzen left Russia and moved to France. Over the years he came to know and befriend many of Europe's leading intellectuals and political revolutionaries, among them Michelet, Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Victor Hugo. He spent the last twenty years of his life in England, where he founded periodicals and newspapers—such as *The Polar Star* and *Kolokol* (The bell)—intended for clandestine distribution in czarist Russia. Herzen had a special interest in and very close ties with Italian revolutionaries. Gramsci alludes in passing to Herzen's influence on Mazzini, Pisacane, and others in Notebook 15, §52, and Notebook 17, §28.

13. Orlo Williams quotes Bacchelli's letter in his introduction to *The Devil at Long Bridge* (pp. xv–xvi).

§9. *The academy of Ten*

1. Curzio Malaparte, "Una specie d'Accademia" (A sort of academy) in *La Fiera Letteraria* 4, no. 23 (June 3, 1928). The article focuses on the for-

tunes of a novel entitled *Lo zar non è morto* (The czar is not dead) that was purportedly coauthored by ten writers.

2. Giacomo Di Giacomo started organizing Fascist trade unions for intellectuals and writers very early in the 1920s. By 1922 he was the secretary-general of the National Federation of Intellectual Unions. Toward the end of the decade all the intellectual unions were absorbed by the Fascist Confederation of Professionals and Artists and Di Giacomo became its president. *Il Raduno* was the organ of the Artists' and Writers' Union.

3. Gramsci's emphasis and parenthetical comments.

4. Pietro Fedele (1873–1953), a professor of medieval and Renaissance history at the University of Rome, was first elected to parliament in 1919 as a Nationalist. He joined the Fascist Party in 1924, and the following year he succeeded Giovanni Gentile as minister of education, a post he held for over four years. Fedele favored a law, passed in 1925, that enabled the dismissal of university professors from their posts for lack of loyalty to the state, as was already possible for all other government employees. He also played a role in the founding of the Royal Academy of Italy. Fedele was made a senator in 1928.

On Emilio Bodrero, see Notebook 2, §25, n. 1.

5. Curzio Malaparte, "Coda di un'Accademia" (The tail end of an academy), *La Fiera Letteraria* 4, no. 25 (June 17, 1928).

6. Emilio Salgari (1863–1911), a prolific author of popular fiction, was best known for his stories of pirates and of adventures in exotic jungle settings. His work had no literary pretensions and appealed mostly to children. In 1927 *Il Raduno* proclaimed him one of the greatest Italian writers, overshadowing even the "democrat" Jules Verne. Gramsci makes another reference to this incident in Notebook 3, §36.

§10. *Proudhon and the Italian literati (Raimondi, Jahier)*

1. Giuseppe Raimondi, "Rione Bolognina" (A Bologna neighborhood), *La Fiera Letteraria* 4, no. 25 (June 17, 1928). Proudhon's motto—"Poverty is good, and we should regard it as our source of joy"—is used by Raimondi as an epigraph for his article.

2. The parenthetic comment is Gramsci's.

3. On the same topic, see Notebook 1, §94. For more on Raimondi and Jahier, see Notebook 1, §94, n. 1.

§11. *Americanism*

1. "Pirandello parla della Germania, del cinema sonoro, e di altre cose" (Pirandello discusses Germany, the talkies, and other matters), *L'Italia*

Letteraria 1, no. 5 (April 14, 1929)—a report of an interview by the Berlin correspondent, Corrado Alvaro.

Corrado Alvaro (1895–1956), essayist and author of short stories and novels (many of them set in Calabria), spent some years (1930–35) traveling abroad as a special correspondent for several Italian newspapers and periodicals.

§12. *David Lazzaretti*

1. Domenico Bulferetti, "David Lazzaretti e due milanesi" (David Lazzaretti and two Milanese), *La Fiera Letteraria* 4, no. 35 (August 26, 1928).

Davide (or David) Lazzaretti (1834–78) was born in Arcidosso, in the Monte Amiata region, a remote area in the southeastern corner of Tuscany. He fought as a volunteer in the national army in 1860 and was a carter by trade. In 1868 he experienced religious visions, underwent a spiritual conversion, and adopted the life of a hermit. His visions revealed to him that he was a descendant of a French king and that a prophet would come who would free all peoples from despotism and misery. Lazzaretti found many admirers and followers mostly but not exclusively in his region, and he established a number of colonies, or congregations. Twice, in 1871 and 1873, the authorities brought charges against him, but he was never convicted. Eventually, Lazzarretti convinced himself and his followers that he was the messiah of the new order. In his view, the Kingdom of Grace (i.e., the pontificate of Pius IX, who died in February 1878) was coming to an end; it would be followed by the Kingdom of Justice, which in turn would give way to the Reform of the Holy Ghost, namely, the millennium. He was shot dead by the carabinieri when he ceremoniously came down from the mountain near Arcidosso to present himself to the crowds as the messiah and to proclaim the establishment of the republic of God. For a discussion of Lazzaretti and the sociopolitical context of his activities, see E. J. Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels* (New York: Norton, 1965), pp. 65–73.

2. These books are all mentioned by Bulferetti in his article.

Andrea Verga (1811–95), a psychiatrist and the author of *David Lazzaretti e la pazzia sensoria* (David Lazzaretti and sensory madness), was the director of the major hospital in Milan. A professor of clinical medicine, he advocated the introduction of the study of psychiatry into all Italian universities. He was made a senator on 1876.

Cesare Lombroso, *Pazzi e anormali* (The mad and the abnormal), 2d ed. (Città di Castello: Lapi, 1890). On Lombroso, see Notebook 1, §26, n. 1.

Giacomo Barzellotti, *David Lazzaretti* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1885). A revised edition of this book was brought out under a different title:

Monte Amiata e il suo profeta (Monte Amiata and its prophet) (Milan: Treves, 1909). Giacomo Barzellotti (1844–1917), a scholar of philosophy and literature, became a professor of philosophy at the University of Rome in 1896.

3. The parenthetical comment is Gramsci's.

4. Following unification and the establishment of the secular state in Italy, the Vatican declared in 1871 that it was "not expedient" (*non expedit*) for Catholics to participate in national elections. The *non expedit* was actually a prohibition. It was relaxed somewhat in 1904 and tacitly withdrawn in 1913 (with the Gentiloni Pact); however, it remained official church policy until 1919.

5. Giuseppe Rovani (1818–74), a Milanese republican who participated in the war of independence and in the 1848 defense of the Roman republic, wrote historical novels. Some of them were first published in serial form and thus reached a rather wide readership. His best-known work is *Cento anni* (A hundred years), serialized in a Milanese newspaper in 1857–58. *Manfredo Pallavicino* was first published in Milan in 1845.

6. Gramsci is referring to the failed popular uprising in Benevento in 1877 that was led by, among others, the anarchists Carlo Cafiero and Errico Malatesta.

§13. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Alfredo Panzini:* Vita di Cavour

1. Alfredo Panzini's life of Cavour was published in a single volume the following year: *Il conte di Cavour* (Milan: Mondadori, 1931). On Panzini, see Notebook 1, §13, n. 1.

2. Panzini's letter to the editor of *Il Resto del Carlino*, published in *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 13 (June 30, 1929), is a response to an article—signed "Lom."—that appeared in *Il Resto del Carlino* (a Bologna newspaper) on June 23, 1929. "Lom." suggested that certain expressions used by Panzini in his description of Cavour's "dictatorship" were probably a veiled criticism of Mussolini. "It should also be noted that certain barbs against the dictatorship, certain double-edged phrases on how men and people should be governed, certain biting remarks about the present generation of young people—these young people, Mr. Panzini, study hard, much harder than you seem to believe—damage the seriousness and the objectivity of the work. Their exact meaning cannot be pinned down, and they lend themselves to the most diverse interpretations—in any case, they are the kinds of things one would expect to hear from Benedetto Croce rather than from Alfredo Panzini."

Gramsci returns to this question later in this same notebook (see Notebook 3, §38).

3. On the meaning Gramsci attaches to Stenterello in relation to Machiavelli, see Notebook 1, §48, n. 2.

4. Gramsci is thinking of an article by Luigi Russo, "Io dico seguitando . . ." (I follow by saying . . .) in *La Nuova Italia* 1, no. 1 (January 20, 1930): 1–12. In his article, Russo criticizes the fashion of writing biographies in the form of novels. Among other things, he points to "the biographies of Machiavelli narrated as if they were the story of Pinocchio or some such hero . . . or, lives of Cavour described with the same stylistic flourishes that one would use when recounting the exploits of Gelsomino, the king's clown."

§15. *Ettore Ciccotti*

1. Guido De Ruggiero's review is in *La Critica* 28, no. 1 (January 20, 1930): 57–59; and Mario De Bernardi's is in *La Riforma Sociale* 36, nos. 11–12 (November–December 1929): 589–92.

Ettore Ciccotti (1863–1939) started his academic career as a professor of ancient history at an academy in Milan, but he was removed from his post in 1898 because of his involvement in a popular uprising in the same city. Able to resume his teaching some time later, he taught history and Latin literature at various Italian universities. He was also elected to parliament, where he supported the socialist opposition at a time when Giolitti dominated the political scene. He was also interested in and wrote about the southern question in Italy. Ciccotti edited an Italian translation of the works of Marx, Engels, and Lassalle that was first brought out in installments (1899–1911) and then published in an eight-volume edition, of which owned a copy (K. Marx, F. Engels, and F. Lassalle, *Opere*, 8 vols., ed. Ettore Ciccotti, 2d ed., revised [Milan: Società Editrice Avanti, 1922]). Gradually, Ciccotti distanced himself from the Socialist Party, and in 1915, supporting Italy's intervention in the war, he broke off from it completely. He was made a senator in 1924. In his numerous scholarly publications, the influence of positivism is quite marked, as are his leanings toward historical materialism. *Confronti storici* is a study in comparative historiography in which Ciccotti expounds his methodology and principles of interpretation.

2. Gramsci makes a slight error in recording the dates of the two-part publication of Ciccotti's essay: Ettore Ciccotti, "Elementi di 'verità' e di 'certezza' nella tradizione storica" (Elements of "truth" and "certainty" in the historical tradition), *Rivista d'Italia* 30, no. 7 (July 15, 1927): 414–51; and 30, no. 8 (August 15, 1927: 585–616.

3. On Guglielmo Ferrero and Corrado Barbagallo, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 17.

§16. *Political development of the popular class in the medieval commune*

1. See Notebook 3, §15, n. 2, above.
2. I.e., the head of the commune, or city-state.

§17. *1917*

1. In prison Gramsci owned a book by Arrigo Serpieri on the effects of the war on the rural population—*La guerra e le classi rurali Italiane* (Bari: Laterza, and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930)—a publication of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. In a note on p. 70 of his book, Serpieri refers to the two works mentioned here by Gramsci. Riccardo Bachi's *L'alimentazione e la politica annonaria in Italia* (Bari: Laterza, 1926), also a publication of the Carnegie Endowment, discusses the problem of nutrition and food rationing in Italy. Umberto Ricci's *Il fallimento della politica annonaria* is about the failure of food-rationing laws. On Umberto Ricci, Notebook 1, §61, n. 12.

Arrigo Serpieri (1877–1959), a well-known expert in agrarian economy, started his career as a professor of agricultural science and director of an institute for the advanced study of forestry. He served as an undersecretary of agriculture for about a year under Mussolini's regime, and as a member of parliament he drafted the law that came to be known as the Bonificia Integrale (1928). This law established a massive (and very successful) program of land improvement, which included the draining of marshes to reduce malaria and increase agricultural production, the reforestation of mountainous areas to prevent soil erosion, and the construction of irrigation systems. Once the law was enacted, Mussolini appointed Serpieri to oversee its implementation.

§18. *History of the subaltern classes*

1. See Notebook 3, §15, n. 2, above.
2. Tanaquil was the wife of Tarquinius Priscus. Legend has it that the half-Greek and half-Etruscan Tarquinius seized the throne of Rome and held it for almost four decades before being murdered by the sons of his predecessor, Ancus Marcius. Tanaquil, who is said to have encouraged her husband's ambition, is also credited with having thwarted the designs of the murderers and securing the succession of Servius Tullius. The latter was subsequently murdered by order of Tarquinius Superbus (the last king of Rome and the son of Tarquinius Priscus) at the instigation of his wife, Tullia (the daughter of Servius Tullius). Many legends are connected with these intrigues—or "personal episodes," as Gramsci calls them—among

the later kings and the patrician families of Rome; the famous legend of the rape of Lucretia is one of them.

3. The tribunes of the plebs were magistrates of plebeian birth entrusted with the protection of the people. They were elected annually and had the right to call meetings of the plebeians to discuss public affairs and propose changes in the laws.

4. In 1378 the *ciompi* (wage earners in the wool industry), together with the shopkeepers and artisans from the minor guilds, revolted against the oligarchic rule of the patricians in Florence. The Revolt of the Ciompi, which resulted in the establishment of a radically democratic government, proved to be only a temporary setback for the nobles and the powerful merchants (who were the mainstay of the Guelf party). Within four years oligarchic rule was fully restored in the Florentine republic.

§19. *The problem of the young*

1. Gramsci had a copy of this book (a collection of Mussolini's parliamentary speeches on the Lateran Pacts signed between the Vatican and the Italian government in 1929); he lists it in Notebook 2 among the "Books Delivered to Tatiana on 15 June 1930" (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:529).

§20. *Documents of the times*

1. See *Commissione d'indagine per la spedizione Polare dell'aeronave "Italia"* (Rome: *Rivista Marittima*, 1930). Gramsci had a copy of this publication in prison; it is included in the list of "Books Delivered to Tatiana on 15 June 1930" in Notebook 2 (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:528).

In the summer of 1928, the Italian airship *Italia* crashed in the Arctic after it had already conducted a series of flights over unexplored polar regions. A commission of inquiry was set up by the Italian government to look into the accident. In its report, submitted in February 1929 and published in the volume cited by Gramsci, the commission found Umberto Nobile, the commander of the airship, responsible for the disaster, which had cost the lives of seventeen crew members, although Nobile himself and seven of his companions were rescued. As a result, Umberto Nobile (1885–1978), an aeronautical engineer who had already successfully flown over the North Pole in 1926, felt constrained to resign from the air force, in which he held the rank of general. The findings of the commission of inquiry may have been politically motivated: Nobile was not considered a supporter of the Fascist regime. After World War II, the commission's report was discredited, and Nobile was reinstated. In 1946 Nobile was elected to the Constituent Assembly on the list of the Communist Party.

2. Gramsci is referring to a battle fought during World War I in which the Italian army, under the command of General Luigi Cadorna, suffered a devastating and humiliating defeat on the Isonzo front near Caporetto (October 1917) at the hands of the Germans and Austrians. "Caporetto" became part of the Italian language, meaning "catastrophic defeat" or "rout."

§21. *Italian diplomacy before 1914*

1. See Alessandro De Bosdari, "Lo scoppio della guerra balcanica visto da Sofia" (The outbreak of the Balkan War as seen from Sofia), *Nuova Antologia* 62, no. 1331 (September 1, 1927): 90–98. The article reproduces a chapter from De Bosdari's book on the Balkan Wars and World War I. Gramsci quotes the opening of the article and inserts his comments in parentheses.

On Alessandro De Bosdari, see Notebook 2, §33, n. 1.

2. Gramsci is referring to a passage from Francesco Guicciardini's *Ricordi*. See Guicciardini, *Maxims and Reflections*, trans. N. Rubinstein (New York: Harper, 1965), p. 39:

> The pious say that faith can do great things, and, as the gospel tells us, even move mountains. The reason is that faith breeds obstinacy. To have faith means simply to believe firmly—to deem almost a certainty—things that are not reasonable, to believe them more firmly than reason warrants. A man of faith is stubborn in his beliefs; he goes his way, undaunted and resolute, disdaining hardship and danger, ready to suffer any extremity.
>
> Now, since the affairs of the world are subject to chance and to a thousand and one different accidents, there are many ways in which the passage of time may bring unexpected help to those who preserve in their obstinacy. And since this obstinacy is the product of faith, it is then said that faith can do great things.

This passage from Guicciardini's *Ricordi* is quoted in one of the books Gramsci owned in prison, to which he refers on a number of occasions in the notebooks; see Francesco De Sanctis, "L'uomo del Guicciardini" (The Guicciardinian man), in his *Saggi Critici*, ed. P. Arcari (Milan: Treves, 1924), 3:40.

§22. *Lorianism*

1. See Notebook 1, §32.

2. Giacomo Lumbroso in fact died in 1925. On Alberto and Giacomo Lumbroso, see Notebook 1, §32, n. 1.

3. See Vittorio Scialoja, "Giacomo Lumbroso," *Nuova Antologia* 62, no. 1332 (September 16, 1927): 218–22. According to the article, Giacomo Lumbroso "was also a scholar of modern history and literature, with special expertise in the history of the Napoleonic period."

4. Gramsci is referring to Pietro Fedele, already mentioned in Notebook 3, §9.

§23. *Loria*

1. See Achille Loria, *Ricordi di uno studente settuagenario* (Memoirs of a septuagenarian student) (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1927). This book was advertised repeatedly in *Nuova Antologia* and *L'Italia Che Scrive* between August and October 1927; in all probability, this is how Gramsci learned about it.

§24. *Risorgimento motifs. Sicilian separatism*

1. Gramsci is quoting from an unsigned review of Luigi Natoli's book on Sicilian uprisings between 1848 and 1860 and their relation to the Italian unification movement. The review appeared in *Nuova Antologia* 62, no. 1334 (October 16, 1927): 539–40. Another comment by Gramsci on the controversy between Luigi Natoli and Benedetto Croce is in Notebook 1, §43; see also the related note (n. 16).

§25. *The role of Catholics in Italy (Catholic Action)*

1. See Gianforte Suardi, "Quando e come i cattolici poterono partecipare alle elezioni politiche" (When and how Catholics could participate in national political elections), *Nuova Antologia* 62, no. 1335 (November 1, 1927): 118–23. All the information recorded by Gramsci in this note is drawn from Suardi's article, with his clarifications appearing in parentheses.

2. On Tommaso Tittoni, see Notebook 2, §6, n. 1.

3. In September 1904 Italy was shaken by a series of strikes that the Giolitti government tried to repress with force, causing many casualties. Unrest spread throughout the country. On October 18 parliament was dissolved and national elections announced for November 6.

4. The *non expedit* forbade Catholics from voting and from presenting themselves as candidates in national elections, but it did not apply to administrative elections, in which Catholics participated in substantial numbers.

5. Geremia Bonomelli (1831–1914), a bishop, wrote and spoke openly about the need for the Catholic Church to abandon its claims of temporal power. In 1906 he issued a pastoral letter advocating the separation of

church and state. Some of his publications were officially condemned by the Vatican and placed on the index of forbidden books. Bonomelli always submitted to church discipline, however, and hence retained his position and exercised considerable influence. He strongly urged both Leo XIII and Pius X to revoke the *non expedit* and allow Catholics to participate fully in the political life of the nation.

6. Antonio Agliardi (1832–1915) spent more than a decade as a parish priest in Bergamo before being made archbishop. Between 1886 and 1889 he was secretary of ecclesiastical affairs at the Vatican. He was elevated to cardinal in 1896. Agliardi was one of the first prominent members of the church hierarchy to promote conciliation between the Vatican and the Italian state and to support the idea of forming a Christian Democratic (i.e., Catholic) party in Italy.

7. As a result of the heavy participation of Catholics in the 1904 elections, the extreme left lost ground, ending up with eight fewer seats than it had in the previous parliament. The reformist socialists obtained about 20 percent of the total vote, a significant improvement on their showing in the 1900 elections. Two Catholic clericalists won parliamentary seats: the lawyer Agostino Cameroni, from Treviglio (in Bergamo), and Count Ottavio Cornaggia, from Milan.

Carlo Ottavio Cornaggia Medici Castiglioni (1851–1935) belonged to one of the oldest aristocratic families in Milan. In his very active political life he worked hard to bring about the full participation of Catholics in Italian politics, often mediating between moderates and Catholics to form alliances for local administrative elections. As editor-in-chief of the daily *Lega Lombarda* he was encouraged by Bonomelli to oppose the intransigent clericalists and promote the abrogation of the *non expedit* on the grounds that Catholic abstentionism favored the advance of the "reds." Cornaggia's views were quite conservative; among other things, he favored limited suffrage.

§26. *America and Europe*

1. All the information recorded by Gramsci in this note—including the reference to the International Labor Organization publication—is drawn from an article signed "Munitor": "Gli albori di un nuovo spirito sociale in America" (The dawning of a new social spirit in America), *Nuova Antologia* 62, no. 1336 (November 16, 1927): 118–23.

§27. *Prince Karl Rohan*

1. Gramsci extracted this information from an article by A. Rovini: "Il Quarto Congresso internazionale delle Unioni Intelletuali" (The fourth

congress of the Unions of Intellectuals) in *Nuova Antologia* 62, no. 1335 (November 1, 1927): 129–30.

Vittorio Scialoja (1856–1933), a professor of Roman law, had a distinguished political career: minister of justice in 1909–10, in Sonnino's government; foreign minister in 1919–20, during Nitti's prime ministership; and Italian delegate to the League of Nations from 1921 to 1933.

2. The information on Karl Rohan's book was obtained from another article by A. Rovini, "Un principe nella Russia bolscevica" (A prince in Bolshevik Russia), in *Nuova Antologia* 62, no. 1338 (December 16, 1927): 538–39.

§28. *Types of periodicals*

1. On Francesco Coppola, see Notebook 1, §35, n. 1; on Alfredo Rocco, see Notebook 2, §25, n. 1.

2. Gramsci returns to a discussion of the need for a "yearbook" of the kind he describes in Notebook 4, §49 (final paragraph), and its corresponding C text, Notebook 12, §1. In 1924, while in Vienna, Gramsci conceived of the idea of publishing a "yearbook of the working class," but what he seems to have had in mind at that time was somewhat different from the kind of yearbook he describes in this note and much more similar to the type of "popular Almanac" he discusses in Notebook 14, §60. Gramsci outlined his idea in a letter he sent from Vienna to the executive committee of the Italian Communist Party on December 20, 1923:

> I want to propose to you the compilation of a sort of yearbook of the working class that would contain, in succinct form, everything that can be of interest to a party member or a sympathizer. I have already planned the contents and I have thought about the allotment of the work for the various chapters. It could be published in the second half of 1924 in a volume of six hundred or even seven hundred pages.
>
> In about thirty chapters it is possible to provide: an overview of the political and trade union movement in the world; an analysis of the Italian situation from all points of view (economic, military, labor, financial, etc.). One section should be devoted to Marxism and its history, with special reference to Italy. One section should focus on Russia, its political organization, its economic situation, the history of the Bolshevik party, etc. One of the chapters should summarize the position and the tactics of the Comintern as they have been developed in the congresses, the enlarged committees, and the most important public expressions of the executive committee.
>
> I believe that after three years of civil war—which have made it very difficult to keep track systematically of the party newspapers

and publications—it would a pleasure, especially for the expatriates, to have available a volume of this sort comprising the materials I have sketched.

For a complete version of Gramsci's letter, see the critical edition of his preprison letters: *Lettere: 1908–1926*, ed. Antonio Santucci (Turin: Einaudi, 1992), pp. 146–50.

§29. *Catalogo dei cataloghi del libro italiano*

1. Gramsci's source of information on the *Catalogo dei cataloghi del libro italiano* (Catalog of catalogs of Italian books) is a note by Aldo Sorani, "Un repertorio della bibliografia italiana" (An inventory of Italian bibliography) in the "Bibliografie" (Bibliographies) section of *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 25 (June 17, 1927). Gramsci may have learned about the subsequent publication of supplements to the *Catalogo* from advertisements that appeared in *L'Italia Che Scrive*.

§30. *Another bibliographical publication*

1. Gramsci found the information on the *Catalogo metodico degli scritti contenuti nelle pubblicazioni periodiche italiane e straniere* (Systematic catalog of the contents of Italian and foreign periodicals) in a brief note, "Un repertorio di pubblicazioni periodiche" (An inventory of periodical publications) in *Il Marzocco* 33, no. 30 (July 22, 1928).

§31. *Types of periodicals*

1. Carlo Cattaneo launched *Il Politecnico*, a monthly review, in Milan in 1839. Most of its articles were concerned with social issues, economics, science, and technology. The contributors were progressive intellectuals interested in the problems of education, labor, banking, and so on that were arising out of the new industrial and economic developments in northern Italy. The journal ceased publication in 1844, but it was restarted in 1859 and lasted until 1868, although Cattaneo relinquished the editorship in 1868. The *Archivio triennale delle cose d'Italia* consisted of three volumes (published between 1850 and 1856) edited by Cattaneo that contained documents pertaining to Italian politics in the turbulent years of 1846–48. On Carlo Cattaneo, see Notebook 2, §22, n. 4.

Eugenio Rignano (1870–1930), who studied industrial engineering in Turin, went on to write extensively on such diverse subjects as political economy, sociology, biology, psychology, philosophy, and education. He was one of the founders of the international journal *Scientia*, which started publication in 1907, and became its editor-in-chief in 1915.

2. On Antonio Labriola and his writings, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 51.

3. In his autobiography, *My Life* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1930), Leon Trotsky writes as follows about Labriola:

> It was in my cell [in 1898] that I read with delight two well-known essays by an old Italian Hegelian-Marxist, Antonio Labriola, which reached the prison in a French translation. Unlike most Latin writers, Labriola had mastered the materialist dialectics, if not in politics—in which he was helpless—at least in the philosophy of history. The brilliant dilettantism of his exposition actually concealed a very profound insight. He made short work, and in marvellous style, of the theory of multiple factors which were supposed to dwell on the Olympus of history and rule our fates from there.
>
> Although thirty years have gone by since I read his essays, the general trend of his argument is still firmly entrenched in my memory, together with his continuous refrain of "Ideas do not drop from the sky." After Labriola, all the Russian proponents of the multiplicity of factors, Lavrov, Mikhaylovsky, Kareyev, and others, seemed utterly ineffectual to me. (106)

Trotsky continues: "At that time I was still comparatively ignorant of the basic literature of the Marxists. The essays by Labriola were really philosophic pamphlets and presumed a knowledge that I had not, and for which I had to substitute guesswork. I finished them with a bunch of hypotheses in my head" (108).

Gramsci went to great lengths to obtain a copy of the Italian edition of Trotsky's autobiography: *La mia vita*, trans. E. Pocar (Milan: Mondadori, 1930). On August 25, 1930 he wrote to his brother Carlo, asking him to apply for permission for Gramsci to be allowed to have certain books in prison, among them Trotsky's memoirs. The letter was withheld by the prison censor and never reached Carlo; at Gramsci's insistence, however, the letter was forwarded to the minister of justice, who denied Gramsci's request. In September 1930 Gramsci wrote directly to Mussolini. He drafted the "Petition to H. E. the head of government" in Notebook 2 (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:526–27). On December 1, 1930, he wrote to Tatiana Schucht:

> As you remember, some time ago, I submitted a request to the Head of Government to be allowed to read certain books that have been withheld, as well as two other books that I did not have but wanted permission to buy, namely: Fülop-Miller, *Il volto del bolscevismo*, with a preface by Curzio Malaparte, Bompiani, Milan; and Leon Trotsky, *Mia vita*, Mondadori, Milan. (I am not sure whether

> Trotsky's book has this title or something similar.] The answer has arrived and it is favorable so I ask you to please write to the bookstore and have them sent to me.

It is unclear, however, how Gramsci knew about Trotsky's comment on Labriola when he composed this note. Presumably, Trotsky's book reached him sometime after December 1, 1930, whereas this note appears to have been written between May 30, 1930 (the date of composition of Notebook 3, §13, as indicated by Gramsci himself) and October 2, 1930 (which is when Gramsci consigned to his brother Carlo the book from which he quotes verbatim in §32—unless, of course, he was quoting from memory).

4. Gramsci owned a copy, in prison, of Georgy V. Plekhanov's *Les questions fondamentales du marxisme* (Paris: Editions Sociales Internationales, 1927). For an English translation of this work (first published in Russian in 1908), see *Fundamental Problems of Marxism*, ed. D. Ryazanov, trans. Eden and Cedar Paul (New York: International Publishers, 1929).

Georgy Valentinovich Plekhanov (1856–1918), who spent most of his life in exile, was one of the most influential Marxist intellectuals of the Social Democratic movement in late-nineteenth-century Russia. In spite of the fact that he sided with the Mensheviks after 1903, he retained the high esteem of Lenin and the Bolsheviks as a major philosopher of "dialectical materialism"—a phrase that was first used by him to describe what he took to be Marx's fundamental theory of economic determinism applied in a dialectical way.

5. Gramsci is referring to Otto Bauer's *Le socialisme, la religion et l'eglise* (Brussels: L'Eglantine, 1928), a translation of *Sozialdemokratie, Religion und Kirche* (Vienna: Weinz Volksbuchhandlung, 1927). Gramsci received a copy of this book during his first year in the prison of Turi. In this work, Otto Bauer (1882–1938) tried to reconcile Marxist economics and the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas. Like other leading exponents of the current known as Austro-Marxism, such as Max Adler and Rudolf Hilferding, Bauer regarded Marxism as primarily a scientific system of sociological knowledge. In the Austro-Marxists' view, Marx's fundamental contribution consisted in revealing the objective and causal laws that govern society and its development. They were opposed to the idea of a Bolshevik-style revolution, and their positivist approach to social and historical analysis was accompanied by a search for values in Kantian transcendental ethics. When Gramsci wrote that the Plekhanovian tendency "created its opposite," he probably had in mind some of the remarks made by Plekhanov himself in the opening pages of *Fundamental Problems of Marxism*, including the following: "Hitherto, no one has attempted to 'supplement' Marx by St. Thomas Aquinas. Still, it may well happen that,

despite the recent papal encyclical against the modernists, the Catholic world will produce a thinker capable of such a flight of fancy" (2).

6. On Henri De Man and his psychological treatment of socialism, see Notebook 1, §61, n. 13.

7. Gramsci is referring to Rosa Luxemburg's essay "Stillstand und Fortschritt im Marxismus," first published in *Vorwärts* on March 14, 1903. In all probability, Gramsci read Luxemburg's essay in a collection of writings on Marx edited by D. Ryazanov, *Karl Marx homme, penseur et révolutionnaire* (Paris: Editions Sociales Internationales, 1928). For an English translation, see "Stagnation and Progress of Marxism," in D. Ryazanov, ed., *Karl Marx: Man, Thinker and Revolutionist*, trans. Eden and Cedar Paul (New York: International Publishers, 1927), and in Mary-Alice Waters, ed., *Rosa Luxemburg Speaks* (New York: Pathfinder, 1970). In her essay, Luxemburg writes:

> From the scientific standpoint, the third volume of *Capital* must, no doubt, be primarily regarded as the completion of Marx's critique of capitalism. Without this third volume, we cannot understand, either the actually dominant law of the rate of profit; or the splitting up of surplus value into profit, interest, and rent; or the working of the law of value within the field of competition. But, and this is the main point, all these problems, however important from the outlook of pure theory, are comparatively unimportant from the practical outlook of class war. As far as the class war is concerned, the fundamental theoretical problem is the origin of surplus value, that is, the scientific explanation of exploitation; together with the elucidation of the tendency towards the socialization of the process of production, that is, the scientific explanation of the objective groundwork of the socialist revolution.
>
> Both these problems are solved in the first volume of *Capital*, which deduces the "expropriation of the expropriators" as the inevitable and ultimate result of surplus value and of the progressive concentration of capital. Therewith, as far as theory is concerned, the essential need of the labor movement is satisfied. The workers, being actively engaged in the class war, have no direct interest in the question how surplus value is distributed among the respective groups of exploiters; or in the question how, in the course of this distribution, competition brings about rearrangements of production.
>
> That is why, for socialists in general, the third volume of *Capital* remains an unread book. . . .
>
> The working class will not be in a position to create a science and an art of its own until it has been fully emancipated from its present class position.

> The utmost it can do today is to safeguard bourgeois culture from the vandalism of the bourgeois reaction, and create the social conditions requisite for a free cultural development. . . .
>
> Only in proportion as our movement progresses, and demands the solution of new practical problems do we dip once more into the treasury of Marx thought, in order to extract therefrom and to utilize new fragments of his doctrine. But since our movement, like all the campaigns of practical life, inclines to go on working in old ruts of thought, and to cling to principles after they have ceased to be valid, the theoretical utilization of the Marxist system proceeds very slowly. (Waters, 109–11.)

8. On Andrea Costa, see Notebook 3, §8, n. 5, above.

§32. *"Rendre la vie impossible"*

1. Eugène D'Ors, *La vie de Goya* (Paris: Gallimard, 1928). Gramsci had a copy of this book in prison; it is listed in Notebook 2 among the "Books delivered to Carlo on 2 October 1930" (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:529).

2. See D'Ors, *La vie de Goya*, p. 54: "Fuyant l'Inquisition—au moins l'Inquisition diffuse, qui tue elle aussi en 'rendant la vie impossible'—Goya a laissé Saragosse pour Madrid."

§34. *Past and present*

1. See Notebook 1, §127.

2. Gramsci is referring to an article by Benito Mussolini, "Preludio al Machiavelli" (Preface to Machiavelli), *Gerarchia* 3, no. 4 (April 1924). It has been published in English as "Prelude" in the edition of Machiavelli's *Prince* translated with an introduction by George Bull (London: Folio Society, 1970). Among other things, Mussolini writes:

> Well then, what emerges clearly, even from a superficial reading of *The Prince*, is the acute pessimism of Machiavelli in the face of human nature. Like all those who have occasion for continuous and extensive intercourse with their own kind, Machiavelli is a despiser of men and likes to present them to us . . . in their most negative and humiliating aspects.
>
> . . . It is also evident that Machiavelli, in judging men as he did, did not refer only to those of his own time, to the Florentines, Tuscans, Italians who actually straddled the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but to men irrespective of time and place. Time has

passed, but if I were allowed to judge my fellows and contemporaries, I could not in any way attentuate Machiavelli's verdict. I should have, perhaps, to go further still. Machiavelli does not deceive himself and he does not deceive the Prince. The antithesis between Prince and people, between State and individual is, in Machiavelli's thought, preordained. What was called Machiavellian cynicism, utilitarianism, pragmatism, follows logically from this original position. The word Prince must be understood as State. In the thought of Machiavelli the Prince is the State. While individuals, motivated by their egoism, tend towards social indifference, the State represents organization and restrictions. The individual always tends to evade his public responsibilities. He tends to disobey laws, to avoid paying taxes, to escape war. Few are those—heroes or saints—who sacrifice their own selves on the altar of the state. . . .

. . . So, even in regimes that have been concocted from the Encyclopedia—which erred, through Rousseau, from a boundless excess of optimism—there is inherent discord between the organized force of the State and the fragmentation of individuals and groups. Regimes based completely on consent have never existed, do not exist, and probably never will exist.

3. See Giuseppe Rensi, "La 'belva bionda' " (The fair-haired beast), *Rivista di Milano*, March 5, 1920, reprinted in Rensi's book, *Principî di politica impopolare* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1920), pp. 162–174. Rensi writes:

The disorder and the deep division of minds that prevail in the moral sphere are mirrored in the economic sphere. It is now clear to everyone that the disorganization in the field of labor is total. Labor unrest, incessant strikes, the continuous escalation of demands (no sooner is one demand met than another one is raised)—this convulsive tumult that makes it obvious that the working class is no longer expressing its desire for economic improvements but rather its *will to power*—are seriously paralyzing industry and production. It is therefore even more obvious to everyone that either the strikes, unrest, and demands will destroy the social structure, shattering the delicate interdependent web of work, needs, population, and demography, pushing humanity back to a primitive economy; or else an authority is now needed to impose itself and to introduce, by force if necessary, order, reliability, the necessary discipline, and the subordination of the individual to society and its needs: a way must be found to constrain the impulses, the caprices, the explosions of individual interests. Or else, what is needed is (to use a charged term) slavery, in that slavery consists in a pressure that forces the individual not to use his

> time and his activities entirely according to his own wishes. Let it be known: after the abolition of ancient slavery and servitude, this pressure was the very same one that became automatically a part of the wage-earning system: that is, it was inherent in the fact that since the workers had no other means of subsistence, in order to live they had to perform some kind of rigorously specified work. Suppose the wage-earning system disappears and the workers become the owners of the means of production and of industry with all forms of power in their hands; it will not be possible unless the automatic pressure by which the wage-earning system compelled workers to work regularly were replaced by some other, equally effective form of pressure: in other words, a form of pressure that would compel one to work regularly in spite of the ineluctable inclination we all have to rebel against such work unless coerced. (pp. 164–65)

In another essay, "Rivoluzione di schiaveria" (Revolutions of slavishness), also in *Principî di politica impopolare,* Rensi writes:

> I pose the general question in the following manner: can the worker—the man *in so far as he works*—be the master? There is no doubt in my mind that no is the answer. The worker—and this applies not only to the manual worker who is taken to be the authentic "proletarian" but also to those who work in the liberal and bourgeois professions, like doctors, engineers, and lawyers—the worker, as I was saying, *in so far as he works,* is and cannot but be dependent, subservient, a *servant* in some way or another of whoever requires his services. It is to the latter that the worker, in so far as he works, hands over his activity and his time; in other words, *his life.* It is the latter who can and must command: he should be able, within the working context, to make the workers *do what he wants,* and to have the means—at least with the power to fire the workers—to compel the workers to obey him, as far as work is concerned. Aristotle was absolutely right when he asserted that slavery was necessary and that there will always be slavery. (pp. 3–4)

Rensi's book is dedicated to the Socialist Party leader Filippo Turati, and its frontispiece has the following quotation from Machiavelli (*The Discourses,* book 3, chap. 27): "The Roman Consuls who reconciled the people of Ardea provide us with an example of how to restore union in a divided city: there is no other cure than to destroy the ringleaders of the disturbances."

Giuseppe Rensi (1871–1941) was a journalist and a lawyer before he turned to philosophy, which he taught at the universities of Messina and

Genoa. The author of many books, he was especially interested in the philosophy of skepticism. His anti-idealism made him an opponent of Benedetto Croce and Giovanni Gentile, two of the most prominent Italian philosophers of the time. His skepticism made him suspicious of dogmatism in theory, but politically he was antiliberal and antidemocratic. After 1922, however, he started distancing himself from the Fascist movement; he became a severe critic of the Fascist regime and in 1934 was forced to resign his professorship. Rensi had known Mussolini since 1898 when they met in Como, at a time when they were both socialist political émigrés.

§35. *Giuseppe Rensi*

1. Giuseppe Rensi started writing for the socialist periodical *Critica Sociale* in 1895. He moved to Switzerland in 1898 and returned to Italy in 1908.

2. Gramsci is referring to two articles by Giuseppe Rensi: "La ragione del male nella storia secondo Seneca e Renouvier" (The cause of evil in history according to Seneca and Renouvier), *Nuova Rivista Storica* 13, no. 3–4 (May–August 1929): 255–70; and "Necessità e razionalità" (Necessity and rationality), *Nuova Rivista Storica* 14, no. 1–2 (January–April 1930): 21–28. In the second article, where he argues against the notion that history is rational, Rensi writes:

> In order to affirm an ethical principle one must deny the rationality of history. For whoever accepts the rationality of history is forced to admit that rationality is embodied in the unjust, monstrous, and atrocious facts out of which past and present history is woven, and he must recognize such facts as rational. On the other hand, whoever denies the rationality of history does so precisely because his alert and watchful ethical sense would not allow him to justify such facts (not even on the grounds that some alleged good could come of them, because the good could have been realized without those facts for which it is supposed to provide the excuse). In other words, whoever denies the rationality of history does so because his ethical sense cannot be suppressed and because he submits facts to the uncompromising judgment of his ethical sense and does not make his ethical sense bow before the facts or be blunted by them. Only such a watchful ethical sense perceives the irreducible antithesis between historical reality and ethicity, or rather between history and rationality. It alone notices that history does not correspond to morals, that history is not what should be: in other words, that history is not rational. The degree of ethicity of an individual, then, is measured precisely by the degree to which he finds history morally intolerable,

> by the number of charges and condemnations that he feels compelled to level against history: that is, by the extent to which he feels history to be irrational. The liveliness of one's awareness of the irrationality of history is the yardstick of one's personal ethicity. (p. 28)

3. Giuseppe Rensi's earliest contributions to *Il Popolo d'Italia* (the daily newspaper founded by Mussolini in 1914) were published in 1915. His articles appeared with greater frequency between 1919 and 1922; in them he expressed nationalistic, antisocialist, and conservative views. By 1923, however, he stopped writing for the newspaper because he had distanced himself from Fascism after the march on Rome. Rensi's articles for *Il Popolo d'Italia* and other writings he published in different newspapers and periodicals have been collected in two volumes: *L'orma di Protagora* (The mark of Protagoras) (Milan: Treves, 1920), and *Teoria e pratica della reazione politica* (The theory and practice of political reaction) (Milan: Società Editrice La Stampa Commerciale, 1922).

4. At the Sixth Congress of Philosophy, held in Milan on March 28–30, 1926, there was a public antifascist demonstration following a courageous speech by Francesco De Sarlo on "L'alta cultura e la libertà" (High culture and freedom). The congress was suspended by the Fascist authorities. Giovanni Gentile wrote an article about the congress in the April 14, 1926, issue of *Il Popolo d'Italia*; the article was reprinted in Gentile's book on Fascism and culture, *Fascismo e cultura* (Milan: Treves, 1928), pp. 103–9. Gramsci owned a copy of this book in prison. In his article, Gentile attacked Rensi, among others:

> that merry philosopher who teaches at Genoa, who leaps and dances and makes faces before the public. Today he demonstrates the truth and tomorrow the falsehood of whatever philosophy he happens to be dealing with; first he was an idealist, then a skeptic, and later a dogmatist; yesterday he was a philosopher of authoritarianism, today he is a philosopher of freedom. He was always a sophist with a vain mind. On this occasion in Milan he too was applauded for his latest farce on "Critical Materialism"—which is like talking about the squared circle.

Rensi responded to Gentile's attack with a letter to *Il Popolo d'Italia*, which the newspaper published on April 16, 1926. Rensi wrote: "Whatever Senator Gentile may think of me, I am consoled by the thought that the views he expressed the other day cannot be those of *Il Popolo d'Italia*. It could not be otherwise, for on November 2, 1922, the editor of this newspaper wrote to me that 'today more than ever good contributors are needed' and that he wished he 'could count on me' to continue doing for

this paper what I had done during the Bolshevik period, when at least three-fourths of those who now want to collaborate did not deign to write or get involved." Rensi also recalled that the previous year Gentile had invited him to write for the *Enciclopedia italiana*, which Gentile directed.

§36. *Cultural matters*

1. On this episode, see Notebook 3, §9.

2. The information on the performance of the farce *Un'avventura galante ai bagni di Cernobbio* (A gallant adventure at the baths of Cernobbio) is extracted from a letter by Carlo Volpati published under the title "Fu Vincenzo Monti l'autore dell'*Avventura galante*?" (Did Vincenzo Monti write the *Avventura galante*?) in the "Commenti e frammenti" (Comments and fragments) section of *Il Marzocco* 33, no. 45 (November 4, 1928).

On Vincenzo Monti, see Notebook 1, §147, n. 1.

§37. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. See Notebook 1, §93. See also Notebook 1, §93, n. 1, for more on Tommaso Gallarati Scotti and his collection of short stories *Storie dell'amor sacro e dell'amor profano* (Tales of sacred and profane love).

2. Paolo Arcari was best known for his studies on such literary and philosophical figures as Vico, Metastasio, Pascal, and Manzoni, even though he wrote several novels, none of which, however, earned him a reputation as a significant novelist. He also edited (with Alberto Caroncini) *L'Azione*, a liberal and nationalist political review published in Milan. For another note on Arcari, see Notebook 2, §25, n. 1.

3. Luciano Gennari was awarded a prize by the Académie Française for one of his novels, *L'Italie qui vient* (Paris, 1929), written in French.

4. The early work of Paul Bourget (1852–1935) was strongly influenced by positivist philosophy; he wrote novels in the naturalistic tradition and literary essays in the mode of Hippolyte Taine. In 1889, however, he changed course radically with the publication of *Le disciple*, a novel that demonizes positivist thought and enjoins youth to resist the seductions of modern scientific theory and to abide by traditional morality. He converted to Catholicism in 1901, after which he wrote increasingly didactic and moralistic novels extolling nationalism, conservative values, Catholicism, and the monarchy.

René Bazin (1853–1932), a professor of law at the Catholic University of Angers, exalted traditional values in novels that contrasted the corruption of city life with the simplicity and virtuousness of life in the provinces. In one of his novels, *Le blé qui lève* (1907), corruption is represented by the

influence of trade unionism on woodcutters. At one time Bazin was regarded as one of the important members of the group of conservative French Catholic novelists who flourished during the first three decades of the twentieth century.

François Mauriac (1885–1970), winner of the 1952 Nobel Prize for Literature, had already established himself as a major novelist in France by the middle of the 1920s. Arguably the best of the French group of conservative Catholic novelists, he was certainly the most successful and acclaimed. Mauriac's novels are mostly psychological moral dramas permeated with religious concerns and motifs: sin, grace, personal redemption.

George Bernanos (1888–1948) was still a minor figure when Gramsci wrote this note. He achieved great success in 1936 with the publication of *Journal d'un curé de campagne* (*The Diary of a Country Priest*). Like the work of other French Catholic novelists, Bernanos's fiction dramatizes the struggle for the soul by the forces of good and evil. Many of his characters are priests. Bernanos also had a keen interest in politics. In 1938 he published *Les grands cimitières sous la lune*, a severe condemnation of fascist violence in the Spanish Civil War and of the Catholic hierarchy that condoned it.

5. Filippo Crispolti, *Un duello* (Milan: Treves, 1900). Gramsci discusses *"Il Duello"* in Notebook 6, §56. Gramsci also comments on Crispolti in Notebook 1, §69; Notebook 5, §101; Notebook 6, §183; and Notebook 7, §50.

Filippo Crispolti (1857–1942), a militant Catholic who participated in the formation of the Popular Party, was a prolific writer on social, political, and cultural topics—almost always from a Catholic perspective. He also held editorial positions at some of the most important Catholic newspapers, including *Il Momento* of Turin and the Vatican's *Osservatore Romano*. Crispolti served as a member of parliament before becoming senator in 1922.

6. Gramsci is referring to Mario Missiroli's book, published in Rome by Tipografia del Littorio (with no date, but actually brought out in 1929): *Date a Cesare: La politica religiosa di Mussolini con documenti inediti* (Give unto Caesar: The religious policy of Mussolini, with hitherto unpublished documents). In this book, Missiroli criticizes the state of Italian Catholic culture in general, and he specifically decries the poverty of religious studies in Italy (see pp. 391–99). Gramsci had a copy of this book while in prison.

On Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

7. Maria Di Borio was the pseudonym of the countess Maria Gauthier Panzoja. Gramsci had once described her as a "Catholic Francophile," a "boring novelist," and a "sanctimonious preacher of virtuousness." See

his article "La divina favella" (The divine language), in his regular column "Sotto la Mole" in the Piedmont edition of *Avanti!* June 27, 1916.

§38. *Father Bresciani's progeny. A. Panzini: "Vita di Cavour"*

1. Gramsci is quoting the opening sentence of the first installment of Alfredo Panzini's *Vita di Cavour* (Life of Cavour) in *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 10 (June 9, 1929). In the rest of this note Gramsci quotes sentences and phrases from subsequent installments of Panzini's biography of Cavour. It seems that when he was writing this note Gramsci had in front of him all the installments of Panzini's work published in the weekly issues of *L'Italia Letteraria* from June 9, 1929, to October 13, 1929 (vol. 1, no. 10–28).

2. The passage refers to Vittorio Emanuele II, king of Sardinia (1849–61) and, after unification, king of Italy (1861–78).

3. Carlo Emanuele III (1701–73) was renowned for his military skills. He inherited the throne of Sardinia-Piedmont in 1730 on the death of his father, Vittorio Amedeo II.

On Emanuele Filiberto, see Notebook 2, §60, n. 1, 1: 556.

4. "Manly honor" and "man of honor" are used here to render the Italian "galantomismo" and "galantuomo," which have no exact equivalents in English. The words have various nuances, such as "honesty, uprightness, gentlemanliness" and "honest man, gentleman, honorable man," respectively.

5. Ferdinando Martini, *Confessioni e ricordi, 1859–1892* (Milan: Treves, 1928), pp. 152–53. Gramsci had this book of memoirs while in prison at Turi. It is among the books that he listed in Notebook 2 and consigned to his relatives in 1932 (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:530). See also Gramsci's letter to his brother Carlo, June 13, 1932. Some of the contents of this book are also discussed in Notebook 6, §114.

On Ferdinando Martini, see Notebook 2, §51, n. 2.

6. Gramsci is referring to (but confuses the published source of) a group of fifty-six letters by Massimo D'Azeglio that formed part of a larger collection of epistolary documents from the Risorgimento that had a very controversial publication history. The first person to propose publication of these documents was Professor Luigi Cesare Bollea in 1912, but he was blocked from doing so by the authorities. Nevertheless, they were published a few years later by Ferdinando Gabotto, in the review *Il Risorgimento Italiano*, n.s., 9, no. 1–2 (1916): 1–544, published in Turin by Bocca. The same collection of documents—which primarily concerned the French-Italian alliance, the war of 1859 against Austria, and the expedition of Garibaldi's Thousand—was then published in a book by Luigi Cesare Bollea himself: *Una silloge di lettere del Risorgimento: Di particolare atti-*

nenza all'alleanza franco-italiana, alla guerra del 1859 e alla spedizione dei Mille. 1839–1873 (Turin: Bocca, 1919). Bollea discussed the legal obstacles he faced in his efforts to publish the documents in an article, "Come fu compilato l'epistolario di L. C. Farini" (How L. C. Farini's correspondence was collected), in a special supplement on the Risorgimento of the *Bollettino Storico-Bibliografico Subalpino* 1 (1912): 68–89, published in Turin. The controversy surrounding the publication of these documents is also brought up in Notebook 2, §95, and Notebook 6, §46.

7. See Notebook 2, §29, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially n. 2.

8. The parenthetic interpolation is Gramsci's.

9. Gramsci is referring to his remarks on p. 10 of the manuscript of this notebook; see Notebook 3, §13. The source of the quotation from Panzini's letter at the end of this paragraph is the same one that Gramsci cited in §13 above: *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 13 (June 30, 1929).

10. See Notebook 1, §24, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially n. 8.

11. See Notebook 1, §24, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially n. 10. On Antonio Bresciani, see Notebook 1, "Notes and Jottings," n. 6.

12. Pierre-Alexis Ponson du Terrail (1829–71) was the author of the fictional adventures of Rocambole, a very long and popular series.

13. Antoine-Nicolas de Condorcet (1743–94), mathematician and philosopher of the Enlightenment, wrote influential books on, among other things, probability theory and humanity's unlimited potential for progress.

Jacques-Henri Bernardin de Saint-Pierre (1737–1814), a friend and follower of Rousseau, celebrated cultural primitivism in his writings. His best-known work is *Paul et Virginie* (1788), a pastoral tale of innocent love that ends in tragedy with the incursion of civilization.

14. Alfonso Ferrero de La Marmora (1804–78)—whose name also appears as Lamarmora—gained a strong reputation as a skillful soldier in the 1848 war against Austria, after which he served as minister of war for over a decade. In 1855 he commanded the Sardinian-Piedmontese forces in the Crimean War. La Marmora was prime minister from 1859 to 1860 and again from 1864 to 1866. In 1866 he led the Italian army against the Austrians in the Battle of Custoza and suffered a heavy defeat.

General Enrico Morozzo della Rocca (1807–97) was chief aide-de-camp to King Vittorio Emanuele II and performed some important diplomatic duties in France; on occasion, he served as a channel of communication between the king and Napoleon III. He served for some time as minister of war and in 1859 became the army chief of staff. In the war of 1866 against Austria he commanded the third corps of the Italian army.

15. On Enrico Cialdini, see Notebook 2, §29, n. 6.

Count Carlo Pellion di Persano (1806–83), minister of the navy in Rattazzi's government, was the admiral in charge of the Italian siege of the island of Lissa, in the Adriatic, in 1866. The blockade was broken by an Austrian naval force with fewer and inferior ships; Persano even lost his flagship in the battle. He was court-martialed and stripped of his rank as a result.

16. Antonio Bruers, "Come e perché Alfredo Panzini ha scritto una *Vita di Cavour*" (How and why Alfredo Panzini has written a life of Cavour), *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 9 (June 2, 1929).

On Antonio Bruers, see Notebook 1, §99, n. 1.

17. In his interview with Panzini, Bruers alludes to the biography of Cavour written by Maurice Paléologue. This must have given Gramsci the impression that Bruers had translated the French historian's work into Italian. In fact, someone else was responsible for the translation; see Maurice Paléologue, *Cavour*, trans. Lyna Fioresi Dondini (Bologna: Cappelli, 1929). Gramsci had a copy with him in prison of the fourth French edition of Paléologue's book: *Un grand réaliste: Cavour* (Paris: Plon, 1926).

18. Felice Orsini (see Notebook 1, §43, n. 29) and some radical accomplices attempted unsuccessfully to assassinate Napoleon III on January 14, 1858. Orsini was guillotined two months later. At first, the assassination attempt threatened to derail the Franco-Piedmontese alliance against Austria; however, relations were solidified soon afterward by an agreement Cavour and Napoleon III reached at a secret meeting in Plombières on July 20, 1858.

§39. *Past and present*

1. Gramsci owned a copy of the 1929 yearbook published by the central office of statistics of the Italian government: *Annuario statistico italiano: 1929*, ser. 3, vol. 3 (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1929). He had asked Tatiana Schucht to send it to him in a letter of March 25, 1929. The volume contains (on pp. 163–81) the results of the census of industrial operations conducted in Italy on October 15, 1927, but it does not provide data on specific cities or industrial centers.

2. On the "hundred cities," see also Gramsci's comment in Notebook 1, §43.

§40. *Reformation and Renaissance*

1. Gramsci first mentions Gobetti's, Missiroli's, and Dorso's interpretations of the Risorgimento as a "royal conquest" in Notebook 1, §44. He returns to this topic in Notebook 9, §89 and §111.

On Piero Gobetti, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 29; on Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12; and on Guido Dorso, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 30.

2. See Notebook 1, §44, n. 30.

3. Guido Mazzali was a frequent contributor (especially between 1925 and 1926) to *Conscientia*, a Protestant journal edited by Giuseppe Gangale. In this instance, Gramsci is probably referring to Mazzali's article "Engels e l'anabattismo" (Engels and the Anabaptist movement), *Conscientia* 4, no. 44 (October 31, 1925). In this article Mazzali criticizes Engels for failing to appreciate the importance of the Reformation.

Gramsci had attacked Mazzali in two articles: "L'espiazione del Partito Socialista" (The expiation of the Socialist Party), in *L'Unità*, September 29, 1926; and "Concezioni comode" (Convenient ideas), in *L'Unità*, October 1, 1926. Gramsci was provoked by a statement made by the socialist Mazzali in a publication sponsored by *Conscientia: Tesi ed amici del nuovo protestantismo* (Rome: Bilychnis, 1926): "I believe I can place Marxist praxis within the framework of an austere conception of life that descends from God and rises toward God" (p. 38). (A copy of this publication is preserved among Gramsci's books.) In the first of his two articles, Gramsci wrote, among other things: "This gentleman [Mazzali] voted in favor of the communist motion at the congress of Livorno, but at the last moment he decided to remain a member of the Socialist Party, because our party did not guarantee him a stipend. That was when he started meditating on the 'religious' conception of socialism and on Marxism as a means of ascent [to God]."

4. Thomas G. Masaryk, *La Russia e l'Europa: Studi sulle correnti spirituali in Russia* (Russia and Europe: Studies on religious currents in Russia), trans. Ettore Lo Gatto, 2 vols. (Naples: Ricciardi, 1922; Rome: Istituto Romane Editoriale, 1925).

Tomás Garrigue Masaryk (1850–1937), a leading Czech nationalist, was interested in and wrote about the Slavic religious heritage. After 1889 he increasingly devoted his energies to the cause of Slavic liberation and during the First World War championed Czech independence. He was president of the Czech nation from its founding in 1918 until 1935.

§41. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. Gramsci is referring to the classic Italian novel *I promessi sposi* (*The Betrothed*), by Alessandro Manzoni, first published in 1827, and to Ugo Foscolo's poem *Dei sepolcri* (On tombs), first published in 1807. In *Dei sepolcri*, the patriotic poet Foscolo (1778–1827) celebrates the historic national glories of Italy through a series of reflections inspired by the tombs of illustrious Italians.

2. Gramsci owned a copy of Henry Ford's *Ma vie et mon oeuvre* (Paris: Payot, 1926), the French translation of Ford's autobiography, *My Life and*

My Work (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1922). In the preface to the French edition, Victor Cambon writes:

> Les Américains du Nord, qui ont sur bien des points des conceptions originales, soutiennent volontiers que la supériorité des intelligences est moins variée qu'on ne le croit et qu'elles s'adaptent généralement aux objets qui, de leur temps, conférent la puissance ou la célébrité.
>
> Voici quelle est leur thèse:
>
> "Le travail le plus en honneur à chaque époque a toujours attiré les plus hautes intelligences de cette époque. Lorsque, sous les Médicis, c'étaient la peinture et la sculpture, les cerveaux les plus vastes s'y adonnaient. Léonard de Vinci, Michel Ange embrassaient toutes les connaissances, même techniques, de leurs temps, mais ils étaient avant tout peintres et sculpteurs. Les grands navigateurs du règne d'Elisabeth, les hardis pionniers comme le Français Lassalle seraient aujourd'hui des hommes de chemins de fer."
>
> Cette idée revient souvent sous la plume des Américains. (pp. vii–viii)

Gramsci discusses this point further in Notebook 15, §53.

§42. *Past and present*

1. Gramsci is concerned here with the failure of the Italian left, and specifically the Socialists, to resist the rise of fascism successfully. In the rest of the note he reflects on the "history" of the Socialist movement, on the events, internal struggles, and policies that rendered both the maximalist and reformist wings ineffectual.

2. In November 1917 the maximalist or "intransigent" faction of the Italian Socialist Party held a secret meeting in Florence, at the house of Mario Trozzi. At the meeting, Trozzi accused Gramsci (who was participating as a representative of the Turin socialists) of being a Bergsonian voluntarist (Gramsci alludes to this episode in Notebook 11, §12). The charge of Bergsonianism was leveled against Gramsci and the *Ordine Nuovo* group on other occasions as well. Gramsci responded to one such accusation in an editorial in *L'Ordine Nuovo* 2, no. 18 (October 16–23, 1920): 137:

> At the congress of the Italian reformists held in Reggio Emilia, the Hon. Claudio Treves—the most cultured man in the parliamentary group, the most brilliant journalist of Italian socialism, the authentic Marxist in our poor country of idiots and Bolshevik sycophants—

revealed that those who write for *L'Ordine Nuovo* are followers of Bergson and that *L'évolution créatrice* is our group's bible. This is not the first, nor will it be the last, of the Hon. Claudio Treves's discoveries in the field of culture. . . . Did he not discover recently that the Moscow congress had decided to save parliaments and universal suffrage and put forward a constitutional system in which parliament and the Soviets would coexist? Did he not discover that Lenin, Bukharin, and Radek have appropriated the theses of Kautsky, Adler, and Hilferding?

Yet the Hon. Claudio Treves, who does not read or study or think . . . and who certainly has not even read the *Communist Manifesto* . . . or Bergson, acts like the teacher of wisdom and of life, and he scolds the revolutionaries for their ignorance and the working class for its immaturity. . . . We, the young, are entitled to ask Italian reformists such as Treves, Turati, Prampolini, and Zibordi: "What have you done to elucidate socialist thought? Where are your books? Where are your analyses of the economic conditions of Italy? . . . Have you examined the mode of existence of the Italian proletariat? Can you tell us how the agrarian question manifests itself in Italy?" . . . Doesn't the anger of reformists who are in danger of being expelled from the party mirror the anger of capitalists who are in danger of being expelled from the factories? The party is ours, we are the ones who organized it; down with Bergson who wants to take it away from us.

3. On January 23, 1920, *Avanti!* published an article in which Nicola Bombacci outlined a proposal for the formation of soviets (also called "councils") in Italy. The idea generated many polemics and considerable interest, especially in Bologna, where the Socialist Union endorsed a motion (by Ercole Bucco, a trade union official) to establish an "urban soviet." The *Ordine Nuovo* group opposed the idea; its objections were articulated by Palmiro Togliatti in a two-part article, "La costituzione dei Soviet in Italia: Dal progetto Bombacci all'elezione dei Consigli di Fabbrica" (The formation of soviets in Italy: From Bombacci's project to the election of factory councils), published in *L'Ordine Nuovo* 1, no. 37 (February 14, 1920), and 1, no. 40 (March 13, 1920). The *Ordine Nuovo* group was totally committed to the formation and promotion of factory councils (which it conceived as workers' soviets) in which all workers would participate, regardless of whether they belonged to the Socialist Party or trade unions—an idea that was vigorously opposed by the Socialist Party mainstream. In his article, Togliatti argues that Bombacci's proposal would result in a formal and juridical structure that would be revolutionary in name only because it would do nothing to transform social

relations. "Bombacci is satisfied with the form," Togliatti writes. "And revolution for him becomes merely a word, a shadow; the revolutionary organs he wants to create are the shadow of a shadow." True revolutionary activity, Togliatti maintains, starts in the working place, where workers become conscious of their own roles and of their adversarial relation to the owners of the means of production. Togliatti concludes: "Bombacci's project assumes that this consciousness already exists among such a large number of producers and so powerfully that it is capable of giving birth to a vast network of state organs. The activity of establishing [factory] councils is based on the recognition that until this consciousness is universally affirmed in the working place, it is futile to talk about the founding of a new state" (315).

4. The first chamber of labor (*Camera del Lavoro*) was founded in 1891, in Milan, by the printers' union of that city and by the Italian Workers Party (the precursor of the Italian Socialist Party). Within a few years many such chambers, representing tens of thousands of workers, were established throughout Italy. Each chamber was autonomous, bringing together and coordinating the activities of various urban and rural labor groups and organizations in a specific area. Many chambers had very close ties with the Italian Socialist Party, but others more closely reflected the politics and policies of the revolutionary syndicalists, the anarchists, or even the Republican Party. In 1906 the chambers of labor joined with the federated trade unions to form the Confederazione Generale del Lavoro (general confederation of labor), which was dominated by reformist socialists. The more radical or revolutionary chambers helped establish the Unione Sindacale Italiana (Italian syndicalist union) six years later. The influence and power of the chambers of labor grew even greater after World War I, thanks to a soaring membership. In the early 1920s, however, they became the frequent targets of violent attacks by organized Fascist squads. Members were intimidated by the destruction of facilities and the physical assaults on their leaders and representatives. The chambers were finally abolished in 1926, by the "Exceptional Decrees" of the Fascist regime.

5. Claudio Treves delivered what came to be known as the "expiation speech" in parliament on March 30, 1920. The full text of the speech is published in Claudio Treves, *Come ho veduto la guerra*, 2d ed. (Milan: Edizioni della Rassegna Internazionale, 1925), pp. 233–56.

In the opening part of the speech he said, addressing the liberal deputies: "The crisis and its tragedy consist precisely in the fact that you are unable to impose your order and we cannot yet impose ours." He concluded the speech as follows:

> The crisis of the regime. See! The speech comes full circle to the point where it started. The crisis, the fever, the restlessness, the agi-

> tated masses, the impotence of economic measures to feed the people and of governments to make peace: things fall apart! You would like it to be over with, and you say to us: "Make the revolution or leave us in peace." Neither one thing nor the other! Revolution is an age, not a day; it has the characteristics of a natural phenomenon: slow erosions, abrupt landslides. We are in the middle of it, and we will be for a good number of years. . . . But, of course, you would like it to be over and done with. It is not dying that scares you; it is this state of nonliving that exasperates you. But it is not in our power to cut short the forward movement of God's plan. That is terribly long and painful. Though long and painful, it is also necessary because it is the ineluctable outcome of what has been done, and no one can undo what has already been done. This is the inexorable corollary of the crime. Yes, gentleman, this is the expiation.

Gramsci makes additional observations on this speech in Notebook 3, §44, and Notebook 11, §12 (in the concluding paragraph of the note).

Claudio Treves (1869–1933), together with his close friend Filippo Turati, was the most prominent leader of the reformist wing of the Italian Socialist Party. He became editor of *Avanti!* in 1910, a position he held until 1912, when Mussolini's faction prevailed over the reformists in the Socialist Party. During his editorship Treves strenuously opposed the Libyan War, and later he campaigned vigorously against Italian intervention in World War I. After the devastating defeat suffered by the Italian army at Caporetto, Treves and other reformists, stung by the accusations of being unpatriotic leveled against them by nationalists, supported the war policies of the government. Treves, like Turati and other reformists, was expelled from the party in 1922; they almost immediately established a new party, the Partito Socialista Unitario, that was more of a labor party than a socialist one. In 1926 Fascist repression compelled Treves to seek refuge in Paris; he was never able to return to his native country. He had been a member of parliament for twenty years—he had first been elected in 1906. In Paris he was one of the most prominent leaders of the exiled anti-Fascist movement, but even then his moderate positions brought him into open conflict with more radical opponents of the regime, such as Carlo Rosselli.

6. The phrase "with a ridiculous sense of self-importance" is a very loose rendering of Gramsci's virtually untranslatable description of the petty bourgeois as people who act like "*mosche cocchiere.*" "*Mosche cocchiere*" literally means "coachmen flies." The phrase—which Gramsci also uses elsewhere—is an allusion to the fly in La Fontaine's fable, *Le coche et la mouche,* who believes that only thanks to his efforts was a coach drawn by six horses able to make it up a steep hill. Giosuè Carducci

entitled one of his essays "Mosche cocchiere": see *Edizione nazionale delle opere di Giosuè Carducci* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1939), 25:362–82.

7. The point that Gramsci is making here—namely, that the widespread popular uprisings of 1919 and 1920 produced a reactionary backlash because of the inept leadership of the Socialist Party and its separation from the people—is reiterated in Notebook 3, §44, and Notebook 14, §10.

8. On September 29, 1918, the Socialist Party and the General Confederation of Labor reached an agreement (the "pact of alliance") concerning their respective spheres of activity: the party would be responsible for proclaiming and directing all political strikes and protests; the CGL would oversee all actions (including strikes) of an economic nature. They also agreed to collaborate without obstructing each other.

Two weeks after the agreement was reached, Gramsci wrote an article about it: "Il patto d'alleanza" (The pact of alliance), published in *Il Grido del Popolo* on October 12, 1918, and in *Avanti!* on October 17, 1918. In this article, Gramsci characterizes the pact as a "juridical" solution to the quarrel between the party and the confederation, and he warns against the illusion "that we have now entered an idyllic era of perfect harmony." The party, Gramsci argues, is still too distant from the workers; its leadership makes agreements on behalf of the workers' movement but has done little to foster a genuinely mass-based revolutionary consciousness. "The leaders acquire an authority and an importance that they should not have in view of the egalitarian and essentially democratic spirit of the organizations. Instead of being executives and administrators, the leaders often—all too often—decide on their own." Gramsci also wrote an editorial on the question of relations between party and trade unions in *L'Ordine Nuovo* 2, no. 13 (August 12, 1920), which he concludes by saying "the Italian movement has not only failed to resolve, in practice, the problem of the relations between the party and the trade unions, but it has not even raised the question for discussion. The Italian proletarian movement finds itself in a situation in which it is the field of activity of two political parties: the official one and the de facto one constituted by the trade union leaders."

Gramsci's remarks in this note echo the assertion made in paragraph 37 of the "Lyons Theses" drafted by Gramsci and Palmiro Togliatti and approved by the third congress of the Italian Communist Party, which was held in that French city from January 21 through January 26, 1926:

> The party leads the class, penetrating all the organizations in which the working masses are assembled; within them and through them it carries out a systematic mobilization of energies in line with the program of the class struggle and an activity aimed at gaining majority support for communist directives.

> The organizations in which the party works—which tend, by their very nature, to incorporate the whole working mass—can never be a substitute for the Communist Party, which is the political organization of revolutionaries, that is, the vanguard of the proletariat. This excludes any relationship of subordination or of "equality" between mass organizations and the party (the Stuttgart trade union pact; the pact of alliance between the Italian Socialist Party and the General Confederation of Labor).

For a translation of the complete text of the "Lyons Theses," see Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from Political Writings: 1921–1926*, ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare (New York: International Publishers, 1978), pp. 340–75.

9. Gramsci is alluding to the events surrounding the popular insurrection known as the "red week" of June 1914. On June 7 the police fired on a crowd attending an antimilitary meeting in Ancona, killing three people and wounding about twenty others. The incident triggered widespread protests, demonstrations, confrontations with the police, and strikes. On June 10 there was a general strike, supported by both the Socialist Party and the General Confederation of Labor. Without informing the Socialist leaders, however, the executive secretary of the confederation issued an order to stop the strike by midnight, June 11—in effect, sabotaging it. The strike fizzled out by June 14 while officials of the party and the confederation were still discussing what to do next.

§43. *Past and present*

1. Bemporad was a major publishing house in Italy, best known for its children's literature—for example, it published Collodi's *Pinocchio*—and its widely adopted textbooks. It also published many other important works, including the writings of Giovanni Verga, scholarly books on Dante, and translations of foreign masterpieces. Filippo Turati was the general editor of a book series "I problemi del lavoro" (Labor problems) published by Bemporad. In 1922 Bemporad published two books by Francesco Nitti: *Decadenza dell'Europa* (The decline of Europe) and *Europa senza pace* (Europe without peace). In 1928, however, the publishing house—which at that time was directed by Enrico Bemporad (1868–1944)—suffered a very severe financial setback: the government set up a state-owned publishing house to produce textbooks, thus depriving Bemporad of its main source of income. As a result, the publishing company had to seek loans and new investors; before long, the Bemporad family lost control of the firm (hence Gramsci's reference to the Banca Commerciale as the de facto administrator of the Bemporad publishing house).

On Francesco Saverio Nitti, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 12.

2. On June 26, 1920, when Giolitti presented his fifth (and, as it turned out, last) government to parliament, Filippo Turati gave a speech in the Chamber of Deputies that was then published as a pamphlet entitled *Rifare l'Italia* (Rebuilding Italy). A detailed account of the speech was also published in an article, "Un programma di azione socialista" (A socialist program for action), in *Critica Sociale* 30, no. 13 (July 1–15, 1920): 195–206. The complete text of the speech is now collected in Filippo Turati, *Discorsi parlamentari* (Rome: Tipografia della Camera dei Deputati, 1950), 3:1737–76. In his speech, Turati acknowledged that he had drawn his technical and economic data from a study written by the Milanese engineer Angelo Omodeo, *I nuovi orrizonti dell'idraulica italiana* (The new horizons of Italian hydraulics). Turati described Omodeo as "a famous engineer of world stature . . . who has the passionate idealism of a true socialist, even though he is not a member of the party." In Omodeo's book, Turati asserted, "there is by far more socialism than in the entire series of our party congresses" (*Discorsi parlamentari*, p. 1768).

Omodeo's role in the preparation of Turati's speech is documented in a May 18, 1920, letter from Anna Kuliscioff to Turati:

> Do you know what you could do to really stimulate parliament and the party? Give a speech at the opening of parliament on the statements issued by the government—a speech in which you would expound in general terms the way in which the riches of Italy can be developed, along the lines explained to you by Omodeo and that you liked very much. It would be an eminently socialist speech and, at the same time, a program for the reconstruction and renewal of the whole country. When he returns from Rome in the next few days, Omodeo will come to see me, and he will put me in a position to act as an intermediary and collaborator of this plan for your parliamentary *reprise*. It is unimportant whether or not the parliamentary group allows you to speak on its behalf. You would speak for yourself, and this will be the fundamental program for a democratic-socialist government—which in my view is not as remote a possibility as you seem to think. In any case, this could also better define the direction of the party as well as the nation and thus become the platform for the next national elections, which certainly are not far away. These are the grounds on which I would like to see the party divide itself and have the better elements of the bourgeoisie align themselves with a democratic-socialist government party. (F. Turati and A. Kuliscioff, *Carteggio*,

vol. 5, *Dopoguerra e fascismo: 1919–1922* [Turin: Einaudi, 1953], p. 345]

The Turati-Kuliscioff correspondence of this period makes frequent reference to the personal friendship and collaboration between Turati and Omodeo.

§44. *Past and present*

1. On Francesco Ciccotti (who legally changed his surname to Scozzese Ciccotti but always signed his writings "Francesco Ciccotti"), see Notebook 1, §116, and the corresponding note to the text, n. 4.

Leonardo Gatto Roissard, who held the rank of major in the Alpine corps, wrote on military affairs (under the pseudonym Anando) for both *Avanti!* and *L'Ordine Nuovo* between 1919 and 1922. In 1922 he joined the reformist socialists and contributed articles on military affairs to their publication, *Giustizia*. Gramsci owned a copy of Leonardo Gatto Roissard's book *Disarmo e difesa* (Disarmament and defense) (Milan: Corbaccio, 1925) but did not have it with him in prison. An article on "Gatto Roissard (Anando)" that appeared in the July 25, 1925, issue of *L'Unità* has been attributed to Gramsci: see Antonio Gramsci, *Per la verità: Scritti, 1913–1926*, ed. Renzo Martinelli (Rome: Editori Riuniti, 1974), pp. 321–23.

2. Pietro Nenni (1891–1980) was a member of the Republican Party, campaigned in favor of Italian intervention in World War I, and wrote for Mussolini's *Il Popolo d'Italia* before joining the Socialist Party in 1921. By the end of 1922 he had become the editor-in-chief of *Avanti!* a position that enabled him to assume a leading role in opposing the fusion of his party with the Communists. In an effort to combat the Fascist dictatorship, Nenni worked for the reconciliation of the Socialist Party with the reformist Unitary Socialist Party, and in 1934, while in exile, he advocated the Pact of Unity with the Communist Party. After the war, Nenni had very prominent roles in both the Socialist Party and the Italian government.

3. Francesco Rèpaci was the brother of the more widely known Leonida Rèpaci, who is mentioned several times in the notebooks. Gramsci is especially severe in his criticism of the Rèpaci brothers in Notebook 9, §48 (and in the corresponding C text: Notebook 23, §26).

4. See Notebook 3, §42, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially nn. 5 and 6.

5. Italo Toscani's article "Carabinieri reali" (Royal carabinieri) has not been traced. Gramsci discusses Toscani at some length in Notebook 3, §165.

§45. *Past and present*

1. On Pietro Abbo and his speech at the Congress of Livorno, see Notebook 1, §2, and n. 2 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§46. *Past and present*

1. *Signore* (plural, *signori*), as Gramsci explains in this paragraph, is a word with many nuances. Within the feudal context, the *signore* was the lord. In the narrowest literal sense, the term means "gentleman" or "mister."

2. "Starveling" is used here to render the figurative phrase *morto di fame*, which connotes a miserable, wretched, poverty-stricken person.

3. See Notebook 2, §25.

4. Carlo Cipolla (1854–1917), a medieval scholar who was a professor at the University of Turin from 1882 to 1906, published many essays in the *Atti dell'Academia delle Scienze di Torino*, but Gramsci appears to be referring to the text of a lecture on the ethnic composition of Italy delivered by Cipolla on November 19, 1900, to mark the formal opening of the academic year at the university; see Carlo Cipolla, *Intorno alla costituzione etnografica della nazione italiana* (Turin: Paravia, 1900).

5. In Notebook 9, §142 (and in the corresponding C text, Notebook 13, §29), Gramsci describes the political positions of the Action Party and of Amadeo Bordiga as gypsylike and nomadic.

§47. *Political science and the positivists*

1. Scipio Sighele's book on private morals and the morals of politics comprised a revised version of his book on sectarian criminality and a reprint of his pamphlet *Contro il parlamentarismo* (Against parliamentarianism). Although no copy of this volume by Sighele is conserved among the books Gramsci owned in prison, though apparently he had perused it.

On Scipio Sighele, see Notebook 2, §25, n. 1.

2. On Cesare Lombroso, see Notebook 1, §26, n. 1.

3. Guglielmo Ferrero, "Morale individuale e morale politica" (Personal morals and political morals), *La Riforma Sociale* 1, no. 21–22 (1894).

On Guglielmo Ferrero, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 17.

4. Enrico Ferri, *Socialismo e criminalità* (Socialism and criminality) (Milan-Turin-Rome: Bocca, 1883); Filippo Turati, *Il delitto e la questione sociale: Appunti sulla questione penale* (Crime and the problem of society: Notes on the penal question), 3d ed. (Bologna: Casa Editrice "La contro-corrente," 1913).

On Enrico Ferri and Filippo Turati, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 15.

5. On Raffaele Garofalo, see Notebook 1, §126, n. 1.

6. Scipio Sighele resigned from the Italian Nationalist Association in 1912 in protest against its antidemocratic positions.

§48. *Past and present. Spontaneity and conscious leadership*

1. Gramsci is referring to the arguments set forth by Henri De Man in his book *The Psychology of Socialism*. See Notebook 1, §61, n. 13.

2. Maurice Maeterlinck (1862–1949), the Belgian writer who won the Nobel Prize for literature in 1911, wrote in French and spent most of his life in France, where he was closely associated with avant-garde currents in the arts and especially with the symbolist movement. Although best known as a playwright, he was also a poet and essayist; in addition, he wrote a number of books in which he expounded his philosophical and mystical speculations. He developed an interest in medieval mystics and turned to the study of the occult and metapsychology.

3. I.e. Lenin's.

4. Gramsci is referring to the struggles of the organized labor movement in Barcelona after the First World War.

5. On the charge leveled against the *Ordine Nuovo* group that it was Bergsonian and voluntarist, see Notebook 3, §42 (and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially n. 2), and Notebook 11, §12.

6. See Notebook 1, §44, n. 38.

7. On Easter Monday, March 30, 1282, at the hour of vespers, the mistreatment of a Sicilian woman by French soldiers near a church close to Palermo sparked a riot against the oppressive rule of Charles I of Anjou, the king of Naples-Sicily. The uprising spread rapidly throughout Sicily; two thousand French soldiers were massacred in Palermo alone. Members of the island's nobility—prominent among them, Giovanni da Procida—were also displeased with the Angevin monarchy and had been conspiring with the Aragonese to displace it. Within six months of the rebellion, the Angevins (who had the support of the papacy and the Italian Guelfs) were forced to abandon Sicily when the forces of Peter III of Aragon (favored by the Ghibellines) landed on the island and quickly established control over it.

§49. *Cultural topics. Ideological material*

1. "Spirit of cleavage" (*spirito di scissione*) is a phrase that recurs frequently in Gramsci's writings. It is an adaptation of a concept found in Georges Sorel, who in the first section of chapter 6 of *Reflections on Violence* discusses "that cleavage between the classes which is the basis of all Socialism" (Georges Sorel, *Reflections on Violence*, trans. T. E. Hulme and J. Roth [Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950], p. 204). According to

Sorel: "When the governing classes, no longer daring to govern, are ashamed of their privileged situation, are eager to make advances to their enemies, and proclaim their horror of all cleavage in society, it becomes much more difficult to maintain in the minds of the proletariat this idea of cleavage which without Socialism cannot fulfill its historical role" (pp. 208–209).

§50. *Concordat*

1. It is most unlikely that Gramsci had access to Luigi Taparelli D'Azeglio's two-volume work *Esame critico degli ordini rappresentativi nella società moderna* (Critical study of the representative orders in modern society) (Rome, 1854); probably he extracted this quotation from a secondary source, which, however, has not been traced.

On Luigi Taparelli D'Azeglio and his political views, see Notebook 2, §13.

§51. *Past and present*

1. See Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1852), in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1979), 11:103: "Hegel remarks somewhere that all facts and personages of great importance in world history occur, as it were, twice. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second as farce." In prison, Gramsci had a copy of the French translation of this text: *Le dix-huit Brumaire de Louis Bonaparte*, in Karl Marx, *Oeuvres complètes*, trans. J. Molitor, vol. 3 (Paris: Costes, 1928).

2. Karl Marx's introduction to his *Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law* (1843–44), in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1975), 3:179. Gramsci translates this passage from the French edition of Marx's works that he had in prison: *Oeuvres philosophiques*, trans. J. Molitor (Paris: Costes, 1927), 1:90–91.

§52. *The pillories of virtue*

1. Eugène Sue's novel *Les Mystères de Paris* was published in serial form in 1842–43. For an English translation, see *The Mysteries of Paris* (New York: Fertig, 1987).

2. Gramsci quotes these sentences in French from *La Sainte Famille*, in Karl Marx, *Oeuvres philosophiques*, trans. J. Molitor (Paris: Costes, 1928), 3:88. For the English translation, see *The Holy Family; or, Critique of Critical Criticism*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1975), 4:189. Marx's comment occurs in

the context of an extensive critique of Sue's work. Furthermore, Gramsci's comment on Sue's criminological theories is a paraphrase of Marx's observation: "For each point of the present penal code, which he retains, Monsieur Sue projects the addition of a counterpart in a reward code copied from it to the last detail" (4:188).

§53. *Past and present. Influence of the romanticism of French serials*

1. Gramsci is referring to Mario Gioda (1883–1924), an anarchist who wrote for Mussolini's newspaper *Il Popolo d'Italia* in support of Italian intervention in the war and subsequently was very active in the nascent Fascist movement in Turin. Gioda also wrote a series of articles on the Turin underworld for the periodical *La Folla* under the Balzacian pseudonym "L'amico di Vautrin" (Vautrin's friend); the articles were subsequently collected in a volume, *Torino sotterranea illustrata* (Turin: Righini, 1914). Gioda's name (Gramsci also called him, disparagingly, Marco Sbroda) appears frequently in Gramsci's journalistic writings; see especially "Il porcellino di terra" (The sow bug), in the column "Sotto la Mole" of the Piedmont edition of *Avanti!*, February 1, 1916; "Il porcellino grugnisce" (The sow bug grunts), in the column "Sotto la Mole" of the Piedmont edition of *Avanti!*, February 8, 1916; and "Caratteri italiani: Gioda o del romanticismo" (Italian characters: Gioda; or, On romanticism), in *L'Unità*, February 28, 1924.

In "Il porcellino di terra" Gramsci opens his attack on Gioda thus:

> The war has created a situation that resembles the sort of thing that happens in the fields when a large rock is turned over: one sees certain whitish little creatures dashing with great speed in all directions, as if they have gone mad. The war has brought forth a large number of those new types of persons, who are now running around restlessly while they face less competition, knowing that their monopoly cannot last long. We know one of these sow bugs. Before the war he spent his life cataloging English lavatories and toilet covers, and in the midst of doing this he would find the time to produce dreadful rabble-rousing articles that every week were supposed to terrify the king greatly—for our sow bug did not mince words. With his visage of a musketeer of English toilets, with his eyes rolling in their sockets, he must have been a source of constant fear among his colleagues working on English lavatories and toilet covers.

In his later article, "Caratteri italiani: Gioda o del romanticismo," Gramsci draws attention to the parallels between the romantic fantasies fostered by French serial novels and the mentality exhibited by Fascists like Gioda:

It is said . . . that fascism is a romantic movement, that it actually is Italian romanticism. Although I am convinced that fascism is a social, that is, a political-economic, movement that came into existence in Italy and was victorious because of an extraordinary historical conjuncture, I am disinclined to dismiss this deep-rooted synthetic view of fascism. The milieu in which individual fascists were formed, the ideology they have abundantly imbibed can be said to be romanticism. I am talking of fascists like Mario Gioda and Massimo Rocca, not like Cesare Maria De Vecchi and Cesare Forni; I am talking about the fascists of old Mussolinism, fascists who until August 1914 were anarchists, syndicalists, revolutionary socialists and then advocated intervention in the revolutionary war and became the earliest fascists, etc., etc. . . . Massimo Rocca was an employee at the Sonzogno publishing house; he translated and contributed to the dissemination of tens of thousands of copies of novels by Ponson du Terrail, Hector-Henri Malot, Henri Richebourg, Eugène Sue. Mario Gioda was "Vautrin's friend" in Paolo Valera's *Folla*; he was Valera's brightest and most promising disciple. In his drawer he must still have a long novel on the Turin underworld, a novel like E. Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris*, a novel in the expansive mode of Carolina Invernizio, in which a peaceful provincial city of honest working people, of peaceful petty bourgeois state pensioners, becomes a sink of iniquity, an aquarium of sea serpents, a refuge for every social monster. This is the romanticism, the romantic milieu, in which the fascist mind was formed. Why was the serial novel, of the kind published by Sonzogno, so popular in Italy before the war? Why was *Il Secolo* the most widely circulated newspaper? Why was Carolina Invernizio the most widely read novelist? Why are Dario Niccodemi's plays still so popular? Why was subversiveness in Italy before the war primarily "criminalist"? And why did the goal of revolution seem to be the reform of prisons and mental hospitals? Because of the great popularity of Paolo Valera? Because Filippo Turati's greatest theoretical and rhetorical effort was aimed at obtaining for prostitutes (elegantly called the "wage earners of love") the right to vote? The serial novel, the ideology for which the serial novel is known and because of which it has been enormously successful, is romanticism. Victor Hugo was a great romantic and the greatest writer of serial novels. . . . Mario Gioda and Massimo Rocca became anarchists reading about Jean Valjean's struggles against Javert. . . . Mario Gioda and Massimo Rocca have solidified their ideas through the novels of Eugène Sue, they became anticlerical reading *Le Juif errant*, they have assimilated Sue's theory on delinquency. Eugène Sue: the most complete representative and the greatest imbecile of the whole romantic movement—indeed, romantic, profoundly romantic, extensively romantic, and socially

romantic. The French romanticism of 1848 also left a segment of the petty bourgeoisie at the barricades, alongside the working class; but the working class was still weak, it was unable to seize power; power was seized by Louis Bonaparte, the petty bourgeoisie became Caesarist. This is the romantic side of the fascist movement, of fascists like Mario Gioda, Massimo Rocca, Curzio Suckert, Roberto Farinacci, etc., etc. An unbalanced imagination, a shudder of heroic fury, a psychological restlessness that contain no ideas but only the sentiments that pervade the serial novels of the French romanticism of 1848. The anarchists thought of the revolution as if it were a chapter of *Les Misérables*, with its Grantaire, Aigle de Meaux and Co., and a dash of Gavroche and Jean Valjean. The fascists want to be the "Prince Rodolphes" of the good Italian people. The historical conjuncture has made it possible for this romanticism to become a "ruling class" and for all of Italy to become a serial novel.

2. Louis Blanc (1811–82), the French socialist who proposed that the state should guarantee employment by setting up workshops that would be controlled by the workers themselves, was strongly influenced by the ideas of Saint-Simon. He was not always in agreement with the Saint-Simonians, however; for example, whereas the latter maintained that workers ought to be compensated according to their productivity, Blanc insisted on the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

3. Section 7 of *The Holy Family* is entitled "Revelation of Political Economic Mysteries" and comprises three sections: "Theoretical Revelation of Political Economic Mysteries," "'The Bank for the Poor,'" and "Model Farm at Bouqueval." See *The Holy Family*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1975), 4:196–200.

4. In *Les Mystères de Paris*, Prince Rodolphe wanders through the underworld dispensing justice. As Marx puts it: "He goes forth into the world to sever the wicked from among the just, to punish the wicked and reward the good. The conception of good and evil has sunk so deep into his weak brain that he really believes in a corporeal Satan and wants to catch the devil alive. . . . On the other hand, he tries to copy on a small scale the opposite of the devil, God. He likes 'de jouer un peu le role de la providence.' . . . Rodolphe regards himself as a good man and thinks that the wicked exist to afford him the self-satisfaction of his own excellence" (*The Holy Family*, 4:203).

§54. *Emilio Bodrero*

1. On Emilio Bodrero, see Notebook 2, §5, n. 1.

2. Roberto Ardigò (1828–1920), an ex-priest and professor for many years at the University of Padua, was one of the best-known and most influential positivist philosophers in Italy. He wrote numerous books, including one on the science of education: *La scienza dell'educazione* (1893). Gramsci discusses Ardigò at some length in Notebook 4, §6.

3. Bodrero was undersecretary of education from 1925 to 1928, when Pietro Fedele was minister of education. On Fedele, see Notebook 3, §9, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

4. Gramsci is referring to a polemical booklet on the Fascist state, the church, and education by the pseudonymous Ignotus, *Stato fascista, Chiesa, e scuola* (Rome: Libreria del Littorio, 1929). Gramsci comments more extensively on this pamphlet in Notebook 5, §70.

5. See Emilio Bodrero, "Itaca Italia" (Ithaca Italy), *Gerarchia* 10, no. 6 (June 1930): 452–65.

6. Bertoldo is a fictional figure who typifies the astute blockhead, the coarse individual who is not quite the fool he appears to be.

7. "Fighting spirit" is used here to translate *combattentismo*, a word that refers to the rebellious, nationalistic movement that gave rise to the Fasci di Combattimento that Mussolini started to organize in 1919 with the support of war veterans and former socialists.

8. Gramsci touches on many of the same thoughts expressed in this note in an April 7, 1931 letter to Tatiana Schucht:

> I'm not surprised that Professor Bodrero's lectures on Greek philosophy did not seem very interesting to you. He is a professor of the history of philosophy in I don't know right now which university (at one time he was in Padua), but he is neither a philosopher nor a historian: he is an erudite philologist who knows how to make speeches in a rhetorical-humanistic manner. I recently read an article of his about Homer's *Odyssey* that has shaken my belief that Bodrero is even a good philologist because in it he discovers that to have fought in a war is an experience that enables one to understand the *Odyssey*; I doubt that a Senegalese can understand Homer better after having fought in a war. On the other hand, Bodrero forgets that Ulysses, according to legend, was a draft dodger and a sort of malingerer because when facing the military commission that had gone to Ithaca to get him, he feigned madness (not a malingerer, I correct myself, but a simulator whose aim was to have himself declared unfit for service).

§55. *Past and present. Otto Kahn*

1. Gramsci's source of information on Otto Kahn's visit to Europe and on the statements made by Kahn and other United States financiers is a

booklet by Samuel Gompers: *Ligue de Nations ou ligue de financiers* (Paris: Payot, 1924), a copy of which Gramsci had in prison. Note especially::

> A vrai dire, c'est toute la psychologie et toute la politique de la finance internationale qui se révèlent à plein dans les discours de ce chef américain d'une des plus grandes entreprises internationales; tout comme Paul Warburg, de la même firme et également d'origine allemande, Kahn a rapporté de son voyage en Europe la plus haute admiration pour les chefs du parti travailliste anglais, affilié à l'Internationale Socialiste. Warburg proclamait que le salut de l'Europe était entre les mains de ce parti révolutionnaire et international. Mais des sympathies tout aussi vives n'empêchent pas M. Kahn de chérir également M. Mussolini. Tout comme Judge Gary, d'autres gros financiers et les délégués de la Chambre de Commerce américaine après leur voyage d'études en Italie, Kahn ne tarit pas d'éloges sur le compte du fascisme. D'après lui, aux "vices d'un régime uniquement parlementaire," Mussolini aurait substitué "des méthodes de gouvernement effectives, énergiques, progressives. (pp. 86–87)

2. On Giuseppe Volpi, who as finance minister was responsible for arranging the Morgan loan, see Notebook 2, §6, n. 3. Information on the Morgan loan is recorded in Notebook 2, §6 (see especially 1:250–51).

Prior to his imprisonment, Gramsci had commented on the Morgan loan in a report he wrote for the August 2–3, 1926, meeting of the Italian Communist Party's executive committee. In the first section of his report, which was subsequently published in *Stato Operaio* 2, no. 3 (March 1928): 82–88, Gramsci wrote:

> One element that must be kept in mind is the fact that the fascist government has completely enslaved Italy to America. In liquidating the war debt to both America and England, the fascist government made no effort to obtain any guarantees concerning the negotiability of Italian bonds. The Italian stock market and Italian finance are exposed at all times to the political blackmail of the American and English governments, who can at any moment inundate the world market with enormous quantities of Italian currency. The Morgan loan, moreover, has been incurred under even worse conditions. Out of the hundred million dollars that have been borrowed, the Italian government has only thirty-three million at its disposal. The Italian government can make use of the other sixty-seven million only with the personal consent of Morgan, which means that Morgan is the real head of the Italian government.

3. Gramsci did not have a copy in prison of Joseph Caillaux's *Où va la France? Où va l'Europe?* (Paris: Aux Editions de la Sirène, 1922), but it seems likely that he had read this book at an earlier time.

On Joseph Caillaux, see Notebook 1, §48, n. 6.

4. Gramsci may be referring to what he had written in Notebook 1, §135.

§56. *The concept of organic centralism and the priestly caste*

1. Gramsci may be referring to the debates on the composition and organizational character of the party that raged within the Italian Communist Party during the period leading to the Third Party Congress, held in Lyons in January 1926. At the time, Amadeo Bordiga, who maintained that the party had to adhere faithfully and consistently to firmly established strategic principles, proposed that the party's organization should be characterized as "organic centralism" rather than "democratic centralism." Gramsci discusses the character and organization of the party in many places throughout the notebooks, but in conjunction with this note see especially Notebook 9, §68, and its corresponding C text in Notebook 13, §36.

§57. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Papini*

1. In *La Civiltà Cattolica* 81 (July 19, 1930): 152–58, an unsigned essay, "Intorno alla vita e agli scritti di S. Agostino" (On the life and writings of Saint Augustine), that reviewed recent publications on Saint Augustine eulogized Giovanni Papini's book *Sant'Agostino*, 2d ed. (Florence: Vallecchi, 1930). Gramsci comments on this review-essay once again in Notebook 6, §182.

On Giovanni Papini, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1.

2. These phrases are quoted in the review-essay "Intorno alla vita e agli scritti di S. Agostino."

§58. *Types of periodicals. The* Voce-Leonardo *type*

1. Gramsci is referring to the *Rassegna Settimanale della Stampa Estera*, a weekly review of the foreign press that he received in prison and used as *the* source for a number of entries in the notebooks.

§59. *Past and present. The intellectual influence of France*

1. Georges Sorel made these observations in an August 28, 1917, letter to Roberto Michels. This and other letters from Sorel to Michels were published in Italian translation in "Lettere di Georges Sorel a Robert Michels,"

Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica 2, no. 5 (September–October 1929): 288–93. The relevant passage from Sorel's letter is quoted verbatim by Gramsci in Notebook 2, §45; see also the corresponding note to the text, n. 2.

§60. *Past and present*

1. "Starvelings" is used here to translate *morti di fame*; see Notebook 3, §46, and n. 2 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

2. *Scapigliatura*, an avant-garde movement in the arts—but primarily literature—in the 1870s and 1880s, was closely associated with the bohemian scene in Milan, although it found adherents throughout Italy. Writers of the *scapigliatura* movement were strongly influenced by the writings of Baudelaire, the French symbolist poets, the German romantics, and Edgar Allan Poe, many of which they translated into Italian. The iconoclasm of the *scapigliati* (literally, "the disheveled") was directed against bourgeois morality, classicism, and Arcadian literature. The name of the movement was coined by Cletto Arrighi, whose real name was Carlo Righetti (1830–1906). Other major figures included the novelists Giuseppe Rovani (1818–74), Emilio Praga (1839–75), and Iginio Ugo Tarchetti (1841–69); Verdi's librettist Arrigo Boito (1842–1918); and the poet and painter Giovanni Camerana (1845–1905).

3. The bibliographical details as well as some of the other information used in this note are drawn from a review of Madini's book by Francesco Cazzamini Mussi, which appeared in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 13, no. 7 (July 1930): 247.

The Compagnia della Teppa was an underground organization of hoodlums and criminals that came into existence in Milan around 1817 and indulged in revelry and bullied people until it was suppressed by the police in 1821. In his review of Madini's book, Mussi writes that the Compagnia della Teppa was squashed "when Austria became fearful of the patriotic activity of Bichinkommer, whose name was foreign but not the spirit."

4. In modern Italian usage, *teppisti* (i.e., members of the Teppa) has come to mean "hooligans," "hoodlums,' "'ruffians," etc.

5. See Victor Hugo, *L'Homme qui rit* (1869), book 1, part 2, chap. 4.

6. The Vehmgericht, also known as the Holy Vehme, was a secret tribunal that exercised great power in Westphalia between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries.

7. Gaetano Salvemini (using the pseudonym Rerum Scriptor) wrote an article, "Per gli incidenti di Terlizzi" (On the incidents in Terlizzi), *L'Unità* 2, no. 39 (September 26, 1913), in which he described how he and his entourage were physically abused and injured by reactionary thugs when he visited a peasants' association in Terlizzi as part of his electoral

campaign in Apulia. The episode was an instance of the government's use of criminal elements in electoral politics, a topic that Salvemini treated in other articles in *L'Unità* and *Avanti!*

On Gaetano Salvemini, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 19.

§62. *Past and present*

1. Léon Daudet, *Le stupide dix-neuvième siècle* (Paris: Librairie d'*Action Française*, 1922). Gramsci also alludes to the reactionary use of the formula, or slogan, "the stupid nineteenth century" in his discussion of Daudet's fellow ideologue of the *Action Française*, Charles Maurras, in Notebook 1, §48.

2. Gramsci is echoing a line from Giosuè Carducci's ode on Shelley, "Presso l'urna di Percy Bysshe Shelley": "sol nel passato è il bello, sol ne la morte è il vero" (in the past alone is beauty, in death alone is truth).

§63. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. Gramsci is quoting from a short unsigned article, "Fallimento del romanzo" (Failure of the novel), in the "Dogana" (Customs house) section of *Critica Fascista* 8, no. 15, (August 1, 1930): 291. The quoted passage is also partially reproduced in "Romanzi d'appendice" (Serial novels), in the "Rassegna della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 32 (August 10, 1930).

2. In their edition of *Selections from Cultural Writings* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press,1985), David Forgacs and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith make the following observation about the relation between ideas of "national" and "popular" sovereignty in the French tradition: "The linking of these two concepts in French political thought can be traced from Rousseau's concept of the sovereignty of the general will, inalienable and thus not delegable to representatives, through the 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man ('sovereignty resides essentially in the nation') and the unimplemented Jacobin constitution of 1793 ('sovereignty resides in the people'). They re-emerged among the republicans in 1848" (p. 208 n. 14).

3. Gramsci is referring to a protracted controversy that arose when Umberto Fracchia, in an open letter, "A S.E. Volpe" (To H[is]. E[xcellency]. Volpe) in *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 25, (June 22, 1930), criticized a speech given by Gioacchino Volpe in his capacity as secretary of the Italian Academy. Volpe's speech was published as an article, "Il primo anno dell'Accademia d'Italia" (The first year of the Italian Academy) in *Nuova Antologia* 65, no. 1398 (June 16, 1930): 490–96. Gramsci refers again to this speech and the polemic it generated in Notebook 6, §16 and §38; he also quotes a brief extract from Volpe's speech in Notebook 7, §66. The con-

troversy generated numerous articles in *L'Italia Letteraria* as well as in other newspapers and periodicals. Among those who intervened was Ugo Ojetti, who published his "Lettera a Umberto Fracchia sulla critica" (A letter on criticism to Umberto Fracchia) in *Pègaso* 2, no. 8 (August 1930): 207–11. Gramsci discusses Ojetti's intervention at some length in Notebook 6, §16. Fracchia responded to Ojetti with, "Ojetti e la critica" (Ojetti and criticism), *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 32 (August 10, 1930).

On Umberto Fracchia, see Notebook 1, §24, n. 18; on Gioacchino Volpe, see Notebook 2, §100, n. 3; and on Ugo Ojetti, see Notebook 1, §24, n. 4.

4. The connection between Fracchia's public campaign against the widespread dissemination of foreign literature and the measures taken by the Ministry of the Interior (and specifically by Bianchi, the undersecretary) concerning the translation and publication of foreign works is brought up again by Gramsci in Notebook 6, §38. One of Gramsci's sources of information on this topic may have been an article, "Trop de zèle" (Too much zeal) in the "Rassegna della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 21 (August 25, 1929), which reported that Bianchi had just issued a circular "to remove, *insofar as it was lawfully permissible,* certain excessive restrictions imposed on some publishers and booksellers by the police authorities against the sale of works by Russian authors such as Gorky, Gogol, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, Turgenev, and also of works by Jack London such as *The Iron Heel.*"

Michele Bianchi (1883–1930) started his political career as a socialist and labor activist, much like Mussolini, with whom he worked very closely in the establishment of the Fascist movement. One of the principal organizers of the March on Rome in 1922, Bianchi played a leading role in the transformation of the Fascist movement into a political party, which he served as its first general secretary. He was appointed undersecretary at the Ministry of Public Works in 1925, undersecretary at the Ministry of the Interior in 1928, and minister of public works in 1929.

5. Camille Flammarion (1842–1925), founder of the French Astronomical Society, was best known for his popular books on science.

6. Gramsci is referring to Ruggero Bonghi's book *Perchè la letteratura italiana non sia popolare* (Milan, 1859), which addresses the failure of Italian literature to attract many readers from among the general public.

On Ruggero Bonghi, see Notebook 2, §8, n. 1.

7. On Manzoni and the language question, see, among others, Notebook 1, §73, and the accompanying Notes to the Text, especially n. 2.

8. Ferdinando Martini examined the state of Italian drama in a short study *Del teatro drammatico in Italia* (1862) that he developed some years later in *La fisima del teatro nazionale* (1888), which is incorporated in his book on the theater, *Al teatro* (Florence: Bemporad, 1895), pp. 113–72. Gramsci alluded to Martini's writings on the Italian theater in one of his

regular columns of theater criticism in the Turin edition of *Avanti!*, February 13, 1916: "If Ferdinando Martini were still writing about these trivialities, and if he were to raise the question once again of why there is no Italian national theater, one could respond . . . that the root problem is the insincerity of the playwrights, especially the young ones. The absence of genius might explain why no masterpieces spring forth. The theater, however, does not derive its sustenance exclusively from masterpieces; besides, masterpieces do not seem to be cropping up with great frequency in other countries, either."

Gramsci refers to the question raised by Martini about the lack of an Italian national tradition in drama elsewhere in the notebooks; see in particular Notebook 14, §14, and Notebook 21, §1.

Ferdinando Martini wrote many books of criticism, essays, narrative fiction, and memoirs, in addition to holding many important political offices; see Notebook 2, §51, n. 2.

9. As can be seen from the C text version of this note (Notebook 21, §5), what Gramsci means here is that there have been no poets in Italy like Pierre-Jean Béranger (1780–1857), whose satires had great popular appeal.

10. On Francesco Domenico Guerrazzi, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 37.

11. Carolina Invernizio (1858–1916) wrote numerous sentimental and sensationalist novels that enjoyed tremendous popular success. Her writings were influenced by and bear many resemblances to the popular fiction produced in France by Xavier Aymonde Montépin and Ponson du Terrail (on whom see Notebook 3, §38, n. 12, and §78, n. 3).

12. Francesco Mastriani (1819–91) wrote more than a hundred serial novels, most of them depicting the miserable lives and experiences of the poor in Naples. He was considered the Italian counterpart of Eugène Sue, whom he obviously imitated.

13. Giovanni Papini's article on Carolina Invernizio, originally published in *Il Resto del Carlino* of December 4, 1916, was later included in his book of essays, *Testimonianze: Saggi non critici* (Milan: Studio Editoriale Lombardo, 1918), pp. 41–53.

On Giovanni Papini, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1.

14. Gramsci is referring to the Papini bibliography (covering the years 1902–27) in Enzo Palmieri's work on his contemporaries, *Interpretazioni del mio tempo*, vol. 1, *Giovanni Papini*, ed. Tito Casini (Florence: Vallecchi, 1927).

15. *Guerrin meschino* (The humble guerino) and *I reali di Francia* (The monarchs of France) are the best-known and most popular chivalric romances by Andrea da Barberino (ca. 1370–ca. 1431). *Guerrin meschino* is discussed at some length in Notebook 6, §207. During his incarceration in Milan, Gramsci read *Guerrin meschino* and mentioned it in a May 2, 1927, letter to his wife, Julia: "You know, when I received your

letter in which you speak of the famous Atlas, I had only a few days earlier returned *Guerrin meschino* to the library, a very popular Italian knightly romance, much read by the peasants etc., especially southerners; I would have liked to transcribe a few geographic passages contained in it, some of the most amusing (Sicily, for example, is set among the Polar regions)."

16. In certain parts of Italy, especially in Tuscany, peasants celebrated May Day with singing and dancing festivals (known as *maggi*) at which they acted out the stories of fabled figures derived from history, the Bible, chivalric romances, and other popular sources.

According to legend, Pia dei Tolomei was a lady from Siena murdered by her husband in the Sienese Maremma. She appears in the last seven lines of canto 5of the "Purgatorio" in Dante's *Divine Comedy*, where she utters the famous words: "Siena made me, Maremma unmade me" (l. 134).

17. Ugo Mioni (1870–1935), a Catholic priest who rose to the rank of monsignor, wrote numerous works of popular fiction and many others on religious topics, such as the liturgy, Catholic missionary activity, and so on.

Guglielmo Massaja (1809–89), an Italian Capuchin friar, missionary, and explorer, wrote a twelve-volume work, *I miei trentacinque anni di missione nell'Alta Etiopia* (1885–95), that recounts his experiences during the thirty-five years he spent in Abyssinia. He was made a cardinal by Pope Leo XIII.

18. The Jesuit Angelo Secchi (1818–78) was one of the earliest scientists with a specific interest in astrophysics. He wrote many books on astronomy and philosophical approaches to physics, several of which were translated into French. Preserved among the books that Gramsci owned during his prison years is a slim volume on Secchi's pioneering work in astrophysics: Giorgio Abetti, *Padre Angelo Secchi: Il pionere dell'astrofisica* (Milan: Casa Editrice Giacomo Agnelli, 1928). Since this booklet is not stamped with the prison seal, it is likely that Gramsci received it after his transfer to the Cusumano clinic in Formia.

19. See, especially, Notebook 1, §89.

§64. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. Gramsci is quoting from an unsigned review of Mario Puccini's book (which through the portrayal of a character named Cola purports to represent the typical Italian) that appeared in the "Rassegna bibliografica" (Bibliographical review) section of *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1344 (March 16, 1928): 270.

Mario Puccini (1887–1957) wrote a number of books describing the lives and feelings of people of humble birth, in a style meant to contrast

with that of Gabriele D'Annunzio. He also produced some travel books about South America and a critical study of Miguel de Unamuno.

§65. *Massimo Lelj,* Il Risorgimento dello spirito italiano: 1725–1861

1. Gramsci probably extracted this bibliographical reference to Massimo Lelj's book (on the revival of the Italian spirit during the one hundred and thirty-six years leading to the Risorgimento) from the list in "Libri ricevuti" (Books received) in *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1344 (March 16, 1928).

§66. *Lorianism and the baroque style*

1. Gramsci is quoting from an article by Paolo Orano, "Ibsen," in *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1345 (April 1, 1928): 289–97. The exclamation points and other insertions within parentheses are Gramsci's. Orano is first labeled a Lorian in Notebook 1, §30.

On Paolo Orano, see Notebook 1, §30, n. 1.

§67. *Gerrymandering*

1. In 1812 the administration of the state of Massachusetts, under the leadership of the governor of the time, Elbridge Gerry, enacted a law that divided the state into new senatorial districts so as to enhance the electoral chances of the Democratic-Republicans and hamper the Federalists. One of the newly drawn districts, Essex County, resembled a salamander in shape—hence the coining of the term "gerrymander."

In all likelihood, this note was prompted by an allusion to the practice of gerrymandering in an article by Veracissimus (a pseudonym used by Tommaso Tittoni), "Per la verità storica" (For the historical truth), in *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1344 (April 1, 1928): 360. Gramsci also refers to this article in Notebook 2, §59.

§68. *Americanism*

1. Guglielmo Ferrero, *Fra i due mondi* (Milan: Treves, 1913). Ferrero's book, which discusses what the author calls "the two worlds" (i.e., Europe and America), is mentioned in the article by Etienne Fournol cited by Gramsci in the next paragraph. It is quite likely that Gramsci had first-hand knowledge of this book, as he did of other writings by Ferrero, whom he had criticized several times in the pages of *Avanti!* For example, in a "Sotto la Mole" column entitled "Prete Pero" in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* July 19, 1918, Gramsci wrote:

> The Hon. Nitti promotes the accord among the banks, the Ansaldo company raises its capital to five hundred million lire, a decree issued by the deputies nominates a commission of six hundred experts (!) to study the aftermath of the war . . . and performances of Dario Niccodemi's play *Prete Pero* [an antiwar play in which the main character is a country priest] are banned. Guglielmo Ferrero has reason to be happy. The government has chosen the right path: the reign of quality has been installed, and it should replace the reign of abhorred quantity. The state (!) takes upon itself the tutelage of the citizens, of the citizens' activities, of the citizens' wealth, of the citizens' aesthetic pleasures.
>
> The banks will only lend money to the aristocrats of national production. You will see what quality, what lovely things, what beautiful machines, what wonderful railroads, what great commerce. But the poor consumers might prefer to have goods that are low priced and abundant. That is impossible, my dears: we have all become aristocrats, we must all have our house rich in beauty. You are unable to buy things? Who says that you should buy things? And who says that you should live? The minister Nitti is a democrat, my dears: he desires little, but what he desires is good and beautiful.

Another "Sotto la Mole" column in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* (August 22, 1918) in which Gramsci attacks Ferrero is entitled "Consulta araldica" (The heralds' college):

> That's the nature of Italian democracy. Guglielmo Ferrero wrote a book to promote quality as opposed to quantity: that is, to promote the return to the artisan mode of production as opposed to capitalist production, the return to the closed aristocracy of production as opposed to the system of open competition that supplies the markets with large quantities of goods at low prices for the poor. The reformists . . . announce the prizes of war; the industrialists want to double the import tax. Italian democracy does not break loose from the confines of the reactionary ideology that typifies the French monarchists, the ideology peculiar to a form of society that has not yet been revolutionized by capitalist industry, a society that is not yet permeated by the valiant ideals associated with economic individualism, a society whose old customs have not been transformed, a petty bourgeois society, servile like sheep, lacking the thrill of initiative and independence. Italian democracy is essentially "Catholic" and its anticlericalism is nothing more that the peevishness of a child who believes that his mother gives larger bowls of soup to his eldest brother.

On Guglielmo Ferrero, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 17.

2. Etienne Fournol, "L'America nella letteratura francese del 1927" (America in French writings of 1927), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1344 (April 1, 1928): 370–81.

3. André Siegfried, *Les Etats-Unis d'aujourd'hui* (Paris: Colin 1928), translated into English as *America Comes of Age* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1928); and Lucien Romier, *Qui sera le maître, Europe ou Amerique?* (Paris: Hachette, 1927), already cited by Gramsci in Notebook 1, §61. Both of these books are mentioned in a footnote in Fournol's article, but Gramsci had direct knowledge of them since they were among the books he received in prison; he also refers to them in a March 25, 1929, letter to Tatiana Schucht.

André Siegfried (1875–1959) wrote numerous books on French as well as international politics and economics, including studies of the United States, Canada, Britain, New Zealand, and South Africa. His writings on the United States were quite extensive.

On Lucien Romier and the English translation of his book, see Notebook 1, §61, n. 7.

4. André Tardieu, *Devant l'obstacle: L'Amerique et nous* (Paris: Librairie Emil Paul, 1927), translated into English as *France and America: Some Experiences in Cooperation* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1927); Luc Durtain (pseudonym of André Nepven), *Hollywood dépassé* (Paris: Editions de la Nouvelle Revue Française, 1927); and Durtain, *Quarantième étage* (Paris: Editions de la Nouvelle Revue Française, 1927). All three books are mentioned in Fournol's article; there is nothing to indicate that Gramsci had firsthand knowledge of them.

André Tardieu (1876–1945) was initially a follower of Georges Clemenceau. A staunch supporter of the Versailles Treaty after the war, he had three brief stints as prime minister of France, in 1929, 1930, and 1932.

5. See Siegfried, *Les Etats-Unis d'aujourd'hui*: "Par là l'absence de ces institutions intermédiaires, dont la collaboration sociale se tempère d'autonomie, le milieu américain tend à prendre l'aspect d'un collectivisme de fait, voulu des élites et allègrement accepté de la masse, qui subrepticement mine la liberté de l'homme et canalise si étroitement son action que, sans en souffrir et sans même le savoir, il confirme lui-même son abdication" (pp. 349–50).

6. See Siegfried's preface to André Philip, *Le problème ouvrier aux Etats-Unis* (Paris: Alcan, 1927), pp. vii–xix. On André Philip's book—of which Gramsci had a copy while in prison—see Notebook 1, §51, n. 4.

§69. *Utopias and philosophical novels*

1. Gramsci is referring to Fénelon's *The Adventures of Telemachus*. Two different editions of this work in the French original are preserved

among Gramsci's books: François de Salignac Fénelon, *Les aventures de Télémaque, fils d'Ulysse* (Paris: Bossange Masson et Bessor, 1804), and *Les aventures de Télémaque* (Paris: Hachette, 1898).

§70. *Frère Vedremo*

1. "*Vedremo*" can mean quite simply "we will see," but it may also signal an inclination to defer actions or decisions, as in "we'll think about it" or "we'll wait and see."

2. Gramsci extracts this quotation from an article by Niccolò Rodolico, "Guelfismo e nazionalismo di Giuseppe De Maistre" (Joseph De Maistre's Guelfism and nationalism), in *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1346 (April 16, 1928): 506–15 (see especially p. 511). Gramsci uses information derived from this same article in Notebook 2, §62.

On Joseph De Maistre, see Notebook 1, §71, n. 1; on Niccolò Rodolico, see Notebook 2, §62, n. 1.

§71. *Utopias and philosophical novels*

1. Giuseppe Gabrieli, "Federico Cesi linceo" (Federico Cesi of the Lincei Academy), *Nuova Antologia* 65, no. 1401 (August 1, 1930): 352–69.

Giuseppe Gabrieli (1872–1942), in addition to being a distinguished orientalist, wrote on the history of scientific societies and institutes, including the Accademia dei Lincei.

2. The Accademia dei Lincei, founded in Rome in 1603 by Federico Cesi (1585–1630), a botanist, was the first—and remains to this day the most prestigious—scientific academy in Italy.

3. Tommaso Campanella's *Città del sole* (City of the sun) was first published in Latin in 1623 with the title *Civitas solis*. Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* appeared in 1624.

On Campanella and his *Città del sole*, see Notebook 1, §62, n. 1.

§72. *Science columns*

1. Attilio Cabiati (1872–1950), a professor at the Università Commerciale Bocconi, a very prestigious business school in Milan, was a prolific writer of books, pamphlets, and articles on Italian and international finance, monetary policy, and general economic topics. In the early 1920s his commentaries on business and economics appeared frequently in the daily newspapers *Il Secolo* and *La Stampa*.

On Luigi Einaudi, see Notebook 1, §11, n. 1.

2. Emilio Cecchi (1884–1966), an essayist, travel writer, art critic, and literary scholar with a special interest in English literature, published his work in many different journals and periodicals, including *Leonardo*, *La*

Voce, Il Marzocco, Nuova Antologia, and *La Ronda.* From 1919 to 1925 he was an Italian correspondent for the *Manchester Guardian,* and during the same period he contributed a regular book column for *La Tribuna.* In 1924 he became the literary editor of the daily *Il Secolo,* and in 1927 his articles started appearing regularly in the *Corriere della Sera.* In 1930 he spent a year teaching Italian culture at the University of California—Berkeley.

On Giuseppe Antonio Borgese see Notebook 1, n. §93, n. 2; on Ugo Ojetti, see Notebook 1, §24, n. 4; and on Goffredo Bellonci, see Notebook 1, §7, n. 1.

3. Ernesto Bertarelli (1878–1957) studied medicine and held many important academic positions in the field both in Italy and abroad. The author of many technical and scientific publications, he also wrote extensively for a wider audience of nonspecialists. Bertarelli was the editor of several periodicals devoted to medical and health issues, including the *Rivista di Igiene, L'Ingegnere Igienista, Pensiero Medico,* and *Salute.*

4. *L'Arduo* appeared for the first time in Bologna in January 1914 and was brought out regularly until December of the same year. It was revived several years later, again in Bologna, and came out regularly from the beginning of 1921 until the end of 1923. Sebastiano Timpanaro, who founded the journal, shared his editorial duties with Bruno Biancoli and Orazio Specchia, both of them physicists, like Timpanaro himself. *L'Arduo* published articles by some of the most interesting thinkers of the time, among them, Piero Gobetti, Guido De Ruggiero, Adriano Tilgher, Rodolfo Mondolfo, Luigi Russo, Federico Enriquez, Luigi Donati, and Orso Mario Corbino.

Sebastiano Timpanaro, Sr. (1888–1949), a distinguished professor of mathematics and physics, had a special interest in the philosophy and history of science, on which he published many books, essays, and articles in various literary and cultural periodicals. His publications include a multivolume edition of Galileo Galilei's writings. Most probably, Gramsci knew of Timpanaro's work primarily through *La Fiera Letteraria,* where Timpanaro published, among other things, a series of short articles under the title "Pretesti" (Pretexts) that he signed with the pseudonym Mario Pant. The journal founded by Timpanaro, *L'Arduo,* is also mentioned in a book that Gramsci cites a number of times in the notebooks; see Giuseppe Prezzolini, *La coltura italiana* (Florence: Società Anonima Editrice La Voce, 1923), p. 339. In prison, Gramsci had a copy of the second revised edition of Prezzolini's book; see Notebook 1, §43, n. 13.

§73. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Luigi Capuana*

1. See Luigi Tonelli, "Il carattere e l'opera di Luigi Capuana" (The character and work of Luigi Capuana), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1347 (May 1,

1928): 5–18. The quoted passage appears on pp. 16–17; the comments in parentheses are Gramsci's.

Luigi Tonelli (1890–1939), a literary critic who taught at the Catholic University of Milan, published books on the history of Italian drama, modern literary criticism, Manzoni, and Tasso.

On Luigi Capuana, see Notebook 1, §45, n. 4.

2. In the articles on the theater that he published regularly in *Avanti!* between 1916 and 1920, Gramsci wrote only once on Capuana: a short review of a performance of *Quacquarà*, one of Capuana's minor plays. Gramsci concludes his review with the following remarks: "This is a work that Luigi Capuana, a man of great ability and good taste, left unpublished for his heirs, who certainly did not pay homage to his memory by presenting it to the public." Gramsci's review appeared in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* on April 27, 1916.

3. *Il fu Mattia Pascal*, generally considered Luigi Pirandello's most successful novel, was first serialized in *Nuova Antologia* from April to June 1904 and brought out in book form the following year by the Treves publishing house of Milan. For an English translation, see Luigi Pirandello, *The Late Mattia Pascal*, trans. William Weaver (New York: Doubleday, 1964).

The first performance of Pirandello's *Liolà* took place in Rome in November 1916. (The play was written and performed in the dialect of Agrigento [Sicily], but a version of it in standard Italian was published in Florence in 1928.) On April 3, 1917, the play opened in Turin, at the Teatro Alfieri; Gramsci was present. In his review, "*Liolà* di Pirandello," which appeared in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* the following day, Gramsci stressed the significance of Pirandello's use of dialect and dwelt at some length on the fact that the plot of the play was drawn from *Il fu Mattia Pascal*. Among other things, Gramsci wrote:

> Luigi Pirandello's new three-act play was not a success at the Alfieri. It did not have the kind of success that is necessary for a play to be profitable. Nevertheless, *Liolà* is a fine play, perhaps the best that has been produced by the Sicilian dialect theater. . . .
>
> *Liolà* is the best product of Luigi Pirandello's literary energy. In it Pirandello has successfully rid himself of his rhetorical habits. Pirandello is deliberately a humorist, which means that all too often the initial intuition of his works is submerged in a rhetorical swamp of unconsciously sermonizing morality and pointless verbosity. *Liolà*, too, has passed through this phase; at the time he was called Mattia Pascal, and he was the central character of a long ironic novel entitled, precisely, *Il fu Mattia Pascal*. . . . Subsequently Pirandello reconceived his creation, and *Liolà* is the result. The plot is the same, but the artistic conception has been completely renewed; it has become whole, it

has become pure representation, totally rid of all that moralizing and artificial humoristic baggage that had weighed it down. *Liolà* is a farce, but in the best sense of the term, a farce that is related to the satyr dramas of ancient Greece and has its pictorial equivalent in the figurative art of the Hellenistic world seen on vases. There is reason to think that dialectal art as expressed in this play by Pirandello is linked to the ancient popular artistic tradition of Magna Graecia, with its buffoons, its pastoral idylls, its country life full of Dionysian frenzy, much of which has survived in the present Sicilian rural tradition, which is where it has been preserved most vitally and sincerely. . . .

Mattia Pascal, the melancholic modern creature, cross-eyed, the observer of life, at times cynical, bitter, sad, sentimental, becomes Liolà, the man of pagan life, full of moral and physical robustness, because he is himself simple vigorous humanity.

4. In a polemical article entitled "La lingua unica e l'Esperanto" (A single language and Esperanto) in *Il Grido del Popolo*, February 16, 1918, Gramsci compared the efforts to establish and impose the use of a uniform, or standard, or correct Italian with the drive to promote Esperanto. Part of his earlier argument is germane to the issue he touches on here:

The promoters of a single language are worried by the fact that while there are a number of people in the world who would like to communicate directly with one another, there is a countless number of different languages which restrict the possibility of communication. . . . This anxiety for a single language has manifested itself in various ways at different times. . . . In Italy this has become a national anxiety; it was expressed in the Accademia della Crusca, among the purists, and in the ideas of Manzoni. The purists posited the ideal of a definitive language: the language of certain fourteenth and sixteenth-century writers which should be perpetuated because it was the only beautiful language, the only genuine Italian. But the beauty of a language is not fixed in space and time; it does not even exist. It is not the language that is beautiful, but poetic masterpieces, and their beauty consists in their adequately expressing the artist's inner world.

Another passage from this same article by Gramsci is quoted in Notebook 1, §2, n. 2.

§74. *Giulio Bertoni and linguistics*

1. The correct title of the neolinguistics primer by Giulio Bertoni and Matteo G. Bartoli to which Gramsci refers (as "Manualetto di linguistica")

is *Breviario di neolinguistica* (Modena: Tipografia Editrice Modenese, 1925). The book is divided into two parts. Bertoni wrote the first part, "Principi generali" (General principles); the second part, by Bartoli, is entitled "Criteri tecnici" (Technical criteria). Gramsci owned a copy of this book prior to his arrest, and he repeatedly asked that it be sent to him—unsuccessfully, it seems. Soon after his arrest, Gramsci wrote a letter (which, though undated, is definitely from mid-November 1926 and almost certainly his very first letter from prison) from the Regina Coeli prison in Rome to his landlady, Clara Passarge, asking her "to send me the following books: (1) the German grammar that was in the bookshelf next to the entryway; (2) the *Breviario di linguistica*, by Bertoni and Bartoli, which was in the cabinet in front of the bed; (3) . . . an inexpensive copy of the *Divine Comedy*." The letter was confiscated by the police and never reached its destination. The *Breviario* was among the books Gramsci requested in an October 3, 1927, letter to Tatiana Schucht. Two months later he still had not received the book, as he communicated to Tatiana Schucht in a December 12, 1927, letter in which he also informed her of his decision to abandon "the plan of writing a dissertation dealing with and entitled 'This Round Table is Square' " (see Notebook 1, "Notes and Jottings," n. 5, 1:374).

The second work to which Gramsci refers is a pamphlet on language and poetry by Giulio Bertoni, *Linguaggio e poesia* (Rieti: Bibliotheca Editrice, 1930), that was published in the series "Quaderni critici raccolti da Domenico Petrini" (Critical notebooks collected by Domenico Petrini). *La Nuova Italia* 1, no. 8 (August 20, 1930), does not contain any passages from Bertoni's pamphlet, only a bibliographical reference to it on p. 348. Gramsci may have been thinking of a review of Bertoni's pamphlet by Ferrucio Blasi in *La Nuova Italia* 1, no. 10 (October 10, 1930): 428–29.

Giulio Bertoni (1878–1942), a linguist and Romance philologist, taught at the University of Turin from 1921 until 1928, when he moved to Rome. His approaches to the study of literature and language were eclectic; while he held on to certain positivistic premises, at the same time many of the views he expressed and the rhetoric he employed betrayed an affinity with the brand of idealism advanced by Croce and even more with the actual idealism of Giovanni Gentile. (Gramsci remarks in a September 20, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht: "Bertoni alone thinks he is a Crocean by dusting off the old theory of beautiful words and ugly words as a linguistic novelty derived from Croce's aesthetics.") The Accademia d'Italia appointed Bertoni to direct one of its major projects: namely, the production of a dictionary of the Italian language. Gramsci extends his critique of Bertoni in other parts of the notebooks; see especially Notebook 6, §20.

2. Matteo Giulio Bartoli (1873–1946) became a professor of linguistics at the University of Turin in 1907, and Gramsci studied with him when he

was attending the university. Bartoli was especially interested in examining the processes of linguistic change, tracing their geographic spread, and studying their relation to history and culture. In 1911 he drew up plans for a linguistic atlas of Italy. An opponent of the neogrammarians and their positivist orientation, Bartoli characterized himself as a neolinguist, as can be seen from the title of the book he coauthored with Giulio Bertoni and of another he published the same year, *Introduzione alla neolinguistica* (Geneva: Olschki, 1925). Later he described his specific field of inquiry as "spatial (or areal) linguistics"; his final book, in fact, consists of a collection of essays expounding his theories on areal linguistics, *Saggi di linguistica spaziale* (Turin: Bona, 1945). Bartoli also made scholarly contributions to the study of proto–Indo-European languages.

Gramsci alludes to his relationship with Bartoli in a March 19, 1927, letter to Tatiana Schucht: "A major intellectual 'remorse' of my life is the deep sorrow that I caused my good professor Bartoli at the University of Turin, who was convinced that I was the archangel destined to put to definitive rout the neogrammarians, since he, belonging to the same generation and bound by a million academic ties to this mob of most infamous men, did not wish, in his pronouncements, to go beyond a certain limit set by convention and by deference to the old funerary monuments of erudition."

3. See Giulio Bertoni, "Nuovi orientamenti linguistici" (New trends in linguistics), *Leonardo* 2, no. 2 (February 20, 1926): 31–34.

4. See Mario Casella, "L'eredità dell'Ascoli e l'odierna glottologia italiana" (The legacy of Ascoli and Italian linguistics today), *Il Marzocco* 35, no. 27 (July 6, 1930).

5. Giovanni Campus (1875–1919), a linguist born in the province of Sassari (Sardinia), wrote his first scholarly work on a major Sardinian dialect; *Fonetica del dialetto logudurese* (Turin: Bona, 1901) was favorably reviewed by Matteo Bartoli. Campus's expertise in phonetics enabled him to produce valuable studies on Latin and Aryo-European velars.

6. Benedetto Croce wrote a brief but favorable review of Bertoni and Bartoli's *Breviario di neolinguistica* in *La Critica* 24, no. 3 (May 20, 1926): 181–82. In 1941, however, Croce criticized Bertoni's work and sought to refute the notion that Bertoni "has advanced in any way the theory I elaborated." "It is clear to me," Croce wrote, "that Bertoni has contaminated my thought with the anesthetic and antiaesthetic thought of so-called actual idealism [i.e., Gentile's philosophy] and he remains embarrassingly trapped in the middle" ("La filosofia del linguaggio e le sue condizioni presenti in Italia" [The philosophy of language and its present state in Italy], reprinted in Benedetto Croce, *Discorsi di varia filosofia* (Bari: Laterza, 1959), 1:235–50).

7. Among many other things, the German philologist Karl Vossler (1872–1949) wrote two linguistic studies, *Positivismus und Idealismus in*

der Sprachwissenschaft (1904) and *Sprache als Schöpfung und Entwicklung* (1905)—translated into Italian and published in a single volume: *Positivismo e idealismo nella scienza del linguaggio* (Bari: Laterza, 1908)—in which his ideas are consonant with (and indebted to) Croce's early theories of language and aesthetics.

8. See Benedetto Croce's short essay "Questa tavola rotonda è quadrata" (This round table is square), originally published in 1905 and later included in one of Croce's book on aesthetics: *Problemi di estetica e contributi alla storia della estetica italiana* (Bari: Laterza, 1923), pp. 169–173. (Gramsci had a copy of this book in prison.) Croce's essay is the first topic treated by Gramsci in his final notebook, which is entirely devoted to the study of grammar (see Notebook 29, §1). On the phrase "this round table is square," see also Notebook 1, "Notes and Jottings," n. 5, 1:374.

§75. *Utopias and philosophical novels*

1. Ezio Chiòrboli, "Anton Francesco Doni," *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1347 (May 1, 1928): 43–48.

Anton Francesco Doni (1513–74) spent most of his life in Florence and Venice. Having set up a printing press, he published the works of other writers as well as his own. (Among other things, he published the translation of Thomas More's *Utopia* by Ortensio Lando (1512–ca. 1553) mentioned in the next paragraph of Gramsci's note.) His better-known works include the two-volume *Librerie*, which comprises information and critical comments on the writings of his contemporaries and is one of the earliest examples of the art of bibliography; *La zucca* (The gourd), a miscellany of proverbs, fables, jokes, conundrums, stories, and so on; *Mondi celesti, terrestri ed infernali* (Celestial, terrestrial, and infernal worlds), a series of satires published between 1552 and 1553; and *I marmi* (The marbles), a sequence of dialogues, also published in 1552–53, in which various characters from diverse social backgrounds converse on moral, social, and other issues on the marble steps of the cathedral of Florence.

2. Petrus Camper (1722–89), a Dutch anatomist and naturalist, was the first to attempt to establish a correlation between a person's intelligence and the width of his or her "facial angle."

3. Johann Kaspar Lavater (1741–1801), a Swiss Protestant pastor, became widely known for his studies of physiognomy. His profound interest in religious experience and the nonrational also led him to study the phenomenon of trances.

Franz Joseph Gall (1758–1828), a German physiologist and anatomist, is credited with having established phrenology as a systematic discipline. He was one of the first scientists to look for and to examine the specific functions of the different areas of the brain.

4. *Mondo pazzo o savio* (A mad or wise world) is one of the satires in the sequence *Mondi celesti, terrestri ed infernali.*

5. Chiòrboli, "Anton Francesco Doni," p. 46.

6. Ibid., p. 47.

7. The edition of Anton Francesco Doni's *I Marmi* edited by E. Chiòrboli (Bari: Laterza, 1928) is cited in a footnote on p. 43 of Chiòrboli's article.

§76. *The question of the language and the Italian intellectual classes*

1. According to legend, the Chinese philosopher Lao-tzu (ca. 604–531 B.C.), who is considered the founder of Taoism, was born with white hair, having remained in his mother's womb for more than sixty (and in other versions more than seventy or eighty) years. Gramsci refers to this legend of Lao-tzu several times in his preprison writings as well as in the notebooks and the letters from prison. In one of his early articles, "Vecchiezze" (Oldness), in the "Sotto la Mole" column of the Turin edition of *Avanti!*, July 13, 1916, he compares the young socialists (including himself) to Lao-tzu: "They accuse us of being old. . . . At times . . . we feel decrepit ourselves. . . . But a brief reflection suffices to dispel this pessimism. We feel old because by perverse destiny we were born in an old age. It is the air we breathe, the institutions that govern us, the men against whom we struggle: they are old. . . . Like Lao-tzu in the Chinese legend, we are old children, people born at the age of eighty. A mass of traditions weighs heavily on us, and we have to strain doubly hard to bear it; centuries-old laws shackle our current activities."

For Gramsci, the legend of Lao-tzu was associated with his memories of the University of Turin, as can be seen from an anecdote he recounts toward the end of an article entitled "Cultura e lotta di classe" (Culture and class struggle) in the May 25, 1918, issue of *Il Grido del Popolo*:

> We recall an old university professor who for forty years was supposedly teaching a course of theoretical philosophy on the "Final Evolutionary Being." Every year he opened with a "review" of the precursors of the system, and he talked about Lao-tzu, the old man-child of Chinese philosophy, the man born at the age of eighty. And every year he started talking about Lao-tzu again, because new students arrived, and they too had to learn about Lao-tzu from the mouth of the professor. And so the "Final Evolutionary Being" became a legend, an evanescent chimera, and for many generations of students the only living reality was Lao-tzu, the old man–child, the baby born at eighty.

Gramsci mentions this anecdote again in Notebook 6, §120, where he identifies the professor as Pasquale D'Ercole (1831–1917), who taught philosophy at the University of Turin.

Gramsci refers to Lao-tzu in the course of discussing the development of his sons and reminiscing about his own childhood in a July 1, 1929, letter to his wife, Giulia: "Indeed, I think that a child's life like that of thirty years ago is impossible today: children today are already eighty years old when they are born, like the Chinese Lao-tzu." One more allusion to Lao-tzu occurs in another letter to Giulia, dated May 18, 1931, and here too Gramsci's train of thought leads him to an implicit comparison between his childhood and that of his sons: "In conclusion: the world is vast and terrible and complicated, and we are acquiring a wisdom that will become proverbial. At least I think that I've become wiser than Lao-tzu, who at the moment of his birth already had the knowledge and composure of a man of eighty; I believe I've completely forgotten how to throw stones and how to catch lizards. Do Delio and Giuliano know how to throw stones far, make them whistle, make them skip four or five times on the water? I'm sorry that I wasn't able to teach them all these skills as well as others."

2. See Filippo Ermini, "Il Mediolatino" (Middle Latin), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1348 (May 16, 1928): 228–36.

Filippo Ermini (1868–1935) is the author of a valuable history of medieval Latin literature from its origins to the seventh century: *Storia della letteratura latina medievale dalle origini alla fine del secolo VII* (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1960). He also wrote a book on St. Benedict of Norcia and produced a critical edition of tenth-century epic poetry in Latin.

3. In a November 17, 1930, letter to Tatiana Schucht, Gramsci mentions that he had done some research on Middle Latin (probably when he was studying linguistics at the University of Turin):

> Ten years ago I wrote an essay on the language question according to Manzoni, and that required a certain amount of research into the organization of Italian culture from the time when the written language (the so-called Middle Latin: that is, the Latin written from 400 A.D. until 1300) became completely detached from the language spoken by the people, which, Roman centralization having come to an end, was fragmented into numberless dialects. This Middle Latin was followed by the vernacular, which was again submerged by humanistic Latin giving rise to an erudite language, vernacular in its lexicon but not in its phonology and even less in its syntax, which was reproduced from Latin: thus there continued to exist a double language, the popular or dialectal one and the erudite, that is, the language of intellectuals and the cultured classes.

During the early months of 1918 Gramsci was engaged in a rather heated polemic with some socialists from Milan and Turin who wanted actively to promote the dissemination and use of Esperanto in the name of "internationalism." Gramsci strongly opposed the idea on both linguistic and ideological grounds. In a letter—undated, but certainly written sometime in February 1918—to Leo Galetto (who, with Gramsci and Ottavio Pastore, was a member of the editorial staff of the Turin edition of *Avanti!*), Gramsci argued: "Purism is a rigidified and mechanistic form of linguistics, and therefore the mentality of the purist resembles the mentality of the advocate of Esperanto. I am a revolutionary, a *historicist*, and I maintain that the only *useful* and rational forms of social (linguistic, economic, political) activity are those that emerge spontaneously and are realized through the free activities of the energies of society. Therefore: down with Esperanto, for the same reason that we say down with all privileges, all mechanizations, all determined and rigidified forms of life—cadavers that infect and assail the process of life."

In his article "La lingua unica e l'Esperanto" (A single language and Esperanto) in *Il Grido del Popolo*, February 16, 1918, Gramsci described the drive to promote Esperanto as

> a cosmopolitan not an international preoccupation; the preoccupation of the bourgeois who travels for business or pleasure, of nomads rather than of stable productive citizens. They want to bring about arbitrarily *results* for which the necessary *conditions* do not yet exist; and since their activity is purely arbitrary, they succeed only in wasting the time and energy of those who take them seriously. They would like to give rise, artificially, to an utterly rigid language that is immune to change in space and time. By doing this they collide head on with the science of language which teaches that in and for itself language is an expression of beauty more than an instrument of communication, and that the history of the fortunes and the dissemination of a given language depends strictly on the complex social activity of the people who speak it.
>
> . . . Esperanto, the single language, is nothing but a whimsy, an illusion of cosmopolitan, humanitarian, democratic mentalities that have not yet been shaken and made fertile by historical criticism.
>
> . . . Each new social stratum that emerges in history, that organizes itself for the good fight, introduces new currents and new usages into the language, and it explodes the fixed schemes established by grammarians for the immediate convenience of teaching. In history, in social life, nothing is fixed, rigid, or definitive, and nothing ever will be. New truths augment the patrimony of knowl-

edge; new and increasingly greater needs are created by new living conditions; new intellectual and moral curiosities spur the spirit, compelling it to renew itself, to improve itself, to change linguistic forms of expression by drawing on foreign languages, reviving dead forms, changing meanings and grammatical functions. In this constant striving for perfection, in this flow of liquefied volcanic matter, utopias, arbitrary acts, vain illusions—like the current one of a single language and Esperanto—burn up and are annihilated.

4. In 842, in Strasbourg, Charles the Bald (king of the West Franks) and Louis the German (king of the East Franks) and their followers took an oath of alliance, known as the Serment de Strasbourg; its text is the oldest written document in Old French.

5. Gramsci is referring to a set of documents dating from 960 to 963 that are known as the *placiti cassinesi*. They are notarial acts certifying sworn testimony, recorded in the vernacular, concerning the property rights and claims of the Benedictine monastery of Montecassino. These documents, preserved in the archives of the monastery, contain the earliest-known transcriptions of the Italian vernacular.

6. In his unfinished treatise (written in Latin) on language, rhetoric, and style, *De vulgari eloquentia*, Dante sought to identify and define a common Italian literary language that, unlike the *volgari municipali* (as he calls the local dialects), was appropriate for dealing with the most elevated themes: love, arms, and virtue. This "high" literary language he characterized as the *volgare illustre* (illustrious vernacular), which was exemplified in the works of the poets of the Sicilian and Bolognese schools and in the Florentine *stil novo* (new style). The *volgare illustre*, as conceived by Dante, was a regularized form of Florentine stripped of its most idiosyncratic dialectal features.

7. For about five years leading up to 1848, a wave of nationalism and liberalism swept across Italy. Secular and clerical intellectuals were, for the most part, united in their calls for liberation from foreign rule and the unification of the country and in their demands for political reform. Vincenzo Gioberti articulated this sense of common purpose when he proposed a neo-Guelf solution to the problem of Italian unification—i.e., a federal Italy, with the pope as president, a concept that theoretically reconciled liberal aspirations and clerical demands (see Notebook 1, §46, n. 1). The actions of Pius IX during the first year of his papacy gave every indication that Gioberti's was an attainable vision. In 1848, however, the pope's position changed: he decided not to declare war on Austria. Gioberti became disillusioned and before long was advocating a different course of action in which the church would play no role; instead, Piedmont would

lead Italy to nationhood. Following the events of 1848, the unification of Italy and the political ideas that inspired it were bitterly opposed by the Vatican and the intellectuals affiliated with it.

8. Ferdinand Brunot (1860–1938), a French linguist who taught at the Sorbonne, wrote the ten-volume *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900* (Paris: Colin, 1905–30).

Emile Littré (1801–81), a philologist and positivist philosopher with close ties to Auguste Comte, was a member of the Académie Française as well as a senator in the National Assembly. He made a major contribution French lexicography with his monumental *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, 4 vols. (Paris: Hachette, 1863–72). His scholarly work includes important writings on literature, sociology, and philosophy, as well as on the history of the French language.

9. See Concetto Marchesi, *Storia della letteratura latina*, 2 vols. (Messina: Principato, 1925–27). Gramsci seems to have been familiar with this history of Latin literature, even though it is not among those books of his that have been preserved.

Concetto Marchesi (1878–1957), a philologist born in Sicily, was a professor at the universities of Messina and Pisa before becoming rector of the University of Padua. In addition to the history of Latin literature mentioned by Gramsci and books on Seneca and Tacitus, he published numerous critical editions as well as translations of Latin texts. Marchesi was also active in politics, first as a socialist and later as a communist. In 1943–44, he played an important role in organizing the Committee of National Liberation in Padua. A member of the Constituent Assembly in 1946, Marchesi was subsequently elected to parliament.

§78. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Popular serial novels*

1. During the time he spent at the prison in Milan awaiting trial, Gramsci read a large number of popular novels. He described his approach to these novels in a letter to Tatiana Schucht, dated April 22, 1929 (see 1:15–16).

Some of Gramsci's views on Victor Hugo's popular novels can be gleaned from one of his early articles: "Pregiudicati" (Convicted), in the "Sotto la Mole" column of the Turin edition of *Avanti!*, August 2, 1916:

> We do not have a great liking for French romanticism. Victor Hugo's bombast, his social preachings, leave us quite cold. Sterile diatribes, they are destructive; they do not even contribute constructively to art. They are the product of a sentimental fetishism of the "people," and they leave one's conscience undisturbed; they provide no stimulus for the creative imagination. Yet finding ourselves by chance in a courtroom has made us think again about the French romantic

writer's grand, titanic tirades against the system of justice of his time. We would like to have his robust lungs so that we could bellow against the mountains of stamped papers that imprint on the foreheads of the victims, who are headed behind bars, the brand that will send them forever to the Henna of the underworld: convicted!

Half an hour's worth of discussion, four trials at express speed, four guilty verdicts, four more convicted persons. The judges do not even know their names, except at the final decisive moment. The main anxiety is to finish off quickly in order to get out of the fetid courtroom to breathe. No sense of responsibility. . . .

We do not like French romanticism. Yet we would like to see one of its great rhetoricians, one of those "people" fetishists, pillory—in a book that passes through everyone's hands—these types of know-it-all jurists, these irresponsible persons who are appointed to the bench with the presumption that they can really protect the community. For we do not think that we are able, any time soon, to impose a penalty on such frivolous behavior. For we would like—but it would be expecting too much—the fury of the people to sweep away these mountains of stamped papers and these clowns in legal robes who are no less despicable than the well-remembered inquisitors of melodramas.

And therefore we would be satisfied if, thanks to a romantic novel, they were hounded, bawled out in the streets.

Gramsci also makes a brief observation on Hugo's politics in Notebook 2, §112.

Karl Marx's critique of Sue's *Les mystères de Paris* is brought up earlier in this notebook; see Notebook 3, §52 and §53. Gramsci directly associates Eugène Sue with "the late romanticism of 1848" in Notebook 1, §27.

2. Emile-Jules Richebourg (1833–98), a popular writer whose sentimental novels were serialized in *La Revue Française* and *Le Petit Journal*.

Pierre Decourcelle (1856–1926), who wrote sequels, acquired some measure of popularity as a playwright.

3. Xavier Aymonde de Montépin (1823–1902) wrote numerous serial novels as well as plays based on them.

4. On Pierre-Alexis Ponson du Terrail, see Notebook 3, §38, n. 12.

5. Monsieur Lecocq was the creation of Emile Gaboriau (1832–73), and Arsène Lupin was invented by Maurice Leblanc (1864–1941).

Gramsci returns to a discussion of the detective novel in Notebook 3, §153.

6. Ann Radcliffe (1764–1823), whose famous novels include *The Mysteries of Udolpho* and *The Italians*, was one of the most successful and widely admired writers of Gothic fiction in England.

7. Gramsci sketches some of his ideas on Jules Verne and the adventure novel in Notebook 3, §149.

Louis-Henri Boussenard (1847–1910) wrote numerous adventure novels.

8. Mario Mazzucchelli (b. 1876) wrote a number of biographical works, several of them on French historical figures, including André Chénier, Saint-Just, Robespierre, and Napoleon III. His book on Manzoni and the nun of Monza has been translated into English: *The Nun of Monza*, trans. E. Gendel (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963).

9. Tommaso Aniello (1620–47), known as Masaniello, led a popular insurrection against the nobility and Spanish rule in Naples in 1647. The revolt was triggered by the imposition of a new tax on fruit. Assassins hired by the nobles murdered Masaniello, who had urged his followers to slaughter the oppressive aristocrats. An opera based on his life, *La muette de Portici* (1828), also known as *Masaniello*, by the French composer Daniel Auber and the librettist Eugène Scribe, was a sensational popular success when first performed in France and elsewhere.

Cola di Rienzo (1313–54), a man of humble birth, had the grandiose vision of restoring the Roman republic and its ancient glory. In 1347, at a time when Rome was dominated by a few patrician families and the papacy had its seat in Avignon, Cola di Rienzo gathered the people on the Capitoline Hill, where he declared that he was abrogating many of the rights and privileges of the nobility. Taking the title of "tribune of the people," he set about reforming the laws, taxation system, and governmental structure of the city. Within a few months he was devising a plan to establish Rome as the capital of all Italy and had invited the city-states and the most powerful rulers of the peninsula to send representatives to a national parliament that he had set up. He also demanded that Louis the Bavarian (Emperor Louis IV) and Charles IV (also known as Charles of Luxembourg) come to Rome so that he could arbitrate their rival claims to the Holy Roman Empire; at the same time, he was making preparations for the election of a Roman emperor of Italy. The pope, the emperor, and especially the Roman nobles, alarmed by Rienzo's rapid accumulation of power, sought to topple him. Although he successfully resisted their first attempt to remove him, he could not muster popular support for long, and before the end of the year he was forced to flee the city. In 1354 Rienzo returned to govern Rome with the title of senator, conferred on him by Pope Innocent VI, who was hoping to use him in order to reestablish papal authority over the city. He was killed that same year by a rioting mob.

10. Bianca Capello (1548–87), a Venetian noblewoman (whose last name is sometimes spelled "Cappello") married to a Florentine gentleman, became the mistress of Francesco I de' Medici, who was married to Johanna, the archduchess of Austria. After the death of their respective

spouses, Bianca and Francesco married in 1578, a union that displeased the Florentine court and greatly angered Francesco's powerful brother, Cardinal Ferdinando I de' Medici. Many legends surround the death of the two lovers, who expired within a day of each other. One story has it that Ferdinando (who renounced his cardinalship in order to succeed his brother Francesco as sovereign ruler of Tuscany) had arranged for them to be poisoned. According to another story, it was Bianca who intended to poison Ferdinando, but her husband mistakenly ate some of the deadly food she had prepared; since she could not bear the thought of living without her beloved Francesco, she accompanied him to the grave by consuming some of the poisoned food herself. The tragedy of Bianca and Francesco inspired the composition of many literary works.

Gramsci may have been thinking of a specific biographical account of Bianca Capello in French: Pierre Gauthier, *Vie de Bianca Cappello* (Paris: Bibliothèque Historia—Tallaudier, 1928). Gauthier's book is discussed in an article by Nello Tarchiani, "Il romanzo di Bianca Cappello" (The extraordinary story of Bianca Cappello), in *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 30 (July 28, 1929).

11. *La monaca di Monza*, a very popular novel by Giovanni Rosini (1776–1855), was first published in three volumes in 1829 and reprinted numerous times in the nineteenth century and in the early decades of the twentieth century. It is a continuation of the story of Gertrude, the nun of Monza, one of the most memorable characters in Alessandro Manzoni's *I promessi sposi* (*The Betrothed*). Manzoni based his fictional creation on a historical figure, Marianna de Leyva.

12. Dario Niccodemi (1874–1934) spent some years studying in Argentina and wrote his first two plays in Spanish. At the turn of the century he moved back to Europe in the company of a French actress for whom he wrote some plays in French. He returned to his native Italy during the First World War, and by the early 1920s he had become one of the most popular and successful playwrights in the country. *Scampolo* (Remnant) was first performed in 1915, *L'aigrette* (The egret) in 1912, and *La volata* (The flight) in 1918.

Gramsci had reviewed the performances in Turin of the following plays by Niccodemi: *Scampolo*, in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* February 6, 1916; *Il titano* (The titan), in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* May 18, 1916; *La nemica* (The enemy), in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* November 9, 1916; *La maestrina* (The schoolmistress), in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* February 28, 1918; *Acidalia*, in the Piedmont edition of *Avanti!* April 8, 1919; and *La volata*, in the Piedmont edition of *Avanti!* April 24, 1919.

More than once in his reviews, Gramsci criticizes Niccodemi for using his skills not to produce good drama but rather to play on the cheap emotions of his audiences, generate applause, and increase ticket sales. He concludes the review of *La maestrina* with the remark, "Great theatrical skill:

no trace of art, and therefore great applause." Most of Gramsci's objections to Niccodemi's work are expressed in his review of *La volata*:

> The factory invades the palace. The old aristocratic palace, where feelings, affections, habits, and family relations have become a mold that is multicolored on the surface but laced with putrefaction at the core, is besieged by the fervent activity of modern work, which makes it crumble, causing many parts of it to break down. Work conquers the palace; the watertight compartment of the caste collapses under the blows of the hammer of the proletariat. The young countess Dora rebels against the tyranny of ancestral conventions and marries Mario Gaddi, an unpretentious worker who makes headway in the world by dint of his tenacious will and innate intelligence.
>
> This motif recurs frequently in Dario Niccodemi's plays. Niccodemi's intellectual preparation, his social and historical experience, are derived directly from the French romanticists of 1848. He is a spiritual epigone of those bourgeois writers who in their novels, plays, and poetry continued fighting the idealistic battle for the rights of man and for equality in matters of the heart and of sentiment, a battle that their ancestors of 1789 had won for the rights of man and for equality before the law.
>
> Niccodemi is a belated Georges Ohnet, and Georges Ohnet was already a latecomer after Eugène Sue, after Victor Hugo, and after countless writers of serial novels. But the motif still has the power of suggestion: it never fails to fascinate and to touch people—which goes to show that in the sphere of sentiment and reason, the modification and enrichment of customs have not proceeded at the same pace as the written law and technological progress. Class struggle is seen from the point of view of tender feelings and warmheartedness: what is established does not even amount to class distinction but rather to a conventional caricature of human beings based on the moral categories of good and evil, on the literary categories of angel and villain, and on the oleographic categories of work and rotten blood. Petty bourgeois soppiness that would have made Octave Mirbeau vomit and would have elicited an ironic smile from Maxim Gorky; the product of a mean envy inherent in the mentality of the pathetic French bourgeois who cannot forgive himself for feeling second-rate in his great admiration for the aristocrat, to whom he hopes to become related by marriage. Niccodemi does not raise himself one iota above the intellectual and artistic level of Carolina Invernizio. *La volata* is constructed along dramatic lines that are habitual to the "wizard" of Italian theater: big clashes, spicy situations, exasperat-

ing conflicts that generate the desired applause with its promise of many repeat performances.

Gramsci also comments on the relation between Niccodemi's plays and popular serial fiction (and specifically the French romanticists) in a later article, "Caratteri italiani: Gioda o del romanticismo" (Italian characters: Gioda; or, On romanticism), *L'Unità*, February 28, 1924 (quoted above in Notebook 3, §53, n. 1). On the same point, see Gramsci's April 22, 1929, letter to Tatiana Schucht, quoted on 1:15–16.

13. Giovacchino Forzano (1884–1970), who wrote many historical dramas, as well as some plays in dialect, is best known as the librettist for two of Puccini's operas, *Suor Angelica* and *Gianni Schicchi*. He also wrote libretti for operas by Ruggiero Leoncavallo, Pietro Mascagni, and others.

Gramsci had written an unfavorable review of one of Forzano's plays, *Madonna Oretta*, in the Piedmont edition of *Avanti!* February 5, 1919.

14. Gramsci had articulated some of his views on Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House* in one of his theater reviews, "La morale e il costume" (Morals and customs) in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* March 22, 1917. His review-essay is as much about the moral state of Italian society as it is about the performance of Ibsen's play that he attended:

> Although the majority of the audience warmly applauded the first two acts, it was dumbfounded and unresponsive after the third act, and the applause was muted: only one curtain call, more for the famous actress than for the superior creature brought into the world by Ibsen's imagination. Why was the audience unresponsive? Why did it fail to experience a flutter of sympathy when witnessing the profoundly moral act of Nora Helmar, who gives up her home, her husband, and her children to look for herself on her own, to dig down and find in the depths of her own self the strong roots of her moral being, to fulfill the obligations that one has, first of all, toward oneself?
>
> Drama, if it is to be truly drama and not a pointless iridescence of words, must have a moral content; it must be a representation of a necessary clash between two inner worlds, two viewpoints, two moral lives. If the clash is necessary, the play immediately grips the minds of the spectators; they will relive it in all its wholeness, in all its elementary as well as its most subtle historical motivations. By reliving the inner world of the play, the spectators also relive its art, the artistic form that has given concrete life to that world, that has concretized that world in a living and reliable representation of human individuals who suffer, rejoice, and struggle continuously to go beyond themselves, to improve the moral fiber of their own cur-

rent historical personalities immersed in worldly life. Why then, at a certain point, did the spectators—the gentlemen and ladies who yesterday evening witnessed the steady, necessary, humanly necessary, unfolding of Nora Helmar's spiritual drama—fail to sympathize with her? Why were they dumbfounded and almost disgusted by the ending? Are these gentlemen and these ladies immoral? Or is the humanity of Henrik Ibsen immoral?

Neither the one nor the other. What happened was simply that our customs rebelled against more spiritually human morals. It was simply a rebellion of our customs (I mean the customs that constitute the life of the Italian public), which are the traditional moral garb of our high and petty bourgeoisie, made up for the most part of servility, of submission to the milieu, of the hypocritical disguising of man the animal, a bundle of nerves and muscles sheathed in voluptuously attractive skin. Our customs rebelled against another custom, against a different, superior, more spiritual, less animalistic tradition. Another custom whereby woman and man are no longer just muscles, nerves, and skin but are essentially spirit; whereby the family is no longer just an economic institution but is, above all, a moral world in the making that is made whole by the intimate fusion of two souls that find in one another what each lacks individually; whereby the woman is no longer just the female who nurses her babies and feels for them a love made up of spasms of the flesh and throbbing of the heart but is a human creature in herself, has a consciousness of her own, her own inner needs, a human personality that is all hers, and the dignity of an independent being.

The customs of the Latin high and petty bourgeoisie rebel; they cannot understand this kind of world. The only form of women's liberation that our customs allow us to comprehend is that of the woman who becomes a cocotte. The *pochade* is really the only dramatic female action that our customs can comprehend: the attainment of physiological and sexual freedom. There is no escape from the dull circuit of nerves, muscles, and sensitive skin.

The rest of the review-essay is very important for understanding Gramsci's views on the situation of women in Italian society at the time.

§79. *The question of the language*

1. Ettore Veo, "Roma nei suoi fogli dialettali" (Rome in its dialect writings), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1350 (June 16, 1928): 515–25.

2. Ibid., p. 515.

3. The "liberal period of Pius IX" lasted for the two years after his accession to the papal throne in 1846. The Roman republic was established in 1849 and destroyed that same year by French military intervention.

§80. *The particular chauvinism of the Italians*

1. Francesco Savorgnan di Brazzà wrote a series of articles on Italian inventors and discoverers that were subsequently collected in a book; see Francesco Savorgnan di Brazzà, *Da Leonardo a Marconi* (Milan: Hoepli, 1933). Gramsci comments briefly on this book in Notebook 17, §19, where he echoes the observations he makes in this note.

§81. *Federico Confalonieri*

1. Gramsci's interest in the puzzling questions surrounding Confalonieri's behavior after his release from the Spielberg prison is evident from his observation in Notebook 1, §44: "The noteworthy fact about the Confalonieri question is this: that unlike other patriots who had been pardoned by Austria, Confalonieri, though he was a remarkable statesman, retired from active political life and after his liberation maintained a very reserved demeanour" (1:149).

On Count Federico Confalonieri, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 42.

2. Ugo Da Como, "Lettera inedita di Giuseppe Mazzini" (Unpublished letter by Giuseppe Mazzini), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1350 (June 16, 1928):425–433. The passage quoted by Gramsci appears on p. 433.

3. Ibid., p. 429.

Gabriele Rosa (1812–97), who shared many of Confalonieri's political views, was arrested by the Austrians for his patriotic activities and spent three years in the Spielberg prison. He wrote several books on various aspects of Italian and European history. His posthumously published *Autobiografia* (1912) is a valuable document for the study of the Risorgimento.

Farinata degli Uberti, who figures prominently in canto 10 of Dante's *Inferno* (discussed in detail by Gramsci in Notebook 4, §78–§88), was an important leader of the Ghibellines, who expelled the Guelfs from Florence in 1248. In 1258, however, the Guelfs triumphed over the Ghibellines, and Farinata was compelled to go into exile in Siena. He returned to Florence two years later, following the Ghibellines' decisive victory over their rivals.

§82. *French and Italian historical culture*

1. On Charles Maurras, see Notebook 1, §14, n. 1; §18; and §48.

On Jacques Bainville and his writings on the history of France, with which Gramsci was familiar, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 36.

2. Francesco Ferrucci (1489–1530), the military commissioner of the Florentine republic, was captured and then murdered by Fabrizio Maramaldo, commander of the combined armies of Pope Clement VII (Giulio dei Medici) and the Holy Roman emperor Charles V. Florence had suffered a long siege (1528–30), but it fell a few days after Ferrucci's death; Florentine republicanism was permanently crushed, and the despotic rule of the Medicis restored.

Milan, Venice, Mantua, Padua, and other northern Italian cities formed the first Lombard League in 1167 in order to protect their freedoms and jurisdictional autonomy from being subordinated to the imperial authority of Frederick I Barbarossa. The city-state of Como sided with the emperor Frederick in his conflict with the cities of the league.

In 1508 Pope Julius II joined a powerful anti-Venetian alliance, known as the League of Cambrai, that had been formed by Louis XII of France (who also ruled Milan), Ferdinand II of Spain (also king of Naples), and the Holy Roman emperor Maximilian I. The following year the troops of the alliance inflicted a heavy defeat on Venice, which enabled the pope to reacquire those large portions of the papal states that had been appropriated by Venice after the death of Pope Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia).

3. See Gioacchino Volpe, *L'Italia in cammino: L'ultimo cinquantennio* (Milan: Treves, 1927), in which the history of Italy since the Risorgimento is presented as a forward march of national consolidation and expansion. Gramsci owned a copy of this book; he mentions it in a letter he wrote from the prison in Milan to Tatiana Schucht on May 23, 1927: "I have very little history, and the same goes for literature: a book by Gioacchino Volpe on the last fifty years of Italian history, which is, however, topical and has a rather polemical slant."

On Gioacchino Volpe, see Notebook 2, §100, n. 3.

4. On Benedetto Croce's *Storia d'Italia dal 1871 al 1915* (Bari: Laterza, 1928), see Notebook 1, §132, n. 3.

5. On Giuseppe Prezzolini and the different editions of his book *La cultura italiana*, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1, and §43, n. 13.

§83. *Past and present*

1. Ermanno Amicucci, "Scuola di giornalismo" (School of journalism), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1351 (July 1, 1928): 71–90.

Ermanno Amicucci (1890–1955) worked indefatigably to establish Fascist control over the press. Founder of the Fascist Federation of Italian Journalists, he also served as secretary of the Fascist Journalist Union and

was a member of the commission that formulated Mussolini's government policies on book censorship. For many years he edited the Turin daily *Gazzetta del Popolo*. Amicucci remained a steadfast Fascist even after the collapse of the regime, and he continued to serve Mussolini during the period of the Republic of Salò; among other functions, he took over the editorship of *Il Corriere della Sera*, the very influential newspaper of Milan. Amicucci received a death sentence for his wartime activities, but an amnesty enabled him to emigrate to Argentina, where he remained until his death.

§84. *The death of Vittorio Emanuele II*

1. Angelo Guidi, "L'archivio inedito di Paulo Fambri" (The unpublished papers of Paulo Fambri), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1350 (June 16, 1928): 454–71; the sentence transcribed by Gramsci appears on p. 457. This is the first part of a long article published in segments in separate issues of *Nuova Antologia*. The third part of the article is cited in Notebook 2, §81.

Guido Baccelli (1832–1916) held the post of minister of education under three different prime ministers: Agostino Depretis, Francesco Crispi, and Luigi Pelloux. He was also minister of agriculture in the cabinet of Prime Minister Giuseppe Zanardelli.

On Paulo Fambri, see Notebook 2, §81, n. 1.

Vittorio Emanuele II, the first king of Italy, died of pneumonia complicated by pleurisy on January 9, 1878; he was fifty-seven years of age.

§85. *Arturo Graf*

1. In Notebook 2, §53, Gramsci describes Giovanni Cena as a "disciple of Graf." Cena, in fact, was Arturo Graf's student at the University of Turin.

For notes on Giovanni Cena and Arturo Graf, see Notebook 2, §53, nn. 1 and 3. For Cena, see also Notebook 3, §93, and Notebook 6, §42.

2. O. M. Barbano, "Per una fede: Da lettere inedite di Arturo Graf" (For faith: From Arturo Graf's unpublished letters), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1352 (July 16, 1928): 151–60.

3. Arturo Graf's slim volume *Per una fede* (Milan: Treves, 1906) consists of a reprint, with some added commentary, of an article Graf had originally published in the *Nuova Antologia* of June 1, 1905: that is, when the prestigious periodical was being edited by Giovanni Cena.

4. The periodical *Il Rinnovamento* (Renewal) was founded in 1907 by Tommaso Gallarati Scotti and other Milanese intellectuals who drew

their inspiration from the political philosophy of Vincenzo Gioberti. As its title indicates, the periodical was launched to promote the renewal of Catholicism by reconciling its teachings with science, its dogmas with historical criticism and biblical exegesis, and its social teachings with liberal, democratic, participatory politics. The intellectuals associated with *Il Rinnovamento* were very much a part of the current that was labeled modernism and officially condemned by Pope Pius X in his encyclical of 1907, *Pascendi dominici gregis*. *Il Rinnovamento* ceased publication in December 1909 as a result of pressure from the church.

§86. *Lorianism. Alfredo Trombetti*

1. Alfredo Trombetti (1866–1929), a polyglot who taught linguistics at the University of Bologna, was a strong advocate of the thesis that all languages derive from a single source. His major works include a four-volume study of comparative linguistics, *Saggi di glottologia generale comparata* (1908–20), and the book on Etruscan, *La lingua etrusca*, cited by Gramsci later in this note. Trombetti was a member of the Italian Academy.

Gramsci also discusses Trombetti's work in Notebook 3, §156.

2. See Pericle Ducati, "Il primo Congresso Internazionale Etrusco" (The first International Congress of Etruscan Studies), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1352 (July 16, 1928): 196–205.

Pericle Ducati (1880–1944), an archaeologist, held professorships at the universities of Catania, Turin, and Bologna and was a member of the Lincei Academy. He wrote extensively on ancient classical art and history, including two books on the Etruscan civilization.

3. Gaetano De Sanctis (1880–1944), an antipositivist classical scholar who attached great importance to the history of art, religion, and law, was a professor of ancient history at the University of Turin from 1900 until 1929, when he moved to the University of Rome. He was forced out of his academic post in 1931 for refusing to take the oath of loyalty to the Fascist regime. He was restored to his professorship in 1944.

Luigi Pareti (1885–1962), a professor of the history of antiquity at the universities of Florence, Turin, and Naples, wrote extensively on the origins of the Etruscan, Italic, and Greek cultures.

4. See Alfredo Trombetti, *La lingua etrusca* (Florence: Casa Editrice Rinascimento del Libro, 1928).

5. Giacomo Devoto (1897–1974) was appointed professor of linguistics at the University of Florence in 1927. He had a special interest in the ancient languages and cultures of the Italian peninsula.

6. On Gramsci's former professor of linguistics, Matteo Bartoli, see Notebook 3, §74, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially n. 2.

§87. *Regarding the formation of the Italian intellectual classes in the early Middle Ages*

1. Gramsci writes on the question of Middle Latin in Notebook 3, §76.

2. Alessandro Manzoni published his tragedy *Adelchi* (1822) with an appendix entitled "Discorso sopra alcuni punti della storia longobardica in Italia" (A discourse on some points of Longobard history in Italy). One of the points Manzoni stresses in his essay is that the indigenous Latin people retained their separate identity and did not fuse with the foreign Lombard invaders. The tragedy itself, as the title indicates, focuses on Adelchis, the son of Desiderius, the last Lombard king in Italy, and on his heroic struggles to regain his father's kingdom from Charlemagne. Manzoni transforms the historical figure of Adelchis into a romantic tragic hero. The tragedy, however, also has a salient nationalist motif. It depicts the Italian people as the victims of domination by two foreign powers, the Longobards and the Franks, engaged in a power struggle with each other. One of the messages Manzoni attempts to convey is that the Italians should not rely on foreigners to free them from oppressive domination by other foreign powers; rather, they need to recognize their common heritage, unite, and achieve independence and nationhood on their own.

3. Francesco Brandileone, "I 'due diritti' e il loro odierno insegnamento in Italia" (The two legal codes and how they are taught in Italy today), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1352 (July 16, 1928): 238–52.

Francesco Brandileone (1858–1929), a distinguished legal historian who held professorships at various universities, was a specialist in the Byzantine legal tradition, on which he wrote extensively. One of his books is a study on Byzantine law in southern Italy from the eighth to the twelfth century.

§88. *The study of the historical formation of the Italian intellectuals*

1. Gramsci discusses the need to go back to the time of the Roman Empire in his study of the history and role of Italian intellectuals in his letters to Tatiana Schucht of November 17, 1930, and August 3, 1931 (see the excerpts quoted in 1:29–30).

§89. *Lorianism*

1. The false news of the discovery of the lost books of Livy received considerable attention in the press for about two months starting in early August 1924. Mario Di Martino-Fusco (the professor whose name Gramsci does not recall), editor-in-chief of the journal *Mouseion*, created the impression that he had discovered among the manuscripts held by

Neapolitan convents the lost decads of Livy's history of Rome. The "discovery" was first reported in early August in the scholarly journal *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica*, edited by Francesco Ribezzo; the report claimed to be based on "Dr. Di Martino's word of honor." The story was picked up by the newspapers, fueled by the comments of some scholars who seemed inclined to give credence to the sensational news. The minister of education initiated an inquiry into the matter and asked Fausto Niccolini to conduct it. Di Martino, who in the meantime had made no effort to refute the stories about his supposed discovery, was compelled to declare that the whole affair stemmed from a misunderstanding. *The Chicago Daily News* contacted Benedetto Croce, asking him to shed some light on the issue. Croce responded with a telegram, the text of which was published in the Turin daily *La Stampa* on October 11, 1926; it can now be found in Benedetto Croce, *Pagine Sparse* (Bari: Laterza, 1960), 2:269–70. Decades later, Fausto Niccolini provided a detailed reconstruction of the entire affair in a pamphlet, *La farsa liviana* (The Livy farce), published privately in 1954; it was later included in a book on Croce's minor works by Fausto Niccolini, *Il Croce minore* (Milan and Naples: Ricciardi, 1963), pp. 193–248.

2. On Matteo Bartoli, see Notebook 3, §74, and n. 2 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§90. *History of the subaltern classes*

1. Gramsci is referring to page numbers in his manuscript and specifically to Notebook 3, §14 and §18.

§91. *Father Bresciani's progeny. The book fair*

1. On Umberto Fracchia, see Notebook 1, §24, n. 18.

§92. *Federico Confalonieri*

1. On Federico Confalonieri, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 42; see also Notebook 3, §81.

§93. *Giovanni Cena*

1. On Giovanni Cena, see Notebook 2, §53, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

See two publications by Alessandro Marcucci extolling Cena's establishment of schools for the benefit of the rural population of Lazio. The first, *G. Cena e le scuole per i contadini* (Rome: Off. Poligr. Ital., 1919), is

a fifteen-page pamphlet reproducing the text of a speech delivered to an audience of peasants at a school in Lazio on May 24, 1918; the second is an article Marcucci published in an educational journal: "La scuola in gloria di Giovanni Cena," *I Diritti della Scuola*, December 4, 1921.

§94. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Polifilo*

1. On Luca Beltrami and his stories (published under the pseudonym Polifilo) about the fictional town of Casate Olona, see Notebook 1, §24, n. 2.

Il Romanzo Mensile and *La Lettura* were monthly supplements of the daily *Corriere della Sera*.

2. Fortunato Pintor, *Bibliografia degli scritti di Luca Beltrami dal marzo 1881 al marzo 1930*, with a preface by Guido Mazzoni (Milan: Tipografia U. Allegretti, 1930). This bibliography of Beltrami's writings was published by his friends to mark "his seventy-fifth birthday and the twenty-fifth anniversary of his nomination as senator of the realm."

Fortunato Pintor (1877–1960), a Renaissance scholar and compiler of some very important bibliographical works, served as an editor of the Italian encyclopedia and oversaw the production of the biographical dictionary of Italians. He held the post of librarian at the National Library in Florence and at the senate.

On Guido Mazzoni, see Notebook 2, §31, n. 2.

3. See the section "Bibliografie" (Bibliographies) in *Il Marzocco* 35, no. 19 (May 11, 1930), which contains a brief description of and comment on Pintor's bibliography of Beltrami's writings; it is Gramsci's source of information for this note.

4. "Bibliografie." The parenthesis is Gramsci's.

5. Francisco Ferrer, a republican and anticlerical Spanish intellectual, was accused of instigating the violent uprising that erupted in Barcelona in July 1909 in opposition to the Moroccan war. Ferrer was found guilty and executed by firing squad on October 13, 1909. The trial and condemnation of Ferrer generated widespread protest marches and strikes in Italy, organized for the most part by anticlericals. *Il Marzocco*, like many other newspapers and periodicals, vehemently condemned Spain for its treatment of Ferrer. In its issue of October 17, 1909 (vol. 14, no. 42), for example, the entire front page, comprising an editorial and two articles, was devoted to the case.

§95. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. See Edoardo Boutet, "Gli aneddoti dell'Argentina: 2. Eschilo tra le lavandaie" (The anecdotes of the Argentina [Theater in Rome]: 2. Aeschylus among the washerwomen), *Il Viandante* 1, no. 23 (November 7, 1909).

Edoardo Boutet (1856–1915), a drama critic and teacher, became the director of the permanent company of the Argentina Theater, in Rome, in 1905, a post he held for three years.

On Tomaso Monicelli and the weekly paper, *Il Viandante*, which he edited, see Notebook 2, §89, n. 5.

2. Gaio [pseudonym of Adolfo Orvieto], "*Danton*, il melodramma, e il 'romanzo nella vita' " [Danton, drama, and 'fiction in life'], in the "Marginalia" section of *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 46 (November 17, 1929).

Adolfo Orvieto (1871–1952), together with his brother, Angiolo, founded the weekly review *Il Marzocco* in Florence in 1896. He was editor-in-chief of the review from 1901 until its suppression by the Fascist regime in 1932.

3. *Les deux orphelines* (1874), a play by Eugène Cormon (1810–1903) and Adolphe Dennery (1811–99), retained its great popularity for many years.

4. The Hungarian playwright who wrote *Danton* was actually Gyula Pekár (1867–1937). *Danton*, originally written in Hungarian, was first published in 1921 in Budapest.

§96. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Popular novels*

1. Baroness Emmuska Orczy (1865–1947) was born in Hungary but spent most of her life in England. She achieved fame with the publication, in 1905, of *The Scarlet Pimpernel*, the extremely popular novel about the adventures of an English aristocrat who rescues French aristocrats by smuggling them out of their country during the Revolution. Orczy's many other novels include sequels to *The Scarlet Pimpernel* and several detective stories.

2. After leaving his native Australia and settling in England, Guy Newell Boothby (1867–1905) wrote a prodigious number of novels and short stories, several of which are tales of adventure set in exotic places such as the South Seas and the East Indies.

3. *La capinera del mulino* (Milan: Sonzogno, n.d.) is the Italian translation of Emile Richebourg's *La fauvette du moulin*, a long novel that first appeared in serial form and was later published in four volumes (Paris: Rouff, 1948). This was one of several novels by Richebourg (mentioned earlier, in Notebook 3, §78) that were translated into Italian and brought out in inexpensive editions by the Sonzogno publishing house.

4. Edoardo Perino's publication of anticlerical literature (including Guerrazzi's work) is also mentioned in Notebook 2, §108.

On Francesco Domenico Guerrazzi, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 37.

§97. *The concordat*

1. The Law of Papal Guarantees, enacted on May 13, 1871, was meant to define and regulate the relations between the Kingdom of Italy and the

Holy See after the seizure of Rome, which completed the unification of the nation and wiped out the last vestiges of the pope's temporal power. Among other things, the law guaranteed the pope's rights and privileges as head of the Catholic Church and formally recognized the extraterritoriality of the Vatican. By this law, the Italian government also undertook to make an annual grant of several million lire to the Holy See. The Vatican, which regarded the Law of Papal Guarantees as an unacceptable unilateral action by a state whose legitimacy it did not recognize, refused to accept the grant, but the Italian government continued regularly to deposit the decreed amount in a fund set aside exclusively for the pope. The issue was resolved only when relations between the Italian state and the Holy See were regularized by the Lateran Accords (i.e., the concordat) of 1929.

§98. *Spartacus*

1. Tenney Frank, *Storia economica di Roma: Dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica*, trans. Bruno Lavagnini (Florence: Vallecchi, 1924). Gramsci had a copy of this book in prison. This book is a translation of Frank's *Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1920). A revised edition of this book was published by Johns Hopkins University Press in 1927. Gramsci is referring to a passage in chapter 10 (chapter 12 in the second edition) of Frank's book: "When Carthage fell, a large part of its population was sold into captivity. The Cimbri taken by Marius, assigned naturally to the heavy work on plantations, made up the backbone of Spartacus' army a few years later." This chapter, entitled "The Plebs Urbana," discusses at some length the impact that the large and diverse population of slaves and their descendants had on the economic and political life of Rome.

§99. *The law of numbers*

1. The content of this note (following the title and parenthesis) is a transcription of part of a footnote on p. 147 of Tenney Frank's *Storia economica di Roma*, cited in n. 1 of §98, above. See chapter 10 (chapter 12 in the second edition) of the original English version of Frank's *Economic History of Rome*.

§100. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Popular literature*

1. On Ugo Mioni, see Notebook 3, §63, and n. 17 in the accompanying Notes to the Text.

§101. *Father Bresciani's progeny. The antipopular or nonpopular-national character of Italian literature*

1. On Adriano Tilgher, see Notebook 1, §28, n. 2.

2. See the unsigned note under the subtitle "Ferragosto" (The August holiday) in the "Rassegna della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 34 (August 24, 1930).

On Giuseppe Parini, see Notebook 1, §88, n. 1.

§102. *Past and present. School of journalism*

1. Gramsci is referring to page numbers in his manuscript; they correspond to Notebook 3, §83.

2. See the column "Notizie sindacali" (Trade union news), in *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 34 (August 24, 1930).

§103. *The Risorgimento and the revolutionary classes*

1. See Nino Cortese, *Memorie di un generale della Repubblica e dell'Impero*, 2 vols. (Bari: Laterza, 1927), which comprises an edition of Francesco Pignatelli's *Memorie storiche del Regno di Napoli dal 1790 al 1815* (Historical memoirs of the Kingdom of Naples from 1790 to 1815) with Cortese's booklength introductory essay, "Stato e ideali politici nell'Italia meridionale e l'esperienza di una rivoluzione" (The state and political ideals in southern Italy and the experience of a revolution).

The information that this note contains on Pignatelli's *Memorie* and on Cortese's introductory essay can be found (in many cases verbatim) in Piero Pieri, "Memorie dell'Ottocento" (Nineteenth-century memoirs), *Leonardo* 3, no. 12 (December 20, 1927). Gramsci had a copy of this issue of *Leonardo* and in all likelihood had read Pieri's article during the period of his internment on the island of Ustica. He did not, however, have access to it at the time he was writing this note (the second half of 1930) (see his March 23, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht. (Tatiana Schucht was later able to obtain for Gramsci copies of the issues of *Leonardo* that had been lost, and he informed her that he had received them in his letter of May 4, 1931.) Gramsci's direct source of information most probably was a summary of Pieri's essay that appeared under the title "Le *Memorie* del generale Pignatelli" in the "Marginalia" section of *Il Marzocco* 33, no. 5 (January 29, 1928). As for the bibliographical details (number of pages, size, price, etc.) pertaining to Cortese's edition, Gramsci probably obtained them from the advertisements of the Laterza publishing house in the issues of the periodicals he had available to him at the Turi prison when he wrote this note.

Francesco Pignatelli, prince of Strongoli (1775–1853), a Neapolitan aristocrat, was attracted early to eighteenth-century liberal thought, which put him at odds with the Bourbon monarchy and eventually led him to espouse the Jacobin cause. In 1798 he joined the French republican army that was occupying Rome under the command of General Championnet, and he led one of its divisions in the campaign against the Kingdom of Naples that resulted in the flight of King Ferdinand to Sicily and the establishment of the Parthenopean republic. Pignatelli played a prominent role in the suppression of dissidents during the short life of the republic. When the Bourbon monarchy was restored, his two brothers (Ferdinando and Mario) were executed, but he managed to flee into exile in France and northern Italy. He returned to Naples in 1806, when it was taken over by Napoleon and King Ferdinand once again fled to Sicily. Pignatelli held important offices under Joseph Bonaparte and Joachim Murat. Later he also participated in military campaigns against Austria.

Gramsci alludes elsewhere to another work on Naples during the Napoleonic era by the historian Nino Cortese; see Notebook 2, §98, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§104. *Popular literature. An anthology of writings by American workers*

1. Gramsci saw *Poèmes d'ouvriers américains* advertised in the issues of *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* he received in prison.

2. Gramsci extracted the information on Despresle's anthology from the "Correspondance" section of *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* 9, no. 410 (August 23, 1930,).

On Henri Barbusse, see Notebook 3, §4, and n. 6 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

3. An advertisement for *Nouvel âge littéraire* appeared in *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* 9, no. 405 (July 19, 1930).

§105. *Lorianism. American peanuts and oil*

1. There is no other note on Lorianism that mentions this proposal to cultivate peanuts in very large quantities for the purpose of satisfying Italy's fuel oil needs.

2. Colonel Barberis's presentation at the science congress, "Il combustibile liquido e il suo avvenire" (Liquid fuel and its future), is mentioned by Manfredi Gravina in the second part of his article "Olii, petroli, e benzina" (Oil, kerosene, and gasoline), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1339 (January 1, 1928): 59–71. The first part of Gravina's article is discussed in Notebook 2, §54.

§106. *Prof. H. de Vries de Heekelingen*

1. All the information contained in this note is drawn from a short article by L. Amaro, "Indagini internazionali sul fascismo" (International research on fascism), in the "Notizie e commenti" (News and comments) section of *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1340 (January 16, 1928): 259–61.

§107. *The social classes in the Risorgimento*

1. Gramsci extracted the quotation from Niccolò Rodolico's book about the people's role during the early stages of the Risorgimento movement in southern Italy—*Il popolo agli inizi del Risorgimento nel'Italia meridionale* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1925)—as well as the bibliographical information on it, from the "Rassegna bibliografica" (Bibliographic review) section of *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1340 (January 16, 1928): 269.

On the Bandiera brothers, who founded the secret society Esperia as part of their efforts for the liberation of Italy, see Notebook 2, §69, n. 2.

On Niccolò Rodolico, see Notebook 2, §62, n. 1.

2. Gramsci is referring to the trials that took place in Turin following the collapse of the insurrection that had been sparked in the early months of 1821 by a group of liberal aristocratic officers, prominent among them Santorre di Santarosa, who were pressing the demands for a constitution and a war of national liberation against Austria. Although the rebellion compelled King Vittorio Emanuele I to abdicate, it was suppressed within a few months by the new king, Carlo Felice, with the help of the Austrian army. The trials resulted in many death sentences, but only two executions were actually carried out, because many of the officers involved were able to go into exile.

3. The failure of the 1853 insurrections inspired by Mazzini's national movement in Milan and elsewhere and the brutal reprisals that followed resulted in serious, widespread criticism of Mazzini's revolutionary strategy, even by many of those who shared his political ideals. Undeterred, Mazzini reaffirmed his convictions, disbanded the London-based National Committee, and established the Action Party

Francesco Crispi (on whom see Notebook 1, §43, n. 10), a close collaborator of Mazzini, moved to Portugal from Paris in 1858, when Italian exiles like himself were regarded with great suspicion by the French following Felice Orsini's attempted assassination of Napoleon III.

§109. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Italo Svevo and Italian litterateurs*

1. Italo Svevo met James Joyce in 1907, when the Irish novelist was residing in Trieste. Joyce was trying to make an income teaching English;

Svevo, whose business affairs entailed frequent visits to England, needed private lessons to help him improve his facility with the language. The two quickly became friends. By that time Svevo had already written and published at his own expense two novels—*Una vita* (1892), translated into English as *A Life* (1963), and *Senilità* (1898), translated into English with the title *As a Man Grows Older* (1932)—both of which failed to get any critical attention. Joyce was greatly impressed by Svevo's work and strongly encouraged his friend to resume writing fiction. Svevo produced one more novel, which, again, he published at his own expense: it was *La coscienza di Zeno* (1923), translated into English as *Confessions of Zeno* (1930). Although it would eventually come to be regarded as Svevo's best novel, *La coscienza di Zeno* was largely ignored by Italian critics when it first came out. Joyce, however, thought very highly of it and recommended it to his Parisian literary friends, among them Valéry Larbaud and Benjamin Crémieux. Their reaction was as enthusiastic as Joyce's: they acclaimed Svevo as a major modern novelist. In Italy, Svevo's stature remained unacknowledged until 1925, when the poet, critic, and future Nobel Prize winner Eugenio Montale published an essay extolling the merits of *La coscienza di Zeno* in *L'Esame*. Through that essay and subsequent critical writings, Montale contributed greatly to the understanding and appreciation of Svevo's writings by Italian readers. (On Italo Svevo, see Notebook 1, §33, n. 1)

2. Editor's note, *La Fiera Letteraria* 4, no. 39 (September 23, 1928). The parenthetical exclamation marks in the quoted passage are Gramsci's.

Three times in the note Gramsci cites *L'Italia Letteraria* when he is, in fact, referring to articles published in *La Fiera Letteraria*. *La Fiera Letteraria* changed its name to *L'Italia Letteraria* in April 1929.

3. See Carlo Linati, "Italo Svevo, romanziere" (Italo Svevo, novelist), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1341 (February 1, 1928): 328–36.

Carlo Linati (1878–1949), a novelist and literary critic, had a special interest in modern British, Irish, and American literature. In addition to translating works by Yeats, Synge, Henry James, D. H. Lawrence, and James Joyce's play *Exiles*, he was the first person to translate some of Pound's poetry into Italian.

4. See Notebook 1, §102, and n. 3 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

5. See Lea Nissim, "Omero Redi e le 'Pìstole' " (Omero Redi and the "Epistles"), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1341 (February 1, 1928): 352–64. This article is about the regular column "Pìstole" (Epistles), by the pseudonymous Omero Redi, in *Il Giornalino della Domenica*, a Sunday paper for the young. The author of "Pìstole" was a priest, Ermenegildo Pistelli (1862–1927), who had created the persona of a Florentine boy named Omero Redi. The columns recounted the experiences of school from the

perspective of the young Omero, thus revealing the shortcomings of the educational system. These "Epistles" were subsequently collected in a volume, *Le pistole di Omero* (1917). A sequel, *Memorie di Omero Redi* (Memoirs of Omero Redi) was published in 1927. Pistelli, an expert philologist who, among other things, produced critical editions of Latin works by Dante and Pascoli, also wrote commentaries for children on some Greek and Roman classics and on Manzoni's *The Betrothed.*

Vamba was the pseudonym used by Luigi Bertelli (1858–1920), who in 1906 founded the extraordinarily successful Sunday paper for young readers *Il Giornalino della Domenica*, which continued to be published after Bertelli's death, until 1924. His many writings found a very large youthful audience.

§111. *Lorianism*

1. See Benedetto Migliore, "Una nuova interpretazione delle rime di Dante e del 'dolce stil nuovo' " (A new interpretation of Dante's rhymes and the *dolce stil nuovo*), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1342 (February 16, 1928): 446–61. In his article, Migliore refers to a book by Luigi Valli, *Il linguaggio segreto di Dante e dei fedeli d'Amore* (Rome: Casa Editrice Optima, 1928), in which Valli purports to provide the key to what he terms "Dante's secret language." Gramsci first mentions Valli's work and labels it Lorian in Notebook 1, §97.

On Luigi Valli, see Notebook 1, §97, n. 1.

§112. *Corrado Barbagallo*

1. Corrado Barbagallo, *L'oro e il fuoco: Capitale e lavoro attraverso i secoli* (Milan: Corbaccio, 1927). While he was imprisoned in Milan awaiting trial, Gramsci received a copy of this book by Barbagallo on the history of capital and labor stretching back into ancient Rome. Gramsci also comments on Barbagallo's work in Notebook 1, §25, and Notebook 4, §60.

For notes on Corrado Barbagallo and his writings on ancient economic history, see Notebook 1, §25, nn. 17 and 18.

2. The disagreement between Joachim Marquardt and Theodor Mommsen on the function of the *collegia opificum et artificum* (i.e., the guilds in ancient Rome that became increasingly important during the imperial period, especially under Diocletian and Constantine) is touched on in a short article by M. Pierro, "I problemi del lavoro" (Labor problems), in the "Notizie e commenti" (News and comments) section in *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1342 (February 16, 1928): 537–539.

Theodor Mommsen and Joachim Marquardt mention the *collegia* on several different occasions in their voluminous writings on ancient Rome; see especially, T. Mommsen, *De collegiis et sodaliciis* (1843), and J. Marquardt, *Römische Finanzverwaltung* (1884).

§113. *Utopias*

1. See Achille Loria, "Pensieri e soggetti economici in Shakespeare" (Economic thoughts and themes in Shakespeare), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1353 (August 1, 1928): 315–29. On pp. 317–18 of his article, Loria makes references to Renan's plays *Caliban* (written in 1887) and *L'eau de jouvence* (written in 1889), both of which use Shakespeare's *Tempest* as the point of departure.

§114. *Past and present*

1. This is a translation of a line Achille Loria quotes (purportedly from Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens*) in Italian on p. 323 of his article "Pensieri e soggetti economici in Shakespeare" (Economic thoughts and themes in Shakespeare), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1353 (August 1, 1928). As Gramsci's parenthetical question mark at the end of the quote indicates, Loria provides no information as to which act and scene he is quoting. Loria's article contains numerous quotations from Shakespeare's plays; none of them is accompanied by a citation. Furthermore, many of Loria's quotations are very loose renditions—rather than faithful translations—of Shakespeare's text. Although in the majority of cases Loria's quotes are more or less recognizable when compared to the original, this particular quotation from *Timon of Athens* cannot be reliably matched to any specific line in the original English version.

§116. *International function of the Italian educated classes*

1. See Eugenio Barbarich, "Un generale di cavalleria italo-albanese: Giorgio Basta" (An Italo-Albanian cavalry general: Giorgio Basta), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1354 (August 16, 1928): 459–73.

Giorgio Basta (ca. 1540–ca. 1612) distinguished himself early as a cavalryman, and in 1579 Alessandro Farnese (the duke of Parma) appointed him general commander of his cavalry. After Farnese's death, Basta joined the army of the Hapsburg emperor Rudolf II. He was eventually made commander of the imperial armies in occupied Transylvania and Hungary and became notorious for his persecution of Protestants. In his later years he devoted himself to scholarship and produced many treatises on military

science, the most influential of which, *Il governo della cavalleria leggera* (1612), is on the strategic and tactical uses of light cavalry.

2. Ibid., p. 473. Raimondo Montecuccoli (1609–80), an Italian prince from Modena who distinguished himself in several major military campaigns, rose to the rank of field marshal in the Austrian imperial army. Montecuccoli was especially esteemed for his expertise in the techniques of fortification and maneuver. He wrote a number of books on military science and military history. His views on the function and use of cavalry were strongly influenced by Giorgio Basta's work.

§119. *Past and present. Agitation and propaganda*

1. Agostino Depretis (1813–87) was first elected to the Piedmont parliament in 1848; he was a follower of Mazzini at the time. He held various ministries before becoming the first leftist prime minister of Italy in 1876, a position that he retained, with three rather brief interruptions, for eleven years. He so completely dominated parliamentary politics that he earned himself the epithet of "dictator." What enabled him to hold on to power for so long was his exercise of "transformism": rather than fight for his legislative projects along party lines, he coopted members of the opposition, bestowing favors on them (in some cases, cabinet positions) and/or on their constituents. In the electoral campaign of 1882, Depretis openly advocated and promoted transformism, and his success in the elections seemed to vindicate his approach. Although his mastery of the art of compromise gained Depretis the collaboration of members of the right-wing coalition and enabled him to enact a number of important reforms (among them, the extension of suffrage and the abolition of certain unfair taxes), he also incurred the anger of some of his most prominent colleagues of the Left, such as Crispi. As Gramsci points out in Notebook 1, §43 and §44, transformism can be traced back to the earliest years of Italy's existence as a unified and independent nation—and even before that to the politics of Piedmont; nevertheless, it was Depretis who really refined transformism into the perdurable system that has often given the complexities of Italian politics their distinctive character. As prime ministers, both Crispi and Giolitti proved to be very adept practitioners of transformism.

On Francesco Crispi, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 10; and on Giovanni Giolitti, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

Gramsci discusses transformism in several places in his notebooks, but see especially Notebook 8, §36.

2. See Max Weber, *Parlamento e governo nel nuovo ordinamento della Germania: Critica politica della burocrazia e della vita dei partiti*, trans. and pref. by Enrico Ruta (Bari: Laterza, 1919). This is the Italian translation

from the German of Max Weber's book on parliament and government in postwar Germany, a political critique of bureaucracy and political parties: *Parlament und Regierung im neugeordneten Deutschland, zur politischen Kritik des Beamtentums und Parteiwesens* (Munich: Duneker and Humblot, 1918). Although this volume is not preserved among the books Gramsci had in prison, it is most likely that he had read it; see his remarks on it in Notebook 12, §1, and Notebook 15, §48, as well as the comment here on the quality of the translation. The bibliographical data he records in this note may have been transcribed from a catalog of the Laterza publishing house.

§120. *Antonio Fradeletto*

1. Antonio Fradeletto (1858–1930), public orator and politician from Venice, a member of the Radical Party, was a parliamentary deputy from 1900 until 1919, when Prime Minister Orlando put him in charge of a newly created ministry for the reconstruction of those areas that had suffered the direct effects of the war. He became a senator in 1920. He published several volumes of the many speeches he delivered on art, literature, Italian history, and education.

On December 20, 1915, Antonio Fradeletto gave a speech at the Vittoria Theater in Turin on "Venezia e l'ora presente" (Venice and the present hour). Italy had entered the war the previous May, and Fradeletto used the speech to stoke patriotic sentiments. The speech provoked Gramsci to write two polemical articles in which he severely criticized Fradeletto for distorting Italian history in order to foster nationalistic myths. The two articles are "Le bestialità storiche dell'on. Fradeletto" (The historical nonsense of the Hon. Fradeletto), in the Turin and Milan editions of *Avanti!* December 21, 1915,; and "Le bestialità storiche dell'on. Fradeletto e dei suoi difensori" (The historical nonsense of the Hon. Fradeletto and his defenders), in the Turin and Milan editions of *Avanti!* December 24, 1915. In the first of these articles, Gramsci writes:

> The orator stated that the three salient features of the history of Venice are (1) the struggle to dominate the Adriatic (with this struggle Venice was supposedly continuing the enterprise of Rome, preventing the Slavs from taking over the sea); (2) the struggle against the Hapsburgs, animated by broad concepts of Italianness and of freedom (thus, in the seventeenth century, Venice and the dukes of Savoy were the only ones thinking of national independence); (3) the struggle against the Turks. . . .
>
> In reality the wars that Venice waged in the Adriatic . . . were directed either against Genoa or against the maritime cities on the

> opposite shore, such as Ragusa and Zara, which were anything but Slavic. . . .
>
> As for the assertion concerning the national Italian sentiment of the Republic of St. Mark in the seventeenth century, that is a glaring historical blunder that is still commonly found in current textbooks but that no serious scholar would even dream of taking seriously. Up to the time of the French Revolution there was no widespread or effective national sentiment in Italy; the expressions of Italianness found in the works of litterateurs and historians are nothing other than literature and rhetoric of greater or lesser seriousness, depending on the individuals. Machiavelli does not embody his entire century. It was the bourgeoisie that, having acquired class consciousness after 1789, had a feeling of national solidarity and launched the national revolution.

Gramsci also discusses Fradeletto's historical revisionism in another article in which, once again, he censures the distortions of Italy's past in the rhetorical excesses of wartime orators; see "Parole! Parole! Parole!" (Words! Words! Words!), *Il Grido del Popolo*, February 26, 1916.

2. Vittorio Cian (on whom see also Gramsci's remarks in Notebook 2, §31, and n. 3 in the corresponding Notes to the Text), a Nationalist member of parliament, was a professor of Italian literature at the University of Turin for many years, including the period when Gramsci was studying there. He appears with great frequency and is often the subject of harsh criticism in Gramsci's journalistic writings. In his article "Da De Sanctis a . . . Cian" (From De Sanctis to . . . Cian) in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* January 18, 1916, Gramsci attacks Cian for his proposal to bar the appointment of non-Italian citizens to university professorships. In the same article, Gramsci also recalls that in 1911 Cian had publicly advocated a "boycott of teachers opposed to the war on Libya." Two days later, in "Il capintesta" (The ringleader), in the "Sotto la Mole" column of the Turin edition of *Avanti!* January 20, 1916, Gramsci ridicules Cian's anti-German posturings (as he does en passant in various other articles). He launched an especially harsh attack on Cian in "Per un mandarino dell'università" (For a university mandarin), in the "Sotto la Mole" column of the Turin edition of *Avanti!* May 17, 1916, where he accuses the professor of "seeking to gain fame and rewards by denouncing to the school authorities all those teachers who are guilty only of wanting to perform their duties as teachers without getting involved in militant politics and who do not yearn to be crowned with the laurels of patriotism." Among many other articles by Gramsci that are critical of Cian's fanatical and reactionary nationalism, see especially "Bollettino del fronte interno" (Bulletin from the home front), in the "Sotto la Mole" column of the

Turin edition of *Avanti!* July 6, 1916; "Disagio" (Uneasiness), in the "Sotto la Mole" column of the Turin edition of *Avanti!* July 21, 1918; "Il mondo, Bertoldo, e il professore Vittorio Cian" (The world, Bertoldo, and Professor Vittorio Cian), in the Turin edition of *Avanti!* September 11, 1918; and "La guerra continua, signori" (Gentlemen, the war goes on), in the column "Sotto la Mole" of the Piedmont edition of *Avanti!* January 20, 1920.

3. On Enrico Corradini, see Notebook 1, §58, n. 3; on Francesco Coppola, see Notebook 1, §35, n. 1; and on Luigi Federzoni, see Notebook 2, §25, n. 1.

Gramsci alludes to the nationalism of Maurice Barrès earlier in this notebook; see Notebook 3, §2, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially n. 6.

§121. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. Arturo Calza. "Concorsi letterari" (Literary contests), in the section "Fra i libri e la vita" (In the midst of books and life) of *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1358 (October 16, 1928): 533. The parentheses are Gramsci's.

Arturo Calza (1862–1934) worked on the editorial staff of the *Giornale d'Italia* from its inception, and he became well known for his regular column "Il farmacista" (The pharmacist). In his writings he toed the conservative, nationalist political line of the newspaper, which was the mouthpiece of Sidney Sonnino, with Alberto Bergamini as editor-in-chief. He left the *Giornale d'Italia* toward the end of 1932 to become a regular contributor to *Nuova Antologia*, where he started using the pseudonym Diogene Laerzio. In 1930 one of his articles provoked the ire of *Critica Fascista*, which attacked him for being an antifascist—an episode that, in effect, ended Calza's journalistic career. Gramsci refers to this episode in Notebook 6, §55.

On Roberto Forges Davanzati, see Notebook 1, §53, n. 4.

§122. *Italian diplomacy. Costantino Nigra and the Treaty of Wuchali*

1. On Costantino Nigra, see Notebook 2, §95, n. 2; and on the Treaty of Wuchali (also known as the Treaty of Uccialli), see Notebook 2, §21, n. 3.

2. Carlo Richelmy, "Lettere inedite di Costantino Nigra" (Unpublished Letters by Costantino Nigra), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1360, (November 16, 1928): 155–61.

3. Emilio Visconti-Venosta (1829–1914) was appointed foreign minister seven different times between 1863 and 1901. His longest uninterrupted

stretch in office lasted from 1869 to 1876. Visconti-Venosta was not foreign minister when the Treaty of Wuchali was signed, but he was in office in October 1896, when, in the aftermath of its military defeat at Adowa, Italy signed the Addis Ababa peace treaty, by which it recognized the full sovereignty and independence of Ethiopia, while holding on to the colony of Eritrea.

4. Richelmy, "Lettere inedite di Costantino Nigra," pp. 156–57.

Count Pietro Antonelli signed the Treaty of Wuchali as Italy's representative. For several years he was the principal Italian negotiator with the Ethiopian government but was unable to resolve the dispute over the conflicting interpretations of the treaty—a dispute that culminated in war and cost Italy dearly.

Oreste Baratieri (1841–1901), a member of Garibaldi's famed "Thousand" and a member of parliament since 1876, was appointed governor of Eritrea in 1892. He had some military successes in the region, but in the end he was responsible for the crushing defeat suffered by the Italians when they lost over five thousand men in a battle against Emperor Menelik II's forces at Adowa on March 1, 1896.

§123. *The pitiful Italian*

1. Filippo Virgilii, "L'espansione della cultura italiana" (The expansion of Italian culture), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1361 (December 1, 1928): 346. The emphases and interpolation are Gramsci's.

§124. *Emigration*

1. Gramsci first alludes to Ferri's parliamentary speech on Italian emigration in Notebook 1, §58; see also n. 2 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

On Enrico Ferri, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 15.

2. See Filippo Virgilii, "L'espansione della cultura italiana" (The expansion of Italian culture), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1361 (December 1, 1928): 339–49, especially pp. 342–43.

Filippo Virgilii also wrote a book on the conditions of agricultural life in Italy: *L'Italia agricola odierna* (Milan: Hoepli, 1930). The book has a preface by Giacomo Acerbo, who at the time was Mussolini's minister of agriculture; Gramsci makes no reference to it anywhere in his notebooks, even though he received a copy of it in prison at Turi di Bari.

3. For notes on Enrico Corradini and the nationalist concept of Italy as a proletarian nation, as well as on Gramsci's treatment of the emigration question in his unfinished essay "Some Aspects of the Southern Question," see Notebook 1, §58, nn. 1 and 3.

4. The quotation from Ferruccio Macola's book on the European takeover of Latin America through emigration, *L'Europa alla conquista dell'America latina* (Venice, 1894), appears on p. 342 of Virgilii's article.

5. As prime minister, Crispi attempted to make Italy a colonial power; his expansionist policy ended in disaster with the debacle in Ethiopia. On Francesco Crispi, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 10.

§125. *Luigi Castellazzo, the Mantua trial, and the other trials under Austrian rule*

1. Luigi Castellazzo (1827–90), a militant member of the Mazinian revolutionary organization in Lombardy, was arrested in April 1852 and sentenced to a long prison term for conspiring against the Austrians. The following year, however, he was pardoned and released. Following his release, he rejoined the struggle for the liberation and unification of Italy, participating in several revolutionary battles, including the campaign in Trentino under Garibaldi. In 1867 he was arrested by the pontifical police and jailed for over two years. As Gramsci points out in this note, Castellazzo was later elected to parliament from the electoral district of Grosseto.

Castellazzo's arrest in 1852 occurred at a time when the Austrian security forces in Lombardy-Veneto, under the command of Field Marshal Joseph Radetzky, were cracking down hard on every form of dissident activity. That same year many other Mazzinian revolutionaries were arrested, and in a trial held in Mantua in November five of them received the death sentence. Enrico Tazzoli (on whom see Notebook 1, §88, n. 1), Angelo Scarsellini, Bernardo de Canal, Giovanni Zambelli, and Carlo Poma were publicly executed at the Belfiore fortress in Mantua on December 7, 1852; they came to be known as the Belfiore martyrs. Austrian repression became even more severe after the insurrection that took place in Milan in early February 1853, at the end of which month another trial in Mantua resulted in three death sentences: the Mazzinian conspirators Tito Speri, Carlo Montanari, and Bartolomeo Graziosi were executed on March 3, 1853, at the Belfiore fortress, thus becoming the second group of Belfiore martyrs. Later that same month, also in Mantua, the Mazzinian Pietro Frattini was condemned to death for conspiracy and high treason. His hanging took place at the Belfiore fortress on March 19, making him the last of the Belfiore martyrs.

The conservative historian Alessandro Luzio wrote a book (cited by Gramsci later in this note) on the trials and executions of the Belfiore martyrs—*I martiri di Belfiore e il loro processo*, 4th ed. (Milan: Cogliati, 1924)—in which he argues that after his arrest, Castellazzo provided the Austrians with damning information that sealed the fate of the Belfiore

martyrs. Other historians have been less inclined to blame Castellazzo's revelations to the police for the death of his fellow revolutionaries.

Gramsci remarks on Luzio's tendentiousness as a historian elsewhere in his notebooks; see Notebook 1, §44 and §48, Notebook 3, §163, and Notebook 8, §23. On Alessandro Luzio, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 45.

2. In the interrogations that followed his arrest in 1821, Giorgio Pallavicino made certain admissions and imprudent or indiscreet statements that led to the arrest of many other anti-Austrian conspirators, among them Count Confalonieri.

On the marquis Giorgio Pallavicino-Trivulzio, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 44; and on Count Federico Confalonieri, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 42.

3. Gramsci makes several allusions to the act of homage that the Milanese nobles paid to the Emperor Francis Joseph I in 1853; see Notebook 1, §43, n. 24.

4. See Romualdo Bonfadini, *Mezzo secolo di patriottismo*, 2d ed. (Milan: Treves, 1886), which Gramsci also cites in Notebook 1, §44.

On Romualdo Bonfadini, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 40.

5. Gramsci comments on Confalonieri's depositions and his behavior following his release from prison in Notebook 1, §149. On the Confalonieri depositions and the controversy that surrounded their discovery, see Notebook 1, §44, nn. 42 and 43. Also on Confalonieri's behavior after he regained his freedom, see Notebook 3, §81, and n. 1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

6. Alessandro Luzio's *I processi politici di Milano e di Mantova restituiti dall'Austria* deals with documents related to the trials of Italian revolutionaries held in Milan and Mantua under Austrian rule, documents that Austria ceded to Italy. Luzio's book, however, does not discuss the Confalonieri depositions, because they were only discovered in the Viennese archives by Francesco Salata and reclaimed by Italy in 1924; i.e., after the publication of Luzio's book. See Notebook 1, §44, n. 42.

7. Alessandro Luzio, *La Massoneria e il Risorgimento italiano*, 2 vols. (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1925). This book is about Freemasonry and the Risorgimento.

8. Pier Luigi Rambaldi, "Luci ed ombre nei processi di Mantova" (Lights and shadows in the Mantua trials), *Archivio Storico Italiano* 63: 257–331.

9. Giuseppe Fatini, "Le elezioni di Grosseto e la Massoneria" (The Elections at Grosseto and Freemasonry), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1362 (December 16, 1928): 506–24. Fatini's article is the source of the bibliographical data on Luzio's books and Rambaldi's article that Gramsci records in this note.

Giosuè Carducci's letter of October 13, 1886, quoted in Fatini's article (p. 522), praises Castellazzo for the bravery he displayed when he partici-

pated in Garibaldi's Sicilian campaign in 1859 and in a battle near Capua in 1860, when he was wounded.

10. For another comment on the failure of the Action Party to educate the masses politically and develop a broad popular base, see Notebook 6, §166.

§126. *The formation of the Italian educated classes and their cosmopolitan function*

1. This note is canceled in the manuscript; unlike all but a handful of the many other canceled notes, however, it is not incorporated or developed in a subsequent notebook.

§127. *The Risorgimento*

1. Amerigo Scarlatti, writing in the section "Libri da fare" (Books to write), *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 2 (February 1928): 34.

Vittorio Amedeo II was duke of Savoy (1675–1713), king of Sicily (1713–20), and king of Sardinia (1720–30).

2. Gramsci is referring to an anecdote, which he mentions earlier in this notebook, that he had read in Ferdinando Martini, *Confessioni e ricordi, 1859–1892* (Milan: Treves, 1928), pp. 152–53; see Notebook 3, §38, and n. 5 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§128. *Machiavelli and Emanuele Filiberto*

1. The information contained in this note is drawn from Pietro Silva's brief review of a collection of essays on *Emanuele Filiberto* (Turin: Lattes, 1928) in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 4 (April 1928): 94.

On Emanuele Filiberto, duke of Savoy, see Notebook 2, §60, n. 1.

§129. *Italian diplomacy*

1. On Antonio Salandra, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 20.

2. See Pietro Silva's review of Alessandro De Bosdari's book on the Balkan wars and World War I in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 4 (April 1928): 94.

On Alessandro De Bosdari, see Notebook 2, §33, n. 1.

3. See Notebook 3, §21, and n. 1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§130. *Italian culture*

1. *Bilychnis*, a monthly review of religious studies sponsored by the Baptist seminary in Rome, was published between 1912 and 1930. It published works by individuals of diverse religious orientations, but its prin-

cipal purpose was to foster a harmonious relationship between religion and science.

§131. *Italian diplomacy*

1. Giuseppe A. Andriulli, review of Antonio Salandra, *La neutralità italiana (1914): Ricordi e pensieri* (Milan: Mondadori, 1928), *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 5 (May 1928): 124. Salandra's book of memoirs deals with his government's decision to keep Italy neutral at the outbreak of World War I. In a subsequent volume, *L'intervento (1915): Ricordi e pensieri* (Milan: Mondadori, 1930), Salandra covers the period in which Italy signed the Pact of London, committing itself to intervene in the war on the side of the Triple Entente. Gramsci received a copy of each of these volumes while he was in prison. On Antonio Salandra, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 20.

2. Antonio Paternò Castello, marquis di San Giuliano (1852–1914), had been Italy's foreign minister for more than four years when World War I broke out. An advocate of colonial expansion, he vigorously promoted the occupation of Libya in 1911. He was also a staunch protector of Italian interests in Dalmatia, Croatia, and Albania, which created many serious tensions between Italy and Austria, in spite of the fact that they were both members of the Triple Alliance. San Giuliano maintained that, the Triple Alliance notwithstanding, Italy was not obliged to join the German and Austrian side in the Great War. He believed that it was to Italy's advantage to negotiate with the conflicting powers from a position of neutrality, extracting from each side the best possible territorial concessions.

San Giuliano died within a few months of the outbreak of the war, and in November 1914 Prime Minister Salandra put Sidney Sonnino in charge of foreign affairs. Sonnino, who had initially leaned toward preserving Italy's ties with the alliance, quickly embraced the neutralist policy of his predecessor and before long was engaged in serious negotiations with the Triple Entente. With the Pact of London, signed in April 1915, Italy promised to declare war against the alliance within one month; in return, the entente agreed that at the end of the conflict Italy would get control over the Austrian Alpine regions of South Tyrol and Trentino, a large portion of Dalmatia, the Dodecanese islands, as well as other territories. (See also the note on Giorgio Sidney Sonnino in Notebook 1, §114, n. 1.)

3. In its pact with the entente, Italy undertook to declare war against *all* the members of the alliance; in May 1915, however, Italy declared war only against Austria, waiting until the end of August 1916 to declare war formally on Germany. Prince Sisto di Borbone-Parma (1886–1934) served as the emissary of the Austrian emperor in several important diplomatic missions that entailed negotiations with the warring powers.

§132. *Lorianism. Paolo Orano*

1. This note is based on Ernesto Buonaiuti's brief review of the "definitive edition" of Paolo Orano's book on early Christianity, *Cristo e Quirino* (Foligno: Campitelli, 1928), in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 6 (June 1928): 157.

Buonaiuti opens his review by quoting a brief passage from the preface to Orano's book: "In the *Mouvement Socialiste* of April 1908, Georges Sorel devoted an essay to [the first edition of] *Cristo e Quirino*, postulating that it is difficult to give an account of a book of this nature and that in summarizing it one runs the risk of spoiling it." Buonaiuti immediately follows this with a passage from a letter that Sorel wrote to Benedetto Croce on December 29, 1907: "J'ai reçu un volume de P. Orano: *Cristo e Quirino*, que vous avez sans doute lu et qui ne me semble pas avoir beaucoup avancé la question des origines chrétiennes; je suis fort embarassé pour en faire le compte rendu que l'auteur me demande de faire dans le *Mouvement Socialiste*." Sorel's letter to Croce had been published in *La Critica* 26, no. 2 (March 20, 1928): 105.

§133. Carlo Flumiani, *I gruppi sociali: Fondamenti di scienza politica*

1. Gramsci probably obtained the bibliographical data on Carlo Flumiani's book from the brief review of it in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 8 (August 1928): 211.

§134. Piero Pieri, *Il Regno di Napoli dal luglio 1799 al marzo 1806*

1. The information on Piero Pieri's history of the Kingdom of Naples between 1799 and 1806 is drawn from a short review of it by Pietro Silva in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 8 (August 1928): 210. Gramsci takes note of Pieri's book elsewhere as well; see Notebook 1, §83, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

2. Alfredo Zazo's work on public and private education in Naples from the middle of the eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, *L'istruzione pubblica e privata nel Neapolitano: 1767–1860* (Città di Castello: Il Solco, 1927) is briefly reviewed on p. 213 of *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 8 (August 1928).

§135. *History and antihistory*

1. Adriano Tilgher's book of essays on ethics and the philosophy of law is reviewed briefly by Mario Missiroli in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 12, no. 1

(January 1929): 16. On Tilgher's other book, *Storia e antistoria* (History and antihistory)—a copy of which Gramsci had while in prison at Turi—see Notebook 1, §28, and n. 2 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

The rest of this note consists of Gramsci's transcription of the entire text of Missiroli's review of Tilgher's *Saggi di etica e di filosofia del diritto.*

§136. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. The information recorded in this note on Giovanni Casati's dictionary of living Italian Catholic writers, *Scrittori cattolici italiani viventi: Dizionario bio-bibliografico ed indice analitico delle opere* (Milan: Romolo Ghirlanda, 1928), is derived from a short review in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 12, no. 1 (January 1929): 17–18. Another note by Gramsci contains more detailed information on this dictionary and its author drawn from an article in *La Civiltà Cattolica*; see Notebook 5, §63.

On Filippo Meda, who contributed a preface to Casati's dictionary, see Notebook 1, §107, and n. 1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§137. *The formation of the Italian intellectual class*

1. The populists, called Narodniks—i.e., the members and sympathizers of the nineteenth-century revolutionary movement in Russia known as Zemlya i Volya (Land and freedom)—were, for the most part, aristocrats and intellectuals who believed that by promoting the traditional communal values of the Russian peasantry and politically educating the masses they could inspire a popular revolt, abolish czarist autocracy, and reconstruct Russian society along socialist lines. In 1879 the movement split into two parties: the Narodnaya Volya (People's will) and the Chorny Peredel (Black repartition). The former party advocated political struggle by all available means, including terrorism, and was responsible for the assassination of Alexander II, in 1881, after which it fell apart and all but vanished. Many members of the Chorny Peredel movement, which continued its work among the peasantry, became Marxist revolutionaries advocating mass agitation and devoting more attention to the urban proletariat. Lenin writes as follows about the Russian populist revolutionary movement, in *What Is To Be Done?* (New York: International Publishers, 1969):

> The history of the revolutionary movement is so little known among us that the name "Narodnaya Volya" is used to denote any idea of a militant centralised organisation which declares determined war against tsarism. But the magnificent organisation that the revolutionaries had in the seventies, and that should serve us as a model, was not established by the Narodnaya Volya, but by the Zemlya i Volya, which split up into the Chorny Peredel and the

> Narodnaya Volya. Consequently, to regard a militant revolutionary organisation as something specifically Narodnaya Volya in character is absurd both historically and logically; for *no* revolutionary trend, if it seriously thinks of struggle, can dispense with such an organisation. The mistake the Narodnaya committed was not in striving to enlist *all* the discontented in the organisation and to direct this organisation to resolute struggle against the autocracy; on the contrary, that was its great historical merit. The mistake was in relying on a theory which in substance was not a revolutionary theory at all, and the Narodnaya Volya members either did not know how, or were unable, to link their movement inseparably with the class struggle in the developing capitalist society. Only a gross failure to understand Marxism . . . could prompt the opinion that the rise of a mass, spontaneous working-class movement *relieves* us of the duty of creating as good an organisation of revolutionaries as the Zemlya i Volya had, or, indeed, an incomparably better one. On the contrary, this movement *imposes* the duty upon us; for the spontaneous struggle of the proletariat will not become its genuine "class struggle" until this struggle is led by a strong organisation of revolutionaries. (pp. 131–32)

§138. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Alfredo Panzini*

1. See Notebook 1, §13, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.
2. See, especially, Notebook 3, §38.
3. As in Notebook 1, §13, Gramsci is quoting from Fernando Palazzi's review of Alfredo Panzini's *I giorni del sole e del grano* (Milan: Mondadori, 1928), in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 12, no. 6 (June 1929): 180–81.

§139. *Past and present*

1. The quotation from Guicciardini's *Ricordi* and the bibliographic citation are taken from a brief review in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 12, no. 6 (June 1929): 183–84. For an English translation of Guicciardini's *Ricordi*, see Francesco Guicciardini, *Maxims and Reflections*, trans. Mario Domandi (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), where the aphorism (Series C, 176) quoted by Gramsci is on p. 85.

On Arturo Labriola, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 15.

§140. *Catholicism and secularism. Religion and science*

1. The bibliographical information on Edmondo Cione's *Il dramma religioso dello spirito moderno e la Rinascenza* (The religious drama of the

modern spirit and the Renaissance) and the quotation are taken from Adriano Tilgher's short review of Cione's work in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 12, no. 6 (June 1929): 190.

Edmondo Cione (1908–65) was strongly influenced by Croce, with whom he was personally acquainted at an early age. In *Il dramma religioso dello spirito moderno e la Rinascenza*, his first book, the Crocean influence is evident in, among other things, its criticism of Gentile. Cione went on to write important works on De Sanctis, the Renaissance and the Reformation, and nineteenth-century Neapolitan culture. In the early 1940s he broke with Croce, and, while claiming not to be quite a Fascist himself, he became a very vocal opponent of antifascists and established friendly relations with Mussolini during the period of the Republic of Salò.

2. See, for example, Notebook 3, §40.

§141. *The international function of Italian intellectuals*

1. Dino Provenzal, in the "Libri da fare" (Books to write) column of *L'Italia Che Scrive* 12, no. 10 (October 1929): 288.

Dino Provenzal (1877–1972) wrote numerous works for younger readers, as well as handbooks and other books for students. He was also an essayist and humorist.

On Cesare Balbo, see Notebook 1, §110, n. 1.

Benedetto Croce's history of the baroque period in Italy, *Storia della età barocca in Italia* (Bari: Laterza, 1929), was among the books Gramsci had while in prison at Turi.

2. Giovanni Botero (1544–1617) was educated by the Jesuits and joined their order in 1572 but left it seven years later. He went on to become an important Counter-Reformation intellectual, writing influential treatises on political and economic theory. His best-known books are *Della ragion di Stato* (1589), in which he expounds a concept of the state in which the church has absolute primacy, and *La causa della grandezza e magnificenza delle città* (1588), in which he correlates the power of the state and the strength of its economy with the population growth.

On Tommaso Campanella, see Notebook 1, §62, n. 1.

§142. *The limits of state activity*

1. Alfredo Poggi's review of Carlo Alberto Biggini's book on the fundamental principles that limit the actions of the state, *Il fondamento dei limiti all'attività dello Stato* (Città del Castello: Casa Editrice Il Solco, 1929), appeared in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 12, no 10 (October 1929): 295.

Carlo Alberto Biggini (1902–45), who studied law and political science, joined the Fascist Party in 1928. He was a professor of law at the University of Siena and later rector of the University of Pisa. His writings betray the

strong influence of Giovanni Gentile's philosophy and theories on the state. Biggini entered parliament in 1934 and served on several parliamentary commissions; he also held important posts within the Fascist Party. In February 1943 he became a member of the Fascist Grand Council as well as Mussolini's minister of education. Later that same year he followed Mussolini to the Republic of Salò, where he resumed his ministerial duties.

2. Within the parentheses Gramsci is summarizing Poggi's account of Biggini's main ideas.

3. Gioele Solari's review of Widar Cesarini Sforza, *"Jus" et "directum": Note sull'origine storica dell'idea di diritto* (*Jus* and *directum*: Notes on the historical origin of the idea of law), in *Leonardo* 1, no. 8 (August 1930): 504–5.

§143. *1914*

1. On June 7, 1914, an antimilitarist public meeting was being held at Ancona, in defiance of a government ban on such demonstrations, when the police fired into the crowd, killing three people and wounding many more. The incident provoked a series of strikes, protest marches, and clashes with the police in numerous cities. The disturbances, which lasted an entire week—it came to be known as the *settimana rossa* (red week)—and resulted in the deaths of sixteen civilians (and hundreds of injuries), were especially intense and violent in Romagna and Marche. Prominent among the rebellious groups were the anarchists, with Errico Malatesta at their head; the socialist faction led by Mussolini; and the republicans, whose leader at the time was Pietro Nenni.

2. Giovanni Papini, "I fatti di giugno" (The events of June), *Lacerba* 2, no. 12 (June 15, 1914): 177–84. Gramsci refers to this essay again in Notebook 9, §42.

On Giovanni Papini, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1.

3. See Gaetano Salvemini (who used the nom de plume Rerum Scriptor), "Una rivoluzione senza programma" (A revolution without a program), *L'Unità* 3, no. 25 (June 19, 1914): 531. Gramsci makes some observations about this article and the events of June 1914 in Notebook 8, §119.

On Gaetano Salvemini, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 19.

§145. *Italian and French culture and the academies*

1. The Accademia della Crusca was founded in 1582 by a small group of Florentine literati. Arrogating to itself the role of arbiter of literature, the Crusca promoted the Tuscan language as employed by Petrarch, Boccaccio, and other fourteenth-century authors as the norm for all good writing. Through its *Vocabolario* (1612) and other works, the Crusca sought unilaterally to prescribe or legislate usage. The *Vocabolario*, of

which a new edition was started in 1863 (but was still unfinished when Gramsci was writing this note), is more like a thesaurus than a dictionary of the kind produced by the Académie Française. The rigid and conservative approach to language that characterized much of the work produced by the Crusca led Francesco De Sanctis to describe it as "the Council of Trent of the Italian language."

§146. *Kipling*

1. These words are attributed to Rudyard Kipling by Aldo Sorani in his article "La morale di Kipling" (Kipling's moral views), *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 44 (November 3, 1929). According to Sorani, these words come from a speech Kipling delivered in September 1929 at the formal opening of the new building of the Junior King's School at Milner Court.

§147. *Italian intellectuals. Carducci*

1. Foscarina Trabaudi Foscarini De Ferrari's name and thematic indexes of Carducci's complete works, *Il pensiero del Carducci*, 2 vols. (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1929), are discussed in the article by Guido Mazzoni, "Il pensiero del Carducci attraverso gli indici delle sue opere" (Carducci's thought through the indexes of his works), *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 44 (November 3, 1929).

On Giosuè Carducci, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 17; and on Guido Mazzoni, see Notebook 2, §31, n. 2.

§148. *The negative popular-national character of Italian literature*

1. Adolfo Faggi, "Fede e dramma" (Faith and drama), *Il Marzocco* 33, no. 46 (November 11, 1928).

2. Gramsci is quoting Adolfo Faggi's rendition (in "Fede e dramma") of some views expressed by Tolstoy in his essay "Shakespeare and Drama." The comparison between Tolstoy and Manzoni is drawn by Faggi; the Russian novelist makes no mention of *I promessi sposi* (*The Betrothed*) or its author in his essay. For an English translation of Tolstoy's essay on Shakespeare, see Leo Tolstoy, *Tolstoy on Shakespeare: A Critical Essay on Shakespeare*, trans. V. Tchertkoff and I. F. Mayo (London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906).

§149. *Popular literature. Verne and the literature of marvelous adventures*

1. Gramsci amplifies his comparison of Jules Verne with H. G. Wells in Notebook 5, §84.

Gramsci did not have a very high opinion of H. G. Wells's work and had not read much of it. See the undated letter to his son Delio in *Letters from Prison*, ed. F. Rosengarten, trans. R. Rosenthal (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 2:378; and *Lettere dal carcere*, ed. S. Caprioglio and E. Fubini (Turin: Einaudi, 1965), p. 885.

2. Adolfo Faggi, "Impressioni di Giulio Verne," *Il Marzocco* 33, no. 8 (February 19, 1928).

The expansionist ambitions of Britain and France in Africa generated a series of disputes that culminated in the Egyptian Sudan on September 18, 1898, in what came to be known as the Fashoda Incident. The tense confrontation between the French expeditionary force led by Jean-Baptiste Marchand and the British force commanded by Herbert Kitchener threatened to explode into a military conflict between the two colonial powers, but it was gradually defused.

Gramsci mentions Verne's anti-British sentiments in an undated letter he wrote to his son Giuliano in 1936 (see *Letters from Prison*, 2:374–75):

> At the movies you saw the [film based on Jules Verne's story] "Sons of Captain Grant," but you don't tell me whether you liked the film and why. I read the book when I was a boy like you, and I remember I liked it a lot, so I reread it many times, with the atlas before me, and sought out other books that would explain the customs of the country crossed by the 34th parallel south (I think). Dr. Paganel with his absent-mindedness made me laugh so loud when I was alone that they would come to see whether I had gone crazy. The only thing I didn't like was Verne's anti-English chauvinism (which perhaps does not appear in the film that you have seen) and the caricature of English geography books. When I was a boy, the English appealed to me a lot because they were great sailors and had many islands where I would have liked to live.

§150. *Popular literature. Emilio De Marchi*

1. Emilio De Marchi (1851–1901), a Milanese teacher of literature, a regular contributor to periodicals and newspapers such as *La Vita Nuova*, *Italia*, and *Corriere della Sera*, and author of children's books, espoused conservative politics and conventional values. Many of his writings are moralistic and didactic; they sentimentally extol religion and the traditional family structure as repositories of the good. De Marchi also achieved some success as novelist, especially with *Demetrio Pianelli* (1890), *Arabella* (1892), and *Giacomo l'idealista* (1897), all three stories of failed love with tragic consequences that (in contrast to many of De Marchi's

other writings) are not allayed by the consolations of religion. *Demetrio Pianelli*, which portrays the milieu of late-ninteenth-century Milan in rich detail, was serialized in *Italia* in 1888, before its publication as a book.

§151. *Negative popular-national character of Italian literature*

1. See Notebook 3, §148.

2. Adolfo Faggi, "Tolstoi e Shakespeare," *Il Marzocco* 33, no. 37 (September 9, 1928). In this article, Faggi discusses Tolstoy's essay on "Shakespeare and Drama," as he does in his other article on Manzoni and Tolstoy, "Fede e dramma" (Faith and drama), which Gramsci discusses in Notebook 3, §148. For an English translation of the book cited in the parenthesis, *Shakespeare, eine kritische Studie* (Hanover, 1906), see Leo Tolstoy, *Tosltoy on Shakespeare: A Critical Essay on Shakespeare*, trans. V. Tchertkoff and I. F. Mayo, followed by "Shakespeare's Attitude to the Working Class," by Ernest Crosby, and a letter by G. Bernard Shaw (London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906).

3. Up to this point, Gramsci is paraphrasing Adolfo Faggi's article, "Tolstoi e Shakespeare"—except for the parenthetical comment on Manzoni.

§152. *"Spectator" = Mario Missiroli*

1. Mario Missiroli's publication of unpublished letters by Sorel (to himself) and the appearance of his articles in *Nuova Antologia* under the pseudonym Spectator and in *L'Italia Letteraria* under his own name are also brought up in Notebook 4, §44.

On Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

This note is canceled by Gramsci in the manuscript, but unlike most other canceled notes, it is not incorporated in any of the later notebooks.

§153. *Popular literature. Notes on the detective novel*

1. Eugène Sue's *Le juif errant* (serialized in 1844–45) comprises a series of plots and schemes by the Jesuit agent Rodin, whose mission is to prevent the fortune of a persecuted Protestant from falling into the hands of his legitimate heirs. For an English translation, see *The Wandering Jew* (New York: Modern Library, 1940).

On Eugène Sue's portrayal of Rodolphe in *Les mystères de Paris*, see, inter alia, Notebook 3, §52 and §53.

2. For a modern English translation of Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber* (1781), a tragedy in five acts, see *The Robbers*, trans. F. J. Lamport (New

York: Penguin, 1979). The earliest English translations of this play date back to 1792 and 1799.

3. See Notebook 3, §78.

4. Javert is the police officer in Victor Hugo's *Les misérables* (1862).

5. See Notebook 3, §78.

6. In prison Gramsci had two books by the English Catholic belletrist and novelist G. K. Chesterton (1874–1936): a French translation of *The New Jerusalem* (1920) (see Notebook 1, §24, n. 13), and an Italian translation of *The Wisdom of Father Brown* (1914; see Notebook 2, "Description of the Manuscript," 1:529). Gramsci's comments in Notebook 7, §38, suggest that he had also read an Italian translation of *The Innocence of Father Brown* (1911).

For additional observations on the detective novel, see Notebook 6, §5, §17, and §28.

§154. *The negative national-popular aspect of Italian literature*

1. Alfredo Gargiulo, "Bruno Cicognani," *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 34 (August 24, 1930). This was the nineteenth in a series of articles by Gargiulo on twentieth-century Italian literature, all of which were published in the weekly *L'Italia Letteraria* under the general title "1900–1930." The first article of the series appeared in *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 30 (January 19, 1930).

In his first work, *Lo crittogama* (1908), Bruno Cicognani (1879–1971), a Florentine writer of short stories, novels, and memoirs, adopted the style of D'Annunzio, but he quickly abandoned it. His subsequent work belongs to the realistic tradition; much of it is set in Florence and portrays the personal and psychological travails of ordinary characters.

Alfredo Gargiulo (1876–1949) published his earliest essays in Croce's journal *La Critica*. He eventually distanced himself from Croce, whose concept of art as pure intuition he was unwilling to endorse, and emerged as one of the prominent critics of the circle associated with the literary periodical *La Ronda*. In addition to important critical works on D'Annunzio and Ungaretti, he translated Kant's *Critique of Judgment* and collected his series of articles in *L'Italia Letteraria*, together with some other essays that had appeared elsewhere, and published them in a single volume, *Letteratura italiana del Novecento* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1958), as a survey of twentieth-century Italian literature.

2. See Notebook 4, §5.

§155. *The new architecture*

1. See Adriano Tilgher, "Perché l'artista scrive o dipinge o scolpisce, ecc.?" (Why does the artist write, paint, sculpt, etc.?), *L'Italia Che Scrive*

12, no. 2 (February 1929): 31–32. Gramsci comments on this article elsewhere; see Notebook 2, §103, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

On Adriano Tilgher, see Notebook 1, §28, n. 2.

§156. *Lorianism. Trombetti and the monogenesis of language*

1. See Notebook 3, §86.

2. Vittore Pisani, "Divagazioni etrusche" (Etruscan digressions), in the "Notize e commenti" (News and comments) section of *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1367, (March 1, 1929): 123–27.

3. This example (*mysterion*) is Gramsci's, whereas the two examples that follow it, as well as the citation of Enno Littmann's work, are derived from Pisani's "Divagazioni etrusche."

4. Gramsci makes the same point in a November 17, 1930, letter to Tatiana Schucht: "Manzoni himself, in revising *I promessi sposi* [*The Betrothed*] and in his studies on the Italian language, in reality took into account only one aspect of language, the vocabulary, but not syntax, which, after all, is the essential part of any language—so much so that English is a Germanic language although more than 60 percent of its words are Latin or Neo-Latin, whereas Romanian is a Neo-Latin language although more than 60 percent of its words are Slavic."

5. Gramsci's source of information on Voltaire's epigrams against Gilles Ménage has not been traced.

Gilles Ménage (1613–92), the French wit and critic of the Académie Française, produced several studies on etymology and grammar.

§158. *The historical conjuncture of 1848–49*

1. Gramsci is referring to the complicated and shifting political alliances that were a prominent feature of Piedmontese parliamentary and cabinet politics starting with the formation of the first constitutional government installed by King Carlo Alberto on May 16, 1848, and led by Cesare Balbo. These alliances involved individuals and groups from the entire political spectrum, and they "fragmented" the democratic forces, as Gramsci puts it, in the sense that they not only prevented certain progressive political formations, such as the Center-Left and the Left, from remaining compact oppositional blocs but actually made them participate in the maneuvers that enabled the conservative and moderate bourgeois forces to retain their hold on power. Within one year, Piedmont had eight different governments, some of them moderate, such as Balbo's, some rather progressive, such as Gabrio Casati's (which included Urbano Rattazzi in the cabinet) and especially Vincenzo Gioberti's, and others quite authoritarian, such as Gabriele de Launay's. This rapid succession of

governments also reflects, of course, the turbulent events of the time, which included, among other incidents, the military defeats (at Custoza in July 1948 and Novara in March 1949) suffered at the hands of the Austrians and the abdication of Carlo Alberto in favor of his son Vittorio Emanuele II. Some degree of continuity and stability was achieved by Massimo D'Azeglio, who became prime minister in May 1949 and remained in office for three full years.

D'Azeglio, too, had to surmount some major crises. The first occurred just a few months after he took office: Unable to persuade parliament to ratify the peace treaty with Austria that had been agreed on in August 1849 in the aftermath of the Piedmontese defeat at Novara, D'Azeglio urged Vittorio Emanuele II to dissolve parliament. On November 20, 1849, the king complied, dissolving parliament (which had been elected the previous July) and issuing a proclamation from his chateau at Moncalieri stating that he wanted "to save the nation from the tyranny of the political parties." By refusing to approve the peace treaty, the deputies, according to the king, were acting in manner "hostile to the crown." The constitutionality of the king's intervention was, at the very least, questionable, but when new elections were held the following month, D'Azeglio emerged victorious.

A parliamentary deadlock in 1852 compelled D'Azeglio to resign, and Vittorio Emanuele entrusted Cavour (who had served in D'Azeglio's cabinet as minister of agriculture) with the task of forming a new government. Earlier that year Cavour had already positioned himself to assume the premiership by distancing himself from the right-wing deputies and forming an alliance (labeled "*connubio*" or "marriage" by his conservative adversaries) with the democratic Center-Left bloc led by Urbano Rattazzi. Cavour thus became prime minister at the head of a centrist coalition.

On Cesare Balbo, see Notebook 1, §110, n. 1; on Massimo D'Azeglio, see Notebook 1, §121, n. 1; on Vincenzo Gioberti, see Notebook 1, §46, n. 1; and on Urbano Rattazzi, see Notebook 2, §29, n. 3.

§159. *Risorgimento*

1. The same point is reiterated in different terms in Notebook 5, §136.

§160. *The economic structure of Italy*

1. Giuseppe Paratore, "La economia, la finanza, il denaro d'Italia alla fine del 1928" (The Italian economy, finance, and currency at the end of 1928), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1367, (March 1, 1929): 74–87. On this same article and its author, see also Notebook 2, §122, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§161. *Leo XIII*

1. Piero Misciatelli, "Un libro di ricordi e di preghiere del papa Leone XIII" (A book of memoirs and prayers by Pope Leo XIII), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1367 (March 1, 1929): 3–16.

On Leo XIII, see Notebook 1, §77, n. 2.

§162. *The historical conjuncture of 1848–49*

1. Carlo Pagani, "Dopo Custoza e Volta nel 1848 (con documenti inediti)" (After Custoza and Volta in 1848 [with previously unpublished documents]), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1367 (March 1, 1929): 102–9.

The Austrians inflicted a heavy defeat on the Piedmontese army at Custoza on July 25, 1848, and again two days later, at Volta.

2. Gabrio Casati became prime minister on July 27, 1848, a position he held for just one month. In forming his cabinet he had the support of Vicenzo Gioberti (on whom see Notebook 1, §46, n. 1), who was president of the Chamber of Deputies.

3. Giuseppe Massari (1821–84) was very active in the political battles for Italian independence and unification. He became acquainted with Gioberti in Paris and in 1849 worked closely with him in Turin. Later, Cavour entrusted him with several diplomatic missions.

4. Carlo Pagani, *Uomini e cose in Milano dal marzo all'agosto del 1848* (Men and events in Milan from March to August 1848) (Milan: Cogliati, 1906).

The bibliographical data recorded in this note are drawn from Carlo Pagani's article, "Dopo Custoza e Volta nel 1848."

§163. *Alessandro Luzio's "history" of the Risorgimento*

1. "Processo politico e condanna dell'abbate Gioberti nell'anno 1833. III" (The political trial and conviction of Abbé Gioberti in 1833. Part III), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (August 4, 1928): 206–19. The first two parts of this unsigned article appeared, bearing the same title, in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (April 21, 1928): 111–21; and 79, no. 3 (July 7, 1928): 19–29.

2. See Alessandro Luzio, *Giuseppe Mazzini carbonaro* (Turin: Bocca, 1920).

For other remarks by Gramsci on Luzio's tendentiousness as a historian, see Notebook 1, §44 and §48; Notebook 3, §125; and Notebook 8, §23. On Alessandro Luzio, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 45.

3. The events to which Gramsci (and the *Civiltà Cattolica* article he cites) is referring took place in 1833 and not, as he erroneously writes, in 1831. Gioberti was arrested in Turin in 1833 because of his alleged collaboration with the Mazzinians, whose activities were deemed subversive

and whose publications had been banned by a royal edict. Actually, Gioberti never stood trial. Largely because he was a priest and chaplain of Carlo Alberto's court, he was allowed to go into exile after being held under arrest for several months. In fact, Luzio discusses Gioberti's attitude during the period he was under arrest in his book *Giuseppe Mazzini carbonaro*—a book known to Gramsci only indirectly through the discussion of it in part 3 of the *Civiltà Cattolica* article "Processo politico e condanna dell'Abbate Gioberti nell'anno 1833," cited above.

On Vincenzo Gioberti, see Notebook 1, §46, n. 1.

4. See part 2 of the unsigned article "Processo politico e condanna dell'Abbate Gioberti nell'anno 1833," especially pp. 22–25.

§164. *Notes on the religious movement. The editorial staff of* La Civiltà Cattolica

1. On the *Codice sociale*, see Notebook 1, §1, n. 2.

In Notebook 5, §62, Gramsci lists some of Angelo Brucculeri's writings on labor issues published by *La Civiltà Cattolica*.

2. The Catholic weekly *L'Amico delle Famiglie* (Family friend) was distributed gratis, and Gramsci may very well have had access to some issues of it in prison.

Enrico Rosa (1870–1938), a Jesuit priest—already mentioned in Notebook 1, §24—joined the staff of *La Civiltà Cattolica* in 1905 and served as its editor-in-chief from 1915 until 1935. He gained a reputation as one of the staunchest defenders of the pope and of the official Catholic position against liberalism and modernism.

3. This index was published in 1926. When Gramsci wrote this note, the analytic index for 1926–30 was not yet available (it was published in 1931).

4. On the Confalonieri depositions and the controversy that surrounded their discovery, see Notebook 1, §44, nn. 42 and 43.

5. Gramsci discusses an article on the brothers Cipriano and Giona La Gala in Notebook 5, §43.

6. For more on Gioberti, see Notebook 3, §163, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

7. Nathan Söderblom (1866–1931), a promoter of peace and religious unity, won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1930. A scholar in the field of comparative religion, Söderblom is regarded as a pioneer of the ecumenical movement. His "evangelical Catholicism," as Gramsci calls it, emphasized the catholicity—that is, the universal, all-embracing character—of Christian faith.

Gramsci derived this information on the pan-Christian, or ecumenical, movement and on Friedrich Heiler's book from the first part of an

unsigned article, "Il sadhu Sundar Sing" (The holy man Sundar Sing), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (July 7, 1928): 3–18.

7. The information on Upadhyaya (i.e., master or teacher) Brahmabandhav is drawn from part two of "Sadhu Sundar Singh," *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (July 21, 1928): 110–25. A "sannyasi" is a Hindu who renounces all material possessions, lives as a homeless mendicant, and reaches the highest stage of religious asceticism.

The Sadhu (i.e., holy man) Sundar Singh, the target of severe criticism by Catholics, was a former Hindu who converted to Protestantism.

§165. *Italo Toscani*

1. Italo Toscani's biography of the Jesuit saint Aloysius Gonzaga, *Vita di S. Luigi Gonzaga* (Rome: Libreria Fratelli Ferrari, 1928), was favorably reviewed in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (July 21, 1928): 152–53.

2. See Notebook 3, §44, and n. 5 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

3. Apart from the bibliographical reference, the information in this note seems to be based on Gramsci's personal recollections and impressions. In 1916 Italo Toscani joined the Ninety-second Infantry Regiment based in Turin. Gramsci probably met him in Turin; he certainly had heard of him, for Toscani had been the editor of *L'Avanguardia*, the weekly published by the Italian Socialist Youth Federation. In September 1916 Toscani was arrested for attempting to disseminate antiwar leaflets prepared by the International Socialist Youth Committee in Berne. Others who were arrested at the same time included Federico Marinozzi (secretary of the Italian Socialist Youth Federation), Luigi Morara (a printer and publisher), and Giuseppe Sardelli (a trade unionist and member of the executive committee of the Chamber of Labor in Rome). They all stood trial before the Military Tribunal in Rome and were found guilty. Toscani was sentenced to six years in prison; the other received five-year terms. After ten months of imprisonment, however, Toscani and Sardelli were released and sent back to the army. Toscani wrote about the trial in a booklet, *A bocca chiusa: Storia di un processo* (Rome: Tipografia Morara, 1920), and in his biography of Morara, *Socialista! Luigi Morara nella storia del socialismo romano, 1892–1960* (Rome, 1961). From the latter work it is possible to understand what the "episode of the false Calabresi" mentioned by Gramsci refers to. The "false Calabresi" was a police informant who gained Italo Toscano's trust by posing as the brother of Toscani's socialist comrade Carlo Calabresi (a leader of the Socialist Youth Federation). "On September 9 our man disappeared, taking with him the civilian clothes and all the correspondence belonging to Toscani, who was arrested the following day in a theatrical fashion at the barracks" (*Socialista!* p. 73). Gramsci owned three books of children's stories written

by Italo Toscani: *La casa vuota e altre novelle* (Rome: Primavera, 1923); *Fra terra e cielo: Storia di una goccia d'acqua* (Rome: Primavera, 1923); and *La palla di fucile e altri racconti* (Rome: Primavera, 1924). These books, however, were not among those that Gramsci had in prison.

§166. *Past and present*

1. See the unsigned article (in fact, written by Angelo Brucculeri) "La conferenza internazionale del lavoro" (The international labor conference), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (August 4, 1928): 233–43, especially pp. 240–41: "The bishops of Lombardy (1920) also point out that in periods of crisis, the capitalist should be the first to feel its effects, not the worker."

NOTEBOOK 4 (1930–32)

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

A ruled school notebook (15×20.5 cm) hardbound in thin cardboard covered with red cloth. A label on the front cover is blank, while Gramsci's prison number (7047) is inscribed with a blue pencil on the cover itself. This notebook is not signed by the prison warden. On a separate label glued after Gramsci's death to the upper right-hand corner of the front cover, Tatiana Schucht wrote "Completo da pg. 1 a 160—XIII" (Complete from pp. 1–160—XIII). The Roman numerals indicate the number that Schucht assigned to the notebook according to the cataloging system she had devised when organizing Gramsci's papers soon after his death.

The notebook consists of eighty leaves with twenty-one lines on each side and unlined endpapers in front and back. The recto sides of the leaves are numbered (1–80) in green ink and stamped with the prison seal: "Casa penale speciale di Turi" (Special prison of Turi). The recto side of the endpaper inside the back cover is similarly numbered (81) and stamped but is otherwise blank. Gramsci's writing fills all the lined pages in the notebook, except for all but the first two lines of p. 7v, the last two lines of p. 10v, and the last four lines of p. 80v. This notebook, then, contains a total of 160 manuscript pages.

In all, the notebook comprises ninety-seven notes. Gramsci crossed out seventy-five of these notes, but they remain perfectly legible (following V. Gerratana's denomination, these entries are called A texts), and he incorporated all but three of them in later

notebooks. The three exceptions are §4 ("Machiavellianism and Marxism"), §57 ("Vincenzo Cuoco and passive revolution"), and §58 ("Popular literature"). The other twenty-two notes are B texts: they were neither canceled nor used again in other notebooks.

The notebook is made up of four segments, or clusters, of notes: Pages 1r through 7v of the manuscript contain a group of notes (an introductory note followed by ten notes, each preceded by the symbol §) collected under the general heading "Canto 10 of the *Inferno*," which Gramsci wrote and underlined at the center of the first line of the opening page of the notebook. This group of notes corresponds to §78 through §88 of the present edition. Pages 8r through 10v contain seven notes on diverse topics, each marked with the customary symbol §; these notes, which are not given a general title by Gramsci, correspond to §89 through §95 of the present edition. Pages 11r through 40v comprise twenty-nine miscellaneous notes, all of which are preceded by the symbol §, and several of which seem to be thematically related (albeit rather loosely in some cases) to the first, unusually long note of the cluster, entitled "The intellectuals" (a title that Gramsci inscribed in larger letters than usual); this cluster of notes corresponds to §49 through §77 of the present edition. Pages 41r through 80v hold forty-eight notes (the first of which is not preceded by the symbol § and seems to have the character of a preface) collected under the general title "Notes on Philosophy. Materialism and Idealism. First Series," which Gramsci inscribed and underlined twice (except for "First Series," which is only underlined once) on the top line of p. 41r; this segment corresponds to §1 through §48 of the present edition.

The sequence in which the notes appear in the manuscript of Notebook 4 obviously does not correspond to the chronological order of their composition. On p. 17r of the manuscript (see §49 in this volume) Gramsci states: "I am writing in November 1930," whereas on p. 61r (§31) he writes: "but to this day—September 1930." Also, on p. 14r, Gramsci cites a note that he had already written on p. 67r of his manuscript (see §49 and §38, respectively, in the present volume). From this internal evidence one can draw certain incontrovertible conclusions: for example, that the note on the "Relations between structure and superstructures" (§38), although it appears on p. 67r in the segment entitled "Notes on Philosophy. Materialism and Idealism" (which starts exactly in the middle of the notebook—i.e., p. 41r—and continues to its very last page), was

written prior to the note on "The intellectuals" (§49), which runs from the first line of p. 11r to the top of p. 19r in the manuscript. Still, it remains difficult to determine the exact chronology of the composition of each part of the notebook. One must always bear in mind that Gramsci often wrote in different sections of a particular notebook as well as in separate notebooks during the same stretch of time and that he did not wait until he ran out of pages in one notebook before starting to make entries in a new one. In any case, this edition replicates the sequential order and enumeration of Gramsci's notes established by Valentino Gerratana.

There can be little doubt that the moment Gramsci put this notebook into use he decided to devote the second half of its pages to his "Notes on Philosophy." It is also extremely likely that at the same time he planned to set aside a number of pages at the beginning of the notebook (probably the first five leaves, or ten pages, initially) for his notes on canto 10 of Dante's *Inferno*. Gerratana believes, however, that the first entry made in the notebook was the prefatory note that opens the sequence of "Notes on Philosophy" on p. 41r. It is all but certain that Gramsci started writing the "Notes on Philosophy" sometime in the first half of May 1930, at the latest. In fact, in §6 (i.e., pp. 47r–49v of the manuscript of Notebook 4) he quotes verbatim and at length passages from a book—Roberto Ardigò's *Scritti vari*—that is included among the "Books Delivered to Tatiana at Turi on 20 May 1930" listed in Notebook 1 (see Notebook 1, Description of the Manuscript, 1:371). Another fact relevant to the dating of these notes is the reference in §5 (on p. 46v of the manuscript of Notebook 4) to an article published in *L'Italia Letteraria* of April 6, 1930. As has already been mentioned, Gramsci himself indicates that he was writing on p. 61r (see §31) of this notebook in September 1930. Furthermore, a quotation from the *Rassegna Settimanale della Stampa Estera* of October 21, 1930, is transcribed on pp. 72v through 73r (see §38), and another one from *Nuovi Studi* of September–October 1930 is copied out on p. 76v (see §42) of the manuscript. Another thing can be ascertained: Gramsci was still entering notes in Notebook 3 when he had already filled at least thirteen pages of Notebook 4 with his "Notes on Philosophy." On p. 74r of the manuscript of Notebook 3 (see §154 of that notebook in this edition) he refers to what he had already written in a note that occupies pp. 44v through 47r of the manuscript of Notebook 4 (i.e., §5 in this edition).

It is more difficult to determine with any degree of exactitude when Gramsci entered the first note under the heading "Canto 10 of the *Inferno*" on p. 1r of the manuscript of this notebook. A very loose time framework, however, can be reconstructed. The first two notes (i.e., §78 and §70 in this edition, and pp. 1r–2v in the manuscript) were definitely composed before September 20, 1931, when Gramsci wrote a letter to Tatiana Schucht synthesizing and elaborating the ideas he had sketched in them. It is possible, however, to be more precise. The sentence that appears on the top two lines of p. 2v in the manuscript (see the conclusion of §79 in this edition) could not have been written prior to the publication of *La Nuova Italia* of June 20, 1930, which it cites. It is also safe to affirm that Gramsci completed §83 (pp. 3v–5v in the manuscript) before March 13, 1931, since in that note he discusses and quotes several passages from Vincenzo Morello's booklet *Dante, Farinata, Cavalcante,* which in Notebook 2 is listed among the "Books Delivered to Carlo on 13 March 1931" (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:529). The entry on pp. 6r–7r (see §86 in this edition), on the other hand, could not have been written any earlier than late March 1932. The contents of §86 are described by Gramsci as "some passages from a letter written by Prof. U. Cosmo (in the early months of 1932)." In fact, the letter was sent by Professor Umberto Cosmo on December 29, 1931, to Piero Sraffa who, on March 1, 1932, mailed it to Tatiana Schucht; she, in turn, transcribed it for Gramsci in her letter of March 9. Gramsci acknowledged receipt of it in a March 21, 1932, letter to Tatiana Schucht.

The cluster of notes that appears on pp. 11r through 40v of the manuscript (i.e., §49–§77 in this volume) must have been started in November 1930; the evidence for this, as has already been pointed out, comes from Gramsci himself who, in the very first note of that cluster (see §49, "The intellectuals"), on p. 17r of the manuscript, remarks parenthetically, "I am writing in November 1930."

The miscellaneous notes on pp. 8r through 10v (i.e., §89–§95 in this volume) were the last to be entered in this notebook. The second note in this group refers to a book review published in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of August 20, 1932 (see p. 8r in the manuscript, or §90 in this volume). Gramsci's source for the last two notes (see §94–95, or p. 10v in the manuscript) is *La Civiltà Cattolica* of September 3, 1932. In all likelihood, these notes were all written in

the course of a couple of weeks, starting in late August or early September 1932.

In *L'officina gramsciana: Ipotesi sulla struttura dei "Quaderni del carcere"* (Naples: Bibliopolis, 1984), p. 141, Gianni Francioni offers the following chronology of the composition of Notebook 4:

§§ 1–8: May 1930
9–27: between May and August 1930
28–30: between August and September 1930
31: September 1930
32–37: between September and October 1930
38–42: October 1930
43–48: between October and November 1930
49–77: November 1930
78: May 1930
79: between May and June 1930
80: July 1930
81–83: between July 1930 and March 13, 1931
84–85: between 1931 and 1932
86–88: 1932 (probably between June and August)
89–95: between August and September 1932

NOTES TO THE TEXT

Notes on Philosophy. Materialism and Idealism. First Series

§1. If one wants to study a conception of the world . . .

1. Gramsci owned an Italian as well as a French translation of Karl Marx's Critique of the Gotha Programme: Marginal Notes to the Programme of the German Workers' Party (1875), but they were not among the books he had with him in prison. The editions owned by Gramsci were: *Critica del programma di Gotha*, in K. Marx, F. Engels, and F. Lassalle, *Opere*, 2d ed., ed. Ettore Ciccotti, vol. 2 (Milan: Società Editrice Avanti, 1922); and *Critique du programme de Gotha*, with a preface and notes by Amédée Dunois (Paris: Librairie de l'Humanité, 1922). For an English translation of the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, see K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, vol. 24 (New York: International Publishers, 1989).

In prison Gramsci had some volumes of French translations of Marx's letters. See K. Marx, *Lettres à Kugelmann*, with a preface by V. I. Lenin and

an introduction by E. Czobel (Paris: Editions Sociales Internationales, 1930); and *Correspondance K. Marx–Fr. Engels*, trans. J. Molitor, vols. 2 and 3 (Paris: A. Costes, 1931). Gramsci, however, did not have access to these books until after he had written this note; they are mentioned in the draft of the petition he sent to Mussolini in October 1931; see Notebook 2, Description of the Manuscript, 1:527–28.

2. Rodolfo Mondolfo, *Il materialismo storico in Federico Engels* (Genoa: Formiggini, 1912). Gramsci owned a copy of this book prior to his imprisonment, but in this note he does not remember the title quite accurately: in his rendition of the title, Mondolfo's book is on "the historical materialism *of* Engels," whereas according to the original title it is about "historical materialism *in* Engels." In two letters (March 25, 1929, and April 11, 1932) he asked Tatiana Schucht to retrieve his copy of Mondolfo's book and send it to him in prison; the book never reached him—at least not while he was still at the Turi prison.

Rodolfo Mondolfo (1877–1976) was a professor of philosophy at the University of Turin from 1910 until 1914, when he moved to the University of Bologna and later to other universities. His earliest published works are on Condillac and on utilitarianism. Mondolfo was especially interested in social and political theory. In his writings on Marxism he emphasized what he termed the "activist character of the Marxist philosophy of praxis." (It may very well be the case that Gramsci borrowed the phrase "philosophy of praxis" directly from Mondolfo.) He left Italy after the Fascists came to power and spent the rest of his life in Argentina. In his later years he turned his attention to ancient Greek philosophy.

3. See Georges Sorel's letter to Benedetto Croce, March 16, 1912, published in *La Critica* 26, no. 6 (November 20, 1928): 435: "Je viens de recevoir un énorme volume: *Il materialismo storico in Federico Engels* du professeur Rodolfo Mondolfo de Turin. Je suis effrayé en songeant qu'il faille tant de pages pour expliquer la pensée d'un homme qui pensait aussi peu qu'Engels."

4. Engels's *Anti-Dühring* (1878) was not among the books Gramsci had in prison, but in all probability he had read it in an Italian or French translation prior to his arrest.

§2. *De Man's book*

1. On Henri De Man's book, originally published in German with the title *Zur Psychologie des Sozialismus* (1926), and on its Italian, French, and English editions, see Notebook 1, §61, n. 13.

On Benedetto Croce's brief review of the French edition of De Man's book in *La Critica* 26, no. 6 (November 20, 1928): 459–60, see Notebook 1, §132, n. 4.

2. Guido De Ruggiero, review of the Italian translation of H. De Man, *Il superamento del marxismo* (1929), *La Critica* 27, no. 6 (November 20, 1929): 459–63.

Guido De Ruggiero (1888–1948) was a liberal and an anti-Marxist whose philosophical and political views were strongly influenced by Croce. De Ruggiero published widely and exercised considerable influence on the cultural scene. He served briefly as minister of education in 1944.

3. "Il tramonto del marxismo" (The decline of Marxism), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (October 5, 1929): 36–45, and 80 (November 16, 1929): 320–29; Giuseppe Santonastaso, review of De Man's *Il superamento del marxismo*, *Leonardo* 5, no. 11–12 (November–December 1929): 304–5.

4. Giovanni Zibordi, *Saggio sulla storia del movimento operaio in Italia: Camillo Prampolini e i lavoratori reggiani*, 2d ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1930). The reference to De Man's book is on p. 5: "A wise and ardent illustration of this correction and integration of the mechanistic conception of historical determinism with respect to the European socialist movement is found in the work of De Man: *Il superamento del marxismo.*"

5. Gramsci is probably referring to the advertisement for De Man's book by its Italian publisher, Laterza, in *La Critica* 17, no. 3 (May 20, 1929).

6. "Socialismo etico ed il nuovo fabianesimo in Germania" (Ethical socialism and the new Fabianism in Germany), *I Problemi del Lavoro* 3, no. 6 (June 1, 1929): 5–7. A brief note preceding this article states: "The theses on *ethical socialism and the new Fabianism in Germany* are found in a book by Henri De Man, translated by Alessandro Schiavi, and just published in two volumes entitled *Il superamento del marxismo* by Laterza of Bari in its Library of Modern Culture series." In its next issue—3, no. 7 (July 1, 1929)—*I Problemi del Lavoro* published the following correction: "In the last issue we published the Oppenheim theses stating that they are found in De Man's book; it should be pointed out, instead, that they are to be found only in the French edition, since the Italian translator has omitted them in order to preserve the pure scientific character of the book" (p. 23).

7. Alessandro Schiavi, preface to Henri De Man, *Il superamento del marxismo*, trans. A. Schiavi (Bari: Laterza, 1929), 1:v–viii.

8. Umberto Barbaro, "Il superamento del marxismo," *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 19 (August 1929).

9. The parenthetical exclamation point is Gramsci's.

§3. *Two aspects of Marxism*

1. On Antonio Labriola, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 51.

2. Max Adler (1873–1937), one of the most prominent intellectuals of what is known as Austro-Marxism, based his efforts to formulate the foun-

dations of Marxism as a sociological science on neo-Kantian and positivist philosophy.

3. The Catholic monsignor Francesco Olgiati (1886–1962) wrote extensively on the history of philosophy, including books on Thomas Aquinas and Descartes. He also wrote a book on Marx—*Carlo Marx*, 2d ed. (Milan: Società Editrice Vita e Pensiero, 1920)—in which his overall approach is heavily indebted to Croce. Olgiati's book on Marx is not preserved among Gramsci's books, but Gramsci's comments here and elsewhere in his notebooks strongly suggest that he read it—probably prior to his arrest and imprisonment.

4. Gramsci, as he himself states, is not so much quoting Missiroli as reconstructing his statement from memory. See Mario Missiroli's column "Opinioni" (Opinions) in the newspaper *La Stampa*, September 10–11, 1925, where he writes: "I cannot subscribe to the ideas that are currently circulating about Marx. It seems to me that his value as a scientific thinker is downplayed in order to exalt his revolutionary character. It is not in the least surprising that professors of political economy, like eunuchs standing in front of the sultan, should discover scientific errors in Marx and confute him triumphalistically in the duplicated lecture notes they provide to their students. It would be interesting, however, to know what the great industrialists and bankers secretly think about Marx's economic theories."

5. Gramsci is referring to Rosa Luxemburg's essay "Stagnation and Progress in Marxism," on which Gramsci also comments elsewhere; see Notebook 3, §31, and the corresponding Notes to the Text (especially n. 7).

6. Sorel's letter was published in an article signed "Spectator" (the pseudonym used by Mario Missiroli), "Sorel e Clemenceau," in *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 37 (December 15, 1929). Sorel wrote that Clemenceau "considers the philosophy of Marx, which constitutes the basic framework of contemporary socialism, to be an obscure theory befitting the barbarians of Germany; this is how it has always appeared to quick and brilliant minds who are used to facile interpretations. Lightweight minds like his fail to understand what Renan understood so well, namely, that things of great historical value may appear alongside literary productions of obvious mediocrity—as mediocre, in fact, as the socialist literature that is offered to the people." On this article, see also Notebook 4, §44.

On Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

7. Benedetto Croce, *Storia dell'età barocca in Italia* (Bari: Laterza, 1929), pp. 11–12. The emphasis is Gramsci's. Gramsci had a copy of this book in prison.

8. The Spanish humanist Juan de Valdes (ca. 1490–1541), who corresponded with Erasmus and espoused many of his views, left his native

Spain to avoid potential problems with the Inquisition following the publication of his book *Diálogo de la doctrina cristiana* (1529) and spent the rest of his life in Italy.

9. See Notebook 1, §44, n. 38.

10. Gramsci makes a similar comment on Maeterlinck in Notebook 3, §48.

11. Guido de Ruggiero, "Erasmo e la Riforma" (Erasmus and the Reformation), *La Nuova Italia* 1, no. 1 (January 20, 1930): 12–17. De Ruggiero's article consists of some passages from his book on the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Counter-Reformation, published the same year: *Rinascimento, Riforma, Controriforma*, 2 vols. (Bari: Laterza, 1930), specifically 1:197–204, 209–17.

§4. *Machiavellianism and Marxism*

1. Gramsci is quoting two lines from Ugo Foscolo's brief reflection on Machiavelli in the famous poem *Dei sepolcri* (On tombs). The relevant passage consists of the following lines: "When I saw the monument/ where lies the body of that great man/who even as he tempers the scepter of the rulers/strips them of their laurels, and lets the people see/how it drips with tears and blood" (lines 154–58). According to Foscolo's interpretation, Machiavelli pretended to write *The Prince* to instruct rulers on how political power is acquired and maintained, while his real intention was to reveal the mechanisms of power to the people.

2. See Benedetto Croce, *Storia dell'età barocca in Italia* (Bari: Laterza, 1929), p. 82.

Unlike most other canceled notes, this one is not incorporated into a later notebook; instead, the central idea articulated here is woven into §8 of this same notebook.

§5. *Historical materialism and practical criteria or canons of historical and political interpretation*

1. "(Cf. p. 50 bis.)" was inserted by Gramsci at a later time, between the lines directly above the title of this note. He is referring to p. 50v in the manuscript of this notebook; see §9 below.

2. Ernest Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*, 6th ed. (Leipzig: Dunker und Humblot, 1908). This edition of Bernheim's book is cited in Benedetto Croce, *Conversazioni critiche: Serie prima* (Bari: Laterza, 1918), of which Gramsci had a copy in prison.

Gramsci mentions Bernheim's book in his letter to Giuseppe Berti, January 30, 1928: "I must correct a mistake contained in one of my letters from Ustica. I mentioned a book on the historical method, attributing it to

a certain Bernstein, whereas the person is Bernheim: my memory really does not serve me well, because I used this book for two years as a textbook; obviously I've aged more than I supposed. The correct name suddenly floated up for no apparent logical reason. I wanted to tell you this for the sake of accuracy." What Gramsci used "for two years as a textbook" was most probably a partial Italian translation (containing chapter 1 and section 5 of chapter 5) of the fourth edition of the German original of Bernheim's work; see *La storiografia e la filosofia della storia* (Milan: Sandron, 1907), to which Gramsci alludes in the C text version of this note (Notebook 16, §3). Another partial Italian translation (containing chapters 3 and 4) of Bernheim's book was also available; see *Euristica e critica*, ed. A. Crivellucci (Pisa: E. Spoerri, 1897).

3. Gramsci is referring to Nikolai Bukharin's *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology*; see Notebook 1, §153, n. 3.

4. On Francesco De Sanctis, see Notebook 1, §96, n. 3.

5. In his writings on aesthetics and in his literary criticism, Croce often made a distinction between what he called the "structural" and the "poetic" elements in literary works of art. In Croce's view, everything other than the "lyrical" moment or expression—for example, philosophical, historical, ideological, or theological concepts and frameworks—in a literary text is extraneous to "poetry" as such; it is "not poetry" and pertains to the "structure" of the work.

6. On Giosuè Carducci, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 17.

7. The cultural weekly *La Voce* was founded by Giuseppe Prezzolini (on whom see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1) in 1908 as a vehicle or instrument for intellectuals committed to bringing about a cultural and moral rejuvenation of Italy. Its main contributors included many of the leading intellectuals of the time, among them, Benedetto Croce, Giovanni Gentile, Luigi Einaudi, Giovanni Papini, and Giovanni Amendola. *La Voce* was animated by a felt need to combat what its contributors perceived as the provincialism of Italian culture.

8. Alfredo Gargiulo, "Dalla cultura alla letteratura" (From culture to literature), *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 14 (April 6, 1930). As Gramsci points out, this article is the sixth in a series entitled "1900–1930." Elsewhere, Gramsci comments on another article in the same series by Gargiulo; see Notebook 3, §154, and n. 1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

9. Gargiulo was quoting from Giovanni Battista Angioletti's preface to Enrico Falqui and Elio Vittorini's anthology of works by contemporary writers, *Scrittori nuovi: Antologia italiana contemporanea* (Lanciano: Carabba, 1930). The parenthetical exclamation marks are Gramsci's.

On Giovanni Battista Angioletti, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1.

10. On Giuseppe Ungaretti, see Notebook 3, §7, and n. 2 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§6. *Roberto Ardigò*

1. Gramsci had a copy of this volume; it is listed in Notebook 1 among the "Books Delivered to Tatiana at Turi on 20 May 1930" (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:371).

2. Ardigò, *Scritti vari*, pp. 248–49.

3. Ibid., p. 248.

4. Ibid, p. 249.

5. Ibid, p. 250. Alberto Mario, mentioned in the quoted passage, was a very active Mazzinian republican. In 1874 he was arrested in Rimini and spent some time in jail for allegedly participating in the planning of an antimonarchical insurrection.

6. Ibid., pp. 252–53. On Alessandro Luzio, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 45.

7. Ibid., pp. 253–54.

8. See part three, "Il liberalismo di Ardigò" (Ardigò's liberalism), of section one, "Polemiche" (Polemics), in ibid., pp. 136–63.

9. The quotation is from section six, "Pensieri" (Thoughts), in ibid., pp. 271–72. The words in capital letters appear in that form in Ardigò's text. The comments in parentheses are Gramsci's.

§7. *Superstructures and science*

1. Gramsci is referring to an article by Mario Missiroli, "Il socialismo contro la scienza" (Socialism against science), in *L'Ordine Nuovo* 1, no. 10 (July 19, 1919). Missiroli wrote, among other things: "Science is an essentially bourgeois concept; it is a class privilege . . .; it is the armor with which the bourgeoisie defends itself, and the axe with which it attacks." Gramsci makes another reference to this article in Notebook 7, §1.

On Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

§8. *Machiavelli and Marx*

1. Quoted in Filippo Meda, "Il Machiavellismo" (Machiavellianism), *Rivista d'Italia* 30, no. 6 (June 15, 1927): 232. Gramsci also cites this article by Meda in Notebook 2, §31.

2. On Foscolo's and Croce's views on Machiavelli to which Gramsci is referring in this instance, see Notebook 4, §4, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

3. The Florentine statesman Piero Soderini (1452–1522) was elected *gonfaloniere* for life in 1502. He was a strong supporter of Machiavelli's idea that Florence should form its own militia rather than rely on mercenary troops. In 1505 Soderini succeeded in passing the law that enabled Machiavelli to realize his goal. With the fall of the republic in 1512 and the restoration of Medici rule, Soderini was forced into exile and spent the rest

of his life in Rome. Machiavelli was critical of Soderini, whom he regarded as an example of the indecisiveness of Florentine rulers.

Machiavelli extols Duke Valentino (Cesare Borgia) as an exemplary leader and ruler in chapter 7 of *The Prince*.

§9. *A repertory of Marxism*

1. Gramsci is referring to p. 45v in the manuscript of this notebook; see Notebook 4, §5.

§11. *Fundamental problems of Marxism*

1. In the subsection "Teleology and Objections to Teleology, Immanent Teleology" of chap. 1, "Cause and Purpose in the Social Sciences (Causation and Teleology)," of his book *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969), Nikolai Bukharin wrote: "It is unnecessary to point out that the apparently teleological elements in the formulations of Marx and Engels are to be understood merely as a metaphoric, esthetic mode of expression" (p. 26). Gramsci returns to a discussion of this question in Notebook 4, §17.

§12. *Structure and superstructure*

1. Gramsci's observations in this note seem to be aimed directly against the views expressed by Nikolai Bukharin in chap. 6, "The Equilibrium Between the Elements of Society," of *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969), pp. 130–241.

§13. *Notes and observations on the* Popular Manual

1. Nikolai Bukharin's *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969) was originally published in Moscow with the title *Teoriia istorischeskogo materializma: Populiarnyi uchebnik marksistkoi sotsiologii* (1921). Gramsci used a French translation of this work published in Paris in 1927; its title, *La théorie du matérialisme historique*, is a literal rendition of the Russian original, as is its subtitle *Manuel populaire de sociologie marxiste*. Gramsci constantly refers to this book as *Saggio popolare* (which I translate as *Popular Manual*), which is a loose Italian rendering of the Russian *populiarnyi uchebnik* and of the French *manuel populaire*. See also Notebook 1, §153, n. 3.

2. In the introduction to *Historical Materialism*, Bukharin writes:

> Some persons imagine that the theory of historical materialism should under no circumstances be considered a Marxian sociology, and that it should not be expounded systematically; they believe that it is only a living *method* of historical knowledge, that its truths may only be applied in the case of concrete and historical events. In addition, there is the argument that the conception of sociology itself is rather vague, that "sociology" signifies sometimes the science of primitive culture and the origin of the primitive forms of the human community (for instance, the family), and at other times extremely vague observations on the most varied social phenomena "in general," and at still other times, an uncritical comparison of society with an organism (the organic, biological school of sociology), etc.
>
> All such arguments are in error. In the first place, the confusion prevailing in the bourgeois camp should not induce us to create still more confusion in our ranks. For the theory of historical materialism has a definite place, it is not political economy, nor is it history; it is the general theory of society and the laws of its evolution, *i.e.*, sociology. In the second place, the fact that the theory of historical materialism is a method of history, by no means destroys its significance as a sociological theory. Very often a more abstract science may furnish a point of view (method) for the less abstract sciences. (pp. 14–15)

This was one of the passages from Bukharin's work that Gramsci translated and adapted for inclusion in the first batch of materials sent out to those who were enrolled in the short-lived Communist Party correspondence school he set up in 1925. In the process of adapting this passage, Gramsci changed it considerably: he not only introduced a specifically Italian example into it, but he also transmuted Bukharin's argument. Here is the relevant section of Gramsci's adaptation:

> There are various bourgeois currents—some of which have been able to acquire resonance even in the proletarian camp—that, while affirming that historical materialism has some merits, seek to limit its importance and strip it of its essential significance, its revolutionary significance. Thus, for example, the philosopher Benedetto Croce writes that historical materialism should be reduced to nothing more than a canon of the science of history, whose truths cannot be developed systematically into a general conception of life and are demonstrable concretely only in that . . . history books are written. In addition, there is the criticism directed against the general concept of sociology, which is said to be totally vague and indeterminate, for the term "sociology" sometimes is taken to be the science of primitive cultures and of the origin of the basic forms of human

life, such as the "family"; at other times, very vague reflections on social phenomena "in general"; and at still other times, the simplistic comparison of human society with an organism (the organic or biological school of sociology). The latter type of criticism has nothing to do with Marxist theory. As for the former type, it is sufficient to point out that historical materialism has not only been a canon of historical research, as has been thoroughly shown in a number of literary masterpieces, but it has also had its concrete manifestation . . . in the Russian revolution, a historical phenomenon that has been experienced and is still being experienced, and not just in books. Historical materialism manifests itself in the whole international workers' movement, which is developing continuously and systematically in keeping with the predictions of Marxists, in spite of the fact that according to bourgeois philosophers such predictions should be regarded as fables because in their eyes historical materialism is useful only for writing history books, not for actively living and functioning in history.

3. Gramsci is referring to p. 581 of his manuscript; see Notebook 4, §23.

§15. *Croce and Marx*

1. Gramsci had in prison a copy of the second edition of Benedetto Croce's *Cultura e vita morale* (Bari: Laterza, 1926). He was also familiar with its first edition (1914): in a letter to Giuseppe Lombardo Radice, March 1918, he lists it among the books that were discussed at the meetings of the Club of Moral Life that he had formed toward the end of 1917.

2. For Croce's comments on Marx in his preface to the 1917 edition of *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, see Notebook 1, §29, n. 4.

On Croce's comment regarding the war and Guido De Ruggiero's reference to it, see Notebook 1, §132, n. 3.

3. See Benedetto Croce's letter, published with a comment by Corrado Barbagallo under the title "Intorno alla storia etico-politica" (On ethico-political history), in *Nuova Rivista Storica* 12, no. 5–6, (September–December 1928): 626–29. A second letter by Croce, once again accompanied by Corrado Barbagallo's comments, appeared under the title "Intorno alla storia etico-politica: Discussione seconda" (On ethico-political history: Second discusssion) in *Nuova Rivista Storica* 13, no. 1 (January–February 1929): 130–33. In the second letter, Croce acknowledges that he made recurrent use of his concept of ethico-political history (he calls it "my war horse") in his attacks on historical materialism.

Gramsci alludes to this exchange between Croce and Barbagallo in an April 18, 1932, letter to Tatiana Schucht: "It seems to me that Croce is

above all concerned with this position of his as the leader of revisionism and that he sees in this the best of his present activity. In a short letter written to Professor Corrado Barbagallo and published in *Nuova Rivista Storica* in 1928 or 1929 (I don't remember exactly), he explicitly states that the entire elaboration of his theory of history as ethico-political history (and this is all or almost all of his activity as a thinker for approximately twenty years) is aimed at deepening his revisionism of forty years ago."

4. See Benedetto Croce, *Elementi di politica* (Bari: Laterza, 1925), pp. 91–92, where Croce states that historical materialism "viewed economic life as substantial and moral life as appearance, illusion, or what it called 'superstructure.' " Gramsci had a copy of this booklet when he lived in Rome, prior to his arrest; it is listed among the books he requested Tatiana Schucht to send him in his letter of March 25, 1929. (It is not preserved among the books he had in prison, so he may never have received it.) The contents of *Elementi di politica* are reproduced in another of Croce's books, *Etica e politica* (Bari: Laterza, 1931), where the passage quoted above appears on pp. 273–74. Gramsci did receive a copy of *Etica e politica* in prison, but only after he had written this note. (In subsequent editions of *Elementi di politica*, the section containing the passage quoted above is omitted.)

5. Benedetto Croce, review of Giovanni Malagodi, *Le ideologie politiche* (Bari: Laterza, 1928), *La Critica* 26, no. 5 (September 20, 1928): 360–62. Gramsci had a copy of Malagodi's book in prison.

Giovanni Malagodi, a liberal like Croce, became the director of the Banca Commerciale Italiana in 1933. After the collapse of Fascism he entered politics in the ranks of the Italian Liberal Party, which Croce had helped reorganize. In 1954 Malagodi was elected secretary-general of the Liberal Party with the strong support of its conservative wing.

6. In his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (New York: International Publishers, 1970), Karl Marx writes: "The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness" (pp. 20–21).

7. Gramsci is again echoing a well-known passage from Marx's preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*: "The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the

precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic—in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out" (p. 21). Gramsci included this passage in the first batch of materials he assembled for the Communist Party correspondence school he set up in 1925. This is also one of the selections from Karl Marx's writings that Gramsci later translated from German into Italian; see the manuscript of Notebook 7, pp. 31–41.

8. Gramsci refers to this same remark from Croce's preface to the 1917 edition of *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica* in Notebook 1, §29. For a translation of the relevant passage from Croce's preface, see Notebook 1, §29, n. 4.

9. Georges Sorel does not use the phrase "historical bloc" in his writings; he does, however, write about the need to look at historical forces "as a whole"—i.e., en bloc, or, as rendered in Italian, "*in blocco*." Gramsci probably had in mind the following passage from Sorel's "Letter to Daniel Halevy," which is printed as an introduction to Sorel's *Reflections on Violence*, trans. T. E. Hulme (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950):

> In the course of this study one thing has always been present in my mind, which seemed to me so evident that I did not think it worth while to lay much stress on it—that men who are participating in a great social movement always picture their coming action as a battle in which their cause is certain to triumph. These constructions, knowledge of which is so important for historians, I propose to call myths; the syndicalist "general strike" and Marx's catastrophic revolution are such myths. As remarkable examples of such myths, I have given those which were constructed by primitive Christianity, by the Reformation, by the Revolution and by the followers of Mazzini. I now wish to show that we should not attempt to analyse such groups of images in the way that we analyse a thing into its elements, but that *they must be taken as a whole, as historical forces* [emphasis added]. (pp. 48–49)

Gramsci does not seem to have had a copy of Sorel's *Reflections of Violence* in prison, but he could have been reminded of it by a discussion of Sorel in a book he did have: Giovanni Malagodi's *Le ideologie politiche.* Paraphrasing Sorel's point, Malagodi writes: "We must not confuse these rather fleeting states of our voluntary consciousness with the stable affirmations of science. We should not attempt to analyze these 'systems of images' in the way we analyze a scientific theory, breaking it down to its elements. We should 'take them en bloc' [in the original Italian, "*prenderli in blocco*"] as historical forces" (p. 95).

§16. *The teleology of the* Popular Manual

1. See chap. 1, "Cause and Purpose in the Social Sciences (Causation and Teleology)," in Nikolai Bukharin, *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969), pp. 19–32. Gramsci included most of this chapter, in somewhat modified form, in the second batch of materials he prepared for the Communist Party correspondence school he set up in 1925. The most significant of Gramsci's modifications is his replacement of the word "law" (used repeatedly by Bukharin) with terms like "regularity," "normality," and "the relation between cause and effect."

2. See chap. 5, "The Equilibrium Between Society and Nature," in Bukharin, *Historical Materialism*, pp. 104–29.

3. This cautionary note is repeated verbatim on the first page of Notebook 11. In the opening paragraph of Notebook 8, Gramsci's remarks on the provisional character of the materials contained in his notebooks are even more emphatic.

§17. *Immanence and the* Popular Manual

1. For the relevant passage in Bukharin's *Historical Materialism*, see the Notes to the Text for Notebook 4, §11.

2. Gramsci was familiar with at least two texts that raise the possibility that some affinities might exist between certain aspects of Giordano Bruno's philosophy and Marx's thought: Rodolfo Mondolfo, "Razionalità e irrazionalità della storia" (The rationality and irrationality of history), *Nuova Rivista Storica* 14, no. 1–2 (January–April 1930): 1–21; and Rodolfo Mondolfo, *Sulle orme di Marx: Studi di marxismo e socialismo*, 2 vols., 3d ed. (Bologna: L. Cappelli, 1923–24). In Mondolfo's book (a copy of which Gramsci owned prior to his arrest), see especially 2:32–49.

§18. *The technique of thinking*

1. Gramsci is here quoting Croce's paraphrase—in *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, 4th ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1921), p. 31—of an observation made by Engels. Croce's rendition of Engels's thought, however, is not quite accurate. Cf. Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring* (New York: International Publishers, 1939), p. 19.: "The art of working with concepts is not inborn and also is not given with ordinary everyday consciousness, but requires real thought, and that this thought similarly has a long empirical history, not more and not less than empirical natural science."

2. See Notebook 1, §153.

3. Benedetto Croce, *Saggio sullo Hegel (seguito da altri scritti di storia della filosofia)*, 3d rev. ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1927), p. 136: "Passing from the extreme right to the extreme left, and dwelling for a moment on a writer who in recent times has been widely read and discussed in Italy, namely, Frederick Engels (the friend and collaborator of Karl Marx), one can see how he liquidates philosophy by reducing it to the positive sciences and preserving of it only 'the doctrine of thought and of its laws: formal logic (!) and the dialectic.' "

Gramsci had a copy of this book by Croce in prison. Croce's book contains, in addition to a long essay on Hegel, other essays on the history of philosophy; it was first published in 1913. The essay on Hegel has been translated into English: *What Is Living and What Is Dead in the Philosophy of Hegel*, trans. D. Ainslie (London: Macmillan, 1915); the quoted passage is on p. 206.

Croce is referring to a passage in the opening chapter of Engels's *Anti-Dühring*: "Modern materialism is essentially dialectical, and no longer needs any philosophy standing above the other sciences. As soon as each separate science is required to get clarity as to its position in the great totality of things and of our knowledge of things, a special science dealing with this totality is superfluous. What still independently survives of all former philosophy is the science of thought and its laws—formal logic and dialectics" (p. 31).

4. See Notebook 1, §153.

5. See Notebook 1, §122, and n. 1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

6. See Giuseppe Prezzolini, *Il linguaggio come causa d'errore: H. Bergson* (Florence: Spinelli, 1904). Prezzolini's booklet was reviewed by Benedetto Croce in *La Critica* 2, no. 2 (March 1904): 150–53; the review is reprinted in B. Croce, *Conversazione critiche: Serie prima* (Bari: Laterza, 1918), pp. 105–7, a copy which Gramsci had in prison.

On Giuseppe Prezzolini, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1.

Vilfredo Pareto devoted many pages of his magnum opus, *Trattato di sociologia generale*, 2 vols. (Florence: Barbèra, 1916), to the discussion of language and definitions. Pareto's voluminous treatise on sociology has been translated into English: *The Mind and Society*, 4 vols., trans. A. Bongiorno and A. Livingston (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1935), later reprinted as *Treatise on General Sociology*, 2 vols. (New York: Dover, 1963). An abridged version of this classic work was edited by Giulio Farina with the approval of Pareto—*Compendio di sociologia generale* (Florence: Barbèra, 1920)—and translated into English as *Compendium of General Sociology*, trans. E. Abbott (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980). For a guide to Pareto's treatment of language, see the "Index-Summary of Theorems" in the *Compendium of General Sociology*, especially the entries under "Language and Definitions," pp. 428–29. Gramsci

refers to Pareto again in Notebook 4, §42, and makes some more extensive remarks on him in Notebook 7, §36.

Vilfredo Pareto (1848–1923), one of Italy's most eminent social scientists, who made major contributions to sociology, economics, and political theory, was born in Paris, the son of a Mazzinian exile. He held important managerial positions in industry before his appointment to a professorship at the University of Lausanne in 1893. Within a few years of his appointment, he was able to devote all his time to research and writing, thanks to a sizable inheritance. Pareto published two major works on economic theory before turning his attention to sociology and political theory. The salient feature of his work is its critique of ideologies and of all rational explanations of human conduct. Pareto insisted that society was governed by nonrational forces. Another well-known and influential element in Pareto's writings is his theory of elites. In his view, democracies are a sham since the most competent few always hold sway over the masses; government, he maintained, is necessarily oligarchic and relies on force even while pretending to be executing the will of the people. Well before the outbreak of the First World War, Pareto had established himself as one of the severest critics of liberalism and the Italian parliamentary system. Later, the Fascists claimed to be inspired by his theories, and Mussolini nominated him to the senate in 1923, just a few months before Pareto died in Switzerland.

§19. *The "technical instrument" in the* Popular Manual

1. See, especially, Notebook 4, §12.

2. See Nikolai Bukharin's extended discussion on music in chap. 6, "The Equilibrium Between the Elements of Society," of *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969), pp. 189–96. At the start of his discussion, Bukharin provides a schematic outline of his approach:

> Our investigation will show the following elements: 1. the element of *objective material things*, the musical technology: musical instruments and groups of musical instruments (orchestra, quartette, etc.; the combinations of instruments may be likened to combinations of machines and tools in factories); also physical symbols and tokens: systems of notation, musical scores, etc.; 2. the *human* organization; these include many forms of human association in musical work (distribution of persons in the orchestra, the chorus, in the process of musical creation; also, musical clubs and societies of all kinds); 3. the *formal* elements of music, including rhythm, harmony (corresponding to *symmetry* in the graphic and plastic arts), etc.; 4. the

> *methods* of uniting the various forms, principles of construction, what corresponds to style in some arts; in a broader sense, the type of artistic *form*; 5. the *content* of the art work, or, if we are dealing with an entire movement or tendency, the content of all the works; we are chiefly concerned here not with the *method* of performance, but with its substance, let us say with the choice of "subject" of presentation; 6. as a "superstructure of the superstructure," we may also include, in music, *the theory of musical technique* (theory of counterpoint, etc.). (pp. 189–90)

3. See chapter 6 in Bukharin's *Historical Materialism*, especially the subsection entitled "Social Technology and the Economic Structure of Society." Among other things, Bukharin writes:

> We have already pointed out that in a consideration of social phenomena it is necessary to begin with the social, material productive forces, with the social technology, the system of tools of labor. We may now supplement these remarks. In speaking of the social technology, we of course meant not a certain tool, or the aggregate of different tools, but the whole *system* of these tools in society. We must imagine that in a given society, in various places, but in a *certain order*, there are distributed looms and motors, instruments and apparatus, simple and complicated tools. In some places they are crowded close together (for instance, in the great industrial centers), in other places, *other* tools are *scattered*. But at any given moment, if people are connected by a labor relation, if we have a society, all these instruments of production—tools and machines, large and small, simple and complicated, manual or power-driven—are united into a single system. (p. 134)

The text continues: "Thus, as there is a definite relation and a definite proportion between the various branches of production; there is also in social technology a certain definite relation between its parts as well as a definite prevailing proportion. This circumstance changes the mere aggregate of tools, machines, instruments, etc., into a system of social technology" (pp. 135–36).

4. See chap. 2, "Le teorie storiche del prof. Loria" (The historical theories of Prof. Loria), in Benedetto Croce, *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, 4th ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1921), pp. 198–204. Gramsci had a copy of this book in prison.

5. In the C text of this note (i.e., Notebook 11, §12) Gramsci transcribes the passages from Marx and from Loria that are quoted and compared by Croce in *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, pp. 39–40.

6. Gramsci makes a slight error in recalling the title of Achille Loria's essay, changing "*aviazione*" (aviation) to "*aeroplano*" (airplane); the correct title is "Le influenze sociali dell'aviazione" (The social effects of aviation). On this article and on Gramsci's references to it in his journalistic writings, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 2.

7. This entire paragraph is a very precise paraphrase of a passage on p. 41 of Croce's *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*. As Gramsci points out, Croce does not indicate which edition of Marx's *Capital* the page numbers he provides refer to. Marx calls attention to the importance of technical innovation and the history of technology on several occasions in *Capital*, both in the main text and in footnotes (Croce is alluding to footnotes). For example, in *Capital* (trans. B. Fowkes [New York: Penguin, 1990]), Marx writes: "The writers of history have so far paid very little attention to the development of material production, which is the basis of all social life, and therefore of all real history" (ch. 7, sec.1, 1:286n). Also:

> A critical history of technology would show how little any of the inventions of the eighteenth century are the work of a single individual. As yet such a book does not exist. Darwin has directed attention to the history of natural technology, i.e. the formation of the organs of plants and animals, which serve as the instruments of production for sustaining their life. Does not the history of the productive organs of man in society, of organs that are the material basis of every particular organization of society, deserve equal attention? And would not such a history be easier to compile, since, as Vico says, human history differs from natural history in that we have made the former, but not the latter? Technology reveals the active relation of man to nature, the direct process of the production of his life, and thereby it also lays bare the process of the production of the social relations of his life, and of the mental conceptions that flow from these relations. (ch. 15, sec. 1, 1:493n)

Croce's remark that Marx "flirted" with the Hegelian dialectic is an allusion to what Marx wrote in the postface to the second edition of *Capital* (1873): "I criticized the mystificatory side of the Hegelian dialectic nearly thirty years ago, at a time when it was still in fashion. But just when I was working at the first volume of *Capital*, the ill-humoured, arrogant and mediocre epigones who now talk large in educated German circles began to take pleasure in treating Hegel . . . as a 'dead dog.' I therefore openly avowed myself the pupil of that mighty thinker, and even, here and there in the chapter on the theory of value, coquetted with the mode of expression peculiar to him" (1:102–3).

§20. *Croce and Marx*

1. See Benedetto Croce, *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, 4th ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1921), p. 93. The parenthesis is inserted by Gramsci on the basis of the sentences preceding the quoted passage.

See Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1975), 6:174:

> Economists have a singular method of procedure. There are only two kinds of institutions for them, artificial and natural. The institutions of feudalism are artificial institutions, those of the bourgeoisie are natural institutions. In this they resemble the theologians, who likewise establish two kinds of religion. Every religion which is not theirs is an invention of men, while their own is an emanation from God. When the economists say that present-day relations—the relations of bourgeois production—are natural, they imply that these are the relations in which wealth is created and productive forces developed in conformity with the laws of nature. These relations therefore are themselves natural laws independent of the influence of time. They are eternal laws which must always govern society. Thus there has been a history, but there is no longer any. There has been a history, since there were the institutions of feudalism, and in these institutions of feudalism we find quite different relations of production from those of bourgeois society, which the economists try to pass off as natural and as such, eternal.

§21. *The technique of thinking*

1. Mario Camis, "L'aeronautica e le scienze biologiche" (Aeronautics and the biological sciences), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1344 (March 16, 1928): 229.

2. Gramsci translated this passage into Italian from the French translation of Sinclair Lewis, *Babbitt*, trans. M. Rémon (Paris: Stock, 1930), p. 50. Gramsci had a copy of this edition in prison; it is listed in the manuscript of Notebook 2 among the "Books Delivered to Carlo on 13 March 1931" (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:529). The passage, in section 4 of chapter 3, is quoted here from the original edition of Sinclair Lewis, *Babbitt* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1922), p. 44.

For other comments by Gramsci on Sinclair Lewis's *Babbitt*, see Notebook 5, §105, and Notebook 6, §49.

3. Don Ferrante is a minor character in Alessandro Manzoni's *I promessi sposi* (*The Betrothed*). Gramsci is alluding to the closing pages of chapter 37 of the novel, where Don Ferrante's formally impeccable but totally misguided reasoning is described with tragicomic irony. Don Ferrante "was a

learned man" who refuted the existence of the plague that would soon decimate the population of Milan. He did this, the narrator tells us, "with a series of arguments whose logical connection, at least, could be denied by no one." When he was unable to explain away the physical evidence of the effects of the plague on the body, Don Ferrante resorted to another impeccable line of reasoning. The doctors were not wrong about the actual existence of the plague, he argued, but they were mistaken "in the reasons to which they attributed it." The real cause of the plague, Don Ferrante explains, is the "fatal conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter." Relying as always on his formal reasoning, Don Ferrante then goes on to prove, at least to his own satisfaction, that the idea of the plague being spread by contagion is absurd. "[The doctors] have the nerve to come to us and say: 'Don't touch this, and don't touch that, and you'll be all right!' As if avoiding the material contact of earthly objects could impede the powerful working of the heavenly bodies! And all that wasted labour of burning rags! Poor wretches! Can you burn Jupiter? Can you burn Saturn?" The narrator concludes the little vignette of Don Ferrante: "*His fretus*—or, in other words, basing himself on these fine suppositions—he took no precautions whatever against the plague. He caught it in due course, took to his bed, and died, like a hero of Metastasio, quarrelling with the stars" (Alessandro Manzoni, *The Betrothed*, trans. B. Penman [New York: Penguin, 1972], pp. 698–700).

4. See the opening of chapter 6 of Leo Tolstoy's *Death of Iván Ilyich*, in *The Death of Iván Ilyich and Other Stories*, trans. L. Maude and A. Maude (Oxford University Press, 1935):

> Iván Ilyich saw that he was dying, and he was in a continual despair.
>
> In the depth of his heart he knew he was dying, but not only was he not accustomed to the thought, he simply did not and could not grasp it.
>
> The syllogism he had learned from Kiesewetter's Logic: "Caius is a man, men are mortal, therefore Caius is mortal," had always seemed to him correct as applied to Caius, but certainly not applied to himself. That Caius—man in the abstract—was mortal, was perfectly correct, but he was not Caius, not an abstract man, but a creature quite, quite separate from all the others.

In prison, Gramsci had a copy of *La tempesta di neve ed altri racconti*, trans. A. Prospero (Turin: Casa Editrice Madia, 1928), a collection of stories by Tolstoy that included *The Death of Iván Ilyich*.

§22. *Croce and Marx. The value of ideologies*

1. See, inter alia, Notebook 1, §18, §48, §53, and §131.

§23 *The* Popular Manual *and sociological laws*

1. See the reference to this note (by manuscript page number) inserted by Gramsci at the end of Notebook 4, §13 (*Notes and critical observations on the* Popular Manual).

§24. *The Restoration and historicism*

1. Gramsci is referring to the period immediately following the final defeat of Napoleon, during which the European powers attempted to restore at least a semblance of the old order. It started with the Congress of Vienna (1815) and lasted, more or less, until the revolutions of 1848.

§25. *Notes on the* Popular Manual

1. "Robinsonades" are narratives or theoretical constructions of a social and/or economic order that are based on the imagined needs and behavior of a fictional individual who, like Daniel Defoe's creation, Robinson Crusoe, is isolated and independent. Karl Marx, in *Capital* (trans. B. Fowkes [New York: Penguin, 1990]), observes that "political economists are fond of Robinson Crusoe stories" (1:169), and he illustrates the pitfalls of constructing economic theories or models based on Robinsonades.

§26. *The* Popular Manual *and the "ultimate cause"*

1. See Frederick Engels's September 21, 1890, letter to Joseph Bloch, published in *Der Sozialistiche Akademiker*, no. 19 (October 1, 1895); and his January 25, 1894, letter to Heinz Starkenburg, published in *Der Socialistische Akademiker*, no. 20 (October 16, 1895). The two letters were translated into Italian and published together in a booklet, *Due lettere di Federico Engels sulla interpretazione materialistica della storia* (Rome: Mongini, 1906); the translations were later incorporated in vol. 4 of K. Marx–F. Engels–F. Lassalle, *Opere*, 2d rev ed., 8 vols., ed. Ettore Ciccotti (Milan: Società Editrice Avanti, 1922), of which Gramsci had a copy prior to his arrest. For an English translation of these letters, see K. Marx and F. Engels, *Correspondence: 1846–1895*, trans. D. Torr (New York: International Publishers, 1936), pp. 475–77 and pp. 516–19.

In these letters, Engels cautions against certain reductive and dogmatic interpretations or applications of his and Marx's ideas. For example, in his letter to Bloch, Engels writes:

> According to the materialist conception of history the determining element in history is *ultimately* the production and reproduction in real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. If

therefore somebody twists this into the statement that the economic element is the *only* determining one, he transforms it into a meaningless, abstract and absurd phrase. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure—political forms of the class struggle and its consequences, constitutions established by the victorious class after a successful battle, etc.—forms of law—and then even the reflexes of all these actual struggles in the brains of the combatants: political, legal, philosophical theories, religious ideas and their further development into systems of dogma—also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their *form*. There is an interaction of all these elements, in which, amid all the endless *host* of accidents (i.e. of things and events whose inner connection is so remote or so impossible to prove that we regard it as absent and can neglect it), the economic movement finally asserts itself as necessary. Otherwise the application of the theory to any period of history one chose would be easier than the solution of a simple question of the first degree. . . .

Marx and I are ourselves partly to blame for the fact that younger writers sometimes lay more stress on the economic side than is due to it. We had to emphasise this main principle in opposition to our adversaries, who denied it, and we had not always the time, the place or the opportunity to allow the other elements involved in the interaction to come into their rights. But when it was a case of presenting a section of history, that is, of a practical application, the thing was different and there no error was possible. Unfortunately, however, it happens only too often that people think they have fully understood a theory and can apply it without more ado from the moment they have mastered its main principles, and those not even always correctly. And I cannot exempt many of the more recent "Marxists" from this reproach, for the most wonderful rubbish has been produced from this quarter too.

Gramsci did not have copies of these two letters by Engels in prison. His recollection of them may have been prompted by Benedetto Croce's paraphrase of their contents (accompanied by a precise citation in a footnote) in his attack on deterministic versions of Marxism in *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, 4th ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1921):

Some have supposed that historical materialism asserts that history is nothing more than economic history, and all the rest is simply a mask, an appearance without reality. And then they labor to discover the true god of history, whether it be the productive tool or the earth,

> using arguments that call to mind the proverbial discussion about the egg and the hen. Frederick Engels was besieged by people who turned to him to ask how to interpret this or that historical factor with respect to the economic factor. In the many letters he wrote in response—letters that now, after his death, are being published in reviews—he let it be understood that when, together with Marx, he conceived this new interpretation of history based on factual study, he had not meant to formulate a rigid theory. In one of these letters he apologizes for whatever modicum of exaggeration he and Marx may have inserted into the polemical articulation of their ideas and recommends that greater attention be paid to his and Marx's interpretations of history rather than to the theoretical expressions they employed. It would be a fine thing, he exclaims, if one could come up with a formula with which to explain all the facts of history! Applying such a formula would render the understanding of any period of history as easy as solving an elementary equation! (pp. 11–12)

In the C text of this note (Notebook 11, §25) Gramsci seems to be echoing Croce's paraphrase of Engels when he criticizes "the degenerate tendency . . . [that] consists in reducing a conception of the world to a mechanical set of formulas that gives one the impression of holding the entirety of history in one's pocket."

§27. *Teleology*

1. For the epigram (in elegiac couplets in the original) from Goethe and Friedrich Schiller's *Xenien* (1796) and the brief comment on it, see Benedetto Croce, *Goethe*, 2d rev. ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1921), p. 262. Croce's book has two parts: a study on Goethe and a translation of selected lyrics. (The first part of Croce's book is available in English; see B. Croce, *Goethe*, trans. E. Anderson [London: Methuen, 1923].) Gramsci, as he himself indicates, transcribed Croce's translation of the epigram "The Teleologist"; it is translated here from Croce's Italian. This volume is not among Gramsci's books that have been preserved, but in all probability he had direct access to it when he wrote this note.

§28. Antonino Lovecchio, *Filosofia della prassi e filosofia dello spirito*

1. Giuseppe Tarozzi's review of Antonino Lovecchio's book on the "philosophy of praxis" (Marxism) and the "philosophy of mind" (idealism)—*Filosofia della prassi e filosofia dello spirito* (Palmi: Zappone, 1928)—in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 6 (June 1928): 156.

2. On Antonio Labriola, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 51; on Giovanni Gentile, see Notebook 1, §15, n. 1; on Rodolfo Mondolfo, see Notebook 4, §1, n. 2; and on Adelchi Baratono, see Notebook 1, §96, and n. 1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§29. *Machiavelli*

1. Mario Sertoli's book on Russian constitutional history, *La costituzione russa: Diritto e storia* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1928), was reviewed by Alfredo Poggi (not Giuseppe Tarozzi) in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 11, no. 8 (August 1928): 212. Poggi alludes to but provides no details about Karl Vorländer's book *Von Machiavelli bis Lenin: Neuzeitliche Staats und Geselleschaftstheorien* (Leipzig: Meyer, 1926). Vorländer, a neo-Kantian scholar, also wrote other books on Marxism.

2. Felice Battaglia's survey "Studi sulla politica di Machiavelli" (Studies on Machiavelli's politics) was published in four parts in *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica* 1, no. 1 (November 1927): 36–47; 1, no. 2 (January 1928): 122–31; 1, no. 4 (September 1928): 376–84; and 2, no. 1 (January–February 1929): 46–57.

§30. *De Man's book*

1. Paolo Milano, review of Henri De Man, *Il superamento del marxismo*, 2 vols., trans. A. Schiavi (Bari: Laterza, 1929), *L'Italia Che Scrive* 12, no. 9 (September 1929): 269–70.

On Henri De Man's book, originally published in German with the title *Zur Psychologie des Sozialismus* (1926), and on its Italian, French, and English editions, see Notebook 1, §61, n. 13. See also Notebook 4, §2, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

2. See "Preface to the First Edition of the German Original," in Henry De Man, *The Psychology of Socialism*, trans. E. Paul and C. Paul (London: Allen and Unwin, 1928): "I speak frankly of the 'liquidation of Marxism,' instead of using some such half-hearted word as 'revision,' 'adaptation,' 'reinterpretation,' or the like, which might seem to imply a wish to run with the hare as well as to hunt with the hounds" (p. 14)

3. See De Man, *The Psychology of Socialism*:

> In Marx's day, the method of science was that of the natural sciences; and the method of the natural sciences was that of the mechanical sciences. We do not need, here, to examine how far the general advance of knowledge, or the advance of the natural sciences themselves, has necessitated the abandonment of mechanical hypotheses. Enough to point out that, in the domain of the historical and psy-

chological sciences, all the knowledge gained during the last fifty years presupposes and confirms the belief that the idea of mechanical causation must yield place to another and far more complicated relationship of cause and effect.

Every happening which man can try to understand may be referred to one of two types of motion, which can be respectively called the type of mechanical reaction and the type of psychological reaction. . . .

. . . The mechanical reaction produces an effect proportional to the energy developed by the cause.—The psychological reaction has an intensity which is not proportional to the stimulus. (pp. 340–41)

4. It is clear from the overall context that Paolo Milano (in his review of De Man's book) is referring to Alfred Adler (1870–1937), the Austrian psychologist and psychiatrist. Gramsci is obviously puzzled because the Adler whose works he knew was Max Adler (1873–1937), a leading intellectual of the Austro-Marxist school whose sociological theories were strongly influenced by neo-Kantian philosophy, not by Freudian psychology.

§31. *By Georges Sorel*

1. Gramsci is referring to p. 781 of his manuscript; see Notebook 4, §44. This page reference was inserted (at a later time) between the lines, directly above the first words of the note.

2. Georges Sorel, "Ultime meditazioni (Scritto postumo inedito)" (Final reflections: A previously unpublished posthumous text), *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1361 (December 1, 1928): 289–307.

3. In fact, this collection of articles by Sorel was published two years later, and Gramsci received a copy of it at the Turi prison. See Georges Sorel, *L'Europa sotto la tormenta*, ed. Mario Missiroli (Milan: Corbaccio, 1932).

On Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

4. Gramsci quotes the conclusion of Sorel's essay later in this note.

5. A volume of letters from Sorel to Missiroli was published more than three decades after Gramsci wrote this note. See Georges Sorel, *Lettere a un amico d'Italia*, ed. Mario Missiroli (Bologna: Cappelli, 1963).

6. Louis-Adolphe Thiers (1797–1877) became president of the French republic in 1871 after the Franco-Prussian war had resulted in the fall of Napoleon III's empire. That same year Thiers virtually destroyed the French socialist and workers' movements when, with a great deal of help from the Germans, he crushed the Paris Commune uprising.

7. In his article, Sorel cites a French translation of Eduard Bernstein, *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozial-*

democratie (Stuttgart: Verlag von. I. W. Dietz Nachf, 1899), the work that laid the foundations of the social-democratic revisionist version of Marxism. For an English translation, see E. Bernstein, *Evolutionary Socialism*, trans. E. C. Harvey (London, 1909).

8. In his article, Sorel cites Charles Andler, *Le Manifeste Comuniste de Karl Marx et F. Engels*, 2 vols. (Paris: Rieder, n.d.). Gramsci owned a copy of this detailed commentary on *The Communist Manifesto*, but most probably it was not among the books he had with him in prison. His familiarity with this work is evident from his reference to it in Notebook 1, §47.

9. See the opening paragraphs of the subsection entitled "Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism," in part 3, "Socialist and Communist Literature," of *The Communist Manifesto*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1976):

> We do not here refer to that literature which, in every great modern revolution, has always given voice to the demands of the proletariat, such as the writings of Babeuf and others.
>
> The first direct attempts of the proletariat to attain its own ends, made in times of universal excitement, when feudal society was being overthrown, these attempts necessarily failed, owing to the then undeveloped state of the proletariat, as well as to the absence of the economic conditions for its emancipation, conditions that had yet to be produced and could be produced by the impending bourgeois epoch alone. The revolutionary literature that accompanied these first movements of the proletariat had necessarily a reactionary character. It inculcated universal asceticism and social levelling in its crudest forms.
>
> The Socialist and Communist systems properly so called, those of Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen and others, spring into existence in the early undeveloped period, described above, of the struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie. (6:514)

The "conspiracy of the equals" was organized by François-Noël Babeuf (1760–97) and the secret society he founded in 1796. In alliance with the Jacobins and other elements opposed to the Thermidorian reaction, the Babouvists planned an insurrection to overthrow the government and return France to the constitution of 1793. The conspiracy was discovered by the police, and Babeuf was guillotined in May 1797. Babeuf's utopian vision of egalitarian communism as well as his delineation of conspiratorial revolutionary organizational strategy and tactics had a profound influence on many nineteenth-century socialists and revolutionaries, including Louis-Auguste Blanqui (see Notebook 1, §48, n. 2).

10. Up to this point, the contents of the paragraphs marked "1" and "2" (including the citations of Bernstein's and Andler's books) are transcribed almost verbatim (with some compression) from Sorel's essay, "Ultime meditazioni."

11. Gramsci is probably referring to some political documents related to Gabriele D'Annunzio's foreign policy during his occupation of Fiume (September 1919–December 1920). D'Annunzio's ultimate goal was to annex Fiume (Rijeka in Croatia) for Italy. He envisioned establishing friendly relations with the Soviet Union, which would have constituted a provocative act of defiance against the Entente powers. These documents were collected in the *Libro violetto* (The violet book) of the command of the city of Fiume, which contains the "Acts and Communiqués of the Office of Foreign Relations from 28 November 1919 to 1 May 1920."

12. Gramsci is here quoting a footnote (n. 15) on pp. 299–300 of Sorel's article "Ultime meditazioni." For an English translation of the "Preface to the Russian Edition [of the *Manifesto*] of 1882," by Marx and Engels, that is mentioned here by Sorel, see Harold J. Laski, *The Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels* (New York: Pantheon, 1967), pp. 111–13.

13. For documents related to Marx's involvement with refugee organizations in 1849–50, see the appendices in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1978), 10:595–637. These documents, the editors explain in a note, "reflect Marx's efforts to gather revolutionary forces scattered after the defeat of the 1848–49 revolution and to render support to the revolutionary refugees suffering poverty and privation in England" (p. 705).

14. Except for the final parenthetical comment, the paragraph numbered "3" is partly a paraphrase and partly a word-for-word transcription of pp. 301–3 of Sorel's "Ultime meditazioni."

15. Sorel, "Ultime meditazioni," p. 304.

16. Ibid., p. 305.

17. Ibid., p. 307.

18. In a footnote (n. 28) on p. 307 of his essay "Ultime meditazioni," Georges Sorel cites his own book, *Matériaux d'une théorie du prolétariat* (Paris: Rivière, 1921). For an English translation of some selected passages from this work, see "From *Materials for a Theory of the Proletariat*," in *From Georges Sorel: Essays in Socialism and Philosophy*, ed. John L. Stanley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 227–56.

19. The view that Gramsci attributes to Croce in this particular instance is not found in Croce's brief review of Henri De Man's book (mentioned by Gramsci in Notebook 1, §132), nor has it been located in any of Croce's published writings. Gramsci may have taken his cue from an

advertisement for De Man's book by its Italian publisher Laterza (mentioned in Notebook 4, §2) that states that De Man "resumes the profoundly spiritualist tradition of socialists like Fourier, Owen, and Proudhon from the first half of the nineteenth century, or like Jaurès from the end of the century." Since Croce collaborated very closely with the publisher Laterza, Gramsci may have assumed that the text of the advertisement was written by Croce.

20. As he did with the reference at the beginning of this note, Gramsci added this reference to p. 78r of his manuscript—corresponding to Notebook 4, §44—at a later time.

§32. *The* Popular Manual

1. See Nikolai Bukharin, *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969), p. 93: "Society consists of individual persons; it could not exist without them, as we may assume without further discussion. But society is not merely an aggregate of persons, constituting their *sum*. Society is more than a mere summation of its various Jacks and Jills. . . . This means that society, as a whole, is greater than the sum of its parts. It cannot in any way be reduced to these parts, which is also true of many systems of various kinds, both living organisms and dead organisms."

2. Gramsci is referring to the philosophy of Giovanni Gentile and his followers. On Gentile, see Notebook 1, §15, n. 1.

3. The story of Saladin is recounted in *Novellino*, also known as *Libro di novelle e di bel parlar gentile* (Book of novellas and of elegant noble speech), a thirteenth-century collection by an unknown Florentine writer of a hundred tales based on a wide range of sources.

§33. The passage from *knowing* to *understanding* to *feeling* . . .

1. See Henri De Man's book, originally published in German, *Zur Psychologie des Sozialismus* (1926). On the Italian, French, and English editions of this work, see Notebook 1, §61, n. 13.

§34. *Apropos of the appellation of "historical materialism"*

1. Diego Angeli, "I Bonaparte a Roma: XI. La principessa Carlotta Napoleone" (The Bonapartes in Rome: XI. Princess Charlotte Napoleon), *Il Marzocco* 62, no. 40 (October 2, 1927).

Diego Angeli (1869–1937) helped found the literary periodical *Il Marzocco* and contributed to various literary journals. He translated

Shakespeare's plays into Italian and wrote some interesting books on the history of Roman art and culture.

Pietro Giordani (1774–1848), a classicist and a purist in matters concerning language and literature, was a fervent supporter of Napoleonic rule in Italy. He held the post of pro-secretary at the Academy of Fine Arts in Bologna from 1808 to 1815. A diehard patriot, Giordani was forced to move to Florence in 1824 to avoid Austrian persecution. His books on language include one on the art of writing, *A un giovane italiano: Istruzioni per l'arte di scrivere* (1821), and another on the art of speech, *Sul vero nelle arti della parola e del disegno* (1827).

§35. *On the origin of the concept of "ideology"*

1. Alessandro Manzoni returned to the Catholic fold in 1810, at about the same time that he left Paris (where he had friends who were associated with the Idéologie philosophical movement) and resettled in Milan. He composed the *Inni sacri* (Sacred hymns) over a period of years between 1812 and 1822. Manzoni met Antonio Rosmini for the first time in 1826; the two became very close friends.

On Antonio Rosmini Serbati, see Notebook 1, §51, n. 1.

2. The information in this paragraph is drawn from an article by Adolfo Faggi, "Stendhal e gli ideologi" (Stendhal and the ideologues), in *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 18 (May 1, 1927).

Antoine-Louis-Claude Destutt de Tracy (1754–1836) had already had a successful military career and been elected to the States General when he started participating in philosophical discussions at the salon of Madame Helvétius, the widow of the distinguished philosopher Claude Helvétius. He developed his distinctive philosophical school, Idéologie, by building on and developing the ideas of John Locke and, even more, the sensationalist philosophy of Condillac. Destutt de Tracy's theories, first systematically expounded in his four-volume work *Eléments d'Idéologie*, emphasized the dependence of knowledge (both its acquisition and its verification) on the human senses.

On Hippolyte Taine and Georges Cabanis, see also the observations recorded in Notebook 2, §91.

On Charles Maurras, see Notebook 1, §14, n. 1; and on Paul Bourget, see Notebook 3, §37, n. 4.

3. Gramsci remarks more than once on the political motivation behind Croce's enthusiasm for De Man; see, for example, Notebook 1, §132

4. This is one of the most important underlying motifs running through the many pages Gramsci devotes to the critique of Bukharin's *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology*.

§36. *Criteria of "literary" judgment*

1. See Benedetto Croce, *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, 4th ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1921), p. 26. Gramsci quotes the same passage in Notebook 1, §11.

§37. *Idealism-positivism. ["Objectivity" of knowledge]*

1. "Religione e filosofia nelle scuole medie" (Religion and philosophy in the middle school), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (June 1, 1929): 419. The article is unsigned, but it was in fact written by Mario Barbera.

2. Karl Marx, preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (New York: International Publishers, 1970), p. 21. Gramsci refers to this same statement by Marx in Notebook 4, §15; see also n. 7 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

3. Gramsci is distinguishing his views from Giovanni Gentile's philosophy of "actualism." See, especially, Giovanni Gentile, *Teoria generale dello spirito come atto puro* (Pisa: Mariotti, 1916), translated into English as *The Theory of Mind as Pure Act*, trans. and introd. H. Wildon Carr (London: Macmillan, 1922).

§38. *Relations between structure and superstructures*

1. Gramsci is quoting from memory. See Karl Marx's preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (New York: International Publishers, 1970), p. 21: "No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society. Mankind thus inevitably sets itself only such tasks as it is able to solve, since closer examination will always show that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the process of formation." Gramsci later translated this passage, together with other selections from Marx's writings, from German into Italian; see the manuscript of Notebook 7, pp. 31–4r. In the C text of this note (Notebook 13, §17), Gramsci quotes his own translation of this whole passage.

2. A very important part of the background of this note is Lenin's polemical work against economism, *What Is to Be Done?* (1902), with its critical assessment of social democratic politics and trade union politics. Prior to his arrest (but not while in prison) Gramsci possessed a copy of the French translation of this work by Lenin, *Que faire?* (Paris: Librairie de l'Humanité, 1925).

3. See Gaetano Salvemini, *La rivoluzione francese (1788–1792)*, 3d ed. (Milan: Signorelli, 1913). This was one of the books discussed at the Club of Moral Life, which Gramsci organized toward the end of 1917; see Gramsci's March 18 letter to Giuseppe Lombardo Radice.

4. See Albert Mathiez, *La révolution française*, vol. 1, *La chute de la royauté* (Paris: Colin, 1922), a copy of which Gramsci had while in prison. Mathiez makes the following observation on the revolutionary significance of the events of August 10, 1792, when the Tuileries Palace was stormed and the monarchy deposed:

> Ce n'était pas seulement le parti feuillant, c'est-à-dire la haute bourgeoisie et la noblesse libérale, qui était écrasé avec la royauté sous le canon du 10 août, le parti Girondin lui-même, qui avait transigé avec la Cour *in extremis* et qui s'était efforcé d'empêcher l'insurrection, sortait amoindri d'une victoire qui n'était pas son oeuvre et qui lui avait été imposée.
>
> Les citoyens passifs, c'est-à-dire les prolétaires, enrôlés par Robespierre et les Montagnards, avaient pris largement leur revanche du massacre du Champs-de-Mars de l'année précédente. La chute du trône avait la valeur d'une Révolution nouvelle. La démocratie pointait à l'horizon. (p. 217)

5. See especially Notebook 1, §44, §110, §114–§115, and §117–§119.

6. Comparisons between the Action Party and the Moderates (here called the "Piedmontese party") are an important feature of Gramsci's analysis of the Risorgimento and its outcome; see, for example, Notebook 1, §43 and §44, and Notebook 3, §125.

7. Mathiez, *La chute de la royauté*, p. 13:

> Un signe infaillible que le pays s'enrichit, c'est que la population augmente rapidement et que le prix de denrées, des terres et des maisons subit une hausse constante. La France renferme déjà 25 millions d'habitants, deux fois autant que l'Angleterre ou que la Prusse. Le bien-être descend peu à peu de la haute bourgeoisie dans la moyenne e dans la petite. On s'habille mieux, on se nourrit mieux qu'autrefois. Surtout on s'instruit. Les filles de la roture, qu'on appelle maintenant demoiselles pourvu qu'elles portent des paniers, achètent des pianos. La plus-value des impôts de consummation atteste les progrès de l'aisance.— Ce n'est dans un pays épuisé, mais au contraire dans un pays florissant, en plein essor, qu'éclatera la Révolution. La misère, qui détermine parfois des émeutes, ne peut pas provoquer les grands bouleversements sociaux. Ceux-ci naissent toujours du déséquilibre des classes.

8. In this edition, the Italian terms "*sindacato*" and "*sindacalismo*" are almost always rendered into English as "trade union" and "trade unionism." In this instance, however, "syndicalism" has been used because Gramsci's phrase "theoretical syndicalism" refers to a specific—though loosely organized and variegated—current in the organized labor movement. Two important facets of the syndicalism to which Gramsci refers were an insistence on the primacy of industrial struggle and a scorn for the role of the political party; indeed, the syndicalists disdained "politics" as such and glorified direct action. [Lenin dealt with syndicalism in many of his writings, and he was especially harsh in his condemnation of anarcho-syndicalism and of the syndicalists' economistic views.] In Italy, syndicalism was strongly influenced by the ideas of Georges Sorel and by the anarchist tradition. The ranks of the Italian syndicalist movement produced many nationalists and interventionists during the years leading to World War I and quite a number of militant Fascists in the postwar period. Gramsci's conviction that the syndicalist approach was ineffective and misguided comes through clearly in the following passages from his unfinished essay "Alcuni temi della questione meridionale" ["Some Aspects of the Southern Question"]:

> No mass action is possible if the masses themselves are not convinced of the goals they want to achieve and of the methods that need to be applied. In order to be able to become a governing class, the proletariat must rid itself of every residue of corporatism, every syndicalist prejudice and incrustation. What does this mean? It means that the distinctions that exist between one trade and another must be overcome. But not only: in order to win the trust and the consent of the peasants and of some semiproletarian urban categories, it is also necessary to overcome certain prejudices and to defeat certain forms of egoism that can and do subsist within the working class as such, even after the disappearance of narrow craft distinctions. The metalworker, the carpenter, the construction worker, etc., must not only think as proletarians and no longer as metalworker, carpenter, construction worker, etc.; they must also take another step forward: they must think as workers who belong to a class that aims to lead the peasants and the intellectuals, a class that can be victorious and can build socialism only if it is helped and followed by the great majority of these social strata. If this is not achieved, the proletariat will not become the leading class, and these strata—which in Italy represent the majority of the population—will remain under bourgeois leadership, thus enabling the state to resist the proletarian drive and wear it down. . . .
>
> If you look closely, the most radical crises in the socialist and workers' movement occurred in the decade 1900–1910. The masses

reacted spontaneously against the policies of the reformist leaders. Syndicalism was born; it was the instinctive, rudimentary, primitive but healthy expression of the workers' reaction against the bloc of alliance with the bourgeoisie and in favor of a bloc with the peasants, and *first and foremost with the southern peasants*. Exactly so. Indeed, in a certain sense, syndicalism is a weak attempt by the southern peasants, represented by their most advanced intellectuals, to lead the proletariat. Who forms the leading nucleus of Italian syndicalism? What is the ideological essence of Italian syndicalism? The leading nucleus of syndicalism is made up almost exclusively of southerners: Labriola, Leone, Longobardi, Orano. The ideological essence of syndicalism is a new liberalism, more energetic, more aggressive, more pugnacious than traditional liberalism. If you look closely, two fundamental issues are at the center of the successive crises of syndicalism and the gradual passage of the syndicalist leaders into the bourgeois camp: emigration and free trade, two issues closely linked to southernism. The phenomenon of emigration gave rise to Enrico Corradini's concept of "proletarian nation"; the Libyan war was seen by a whole layer of intellectuals as the beginning of the "great proletariat's" offensive against the capitalist and plutocratic world. A whole group of syndicalists went over to nationalism; indeed, the Nationalist Party was originally made up of ex-syndicalist intellectuals.

9. Gramsci is referring, in particular, to Henri De Man's book *The Psychology of Socialism*, trans. E. Paul and C. Paul (London: Allen and Unwin, 1928), which he discusses extensively in this and other notebooks.

10. The Vatican's *non expedit*, which prohibited Catholics from participating in national electoral politics, was relaxed somewhat in 1904 and tacitly withdrawn in 1913 (with the Gentiloni Pact); however, it remained official church policy until 1919.

11. Karl Marx, chap. 2, §5, "Strikes and Combinations of Workers," in *The Poverty of Philosophy*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1976), 6:210–11:

The first attempts by workers to *associate* among themselves always takes place in the form of combinations.

Large-scale industry concentrates in one place a crowd of people unknown to one another. Competition divides their interests. But the maintenance of wages, this common interest they have against their boss, unites them in a common thought of resistance—*combination*. Thus combination always has a double aim, that of stopping competition among workers, so that they can carry on general com-

> petition with the capitalist. If the first aim was merely the maintenance of wages, combinations, at first isolated, constitute themselves into groups as the capitalists in their turn unite for the purpose of repression, and in the face of always united capital, the maintenance of the association becomes more necessary to them than that of wages. This is so true that English economists are amazed to see the workers sacrifice a good part of their wages in favour of associations, which, in the eyes of these economists, are established solely in favour of wages. In this struggle—a veritable civil war—all the elements necessary for a coming battle unite and develop. Once it has reached this point, association takes on a political character.

12. See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, chap. 4, §4, "Proudhon," and chap. 6, §3(d), "Critical Battle Against French Materialism," in *The Holy Family; or, Critique of Critical Criticism*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1975), 4:23–54, 124–34.

On translations of *The Holy Family* owned by Gramsci, see Notebook 1, §29, n. 2.

13. Gramsci is referring to Frederick Engels's letters to Joseph Bloch, September 21, 1890, and to Heinz Starkenburg, January 25, 1894; see Notebook 4, §26, n. 1.

14. See Karl Marx's preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (New York: International Publishers, 1970), p. 21. The relevant passage (which is among the selections from Marx's writings that Gramsci later translated in Notebook 7) is quoted in Notebook 4, §15, n. 7.

15. See, for example, Notebook 4, §3.

16. "Historical economism" is the term used by Achille Loria to describe his economic and sociological theories. In his writings, Loria professed great admiration for Marx, but he also claimed to have identified serious problems with the economic theories expounded in *Capital*, problems that he purported to solve, thus enabling socialist economic theory to progress beyond Marx. For a refutation of Loria's "reading" of Marx, see Frederick Engels, preface and "Supplement and Addendum to Volume 3 of *Capital*," in Karl Marx, *Capital*, trans. D. Fernbach (New York: Penguin, 1991), 3:91–111, 1027–47.

17. The article by Loria to which Gramsci is referring was in fact first published in 1910; see Achille Loria, "Le influenze sociali dell'aviazione" (The social effects of aviation), *Rassegna Contemporanea* 3, no. 1 (January 1910): 20–28. On this article and Gramsci's criticism of it in his journalistic writings, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 2.

18. Antonio Laviosa, "L'estrazione del petrolio" (The extraction of petroleum), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1372 (May 16, 1929): 254–62.

19. See "La mania del prestigio" (The fixation with prestige), *Rassegna Settimanale della Stampa Estera* 5, no. 42 (October 21, 1930): 2303–4. The *Rassegna Settimanale della Stampa Estera* (Weekly review of the foreign press) was published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

20. Gramsci is probably referring, as he does earlier in this note, to Frederick Engels's letters to Joseph Bloch, September 21, 1890, and Heinz Starkenburg, January 25, 1894. But he may also be thinking of Engels's letter to Conrad Schmidt, August 5, 1890. For an English translation of this letter, see K. Marx and F. Engels, *Correspondence: 1846–1895*, trans. D. Torr (New York: International Publishers, 1936), pp. 472–75. In this letter (which was frequently quoted in Marxist literature) Engels wrote, among other things:

> In general the word *materialistic* serves many of the younger writers in Germany as a mere phrase with which anything and everything is labelled without further study; they stick on this label and then think the question disposed of. But our conception of history is above all a guide to study, not a lever for construction after the manner of the Hegelians. All history must be studied afresh, the conditions of existence of the different formations of society must be individually examined before the attempt is made to deduce from them the political, civil-legal, aesthetic, philosophic, religious, etc., notions corresponding to them. Only a little has been done here up to now because only a few people have got down to it seriously. In this field we can utilise masses of help, it is immensely big and anyone who will work seriously can achieve a lot and distinguish himself. But instead of this only too many of the younger Germans simply make use of the phrase, historical materialism (and *everything* can be turned into a phrase), in order to get their own relatively scanty historical knowledge (for economic history is still in its cradle!) fitted together into a neat system as quickly as possible, and they then think themselves something very tremendous.

21. See Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?*

22. The Boulangist movement was a short-lived but powerful force on the French political scene in the late 1880s—so powerful, in fact, that it came close to toppling the Third Republic. The popularity of Georges Boulanger (1837–91) rose rapidly after his appointment as minister of war in 1886, largely because he made himself the de facto leader of the revanche movement against German occupation of Alsace-Lorraine. Afraid that he might inflame the nation to the point of war and worried by his relations with a whole array of dissident elements (monarchists, Bonapartists, and some leftists), the government dismissed him from the

war ministry and, soon afterward, from the army. Meanwhile, however, Boulanger won election to the Chamber of Deputies and formed a political party that campaigned for sweeping constitutional, military, and administrative reforms. The Boulangists' success in the elections of January 1889 led to massive popular demonstrations in streets, with the crowds urging Boulanger to seize government power. The immediate danger of a coup subsided as Boulanger refrained from instant action. Once a new cabinet was formed the following month, the government started taking steps to suppress the threat to state security posed by Boulanger and his allies. Fearing arrest, Boulanger fled to Belgium on April 1, 1889, and within a year his movement had all but ceased to exist.

23. The events culminating in Louis Napoleon's coup d'état on December 2, 1851, are the subject of Karl Marx's historical-critical study, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1852).

24. Georges Valois (1878–1945), a French revolutionary syndicalist close to Sorel, founder of the "Cercle Proudhon" and the journal *Cahiers du Cercle Proudhon*, formulated extreme antidemocratic, antiparliamentarian positions that led him to forge alliances with monarchists and other exponents of the far right, including the *Action Française* circle. After he broke off with the *Action Française* in 1925 he organized a movement called "Le Faisceau" that derived its inspiration drectly from Italian Fascism. (Gramsci fleetingly mentions Georges Valois's relations with the *Action Française* in Notebook 1, §48, and Notebook 2, §74.)

General Rudolf Gajda was the commander of the Czech legionnaires in Siberia who fought for the anti-Bolshevik leader Aleksandr Kolchak during the Russian civil war. In the 1920s he was discharged from the Czech army for plotting a military putsch. He subsequently formed a fascist party that won three parliamentary seats in the Czech national elections of 1929.

25. I.e., Lenin's.

§39. *On the* Popular Manual

1. These words, which are missing in the manuscript, are supplied on the basis of the C text version of this note; see Notebook 11, §33.

§40. *Philosophy and ideology*

1. Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring* (New York: International Publishers, 1939), pp. 309–10:

> The seizure of the means of production by society puts an end to commodity production, and therewith to the domination of the product over the producer. Anarchy in social production is replaced

> by conscious organisation on a planned basis. The struggle for individual existence comes to an end. And at this point, in a certain sense, man finally cuts himself off from the animal world, leaves the conditions of animal existence behind him and enters conditions which are really human. The conditions of existence forming man's environment, which up to now have dominated man, at this point pass under the dominion and control of man, who now for the first time becomes the real conscious master of Nature, because and in so far as he has become master of his own social organisation. The laws of his own social activity, which have hitherto confronted him as external, dominating laws of Nature, will then be applied by man with complete understanding, and hence will be dominated by man. Men's own social organisation which has hitherto stood in opposition to them as if arbitrarily decreed by Nature and history, will then become the voluntary act of men themselves. The objective, external forces which have hitherto dominated history, will then pass under the control of men themselves. It is only from this point that men, with full consciousness, will fashion their own history; it is only from this point that the social causes set in motion by men will have, predominantly and in constantly increasing measure, the effects willed by men. It is humanity's leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom.

The same passage (which is the conclusion of part 3, chap. 2, of *Anti-Dühring*) is also included in Engels's *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (1892), of which Gramsci owned (but did not have with him in prison) two Italian editions: *Socialismo utopistico e socialismo scientifico*, trans. P. Martignetti (Milan: Società Editrice Avanti, 1920), and *L'evoluzione del socialismo dall'utopia alla scienza* (Milan: Seum, 1925).

2. In his book on modernism and the relations between philosophy and religion, *Il modernismo e i rapporti tra religione e filosofia* (Bari: Laterza, 1909), Giovanni Gentile writes:

> Catholicism remains the most noteworthy, if not the only surviving historical form of religion in Western civilization, the most noteworthy and maybe the only one that for centuries has stood against the development of the absolute form of the spirit—i.e., philosophy—impeding its progress or battling against it in the practical-social sphere. For this reason, one might say, modernism is one of the great fatal confrontations that, in the history of humanity, must necessarily take place between religion, which is the philosophy of the multitudes, and philosophy, which is the religion of the spirit or, to put it another way, the religion of its highest exponents. (p. 54)

§41. *Science*

1. Bertrand Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy* (New York: Henry Holt, 1911), pp. 152–54:

> Consider such a proposition as "Edinburgh is north of London." Here we have a relation between two places, and it seems plain that the relation subsists independently of our knowledge of it. When we come to know that Edinburgh is north of London, we come to know something which has to do only with Edinburgh and London: we do not cause the truth of the proposition by coming to know it, on the contrary we merely apprehend a fact which was there before we knew it. The part of the earth's surface where Edinburgh stands would be north of where London stands, even if there were no human being to know about north and south, and even if there were no minds at all in the universe. This is, of course, denied by many philosophers, either for Berkeley's reasons or for Kant's. But we have already considered these reasons, and decided that they are inadequate. We may therefore now assume it to be true that nothing mental is presupposed in the fact that Edinburgh is north of London. But this fact involves the relation "north of," which is a universal; and it would be impossible for the whole fact to involve nothing mental if the relation "north of," which is a constituent part of the fact, did involve anything mental. Hence we must admit that the relation, like the terms it relates, is not dependent upon thought, but belongs to the independent world which thought apprehends but does not create.
>
> This conclusion, however, is met by the difficulty that the relation "north of" does not seem to *exist* in the same sense in which Edinburgh and London exist. If we ask "Where and when does this relation exist?" the answer must be "Nowhere and nowhen." There is no place or time where we can find the relation "north of." It does not exist in Edinburgh any more than in London, for it relates the two and is neutral as between them. Nor can we say that it exists at any particular time. Now everything that can be apprehended by the senses or by introspection exists at some particular time. Hence the relation "north of" is radically different from such things. It is neither in space nor in time, neither material nor mental; yet it is something.
>
> It is largely the very peculiar kind of being that belongs to universals which has led many people to suppose that they are really mental.

Gramsci's parenthetical remark indicates that he read this passage (probably prior to his arrest since he is here citing it from memory) in the Italian

translation of Russell's work: *I problemi della filosofia*, trans. B. Ceva (Milan: Sonzogno, 1922). Gramsci alludes to this same passage again in Notebook 7, §25.

§42. *Giovanni Vailati and scientific language*

1. See Notebook 1, §44 and §151; Notebook 3, §48; and Notebook 4, §3. For the relevant passage from *The Holy Family* and for Gramsci's related comments in a letter to Tatiana Schucht, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 38.

2. Luigi Einaudi, "Se esista, storicamente, la pretesa ripugnanza degli economisti verso il concetto dello Stato produttore: Lettera aperta a R. Benini" (The supposed repugnance of economists toward the concept of state as producer: Does it exist, historically? An open letter to R. Benini), *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica* 3, no. 5 (September–October 1930): 302–14. This article is followed (in the same issue of *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica*) by a response from Rodolfo Benini, "Coesione e solidarietà" (Cohesiveness and solidarity), pp. 315–20; and by Ugo Spirito's article "La storia della economia e il concetto di Stato" (The history of economics and the concept of state), pp. 321–24.

On Luigi Einaudi, see Notebook 1, §11, n. 1.

3. Giovanni Vailati (1863–1909), a mathematician and philosopher, described himself as a pragmatist. In his writings he stressed the importance of refining the methodologies of scientific and philosophical research, the primary purpose of which, in his view, was to develop useful instruments capable of reliably predicting or anticipating future phenomena. Vailati also advocated a scientific approach to language aimed at eliminating errors and misunderstandings stemming from the ambiguity of terminology. Through his friend Mario Calderoni, Vailati had close contacts with the circle of intellectuals associated with the Florentine journal *Leonardo* (edited by Giovanni Papini). Both Calderoni and Vailati wrote for *Leonardo*.

Prior to his imprisonment, Gramsci owned a book that contained some of Vailati's writings on pragmatism: Mario Calderoni and Giovanni Vailati, *Il pragmatismo*, ed. Giovanni Papini (Lanciano: Carabba, 1915).

4. On Ugo Spirito, see Notebook 1, §132, n. 2.

5. On Achille Loria, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 1.

6. On Giuseppe Prezzolini's *Il linguaggio come causa d'errore: H. Bergson* (Florence: Spinelli, 1904), and on Vilfredo Pareto (including his discussion of scientific language), see Notebook 4, §18, n. 6.

7. See Ugo Spirito, "La storia della economia e il concetto di Stato" (The history of economics and the concept of State), *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica* 3, no. 5 (September–October 1930): 321–24.

§43. *The "objectivity of the real" and Prof. Lukács*

1. Gramsci is referring to p. 751 of his manuscript; see Notebook 4, §41.

2. Georg Lukács, "What is Orthodox Marxism?" in *History and Class Consciousness*, trans. R. Livingstone (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1971), p. 24 n. 6: "It is of the first importance to realise that the [dialectical] method is limited here to the realms of history and society. The misunderstandings that arise from Engels' account of dialectics can in the main be put down to the fact that Engels—following Hegel's mistaken lead—extended the method to apply also to nature. However, the crucial determinants of dialectics—the interaction of subject and object, the unity of theory and practice, the historical changes in the reality underlying the categories as the root causé of changes in thought, etc.—are absent from our knowledge of nature."

Whatever knowledge Gramsci may have had of Lukács's *History and Class Consciousness*, it was surely partial and secondhand. Most probably, however, he was familiar with at least one of the essays collected in Lukács's volume: an Italian translation of "The Marxism of Rosa Luxemburg" (pp. 27–45 in the edition cited above) was published in three parts in *Rassegna Communista* 1, no. 14 (November 30, 1921): 681–86; 1, no. 15 (December 15, 1921): 727–34; and 1, no. 16 (December 30, 1921): 754–57. Another essay by Lukács (but one that is not included in *History and Class Consciousness*) that Gramsci almost certainly read is "The Question of Parliamentarianism," which originally appeared in *Kommunismus* 1, no. 6 (1920); it was translated into Italian as "Sulla questione del parlamentarismo" and published in three parts in *Il Soviet* 3, no. 12 (April 25, 1920); 3, no. 13 (May 2, 1920); and 3, no. 14 (May 16, 1920). The following passage from "The Question of Parliamentarianism" was reprinted (presumably on Gramsci's own initiative or at least with his editorial approval) in *L'Ordine Nuovo* 2, no. 5 (June 12, 1920): 40:

> As *organizations of the entire proletariat* (both conscious and unconscious) the workers' councils *by their mere existence point the way forward beyond bourgeois society.* They are by their very nature revolutionary and organizational expressions of the growing significance, the ability to act, and the power of the proletariat. As such, they are the true index of the progress of the revolution. For everything that is achieved and attained in the workers' councils is wrested from the defiant grasp of the bourgeoisie and is therefore valuable not simply as a result but chiefly as a means of education for class-conscious action. Attempts (like those of the Independent Socialist Party of Germany) to "anchor the workers' councils in the constitution," to assign them a legally established field of activity, therefore indicate a new peak in "parliamentary cretinism." *Legality is the death of the*

> *workers' councils*. As an offensive organization of the revolutionary proletariat the workers' council can exist only insofar as it threatens the existence of bourgeois society, only insofar as it struggles for and prepares, step by step, the destruction of that society and hence the construction of the proletarian society. Legality in any shape or form—i.e., integration into bourgeois society, with *precisely defined limits* to its competence—would transform its existence into a sham: the workers' council would turn into a cross between a debating society and a poor man's parliamentary committee.

"The Question of Parliamentarianism" is available in English in Georg Lukács, *Political Writings: 1919–1929*, ed. R. Livingstone, trans. M. McColgan (London: NLB, 1972), pp. 53–63.

In all probability, Gramsci knew of the harsh attack (provoked by the critical comments on Engels in *History and Class Consciousness*) on what was termed Lukács's "theoretical revisionism" made by Zinoviev in a report to the Fifth Congress of the Third International in 1924; see *La Correspondance Internationale* 4, no. 43 (July 10, 1924): 440. It is also likely that Gramsci had read the fiercely critical article against Lukács (again focusing on the unorthodox views expressed in *History and Class Consciousness*) by Abraham Deborins in his article "Lukács und seine Kritik des Marxismus," published in the Viennese journal *Arbeiterliteratur* 10 (1924). Lukács's criticism of Engels in his controversial book is also mentioned in the first part of a two-part article by Enrico De' Negri, "Recenti studi tedeschi sul marxismo" (Recent German studies on Marxism), in *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica* 1, no. 1 (November 1927): 132–44; the second part of this article is one of the sources used by Gramsci in Notebook 10, II, §33.

3. Georg Lukács wrote a review of N. Bukharin's *Theorie des historischen Materialismus: Gemeinverständliches Lehrbuch der marxistischen Soziologie* (*Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology*) that was published in *Archiv für Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung* 11 (1925). (For an English translation, see Lukács, *Political Writings*, pp. 134–42.) It is quite possible that Gramsci read Lukács's book review or was told about it while he was in the Soviet Union or in Vienna. In any case, some of Gramsci's own criticisms of Bukharin's book are very similar to Lukács's. Lukács, for example, bemoans the fact that "Bukharin's tendency to simplification is not confined to marginal ideological creations, but encroaches on central questions." More specifically, Lukács, like Gramsci after him, objects strongly to Bukharin's misconception of "science" and to his treatment of the question of "technique" (what Gramsci sometimes calls the "technical instrument"). Lukács writes, among other things:

> The closeness of Bukharin's theory to bourgeois, natural-scientific materialism derives from his use of "science" (in the French sense) as a model. In its concrete application to society and history it therefore frequently obscures the specific feature of Marxism: that *all economic or "sociological" phenomena derive from the social relations of men to one another.* Emphasis on a false "objectivity" in theory leads to fetishism.
>
> The discussion of the role of technique in social development highlights these remnants of undissolved quiddity . . . and false "objectivity." Bukharin attributes to technology a far too determinant position, which completely misses the *spirit* of dialectical materialism.

Lukács also anticipates Gramsci when he points out that a fundamental methodological error of Bukharin is his use of the natural sciences as a model for the construction of a "general sociology" that he misguidedly identifies with Marxism as such.

§44. *Sorel*

1. Spectator (pseudonym of Mario Missiroli), "Clemenceau," *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1386 (December 16, 1929): 478–99; and Mario Missiroli, "Sorel e Clemenceau," *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 37 (December 15, 1929). Gramsci also comments on these two articles in Notebook 5, §126.

2. These two passages by Sorel are, in fact, not taken from letters he wrote to Missiroli but from a single article published in *Il Resto del Carlino*, June 1, 1919, and later reprinted in Georges Sorel, *L'Europa sotto la tormenta*, ed. Mario Missiroli (Milan: Corbaccio, 1932), pp. 123–32.

On Jean Jaurès, see Notebook 2, §75, n. 4.

3. On Sorel's letters to Croce, published in *La Critica*, see Notebook 2, §74, n. 2. Of particular interest in this context is Sorel's letter to Croce of August 22, 1909, published in *La Critica* 26, no. 5 (September 20, 1928): "Vous allez recevoir un volume curieux écrit par un jeune royaliste sur la monarchie et la classe ouvrière; G. Valois est un employé de commerce, dont la valeur littéraire est sérieuse; il s'illusionne certainement sur les conséquences que peuvent avoir les relations de quelques syndicalistes révolutionnaires avec les royalistes de l'*Action française*; mais son livre renferme pas mal d'observations qui montrent que l'auteur a une intelligence élevée et perspicace. Il m'a demandé de le recommander à quelques critiques italiens; je vous serais obligé si vous pouviez lire son ouvrage et en parler" (pp. 334–35). See also, in the same issue of *La Critica*, Sorel's letters of September 5, 1910, and January 25, 1911, where he discusses plans to launch a new journal in collaboration with some monarchists associ-

ated with the *Action Française* group. (The journal, which was to be entitled *La cité française*, never appeared.)

On Georges Valois, see Notebook 4, §38, n. 24.

4. See Edouard Berth, *Les méfaits des intellectuels* (Paris: Rivière, 1914). Berth's book is dedicated to Sorel, who contributed a preface to it.

Edouard Berth had been a contributor to *La Rivoluzione Liberale*, the Turin political journal founded and edited by Gramsci's friend Piero Gobetti. One of Berth's books, *La France au milieu du monde*, was brought out by Gobetti's publishing house in 1924, and Gobetti wrote at some length about it in *La Rivoluzione Liberale* 4, no. 7 (February 15, 1925).

§45. *Structure and superstructures*

1. Gramsci is referring to an observation made by Engels at the conclusion of chapter 2 of part 3 of *Anti-Dühring*. See Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring* (New York: International Publishers, 1939), pp. 309–10. Gramsci alludes to the same passage in Notebook 4, §40; see n. 1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

2. On the significance of these phrases for Gramsci (who derives them from Marx), see Notebook 7, §21.

3. V. I. Lenin (Ilyich in Gramsci's encryption), "Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme," in *Selected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1943), 6:118: "Free and compulsory general and technical education (familiarizing the student with the theoretical and practical aspects of the most important branches of industry) for all children of both sexes up to the age of sixteen; education to be closely associated with the performance by children of socially productive labour." Lenin's text was first published in 1917 (a search for the "Geneva edition" mentioned by Gramsci proved fruitless). The reference to Lavoisier is not in Lenin's text but in the explanatory notes prepared by N. Krupskaya, which are not included in the available English editions of Lenin's writings. These notes have been published in N. Krupskaya, *Pedagogiceskje socinenja* (Moscow, 1957), pp. 424–26.

Antoine-Laurent Lavoisier (1743–94), the French chemist, became a member of the provincial assembly of Orléans in 1787 and was engaged in numerous civic activities and projects, including some involving the improvement of hygiene and public education. He was arrested and executed (with several others) by order of the Revolutionary Convention because he was a member of the detested tax-collecting government agency known as the Ferme Générale.

4. Benedetto Croce, *Cultura e vita morale*, 2d ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1926), p. 45: "The horror of positivism (since I have allowed myself to be carried away by confessions and memories, I will add one more thing; perhaps this

expresses the feelings shared by several others who have suffered the same spiritual travails), my horror of positivism became so violent that for several years it even stifled my democratic leanings, which have always been natural to my heart. '*Omnis enim Philosophia* (I once read in an old German doctoral dissertation) *cum ad communem hominum cogitandi facultatem revocet, per se democratica est; ideoque ab optimatibus non iniuria sibi existimatur perniciosa.*' "

Gramsci had a copy of this book by Croce in prison, and he reproduces this quote in Latin in Notebook 6, §82, and Notebook 7, §38.

§46. *Philosophy—politics—economics*

1. See Notebook 4, §42.

2. See Rosa Luxemburg's essay "Stillstand und Fortschritt im Marxismus," first published in *Vorwärts*, March 14, 1903. In all probability Gramsci read Luxemburg's essay in a collection of writings on Marx edited by D. Ryazanov: *Karl Marx homme, penseur et révolutionnaire* (Paris: Editions Sociales Internationales, 1928). For an English translation, see "Stagnation and Progress of Marxism," in *Karl Marx: Man, Thinker and Revolutionist*, ed. D. Ryazanov, trans. Eden and Cedar Paul (New York: International Publishers, 1927), and in *Rosa Luxemburg Speaks*, ed. Mary-Alice Waters (New York: Pathfinder, 1970). The relevant passage is quoted in Notebook 3, §31, n. 7.

§47. *The objectivity of the real and Engels*

1. Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring* (New York: International Publishers, 1939), part 1, chap. 4, p. 51: "The real unity of the world consists in its materiality, and this is proved not by a few juggling phrases, but by a long and protracted development of philosophy and natural science." Gramsci quotes this passage textually in the C text version of this note; see Notebook 11, §34.

§48. *Henri De Man's book*

1. "Per la pace sociale" (For social peace), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (September 7, 1929): 395). This unsigned article (in fact, written by the Jesuit priest, Angelo Brucculeri), is discussed by Gramsci in Notebook 2, §131.

In his article, Brucculeri refers to the book by Henri De Man, *Il superamento del marxismo*, 2 vols. (Bari: Laterza, 1929). On the editions (with different titles) of De Man's work in various languages, see Notebook 1, §61, n. 13.

2. Giuseppe Prezzolini describes André Philip as a "Christian democrat" in the course of his review of Georges Duhamel's *Scènes de la vie future* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1930) in the "Libri" (Books) section of *Pègaso* 2, no. 9 (September 1930): 383. Prezzolini alludes to André Philip's *Le problème ouvrier aux Etats-Unis* (Paris: Alcan, 1927), a book Gramsci had in prison that he cites on a number of occasions in the notebooks. See, inter alia, Notebook 1, §51, and nn. 4 and 5 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

On Giuseppe Prezzolini, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1.

3. "Il tramonto del marxismo" (The decline of Marxism), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (October 5, 1929): 36–45; and 80 (November 16, 1929): 320–29. This article is among the publications on De Man's work listed in Notebook 4, §2.

4. "Il tramonto del marxismo," *La Civiltà Cattolica* (October 5, 1929): 36.

5. "Il tramonto del marxismo," *La Civiltà Cattolica* (November 16, 1929): 329. (The italicized phrase at the end is a quotation from Dante's *Paradiso*, canto 33, 87.)

§49. *The intellectuals*

1. On Giovanni Agnelli, see Notebook 1, §50, n. 2.

2. The phrase "trained gorilla" has its origins in Frederick W. Taylor's *Principles of Scientific Management* (New York: Harper, 1911): "This work is so crude and elementary in its nature that the writer firmly believes that it would be possible to train an intelligent gorilla so as to become a more efficient pig-iron handler than any man could be" (p. 40). Gramsci, who did not have access to Taylor's work, encountered the phrase in André Philip, *Le problème ouvrier aux Etats-Unis* (Paris: Alcan, 1927), a book he had in prison that he cites several times in the notebooks: "L'ouvrier se trouve ainsi absorbé dans un engrenage mécanique qu'il doit subir sans essayer de le comprendre; ceci conduit à une dégradation de la fonction ouvrière dans la vie industrielle du pays, à une diminution de la personnalité qui pourrait devenir d'une extrême gravité. Taylor n'est-il-pas allé jusqu'à dire que bientôt un gorille entraîné pourrait faire le travail actuellement effectué par un ouvrier?" (p. 224). The phrase "trained gorilla" is also mentioned in a review of André Philip's book published in *Nuova Rivista Storica* 13, no. 1 (January–February 1929): 124.

3. "Conceitedness" is used here to render Gramsci's "*boria*," which he, too, places in quotes; it is a term derived from and meant to echo Vico's observations on the "conceit of nations." See especially *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*, trans. Thomas G. Bergin and Max H. Fisch (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968), p. 61: "On the conceit [*boria*] of nations, there is a golden saying of Diodorus Siculus. Every nation, accord-

ing to him, has had the same conceit that it before all nations invented the comforts of human life and that its remembered history goes back to the very beginning of the world."

4. Gramsci had written on this topic in 1926 in his unfinished essay "Alcuni temi della questione meridionale" ("Some Aspects of the Southern Question"). For a translation of an especially relevant passage, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 11.

5. Gramsci is referring to p. 67r of his manuscript; see Notebook 4, §38.

6. See, especially, Notebook 2, §116 and §117; Notebook 3, §117, §126, and §141; and Notebook 5, §30, §37, §74, §82, §83, and §100. All of these were written prior to this note.

7. Gramsci's disclaimer here is very similar to his cautionary remarks at the end of Notebook 4, §16; see also the first page of Notebook 11 and the opening paragraph of Notebook 8.

8. Gramsci later incorporated most of his scattered notes on American intellectuals in Notebook 22, which he entitled "Americanism and Fordism."

9. On Kulturkampf, see Notebook 1, §5, n. 2.

10. On Plutarco Calles, whose implementation of the Mexican constitution's provisions on religion and education triggered a violent struggle with the Catholic Church, see Notebook 1, §107, n. 3.

11. See, especially, Notebook 3, §5.

12. Gramsci is referring to Notebook 3, §28.

§50. *The common school*

1. Gramsci's term "*scuola unitaria*" (translated here as "common school") could also be rendered as "comprehensive school" or, perhaps, as "unified school." It should be kept in mind that Gramsci's notes on education often contain an implicit critique of the education reform enacted by the Fascist government on May 6, 1923. The reform was designed primarily by the philosopher and ideologue Giovanni Gentile, who at the time was Mussolini's minister of education. One of the salient features of the "*riforma* Gentile," as it was frequently called, was its separation of technical and vocational or professional training from "classical" education (the latter was reserved for the preparation of select students who were meant to move on to the universities).

2. Giovanni Gentile emphasized the importance of "active education" while condemning traditional pedagogy, which, in his view, assigned students a purely passive role.

§52. *Americanism and Fordism*

1. I.e., Leon Trotsky.

2. With the civil war nearing its end and the Soviet economy in shambles, Trotsky put forward a plan to militarize the labor force and subordinate the trade unions to state control. The proposal was fiercely opposed by the Mensheviks and triggered a bitter dispute within the Bolshevik ranks. Lenin, who was initially sympathetic to the idea, repudiated it in the party's Central Committee in November 1920. The whole issue was rendered irrelevant by the economic policies advanced by Lenin and endorsed by the Tenth Party Congress in March 1921.

Trotsky explained his views on the militarization of labor more or less systematically and at considerable length in his book *Terrorism and Communism*, a fierce polemic against Karl Kautsky written in 1920 and soon afterward widely disseminated among communist circles in several translations. Gramsci did not have this book in prison, but he had almost certainly read it years earlier in the Italian translation: *Terrorismo e comunismo: Anti-Kautsky* (Milan: Società Editrice Avanti, 1921). The English version of this work by Trotsky has appeared under three different titles: *Dictatorship vs Democracy* (New York: Workers Party, 1921); *The Defence of Terrorism* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1921); and *Terrorism and Communism: A Reply to Karl Kautsky* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961). Trotsky expounds his views on the militarization of labor in detail in chap. 8, "Problems of the Organization of Labor: The Soviet Government and Industry." This chapter contains, among other things, Trotsky's report to the Third All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions and extracts from other reports he delivered at the All-Russian Congress of Economic Councils and at the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party. A substantial part of Trotsky's argument in this chapter appears in the form of an attack on the Menshevik Rafael Abramovich—not, as Gramsci erroneously recalls, against Yurii Martov (also a prominent Menshevik leader)—who at various congresses and trade union gatherings had criticized Trotsky's plans to form "labor armies."

In *Terrorism and Communism*, Trotsky makes the following points, among others:

> The frightful pressure of war is becoming weaker. Economic requirements and problems are more and more coming to the fore. History is bringing us, along the whole line, to our fundamental problem—the organization of labor on new social foundations. The organization of labor is in its essence the organization of the new society: every historical form of society is in its foundation a form of organization of labor. While every previous form of society was an organization of labor in the interests of a minority, which organized its State apparatus for the oppression of the overwhelming majority of the workers, we are making the first attempt in world-history to

organize labor in the interests of the laboring majority itself. This however does not exclude the element of compulsion in all its forms, both the most gentle and the extremely severe. The element of State compulsion not only does not disappear from the historical arena, but on the contrary will still play, for a considerable period, an extremely prominent part. (p. 133)

The very principle of compulsory labor service is for the Communist quite unquestionable. "He who works not, neither shall he eat." . . . Compulsory labor service is sketched in our Constitution and in our Labor Code. But hitherto it has always remained a mere principle . . . . Only now, when along the whole line we have reached the question of the economic re-birth of the country, have problems of compulsory labor service arisen before us in the most concrete way possible. The only solution of economic difficulties that is correct from the point of view both of principle and of practice is to treat the population of the whole country as the reservoir of the necessary labor-power—an almost inexhaustible reservoir—and to introduce strict order into the work of its registration, mobilization, and utilization.

How are we practically to begin the utilization of labor-power on the basis of compulsory military service?

Hitherto only the War Department had any experience in the sphere of the registration, mobilization, formation, and transference from one place to another of large masses. These technical methods and principles were inherited by our War Department, to a considerable extent, from the past.

In the economic sphere there is no such heritage; since in that sphere there existed the principle of private property, and labor-power entered each factory separately from the market. It is consequently natural that we should be obliged, at any rate during the first period, to make use of the apparatus of the War Department on a large scale for labor mobilization. (pp. 135–36)

The question of the life or death of Soviet Russia is at present being settled on the labor front; our economic, and together with them our professional and productive organizations, have the right to demand from their members all that devotion, discipline, and executive thoroughness, which hitherto only the army required. (p. 141)

Without general labor service, without the right to order and demand fulfilment of orders, the trade unions will be transformed into a mere form without a reality; for the young Socialist State requires trade unions, not for a struggle for better conditions of labor—that is the

task of the social and State organizations as a whole—but to organize the working class for the ends of production, to educate, discipline, distribute, group, retain certain categories and certain workers at their posts for fixed periods. . . .

Consequently, comrades, militarization of labor, in the root sense indicated by me, is not the invention of individual politicians or an invention of our War Department, but represents the inevitable method of organization and disciplining of labor-power during the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism. And if the compulsory distribution of labor-power, its brief or prolonged retention at particular industries and factories, its regulation within the framework of the general State economic plan—if these forms of compulsion lead always and everywhere, as the Menshevik resolution states, to the lowering of productivity, then you can erect a monument over the grave of Socialism. For we cannot build Socialism on decreased production. Every social organization is in its foundation an organization of labor, and if our new organization of labor leads to a lowering of productivity, it thereby most fatally leads to the destruction of the Socialist society we are building, whichever way we twist and turn, whatever measures of salvation we invent. (p. 143).

3. Indications of Trotsky's interest in Americanism can be found in several remarks scattered throughout his writings, including *Terrorism and Communism*. In that work he makes the following observations about Taylorism:

Finally, the bourgeoisie learned how to gain possession even of the trade unions—i.e., the organizations of the working class itself; and it made use of them on a large scale, particularly in Great Britain, to discipline the workers. It domesticated the leaders, and with their help inoculated the workers with the fiction of the necessity for peaceful organic labor, for a faultless attitude to their duties, and for a strict execution of the laws of the bourgeois State. The crown of all this work is Taylorism, in which the elements of the scientific organization of the process of production are combined with the most concentrated methods of the system of sweating. (p. 146)

Under capitalism, the system of piece-work and of grading, the application of the Taylor system, etc., have as their object to increase the exploitation of the workers by the squeezing-out of surplus value. Under Socialist production, piece-work, bonuses, etc., have as their problem to increase the volume of social product, and consequently to raise the general well-being. Those workers who do more for the

> general interest than others receive the right to a greater quantity of the social product than the lazy, the careless, and the disorganizers. (p. 149)

A very pertinent observation by Trotsky on Americanism is found in a speech he delivered on July 28, 1924, which was published under the title "The Premisses of the Proletarian Revolution" in *Izvestia*, August 5, 1924; it is quoted by Quintin Hoare in the critical apparatus of his edition of Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from Political Writings: 1921–1926* (New York: International Publishers, 1978): "If we Americanize our still frail socialist industry, then we can say with tenfold confidence that the future is completely and decisively working in our favour. Americanized Bolshevism will crush and conquer imperialist Americanism" (pp. 492–93 n. 168). Gramsci alluded to this speech by Trotsky in his report to the Central Committee of February 6, 1925.

Trotsky's writings on "*byt*" (Russian for "life" or "mode of living") to which Gramsci is referring consist of a series of articles he wrote for *Pravda* in the summer of 1923. The articles were published together soon afterward in a book entitled *Voprosy Byta* (Moscow, 1923) and translated into English by Z. Vergerova as *Problems of Life* (London, 1924); they are also available in English in Leon Trotsky, *Problems of Everyday Life and Other Writings on Culture and Science* (New York: Monad, 1973).

Trotsky wrote extensively on literary topics; his best-known work on the subject is *Literature and Revolution* (1923), which in the original Russian edition included a note by Gramsci on Italian futurism; see Notebook 1, §124, n. 1.

Gramsci also had close personal contact with Trotsky during the time he spent in Moscow (May 1922 to December 1923) as a delegate to the executive committee of the Third International. On Gramsci's relationship with Trotsky, see Frank Rosengarten, "The Gramsci-Trotsky Question (1922–1932)," *Social Text* 11 (winter 1984–85): 65–95.

4. See Notebook 4, §49, n. 2.

5. In a letter to Tatiana Schucht, October 20, 1930, Gramsci makes the following observations on "the new methods of work" and the "measures taken by the American industrialists . . . like Ford":

> He has a corps of inspectors who check on the private lives of the workers and impose on them a certain regimen: they control even the food, sleeping arrangements, the room size, the hours of rest, and even their most intimate affairs; whoever won't go along is fired and no longer has six dollars minimum daily salary. Ford pays a minimum of six dollars, but he wants people who know how to work, that is, who know how to coordinate work with their life regimen.

> We Europeans are still too bohemian, we believe that we can do a certain kind of work and live as we please, like bohemians; naturally, machinism crushes us, and I mean machinism in a general sense, as scientific organization that also encompasses intellectual work. We are too romantic in an absurd way and not wanting to be petty bourgeois we fall into the most typical form of petty bourgeoisism that is precisely bohemianism.

6. This is a slightly modified version of the line on "easy and readily available love" in Horace's *Satires*, I, ii: "namque parabilem amo venerem facilemque" (line 119).

7. See Notebook 1, §61.

8. Gramsci uses the English word "turnover," which, in all likelihood, he derives from André Philip, *Le problème ouvrier aux Etats-Unis* (Paris: Alcan, 1927), p. 88ff.

§53. *Concordats and international treaties*

1. On February 11, 1929, the Fascist government and the Holy See concluded eighteen months of secret negotiations with the signing of the Lateran Accords (also known as the Lateran Pacts). The pacts comprised three documents: a treaty, a concordat, and a financial convention. The treaty settled the bitter dispute between the Catholic Church and the Kingdom of Italy, which dated back to the Risorgimento and specifically to the seizure of Rome in 1870 and the unilateral enactment of the Law of Guarantees a year later (see Notebook 3, §97, and the corresponding Notes to the Text); this part of the agreement was therefore called the Conciliation Treaty. The treaty, in effect, created Vatican City, which Italy agreed to recognize as an independent and sovereign state with its own inviolable territory. Italy also recognized Roman Catholicism as the sole religion of the state. The Holy See, for its part, formally recognized the Kingdom of Italy with Rome as its capital, and by so doing it renounced its territorial claims on the former Papal States. The concordat guaranteed for the Catholic Church in Italy a privileged position and an extremely powerful presence in civil society: the church was guaranteed complete freedom in spiritual matters; marriages were to be governed by canon law; religious instruction was to be made mandatory in all elementary and secondary schools; teachers of religion had to be approved by the church; Catholic Action was formally recognized by the state as an autonomous organization. The financial convention provided the Vatican with compensation for the papal territories that had been absorbed by Italy in the process of unification. The Italian government undertook to pay the pope 1.75 billion lire, 1 billion lire of which consisted of government bonds.

The Lateran Accords were approved by the senate on May 25, 1929; they were opposed only by a handful of senators, among them Benedetto Croce, who argued that the accords violated one of the basic principles on which the unified Italian state had been founded: namely, the separation between church and state.

2. Prussia (which at the time was a state or *Land* in the German *Reich*) and Vatican City signed a concordat on June 14, 1929, by which the Catholic Church obtained new privileges in addition to the restoration of some older ones. Most of the provisions of the concordat concerned the establishment of bishoprics and parishes and state subsidies for the church.

3. See the following articles, all of them published in *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica*: Ugo Spirito, "Il concordato" (The concordat), 2, no. 2–3 (March–June 1929): 81–87; Arnaldo Volpicelli, "La Conciliazione" (The conciliation) 2, no. 2–3 (March–June 1929): 88–97; Arnaldo Volpicelli, "Stato e Chiesa di fronte alla Conciliazione" (Church and state in light of the conciliation) 2, no. 4 (July–August 1929): 161–70; Arnaldo Volpicelli, "Le nuove relazioni politiche tra lo Stato e la Chiesa" (The new political relations between church and state) 2, no. 6 (November–December 1929): 305–10; Arnaldo Volpicelli, "Le nuove relazioni giuridiche tra lo Stato e la Chiesa" (The new juridical relations between church and state) 2, no. 6 (November–December 1929): 311–15; Arturo Carlo Jemolo, "Religione dello Stato e confessioni ammesse" (The religion of the state and permitted religions) 3, no. 1 (January–February 1930): 21–44; Arnaldo Volpicelli "La natura super-confessionale dello Stato italiano" (The super-confessional nature of the Italian state) 3, no. 2 (March–April 1930): 89–102. See also the polemical exchange between Francesco Ercole and Arnaldo Volpicelli in *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica* 3, no. 2 (March–April 1930): 126–36.

4. General Anton Ivanovich Denikin (1872–1947) commanded the White forces in southern Russia during the civil war that followed the Bolshevik Revolution. In 1919 he marched through Ukraine and was headed toward Moscow in October when his forces were defeated by the Red Army at Orel, less than three hundred miles from the capital. His army retreated in disarray, and the following year it was evacuated to the Crimea, where Denikin gave up his command and sought exile in France before emigrating to the United States.

On May 7, 1920, Soviet Russia signed a formal agreement with the government of Georgia, in which the Mensheviks were the majority party. One of the provisions of the agreement guaranteed the rights of the Bolsheviks to function legally within Georgia. (The Bolsheviks would eventually succeed in taking control of Georgia, which was proclaimed a Soviet republic in February 1921.) Gramsci had alluded to this agreement in two articles he wrote in the course of a heated polemic with Claudio

Treves on the question of Georgia: "La coda di paglia dell'onorevole Treves" (The Hon. Treves's guilty conscience), *L'Unità*, August 2, 1925, and "Il fronte antisoviettista dell'onorevole Treves" (The anti-soviet front of the Hon. Treves), *L'Unità*, August 18, 1925.

5. *Nuovi Studi di Dirittto, Economia e Politica* was founded in 1927 by Ugo Spirito and Arnaldo Volpicelli, both of whom belonged to Giovanni Gentile's philosophical school of "actual idealism"; see Notebook 1, §132, and n. 2 in the corresponding Notes to the Text. Gramsci received and retained a copy of every issue of the journal from its inception up to 1933.

6. The reform of the educational system spearheaded by Giovanni Gentile (who was minister of education at the time) and enacted by the Fascist government on May 6, 1923, made religious instruction mandatory at the elementary school level. The policies of Gentile's successor as minister of education, Pietro Fedele, and the provisions of the concordat extended the requirement of religious instruction to all secondary school levels up to (but not including) the university.

7. The University of the Sacred Heart (Università del Sacro Cuore), a private Catholic university in Milan, was established in 1921 and received official government recognition in 1924. The founder of the university, the Franciscan friar Edoardo Agostino Gemelli (1878–1959) was a conservative Thomist who in 1908 launched an influential journal of neoscholastic philosophy, the *Rivista di Filosofia Neoscolastica*, and in 1914 another periodical, *Vita e Pensiero*. A fierce opponent of all forms of modernism—positivism, liberalism, neoidealism—he was also openly supportive of the Fascist regime and its ventures, including the Ethiopian war and intervention in the Spanish Civil War. In 1939 (the year after the Fascist regime had made anti-Semitism its official policy and proclaimed the racial laws that were specifically directed against the Jewish minority), Gemelli publicly endorsed anti-Semitism in a speech at the University of Bologna. On Gemelli, see Notebook 9, §31.

8. Gramsci's source of information in this instance is most probably a book by Mario Missiroli (of which he owned a copy) on the concordat of 1929 and on the relations between church and state in Italy: *Date a Cesare: La politica religiosa di Mussolini, con documenti inediti* (Give unto Caesar: Mussolini's policy on religion, with previously unpublished documents) (Rome: Tipografia del Littorio, 1929). In his book, Missiroli quotes from an account published in *L'Osservatore Romano* on July 29, 1929, of a speech delivered by Pope Pius XI to the Italian bishops:

> The pope confessed that he was deeply preoccupied by the throngs knocking at the doors of the seminaries and of the apostolic schools that are in effect the seminaries of the religious orders. After a period

> of crisis and of a scarcity of vocations to the ecclesiastical life, there is now in some places an enormous number of young men headed for the priesthood. It would certainly be unfortunate if one had to repeat: *Multiplicasti gentem, sed non magnificasti laetitiam.* It is, therefore, necessary to bear in mind three factors that may be influencing this abundance of students at church institutions. Parents are easily induced to point their sons toward the priesthood by the exemption of military service conceded to clerics *in sacris*. Another factor is to be found in the improved economic and financial positions of the clergy. The third factor is the ease with which the course of studies can be completed. (pp. 389–90)

9. On Catholic Action, see Notebook 1, "Notes and Jottings," n. 2, 1:373.

10. Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621), the Jesuit cardinal and renowned Counter-Reformation theologian who is best known for his prosecutorial role in the trial of Galileo, addressed the question of the temporal and spiritual power of the pope in his major theological works, including *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*, 3 vols. (1586–93), and *De potestate summi pontificis in rebus temporibus* (1610). Instead of the pope's right to temporal power, Bellarmine emphasized the supreme power of the church over all aspects of society, a power that the church exercised "indirectly," that is, without necessarily having to assume the function of a direct, temporal ruler. On Bellarmine, see also Notebook 6, §151, and Notebook 7, §88.

11. Gramsci probably read a number of articles in various journals about the Seventh National Congress of Philosophy that was held in Rome in May 1929. At the congress, Father Agostino Gemelli (the founder of the Università del Sacro Cuore) delivered a speech fiercely attacking the philosophy of Giovanni Gentile. Parts of the speech are quoted in Eugenio Garin, *Cronache di filosofia italiana, 1900–1943* (Bari: Laterza, 1955); for example: "Nothing is less religious, less Christian than the philosophy of Gentile and the idealists . . . nothing is more anti-Christian; and it is worth stating this because there is nothing that corrodes the Christian soul worse than idealism; no system negates the Christian foundation of life as totally as idealism, even though it uses our vocabulary. . . . In a Catholic country, the teacher has no right to administer philosophical poison, the poison of idealism, to the young sons of Catholic parents" (pp. 490–91).

12. Gramsci may have been thinking of a comment he came across in André Maurois's *La vie de Disraëli* (Paris: Gallimard, 1927), a copy of which he had in prison. For an English translation, see André Maurois, *Disraeli: A Picture of the Victorian Age*, trans. H. Miles (New York: Appleton, 1928), especially p. 56: "He did not understand how a Jew could

not be a Christian; in his eyes that was to stop half-way and to renounce the glory of the race, which was that it had given the world a God."

13. The pope maintained that the different components of the Lateran Accords—specifically the treaty and the concordat—went hand in hand, such that an abrogation of one would inevitably entail the annulment of the other. Should the treaty fail to hold, Gramsci is arguing, the church would have to face the problem of restituting the large sums of money that it received from the Italian state as part of the agreements. For further discussion of this issue, see Notebook 6, §23.

§54. *1918*

1. The quoted passage and all the other information in this note are derived from the article by Arturo Carlo Jemolo, "Religione dello Stato e confessioni ammesse" (The religion of the state and permitted religions), *Nuovi Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica* 3, no. 1 (January–February 1930): 21–44. D. Schiappoli's pamphlet, *I recenti provvedimenti economici a vantaggio del clero* (The recent economic measures for the benefit of the clergy) was originally published in the proceedings of the Royal Academy of Moral and Political Sciences of Naples.

On Arturo Carlo Jemolo, see Notebook 1, §51, n. 2.

The "Sardinian law of 29 May 1855," passed by the senate of Piedmont and reluctantly approved by King Vittorio Emanuele II, suppressed religious orders and confiscated ecclesiastical property. The law was regarded as an affirmation of the principle of separation between church and state upheld by the liberal majority in the government led by Prime Minister Cavour.

§55. *The educational principle in elementary and secondary school*

1. Gramsci is referring to the changes in the Italian educational system introduced by the "*riforma* Gentile" (on which, see, inter alia, the Notes to the Text for Notebook 4, §50). On this issue, Harold Entwistle makes the following pertinent observation in his *Antonio Gramsci: Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), p. 184:

> Nowadays primary and elementary tend to be used interchangeably (the former in Britain, the latter in North America, for example), to refer to that *stage* of early schooling which precedes universal secondary schooling. In Gramsci's time, however, elementary was a *kind* of schooling which was terminal for most children. In its upper

grades it often overlapped with secondary schooling and consisted of more than merely the teaching of the basic academic skills of literacy and numeracy. It is to this earlier elementary tradition that Gramsci was referring in defending the old elementary school.

2. Here, again, Gramsci is criticizing the views of Giovanni Gentile, which in this case coincided with Benedetto Croce's. See Giovanni Gentile, *La riforma dell'educazione: Discorsi ai maestri di Trieste* (Bari: Laterza, 1920). For an English translation, see Giovanni Gentile, *The Reform of Education*, trans. D. Bigongiari, intro. by B. Croce (New York: Harcourt, 1922), especially p. 190: "The antithesis between instruction and education is the antithesis between realistic and idealistic culture, or again, that existing between a material and a spiritual conception of life."

3. The Casati Educational Law (named after Vittorio Emanuele II's minister, Gabrio Casati), enacted in 1859, established for the first time a comprehensive and centralized system of public education in Piedmont and Lombardy. After unification, the provisions and regulations of the Casati Act (as it was also known) were made to apply to the whole country. Although it underwent some modifications over the years, the Casati Law remained the basis of the Italian educational system until it was replaced by the Gentile Reform in 1923.

4. In one of his essays, Giosuè Carducci remarks that ever since Dante wrote *De vulgari eloquentia*, Italians have been so self-conscious about their use of language that they are always "watching their tongue" (Giosuè Carducci, *Bozzetti e scherme*, in *Opere*, [Bologna: Zanichelli, 1914], 3:268–69). Carducci's remark is quoted in a book Gramsci had in prison, namely Benedetto Croce's collection of essays on Manzoni, *Alessandro Manzoni: Saggi e discussioni* (Bari: Laterza, 1930), p. 69.

On Giosuè Carducci, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 17.

5. This same view recurs in different contexts in Gramsci's writings. See, for example, his June 16, 1936, letter to his son Delio: "I believe that one of the most difficult things at your age is to sit behind a desk and put one's thoughts in order (or even to think) and to write them down with a certain grace; this sometimes is an apprenticeship more difficult than that followed by a worker who wants to acquire a technical qualification, and it must begin precisely at your age."

6. The Gentile Reform introduced compulsory religious instruction in the schools; see Notebook 4, §53, n. 6.

For a related argument on dogmatism and religion in the schools, see also Notebook 8, §200, and the corresponding C text, Notebook 11, §1.

7. "Barbara" and "Bàràlipton" were terms used by students as mnemonic devices for memorizing different types of syllogism in classical logic.

In a July 4, 1927, letter to his friend Giuseppe Berti, who was interned at Ustica, Gramsci expresses his views on how philosophy should be taught and studied in the "school" that the political prisoners had organized among themselves: "Each member would have to offer his contribution as lecturer or reporter on specific scientific, historical, or philosophical but especially didactic or pedagogical subjects. For the philosophy course I believe, still by and large, that the historical presentation ought to be a summary while on the other hand the course should emphasize a concrete philosophical system, the Hegelian, dissecting and criticizing it in all aspects. I would also set up a course in logic, I would even say including the *barbara, baralipton*, etc., and a course in dialectics."

8. "Gentleman" is used here to render the Italian "*signore*," which has no exact equivalent in English. For a discussion of some aspects of the status of a "*signore*" in Italian society, see Notebook 3, §46.

§56. *Machiavelli and the "autonomy" of the phenomenon of politics*

1. Soon after his accession to the Prussian throne in 1740, Frederick II (1712–86) published a short treatise (in French) entitled *L'anti-machiavel; ou, Examen du Prince de Machiavel*, a work strongly influenced by Voltaire.

2. See Benedetto Croce, *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica*, 4th ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1921), p. 112: "Marx, as a sociologist, has certainly failed to give us carefully developed definitions of 'sociality,' such as may be found in the works of certain contemporary sociologists, of the Germans Simmel and Stammler, or of the Frenchman Durkheim; but he teaches us, albeit in propositions that are approximate in content and paradoxical in form, how to get to the heart of what society is in its effective reality. Indeed, from this point of view, I am surprised that no one has yet thought of giving him the honorary title of the 'Machiavelli' of the proletariat." Gramsci had a copy of this book in prison. For a somewhat looser translation of the same passage, see B. Croce, *Historical Materialism and the Economics of Karl Marx*, trans. C. M. Meredith (London: Allen and Unwin, 1914), p. 118.

3. The phrase "dialectic of distincts" was never used by Croce himself; it is, in fact, rather confusing, since Croce developed his theory of distinction as a corrective to what he considered Hegel's misapplication of the dialectic, which in his view stemmed from Hegel's confusion of "opposites" with "distincts." Gramsci may have encountered the phrase in (and adopted it from) an article by Arnaldo Volpicelli, "La teoria del diritto di Benedetto Croce" (Benedetto Croce's theory of right), *Nuovi*

Studi di Diritto, Economia e Politica 1, no. 4 (May 1928): 241–78. It is nonetheless the case that Croce's concept of distinction lies at the very heart of his critique—or "reform," as Gramsci calls it—of Hegel and constitutes a crucial element of his own philosophy. A succinct description of Croce's position is provided by Douglas Ainslie in his introduction to his translation of Benedetto Croce, *Aesthetic: As Science of Expression and General Linguistic*, 2d rev. ed. (London: Macmillan, 1922), p. xxi–xxii:

> If the great conquest of Hegel be the dialectic of opposites, his great mistake lies in the confusion of opposites with things that are distinct but not opposite. If, says Croce, we take as an example the application of the Hegelian triad that formulates becoming (affirmation, negation and synthesis), we find it applicable for those opposites which are true and false, good and evil, being and not-being, but *not applicable* to things which are distinct but not opposite, such as art and philosophy, beauty and truth, the useful and the moral. These confusions led Hegel to talk of the death of art, to conceive as possible a Philosophy of History, and to the application of the natural sciences to the absurd task of constructing a Philosophy of Nature. Croce has cleared away these difficulties by showing that if from the meeting of opposites must arise a superior synthesis, such a synthesis cannot arise from things which are distinct *but not opposite*, since the former are connected together as superior and inferior, and the inferior can exist without the superior, but *not vice versa*. Thus we see how philosophy cannot exist without art, while art, occupying the lower place, can and does exist without philosophy.

In their introduction to *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers, 1971), Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith make the following observation: "The distinct 'categories' of the Crocean system allow for the existence of four sciences, Aesthetics, Economics, Logic and Ethics, relating to the pursuit respectively of the Beautiful, the Useful, the True and the Good. Politics, in this conception, can only be a composite entity, a mere 'passion,' of no philosophical value" (p. xxiii). For other useful observations on this issue, see David D. Roberts, *Benedetto Croce and the Uses of Historicism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), especially pp. 52–53; and Maurice A. Finocchiaro, *Gramsci and the History of Dialectical Thought* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), especially pp. 176–179.

4. See, for example, Ugo Spirito, *L'idealismo italiano e i suoi critici* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1930).

5. Croce discusses the link between Vico and Hegel in, among other places, *La filosofia di Giambattista Vico*, 2d ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1922), and *Saggio sullo Hegel (seguito da altri scritti di storia della filosofia)*, 3d rev. ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1926). Gramsci was familiar with both works and had a copy of the latter in prison. For English translations, see *The Philosophy of Giambattista Vico*, trans. R. G. Collingwood (London: Latimer, 1913), and *What Is Living and What Is Dead of the Philosophy of Hegel*, trans. D. Ainslie (London: Macmillan, 1915).

Bertrando Spaventa (1817–83) was the progenitor of Italian neo-Hegelianism. In his writings on the history of philosophy he sought to establish a link between the Italian tradition and Hegelian idealism by tracing a philosophical thread running from Giordano Bruno and Tommaso Campanella to Hegel. Giovanni Gentile studied philosophy under one of Spaventa's closest followers, Donato Jaja. In many respects, Gentile's philosophy is a development and elaboration of issues and ideas adumbrated in Spaventa's work. Gentile also edited many volumes of Spaventa's writings.

6. Gramsci is citing from memory the final sentence in Frederick Engels's *Ludwig Feuerbach and the Outcome of Classical German Philosophy* (1888): "The German working class is the inheritor of German classical philosophy."

§57. *Vincenzo Cuoco and passive revolution*

1. This is the first reference in the notebooks to Vincenzo Cuoco's concept of passive revolution. The references that appear at the end of the first paragraph of Notebook 1, §44, and in Notebook 1, §150, were inserted by Gramsci at a later time. It is rather obvious that Gramsci's observations in this note were not prompted by a reading or rereading of Cuoco's work on the Neapolitan revolution. Instead, Gramsci may have been stimulated by some allusion to Cuoco's concept of passive revolution that he encountered in his reading of secondary materials. Benedetto Croce mentions Cuoco's term in the preface to his own book on the Neapolitan revolution; see B. Croce, *La rivoluzione napoletana del 1799*, 4th rev. ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1926), pp. ix–x. On p. 77r of the manuscript of Notebook 8, Gramsci made a list of thirteen books based on information he derived from diverse sources; one of the books he listed was a small selection of writings by Cuoco, *Storia, politica e pedagogia* (Torino: Paravia, n.d.), edited by Domenico Bulferetti and published in the series Scrittori italiani (Italian writers). There is no evidence anywhere that Gramsci ever asked for or received a copy of this book.

On Vincenzo Cuoco, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 2.

Unlike most other canceled notes, this one is not incorporated into a later notebook.

§58. [*Popular literature*]

1. This bibliographic entry was probably extracted from the "Semaine bibliographique" section of *Nouvelles Littéraires* 9, no. 380 (January 25, 1930): 11.

§59. [*History of the subaltern classes*]

1. Gramsci probably extracted the information on this edition of Antonio Rosmini's booklet on communism and socialism (originally titled *Il comunismo e il socialismo* and first published in 1849) from a brief review of it by Giuseppe Tarozzi that appeared in *L'Italia Che Scrive* 13, no. 8 (August 1930): 278.

On Antonio Rosmini, see Notebook 1, §51, n. 1.

2. Gramsci had a copy of the text of the *Syllabus* and of Pius IX's encyclicals; see Notebook 1, §1, n. 2.

3. Gramsci seems to be referring to the opening sentences of the preamble of the *Communist Manifesto*. See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1976), 6:481: "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the Powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies."

4. See Gaetano Salvemini, *Mazzini* (Rome: Editrice La Voce, 1920). Gramsci owned a copy of this book prior to his arrest and in a letter of March 25, 1929, he asked Tatiana Schucht to send it to him in prison. The "bibliographical chapter" to which he refers is in fact appendix B (pp. 171–74) in Salvemini's book; it is entitled "La paura del socialismo fra il 1847 e il 1860" (The fear of socialism between 1847 and 1860). This "bibliographical chapter"—which contains a reference to Rosmini's booklet on socialism and communism—was reproduced by Gramsci in the second (and last) batch of study materials he prepared for the correspondence course of the short-lived "Party School" that he had set up in 1925.

On Gaetano Salvemini, Notebook 1, §25, n. 19.

§60. *Cultural topics*

1. Gramsci makes reference to Giuseppe Salvioli's book on capitalism in antiquity, *Il capitalismo antico: Storia dell'economia romana* (of which he had a copy), in Notebook 2, §99. He also discusses this book at some length in a February 10, 1930, letter to his wife, Julia Schucht. For a translation of the relevant passage from Gramsci's letter and for notes on Salvioli and his work, see Notebook 2, §99, nn. 1 and 2.

2. For notes on Corrado Barbagallo and his polemic with Giovanni Sanna, see Notebook 1, §25, nn. 17 and 18.

Gramsci also discusses Barbagallo's *L'oro e il fuoco* in Notebook 3, §112.

3. Antonio Labriola, "Da un secolo all'altro: Considerazioni retrospettive e presagi" (From one century to the other: Retrospections and foreshadowings), an unfinished work included in A. Labriola, *Saggi intorno alla concezione materialistica della storia*, ed. Luigi Dal Pane (Bologna: Cappelli, 1925), pp. 40–42 and especially pp. 45–46, where Labriola observed: "The reasons behind the decree [establishing the French revolutionary calendar] are a striking testimony to the fully conscious way in which those responsible for the great uprising severed themselves entirely from the past and set down a date of origin for the whole great revolution that to this day continues to stir the Western world."

Gramsci had a copy of this work by Labriola both prior to his arrest and later on in prison as well. He refers to it in a March 25, 1929, letter to Tatiana Schucht.

4. The polemic started with a note by Corrado Barbagallo in his review of a book on recent Italian history by Domenico Petrini, *L'ultimo cinquantennio di storia*, in *Nuova Rivista Storica* 12, no. 4 (July–September 1928): 420–26. Barbagallo's note on Benedetto Croce is on pp. 422–23. Croce responded with a letter that was published, together with Barbagallo's counter-response, under the title "Intorno all storia etico-politica" (On ethico-political history) in *Nuova Rivista Storica* 12, no. 5–6 (September–December 1928): 626–29. The polemic carried over into the next issue of the same journal; see "Intorno all storia etico-politica: Discussione seconda" (On ethico-political history: Second part of the discussion), *Nuova Rivista Storica* 13, no. 1 (January–February 1929): 130–33. It ended with a brief letter by Croce in *Nuova Rivista Storica* 13, no. 2 (March–April 1929): 221.

5. Gramsci places the work of both Guglielmo Ferrero and Corrado Barbagallo within the category of Lorianism in Notebook 1, §25.

On Guglielmo Ferrero, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 17.

6. On Luigi Einaudi, see Notebook 1, §11, n. 1.

7. Mario Borsa, *Londra* (Milan: G. Agnelli, 1929). Gramsci probably read a review of this book by Carlo Linati in *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 13 (June 30, 1929).

Mario Borsa (1870–1952), a journalist and essayist, started his career as a drama critic. For fifteen years he was the London correspondent for the Milan newspaper, *Il Secolo*. Later he worked for *Il Corriere della Sera* and served for over two decades (1918–40) as the Milan correspondent for the *London Times*. He wrote extensively on British history and culture.

8. Angelo Crespi, *La funzione storica dell'Impero britannico*, pref. by Thomas Okey (Milan: Treves, 1918). Gramsci may have read this book prior to his arrest and imprisonment.

Both Mario Borsa and Angelo Crespi contributed to a volume of essays on Britain that Gramsci owned (it is preserved among his books) but did not have with him in prison; see Giovanni Ansaldo, C. Ariaghi, Mario Borsa, Angelo Crespi, Guido De Ruggiero, C.R., and F. P. Giordani, *Che cos'è l'Inghilterra* (Turin: Piero Gobetti Editore, 1924).

9. All the information on the speech by the president of the Westminster Bank is derived from a short article signed R.A., "I discorsi annuali dei banchieri inglesi" (The annual speeches of the English bankers), in the "Informazioni economiche e finanziarie" (Economic and financial news) section of *Rivista di Politica Economica* 20, no. 3 (March 31, 1930): 293–96; see especially p. 294. Gramsci reproduces a section of R.A.'s article almost verbatim, except for one small inaccuracy: the speech to which he refers was delivered at the bank's annual general meeting of 1930 (not 1929).

§61. *Philosophy-ideology, science-doctrine*

1. Gramsci's source of information on Gaëtan Pirou's *Doctrines sociales et science économique* (Paris: Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1929), as he himself points out later in this note, is an article by Alfonso De Pietri-Tonelli in the "Rassegna delle pubblicazioni economiche" (Review of publications on economics) section of *Rivista di Politica Economica* 20, no. 3 (March 31, 1930): 328.

On Alfonso De Pietri-Tonelli, see Notebook 1, §146, n. 1.

§62. *Military and political craft*

1. The three quotations are taken from an article by Giovanni Carano-Donvito, "La scienze della militare economia del marchese Palmieri" (The military economic science of the marquis Palmieri), in *Rivista di Politica Economica* 20, no. 3 (March 31, 1930): 237, 238, and 239n. Carano-Donvito's article discusses and paraphrases the military-economic ideas expounded in book 5 of volume 2 of *Riflessioni critiche sull'arte della guerra* (Critical reflections on the art of war) by Giuseppe Palmieri.

Giuseppe Palmieri (1721–94), an economist, was made the general director of finance of the Kingdom of Naples by the Bourbon monarch Ferdinand I.

Pietro Colletta (1775–1831), to whom the last of the three quoted maxims is attributed, started his military career in the Bourbon army but subsequently fell out of favor with the monarchy and spent the last eight years of his life in Florence, where he devoted his time to the writing of memoirs and historical studies.

§63. *The Sorel-Croce correspondence*

1. Guglielmo Oberdan (1858–82), born in Trieste, which was under Austrian rule at the time, left his birthplace in 1878 to escape military service and moved to Rome where he joined the "irredentist" movement—i.e. the Italia Irredenta Association founded in 1877 and dedicated to freeing the "unredeemed lands" (primarily Trent and Trieste) from Austrian rule and incorporation into Italy. In mid-September 1882, Oberdan was on his way to Trieste—with a plot to assassinate the emperor Franz Josef during a scheduled visit to the area later that month—when he was arrested by the Austrian police and charged with attempted regicide. He was tried, convicted, and sentenced to death by hanging. His execution on December 20, 1882, provided the irredentist movement with a martyr and a wave of popular support.

Gramsci is referring to a letter from Georges Sorel to Benedetto Croce dated December 25, 1914, which was published in *La Critica* 27, no. 2 (March 20, 1929): 115–16. In his letter, Sorel does not mention Guglielmo Oberdan by name, but the reference to him is quite obvious: "Les démonstrations que l'on fait en Italie en l'honneur d'un régicide qui parait avoir été assez simple d'esprit, me plongent dans l'étonnement; est-ce que l'Italie va revenir aux légendes des bons brigands, des héroïques assassins et des personnages de romans? Un pareil dénouement à une longue période de relèvement intellectuel porte à désespérer de l'esprit humain." Croce's comments on this passage in a note that appears on the same pages as Sorel's letter:

> Sorel failed to appreciate fully the spirit of sacrifice that induced Oberdan to act as he did: he was not driven by hatred and savagery but by the need to offer himself as a martyr to the irredentist cause. The new Italy had been quite severe with regicides; in Naples they always resisted proposals to commemorate or to name a street for Agesilao Milano, in spite of the fact that he was the most dramatic and, one might say, the most chivalrous of regicides, for, in the course of a military parade and in the midst of thousands of soldiers in formation, he broke ranks and attacked Ferdinand II, who was surrounded by his officers, with his bayonet, knowing that he was condemning himself to certain death.

Croce had also commented on the significance of Guglielmo Oberdan's action in an earlier work (which Gramsci owned and read in prison), namely his *Storia d'Italia dal 1871 al 1915* (Bari: Laterza, 1928), which has been translated into English as *A History of Italy: 1871–1915* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963). The marked difference between Croce's views

and Sorel's on this matter can be seen from the following passage in *A History of Italy*:

> The myth of *Italia irredenta* embodied, in the spasmodic and despairing form which the times had imposed, the principle of the independence and freedom of nations, which inspired the Italian Risorgimento and which revolted and protested against the hated "Bismarckism" and the sordid and grasping policy dominant in Europe. The protest became violent when it was seen at the Congress of Berlin how all the European powers seized territories to their military and commercial advantage and Italy alone remained with empty hands, Italy who coveted nothing save that which was her right as a nation, who did not desire to rob, but only to continue her work of introducing into the world a little more justice. This was certainly not practical politics, but the speech of unarmed prophets is never practical politics. A nation, however, has need of both practical and unpractical politicians; and if the first are deemed wise and the last foolish, it has need of both wise men and fools; and woe to the nation that has only wise politicians, for it usually belongs to the foolish to plant and cultivate the seeds of future policy. When Irredentism gained its martyr, when in 1882 the young Oberdan thought to perform an act of heroism, and to make of his sacrifice an unforgettable barrier between Italy and Austria, he created in Italy a frame of mind which, all alliances notwithstanding, did in fact make it impossible for Italy, save in the most exceptional and desperate circumstances, to enter the field at the side of the Austrians. Thus was preserved the spark of an ideal which, although statesmen of the Right and the Left might hold as an article of faith the necessity for Italy of the existence of an Austro-Hungarian Empire, led ultimately to the break-up of that Empire. (pp. 119–20)

2. An account of Arturo Stanghellini's attack against the publication of Sorel's letters to Croce appeared in the "Rassegna della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 12 (June 23, 1929), where the following passage attributed to Stanghellini is quoted: "That a Frenchman should talk of Italians and of Italy with condescension and irony is neither a novelty nor a rarity. But that an Italian of Croce's stature should allow such letters to be written to him and at such times and that he should now publish them without a comment or a note showing the divergence between his views and those of the French sociologist—this reveals a servile compliance, and it leads one to believe that he not only subscribes to those views but even provoked them. It is bad enough that he received those letters; the fact that he has published them is worse."

§64. *"History and Antihistory"*

1. There is no evidence that Gramsci had a copy of Goethe's novel *Wilhelm Meister* during his time in prison. This quotation is, in all likelihood, extracted from a secondary source (which, however, has not been traced). Gramsci did translate parts of other works by Goethe from German into Italian; they are all in Notebook C, a notebook devoted entirely to translation exercises.

The quotation here is not a literal translation of the Italian version transcribed by Gramsci but is taken from Thomas Carlyle's 1824 translation: *Wilhelm Meister* (London: Everyman, 1912).

§65. *Past and present*

1. All efforts to find a copy of the article by Salvatore Di Giacomo mentioned here by Gramsci have been unsuccessful.

Salvatore Di Giacomo (1860–1934) was a prolific Neapolitan writer who published many articles, poems, and short stories in major newspapers and periodicals. He produced a substantial body of poetry and drama in dialect, which he also used extensively in his narrative works. Di Giacomo's fiction, with its rich local color and its portrayal of characters from the lower walks of life, has many of the characteristics associated with the *verismo* literary movement (of which Giovanni Verga was the most renowned exponent), which Gramsci describes, in Notebook 23, §56, as "Italian naturalism or provincial realism."

2. This anecdote is also mentioned in Notebook 2, §10. On Ruggero Bonghi, see Notebook 2, §8, n. 1.

§66. *The military element in politics*

1. See Notebook 1, §43.

2. Petar Zivkovic (1879–1947) first achieved prominence in the military; King Alexander I of Yugoslavia appointed him commander of the Palace Guards in 1921. He was made prime minister in 1929 and remained in office until 1932. With the support (and at the instigation) of the monarch he installed a dictatorial system, eliminating political parties and persecuting opponents of his regime. Zivkovic justified his actions as necessary measures to combat the threat of communism.

Aleksandr Zankov played a major role in the coup d'état of June 1923 in Bulgaria that toppled the government of Aleksandr Stamboliyski. (Stamboliyski himself, who had led the revolutionary Peasant Party to power in 1919, was assassinated.) Following the coup, Zankov became prime minister; his government, which was effectively controlled by the military, the agrarian landowners, and the monarchy, immediately set out to

repress all dissident movements, but it was especially harsh in its persecution of communists. Zankov's premiership ended in 1926, but he continued to be active in politics for several more years. His followers were among the organizers of a fascist movement in Bulgaria in the mid-1930s.

§67. *The relative greatness of powerful nations*

1. On this issue, Gramsci raises an interesting question in the opening paragraph of Notebook 9, §132.

§68. *Il libro di don Chisciotte* by E. Scarfoglio

1. Edoardo Scarfoglio's *Il libro di don Chisciotte* (The book of Don Quixote) was first published in 1885. Gramsci owned the revised and amplified edition of it published by Mondadori of Milan in 1925; it is among the "Books Delivered to Tatiana on 15 June 1930" listed on p. 162 of the manuscript of Notebook 2 (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:528).

Edoardo Scarfoglio (1860–1917) distinguished himself early as a literary critic. He was a member of the inner circle of aesthetes and litterateurs associated with the short-lived but tremendously successful journal *Cronaca Bizantina*. The *bizantini*, as they were known, regarded themselves as a vanguard; great admirers of Giosuè Carducci, they shunned the dominant literary conventions and expressed a special disdain for romanticism. In Scarfoglio's critical essays, the best of which were collected in *Il libro di don Chisciotte* (1884), the influence of Carducci is quite evident. (Gramsci alludes to Scarfoglio's friendship with Carducci in Notebook 1, §44.) His most effective pieces deal with new literary currents and innovative contemporary writers like Verga and Capuana. While still in his twenties Scarfoglio shifted his interest to political journalism. Together with his wife, the novelist Matilde Serao, he founded the *Corriere di Napoli* in 1888. Differences with their financial backer forced Scarfoglio and Serao to abandon *Il Corriere*, but in 1892 they launched a new paper, *Il Mattino*, which quickly became one of Italy's most influential and conservative dailies. (The political views that Edoardo Scarfoglio and later his sons promoted through *Il Mattino* are discussed by Gramsci in Notebook 1, §44).

2. Alfredo Oriani (1852–1909) studied law but quickly forsook a career in jurisprudence and spent almost his entire life secluded in his rural villa in Romagna, where he devoted all his energies to writing. His many novels are animated by a romantic sense of malaise and frustration that often expresses itself in sentimental forms of anguished, violent revolt. In his political and historical writings, Oriani inveighed against Italy's weakness, corruption, lack of idealism, and the country's consequent failure to

fulfill her destiny. The national ideal and revolutionary warfaring spirit that inspired the Risorgimento, he believed, had been betrayed by the political pragmatism and cultural positivism of postunification Italy. His best known political-historical work, *La lotta politica in Italia: Origini della lotta attuale* (The political struggle in Italy: The origins of the current struggle), first published in 1892, comprises an idiosyncratic panoramic view of Italian history (starting from as far back as the fifth century) coupled with an identification of the different currents of thought—or, in Oriani's pseudo-Hegelian vocabulary, "idea-forces"—and tendencies that made Italy alternately strong and weak. Through this work Oriani enjoined Italy to resume its civilizing mission by revitalizing its national spirit and embarking on an imperial mission to colonize Africa. In his own time, however, Oriani remained a marginal figure and had little or no impact on the political scene. His fortunes were revived posthumously when the Nationalists and the Fascists claimed him as a precursor; Mussolini himself edited Oriani's *Opera omnia*, 30 vols. (Bologna: Cappelli, 1923–33).

Gramsci comments on *La lotta politica in Italia* in Notebook 9, §106, and the corresponding C text, Notebook 19, §5. On Oriani, see also Notebook 6, §68, and Notebook 8, §165.

3. Scarfoglio, *Il libro di don Chisciotte*, p. 231.

4. Quoted in ibid., p. 228. (Alfredo Oriani's *Quartetto* was first published in 1883 by Galli of Milan.)

§69. *On political parties*

1. For an extensive discussion of charisma and political leadership, see Notebook 2, §75.

§70. *Sorel, the Jacobins, violence*

1. The letter to which Gramsci alludes was later reproduced as the introduction to Georges Sorel, *Réflexions sur la violence* (1908). For an English translation, see "Introduction: Letter to Daniel Halevy," in Georges Sorel, *Reflections on Violence*, trans. T. E. Hulme and J. Roth (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950), pp. 31–73. Most of the contents of Sorel's *Réflexions* appeared for the first time as a series of essays published from January to June 1906 in *Mouvement Socialiste*.

§73. *Lorianism*

1. Corso Bovio had been a socialist parliamentary deputy and an editor of *Avanti!* In July 1925 he published an article in the Fascist periodical

Roma. L'Unità immediately drew attention to this in its July 29, 1925, issue, with an unsigned editorial article entitled "Corso Bovio filofascista" (Corso Bovio, Fascist sympathizer). Bovio was expelled from the Italian Socialist Party (PSI) on September 12, 1925. An unsigned editorial comment (perhaps written by Gramsci himself) on Bovio's expulsion appeared in *L'Unità* of September 13, 1925:

> *Avanti!* and the maximalist [i.e., the PSI, as opposed to the reformist socialists of the Partito Socialista Unitario] leadership have tossed the deputy Corso Bovio into the ocean. In truth, *Avanti!* has taken a rather long time to throw this strange type of invertebrate amphibian back into the ocean, which is why one can say that, in effect, it was the "little Corso" who tossed *Avanti!* into the ocean. The story of this maximalist honorable deputy is of great interest to the working masses. In brief: at the beginning of the war he was an absolute neutralist. He then had scruples and crossed over to Turati's camp. After that he left the [Socialist] Party and became an interventionist. Once the war was over he ran for election on the Democrats' list. . . . Afterward he became a proelections communist, and as such he was among the candidates elected from the joint lists of the left, and for a while he supported the extreme left wing of the PSI, following the Livorno Congress. When it came to expelling the Third Internationalists, Corso Bovio was in favor; in his speech at the Milan Congress (1923), he was one of those who defended the expulsion of the Third Internationalists on the basis of a counterrevolutionary Marxism. In order to reward him for his efforts, Nenni and his associates gave him a secure position with the maximalist newspaper, entrusting him with a regular column in which he indulged himself for quite some time writing mythic riddles and political stupidities that were awkward to deal with. Every article of his was a calculated blow against the politics of class; he was an insult to the working class. But the people at *Avanti!* liked him because he was a member of the clique that had kicked out the Third Internationalists: those guilty of being upright and consistent. Now this little clown has abandoned *Avanti!* and gone over to the Fascists. The maximalists pretend that they have kicked him out. The truth is that they are the ones who cultivated him, and his petty meanness is the outcome of their own greater vileness.

Gramsci referred to "the Bovio case" in his article "Nenni e l'indulgenza della direzione massimalista" (Nenni and the indulgence of the maximalist leadership), *L'Unità*, June 30, 1926.

A copy of Corso Bovio's *Giovanni Bovio nella vita intima: Con lettere e documenti inediti* (Milan: Società Editrice Avanti, n.d.) is preserved

among the books once owned by Gramsci, but there is no evidence that he had it while in prison.

§74. *G. B. Angioletti*

1. The documents mentioned here by Gramsci were published without a title in *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 20 (May 18, 1930): 2. A brief prefatory note explains that "on 30 April 1930, the newspaper *La Quarta Roma* published an article by its editor-in-chief, Mr. Guglielmo Danzi, which attacked one of our editors-in-chief, G. B. Angioletti, with outrageous insults and calumnies." The note is followed by a reproduction of documents meant to rebut Danzi's accusations. Among other things, the documents set out to prove that Angioletti was never hostile to Fascism.

On Giovanni Battista Angioletti, the coeditor of *L'Italia Letteraria*, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1.

2. Adone Nosari (1875–1957), an editor of the *Giornale d'Italia*, was also the author of several novels, short stories, and a study of literary life in Rome.

On Giuseppe Ungaretti, a contributor to *L'Italia Letteraria* and a friend of Angioletti's, see Notebook 3, §7, n. 2.

3. The note Angioletti consigned to his backers and published in *L'Italia Letteraria* states, among other things: "Participation, in 1919, with the students of the Milan Polytechnic in the first action against the communists (15 April)."

On April 15, 1919, during a general strike in Milan, groups of Fascists and other right-wing squads set fire to the offices of the socialist newspaper *Avanti!* It was only one of the first of many similar violent attacks on socialist clubs, offices, and so on.

4. In 1923 Mussolini honored Bernardo Barbiellini by naming him "ras" (i.e., chief) of the Fascists in Piacenza. The title (derived from the term for Ethiopian chieftains) was conferred on individuals who played leading roles in the organization and command of Fascist paramilitary squads in the provinces: i.e., the armed squads who often engaged in violent actions in their campaigns of intimidation against socialists and leftist sympathizers.

§75. *Past and present*

1. The term "totalitarian" here and elsewhere in Gramsci means "unified" and "all-embracing."

2. Piero Gobetti had touched on the question of religion with reference to the Russian revolution in some essays he wrote in the early 1920s. Mario Missiroli had put forward the thesis that the weaknesses of

Italy as a nation were attributable to the fact that the country had never gone through a Protestant reformation. Gramsci discusses these issues at some length in Notebook 14, §26, where, among other things, he characterizes Missiroli's thesis as a mechanical application to Italy of ideas derived from Renan and Sorel, whose views pertained specifically to French culture.

On Piero Gobetti, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 29; and on Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

§76. *Vittorio Macchioro and America*

1. There is no evidence that Gramsci ever had direct access to Vittorio Macchioro's book on the religion of the Romans, *Roma capta: Saggio intorno alla religione romana* (Messina: Casa Editrice G. Principato, 1928); in all likelihood, he had gathered some information about it from a secondary source, which, however, has not been traced.

2. The passage from Vittorio Macchioro's article in *Il Mattino* was reproduced under the title "America" in the "Rassegna della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 11 (March 16, 1930).

§77. *Types of periodicals*

1. On this issue, see also, inter alia, Notebook 4, §71.

Canto 10 of the Inferno

1. Gramsci's interest in and careful reading of Dante's *Divine Comedy* date back to his student days. In the very first letter he wrote after his arrest—the letter was withheld by the prison authorities—he asked his landlady to send him a German grammar book and a linguistics handbook from among the books he had in his room and then added a request: "I would be most grateful if you would send me an inexpensive copy of the *Divine Comedy* because I have loaned my copy." From the moment he obtained permission to write in his prison cell, Gramsci planned to articulate his views on "Cavalcante Cavalcanti: his position in the structure and art of the *Divine Comedy*" (see the fifth item in the list of "Main Topics" on the first page of Notebook 1). He communicated his interest in this topic to Tatiana Schucht for the first time in his letter of August 26, 1929:

> I've made a little discovery about this canto by Dante [i.e., canto 10 of the *Inferno*] that I believe is interesting and that would in part correct B. Croce's thesis on the *Divine Comedy*, which is too absolute. I won't describe the argument here because it would take too much

> space. . . . Then [i.e., after reading the most recent scholarship on the subject] I'll write my "Dante comment," and quite possibly I'll send it to you with the author's compliments, indited in very beautiful calligraphy. I say this just for fun, for in order to write a comment of this kind, I would have to review a certain amount of material . . . that can be found only in the largest libraries. . . . I will however write some notes and perhaps sketch the preparatory draft for a future comment.

A year later Gramsci reiterated his intention to write on Dante in a September 7, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht: "In one of my future letters I will summarize the contents of an essay on canto 10 of Dante's *Inferno*, so that you may forward this outline to Professor Cosmo, who, as an expert in Dante studies, will be able to tell me whether I have made a false discovery or whether it is really worth being transformed into a contribution, a trifle to be added to the millions upon millions of similar notes that have already been written." About two weeks later, in his letter of September 20, 1931, Gramsci was ready to provide Tatiana Schucht with a rather detailed account of his "little discovery": "I will write to you briefly on personal matters, because today I want to try to draft the outline on canto 10 to be forwarded so as to get some advice from my old university professor [i.e., Umberto Cosmo]; if I don't do it today I will never do it." Except for the opening paragraph and the concluding remarks, which are devoted to personal and family matters, the whole letter consists of a relatively detailed exposition of his original interpretation of the tenth canto of the *Inferno*. At the end of his exposition, Gramsci reiterates his wish to have Umberto Cosmo review his ideas: "Professor Cosmo might be able to tell me whether what we have here is a new discovery of the umbrella or whether my outline contains an idea that I might develop in a short comment, just to pass the time." Tatiana Schucht transcribed the relevant section of the letter for Piero Sraffa, who sent it on to Umberto Cosmo. Cosmo responded with a December 29, 1931, letter to Sraffa, who transmitted its contents to Tatiana Schucht; she in turn transcribed it in a March 9, 1932, letter to Gramsci. Gramsci reproduces a substantial segment of Cosmo's letter in Notebook 4, §86.

For a careful critical study of Gramsci's analysis of the tenth canto of the *Inferno* that also supplies the pertinent background and context for this cluster of notes, see Frank Rosengarten, "Gramsci's 'little discovery': Gramsci's Interpretation of Canto X of Dante's Inferno," *boundary 2* 14, no. 3 (spring 1986): 71–90. Rosengarten also provides the following useful synopsis of canto 10:

> The scene is the sixth circle, the first of four that comprise the city of Dis in lower Hell. In this circle are punished the founders and fol-

lowers of all heretical beliefs, but the heretics who occupy the center of Dante's attention are the Epicureans, those "who make the soul die with the body." They, like all other heretics, are buried in uncovered fiery tombs. As Dante passes by with his guide Virgil, one of the damned, Farinata degli Uberti, a leader of the Tuscan Ghibellines, calls out to him. The majesty of his bearing is impressive, his defiance of hell awesome in its perverse integrity. After recognizing each other as members of opposed factions, Farinata and Dante begin to discuss politics, but are interrupted by another shade who rises from the same tomb. It is Cavalcante de' Cavalcanti, father of Guido, Dante's friend and fellow poet. [Cavalcanti is also related to Farinata by marriage, since his son, Guido, is married to Farinata's daughter.] Cavalcante inquires about his son, asking why, if poetic genius accounts for Dante's great journey, his son is not with him. Cavalcante mistakenly infers from Dante's reply that Guido is dead, and falls back in despair into the flames. Farinata then resumes the speech he had begun before Cavalcante's appearance, and prophesies Dante's banishment from Florence. In answer to a question from Dante, he explains how it is that the damned can foresee the future but have no knowledge of the present. He also names others who share his fate in hell. Dante takes his leave with a sense of respect for his proud enemy, pausing only long enough to ask Farinata to tell Cavalcante that his son is still alive. (p. 75)

§78. The question of "structure and poetry" in the *Divine Comedy* . . .

1. Gramsci's summary of his project in his September 20, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht (which he intended for his old professor, Umberto Cosmo, to read) helps explain why he regarded his interpretation of canto 10 of the *Inferno* primarily as a contribution to the understanding of the relationship between "structure and poetry" in the *Divine Comedy*, a relationship that, in his view, Benedetto Croce and other commentators had misunderstood. Familiarity with this letter is indispensable for grasping the main thrust of Gramsci's argument, which is expounded in a somewhat disjointed or fragmentary way in the cluster of notes he composed under the rubric "Canto 10 of the *Inferno*":

I will now try to summarize the famous project, Cavalcante and Farinata. (1) In his essay on Farinata, De Sanctis remarks on the harshness that characterizes the tenth canto of Dante's *Inferno* because Farinata, after having been depicted heroically in the first

part of the episode, in the final part becomes a pedagogue; that is, to use Crocean terms, Farinata after having been poetry becomes structure. Traditionally, the tenth canto is Farinata's canto, hence the harshness noted by De Sanctis has always appeared plausible. I maintain that two dramas are played out in the tenth canto: Farinata's and Cavalcante's and not Farinata's drama alone. (2) It is strange that Dante hermeneutics, though so minute and Byzantine, has never noticed that among the Epicureans of the fiery tombs, Cavalcante alone is truly punished—I say punished with an immediate and personal punishment—and that Farinata closely participates in this punishment but also in this instance "as if he had great scorn of heaven." The law of retribution for Cavalcante and Farinata is this: for having wished to see into the future, they (theoretically) are deprived of the knowledge of earthly things for a certain specific period of time; that is, they live in a cone of darkness from whose center they can look both into the past and the future but only beyond a certain perimeter. When Dante approaches them, the position of Cavalcante and Farinata is this: they see Guido alive in the past, but they see him dead in the future. But is Guido dead or alive at that given moment? We can see here the difference between Cavalcante and Farinata. When the latter hears Florentine spoken, he becomes a partisan again, the Ghibbeline hero, while Cavalcante thinks only of Guido and on hearing Florentine spoken rises up to find out whether Guido is alive or dead at that moment (they can be informed by newcomers). The drama involving Cavalcante directly is extremely rapid but of inexpressible intensity. He immediately asks about Guido, hoping that he might be with Dante, but when from the poet, who is not exactly aware of the punishment, he hears the words "he had"—that is, the verb in the past tense—after a heartrending cry he "fell back supine and did not rise again." (3) In the first part of the episode, "Guido's disdain" became the focus of the studies of all the fashioners of hypotheses and contributions, just as in the second part, Farinata's prediction concerning Dante's exile absorbed all the attention. I would say that the importance of the second part lies especially in the fact that it casts light on Cavalcante's drama, providing all the essential elements for the reader to relive it. Does that mean it is a poem of the ineffable, the unexpressed? I don't think so. Dante does not pass up the opportunity to represent the drama directly, for this is precisely his way of representing it. We have here a "mode of expression," and I think that "modes of expression" can change in time just as the language itself changes. . . .

I remember that in 1912, when I was attending Professor Toesca's [1877–1962] course in art history [at the University of Turin], I saw a reproduction of the Pompeian painting in which Medea is present at

the murder of the sons she had with Jason; she stands there with her eyes blindfolded, and I think I remember Toesca saying that this was one way in which the ancients expressed themselves and that Lessing in *Laokoön* (I quote these lectures from memory) did not consider this a device typical of the powerless but rather the best means to convey the impression of a parent's infinite sorrow, which if represented materially would have become crystallized in a grimace. Even Ugolino's expression "Then fasting did more than grief had done" [*Inferno*, canto 33, line 75] belongs to this mode of expression, and people generally have understood it as a veil drawn over the father as he devours his son. . . . Indeed, the fact that Farinata's disquisition is closely linked to Cavalcante's drama is stated by Dante himself when he concludes: "Now you shall say to that fallen man, that his son is still among the living" (Farinata's daughter is also among the living, but Farinata is so deeply involved in the partisan struggle that he has not given any sign of distress over the news conveyed by that "he had," i.e., that Guido was dead; Cavalcante was the one most punished and for him that "he had" meant the end of the agony of doubt as to whether Guido at that moment was alive or dead). (4) It seems to me that this interpretation mortally wounds Croce's thesis on the poetry and structure of the *Divine Comedy*. Without structure there would be no poetry, and therefore the structure also has a poetic value.

But a further question is linked to this: what is the importance of stage directions in works for the theater? The recent innovations in performance art that give ever-greater importance to the director pose the question in ever-sharper form. The author of the play struggles with actors and director by means of the stage directions, which allow him to define his characters better; the author wants his share in the spectacle to be respected, and he wants the interpretation of the play by the actors and director (who are translators from one art to another and critics at the same time) to remain true to his vision. In *Man and Superman*, G. B. Shaw provides in an appendix a small manual written by John Tanner, the protagonist, to define the protagonist's character better and help the actor to be more faithful to his image. A theatrical work without stage directions is lyricism rather than the depiction of living people in a dramatic conflict; stage directions have in part incorporated the old monologues, etc. If in the theater the work of art is the result of the collaboration of writer and actors unified aesthetically by the director of the performance, in this creative process stage directions have an essential importance insofar as they limit the arbitrary decisions of the actors and director. The entire structure of the *Divine Comedy* is devoted to this exalted function, and if it is right to make distinctions, one must be very cautious at each particular instance.

Shaw's appendix to his *Man and Superman* (1906) is entitled "*The Revolutionist's Handbook and Pocket Companion* by John Tanner." John Tanner, the principal character in Shaw's play (translated into Italian as *Don Giovanni*), is a young revolutionist and a Don Juan figure.

2. Gramsci is referring to critical works he had access to and read, as he indicates in his September 20, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht: "I do have De Sanctis's essays and Croce's *Dante*. In the 1928 *Leonardo* I read part of Luigi Russo's study that was published in Barbi's review and that (in the part that I read) makes reference to Croce's thesis. I also have the issue of *La Critica* with Croce's reply. But I haven't seen this material for some time—that is, before I thought of the main core of this project—because it lies at the bottom of a box in the storeroom." See Benedetto Croce, *La poesia di Dante*, 3d rev. ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1922), especially the chapter "La struttura della *Commedia* e la poesia," pp. 53–71. This work is available in English: *The Poetry of Dante*, trans. D. Ainslie (New York: Henry Holt, 1922); chap. 3, "The Structure and Poetry of the *Comedy*," is on pp. 73–101. Luigi Russo's "Critica dantesca" (Dante criticism) appeared in *Leonardo* 3, no. 12 (December 20, 1927): 305–11. For Croce's response to Russo's reading of Dante, see *La Critica* 26, no. 2 (March 20, 1928): 122–25.

On Luigi Russo, see Notebook 1, §35, n. 2.

3. Gramsci discusses Vincenzo Morello's interpretation of canto 10 in a separate note; see Notebook 4, §83.

4. Fedele Romani, *Il canto X dell'Inferno* (Prato-Florence, 1906), an offprint from *Giornale Dantesco* 13, no. 1 (1906).

Fedele Romani (1855–1910), in addition to critical essays on major authors such as Dante, Petrarch, Manzoni, Homer, and Virgil, also wrote some volumes of memoirs and produced a series of introductory books on different Italian dialects, including one on Sardinian.

5. Francesco De Sanctis's essay "Il Farinata di Dante" appeared in the three-volume collection of his critical essays edited by Paolo Arcari, *Saggi critici* (Milan: Treves, 1924), 2:202–26. Gramsci had a copy of this work in prison. The essay is translated as "Farinata" in *De Sanctis on Dante*, ed. and trans. Joseph Rossi and Alfred Galpin (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), pp. 53–86.

On Francesco De Sanctis, see Notebook 1, §96, n. 3.

6. Gramsci uses the word "*didascalie*," which in addition to "stage directions" also means "explanations," "explanatory passages," or "commentaries."

7. For more on the function of stage directions in dramatic works and the relevance of that function to the question of the relation between "structure and poetry," see Notebook 4, §78, n. 1.

8. See Notebook 4, §78, n. 1, above. Gramsci also refers to this picture in an earlier letter to Tatiana Schucht, dated August 26, 1929, where he raises for the first time the possibility of writing a "Dante comment":

> In order to write a comment of this kind, I would have to review a certain amount of material (for example, the reproductions of the Pompeian paintings) that can be found only in the largest libraries. That is, I would have to collect historical elements that prove how by tradition, from classical art until the Middle Ages, painters refused to depict sorrow in its most elementary and profound forms (maternal sorrow): in the Pompeian wall paintings, Medea, while cutting the throats of the children she had with Jason, is depicted with her face covered by a veil, because the painter considers it superhuman and inhuman to give an expression to her face.

In his essay, "Gramsci's 'little discovery' ": Gramsci's Interpretation of Canto X of Dante's Inferno," *boundary 2* 14, no. 3 (spring 1986), Frank Rosengarten makes the following pertinent observations:

> Drawing on various readings and memories of lectures in art history at the University of Turin, Gramsci mentions the often cited case of the painter Timanthes who, according to Pliny, after demonstrating his ability to express human suffering in the faces of all the people who were about to witness the sacrifice of Iphigenia, chose to cover the face of Iphigenia's father, Agamemnon, with a cloak, since such elemental and unspeakable pain was better left unrevealed. Gramsci correctly cites the fresco at Pompeii, presumably derived from the original by Timanthes, that shows Agamemnon with his face covered moments before the sacrifice is consummated. But it is curious and psychologically significant perhaps that Gramsci cites another analogy with veiled suffering in painting that turns out to be incorrect: on four occasions in the text of his analysis he mentions the Pompeii fresco of Medea "whose face is veiled as she kills the children she has had with Jason." But the frescoes at Pompeii do not show Medea in the act of killing her children. In one, she is seated in a somber contemplative mood as she appears to lament her destiny as mother; in another she is standing near her children, with a rather vacant, expressionless stare. In neither of these frescoes is her face veiled. (pp. 81–82)

9. One of Farinata's daughters, Beatrice (Bice), was betrothed to Cavalcanti's son, Guido (whom she subsequently married), in 1267, three years after Farinata's death. This matrimonial arrangement was part of an attempt to heal the bitter divisions between the Ghibellines and the Guelfs.

10. Isidoro Del Lungo, *Dino Compagni e la sua Cronica*, 3 vols. (Florence: Le Monnier, 1879–87), especially 1:187–88 and 1111–15 and 2:98. See Gramsci's letter to Tatiana Schucht, February 22, 1932: "What you write to me about my outline for the Farinata canto reminds me that in fact I may have spoken of it to someone in past years. I remember now

that the first time I thought of this interpretation was while reading Isidoro Del Lungo's weighty opus on Dino Compagni's *Cronaca fiorentina* [Florentine chronicle], in which Del Lungo for the first time fixed the date of Guido Cavalcanti's death."

In addition to his scholarly edition of Dino Compagni's Florentine chronicles, Isidoro Del Lungo (1841–1927) produced a number of important studies on Dante, some of which Gramsci mentions in Notebook 4, 81. An influential scholar and literary historian, Del Lungo served as president of the Dante Society of Italy and was a highly prominent member of the prestigious Crusca Academy.

11. The entire encounter between Dante's narrative persona and Cavalcanti in canto 10 of the *Inferno* is as brief as it is poignant; it occupies only about twenty lines (52–72). *The Divine Comedy: Inferno*, trans. with commentary by Charles S. Singleton (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977), provides a reliable, close, prose translation:

> Then there arose to sight alongside of him a shade, visible to the chin: I think he had raised himself on his knees. He looked round about me as though he wished to see whether someone was with me, but when his expectation was quite spent, he said, weeping, "If you go through this blind prison by reason of high genius, where is my son, and why is he not with you?"
>
> And I to him, "I come not of myself. He who waits yonder, whom perhaps your Guido had in disdain, is leading me through here."
>
> Already his words and the manner of his punishment had read his name to me: hence was my answer so full.
>
> Suddenly straightening up, he cried, "How? Did you say 'he had'? Does he not still live? Does the sweet light not strike his eyes?" And when he perceived that I made some delay in answering, he fell supine again and showed himself no more. (1:103)

§79. *Criticism of the "unexpressed"?*

1. See Alessandro Manzoni, *I promessi sposi* (*The Betrothed*), chap. 17. The emphases are Gramsci's.

2. Gramsci made similar remarks about Manzoni in his September 20, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht: "These Dantean modes of expression have nothing in common with some of Manzoni's. When Renzo thinks of Lucia after crossing the Veneto border, Manzoni writes: 'We will not venture to describe his feelings; the reader knows the circumstances, and he can use his own imagination.' But Manzoni had already declared that in order to reproduce our revered species, there was more than enough love in the world for there to be any need to talk of it also in books. In fact, Manzoni renounced representing love for practical or ideological reasons."

3. Count Ugolino's final remark in *Inferno*, canto 33, line 75, "Poscia, più che 'l dolor, poté 'l digiuno,"—which in Charles Singleton's translation, *The Divine Comedy: Inferno* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977), is rendered as "Then fasting did more than grief had done" (1:353)—pithily conveys the tragic fate suffered by Ugolino, for whom death by grief would have been merciful as he witnessed his sons (who were imprisoned with him) starve to death; instead, he was forced to experience the horror of groping blindly in his cell over the corpses of his sons until finally lack of food killed him too. The line has sometimes been taken to suggest that hunger finally drove Ugolino to feed on the bodies of his sons. Gramsci also alludes to this line in his September 20, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht.

The story of Myrrha (or Smyrna), who deceitfully succeeded in consummating her incestuous love for her father, Cinyras, king of Cyprus, is recounted in considerable detail by Ovid in *Metamorphoses* (book 10, lines 298–513). In *Inferno*, canto 30, lines 38–39, Dante describes her as "Mirra scellerata, che divenne / al padre, fuor del dritto amore, amica"; Singleton translates this as "infamous Myrrha, who became loving of her father beyond rightful love" (p. 317).

4. Benedetto Croce, *Alessandro Manzoni: Saggi e discussioni* (Bari: Laterza, 1930), pp. 24–25. Gramsci had a copy of this book in prison.

5. Giuseppe Citanna, "*I promessi sposi* sono un'opera di poesia?" (Is *The Betrothed* a work of poetry?), *La Nuova Italia* 1, no. 6 (June 20, 1930): 225–31, especially p. 230.

§80. Pliny records that when Timanthes of Sicyon painted . . .

1. See Pliny (the Elder), *Natural History*, book 35, 73–74.

2. See Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Laokoon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 67.

3. Gramsci read the synopsis of Paolo Enrico Arias's essay, which appeared under the title "I monumenti d'Ifigenia in Aulide" (The monuments of Iphigenia at Aulis), in the "Marginalia" section of *Il Marzocco* 35, no. 28 (July 13, 1930).

4. Many of Gramsci's remarks in this note are based on his memory of the lectures on art history he heard Pietro Toesca deliver at the University of Turin in 1912; see his August 26, 1929, and September 20, 1931, letters to Tatiana Schucht, both of which are quoted above, in Notebook 4, §78, nn. 1 and 8.

§81. The date of Guido Cavalcanti's death . . .

1. On Isidoro Del Lungo's work, see Notebook 4, §78, n. 10.

In this note, Gramsci uses information extracted from an article by Pio

Rajna, "Del Lungo e la Cronica di D. Compagni" in *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 20 (May 15, 1927).

§82. *Guido's disdain*

1. Enrico Sicardi's book on the Italian language in Dante, *La lingua italiana in Dante* (Rome: Casa Editrice Optima, 1929) was reviewed by Giuseppe S. Gargàno in an article entitled "La lingua nei tempi di Dante e l'interpretazione della poesia" (The language in Dante's times and the interpretation of poetry) in *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 15 (April 14, 1929).

Giuseppe Gargàno (1859–1930), a literary critic, belonged to the group of literati that founded the journal *Il Marzocco* in 1896.

2. I.e., "whom," in "whom perhaps your Guido had in disdain" (*Inferno*, canto 10, line 63). "*Cui*" can also mean "which."

3. I.e., "with."

4. I.e., "had in disdain."

5. See *Inferno*, canto 10, line 61: "I come not of myself."

6. I.e., "coming."

7. I.e., "to come."

8. The emphasis is Gramsci's.

9. See *Inferno*, canto 10, line 59.

10. I.e., "had."

11. On the issues raised in this note, see also Gramsci's September 20, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht.

§83. Vincenzo Morello. *Dante, Farinata, Cavalcante*

1. In the passages quoted from this work the emphases and parenthetical exclamations are Gramsci's.

Gramsci owned a copy of Morello's booklet prior to his arrest. It is among the books he requested Tatiana Schucht to send to him in his letter of December 17, 1928. He reminded Tatiana Schucht of his request in his letter of August 26, 1929. Obviously, she sent it to him, and he had it beside him when he composed this note. Almost as soon as he was finished with it he bundled it with the "Books Delivered to Carlo on 13 March 1931"; the list is on pp. 163–64 of the manuscript of Notebook 2 (see Description of the Manuscript, 1:529).

On Vincenzo Morello, see Notebook 1, 116, n. 13.

2. The quotation is from Ugo Foscolo's detailed study on the *Divine Comedy*, "Discorso sul testo della Commedia di Dante" (1825), now in volume 9, part 1, of the "Edizione nazionale" of Foscolo's complete works; see U. Foscolo, *Studi su Dante*, ed. Giovanni Da Pozzo (Florence: Le Monnier, 1979), p. 424.

3. Morello quotes from Francesco De Sanctis's essay "Il Farinata di Dante" (1869), with which Gramsci was very familiar. See *De Sanctis on Dante*, ed. and trans. Joseph Rossi and Alfred Galpin (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), p. 82. "The badly learned art" echoes a comment made by the wayfaring Dante to Farinata (*Inferno*, canto 10, line 51) that alludes to the Ghibellines' inability to return from exile successfully, a comment that disturbs Farinata sufficiently to make him return to it the moment Cavalcanti leaves the scene (*Inferno*, canto 10, line 77).

4. See *Inferno*, canto 10, lines 103–5.

5. On Giovanni Rosini's *La monaca di Monza*, see Notebook 3, §78, n. 11.

6. See *Paradiso*, canto 17, line 69.

7. Gramsci comments on "Dante's political position" in the context of his times in Notebook 6, §85, and Notebook 28, §7.

§84. The "renunciations of description" in the *Divine Comedy*

1. Luigi Russo, "Per la poesia del 'Paradiso' dantesco" (Concerning the poetry of Dante's *Paradiso*), *Leonardo* 3, no. 8 (August 20, 1927): 200–202.

On Luigi Russo, see Notebook 1, §35, n. 2.

2. It appears that Russo's article was Gramsci's only source of information on the contents of Augusto Guzzo's essay.

3. See *Paradiso*, canto 14, line 103, and canto 23, line 55.

4. Russo, "Per la poesia del 'Paradiso' dantesco," p. 202.

5. Luigi Russo, "Il Dante del Vossler e l'unità poetica della Commedia" (Vossler's Dante and the poetic unity of the Divine Comedy), *Studi Danteschi* 12 (1927): 5–29.

Michele Barbi (1867–1941), a philologist and literary historian, was one of the most prominent Dante scholars of his time. In addition to writing many books on Dante and on some other major Italian authors, Barbi edited *Studi Danteschi* which he founded in 1920.

§85. One of the "Sotto la Mole" columns, entitled "Il cieco Tiresia" . . .

1. Gramsci is referring to an article of his, "Il cieco Tiresia" (The blind Tiresias), in the column "Sotto la Mole" of the Piedmont edition of *Avanti!*, April 18, 1918:

> *La Stampa* reports the story of a poor blind boy from Ostria, in Marche, who has prophesied that the war will end before 1918 is over. The little prophet was not blind prior to the prophecy; his blindness, however, was indissolubly linked with his newly acquired ability. He

went blind immediately after he had cheered people with the happy news that they would soon be freed from the bloody nightmare.

Ostria is in Marche (near Sinigallia, *La Stampa* points out); the Cottolengo Institute [for the sick and the derelict] is in Turin. Two weeks ago it was announced that at the charitable institution of Cottolengo, a girl endowed with the spirit of prophecy started foreseeing a whole series of minor events. Suddenly she stated that she knew when the war would end but refused to reveal the date because she was convinced that she would go blind. Like the boy from Ostria (the report goes on) she was examined by specialists, who declared her eyes immune from anything that could lead to blindness. She was induced to talk; she made her prophecy and immediately lost her eyesight. Turin-Ostria; just as in 1916 Turin-Padua–St. Anthony and the friar in the Capuchin convent. Each year a prophecy; each year a peace. In 1918, however, the popular mind has appropriated the tradition; it has embellished it with the naive poetry that enlivens its spontaneous creations. The quality of being a prophet was reconnected with the misfortune of blindness. The Greek Tiresias was blind; the sheer clarity of his thinking was trapped in an opaque body, blocked from all impressions of actuality. It is the ineluctable price that nature exacts from its exceptions: there is a principle of the idea of justice. It is an atrocious fate, like that of Cassandra, who was not believed: she knows the events of the future, she sees them approaching, she knows who will be swept away, she cries and she speaks out, only to find skeptical, indifferent people who make no provision for the future and do not struggle against fate. Cassandra experiences a rather more particular drama; she is the creation of refined poetry that is already polished in a literary sense. Tiresias is popular; he is concrete. Misfortune assumes an external aspect in his figure; his drama is first and foremost physical and more than internal: the feeling of pity is immediate; it is aroused even without reflection and reasoning. It seems like a small thing, but in reality it is a tremendous experience that only the popular tradition could successfully feel and concretize. The tenth canto of Dante's *Inferno*—the reception it has received in criticism and on the popular level—depends on this experience. Farinata and Cavalcante are punished for having wanted to see too far into the world beyond and hence transgressing Catholic discipline: their punishment is the inability to know the present. But criticism has failed to grasp this drama. Farinata is admired for his statuesque attitude of pride, for standing tall in the midst of the horrors of hell. Cavalcante is ignored; yet he is leveled by a word—*"he had"*—which makes him think that his son is dead. He does not know the present; he sees the future, and in the future his son is dead: but in the

present? Tormenting doubt, a terrible punishment in this doubt, the highest drama that is consummated in a few words. But a *difficult* drama, complicated, that can only be understood with reflection and reasoning; a drama that is horrifyingly chilling in its rapidity and intensity, but only after critical analysis. Cavalcante does not see, but he is not blind; he does not have concrete, corporeal evidence of his misfortune. Dante is a refined poet in this case. The popular tradition wants concreteness, its poetry is simpler and more direct.

The boy from Ostria and the girl from the Casa del Cottolengo are, in fact, two cantos of popular poetry: poetry, nothing other than poetry . . .

§86. I am transcribing some passages on the topic of Cavalcanti and Farinata . . .

1. The ideas on canto 10 of the *Inferno* that Gramsci sketched in his letter to Tatiana Schucht on September 20, 1931, were sent to Umberto Cosmo for his comments by Piero Sraffa (who had received a transcription of Gramsci's letter from Tatiana Schucht). Cosmo responded to Gramsci's interpretation with a letter to Piero Sraffa on December 29, 1931. Sraffa attached a copy of Cosmo's comments to a letter to Tatiana Schucht on March 1, 1932, and Tatiana Schucht, in turn, promptly transcribed them in a letter to Gramsci on March 9, 1932. In this note Gramsci transcribes Cosmo's letter in its entirety, except for some opening and concluding epistolary niceties.

On Umberto Cosmo, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 27.

Gramsci wrote at some length about Umberto Cosmo in two of his letters to Tatiana Schucht. The letter of February 23, 1931, contains some very interesting information about the relationship between the two, which dated back to Gramsci's student years in Turin:

> Sometime ago I received *Vita di Dante* [Life of Dante], by Professor Umberto Cosmo, which Piero [Sraffa] thought might interest me. I must say that from it I've drawn less satisfaction than I had thought, for various reasons, but especially because I got the impression that Cosmo's scientific and moral personality has rather deteriorated. He must have become terribly religious in the positive sense of the word, that is, he must have undergone (certainly in a sincere and not a snobbish or careerist manner) the crisis that is taking place, it would seem, in many academic intellectuals following the creation of the University of the Sacred Heart, a crisis that would double and triple its victims if other Catholic universities were to open, with many more chairs for neoconverts from Crocean and Gentilian ide-

alism. At the first opportunity ask Piero to tell you what is going on. I still remember, during my first year at the university, a fierce discussion between Cosmo, who was substituting for Arturo Graf in the course of Italian literature, and a student from Canton Ticino, Pietro Gerosa, a fanatical Rosminian and Augustinian, concerning the judgment delivered by De Sanctis on Cesare Cantù. Gerosa was immovable in asserting that De Sanctis's negative opinion was determined by political and religious sectarianism, because Cantù was Catholic and a federalist-republican (neo-Guelf), while De Sanctis was Hegelian and a unification-monarchist . . . and poor Professor Cosmo tried in vain to persuade him that De Sanctis was an impartial and objective scholar. For Gerosa, who had the temper of an inquisitor, Cosmo, too, was a diabolical Hegelian, dipped in the same infernal pitch as De Sanctis, and he did not hesitate to assert this openly with ample quotations from Rosmini and St. Augustine. About a year ago I saw that Cosmo and Gerosa had worked together to compile an anthology of Latin Christian writers of the first centuries, which made me decide that Hegel had capitulated to St. Augustine, through the good offices of Dante and especially St. Francis, of whom Cosmo has always been a fervent student. In any event, when I saw Cosmo the last time, in May 1922 (he was then secretary or counselor at the Italian embassy in Berlin), he still insisted that I write a study of Machiavelli or Machiavellianism; this had been a fixed idea of his since 1917—that I had to write a study of Machiavelli—and he reminded me of it at every occasion, although Machiavelli doesn't go very well with St. Francis and St. Augustine. With all that, I preserve a memory full of affection for Cosmo, and I would even say veneration, if this word did not have a meaning that does not suit my feelings; he was and I think still is a man of great sincerity and moral righteousness with many a streak of that inborn naïveté that is typical of great learned men and scholars. I will always remember our encounter in 1922 in the majestic entrance hall of the Italian embassy in Berlin. In November 1920 I had written a very violent and cruel article against Cosmo such as one is able to write only at certain critical moments of the political struggle; I heard that he had begun to weep like a child and remained shut away at home for several days. Our personal cordial relations of teacher and former student broke off. When in 1922 the solemn doorman of the embassy deigned to telephone Cosmo in his diplomatic office that a certain Gramsci wished to be received, his ceremonial soul was thunderstruck when Cosmo descended the stairs at a run and flung himself at me, inundating me with tears and beard saying again and again: "You understand why! You understand why!" He was in

> the throes of an emotion that astounded me but made me understand how much distress I must have caused him in 1920 and what his friendship with his students meant to him. Just look how many memories have sprung from this *Vita di Dante* [Life of Dante] and the remark by Piero (who, after all, was introduced to me for the first time precisely by Professor Cosmo).

Tatiana Schucht transcribed this letter for Piero Sraffa, who wrote to Cosmo, informing him that Gramsci wished to have news of his old professor and quoting some parts of Gramsci's letter. Cosmo responded with a letter to Piero Sraffa, August 10, 1931, in which—after explaining that he had not responded more promptly because he had been sick—he reminisces briefly about his former students Gramsci and Gerosa, describes some of his recent scholarly work, and asks Sraffa to communicate his feelings of affection and admiration to Gramsci. (One of Cosmo's remarks is particularly interesting: he states that two of his favorite students, Gramsci and Gerosa, had "opposite minds," but they resembled each other in one thing, namely, that when it came to the study of literature, they both "attached greater importance to the religious, social, and political element than to the aesthetic.") Sraffa immediately sent a transcription of Cosmo's letter to Tatiana Schucht, who just as promptly copied its contents in a letter to Gramsci, dated August 13, 1931. Gramsci's reflections on reading Cosmo's letter are recorded in an August 17, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht:

> I read with great interest Professor Cosmo's letter that you have copied for me. My impression is quite complex. I would regret it very much if Professor Cosmo even remotely suspected that I entertained an opinion that might cast doubt on his rectitude, the dignity of his character, and his sense of duty. From the last pages of his *Vita di Dante* [Life of Dante] it appears that the author himself is a fervent believer in Catholicism. I had connected this impression with the fact that Cosmo, together with Gerosa, has compiled an anthology of Latin writers of the church's early centuries for a Catholic publishing house, and I had thought that Cosmo had converted. I certainly did not think that this conversion was at all "opportunistic," much less venal, as unfortunately has happened with many important intellectuals; indeed, Gerosa's fervent Catholicism, as I well remember, was tinged with Jansenism rather than Jesuitism. Yet this fact displeased me. When I was Cosmo's student, I did not agree with him on many things, of course, although at the time I had not fully defined my position, quite apart from my affection for him. But it seemed to me that both myself and Cosmo, like many other intel-

lectuals of the time (that is to say, during the first fifteen years of the century), found ourselves on a common ground that was as follows: we were participating wholly or in part in the movement of moral and intellectual reform initiated in Italy by Benedetto Croce, whose first point was this: that modern man can and must live without religion, and that means without religion revealed, positive, mythological, or whatever else you want to call it. This point seems to me even today the major contribution to world culture made by modern Italian intellectuals, and I regard it as a civic achievement that must not be lost, and so that somewhat apologetic tone displeased me and gave rise to that doubt. I would regret it now if my old professor had been hurt because of me, also because it appears from his letter that he has been seriously ill. Despite everything, I hope to be able to see him again and get caught up in one of those long discussions we used to have from time to time during the war years, strolling at night through the streets of Turin.

2. The parenthetical exclamation point and question mark are Gramsci's.

3. Full citations of Umberto Cosmo's bibliographical references follow: Luigi Russo, *Problemi di metodo* (Bari: Laterza, 1929), a book on the problems of method in criticism; Vladimiro Arangio Ruiz, "Il problema estetico della *Commedia*" (The aesthetic problem of the *Divine Comedy*), *La Critica* 20 (1922): 340–57; Mario Botti, "Per lo studio della genesi della poesia dantesca. La seconda cantica: poesia e struttura nel poema" (For a study of the genesis of Dante's poetry. The second canticle: Poetry and structure in the poem), *Annali dell'Istruzione Media* (1930): 432–73; Michele Barbi, "Nuovi problemi della critica dantesca" (New problems in Dante criticism), *Studi Danteschi* 16 (1932), especially parts 2 and 3 of the essay: "Poesia e struttura nella *Divina Commedia*" (Poetry and structure in the *Divine Comedy*), pp. 47–56, and "Per la genesi dell'ispirazione centrale della *Divina Commedia*" (On the genesis of the central inspiration of the *Divine Comedy*), pp. 56–67; Michele Barbi, "Con Dante e coi suoi interpreti" (With Dante and his interpreters), *Studi Danteschi* 15 (1931): 5–42; Michele Barbi, "Il canto di Farinata" (The Farinata canto), *Studi Danteschi* 8 (1924): 87–109.

4. Gramsci comments on Cosmo's response to his views on canto 10 of the *Inferno* in a March 21, 1932, letter to Tatiana Schucht:

I've read Professor Cosmo's remarks about the canto of Dante's *Inferno*. I thank him for his suggestions and his bibliographical indications. However, I do not believe it would be worthwhile to buy the issues of the periodicals he lists; for what purpose? If I wanted to write an essay for publication, these writings would not be sufficient

(or at least wouldn't seem sufficient to me and might give rise to an inhibited and dissatisfied state of mind); in order to write something for myself, to while away the time, there's no point in importuning such solemn monuments as Michele Barbi's *Studi Danteschi*, which, quite possibly, on being read do not offer any necessary or indirectly useful ideas. The literature on Dante is so plethoric and prolix that the only justification for writing something on the subject would, it seems to me, be that of saying something truly new, with the greatest possible precision and the fewest possible words. I feel that Professor Cosmo himself suffers somewhat from the professional disease of the Dante specialists; if his suggestions were followed to the letter, one would have to write an entire book. I'm satisfied to know that the interpretation of the canto I have outlined is relatively new and worthy of treatment; for my humanity as an incarcerated man this is enough to encourage me to distill a few pages of notes that will not a priori seem a superfluity to me.

§87. Since one should not care a hoot about the solemn task . . .

1. "Rastignac" was the pseudonym used by Vincenzo Morello. On Vincenzo Morello's small book on Dante (one half of which consists of the text of a lecture he delivered at the Casa di Dante in Rome), see Notebook 4, 83, and n. 1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§88. *Shaw and Gordon Craig*

1. See Aldo Sorani, "Gordon Craig e il teatro" (Gordon Craig and the Theater), *Il Marzocco*, 1 November 1931 (XXXVI, 44).

This note ends on the second line of p. 7v of the manuscript of Notebook 4; the rest of the page is left blank.

§90. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*

1. On Ugo Mioni, see Gramsci's comments in Notebook 3, §63; n. 17 in the corresponding Notes to the Text; and §100.

2. Unsigned review of Ugo Mioni, *Manuale di Sociologia* (Turin: Marietti, 1932), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 83 (August 20, 1932): 391–92.

On the Catholic integralists and the Jesuits, see, inter alia, Notebook 5, 1, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

3. The social weeks of France (*semaines sociales de France*) are annual institutes in which courses and workshops are conducted by experts in theology, philosophy, and the social sciences, for the purpose of developing among the Catholic laity an awareness of and an approach to problems of social justice. The founding of the "social weeks" in 1904 was inspired

primarily by the social doctrines enunciated in Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Rerum novarum*. Similar "social weeks" have also been organized in Italy and in some other countries besides France.

4. Ferdinando Cavallera, *Précis de la doctrine sociale catholique* (Paris: Editions Spes, n.d.), p. 129.

§91. *The cosmopolitan character of Italian intellectuals*

1. Arturo Pompeati, "Tre secoli di italianismo in Europa" (Three centuries of Italianism in Europe), *Il Marzocco* 37, no. 10 (March 6, 1932). Pompeati's article consists of a discussion of Antero Meozzi's book on the influence and dissemination of Italian literature in Europe from the fifteenth through the seventeenth century, *Azione e diffusione della letteratura italiana in Europa: Sec. XV–XVII* (Pisa: Vallerini, 1932), but it does not contain the bibliographical data recorded here by Gramsci; instead, Gramsci derived the details from a review of the same book by Benedetto Croce, which he mentions and quotes later in the note.

Arturo Pompeati (1880–1961), a literary critic who wrote monographs on Dante and Ariosto as well as essays on the relation of some modern writers to music, is best known for his authorship of a multivolume history of Italian literature.

2. The three chapters into which Meozzi's book is divided deal respectively with Italian writers abroad, foreign writers in Italy, and the channels of dissemination of what he calls "Italianism."

3. Benedetto Croce, review of Meozzi, *Azione e diffusione della letteratura italiana in Europa*, *La Critica* 30, no. 3 (May 20, 1932): 217–18.

§92. *Cultural topics*

1. Ezio Levi, *Castelli di Spagna* (Milan: Treves, 1931).

Ezio Levi (1884–1941) wrote several books on Italian and Spanish poetry from the early Middle Ages through the Renaissance. In his writings he also dealt with the influence of the Arabic tradition on Spanish culture. Gramsci makes other references to Ezio Levi's work in Notebook 5, §42 and §123.

2. Angel Gonzalez Palencia's work on the legacy of Islam was reviewed by Ezio Levi in an article entitled "La luce della mezzaluna" (The light of the crescent) in *Il Marzocco* 37, no. 22 (May 29, 1932).

§93. *Intellectuals. Brief notes on English culture*

1. Guido Ferrando, "Libri nuovi e nuove tendenze nella cultura inglese" (New books and new currents in English culture), *Il Marzocco* 37, no. 16 (April 17, 1932).

For another note on English culture that is based on a different article by Guido Ferrando, see Notebook 9, §87.

§94. *Concordat*

1. The bibliographical information on Raffaele Jacuzio's commentary on the new laws that were enacted in Italy in conjunction with the concordat is extracted from an unsigned review in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 83 (September 3, 1932): 492–93. The quotation, too, is from this source.

On the concordat, see Notebook 4, §53, n. 1.

On Catholic Action, see Notebook 1, "Notes and Jottings," n. 2, 1:373.

On Alfredo Rocco, see Notebook 2, §25, n. 1.

§95. *History of the subaltern classes*

1. Gramsci's source of information on Pietro Ellero's book on social issues was an unsigned article, "Il pensiero sociale di S. Agostino: La funzione disciplinatrice del cristianesimo" (The social thought of St. Augustine: The disciplinary function of Christianity), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 83 (September 3, 1932): 434–47. Gramsci's attention may have been attracted by the following passage in the article: "In his book on *La quistione sociale* [The social question]—which has fallen into oblivion—Pietro Ellero asserts that the Gospel was animated by the antipolitical principle that formed those kinds of citizens who 'would never have been able to become magistrates, or soldiers, or courtiers, or subject, or rebels' " (p. 435).

NOTEBOOK 5 (1930–32)

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

A ruled school notebook (14.7×19.8 cm) with hard black covers and a yellow spine. A label on the front cover carries the imprint of the stationer: "Gius. Laterza e figli, Bari." Inside the blank space of the label, Gramsci's prison number (7047) is written in black pencil. After Gramsci's death, Tatiana Schucht glued another label on the upper right-hand corner of the front cover, and on it she wrote: "Completo—da pg. 1 a 152. IX" (Complete—from p. 1 to 152. IX). The Roman numerals indicate the number that Tatiana Schucht assigned to the notebook according to the cataloging system she had devised when organizing Gramsci's papers soon after his death. This notebook has the same external characteristics as Notebook 3.

The notebook consists of seventy-six leaves with twenty-one lines on each side and unlined endpapers in front and back. The recto side of the front endpaper is stamped with the prison seal and with the seal of the prison warden. A signature directly underneath the latter is indecipherable; it probably belongs to one of the warden's substitutes. The recto sides of the leaves are numbered (1–76) in blue ink and stamped with the prison seal: "Casa penale speciale di Turi" (Special prison of Turi). The recto side of the endpaper inside the back cover is also numbered (77) but not stamped with the prison seal; it is otherwise blank. Gramsci wrote on both sides of the lined leaves and filled them entirely with his notes; this notebook thus contains 152 manuscript pages. In all, the notebook comprises 161 notes or sections. Of these, 16 notes are crossed out, but they

remain perfectly legible (following Valentino Gerratana's denomination, these are called A texts), and all of them were incorporated by Gramsci in other notebooks. The other 145 notes are B texts: they are neither crossed out nor used again in other notebooks.

Most of the entries on miscellaneous topics in this notebook are the product of Gramsci's systematic review of periodicals he had received earlier in prison. A substantial number of notes refer to the 1928–29 issues of *La Civiltà Cattolica* and the 1929 issues of *Nuova Antologia*. The context of the composition of this notebook (and others from the same period) is provided by Gramsci himself in a letter to Tatiana Schucht, dated November 17, 1930: "For the time being you must not send me any books. Put the ones you have aside, and wait for me to tell you to ship them. I first want to get rid of all the old periodicals that have accumulated over four years: before sending them away I go through them again and take notes on the subjects that interest me most, and naturally this takes up a good part of my day, because the scholarly notes are accompanied by references, comments, etc."

Toward the end of §14 (on p. 9v of the manuscript), Gramsci writes: "To this day (October 1930), Father Rosa has not . . ." In all likelihood, then, Gramsci started this notebook sometime in very late September or in October 1930. The last few pages of the notebook were probably written during the last few months of 1931 and the beginning of 1932. In §146 (p. 72r of the manuscript) Gramsci makes an indirect reference to an article that appeared in the *Nuova Antologia* of August 16, 1931. The penultimate note, §160 (pp. 76r–76v in the manuscript), is based on a reading of a book by G. Toffanin, *Che cosa fu l'umanesimo*, which Gramsci asked Tatiana Schucht to send to him in a letter of November 23, 1931.

In *L'officina gramsciana: Ipotesi sulla struttura dei "Quaderni del carcere"* (Naples: Bibliopolis, 1984), p. 141, Gianni Francioni offers the following chronology of the composition of Notebook 5:

§§ 1–14: October 1930
15–96: between October and November 1930
97: November 1930
98–135: between November and December 1930
136–45: December 1930
146–59: December 1930 (or between August 1931 and the beginning of 1932?)
160–61: early in 1932

NOTES TO THE TEXT

§1. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*

1. Catholic integralism had its roots in the early eighteenth century. It arose as a reaction against the Enlightenment and the growth of rationalism and developed into an implacable enemy of liberal politics and secular thought. The integralists found their initial inspiration in the early writings of Hughes-Félicité-Robert de Lamennais, which advocated a revival of Catholicism based on an uncompromising affirmation of the supreme authority of the papacy and a subordination of social and political life to Catholic doctrinal principles. (Lamennais subsequently modified his views drastically and broke with the church. On Lamennais, whose ideas had a strong influence on Italian religious and political thinkers, see Notebook 1, §71, n. 1.) In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Catholic integralism gained considerable momentum as many elements of the church conducted an intransigent struggle against all forms of religious reform, liberalism, and secularism (which were often lumped together indiscriminately under the label of modernism). An especially important point of reference for the integralists was Pius IX, who formally condemned liberalism and the "errors" of modern thought in his encyclical *Quanta cura* (1864) and the *Syllabus*.

2. Pius X's papacy lasted a little over a decade (1903–14) and was characterized by an unqualified hostility toward all currents of modernization both within and outside the Catholic Church. Pius X sought to stamp out modernism, prohibited Catholics from forming social movements or popular action groups and thus participating in political life, and did everything he could to block the separation of church and state.

3. Umberto Benigni (1862–1934), a priest who attained the rank of monsignor, started his engagement in journalism early in his career. In 1891, having already spent some years editing a regional Catholic newspaper, he founded a periodical devoted to social issues, *La Rassegna Sociale*, which ceased publication in 1903. He taught church history at ecclesiastical institutions and for a time edited *Miscellanea di Storia Ecclesiastica*, which was open to some of the progressive ideas he would later denounce. His interest in politics and his conservative views were already evident in a book he published in 1897, *Die Getreidepolitik der Päpiste*, a defense of the Vatican's opposition to agrarian reform. From 1900 to 1904 he was editor in chief of *Voce della Verità*, a journal through which he gave full expression to his fierce and unyielding opposition to liberal political currents and modernism in general. He also wrote several volumes of church history and helped launch other conservative publica-

tions, including two influential newsletters, *La Corrispondenza* in 1909 and *Agence Internationale de Rome* in 1912. Benigni held official positions in a number of different Vatican commissions and secretariats, and eventually he was attached to the Vatican's press office. These positions enabled him to assume a prominent role in the battle against modernism during the pontificates of Leo XIII and Pius X and to lend his support to French monarchists and nationalists associated with Charles Maurras's *Action Française*.

Umberto Benigni founded the Sodalitium Pianum, or Sodality of St. Pius V (also known as "Sapinière," from the initials *S* and *P*) in 1909. The sodality was a shady organization controlled by die-hard integralists whose secret activities were aimed at undermining the authority of anyone—including reputable scholars, theologians, and high-ranking ecclesiastics—whom they deemed insufficiently committed to the all-out war against modernism and to the defense of the strictest Catholic orthodoxy. During World War I, the German occupying forces in Ghent, Belgium, discovered a cache of documents that revealed the underhanded and conspiratorial methods employed by the integralists of the sodality against their enemies. The documents were transmitted to the Vatican authorities in 1921, and that same year the sodality was officially suppressed by the Holy See. Many adherents of the sodality continued to militate for the conservative cause within the ranks of the *Action Française* movement. Gramsci alludes to some of the nefarious activities of the Sodalitium Pianum in Notebook 5, §14.

In the later (C text) version of this note—i.e., Notebook 20, §4—Gramsci specifies that the Sodalitium Pianum was named after Pius V. His source of information on this detail was a book he had in prison, as he cites explicitly in Notebook 5, §14: Nicolas Fontaine, *Saint-Siège, "Action Française" et "Catholiques intégraux": Histoire critique, suivie, entre autres documents, d'un memoire sur le "Sodalitium Pianum" et de la "Lettre du Gouverneur Smith"* (Paris: Librairie Universitaire J. Gamber, 1928), p. 140.

4. Umberto Benigni, *Storia sociale della Chiesa* (Milan: Vallardi, 1906–30). A fifth volume of the same work was brought out by the same publisher in 1933.

5. The periodical *Sillon* was the organ of a progressive Catholic social movement known by the same name. It was founded in Paris in 1894 by the leading French Christian Democrat, Marc Sangnier. Pius X condemned the Sillon movement in 1910 because of its modernist heretical tendencies. (See also Gramsci's passing reference to Marc Sangnier and Sillon in Notebook 2, §73.)

6. Enrico Rosa, "Risposta ad 'Una polemica senza onestà e senza legge'" (Reply to "A dishonest and unfounded polemic"), *La Civiltà*

Cattolica 79 (July 21, 1928): 158–67. As its title indicates, this article by the Jesuit father Rosa is a rebuttal of the attack published against him by Ernesto Buonaiuti under the heading "Una polemica senza onestà e senza legge: Lettera aperta al P. Enrico Rosa S.J." (A dishonest and unfounded polemic: An open letter to Father Rosa S.J.) in *Ricerche Religiose* 4 (1928): 329ff. Rosa's article is the direct source of the information recorded by Gramsci in the rest of this note.

7. Umberto Benigni's polemical pamphlet *Di fronte alla calunnia* (Faced with slander) was published in Rome in 1928.

8. For additional remarks on the conservative Catholic weekly *Fede e Ragione*, published in Florence, see Notebook 7, §107.

9. Ernesto Buonaiuti (1881–1956), a priest and an expert in the history of Christianity, was one of the most prominent and active modernist intellectuals in Italy. He was excommunicated in 1926 and forced to discontinue teaching the history of religion at the University of Rome. In 1931 Buonaiuti was one of thirteen university professors who refused to take the mandatory oath of allegiance to Fascism and were compelled to resign from their academic positions. For five years (1905–10) he edited *Rivista Storico-Critica delle Scienze Teologiche*, a scholarly review he had founded that was devoted to historical and critical approaches to theology. In 1908 he published *Lettere di un prete modernista* (Letters of a modernist priest), an influential work in which he set forth his modernist views and displayed a somewhat open-minded attitude toward socialism. That same year he founded another periodical, *Nova et Vetera*, which was quickly condemned by the Catholic Church for the modernist positions it sought to advance. Buonaiuti was also a regular contributor to *Studi Religiosi*, which between 1901 and 1907, under the editorship of another priest, Salvatore Minocchi, became the primary vehicle for the dissemination in Italy of the modernist theories of the Irish Jesuit George Tyrrell (1861–1909) and the Frenchmen Maurice Blondel, Lucien Laberthonnière, and Alfred Loisy. Tyrrell translated Buonaiuti's booklet *Il programma dei modernisti* (1907) into English; see *The Programme of Modernism: A Reply to the Encyclical of Pius X, "Pascendi Dominici Gregis," with the Text of the Encyclical in English*, trans. G. Tyrrell, with an introduction by A. Leslie Lilley (London: Putnam, 1908).

10. See Ernesto Buonaiuti, *Le modernisme catholique*, trans. René Monnot (Paris: Rieder, 1927). In his article, Enrico Rosa cites this work by Buonaiuti, but he does not indicate that it was published as part of the series "Christianisme"; Gramsci must have had another source for this detailed information. In fact, Gramsci owned another book published in the "Christianisme" series (under the general editorship of P. L. Couchoud): namely, Louis Coulange's *La Messe* (Paris: Rieder, 1927). Sometime after he wrote this note (probably during his time in Formia),

Gramsci obtained a copy of Buonaiuti's *Le modernisme catholique*, as can be seen from his remarks in the C text of this same note (Notebook 20, §4) and from the fact that it is conserved among his books. Gramsci also owned a copy of another work by Buonaiuti, *Gesú il Cristo: Profilo* (Rome: Formiggini, 1926); see Notebook 2, Description of the Manuscript, 1:530.

11. In his encyclical of September 8, 1907, *Pascendi dominici gregis* (Feeding the Lord's flock), Pius X formally condemned modernism, describing it as "the résumé of all heresies."

12. See Buonaiuti, "Una polemica senza onestà e senza legge," p. 335.

§2. *Rotary Club*

1. Gramsci uses the English phrase "open shop." As editor of the *Ordine Nuovo* he had published in the July 5, 1921, issue a short article by Piero Sraffa (who was writing from England) entitled "Lettere dall'estero: 'Open Shop Drive' " (Letters from abroad: The open shop drive). Among other things, Sraffa wrote: "Most people take 'open shop' to mean the following: that workers must be employed regardless of whether they are organized or not. In reality, however, almost all the industrialists, as a rule, do not employ workers whom they know to be members of a trade union."

2. With a few exceptions, most notably the concluding remarks enclosed in parentheses, the contents of the rest of this note are extracted from an unsigned article, "Rotary Club e Massoneria" (The Rotary Club and Freemasonry), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (July 21, 1928): 97–109.

3. The civilian service club known as "Rotary" was founded in 1905 by a Chicago lawyer, Paul P. Harris. In 1912 its name was changed to "International Association of Rotary Clubs," and in 1922 it adopted the name by which it is still known today, "Rotary International."

4. The article "Rotary Club e Massoneria" contains no reference to the review *Realtà*, edited by Giuseppe Bevione.

On Giuseppe Bevione, see Notebook 2, §25, n. 1.

§3. *Owen, Saint-Simon, and Ferrante Aporti's infant schools*

1. The quotations as well as the other information contained in this note are all extracted from "La questione delle scuole infantili e dell'abate Aporti secondo nuovi documenti" (The question of the infant schools and Abbé Aporti in the light of new documents), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (August 4, 1928): 219–32.

2. Gramsci also comments on Ferrante Aporti's infant schools in Notebook 1, §46.

On Ferrante Aporti, see Notebook 1, §46, n. 3.

3. On Raffaello Lambruschini, see Notebook 2, §5, and the accompanying Notes to the Text.

§4. *Saint-Simonism, Freemasonry, Rotary Club*

1. Gramsci expresses an interest in examining the influence of Saint-Simonism in Italy in Notebook 7, §59.

§5. *Catholic social action*

1. "La conferenza internazionale del lavoro," *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (August 4, 1928): 233–43, summarizes Albert Thomas's speech on pp. 239–43. Although the article is unsigned, it was in fact written by the Jesuit priest Angelo Brucculeri. Gramsci comments on another article by Brucculeri that discusses Albert Thomas in Notebook 2, §128.

On Albert Thomas, the French labor leader who was the first director of the International Labor Conference, see Notebook 2, §128, n. 2.

§6. *Past and present*

1. In two articles published in the Catholic newspaper of Turin, *Il Corriere*, on July 6 and July 8, 1926, Carlo Lovera di Castiglione expressed his support of an initiative undertaken by the Catholic periodical *Il Lavoratore* to send a delegation of Catholic workers on a foreign study trip to the Soviet Union. Lovera's articles sparked a fierce polemic; he was attacked not only by the Fascist press but also by a number of Catholic publications, including the Roman newspaper *Il Corriere d'Italia*. An article published in *Il Corriere d'Italia* on July 11, 1926 elicited a response from Lovera, published in *Il Corriere* of Turin on July 13, 1926, under the title "Antifascisti ostinati o popolari in ritardo?" (Stubborn anti-Fascists or belated popularists?). *Il Corriere d'Italia* retorted with another, yet more vicious attack on Lovera: an article entitled "Gli sviluppi nell'involuzione antifascista" (The further decline of anti-Fascism), published on July 14, 1926. Extensive reports on Carlo Lovera di Castiglione's articles and on the polemics that surrounded them appeared in various issues of *L'Unità* in July 1926.

2. The book title provided by Gramsci is incorrect. He is certainly referring to Guido Miglioli's *Una storia e una idea* (Turin: Tipografia C. Accame, 1926). Miglioli's book is based on the author's observations and the information he gathered during a study trip he made to the Soviet Union. Gramsci had a copy of this book, and he refers to it again in Notebook 10, II, §22.

Guido Miglioli (1879–1954), a lawyer by training, played a very active role in Catholic social movements. Prior to the war he was deeply engaged in the formation and leadership of peasant organizations. These activities as well as his opposition to Italian intervention in the war set him apart from mainstream Catholic politics. After the war he joined the Popular Party but retained his leftist leanings; among other things, he favored collaboration with the socialists and argued for an unqualified repudiation of Fascism. Conservatives denounced Miglioli (who was a member of parliament from 1913 to 1923) as a "Christian revolutionist" and a "white Bolshevik." His house was destroyed by Fascist thugs in July 1922. Two years later, in an interview published in *L'Unità* on December 11, 1924, he suggested that workers of all political stripes should form a common front against Fascism. That led to his expulsion from the Popular Party. Miglioli fled into exile in 1926 but continued to combat Fascism and later managed to return to Italy and join the Resistance.

3. An article entitled "Neocattolici estetizzanti" (Neo-Catholics with aesthetic attitudes), published in Piero Gobetti's journal *Rivoluzione Liberale* on April 16, 1922, contained a critical attack against *Arte e Vita*, a Catholic periodical published in Turin, of which Carlo Lovera di Castiglione was one of the editors (see *Rivoluzione Liberale* 1, no. 9). Lovera responded by sending an article to Gobetti; it was published (with a short editorial comment) in the "Esperienza liberale" (The liberal experience) section of *Rivoluzione Liberale* 1, nos. 11–12 (May 4, 1922).

On Piero Gobetti, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 29.

Il Davide, a short-lived Catholic journal of philosophy and the arts edited by Giuseppe Gorgerino, was published in Turin; its first issue appeared on January 15, 1926.

4. On Count Clemente Solaro della Margarita, see Notebook 2, §62, n. 4.

5. This last observation is based on information gleaned from an unsigned article, "Visita del Solaro della Margarita a Pio IX nel 1846: Documenti inediti" (Solaro della Maragrita's visit to Pius IX in 1846: Previously unpublished documents), that appeared in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (September 15, 1928): 497–515. On p. 498, the author points out that in his research he used documents from the Solaro Archive "to which we had access thanks to the courtesy of the owner, Count Lovera di Castiglione."

§7. *On Catholic "social thought" . . .*

1. "Pensiero e attività sociali" (Social thought and social action), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (September 1, 1928): 414–24. This unsigned article (which, in fact, is by the Jesuit priest Angelo Brucculeri) discusses a number of different publications, among them, Albert Muller's *Notes d'é-*

conomie politique, on pp. 414–16. Gramsci uses information extracted from this article in the next three notes.

§8. *America and the Mediterranean*

1. Gramsci's source of information on Giuseppe Frisella Vella's book (which discusses trade routes between America and Asia going through the Mediterranean) is the unsigned article (by Angelo Brucculeri), "Pensiero e attività sociali" (Social thought and social action), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (September 1, 1928): 414–24; see especially pp. 416–19.

§9. *Lucien Romier and Catholic Action in France*

1. For more on the social weeks of France (*semaines sociales de France*), see Notebook 4, §90, n. 3.

On Lucien Romier, see Notebook 1, §61, n. 7.

2. Pietro Gasparri (1852–1934) was made cardinal in 1907, and in 1914 Pope Benedict XV appointed him papal secretary of state, a position he held until 1931. Gasparri, who wielded extraordinary power within the church, was the principal Vatican negotiator with the Italian government in the discussions that led to the signing (by him and Mussolini) of the Lateran Pact in 1929.

3. Except for the bibliographic reference enclosed in square brackets, which Gramsci inserted between the lines at a later time, the information contained in this note is derived from the unsigned article (by Angelo Brucculeri), "Pensiero e attività sociali" (Social thought and social action), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (September 1, 1928): 414–24; see especially pp. 419–21.

§10. *Catholic Action in Belgium*

1. The data recorded in this note are taken from the unsigned article (by Angelo Brucculeri), "Pensiero e attività sociali" (Social thought and social action), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (September 1, 1928): 414–24; see especially pp. 422–23.

§11. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*

1. For other remarks by Gramsci on the conservative Catholic weekly *Fede e Ragione*, published in Florence, see Notebook 7, §107.

On the Catholic integralists, see Notebook 5, §1, n. 1.

2. The questions raised by Gramsci in this note were probably stimulated by an unsigned article, "La recente calunnia di *Fede e Ragione* con-

tro *La Civiltà Cattolica*" (The recent calumny by *Fede e Ragione* against *La Civiltà Cattolica*), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (September 15, 1928): 527–31.

§12. *The Risorgimento. Solaro della Margarita*

1. Gramsci alludes to Count Clemente Solaro della Margarita's *Memorandum storico-politico* (1851) in Notebook 2, §62; see also **n.** 4 in the corresponding Notes to the Text. The republication of the *Memorandum* in 1930 elicited the remarks made by Gramsci in Notebook 6, §176.

On Count Clemente Solaro della Margarita, see Notebook 2, §62, n. 4.

2. "Visita del Solaro della Margarita a Pio IX nel 1846: Documenti inediti" (Solaro della Margarita's Visit to Pius IX in 1846: Previously unpublished documents), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (September 15, 1928): 497–515.

3. In December 1845 the seven Catholic cantons of Switzerland formed a defense union—which their opponents labeled Sonderbund (Separatist League)—to oppose the anti-Catholic measures that were being taken by the other Protestant and liberal cantons. In August 1847 the Swiss Diet voted to disband the Sonderbund, expel the Jesuits, and draft a new federal constitution. A civil war ensued in November 1847; it lasted eighteen days and ended with the total defeat of the Sonderbund forces.

§13. *Catholic Action*

1. The bibliographical information on this volume of writings by Pope Leo XIII on Catholic social doctrine is extracted from a notice that appeared in the "Bibliografia" section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (November 3, 1928): 265.

§14. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*

1. Unsigned article (in fact by the Jesuit father Enrico Rosa), "L'equilibrio della verità fra gli estremi dell'errore" (The equilibrium of truth between the extremes of error), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (November 3, 1928): 193–203.

2. Nicolas Fontaine, *Saint-Siège, "Action Française" et "catholiques intégraux": Histoire critique, suivie, entre autres documents, d'un memoire sur le "Sodalitium Pianum" et de la "Lettre du Gouverneur Smith"* (Paris: Librairie Universitaire J. Gamber, 1928). Gramsci received a copy of this book while he was at the Turi di Bari prison.

3. I.e., the Sodalitium Pianum, or the Sodality of St. Pius, also known as Sapinière; see Notebook 5, §1, and n. 3 of the corresponding Notes to the Text.

4. "L'equilibrio della verità," p. 193n.

5. Pope Pius XI publicly condemned the *Action Française* movement in 1926; the group's paper as well as various writings by its principal ideologues were placed on the Index of Forbidden Books.

On the relationship between Catholic integralism and the papacy of Pius X, see Notebook 5, §1, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially n. 2.

6. The pontificate of Pius XI lasted from 1922 to 1939. He is best remembered for having signed the Lateran Accords with Mussolini's government in 1929.

7. On Charles Maurras, the most prominent leader of the *Action Française* movement, see Notebook 1, §14, n. 1.

8. "L'equilibrio della verità," p. 194. The emphases are Gramsci's.

9. Ibid., p. 196. The emphasis and the parenthetical question mark are Gramsci's.

10. Louis Billot (1846–1931), born in Metz, was ordained as a priest in 1869 and joined the Jesuit order soon after. In 1885 he moved to Rome, where he taught dogmatic theology at the Gregorian University until 1911, when he was made a cardinal. A traditional Thomist with strong conservative views, Billot was uncompromisingly opposed to modernism and had very close ties with the *Action Française* movement. Soon after the latter was formally condemned by the pope, Billot gave up the office of cardinal and in 1927 retired to the Jesuit novitiate of Galloro, in Rome, where he spent the rest of his years in seclusion. One of Louis Billot's books attacking liberalism is available in English: *Liberalism: A Criticism of Its Basic Principles and Diverse Forms* (Beatty, Pa.: Archabbey, 1922).

11. On Umberto Benigni (who sometimes published under the name of G. M. Mataloni), see Notebook 5, §1, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially, n. 3.

The author of "L'equilibrio della verità fra gli estremi dell'errore" claims, on p. 197 of his article, that the libelous anti-Jesuit writings that Abbé Boulin published under the pseudonym of Roger Duguet were often cited and reproduced by the activists of the *Action Française* and their allies.

12. See "L'equilibrio della verità," pp. 197–98.

13. Ibid., p. 200. The emphases are Gramsci's.

14. Pope Benedict XV's encyclical *Ad beatissimi* was published in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 65 (December 5, 1914): 513–43.

15. As examples of the anti-Jesuit publications compiled by Abbé Boulin under the pseudonym of I. de Récalde, see *Histoire intérieure de la Compagnie de Jésus d'après les documents adaptés par I. de Récalde du récent ouvrage espagnol de Miguel Mir*, vol. 1, *Les principes* (Paris: Librairie Moderne, 1922), and *Ecrits des curés de Paris contre la politique*

et la morale des Jésuites (1658–1659) avec une étude sur la querelle du laxisme (Paris: Editions et Librairies, 1921).

16. "L'equilibrio della verità," p. 201.

17. *La Ronda*, a monthly literary review, was founded in 1919 by a group of young writers (among them, Riccardo Bacchelli) reacting against the experimentalism and avant-garde currents of their time. The *La Ronda* writers cultivated technical and formal elegance and regarded themselves as the defenders of literary purity and autonomy. They affected a disdain for politics while seeking to recuperate the glories of national literary tradition, especially in prose. *La Ronda* ceased publication in 1923. In Notebook 23, §33, Gramsci describes *La Ronda* as "a manifestation of Jesuitism in the arts."

18. The parenthetical *sic* is Gramsci's.

19. "L'equilibrio della verità," p. 202.

20. Ibid., p. 203n.

21. Ibid., p. 203.

22. See the unsigned article "Internazionalismo e nazionalismo nelle difamazioni di un'agenzia clandestina" (Internationalism and nationalism in the calumnies of a clandestine agency), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 78 (December 30, 1927): 385–400.

§15. *Lucien Romier and Catholic Action in France*

1. On Lucien Romier, see Notebook 1, §61, n. 7; see also Notebook 5, §9.
On Edouard Herriot, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 6.

§16. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*

1. Gramsci's source of information on Havard de la Montagne and on *Rome*, the French-language weekly published in the Italian capital, is Nicolas Fontaine, *Saint-Siège, "Action Française" et "Catholiques intégraux": Histoire critique, suivie, entre autres documents, d'un mémoire sur le "Sodalitium Pianum" et de la "Lettre du Gouverneur Smith"* (Paris: Librairie Universitaire J. Gamber, 1928); see especially pp. 58–61. Gramsci had a copy of this book in prison.

2. On the Catholic integralists, see Notebook 5, §1, n. 1.
On Charles Maurras, see Notebook 1, §14, n. 1.

§17. *The Pan-Christian movement*

1. On the "social weeks," which originated in France but were subsequently duplicated in other countries, see Notebook 4, §90, n. 3.

2. The proceedings of the fifteenth social week of Milan were published as *La vera unità religiosa* (Milan: Società Editrice Vita e Pensiero, 1928).

Gramsci derived the bibliographical data and other information used in this note from an unsigned article, "Gli atti della quindicesimo settimana sociale di Milano" (The Proceedings of the fifteenth social week of Milan), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (November 17, 1928): 338–44.

3. Pius XI's encyclical *Mortalium animos* (1928) dealt specifically with the question of religious unity.

§18. *Catholic social thought*

1. "Autorità e 'opportunismo politico' " (Authority and "political opportunism"), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (December 1, 1928): 385–96.

2. On the *Codice sociale* (Social code), a handbook of Catholic social thought strongly influenced by the teachings of Pope Leo XIII, see Notebook 1, §1, n. 2.

3. During the pontificate of the conservative and authoritarian Pius IX, the relationship between the Catholic Church and the secular governments of many countries in Europe and elsewhere had become very strained. Many Catholics were alienated and isolated from the political and cultural life of modern secular society. Leo XIII, who was elected to succeed Pius IX in 1878, adopted a more conciliatory policy toward the civil authorities of certain states and, on occasion, a somewhat less rigid approach to the thorny question of the separation of state and church. (None of this, however, applied to Italy.) In Germany, for example, a policy of rapprochement with Bismarck brought an end to the bitter Kulturkampf. In addition, Leo XIII contributed to the reintegration of French Catholics into the life of the state when he enjoined them to support or to rally behind the republic (whence Gramsci's reference). For more, see Notebook 1, §77, n. 2.

4. Louis Napoleon, who was elected president of France on December 10, 1848, reinforced his hold on power with the successful coup d'état of December 2, 1851. He became Emperor Napoleon III on December 2, 1852.

§19. *Catholic Action in Italy*

1. A summary of the unsigned article "Precisazioni" (Clarifications) originally published in the Vatican newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano* on November 17, 1928, appeared in the "Cose italiane" (Italian affairs) section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (December 1, 1928): 468–70.

§20. *Machiavelli and Emanuele Filiberto*

1. "Emanuele Filiberto di Savoia nel IV centenario della nascita" (Emanuele Filiberto of Savoy on the fourth centenary of his birth), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (December 15, 1928): 485.

On Emanuele Filiberto, see also Notebook 2, §60 and §61, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§21. *For the history of the Italian workers' movement*

1. The bibliographical data on Agostino Gori's brief, posthumously published memoir, *Ricordo* (Florence: Tipografia M. Ricci, 1927) and the other information recorded in this note are extracted from a notice in the "Bibliografia" section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (December 15, 1928): 553.

§22. *Catholic Action in Germany*

1. The information on Erhard Schlund's book on documents pertaining to Catholic Action and on its activities, *Die Katholische Aktion: Materielen und Akten* (Munich: Verlag Josef Kosel and Friedrich Pustet, 1928), and on the first volume of Maximilian Kaller's study of the Catholic lay apostolate, *Unser Laienapostolat* (Leusterdorf am Rhein: Verlag des Johannesbund, 1927), is extracted from a short article, "L'Azione Cattolica in Germania" (Catholic Action in Germany), in the "Rivista della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (December 15, 1928): 536–39.

§23. *Brief notes on Chinese culture*

1. For Gramsci's views on Esperanto, see Notebook 1, §73, n. 2, as well as Notebook 3, §73, n. 4, and §76, n. 3.

2. Gramsci discusses Middle Latin at some length in Notebook 3, §76.

3. Sun Yat-sen (1866–1925) was born in the South Chinese province of Kwangtung but spent some of his youth in Hawaii before graduating from medical school in Hong Kong in 1892. He soon abandoned medicine in favor of a political career, and by 1894 he was back in Hawaii, where he established the Revive China Society to oppose the Ch'ing dynasty and struggle for the modernization of China. During the crisis that ensued following China's defeat in the Sino-Japanese war in 1895, Sun Yat-sen returned to Hong Kong with a plan to stage an uprising in Canton. The plot went awry, and he went into exile for sixteen years, during which period he lived in various countries, most notably England, the United States, Canada, and Japan. Wherever he went, he continued working incessantly to construct a political and financial base for his revolutionary movement (in 1905, at a conference held in Tokyo, he was named head of the Alliance Society, a coalition of revolutionary groups operating from within China and abroad). From the many years he spent in exile, he also acquired a profound understanding of Western politics, society, and culture.

Sun Yat-sen rushed back to China from the United States in December 1911, when the revolution that would overthrow the Manchu dynasty was already under way; that same month he was elected provisional president of the Republic of China, a position he held only until February 12, 1912. In the turbulent years that followed, his political fortunes fluctuated greatly. During this period the loosely organized Alliance Society was refashioned into a political party that called itself the Kuomintang (Nationalist Party). Sun Yat-sen finally succeeded in gaining control of the country in 1923, when he installed himself as generalissimo. The backing he received from the Soviet Union enabled him in no small measure to consolidate his hold on power. Among other things, the Soviets enjoined the Chinese Communist Party to support and cooperate with the Kuomintang. Sun Yat-sen, for his part, set about reorganizing the Kuomintang, which not only came to resemble the Soviet Communist Party in its structure but also agreed to elect three communists to its central executive committee. After his death, Sun Yat-sen came to be regarded as a great modernizer and a pioneer of the Chinese revolution. The major political document bequeathed by Sun Yat-sen is a set of sixteen lectures on what he called the "Three Principles of the People"—i.e., nationalism (*min-tsu chu-i*), democracy (*min-ch'üan chu-i*), and the people's livelihood, or the regulation of private capital and landed property (*min-sheng chu-i*). The text of this work is available in English; see Sun Yat-sen, *San Min Chu I: The Three Principles of the People*, trans. Frank W. Price and ed. L. T. Chen (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1927; reprint, New York: Da Capo, 1975). Gramsci writes about the "Three Principles of the People" in Notebook 5, §51 and §122.

4. Prospero Intorcetta (1625–96), Christian Herdtrich (1625–84), François Rougemont (1624–76), and Phillipe Couplet (1622–92) were all Jesuit priests who spent many years as missionaries in China. Each wrote books on diverse topics pertaining to China; theirs were among the earliest writings to provide European readers with more or less reliable works on specific aspects of Chinese history, language, and culture. All four missionaries collaborated on one major project, an edition and translation (from Chinese into Latin) of a selection of Confucian texts: *Confucius Sinarum philosophus, sive scientia Sinensis Latine exposita* (Paris: D. Horthemels, 1687). The volume contains translations of *Lun yü* (*Analects*) and of two separate chapters from *Li chi* (Record of rights): namely, *Ta hsüeh* (Great learning) and *Chung yung* (Doctrine of the Mean). These three Confucian texts, together with *Meng-tzu* (Mencius), are known as the *Ssu shu* (Four books); they were originally published in 1190 by the Neo-Confucian philosopher Chu Hsi, whose commentaries are regarded as fundamentally important for the study of the Confucian canon. The edition of selected Confucian texts in Latin by Intorcetta and his collabora-

tors attracted considerable attention among European scholars, and within a few years an abridged version of it was translated into English; see *The Morals of Confucius, a Chinese Philosopher, Who Flourished above Five Hundred Years Before the Coming of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: Being One of the Most Choicest Pieces of Learning Remaining of That Nation* (London: Randal Taylor, 1691).

5. The magnum opus of Jean-Baptiste du Halde (1674–1743), a Jesuit missionary who traveled widely in China and other parts of the Far East, was in fact first published in 1735, in a lavish four-volume edition with several copperplate engravings and folded maps; see J.-B. du Halde, *Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique, et physique de l'empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise*, 4 vols. (Paris: P. G. Lemercier, 1735). It was almost immediately translated into English: *The General History of China: Containing a Geographical, Historical, Chronological, Political, and Physical Description of the Empire of China, Chinese-Tartary, Corea*, 4 vols., trans. Richard Brookes (London: J. Watts, 1736).

6. Etienne Fourmont (1683–1745) received his formal training in philology and biblical exegesis. In 1715 he became a professor of Arabic and later also of Hebrew at the Collège de France. He became engaged in the study of Far Eastern languages in 1722, when he was put in charge of oriental manuscripts at the royal library. He never visited China and acquired knowledge of the Chinese language with the help of a young man from Canton who was brought to France by a missionary priest. Fourmont's main contribution to eighteenth-century sinology was his work on Chinese script and syntax, *Linguae Sinarum mandarincae hieroglyphicae grammatica* (Paris: H. L. Guerin, 1742).

Joseph-Henri de Prémare (1666–1736), a Jesuit missionary in China, is best remembered for his posthumously published writings on the Chinese language and religion; see *Notitia linguae sinicae* (Malacca: Academiae Anglo-Sinensis, 1831) and the booklet *Lettres inédites du P. Prémare sur le monothéisme des chinois* (Paris, 1861).

7. The chair of Chinese language and literature at the Collège de France was created by the minister of the interior, Abbé François Montesquiou-Fezensac, who appointed Abel Rémusat (1788–1832) to it on November 9, 1814. Rémusat's inaugural lecture, delivered on January 16, 1815, is reproduced in the booklet *Programme du cours de langue et de littérature chinoises et de tartare-mandchou* (Paris: Charles, 1815) In 1822 he founded the Société Asiatique of Paris, and in 1824 he was named administrator of the oriental manuscripts collection in the royal library. Rémusat produced a large body of work on Chinese language, history, religion, and literature. He also edited and translated numerous texts from Chinese and other oriental languages into French. His major books include *Recherches sur les*

langues tartares; ou, Mémoires sur différents points de la grammaire et de la littérature des Mantchoux, des Ouigours, et des Thibétains (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1820) and *Eléments de la grammaire chinoise; ou, Principes généraux du Kou-wen, ou style antique, et du Kouan-hoa, c'est-à-dire, de la langue commune généralement usitée dans l'empire chinois* (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1822).

8. Stanislas Julien (1799–1873) had already distinguished himself as a student of modern languages at the Collège de France when in 1824 he decided to study oriental languages with Abel Rémusat. Within a few years he established himself as the leading sinologist of his generation, and in 1832 he succeeded Rémusat as professor of Chinese language and literature at his alma mater. He also taught at the Ecole des Langues Orientales. Julien translated (often supplying explanatory notes and commentary) an impressive number of literary and philosophical texts from Chinese into French, including Lao-tzu's *Tao-te Ching* (The way and the power), which appeared as *Le livre de la voie et de la vertu* (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1842); he also wrote extensively on various aspects of Chinese history and culture. His studies on Chinese grammar and lexicography were used by sinologists and linguists throughout Europe. Julien's last major publication was *Syntaxe nouvelle de la langue chinoise fondée sur la position des mots, suivie de deux traités sur les particules et les principaux termes de grammaire, d'une table des idiotismes; de tables, de légendes et d'apologue, traduit mot à mot*, 2 vols. (Paris: Librairie de Maisonneuve, 1869–70).

9. Gramsci is referring to Franz Nikolaus Finck, *Die Sprachstämme des Erdkreises*, 3d ed. (Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1923). He had ordered a copy of this book (first published in 1909) when he was in prison in Milan awaiting trial. A different book by Finck—*Die Haupttypen des Sprachbaus* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1910)—was sent to him by mistake. He wrote to Tatiana Schucht, October 3, 1927:

> I had ordered a small book by Finck from the Sperling and Kupfer bookstore (Via Larga 23); since I didn't remember the title, instead of the book I wanted they've sent me one that might be rather interesting for a person who wants to study Chinese, Lap, Turkish, Georgian, Samoan, and the dialect of the Negroes of Zambia, but it is not yet of interest to me, since I have not as yet decided to undertake such arduous labors. The exact title of the book I want is: F. N. Finck, *Die Sprachstämme des Erdkreises*, published by Teubner, in Leipzig, in the series "Aus Natur und Geisteswelt." This is a classification of all the languages in the world, but the subject of the book is only the classification and not the separate study of the languages. Instead, the book I received is definitely devoted to the basic grammatical ele-

ments of the languages I mentioned above (as well as Arabic and modern Greek), together with a selection of texts.

A short time later, Gramsci received a copy of the third edition of Finck's *Die Sprachstämme des Erdkreises*, as he informed Tatiana in his letter of November 14, 1927. After he got permission to write in his cell, following his transfer to the prison of Turi di Bari, Gramsci translated Finck's book in its entirety (Translation Notebooks B and C).

Franz Nikolaus Finck (1867–1910), whose early work dealt with Celtic dialects, produced an impressive number of studies on an extraordinarily broad range of languages and literatures: Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, Slavic, Baltic, and several others.

10. Alberto Castellani, "Prima sinologia" (Early sinology), *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 8 (February 24, 1929).

11. See Alberto Castellani, "Una valutazione sintetica della letteratura cinese" (A concise assessment of Chinese literature), *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 30 (July 24, 1927).

12. The Neo-Confucian philosopher, Chu Hsi (1130–1200), was the preeminent Chinese philosopher of this millennium. His moral philosophy stressed the importance of self-cultivation, while his own ability to combine the life of a scholar with a career in public service was for long held to be exemplary. For centuries, study of his commentaries on the classical texts was mandatory for anyone pursuing higher education in China.

13. Léon Wieger, *La Chine à travers les âges*, 2d ed. (Hien-hien, 1924).

14. Alberto Castellani, "Filosofia cinese in veste europea e . . . giapponese" (Chinese philosophy in European and Japanese guise), *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 43 (October 23, 1927).

15. Alfred Forke (1867–1944), a renowned German sinologist, produced important studies on various aspects of Chinese culture. Among other works he translated several dramatic and poetic texts from Chinese into German. Above all, Forke contributed significantly to the appreciation and understanding of Chinese philosophy; among his many publications on the subject, see *The World Conception of the Chinese: Their Astronomical, Cosmological, and Physico-Philosophical Speculations* (London: A. Probsthain, 1925).

16. Hu Shih (1919–62) received a formal Chinese education, with its traditional emphasis on the Confucian classics and orthodox literary form, before attending university in the United States. He obtained his Ph.D. in philosophy in 1917 from Columbia University, where he wrote his doctoral thesis under the direction of the pragmatist philosopher John Dewey. The thesis was later published in both Chinese and English; see *The Development Method of the Logical Method in Ancient China* (Shanghai:

Oriental Book Co., 1922). When he returned to China, Hu Shih joined the faculty of Peking National University and became a leader in the movement for cultural and educational reform. He worked hard to promote and disseminate vernacular literature, a literature accessible to the masses. (The vernacular became the official national language by government decree in 1920.) In his writings he also made a strong case for the critical reevaluation of the Chinese classical tradition in literature, philosophy, and historiography. One of his important early works in this regard is the book on the history of Chinese philosophy mentioned by Gramsci (which has not been translated into English): *Chung-kuo che-hsüeh shih ta-kang* (Shanghai, 1919). In 1933 Hu Shih delivered the Haskell Lectures in Comparative Religion, which were then published in a volume entitled *The Chinese Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934). Between 1938 and 1942 Hu Shih resided in Washington, D.C.; he returned to China after the war and in 1945 was appointed chancellor of Peking National University. Hu Shih left China in 1949 and went to live in New York City, where he remained until 1958, when he moved to Taiwan.

17. Gramsci obtained the bibliographical information on Alberto Castellani's book outlining the doctrine of Taoism, *La dottrina del Tao ricostruita sui testi ed esposta integralmente* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1927), and his book on the "celestial rule" of Lao-Tzu, *La regola celeste di Lao-Tse* (Florence: Sansoni, 1927), from an article by Adolfo Faggi, "Sapere cinese" (Chinese knowledge), *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 24 (June 12, 1927).

18. I.e., the provincial military rulers who operated like warlords.

§24. *Past and present. Respect for the national artistic heritage*

1. Luca Beltrami, "Difesa d'arte in luoghi sacri e profani" (Protection of art in secular and religious sites), *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 20 (May 15, 1927).

On Luca Beltrami, see Notebook 1, §24, n. 2.

2. The "episodes of vulgar ostentation" mentioned here are related to a banquet followed by a ball that was held at the Castel Sforzesco museum in Milan.

§25. *Machiavelli and Manzoni*

1. Tommaseo's book consists of Tommaseo's account of his conversations with the novelist Alessandro Manzoni, whom the author befriended during a sojourn in Milan.

Niccolò Tommaseo (1802–74) produced an enormous body of work on a great diversity of subjects: history, literature, education, politics, religion. He also wrote poetry and a novel, in addition to compiling two dic-

tionaries. Although a steadfast Catholic, he had profound liberal convictions and strong nationalist sentiments. Because of his political views he was compelled to spend several years in exile. He also spent several months in jail in Venice (in 1847–48) for publicly campaigning for freedom of the press.

2. See Giuseppe S. Gargàno, "Manzoni in Tommaseo" (Manzoni in Tommaseo's work), *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 5 (February 3, 1929).

§26. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Alfredo Panzini*

1. Alfredo Panzini's translation of Hesiod's *Works and Days* was published as *Le opere e i giorni* (Milan: Treves, 1928).

On Panzini, about whom Gramsci makes many derogatory comments scattered throughout the notebooks, see Notebook 1, §13, n. 1.

2. Angiolo Orvieto, "Da Esiodo al Panzini," *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 5 (February 3, 1929).

3. The Fascist government tried extremely hard to halt the exodus of peasants from the countryside and from unproductive regions to the cities and the industrial centers. It launched an ambitious land reclamation program and attempted to enhance the life of the rural population by improving agricultural productivity. The Ministry of Public Works formed a permanent Committee on Internal Migrations in 1926, and an Office of Migrations and Internal Colonization was created in 1928. And as part of its campaign to stem internal migration, the government propaganda machine sought to generate and disseminate an attractive, quasi-idyllic image of rural life.

§27. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. Enrico Corradini's play *Carlotta Corday* was reprinted with a preface by the author in 1928, in the drama series "Collezione teatrale" put out by the Florentine publisher Barbèra. Gramsci's observations are based on an article by the pseudonymous Gaio: "*Carlotta Corday* di Enrico Corradini," *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 5 (February 3, 1929).

On Enrico Corradini, see Notebook 1, §58, n. 3.

§28. *Ideology, psychologism, positivism*

1. Gramsci probably wrote this note after reading an article by Adolfo Faggi, "L'ultimo degli psicologisti: G. Brandes" (The last of the psychologists: G. Brandes), in *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 23 (June 5, 1927). Faggi wrote, among other things: "Psychologism was already linked to eighteenth-century French 'ideology,' and having been amplified and integrated with the

theory of *milieu*, it was supported and reinforced by nineteenth-century positivism. Its decline in our time explains why Brandes's work has faded into relative obscurity."

Georg Brandes (1842–1927), the Danish scholar who wrote extensively on nineteenth- and early twentieth-century literature and philosophy, was strongly influenced during his formative years by the ideas of Taine, Renan, and John Stuart Mill, all three of whom he met in Paris. His major work in literary history and criticism is *Hovedstrømninger i det 19de aarhundredes litteratur* (1871–87); for an English translation, see *Main Currents in Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 6 vols., trans. D. White and M. Morison (New York: Heinemann, 1901–5).

In many of his writings, the scholar and critic Hippolyte Taine (1828–93), one of the most powerful exponents of positivism in France, sought to counter spiritualist philosophy by applying what he regarded as "the scientific method" to the study of literature, art, metaphysics, ethics, and psychology. In his analyses of literature, Taine took pains to demonstrate that the production and character of literary texts are determined by the inherited personality ("*la race*") of their authors and by the sociocultural context ("*le milieu*") as well as the historical situation ("*le moment*") in which they are composed. Taine's approach to literature is expounded most thoroughly in his four-volume *Histoire de la littérature anglaise* (1863–64); for an English translation, see *History of English Literature*, 4 vols., trans. H. Van Laun (New York: Ungar, 1965). The argument for applying the scientific (i.e., experimental) method to the study of psychology is laid out most systematically by Taine in his *De l'intelligence* (1870); for an English translation, see *On Intelligence*, 2 vols., ed. Daniel N. Robinson, trans. T. D. Haye (Washington, D.C.: University Publications of America, 1977).

§29. *East-West*

1. Gramsci extracted the information on Henri Bergson's lecture and the reference to the French philosopher's book *L'énergie spirituelle* (Paris, 1920) from an article by Antonino Pagliaro: "Sapienza indiana" (Indian knowledge), *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 23 (June 5, 1927).

Antonino Pagliaro (1898–1973), a linguist and literary critic, produced scholarly works on Aryo-European linguistics and on Persian literature. He was also an expert in semantics, and in several publications he brought his semantic theories to bear on the interpretation of literary texts, including Dante's *Divine Comedy*.

The lecture to which this note alludes was delivered by Bergson to the Society for Psychical Research in London on May 28, 1913. It is reprinted as one of the chapters in Bergson's *L'energie spirituelle*. In the English

translation, *Mind-Energy: Lectures and Essays*, trans. H. Wildon Carr (London: Macmillan, 1920); the relevant passage appears in chap. 3, " 'Phantasms of the Living' and 'Psychical Research' ":

> I have sometimes asked myself what would have happened if modern science, instead of setting out from mathematics to turn its direction towards mechanics, physics and chemistry, instead of bringing all its forces to converge on the study of matter, had begun by the consideration of mind—if Kepler, Galileo and Newton, for example, had been psychologists. They would have produced a psychology of which to-day we can form no idea, just as before Galileo no one could have imagined what our physics would be—a psychology which probably would have been to our present psychology what our physics is to that of Aristotle. Foreign to every mechanistic idea, science would have studied eagerly, instead of dismissing *a priori*, phenomena such as those you study; perhaps "psychical research" would have stood out as its principal preoccupation. The most general laws of mental activity once discovered (as, in fact, the fundamental principles of mechanics were discovered), science would have passed from pure mind to life. . . . So would have been founded, so would have developed, the science of mind-energy. But when this science, following the manifestations of mind step by step from higher to lower, passing life and organization, had come at last to inert matter, it would then have stopped abruptly, surprised and dismayed. It would have tried to apply its accustomed methods to this new object, and it would have obtained no hold on it, just as to-day the processes of calculation and measurement have no hold on the things of the mind. It is matter, and not mind, which in this case would have been the realm of mystery. (pp. 79–81)

§30. *The international function of Italian intellectuals*

1. The source of Gramsci's information for this note is a short item in the "Marginalia" section of *Il Marzocco* 35, no. 4 (January 26, 1930).

§31. *On the Italian national tradition*

1. The source of the information and quoted passages in this note is Bernardino Barbadoro's brief article "Sicilia e Italia sotto Federico II" (Sicily and Italy under Frederick II) in the "Marginalia" section of *Il Marzocco* 33, no. 51 (December 16, 1929), in which Barbadoro cites an unsigned item, "Nel settimo anniversario della seconda lega Lombarda"

(On the seventh centenary of the second Lombard League), that appeared in the "Marginalia" section of *Il Marzocco* 31, no. 39 (September 26, 1926).

2. Quoted in Barbadoro, "Sicilia e Italia sotto Federico II."

Frederick I (ca. 1123–90), of the Swabian House of Hohenstaufen, whom the Italians nicknamed Barbarossa, was elected German king in 1152 and crowned emperor by Pope Adrian IV in 1155. In his efforts to assert imperial rights fully he conducted several campaigns in Italy. The resentment aroused by his destruction of Milan in 1162 led to the formation of the Lombard League, which had the support of those who had reason to be threatened by Frederick's consolidation of power, especially the pope (Alexander III, at the time), the Venetians, and William of Sicily.

Barbarossa's grandson Frederick II (1194–1250), whose father Henry VI had conquered Sicily, was crowned emperor by Pope Honorius III in 1220. In his person he thus unified the Kingdom of Sicily (which extended as far north as Naples) and the empire. His assertion of imperial authority, however, was resisted by, among others, the pope and the cities of Lombardy. The Lombard League was reconstituted in 1226 (hence the reference in this note to the "second Lombard League"). Frederick II militarily defeated the Lombard League at Cortenuova in 1237. At the same time he designated his son as king of Sardinia. Fearing that his power would be subordinated to that of the emperor and that his suzerainty in the papal states would be threatened next, the pope (Gregory IX, at the time) excommunicated the emperor. Frederick's reaction was to strengthen his control over Italy (particularly in the north) and the Kingdom of Sicily. He also sent his army into central Italy, and in 1240 it entered the papal states and subsequently occupied Rome. This conflict between the empire and the papacy gave rise to the parties known as the Ghibellines (supporters of imperial rule) and the Guelfs (backers of papal authority). In 1242 negotiations between Pope Innocent IV and Frederick II ended in failure, seemingly because of disagreement concerning the status of the Lombard states. The pope took refuge in Lyons, where he convened a council in 1245 and formally deposed the emperor. The struggle for supremacy between the papacy and the emperor raged for several more years, but by the time of Frederick's death the unifying power of the empire was already in decline.

3. See Barbadoro, "Sicilia e Italia sotto Federico II."

§32. *Ugo Foscolo and Italian literary rhetoric*

1. In his best-known poem, *Dei sepolcri* (On tombs), first published in 1807, Ugo Foscolo (1778–1827) eulogizes the past glories of Italy through a series of reflections on the tombs of great men such as Machiavelli, Michelangelo, and Galileo.

2. Ugo Foscolo, responding to the French critic Sylvestre Guillon, asserted that his poetic meditation on the tombs of great men was, indeed, politically motivated. His aim was "to inspire political emulation in Italians" by promoting "the resurrection not of bodies but of virtues" (U. Foscolo, *Opere* [Florence: Le Monnier, 1972], 6:518).

Gramsci's observations in this note were triggered by his reading of an article by Giuseppe Gargàno, "Le tombe ispiratrici e i *Sepolcri* del Foscolo" (The inspiring tombs and Foscolo's *Dei sepolcri*), *Il Marzocco* 32, no. 50 (December 11, 1927).

§33. M. Iskowicz, *La littérature à la lumière du matérialisme historique*

1. Gramsci must have received in prison a copy of this bulletin announcing the new books published by the Maison du Livre Française (MLF), but it is not preserved among his books.

§34. *Past and present*

1. Gramsci's comments on Giuseppe Prezzolini and his review *La Voce* are scattered throughout the notebooks. See, inter alia, Notebook 1, §90. On Prezzolini, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1.

Leonardo, a cultural periodical devoted primarily to philosophy and literature, was founded in Florence in 1903 by Giovanni Papini, who coedited it with Giuseppe Prezzolini. The writers associated with the journal exhibited certain nationalistic tendencies; they saw it as their mission to revitalize Italian culture. *Leonardo* also came to be seen as a major proponent of pragmatist philosophy in Italy: William James established closed contacts with Papini in 1905 and contributed significantly to the study of pragmatism in Italy. Some of C. S. Peirce's work also was published in *Leonardo* (which ceased publication in 1907).

On Giovanni Papini and his avant-garde periodical *Lacerba* (published twice a month between 1913 and 1914 and weekly, a total of twenty-one issues, in 1915 until Italy entered the war), see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1.

On Gaetano Salvemini, the founder and editor of the political weekly *Unità*, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 19.

Giani Stuparich's *Scipio Slataper* (Florence: Casa Editrice La Voce, 1922) is not among the books owned by Gramsci that have been preserved. It seems unlikely that he had a copy of it during his incarceration; most probably, he had read it at an earlier time.

Scipio Slataper (1888–1915) was born in Trieste and studied literature at the University of Florence. He became closely involved with *La Voce*, though he drifted away from it around 1913. His autobiographical work *Il*

mio Carso (1912) is regarded as one of the finest pieces of early twentieth-century Italian prose. In it, as in some of his more overtly political writings, Slataper attacks the irredentism of certain segments of the bourgeoisie in Trieste; for him, their nationalist sentiments were little more than a veneer meant to conceal crass economic interests. Slataper, who enlisted in the army when Italy entered the war, was killed in action not far from Carso, the very same area that provided him with the setting for his finest writing. Many of Slataper's writings were published posthumously by Giani Stuparich.

Giani Stuparich (1891–1961), born in Trieste, started his university studies in Prague and completed them in Florence. In 1915 he published his first book, a historical and political monograph on the Czech people. That same year he joined the army as a volunteer, and with his friend Slataper he experienced combat on the front lines in the Carso region. In addition to his biography of Slataper, he wrote a book on his relationship with his brother (who also died in the war, on the same front) and a number of other autobiographical works related to his wartime experiences. By the early 1930s Stuparich was also making his mark as a novelist, and over the years he produced a considerable body of fiction.

§35. *Risorgimento*

1. On September 15, 1864, the Italian government (with Marco Minghetti as prime minister) signed a controversial treaty with France that came to be known as the September Convention. Napoleon III, who had assumed the role of protector of what was left of the Papal States, undertook to withdraw French troops from Rome within two years, thus giving the pope time, in theory, to assemble an international army, which was supposed to serve a purely defensive purpose. In return, Italy undertook to refrain from attacking Rome, to respect the integrity of the papal territory, and to assume part of the debts that had been incurred by the Papal States, which had since been incorporated into the new Italian nation. Furthermore, in order to demonstrate that it no longer had designs on Rome, Italy pledged to establish its new capital in a another city within six months. A special commission was appointed to select the appropriate city, and it designated Florence. The news that the government had renounced the idea of Rome as the future capital of the country was greeted with massive protests, especially in Turin, where the reaction was particularly violent. In two days of riots (on September 21–22) angry crowds looted stores, attacked newspaper offices, and tried to break into the government buildings. The police, backed by military detachments, responded with force, firing into the crowds; more than fifty people died in the clashes. The bloodshed was such that Prime

Minister Minghetti was compelled to resign. Nevertheless, in spite of the popular discontent (and his own lack of enthusiasm for the agreement), the king, Vittorio Emanuele II, left Turin and established his residence in Florence.

2. Gramsci extracted the bibliographical data and other information on the edition of Massimo D'Azeglio's private letters to Teresa Targioni Tozzetti from an article by Giuseppe Gargàno, "D'Azeglio politico nell'intimità" (The intimate side of D'Azeglio the politician), *Il Marzocco* 35, no. 26 (June 29, 1930).

On Massimo D'Azeglio, see Notebook 1, §121, n. 1.

§36. *Past and present*

1. "La prima seduta pubblica dell'Accademia d'Italia" (The first public session of the Italian Academy), *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 24 (June 15, 1930).

The Accademia d'Italia, which was meant to be the Italian equivalent of the Académie Française was established by a special legislative act in 1926. It did not formally come into existence, however, until 1929, when it was inaugurated with a solemn ceremony in the Campidoglio. The first group to be inducted into the academy included the playwright Luigi Pirandello, the physicist Enrico Fermi, the composer Pietro Mascagni, and the futurist artist Filippo Tommaso Marinetti. Some eminent intellectuals, such as Benedetto Croce, refused to have any connection with the academy for fear of being seen as supporters of the Fascist regime.

2. Antonio Aniante, "Cronaca per la storia" (For the historical record), *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 24 (June 15, 1930).

Antonio Aniante was the pseudonym used by the novelist and playwright Antonio Rapisarda (b. 1900). In 1930 he moved to France, where he lived for several years, writing, among other things, *Vie et aventures de Marco Polo*, which earned a prize from the Académie Française in 1938.

§37. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*

1. Stefan Zweig, "Influence du sud sur Nietzsche," *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* 9, no. 405 (July 19, 1930). A note at the end of Zweig's article reads: "Traduction inédite d'Alzir Hella et Olivier Bournac."

§38. *The non–national-popular character of Italian literature*

1. Orazio Pedrazzi, "Le tradizioni antiletterarie della burocrazia italiana" (The antiliterary traditions of the Italian bureaucracy), *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 18 (August 4, 1929).

§39. *Skepticism*

1. See Roberto Ardigò, *Scritti vari*, ed. Giovanni Marchesini (Florence: Le Monnier, 1922), p. 270: "Bergson's sparkling and evanescent philosophy (which contains traces of gnosticism and of the ancient Plotinus), especially when one looks exclusively at its 'vitalist' aspect, is more than anything else a type of irrationalism that may give rise to new forms of Nietzschianism and social imperialism that are antithetical to socialist ethics and ideals. Where we agree with Bergson and with all idealists, however, is in those instances in which they exalt voluntarism in the face of determinism and mechanistic views of history."

Gramsci had a copy of Ardigò's *Scritti Vari* while he was in Turi, but he had returned it to Tatiana Schucht some months prior to writing this note; it is listed in Notebook 1 among the "Books Delivered to Tatiana at Turi on 20 May 1930"; see Notebook 1, Description of the Manuscript, 1:371.

2. Especially relevant in this context are the assertions on the relationship between traditional materialism and idealism that Marx made in the first of his "Theses on Feuerbach" (1845):

> The chief defect of all previous materialism—that of Feuerbach included—is that things [*Gegenstand*], reality, sensuousness are conceived only in the form of the *object*, or of *contemplation*, but not as *human sensuous activity, practice*, not subjectively. Hence it happened that the *active* side, in contradistinction to materialism was set forth by idealism—but only abstractly, since, of course, idealism does not know real, sensuous activity as such. Feuerbach wants sensuous objects, really distinct from conceptual objects, but he does not conceive human activity itself as *objective* activity. In *Das Wesen des Christenthums*, he therefore regards the theoretical attitude as the only genuine human attitude, while practice is conceived and defined only in its dirty-Jewish form of appearance. Hence he does not grasp the significance of "revolutionary," of practical-critical activity. (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* [New York: International Publishers, 1976], p. 6)

This was one of the passages that Gramsci rendered from German into Italian in the segment of Notebook 7 he devoted to translation exercises.

§40. *Pirandello*

1. Benjamin Crémieux, *Henry IV et la dramaturgie de Luigi Pirandello, suivi de la traduction française de Henry IV* (Paris: Gallimard,

1928). It is highly unlikely that Gramsci ever had the opportunity to consult this text.

Luigi Pirandello's play *Enrico IV* (*Henry IV*) was first performed in 1922.

On Benjamin Crémieux, see Notebook 1, §73, n. 1.

§41. *Vocational guidance*

1. The unsigned article "L'orientazione professionale" (Vocational guidance), which was in fact written by the Jesuit priest Angelo Brucculeri, was published in three parts in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 79 (October 6, 1928): 40–53; (November 3, 1928): 204–15; and (November 17, 1928): 304–13.

§42. *The tradition of Rome*

1. In his poem "La terra dei morti" (The land of the dead), from which Gramsci quotes a line, Giuseppe Giusti eulogizes a series of great living Italians; it is his response to Lamartine's description of Italy as "the land of the dead."

Giuseppe Giusti (1809–50) is best remembered for his satiric poetry. His targets included foreign oppressors (especially the Austrians), demagogues, intransigent revolutionaries, dictatorial governments, the Jesuits, and opportunism and hypocrisy in general. Giusti was active for many years in Florentine politics and in 1848 participated in the revolutionary uprisings in Tuscany.

Carducci's lines are quoted from his poem "Nell'annuale della fondazione di Roma" (On the anniversary of the founding of Rome).

On Giosuè Carducci, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 17.

On Ugo Foscolo and his poem *Dei sepolcri* (On tombs) see, inter alia, Gramsci's comments in Notebook 5, §32, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

2. Gramsci's source of the statement attributed to Lessing was, most probably, a remark made by Benedetto Croce in his study on nineteenth-century Italian historiography, *Storia della storiografia italiana nel secolo XIX*, 2 vols. (Bari: Laterza, 1921), of which Gramsci had a copy in prison: "Lessing was taking aim against that rhetorical construction [i.e., boasting of Roman origins] with his rude epigram on the wasps (the Italians) who were born out of the carrion of a warhorse and prided themselves on being its daughters" (1:113).

3. H. G. Wells's *A Short History of the World* (New York: Macmillan, 1922) was published in Italian as *Breve storia del mondo*, trans. F. E. Lorizio (Bari: Laterza, 1930). There is little doubt that Gramsci had a copy of the Italian edition of this work, even though it has not been preserved

with his books. Gramsci comments on Wells's book in a September 28, 1931, letter to his brother Carlo:

> H. G. Wells's book . . . is very badly translated despite the seriousness of the Laterza publishing house. It is interesting because it tends to break with the prevailing habit of thinking that history only existed in Europe, particularly in ancient times; Wells discusses the ancient history of China, India, and the medieval history of the Mongols with the same tone he adopts in speaking of European history. He shows that from a world standpoint Europe should not be regarded as anything more than a province that considers itself the depository of all of world civilization. Another innovation introduced by Wells, which I find less attractive, is the history of the earth before the appearance of man. Also the history of the Catholic Church and its influence on the development of civilization is biased; one feels that Wells is an Anglican anti-Papist and not an unprejudiced historian.

Gramsci also expressed his views on Wells in an undated letter to his son Delio (written sometime in 1935 or, most probably, 1936):

> I haven't read a lot by Wells, because I don't like his books all that much. I believe that if you, too, don't read him, it won't be a great loss for your intellectual and moral development. I didn't like his book of world history very much either, although he does try (and therein he represents a certain novelty, at least in the historical literature of Western Europe) to broaden the traditional historical horizon, attributing importance not only to the Greeks, Egyptians, and Romans, etc., but also to the Mongols, the Chinese, the Indians, etc. As an imaginative writer it seems to me that he is too mechanical, dry, and flavorless; as a historian he lacks intellectual discipline, the sense of order and method. (Antonio Gramsci, *Letters from Prison*, ed. F. Rosengarten, trans. R. Rosenthal [New York: Columbia University Press, 1994], 2:378)

See also Gramsci's passing remark on Wells in Notebook 14, §63.

4. Camille Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule*, 8 vols. (Paris: Hachette, 1908–26).

5. This brief passage from Camille Jullian's *Histoire de la Gaule* is quoted in Piero Baroncelli, "La figura di Roma in uno storico celtista" (A Celtic historian's view of Rome), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1368 (March 16, 1929): 208.

6. Baroncelli, "La figura di Roma," p. 208. The emphasis are Gramsci's.7. Ibid., p. 225. The emphasis is Gramsci's.

8. Gramsci is alluding to a statement made by Sorel in an August 28, 1917, letter to Robert Michels: commenting on Michels's assertion in one of his speeches that Italy "is the most authentic daughter of Rome," Sorel observed, "Il n'y a pas de pays moins romain que l'Italie." Gramsci quotes the passage from Sorel's letter that contains this remark in Notebook 2, §45.

9. On Ezio Levi, see Notebook 4, §92, n. 1.

§43. *The episode of the arrest of the La Gala brothers in 1863*

1. Tommaso Tittoni, "Ricordi personali di politica interna" (Personal recollections on internal political affairs), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1369 (April 1, 1929): 304–27. (This is the first segment of an article published in two parts in consecutive issues of *Nuova Antologia*. The second segment is treated by Gramsci in the next note.) All the information recorded in this note is extracted from Tittoni's article.

On Tommaso Tittoni, see Notebook 2, §6, n. 1.

On the incident involving the La Gala brothers, Cipriano and Giona, see Gramsci's remarks in Notebook 3, §164.

2. Vincenzo Tittoni (1830–1905) was exiled from the Papal States in 1859 because of his liberal views. He was able to return to Rome in 1870 when the city was seized from the pope by Italian troops. Vincenzo Tittoni served as a member of parliament from 1870 until 1886 when he was made senator.

3. The Italian National Committee was founded in London in September 1870 by Giuseppe Mazzini and his close associates. Conceived more or less as an embryonic political party, the National Committee declared its commitment to revolutionary action aimed at liberating Italy and transforming it into a unified republic.

4. The references to Isaia Ghiron's article, "Annali d'Italia in continuazione al Muratori e al Coppi" (Annals of Italy: A supplement to Muratori and Coppi), in the *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento* (1927) and to the article on the La Galla affair published by *La Civiltà Cattolica* in 1863 are extracted from Tittoni's "Ricordi personali di politica interna," pp. 305–306.

§44. *T. Tittoni*, "Ricordi personali di politica interna"

1. Tommaso Tittoni, "Ricordi personali di politica interna" (Personal recollections on internal political affairs), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1369 (April 1, 1929): 304–27; no. 1370 (April 16, 1929): 441–67. This two-part

article is the source of all the information, bibliographical references, and quotations (except for the parenthetical exclamation marks inserted by Gramsci) in this note.

Gramsci also discusses Tommaso Tittoni elsewhere in the notebooks; see, inter alia, Notebook 2, §59, and Notebook 2, §6, n. 1.

2. The conciliation treaty (together with the concordat and the financial convention) was part of the Lateran Accords, signed February 11, 1929, that normalized relations between the Kingdom of Italy and the Holy See.

3. In September 1870 the temporal power of the pope was effectively brought to an end when Italian troops occupied Rome. The following year the capital of Italy was transferred from Florence to Rome. Pope Pius IX, however, adamantly refused to recognize the legitimacy of the Kingdom of Italy; his actions fueled anticlericalism in Italy, but they also hardened the resolve of the conservative, pro-church elements.

4. The papal *non expedit* forbade Catholics from voting and from presenting themselves as candidates in national elections, but it did not apply to regional and local elections. A group of prominent Catholic politicians formed the Roman Union in order to participate in the administrative elections of 1871. Occupying as it did a middle position between the liberals and the intransigent clerical conservatives, the Roman Union obtained good electoral results; however, the Vatican's reluctance to sanction the participation of Catholics in national mainstream politics prevented it from developing into a larger, more widespread movement.

5. Paolo Campello della Spina (1829–1917) was one of the founders of the Roman Union, which he served as vice president and later as president. In 1879 he also played a leading role in the efforts to establish a Catholic political party that was to be called the National Conservative Association. The idea was quashed by the Pope Leo XIII, who not only remained opposed to any rapprochement between the church and the Italian state but also repeatedly reaffirmed the *non expedit*.

6. Auguste Comte, *Cours de philosophie positive*, 6 vols. (Paris: Bachelier, 1830–42), translated into English as *The Positive Philosophy*, 2 vols. (London: Trubner, 1875).

7. Auguste Comte, *Catechisme positiviste* (Paris, 1852); for an English translation, see *The Catechism of Positive Religion*, 3d rev. ed., trans. Richard Congreve (Clifton, N.J.: A. M. Kelley, 1973).

8. On Emile Littré, see Notebook 3, §76, n. 8.

9. In 1898 long-simmering popular discontent over the continuing rise of the price of bread exploded into street demonstrations and riots in many parts of Italy. The conservative prime minister Antonio Starabba di Rudinì reacted with very severe repressive measures. More than eighty people were killed in just three days of disturbances (May 6–9) in Milan alone. The show of force was accompanied by the suppression of several newspapers

and the arrest of many oppositional figures. Rudinì also tried to enact laws aimed at limiting the freedom of the press, the right to strike, and other civil liberties. He was compelled to resign; Luigi Pelloux, a general who had earlier served in one of Rudinì's cabinets, succeeded him on June 29, 1898. Within a few months of becoming prime minister, Pelloux introduced a number of bills that differed little from the measures proposed by Rudinì and had the same intent: namely, to weaken leftist opposition and deprive it of popular support. The stiff opposition of the Left and Pelloux's efforts to implement the restrictive bills by decree led to a full-blown constitutional crisis that did not abate until the middle of 1900, when national elections were held and a new governing coalition was formed.

10. Tommaso Tittoni held the office of prefect of Naples from 1900 until 1903, when he was named minister of foreign affairs by the prime minister, Giovanni Giolitti. In 1902 Naples figured prominently in parliamentary discussions that culminated in the passage of two bills providing the city with financial support to ease the very heavy burden of debts it had incurred.

11. See Gianforte Suardi "Quando e come i cattolici poterono partecipare alle elezioni politiche" (When and how Catholics could participate in national political elections), *Nuova Antologia* 62, no. 1335 (November 1, 1927): 118–23. Gramsci deals with this article in Notebook 3, §25.

12. On Giorgio Sidney Sonnino, see Notebook 1, §114, n. 1.

13. On the scandal involving the priest Giovanni Riva and the nun Maria Giuseppina Fumagalli, see Notebook 1, §24, and n. 3 of the corresponding Notes to the Text.

14. On June 7, 1914, an antiwar demonstration was held in Ancona in defiance of a government ban on such protests. The carabinieri fired on the crowd, killing three demonstrators and wounding many others. The incident provoked a weeklong series of strikes, demonstrations, and clashes with the police in many Italian cities.

15. Filippo Meda (see Notebook 1, §107, n. 1) and Giulio Rodinò were among the prominent Catholic politicians who had played important roles in the Popular Party (founded by the priest Luigi Sturzo) since its inception in 1919. Rodinò served a very brief term as minister of war in Francesco Saverio Nitti's cabinet in 1920 and was appointed minister of justice by Prime Minister Ivanoe Bonomi in 1921. Both Meda and Rodinò were moderate or centrist in their politics, whereas Guido Miglioli, who had also joined the Popular Party in 1919, held decidedly more leftist views. On Miglioli, see Notebook 5, §6, n. 2.

§45. *Enrico Catellani*, "La libertà del mare"

1. Enrico Catellani, "La libertà del mare" (Freedom of the seas), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1369 (April 1, 1929): 372–84.

§46. *Claudio Faina*, "Il carburante nazionale"

1. Claudio Faina, "Il carburante nazionale" (National gasoline), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1370 (April 16, 1929): 514–28.

2. Gramsci is referring to his comment in Notebook 2, §65, on Claudio Faina's earlier article "Foreste, combustibili e carburante nazionale" (Forests, fuels, and national gasoline), published in *Nuova Antologia* 63, no. 1347 (May 1, 1928): 82–106.

§47. *Catholic Action*

1. Gianforte Suardi, "Costantino Nigra e il XX settembre 1870" (Costantino Nigra and September 20, 1870), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1371 (May 1, 1929): 578–79.

2. See Gianforte Suardi "Quando e come i cattolici poterono partecipare alle elezioni politiche" (When and how Catholics could participate in national political elections), *Nuova Antologia* 62, no. 1335 (November 1, 1927): 118–23. See Gramsci's treatment of this article in Notebook 3, §25.

3. I.e., the Lateran Accords (or the concordat, as it is more commonly known) signed in February 1929.

4. Suardi, "Costantino Nigra," p. 132.

§48. *Domenico Spadoni*, "Le società segrete nella rivoluzione milanese dell'aprile 1814"

1. Domenico Spadoni, "Le società segrete nella rivoluzione milanese dell'aprile 1814" (The secret societies in the Milan revolution of 1814), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1372 (May 16, 1929): 197–211.

2. Giuseppe Prina (1766–1814), who was appointed minister of the Kingdom of Italy by Napoleon, incurred the wrath of the people because of his austere economic measures. He was also suspected of having enriched himself at the expense of the public treasury. On April 20, 1814, shortly after the defeat of Napoleon, the people of Milan rebelled, and Prina was killed by an angry mob.

§49. *Bernardo Sanvisenti*, "La questione delle Antille"

1. Bernardo Sanvisenti, "La questione delle Antille" (The question of the Antilles), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1373 (June 1, 1929): 353–68.

§50. *Brief notes on Japanese culture*

1. Raffaele Pettazzoni, "La religione nazionale del Giappone e la politica religiosa dello Stato giapponese" (The national religion of Japan and the

religious policy of the Japanese state), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1373 (June 1, 1929): 314–30. Raffaele Pettazzoni's book *La mitologia giapponese secondo il primo libro del Kojiki* (Japanese mythology according to the first book of the Koji-ki) was brought out by the Bologna publishing house of Zanichelli in 1929 in its series "Testi e documenti per la storia della religione" (Texts and documents on the history of religion).

2. On Sun Yat-sen, see Notebook 5, §23, n. 3. See also Gramsci's comments on Sun Yat-sen's "Three Principles of the People" elsewhere in this notebook, specifically Notebook 5, §51 and §122.

3. The Italian word used by Gramsci in this instance is "*Riforma*" (capitalized), which normally signifies the Protestant Reformation. By using this word he seems to be indicating that he perceives some analogies between the process of secularization set in motion in Europe by the Reformation and the religious developments in Japan. He elaborates on this idea in Notebook 8, §87, where he again uses the word "*riforma*," though he does not capitalize it.

§51. *Brief notes on Chinese culture*

1. This unsigned article was published in two parts with slightly different titles: "Il riformatore cinese Suen Uen e le sue teorie politiche e sociali" (The Chinese reformer Sun Yat-sen and his political and social theories), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (May 4, 1929): 205–20; and "Le teorie politiche e sociali di Suen Uen" (Sun Yat-sen's political and social theories), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (May 18, 1929): 300–314.

Sun Yat-sen is sometimes referred to as Suen Uen and sometimes as Sun Wen. These variants have been left unchanged when they occur in the titles of books and articles; in the body of the translation, however, the name has been rendered consistently as Sun Yat-sen. Also, for the purposes of consistency and clarity, the Italian phrase "*triplice demismo*" (literally, "triple demism") has been translated in all cases as "Three Principles of the People."

On Sun Yat-sen, see Notebook 5, §23, n. 3. Gramsci makes further comments on Sun Yat-sen's "Three Principles of the People" in Notebook 5, §122.

2. The Italian Jesuit priest, Pasquale D'Elia, spent many years in China and wrote on diverse aspects of Chinese culture and history. He made especially important contributions to the study of the history of Catholicism in China. Some of his works are available in English, including *Catholic Native Episcopy in China. An Outline of the Formation and Growth of the Chinese Catholic Clergy: 1300–1926* (Shanghai: Tusewei Printing Press, 1927), *The Catholic Missions in China: A Short Sketch of the History of the Catholic Church in China from the Earliest Records to*

Our Own Days (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1934), and *Galileo in China. Relations through the Roman College Between Galileo and the Jesuit Scientist-Missionaries: 1610–1640*, trans. R. Suter and M. Sciascia (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960).

3. Pope Leo XIII's encyclicals *Rerum novarum* and *Immortale Dei* were promulgated in 1891 and 1885, respectively. On the *Codice sociale* (Social code), a handbook of Catholic social thought strongly influenced by the teachings of Pope Leo XIII, see Notebook 1, §1, n. 2.

§52. *Domenico Meneghini*, "Industrie chimiche italiane"

1. See Domenico Meneghini, "Industrie chimiche italiane" (Italian chemical industries), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1374 (June 16, 1929): 507–22.

§53. *Reformation and Renaissance. Nicholas of Cusa*

1. Ludwig von Bertalanffy, "Un cardinale germanico (Nicolaus Cusanus)" (A German cardinal: Nicholas of Cusa), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1374 (June 16, 1929): 536–39. This article is, in fact, an Italian translation of the introduction Ludwig von Bertalanffy wrote for his small edition of excerpts from the works of Nicholas of Cusa translated into German; see *Nikolus von Kues* (Munich: G. Muller, 1928)

Nicholas of Cusa (1401–64), born in Kues, Germany, was a paradigmatic example of the Renaissance man. He had an impressive range of interests and made significant contributions to diverse fields of knowledge, including philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, and the applied sciences (especially biology). In his philosophical writings he emphasized and discussed the implications of the limits or incompleteness of human knowledge: both of God and of the universe. As a scientist, Cusa stood at the threshold of modernity, in the sense that he stressed the importance of experimentation and empirical investigation. As a prominent churchman, he argued strenuously for ecclesiastical reform. Cusa was a cardinal and bishop of Brixen (Bressanone) in Italy.

2. Paolo Rotta, a Catholic scholar, wrote extensively on ancient and medieval philosophy. His major work on Cusa, *Il cardinale Nicolo di Cusa, la vita e il pensiero* (Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa: His life and thought), was brought out in Milan in 1928 by the Catholic publishing house of Vita e Pensiero in its series "Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore."

3. Nicholas of Cusa did not participate in the Council of Constance (1414–18); it was at the Council of Basel (1431–49) that he stood up for the reassertion of the rights of councils.

4. In 1432, at the Council of Basel, Nicholas of Cusa challenged papal authority by opposing the candidate the pope had named for the archbishopric of Trier. He followed this with a work, *De concordantia catholica* (1433), in which he argued that the authority of the pope was subordinate to that of the general councils of the church. Within a few years, however, he became disillusioned about the ability of the councils to foster harmony within the church and to enact needed reforms. He not only reconciled himself with the pope, Eugenius IV, but also became one of his vigorous supporters.

5. Following the seizure of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, Nicholas of Cusa, long a proponent of religious peace, expressed the need for Christianity to cultivate a more conciliatory or tolerant attitude toward Islam. For a recent critical edition of the Latin text, with parallel German translation, of Nicholas of Cusa's work on the Koran, see *Cribratio Alkorani/Sichtung des Korans*, ed. L. Hagemann and R. Glei (Hamburg: Meiner, 1989).

6. Nicholas of Cusa's best-known work, *De docta ignorantia*, was first published in 1440. For an English translation, see *Of Learned Ignorance*, trans. Germain Heron (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

"*Coincidentia oppositorum*" (identity of opposites) is a concept often associated with the philosophy of Nicholas of Cusa.

7. The editorial note in *Nuova Antologia* provides incomplete information about Michele Losacco's paper on Nicholas of Cusa's dialectics, "La dialettica del Cusano." In fact, as Gramsci surmised, the paper was presented at the Lincei Academy in Rome and published in the academy's own periodical report, *Rendiconti della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* 4, no. 4 (1928): 309–44.

§54. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. The poet Giosuè Carducci (on whom see Notebook 1, §44, n. 17) published three small collections of "barbarous odes," as he called them: *Odi barbare* (1877), *Nuove odi barbare* (1882), and *Terze odi barbare* (1889). In both content and form these poems constitute a reaction against what Carducci regarded as the sentimentalism and facile versification of the late romantic poets. Through his odes Carducci was proposing a return to classical motifs and metrical forms. He termed them "barbarous" because there was an element of experimentation and innovation in his effort to adapt classical metrical measures to modern Italian; the results, he believed, would have sounded "barbarous" to the ears of the ancients.

2. For other comments by Gramsci on the "narcotic" effects of certain forms of popular literature, see Notebook 6, §28 and §134.

§55. *Romagna and its role in Italian history*

1. Luigi Cavina, "Fiorentini e Veneziani in Romagna" (Florentines and Venetians in Romagna), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1374 (June 16, 1929): 442–56.

2. With the help of the French, Duke Valentino (i.e., Cesare Borgia, the son of Pope Alexander VI) conducted a series of military campaigns between 1499 and 1503 that enabled him to take control of the whole of Romagna, subjugating the fractious nobles of the region and firmly reasserting the pope's suzerainty over the entire territory. Machiavelli first met Valentino in 1502, when he was sent to him on a diplomatic mission from Florence. Following the death of Pope Alexander VI in 1503, Valentino's power collapsed. Taking advantage of the power vacuum, Venice added Romagna to the already extensive territories under its control. In 1508 Pope Julius II, determined to regain possession of the Papal States, joined an alliance—known as the League of Cambrai—that included virtually everyone who had lost territory to Venice, namely the emperor Maximilian I, Louis XII of France, Ferdinand II of Aragon, and the cities of Mantua and Ferrara. The league enjoyed an early success when the French defeated the Venetians at the battle of Agnadello (near Milan), in 1509. By the end of 1510, however, the alliance had crumbled. Pope Julius II, having recovered the cities of Romagna, formed the Holy League with Venice (now weakened and no longer a threat) and Ferdinand of Aragon in 1511. His ultimate aim was to drive the French out of Italy and possibly establish the papacy as the dominant ruling power in the entire peninsula.

3. It is important to bear in mind the context in which Machiavelli makes this statement:

> We owe them [i.e., the church and the priests] an even greater debt, which is the second cause of our ruin; namely, that the church has kept and continues to keep this country divided. For in truth, no country has ever been united and happy unless it has submitted itself wholly to the jurisdiction of a single republic or a single prince, as was the case with France and Spain. And the only reason Italy is not in the same position and is not governed by either one republic or one prince is the church. For although the church is based in Italy and has temporal power, it has never been sufficiently powerful nor had enough courage to seize power in Italy and rule it. On the other hand, the church has not been so weak that when threatened with the loss of temporal power it could not call on one of the powers to defend it against an Italian state that had become too powerful. . . . The church, then, lacking the power to occupy all Italy and forbidding anyone else from occupying it has been the cause why Italy could not come under

> one head but has been under many princes and signori who were responsible for such disunity and weakness that Italy has now become the prey not only of barbarian potentates but of anyone who attacks it. For this, we Italians have none other than the church to thank. (Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Discourses*, book 1, §12)

4. Cavina, "Fiorentini e Veneziani in Romagna," pp. 448–49.

5. See especially Notebook 1, §150, and Notebook 3, §118, as well as the many notes on the cosmopolitan character of Italian intellectuals.

6. Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, chap. 3.

7. I.e., the Lateran Accords, more commonly known as the concordat.

8. Bernard Groethuysen, *Origines de l'esprit bourgeois en France*, vol. 1, *L'eglise et la bourgeoisie* (Paris: Gallimard, 1927). For a condensed English translation of this volume, see *The Bourgeois: Catholicism vs. Capitalism in Eighteenth-Century France*, trans. Mary Ilford (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968).

Gramsci received a copy of Groethuysen's work while he was at the San Vittore prison in Milan, where he wrote to his friend Giuseppe Berti about it on August 8, 1927: "I am now reading *L'eglise et la bourgeoisie*, volume one (300 pages in octavo) in *Origines de l'esprit bourgeois en France* by a certain Groethuysen. The author, with whom I am not familiar but who must be a follower of Paulhan's sociological school, has had the patience to carry out a molecular analysis of the collections of sermons and devotional books published before 1789, so as to reconstruct the points of view, beliefs, and attitudes of the new ruling class that was then being formed." Gramsci also comments on Groethuysen's work in an April 22, 1929, letter to Tatiana Schucht, quoted on 1:15–16.

9. Leon Battista Alberti (1404–72), a Renaissance humanist, possessed such a wide-ranging intellect and made so many important contributions to diverse fields of knowledge that he is sometimes compared to Leonardo da Vinci. His book on painting, *De pictura* (1435), set forth the basic principles of the science of perspective, while his work on architecture, *De re aedificatoria* (1450), became the fundamental text for architectural design and engineering during the Renaissance (Alberti was himself a successful architect). A brilliant mathematician, he also did pioneering work in cryptography and cartography. Furthermore, he produced a substantial body of literary work in both Latin and Italian and wrote what is probably the earliest grammar of the Italian language, or, to be more precise, of the Tuscan vernacular. Alberti's most important writings on morals and ethics include *Intercoenales*, composed in Latin over many years; the four volumes of *Della famiglia* (On the family), published in Italian between 1437 and 1438; and the work he completed just before his death, *De iciarcha* (Alberti himself explained that he derived the term "iciarch" from the Greek and

that it signifies "the man of excellence and the primary ruler of his family"). In *Della famiglia*, written in the form of dialogues, Alberti offers reflections on the value of family, on education, on husbandry, on the fickleness of fortune, on civic duty, and on other matters. *De iciarchi*, also in dialogue form, extols the humanist ideals of civic involvement, productive activity, and achievement. For English translations of *Intercoenales* and *Della famiglia*, see, respectively, *Dinner Pieces*, trans. David Marsh (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1987), and *The Albertis of Florence: Leon Battista Alberti's Della famiglia*, trans. Guido. A. Guarino (Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 1971).

10. Baldassare Castiglione (1478–1529), was linked throughout his career to the courts of powerful dukes, whom he served mostly as a diplomat. He was a member of the court of Guidobaldo da Montefeltro, duke of Urbino, when he started writing *Il cortegiano* in 1513. In that work, which he completed in 1518 and published in 1528, Castiglione draws a portrait, in dialogic form, of the ideal courtier: an aristocratic ideal based on elegance of comportment and of language and on refinement in poetry, music, connoisseurship, and the military arts. The book quickly became one of the best-known works of its time, the authoritative handbook of aristocratic manners and the art of chivalry. It was soon translated into several languages; the first English version, *The Courtyer*, translated by Sir Thomas Hoby, was published in 1561. For a modern translation, see *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. George Bull (Baltimore: Penguin, 1976).

11. The major political works of Francesco Guicciardini (1483–1540) include, among other titles, *Dialogo del reggimento di Firenze* (1526) and *Considerazioni intorno ai "Discorsi" del Machiavelli* (written sometime between 1528 and 1530). For the respective English translations, see *Dialogue on the Government of Florence*, ed. and trans. Alison Brown (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); and "Considerations on the '*Discourses*' of Machiavelli," in *Selected Writings*, ed. Cecil Grayson and trans. Margaret Grayson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965). Of course, Guicciardini's historiographical writings, particularly his masterpiece *Storia d'Italia*, are in many respects important works of political analysis as well. For an English translation of *Storia d'Italia*, see *The History of Italy*, ed. and trans. Sidney Alexander (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984).

§56. *Catholic Action*

1. See the unsigned article (in fact written by the Jesuit priest Angelo Brucculeri), "Verso la pace industriale" (Toward peace in industrial relations), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (January 5, 1929): 29–40.

2. I.e., the Bureau Internationale de Travail (International Labor Office).

3. See Angelo Brucculeri, *Problemi odierni del lavoro* (Rome: Editrice *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 1929).

4. On the Office of Malines and the *Codice sociale*, see Notebook 1, §1, n. 2.

§57. *Catholic Action in the United States*

1. "La campagna elettorale degli Stati Uniti e le sue lezioni" (The electoral campaign in the United States and its lessons), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (January 5, 1929): 86–93.

2. In 1928 Alfred E. Smith, who had served four terms as governor of New York, was chosen by the Democratic Party to run as its candidate for the presidency of the United States. His Republican opponent was Herbert Hoover, who won the election in a landslide. Nothing contributed more to Smith's defeat than his opposition to prohibition and the fact that he was Catholic. He was totally rebuffed by conservative Protestant voters and suffered his heaviest defeats in the southern states, where the Ku Klux Klan was only one of the groups that mounted campaigns against him.

3. In the course of his campaign, Alfred Smith published an open letter to rebut charges that his Catholic faith rendered him unsuitable for the presidency. The fact that he was Catholic, Smith explained, did not make him any less loyal to the Constitution. He also reaffirmed his belief in the principle of the separation of church and state. Papal encyclicals and declarations (such as Pius IX's *Syllabus*) that condemned the notion of the secular state, Smith argued, are not binding statements of faith and dogma. The text of Smith's open letter is reproduced (in French translation) in a book Gramsci had in prison: Nicolas Fontaine, *Saint-Siège, "Action française" et "Catholiques intégraux"* (Paris: Librairie Universitaire J. Gamber, 1928), pp. 177–88.

§58. *Catholic Action*

1. Gramsci brings up the same issue in a July 27, 1931, letter to his wife, Julia:

> In a few days Delio will be seven years old, and at the end of the month Giuliano will be five. The date is important for Delio, because seven years is considered an important stage in the development of a personality. The Catholic Church, which undoubtedly is the world organism that possesses the greatest accumulation of organizational and propaganda experience, has fixed at seven years, through the first communion, a person's solemn entry into the religious community, which presupposes in the young child the first responsibility for the

> choice of an ideology that should leave the imprint of an indelible, lifelong memory. I don't know whether you will give Delio's birthday a particular character that will leave in his memory a deeper and more lasting imprint than other anniversaries. If Giuliano were not just five years old and if it were not impossible, at least within certain limits, to distinguish between Delio and Giuliano, I believe that this would be the moment to explain to Delio that I am in prison and why. I believe that such an explanation, together with the fact that he is now considered capable of a certain sense of responsibility, would make a great impression on him and would unquestionably mark a date in his development.

2. Gramsci had mentioned the same episode from Fogazzaro's novel in his article "L'appello ai pargoli" (The appeal to little children) published in the "Sotto la Mole" section of the Piedmont edition of *Avanti!* July 31, 1916.

On Antonio Fogazzaro, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 6, and §72, n. 3.

For an English translation of Fogazzaro's novel *Piccolo mondo antico* (which was first published in 1895), see *The Little World of the Past*, trans. W. J. Strachan, intro. by Tommaso Gallarati Scotti (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).

3. Gramsci extracted the publication information from an unsigned review article, "Il decreto sull'età per la prima comunione commentato da Mons. Segr. della S. C. dei Sacramenti" (The decree on the age of First Communion with a commentary by the monsignor secretary of the Holy Congregation of the Sacraments), in the "Rivista della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (January 19, 1929): 150–54.

On Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, see Notebook 5, §9, n. 2.

§59. *Catholic Action in Germany*

1. See the unsigned article "La lega di pace dei cattolici tedeschi" (The German Catholic League for Peace), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (January 19, 1929): 165–70.

2. See "Lettera del S. Padre all'Eminentissimo Cardinal Bertram" (Letter from the Holy Father to His Eminence Cardinal Bertram) in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (January 19, 1929): 102–4.

§60. "La schiavitù del lavoro indigeno" (by A. Brucculeri)

1. See the unsigned article (in fact written by the Jesuit priest Angelo Brucculeri), "La schiavitù del lavoro indigeno" (The slavery of indigenous labor), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (February 2, 1929): 202–16.

§61. *Rotary Club*

1. "Ancora Rotary Club e Massoneria" (More about the Rotary Club and Freemasonry), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (February 16, 1929): 337–46.

2. According to "Ancora Rotary Club e Massoneria," the Spanish bishop to whom Gramsci refers was the archbishop of Toledo, Cardinal Pietro Segura y Saenz, who condemned the Rotary Club in his pastoral letter of January 23, 1929.

§62. The editorial staff of *La Civiltà Cattolica*

1. Most of the articles in *La Civiltà Cattolica* are unsigned. In all likelihood, Gramsci obtained the information about the authorship of various articles from the *Indice analitico delle annate 1926–1930* (Analytic index of the issues from 1926 to 1930) compiled by Giuseppe Del Chiaro and brought out by the publishing house of *La Civiltà Cattolica* in Rome in 1931.

2. See Angelo Brucculeri's book on the major labor issues of the time, *Problemi odierni del lavoro* (Rome: Editrice *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 1929). Gramsci discussed several of the articles in this volume in different parts of his notebooks: on "L'organizzazione internazionale" (The international organization [of labor]), see Notebook 2, §128, and Notebook 5, §5; on "L'orientazione professionale" (Vocational guidance), see Notebook 5, §41; on "Verso la pace industriale" (Toward peace in industrial relations), see Notebook 5, §56; and on "La schiavitù del lavoro indigeno" (The slavery of indigenous labor), see Notebook 5, §60.

3. See the following books by Angelo Brucculeri, published by Editrice *La Civiltà Cattolica*: on wage scales and workers' participation, *Salariato e compartecipazione* (1920); on the problem of land ownership and distribution, *Il problema della terra*, 2d ed. (1921); on the history of strikes from ethical and economical perspectives, *Lo sciopero nella storia, nella morale, nell'economia*, 2d ed. (1922); on establishing limits on working hours and the principle of the eight-hour workday, *La limitazione della giornata di lavoro e il principio delle otto ore*, 2d ed. (1923); on the Malthusian problem, *Sul problema di Malthus. Rilievi* (1928).

§63. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. All the information recorded in this note on Giovanni Casati' dictionary of living Italian Catholic writers, *Scrittori cattolici italiani viventi: Dizionario bio-bibliografico ed indice analtico delle opere* (Milan: Romolo Ghirlanda, 1928) is extracted from the "Rivista della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (March 2, 1929): 437–42. Gramsci had already learned about the publication of Casati's work from a listing in *L'Italia Che Scrive*; see Notebook 3, §136.

On Filippo Meda, who contributed the preface to Casati's work, see Notebook 1, §107, and n. 1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

2. The article in *La Civiltà Cattolica* provided no publication information regarding the A–B volume of Giovanni Casati's *Scrittori d'Italia dalle origini fino ai viventi* (Italian writers: From the earliest to those still living).

3. See Giovanni Casati's book on literary works that were condemned by the Catholic Church and placed on its Index of Forbidden Books, *I libri letterari condannati dall'Indice: Saggi*, pref. by Pietro Maffi (Milan: Ghirlanda, 1922).

4. On Gaetano De Sanctis, see Notebook 3, §86, n. 3; and on Pietro Fedele, see Notebook 3, §9, n. 4.

5. On Giovanni Papini, who is discussed by Gramsci in various places throughout the notebooks, see Notebook 1, §8, n. 1; on Domenico Giuliotti, see Notebook 1, §72, n. 1; and on Pietro Mignosi, see Notebook 1, §75, n. 1.

6. Pier Silvio Rivetta used the pseudonym Toddi for his contributions to the Rome satirical weekly *Il Travaso delle Idee*.

§64. *Church and state in Italy before the conciliation*

1. "La Conciliazione fra lo Stato italiano e la Chiesa—cenni cronistici" (The reconcilation between the Italian state and the church—references in the news coverage), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (March 2, 1929): 451–67. The reconciliation took place formally on 11 February 1929 with the signing of the Lateran Pacts.

2. On the "social weeks," which originated in France but were subsequently duplicated in other countries, see Notebook 4, §90, n. 3.

3. Benedict XV, who was elected pope in 1914, died on January 22, 1922. Among other things, he lifted the *non expedit* that had forbidden Catholics from participating in national politics, and he permitted the formation of a Catholic political party: the Popular Party, founded by the priest Luigi Sturzo.

The *Civiltà Cattolica* article cited at the beginning of Gramsci's note reproduced (in a footnote on p. 453) Senator Alfredo Petrillo's account as follows:

> "Benedict XV had died," Senator Petrillo recounts in the *Popolo d'Italia* (17 February), "and the Bonomi cabinet was agonizing about what to do, even though—or perhaps because—it was receiving spiritual guidance from Don Sturzo. In the Chamber [of Deputies] there was great agitation, not because of the upcoming conclave [to elect a new pope] but because a government crisis was imminent. The

groups were permanently in session. The group of the Right, presided over by the Hon. Salandra, had completed its meeting; the Hon. Salandra was still in the meeting room with the Hon. Ricci, myself, and a few others. The Fascist group was gathered in an adjacent room. The door connecting the two room was opened and in walked the Hon. Mussolini, followed by the Hon. Acerbo and, if I remember correctly, the Hon. Federzoni. He walked straight toward Salandra and told him, resolutely and tersely: 'I believe it is politically very important that the Italian Chamber should commemorate the Pontiff. You, Hon. Salandra, would be the most suitable person to make a speech.' The Hon. Salandra remained perplexed, surprised by the unexpected proposal. 'Yes,' he replied, perhaps more out of deference than conviction, 'yes, the commemoration has its importance.' He paused, then added: 'I cannot be the orator, for what I would have to say is not appropriate for a commemoration.' The Hon. Salandra, evidently, was looking at the past, even the recent past; Mussolini was already working for the future, even if it were still a distant future. Benedict XV was not commemorated in the chamber."

4. On Ivanoe Bonomi, who was prime minister between 1921 and 1922 and had three Popular Party members in his cabinet, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 21.

5. Nicola Bombacci (1879–1945) was a prominent figure in the Communist Party and a member of parliament at the time. Expelled from the party in 1927, Bombacci drifted increasingly closer to the Fascists and eventually became a member of Mussolini's innermost circle and one of his most loyal supporters.

On Giuseppe Bevione, see Notebook 2, §25, n. 1.

§65. *Risorgimento. The historical conjuncture of 1848–49*

1. The unsigned article "Il P. Saverio Bettinelli e l'abate Vincenzo Gioberti" (Father Saverion Bettinelli and Abbé Vincenzo Gioberti) was published in two parts in *La Civilità Cattolica* 80 (March 2, 1929): 408–21; and (March 16, 1929): 504–21.

2. On Vincenzo Gioberti, see Notebook 1, §46, n. 1.

3. "Il P. Saverio Bettinelli e l'abate Vincenzo Gioberti," part 2, p. 511.

On Count Clemente Solaro della Margarita, see Notebook 2, §62, n. 4.

4. On Antonio Bruers, see Notebook 1, §99, n. 1.

5. Umberto Padovani was a professor at the Università del Sacro Cuore, the Catholic university in Milan.

6. On Antonio Salandra, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 20.

§66. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Ugo Ojetti and the Jesuits*

1. Ugo Ojetti published his open letter to the Jesuit priest Enrico Rosa, "Lettera al reverendo Padre Enrico Rosa, S.J.," in his journal *Pégaso* (1, no. 3 [March 1929]: 344–47). The open letter was reprinted together with a lengthy response by Father Rosa under the title "Intorno alla Conciliazione (Concerning the conciliation) in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (April 6, 1929): 3–19. Gramsci also comments briefly on Ojetti's open letter and Father Rosa's response in Notebook 1, §42.

On Ugo Ojetti, see Notebook 1, §24, n. 4.

2. The Lateran Pacts between the Italian state and the Catholic Church were formally signed on February 11, 1929.

3. The parenthetical remark is Gramsci's.

4. The aside enclosed in parenthesis is Gramsci's.

5. All the question marks, exclamation points and comments enclosed in parentheses are inserted by Gramsci, except for "(and if it is eternal, how can it be reconciled?)," which is in Ojetti's original text.

§67. *Catholic Action*

1. The *Annuario pontificio* (Papal yearbook) of 1929 was reviewed in the "Bibliografia" section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (May 4, 1929): 252.

2. The *Almanacco cattolico* (Catholic almanac) was brought out by the Milan publishing house of the Catholic periodical *Vita e Pensiero*.

§68. Monsignor Francesco Lanzoni, *Le Diocesi d'Italia . . .*

1. Francesco Lanzoni's detailed two-volume study *Le Diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII (anno 604)* (Italian dioceses from their origins to the beginning of the seventh century—604 A.D.) was published by Faenza's F. Lega publishing house in 1927, in the "Studi e testi" (Studies and texts) series of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Gramsci derived the bibliographical data and all other information on Lanzoni's book (as well as the references to the writings of Duchesne and Harnack mentioned later in the note) from an unsigned review-essay, "L'origine delle antiche Diocesi in Italia secondo la leggenda e secondo la critica storica" (The origins of the old Italian dioceses according to legend and according to historical criticism), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (May 18, 1929): 327–42.

2. Gramsci had a copy of Henri Pirenne's *Les villes du Moyen Ages: Essai d'histoire économique et sociale* (Brussels: M. Lamertin, 1927). For an English translation, see *Medieval Cities: Their Origins and the Revival of Trade*, trans. Frank D. Halsey (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946). The contents of this work are based on a series of lectures delivered

by the renowned Belgian medievalist Henri Pirenne (1862–1935) at various universities in the United States in 1922.

3. For Louis Duchesne's studies on Italian bishoprics at the time of the invasion of Lombardy and on episcopal sees in the old Duchy of Rome, see, respectively, "Les évêches d'Italie et l'invasion Lombarde," which was first published by the Ecole Française de Rome as volume 23 of *Extrait de mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* (Rome, 1903) and later incorporated into Louis Duchesne's *Scripta minora: Etudes de topographie romaine et de géographie ecclésiastique* (Rome: Ecole Française de Rome, 1973); and "Le sedi episcopali dell'antico ducato di Roma," *Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria* 15 (1892): 457–503.

4. Adolf von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhundertern*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1915). For an English translation, see *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, 2 vols., trans. James Moffatt (Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1972).

§69. *Encyclopedic notions*

1. The German socialist Ferdinand Lassalle (1825–64) spoke disparagingly of the liberal concept of the state as "night watchman" in his "Offene Antwortschreiben an das Zentral-Kongresses zu Leipzig" (Open letter of reply to the central committee for the convocation of a general congress of German workers in Leipzig), which he composed in February 1863 and published in the form of a pamphlet a month later.

Gramsci returns to a discussion of the concept of the state as "night watchman" in Notebook 6, §88.

§70. *The state is the church*

1. Ignotus, *Stato fascista, Chiesa, e scuola* (Rome: Libreria del Littorio, 1929), pp. 67–68. Gramsci makes a passing allusion to this polemical pamphlet on the Fascist state, the church, and education in Notebook 3, §54.

2. The text of education minister Giuseppe Belluzzo's circular, first published in the *Bollettino Ufficiale* (Official bulletin) of the Education Ministry, was reproduced in full in the "Cose italiane" (Italian affairs) section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (May 18, 1929): 373–74.

On Giuseppe Belluzzo, see Notebook 1, §32, n. 3.

3. Ignotus, *Stato fascista, Chiesa, e scuola*, p. 66.

4. On the reform of the national educational system designed by Giovanni Gentile (and commonly referred to as the "*riforma* Gentile") see, inter alia, the Notes to the Text for Notebook 4, §50, and Notebook 4, §53, n. 6.

5. The royal decree "Ordinamento dei gradi scolastici e dei programmi didattici dell'istruzione elementare" (Regulations governing school grades and curricula in elementary education) was one of a series of laws enacted as part of the implementation of Gentile's reform of the educational system in Italy. Gramsci extracted the quotation from the unsigned article (in fact written by the Jesuit priest Mario Barbera) "Religion and philosophy in the secondary schools" in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (June 1, 1929).

6. The quotation from the article *on religious instruction in the secondary schools* published by *La Tribuna* is taken from "Religione e filosofia nelle scuole medie."

7. The Albertine Statute was proclaimed by King Carlo Alberto of Savoy in February 1848 in response to popular demands for the liberalization of the state. Among other things, the Statuto Albertino established the sharing of legislative power between the monarch and parliament. It also affirmed the principle of equal justice for all, guaranteed individual freedom and freedom of the press, protected the right of peaceful assembly, and asserted the inviolability of private property. The first article of the statute defined Catholicism as the "only state religion" but also expressed tolerance for other religions. In 1861 the statute became the constitution of the Kingdom of Italy. (The statute was replaced in January 1948 with the constitution of the Republic of Italy.)

The Conciliation Treaty—one of three documents that constitute the Lateran Pacts signed in February 1929—confirmed the privileged position of Roman Catholicism as the sole religion of the state in Italy.

8. "Religione e filosofia nelle scuole medie," pp. 414–27. Gramsci also touches on the contents of this article in Notebook 4, §37.

§71. *The nature of the concordats*

1. "Lettera di S. S. Pio XI all'E.mo Card. Segretario di Stato" (Letter of His Holiness Pius XI to His Eminence the cardinal secretary of state), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (June 15, 1929): 483. Emphasis added by Gramsci.

On Cardinal Gasparri, see Notebook 5, §9, n. 2.

2. On the three documents that together constituted the Lateran Pacts, see Notebook 4, §53, n. 1.

§72. *Past and present*

1. "La Conciliazione fra lo Stato italiano e la Chiesa: Cenni cronistorici" (The conciliation between the Italian state and the church: References in historical chronicles), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (April 6, 1929): 68–69n.

§73. *Politico-military direction of the war*

1. G.S., "Benes l'immemore" (Benes the forgetful), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1374 (June 16, 1929): 526–27.

2. Cesare Spellanzon (1884–1957) abandoned his journalistic career during the Fascist period and devoted his energies to his other interest: namely, studying and writing about Italian history. Most of his published work deals with the history of the Risorgimento.

3. See Edvard Benes, *Souvenirs de guerre et de révolution: 1914–1918* (Paris: Leroux, 1928). For an English translation, see *My War Memoirs*, trans. Paul Selver (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1928).

Edvard Benes (1884–1948) was one of the founders of Czechoslovakia. A member of the nationalist leadership group that established a Czechoslovak provisional government during the war. Benes became his country's foreign minister when the provisional government and its claims to Czechoslovak independence were recognized by Britain and France in 1918. He retained the position for twenty years.

§74. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*

1. All the bibliographical data and quoted passages in this note are extracted from a review-article, "San Benedetto e Cassiodoro" (St. Benedict and Cassiodorus), in the "Notizie e commenti" (News and comments) section of *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1375 (July 1, 1929): 126–29.

2. Aurelio Giuseppe Amatucci, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana* (History of Christian literature in Latin) (Bari: Laterza, 1929).

3. Cassiodorus (ca. 487–ca. 480) held several high administrative offices before he retired to his birthplace, Scylacium (Squillace), in southern Italy, sometime around 540, and established a monastery called Vivarium. There, the monks copied manuscripts under the direction of Cassiodorus, a collector of manuscripts intent on preserving Roman culture. Cassiodorus's most important work is the *Institutiones divinarum et seacularium litterarum*, a part of which comprises directions to his monks on the study of scripture and the copying of manuscripts. For an English translation of the *Institutiones*, see *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings*, ed. and trans. Leslie Webber Jones (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946).

4. Luigi Salvatorelli's book on Saint Benedict and the Italy of his time was published by Laterza in 1929. For more on Luigi Salvatorelli, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 27.

5. The Roman firm of Formiggini published Ermini's small book on St. Benedict in its "Profili" (Profiles) series in 1928.

On Filippo Ermini, see Notebook 3, §76, n. 2.

§75. *Maggiorino Ferraris and life in Italy from 1882 to 1926*

1. See the bibliographical note entitled "Scritti di M. Ferraris" (Writings by M. Ferraris) in *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1375 (July 1, 1929): 7–10. This bibliographical note accompanies a set of articles commemorating the recently deceased Maggiorino Ferraris.

§76. *On the crisis of 1898*

1. The four articles by Maggiorino Ferraris mentioned here—"Il rincaro del pane" (The increase in the price of bread), "L'ora presente" (The present hour), "Il nuovo rincaro del pane" (The latest increase in the price of bread), and "Politica di lavoro" (labor policy)—were all published in *Nuova Antologia* on the dates indicated, and they are all included in the bibliographical list cited in §75, n. 1, above.

§77. *Garibaldi's crossing from Sicily to Calabria in 1860*

1. When Garibaldi defeated the Neapolitan army at Milazzo on July 20, 1860, thus gaining control of all of Sicily and bringing an end to Bourbon rule of the island, King Vittorio Emanuele sent him an official message asking him to stop his campaign. At the same time, the king secretly let Garibaldi know that he would not be displeased if the latter disobeyed and marched on to Naples. Garibaldi crossed the straits of Messina in mid-August and entered Naples triumphantly on September 7.

2. Maggiorino Ferraris's article, "Vittorio Emanuele e Garibaldi ed il passaggio del Faro nel 1860: Da documenti storici" (Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi and the crossing at Faro in 1860: Based on historical documents), which was published in the January 1, 1912, issue of *Nuova Antologia*, is included in the bibliographical list cited in §75, n. 1, above.

§78. *Monasticism and feudalism*

1. I.e., the Benedictine rule

2. This whole note is based on an article by Carlo Calisse, "San Benedetto" (St. Benedict), in *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1375 (July 1, 1929): 11–29.

§79. *A. G. Bianchi,* "I clubs rossi durante l'assedio di Parigi"

1. Augusto Guido Bianchi, "I clubs rossi durante l'assedio di Parigi" (The red clubs during the siege of Paris), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1375 (July 1, 1929): 46–55.

2. As Gramsci correctly surmised, *Les clubs rouges pendant le siège de Paris* (Paris: Garnier, 1871) was written by the French journalist and political commentator Gustave de Molinari (1819–1912). Contrary to the impression conveyed by Bianchi's article, however, de Molinari's book is not a pamphlet but a volume of well over three hundred pages.

§80. *Sorel and the Jacobins*

1. Quoted by Augusto Guido Bianchi in his article "I clubs rossi durante l'assedio di Parigi" (The red clubs during the siege of Paris), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1375 (July 1, 1929): 47.

2. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, *De la justice dans la révolution et dans l'église: Nouveau principe de philosophie pratique*, 3 vols. (Paris: Garnier, 1858). Some portions of this work are available in English translation in *Selected Writings of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon*, ed. Stewart Edwards, trans. Elizabeth Fraser (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1969).

§81. *Past and present. Territorial distribution of the Italian population*

1. Gramsci extracted the data recorded in this note from the second half of a two-part article by Giorgio Mortara, "Natalità e urbanesimo in Italia" (Birth rates and urbanism in Italy), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1374 (June 16, 1929): 485–96, and no. 1375, (July 1, 1929): 102–15. Other information derived from this article is used by Gramsci in Notebook 2, §124.

2. As part of its program to centralize the state, the Fascist regime in February 1926 started to implement a law—known as the "podestà law"—that was meant to transform local administrative structures radically. In the first phase, the office of mayor and the local councils were eliminated in towns of less than five thousand inhabitants. Their functions were taken over by the "podestà," who was appointed by the central government—thus obviating the need for local administrative elections—and who was answerable only to the administrative authorities of the relevant province. Later that same year, the nondemocratic, hierarchical "podestà" system of administration was installed, with some modifications, in more populous centers.

§82. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*

1. Antonio Panizzi (1797–1879) left Italy in 1822 to escape persecution for his revolutionary patriotic activity. Within a few years of settling in England he was appointed professor of Italian at University College,

London. He became the principal librarian of the British Museum in 1856, after serving about twenty-five years as assistant librarian. Panizzi was knighted in 1869.

2. Carlo Segrè, "Il Petrarca a Montpellier" (Petrarch at Montpellier), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1376 (July 16, 1929): 137–53.

Pietro di ser Parenzo, also called Petracco, father of the great Italian poet Francesco Petrarca, or Petrarch (1304–74), was banished from Florence together with Dante and other Guelf leaders. After several years spent in other parts of Italy, including Arezzo, where Francesco was born, the family moved to France. Francesco received his early education in the village of Carpentras, near Avignon. Submitting to his father's wishes, he studied law, first at the University of Montpellier (1316–20) and then at the University of Bologna (1320–26), after which he returned to Avignon. It was in the church of Saint Claire in Avignon that, on April 6, 1327, Petrarch saw Laura, the woman who would inspire his finest poetry.

3. Ibid., p. 140.

4. Piacentino (d. 1192), so called after his birthplace Piacenza, is also known as Petrus Placentinus. Trained as an exegete of Roman legal texts by the followers of the renowned glossator Irnerius (ca. 1055–ca. 1125), he taught at Bologna and Mantua before moving to France, where he became a distinguished professor at Montpellier. Placentinus wrote several important treatises on Roman law, among them the *Summa codicis* and *Summa institutionum*.

§83. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*

1. Ferdinando Nunziante, "Gli italiani in Russia durante il secolo XVIII" (The Italians in Russia during the eighteenth century), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1376 (July 16, 1929): 187–210.

2. Ibid., p. 196.

3. One of the most successful members of the Panin family in Russia was Count Nikita Ivanovich Panin (1718–83), who for well over a decade was Catherine the Great's principal adviser in foreign affairs.

§84. *Popular literature*

1. For the judgment on H. G. Wells that Gramsci expressed in his letters, see Notebook 5, §42, n. 3.

2. Laura Torretta, "L'ultima fase di Wells" (Wells's final phase), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1376 (July 16, 1929): 217–18.

3. For more comparison between H. G. Wells and Jules Verne, see Notebook 3, §149.

§85. *Development of the bourgeois spirit in Italy*

1. Manilo Torquato Dazzi, "Nel centenario della morte di Albertino Mussato" (On the centenary of Albertino Mussato's death), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1376 (July 16, 1929): 154–75.

2. Albertino Mussato (1261–1329), statesman, poet, and historian, was a member of the council of his native Padua and was entrusted with a number of important diplomatic and ambassadorial missions. He also participated in the military defense of Padua during its long war with Vicenza. For several months in 1314 he was the prisoner of Cangrande della Scala of Verona but was able to return to Padua, where he was publicly and ceremoniously crowned poet. In 1325, however, he had a falling-out with the lord of Padua, Marsilio da Carrara, and was constrained to spend his remaining years in exile. His two major contributions to historiography were the *Historia Augusta de gestis Henrici VII*, which recounts the emperor Henry VII's deeds in Italy, and *De gestis Italicorum post Henricum VII Caesarem*, which covers the period following Henry VII's death (1313) up to 1329. (Although himself a Guelf, Mussato was a great admirer of Henry VII.) As a historian he modeled himself on Livy and adopted an approach distinctly different from that of the typical medieval chroniclers.

3. Giuseppe Lisio (1870–1912) was primarily a literary critic. He made significant contributions to Dante scholarship and produced a valuable critical edition of Machiavelli's *Principe*, on which he also wrote an important study.

Eduard Fueter (1876–1928) wrote, among many other historical works, a history of modern historiography: *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (Munich, 1911).

Ugo Balzani (1847–1916), in addition to his archival work on medieval chronicles, wrote books on the relations between the popes and the royal house of Hohenstaufen and on Pope Sixtus V.

4. On Leon Battista Alberti, see Notebook 5, §55, n. 9.

5. See Alfredo Lensi, *Palazzo Vecchio* (Milan-Rome: Bestetti e Tumminelli, 1929). Gramsci almost certainly read reviews of this book in the periodicals he received in prison, perhaps Nello Tarchiani's "Vita Vissuta in Palazzo Vecchio" (A life spent in Palazzo Vecchio), *Il Marzocco* 35, no. 6 (February 3, 1930) or Corrado Pavolini's review in *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 6 (February 9, 1930).

§86. *England*

1. This note is based on Gramsci's reading of an article by the pseudonymous Augur, "La politica della Gran Bretagna" (The policy of Great Britain), in *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1376 (July 16, 1929): 211–16. For Gramsci's comments on Augur, see Notebook 2, §32.

§87. *Political-military leadership in the war of 1914–18*

1. Mario Caracciolo, "Il comando unico e il comando italiano nel 1918" (Unified command and the Italian command in 1918), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1376 (July 16, 1929): 229–40.

2. Mario Caracciolo's book on Italian troops in France during World War I was published by the Milan firm of Mondadori in 1929.

3. Caracciolo, "Il comando unico," p. 232.

4. In fact, none of the newspapers, not even *Avanti!* carried any reports on the disturbances in and around Palazzo Siccardi, which housed the Turin offices of the Chamber of Labor.

§88. *On the Italian Risorgimento. Michele Amari and Sicilianism*

1. Francesco Brandileone, "Michele Amari," *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1377 (August 1, 1929): 352–59.

On Francesco Brandileone, see Notebook 3, §87, n. 3.

Michele Amari (1806–89) was born in Palermo, but his strong nationalist sentiments and open dislike of the absolutist Bourbon monarchy compelled him to seek exile in Paris. Before he left his native island he had already written and published a widely acclaimed historical study of the Sicilian Vespers revolt and the war that ensued, *La guerra del Vespro siciliano* (1842). While in Paris he studied Arabic and started gathering materials for a history of Arab rule in Sicily. With the revolution of 1848 he was able to return to Sicily, where he served briefly as minister of finance. The revolution soon collapsed, however, and Amari was back in exile, concentrating on his research. During this period he started to publish his monumental multivolume work on Sicily under the Arabs, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia* (1854–72). Amari returned to the Italian mainland in 1859 and a year later was back in Sicily, where Garibaldi appointed him minister of education and of public works. After the unification of Italy he was elected senator and served for some time as minister of education. In 1864 he moved to Florence and devoted the rest of his life to historical research. Amari's writings constitute one of the most important bodies of work on Sicilian medieval history. His book on the Sicilian Vespers was translated into English: *History of the War of the Sicilian Vespers*, 3 vols., trans. Francis Egerton (London: R. Bentley, 1850).

2. Emanuele Orlando's edition of Amari's writings was published by the Milan firm of Treves in 1928.

On Vittorio Emanuele Orlando, prime minister of Italy from 1917 to 1919 and, like Amari, a native of Palermo, see Notebook 1, §116, n. 17.

3. Gramsci is referring to a speech made by Vittorio Emanuele Orlando in Palermo on July 28, 1925. Responding to the Fascists, who had accused

him of promoting the interests of the Mafia by supporting the candidates of the opposition in local elections, Orlando said (according to a report in *Avanti!* July 29, 1925): "If by Mafia one understands the help that one friend extends to another, if by Mafia one understands the self-esteem of a people, if by Mafia one understands affection carried even to the limits of paroxysm or loyalty carried even to the point of exasperation, then I say as one native of Palermo to another: I am the first among the Mafiosi."

4. When Naples was taken over by Napoleon in 1806, the Bourbon king Ferdinand fled to Sicily, where the British, who propped up his rule over the island, pressured him into attenuating his absolutism and granting the Sicilians a constitution in 1812. In 1816, following the fall of Napoleon, Ferdinand returned to Naples, and, restored as the king of the Two Sicilies, he reverted to absolutist rule. As a consequence, Sicily lost whatever autonomy it had gained. The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies erupted into open rebellion in 1820; in Naples the rebels demanded a constitution, whereas in Sicily, and especially in the revolutionary stronghold of Palermo, the populace clamored for a return to the 1812 constitution and Sicilian independence. The Neapolitan leaders of the uprising succeeded in obtaining a liberal constitution from the king, but far from being sympathetic to the Sicilian cause, they sent General Pepe to the island, and he crushed the rebellious forces mercilessly.

5. Brandileone, "Michele Amari," p. 353.

6. Alessandro D'Ancona's edition of Michele Amari's correspondence is cited in a footnote on p. 358 of Brandileone's "Michele Amari."

7. Quoted in Brandileone, "Michele Amari," p. 355.

8. Brandileone, "Michele Amari," p. 358. Brandileone is referring to a passage in Benedetto Croce's introduction to his *Storia del regno di Napoli* (Bari: Laterza, 1925). See the English translation of Croce's work, *History of the Kingdom of Naples*, trans. Frances Frenaye (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1970): "The supporters of regional autonomy, in 1860 and after, in order to intensify the expression of their dismay and sorrow for the fall of the old Kingdom of Naples, were always mouthing a pompous but unrealistic reference to the 'glorious reign of Roger.' The fact is that the Norman-Swabian story is ours only in small part, practically not at all. Norman-Swabian politics and culture had no indigenous and national character" (p. 16).

§89. *Gabriele Gabbrielli*, "India ribelle"

1. Gabriele Gabbrielli, "India ribelle" (Rebel India), *Nuova Antologia* 65, no. 1377 (August 1, 1929): 375–84.

2. "Ispolcom" is the acronym, also used by Gabbrielli in his article, for the executive committee of the Communist International.

3. In his article, Gabbrielli uses the unabbreviated title of the organization "Entente contre la Troisième Internationale" that was formed in Geneva to combat Ispolcom.

4. Gramsci had a copy of a book by the French Catholic conservative Henri Massis, *Défense de l'occident* (Paris: Plon, 1927). He read it during the period of his imprisonment in Milan and commented on it in an August 8, 1927, letter to his friend Giuseppe Berti:

> I had a great intellectual disappointment with the highly touted book by Henri Massis, *Défense de l'occident*; I think that either Filippo Crispolti or Egilberto Martire [both of them journalists, conservative Catholics, and Fascist supporters] would have written a sparer book if the subject had occurred to them. What makes me laugh is that the eminent Massis, who is dreadfully afraid that Tagore's and Gandhi's Asiatic ideology might destroy French Catholic rationalism, does not realize that Paris has already become a semicolony of Senegalese intellectualism and that in France the number of people of mixed race is increasing by leaps and bounds. One might, just for a laugh, maintain that, if Germany is the extreme outcrop of ideological Asianism, France is the beginning of darkest Africa, and the jazz band is just the first molecule of a new Euro-African civilization!

For an English translation of Henri Massis's book, see *Defence of the West*, trans. F. S. Flint, pref. by G. K. Chesterton (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1928).

See also Gramsci's remarks on Henri Massis in Notebook 5, §141, and Notebook 6, §195.

5. See Notebook 5, §66.

6. See Gabbrielli, "India ribelle," p. 377 n. 2.

§90. *Brief notes on Islamic culture*

1. Bruno Ducati, "I santi dell'Islam" (The saints of Islam), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1377 (August 1, 1929): 360–74.

2. The parenthesis is Gramsci's.

§91. *Renaissance and Reformation*

1. Fortunato Rizzi's book on the spirit of the sixteenth century and Italian vernacular (as opposed to Latin) poetry was published by Treves, in Milan, in 1928).

2. See Notebook 1, §14, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

3. Alfredo Galletti, "La lirica volgare del Cinquecento e l'anima del Rinascimento" (The sixteenth-century vernacular lyric and the spirit of the Renaissance), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1377 (August 1, 1929): 273–92.

Alfredo Galletti (1872–1962), a literary historian, was strongly influenced by the positivist school of criticism. He expressed his opposition to idealism in some writings that were severely critical of Croce. (These are probably the writings "overflowing with recriminations" to which Gramsci alludes later in this note.) Galletti wrote books on the history of rhetoric from the classical period to the sixteenth century, on eighteenth-century Italian drama, and on nineteenth-century literature, as well as monographs on Pascoli and Manzoni.

4. On Gaetano Salvemini, see Notebook 1, §25, n. 19; and on Leonida Bissolati, see Notebook 1, §157, n. 2.

5. Galletti, "La lirica volgare del Cinquecento," p. 277. The parenthetical exclamation points and question marks are Gramsci's.

6. Gramsci is reiterating a point he expressed a few pages earlier in this same notebook; see Notebook 5, §55, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially nn. 9 and 10.

§92. *Italian diplomacy*

1. Gramsci mentions this same incident in Notebook 2, §59.

2. Alberto Lumbroso's two-volume work on the economic and diplomatic causes of the first World War—*Le origini economiche e diplomatiche della guerra mondiale*, vol. 1, *La vittoria dell'imperialismo anglosassone*; vol. 2, *L'imperalismo britannico dagli albori dell'ottocento allo scoppio della guerra* (Milan: Mondadori, 1926–28)—is devoted in large part to a discussion of the history of Britain's imperial expansion; Lumbroso mentions Tommaso Tittoni's role in the diplomatic incident involving the two French ships *Carthage* and *Manouba* on 2:370–71. Gramsci had a copy of this book, which contains many reference to Tommaso Tittoni.

For more on Alberto Lumbroso, whom Gramsci classifies as a Lorian in Notebook 1, §32, see Notebook 1, §32, n. 1.

3. See Veracissimus (a pseudonym sometimes used by Tommaso Tittoni), "I documenti diplomatici francesi: 1911–1912" (French diplomatic documents: 1911–1912), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1378 (August 16, 1929): 456–68.

Gramsci may have been thinking of Tommaso Tittoni's book on Italian foreign and domestic policy, *Nuovi scritti di politica interna ed estera* (Milan: Treves, 1930). This book comprises some speeches Tittoni made in the Italian senate and a number of essays that had been previously published in *Nuova Antologia*; however, it does not include the article ("I documenti diplomatici francesi: 1911–1912") mentioned here.

On Tommaso Tittoni, see Notebook 2, §6, n. 1.

§93. *Eighteenth-century Italian morals*

1. Alessandro Giulini, "Una dama avventuriera del Settecento" (An eighteenth-century adventuress), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1378 (August 16, 1929): 499–506.

2. Giuseppe Parini's incomplete satiric poem *Il Giorno*, written in mock-heroic style, portrays a day in the life of a young Milanese aristocrat. It is an indictment of the frivolity, ostentation, and general moral decadence of the upper classes during the second half of the eighteenth century.

On Giuseppe Parini, see Notebook 1, §88, n. 1.

3. Gramsci is referring to Giuseppe Balsamo (1743–95), the charlatan and adventurer better known as Cagliostro. Born in Sicily, he was able, for a while, to fascinate most of Europe, especially Parisian high society.

§94. *The negative popular-national character of Italian literature*

1. Enrico Thovez (1869–1925), a poet, literary critic, and painter, was born and died in Turin, where he was the director of the city's museum of modern art. His literary criticism constitutes an impassioned attack on the contrived literariness, technical affectation, and insincerity of the Italian poetic tradition. Gabriele D'Annunzio and Giosuè Carducci were his prime targets, whereas he held Giacomo Leopardi to be an exemplary poet. His best-known work of literary criticism is the one mentioned by Gramsci, *Il pastore, il gregge, la zampogna: Dall'Inno a Satana alla "Laus Vitae"* (The shepherd, the flock, and the reed-pipe": From [Carducci's] Hymn to Satan to [D'Annunzio's] "Laus Vitae"), which was first published in 1910 by Ricciardi of Naples and brought out a year later by the same publisher in a new edition that included an additional chapter, "Dai cani da guardia ai critici" (From the watchdogs to the critics).

2. On Francesco De Sanctis, see Notebook 1, §96, n. 3. Gramsci's esteem for De Sanctis is especially evident in Notebook 23, §1 and §3.

3. Alfonso Ricolfi, "Enrico Thovez poeta e il problema della formazione artistica" (Enrico Thovez the poet and the problem of artistic formation), *Nuova Antologia* 74, no. 1378 (August 16, 1929): 469–83.

4. An article by Prezzolini entitled "Thovez il precursore" (Thovez the forerunner) is mentioned (but without any bibliographical reference) in Ricolfi, "Enrico Thovez poeta," p. 471.

§95. *Fifteenth-century and sixteenth-century man*

1. On Leon Battista Alberti and Baldassare Castiglione (including his major work *Il Cortegiano*, discussed in this note) see the Notes to the Text for Notebook 5, §55, in particular, nn. 9 and 10.

2. For a long time, the authorship of book 3 of Leon Battista Alberti's work *Della famiglia* was erroneously attributed to Agnolo Pandolfini.

3. Vittorio Cian's article "Il conte Baldassar Castiglione: 1529–1929" was published in two parts in *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1378 (August 16, 1929): 409–23, and no. 1379 (September 1, 1929): 3–18.

On Vittorio Cian, see Notebook 2, §31, n. 3.

4. Francesco Sansovino is quoted by Vittorio Cian in part 1 of "Il conte Baldassar Castiglione," p. 410.

5. Cian, "Il conte Baldassar Castiglione," part 2, pp. 8–9.

6. Ludovico Ariosto (1474–1533) published his first version of *Orlando Furioso*, comprising forty cantos, in 1516. In 1521 he published a revised version with some additions and deletions as well as improvements in language and style. He published the third and final version, with forty-six cantos, in 1532.

The first part of Miguel de Cervantes's *Don Quixote* was published in 1605, and the second part in 1615.

7. See Vittorio Cian, *Il cortegiano del Conte Baldesar Castiglione*, 3d rev. ed. (Florence: Sansoni, 1929). Cian refers to his own edition of Castiglione's *The Courtier* in his article "Il conte Baldassar Castiglione," part 1, p. 418 n. 7.

§96. *The negative national-popular character of Italian literature*

1. *I migliori libri italiani consigliati da cento illustri contemporanei* (The best Italian books recommended by a hundred renowned contemporaries), published by Hoepli, in Milan, 1893, is mentioned by Vittorio Cian in the second part of his article "Il conte Baldassar Castiglione: 1529–1929," *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1379 (September 1, 1929): 4.

§97. *The intellectuals*

1. See Notebook 4, §50.

2. The announcement of the forthcoming publication of E. Salaris's book on the Italian academies and cultural institutes is made by Salaris himself in a note, "La società letteraria di Verona" (The literary society of Verona), in the "Notizie e commenti" (News and comments) section of *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1379 (September 1, 1929): 128 n. 1.

§98. *Postwar history*

1. Giovanni Marietti's article "Il trattato di Versailles e la sua esecuzione" (The Versailles Treaty and its implementation) was published in two parts in *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1380 (September 16, 1929): 243–54, and no. 1382 (October 16, 1929): 500–512.

§99. *German armament at the time of the armistice*

1. All the information in this note is extracted from the second part of Giovanni Marietti, "Il trattato di Versailles e la sua esecuzione" (The Versailles Treaty and its implementation), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1382 (October 16, 1929): 506.

§100. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*

1. Ettore Lo Gatto's article "L'Italia nelle letterature slave" (Italy in Slavic Literatures) was published in three parts in *Nuova Antologia* 64 (September 16, 1929): 232–42; (October 1, 1929): 327–46; (October 16, 1929): 427–39.

Ettore Lo Gatto was the director of the Institute for Eastern European Studies in Rome between 1921 and 1943. In 1931 he was named professor of Slavic literature at the University of Padua, and in 1941 be became professor of Russian literature at the University of Rome. He founded and edited the *Rivista di Letterature Slave* (1926–32) and coedited *Europa Orientale* (1921–43). Lo Gatto's books include a history of Russian literature and a detailed study on Italian artists in Russia.

§101. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Filippo Crispolti*

1. Filippo Crispolti, "La madre di Leopardi" (Leopardi's mother), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1380 (September 16, 1929): 137–48.

On Filippo Crispolti, see Notebook 3, §37, n. 5.

2. Giovanni Ferretti (1885–1952), a literary historian who also made some contributions to Dante studies, wrote a biography of Giacomo Leopardi—*Vita di Giacomo Leopardi* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1945)—and prepared an edition of Leopardi's complete works.

3. The poet, scholar, and philosopher Giacomo Leopardi (1798–1837) was born in the small city of Recanati, in the Marches. His parents, Count Monaldo and Marquise Adelaide Antici, were aristocrats of limited means. It appears that Adelaide Antici was especially preoccupied with managing and conserving the family's shrunken patrimony. Physically deformed from birth, tormented by ill health, and severely limited in his actions because of lack of money, Leopardi's short life was difficult and painful. His parents' seeming insensitivity or indifference toward him hurt him deeply, although he did enjoy happy relationships with his brother and sister during his childhood.

4. On Massimo D'Azeglio, see Notebook 1, §121, n. 1.

5. See Alessandro Varaldo, "Pellegrinaggio a Recanati" (A pilgrimage to Recanati), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1380 (September 16, 1929):159.

Alessandro Varaldo (1876–1953) was best known as a playwright and drama critic, although he also wrote novels, short stories, and poetry.

§102. *Italian literature. The contribution by bureaucrats*

1. See Notebook 5, §38.

2. *Nazioni e minoranze etniche* (Nations and ethnic minorities) was written by Luca Pietromarchi under the pseudonym Luca dei Sabelli and published in two volumes by Zanichelli of Bologna (no date). The comment on this book that is quoted by Gramsci is extracted from the "Notizie e commenti" (News and comments) section of *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1380 (September 16, 1929): 267–71.

§103. *Popular literature. Theater*

1. Alberto Manzi, "Il conte Giraud, il governo italico e la censura" (Count Giraud, the Italian government, and censorship), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1381 (October 1, 1929): 359–80. The passage quoted by Gramsci is on p. 370.

2. The French playwright Jean Henri Ferdinand Lamartelière (1761–1830) had such great popular success with his *Robert chef de brigands* that he wrote a sequel to it, *Le tribunal redoutable; ou, La suite de Robert, chef de brigands*. Both plays are in five acts, and the first is an adaptation of Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber*. For an English translation of *Die Räuber* (1781), a tragedy in five acts, see *The Robbers*, trans. F. J. Lamport (New York: Penguin, 1979).

3. I. e., "Nina Crazed by Love," "Chevalier de la Barre," and "Delirium."

4. The quotations by Alberto Manzi in his article "Il conte Giraud," pp. 371–72, are from a booklet by Marie Jacques Amand Boïeldieu, *De l'influence de la chaire, du théâtre et du barreau, dans la société civile, et de l'importance de leur rétablissement sur des bases qui puissent relever en France leur ancienne et véritable splendeur: Ouvrage politique et moral* (Paris: Demonville, 1804).

§104. *The sixteenth century*

1. Emilio Lovarini's edition of *La Venexiana: Commedia di ignoto cinquecentesco* (The Venetian woman: A play in five acts by an unknown sixteenth-century writer) was published in 1928 by Zanichelli of Bologna as the first title in its series "Nuova scelta di curiosità letterarie inedite o rare" (New selection of previously unpublished or rare literary curiosities).

La Venexiana, which is partly in dialect, has come to be regarded as one of the great works of sixteenth-century Italian drama. According to a widely accepted hypothesis, it was written sometime between 1535 and 1537 by Girolamo Zanetti, a friend and admirer of Ruzzante.

Emilio Lovarini (1866–1955), a philologist and literary historian, conducted extensive research on the Paduan dialect literature and Venetian drama of the Renaissance. He was a major authority on Ruzzante.

Gramsci's source of information on Lovarini's edition of *La Venexiana* is Ireneo Sanesi, "*La Venexiana*," *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1381 (October 1, 1929): 273–81.

2. See Benedetto Croce, "Intorno alla commedia italiana del Rinascimento" (On Italian Renaissance drama), *La Critica* 28, no. 2 (March 20, 1930): 97–99.

3. Sanesi, "*La Venexiana*." See Ireneo Sanesi, *La Commedia*, vol. 1 (Milan: Vallardi, 1911). The second volume of Sanesi's work on the history of Italian comedy was published in 1935.

Ireneo Sanesi (1868–1964), a literary critic and historian, taught Italian literature at the University of Pavia. In addition to his history of Italian comedy, he also produced a critical edition of Manzoni's poetry and dramatic works.

4. See Alfred Mortier, *Un dramaturge populaire de la renaissance italienne: Ruzzante*, 2 vols. (Paris: J. Peyronnet, 1925–26), in which Ruzzante's plays are "traduits pour la première fois de l'ancien dialecte padouan rustique."

Ruzzante (or Ruzante) was the pseudonym and stage name of Angelo Beolco (ca. 1496–1542). He wrote about a dozen comedies in a mixture of rustic dialect (for the most part Paduan) and standard Italian; when they were performed he would often play the part of the peasant Ruzzante, hence his nickname. Through his use of dialect and rustic characters, Ruzzante was able to parody the artificiality of literary language and the manners of refined society. His plays, however, were written and performed for his circle of aristocratic friends. One of Ruzzante's plays that has been translated into English is *Anconitana*; see *The Woman from Ancona*, trans. Nancy Dersofi (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

5. The poet Ludovico Ariosto (1474–1533), best known for his *Orlando Furioso*, also wrote plays, including *Il negromante* (1528), *I suppositi* (1529–31), and *La cassaria* (1531), the latter two in verse.

Bernardo Dovizi (1470–1520) is also known as Bibbiena. A diplomat close to the Medicis who was made cardinal by Pope Leo X in 1513, *he* is one of the interlocutors in Castiglione's *Cortegiano*. He wrote a highly regarded play, *La candria* (with a prologue by Castiglione), that was first performed in Urbino in 1531.

6. The reference to Adolfo Orvieto's article on *La Venexiana* is taken from Ireneo Sanesi's article in *Nuova Antologia*.

The works of the playwright Henry Becque (1837–99) are generally regarded as important examples of naturalism in drama. Some of his best plays, such as *Les corbeaux* (1876) and *La parisienne* (1885) have been

translated into English; see *The Vultures, The Woman of Paris, The Merry-Go-Round*, trans. Freeman Tildon (New York: Kennerly, 1913).

§105. *Americanism*

1. Carlo Linati, "Babbitt compra il mondo" (Babbit buys the world), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1382 (October 16, 1929): 492–99.

On Carlo Linati, see Notebook 3, §109, n. 3.

2. Ibid., p. 492. See Edgar Ansel Mowrer, *This American World* (New York: J. H. Sears Co., 1928). Mowrer's book contains chapters on, among other things, "The Essence of Americanism," "Europe Before the War," "Europe Becomes Americanized," "The Limits of Americanization," and "The Future of the United States."

3. Sinclair Lewis's novel *Babbitt* was first published in 1922. Gramsci had a copy of the French translation: *Babbitt*, trans. Maurice Rémon (Paris: Librairie Stock, 1930).

4. Siegfried's comparison between the Parisian artisan and the Taylorized worker is to be found elsewhere: namely, in Siegfried's preface to André Philip's, *Le problème ouvrier aux Etats-Unis* (Paris: Alcan, 1927), pp. xv–xvi. Gramsci had a copy of this book, and he cites it several times in various notebooks.

On André Siegfried, see Notebook 3, §68, n. 3; on André Philip's book, see Notebook 1, §51, n. 4.

§106. *Luigi Villari*, "Il governo laburista britannico"

1. Luigi Villari, "Il governo laburista britannico" (Britain's Labour government), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1382 (October 16, 1929): 467–78.

2. Gramsci is referring to Tommaso Tittoni, on whom see Notebook 2, §6, n. 1.

§107. *Italy and Palestine*

1. Romolo Tritonj, "La riforma del mandato sulla Palestina" (The revision of the [British] mandate over Palestine), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1382 (October 16, 1929): 479–91.

§108. *Sicily. The Sicilian Pantheon of San Domenico*

1. Gramsci learned about the Sicilian Pantheon in Palermo from an article by Romeo Vuoli, "Il generale Giacinto Carini" (General Giacinto Carini), published in two parts in *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1383 (November 1, 1929): 86–98, and no. 1384 (November 16, 1929): 214–26. The Sicilian Pantheon is mentioned in the first half of the article (p. 86).

On Francesco Crispi, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 10.

Rosolino Pilo (1820–60), a Sicilian nobleman, was an ardent follower of Mazzini and a close associate of Crispi's, both of whom he met during the years he spent in exile following his participation in the Sicilian uprising in 1848. In April 1860, very soon after the outbreak in Palermo of the revolt led by Francesco Riso against the Bourbon monarchy, Pilo arrived in Sicily to organize the rebels on behalf of the republican cause of Italian unification. The rebellion was all but crushed, and Pilo himself was killed by Bourbon troops in a skirmish just outside Palermo; in May, however, Garibaldi embarked on his expedition with the Thousand and before long took over the island in the name of King Vittorio Emanuele.

Giacinto Carini (1821–80), who was born in Palermo, played a prominent role in the Sicilian insurrection of 1848. In order to escape the repression that followed, Carini went into exile in Paris. He returned to Italy to join the expedition of Garibaldi's Thousand to Sicily. He distinguished himself in the conflict, and in 1862 he joined the Italian regular army and participated with distinction in its campaigns. Later he served five terms as a member of parliament.

§109. *Sicily*

1. Romeo Vuoli's article was published in two parts in *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1383 (November 1, 1929): 86–98, and no. 1384 (November 16, 1929): 214–26. The passage quoted by Gramsci is in the first part of the article, on p. 88.

On Giacinto Carini, see Notebook 5, §108, n. 1.

2. See the book by Gabriele Colonna-Fiumedinisi and Roberto Maurigi on the biographical backgrounds of the electoral candidates from the Palermo districts, *I quattro candidati ai collegi di Palermo: Cenni biografici* (Palermo: Lo Bianco, 1860). Gramsci extracted this bibliographical information from Vuoli, "Il generale Giacinto Carini," part 1, p. 88 n. 2.

§110. *France and Italy*

1. The quotation from Victor Hugo's political work *Histoire d'un crime* is taken from the first part of Romeo Vuoli's article, "Il generale Giacinto Carini," *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1383 (November 1, 1929): 91.

In *Histoire d'un crime*, written in 1852 but published only in 1877, Hugo provides a detailed account of Louis Bonaparte's coup from the point of view of a highly critical witness. For an English translation, see *History of a Crime: Deposition of a Witness*, trans. Huntington Smith (New York: Crowell, 1888).

§111. *The Italian Academy*

1. The texts of the speeches made by Benito Mussolini and Tommaso Tittoni at the formal inauguration ceremonies of the Accademia d'Italia were published in *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1383 (November 1, 1929): 5–6 and 7–14, respectively.

On the Italian Academy, see Notebook 5, §36, n. 1.

On Tommaso Tittoni, see Notebook 2, §6, n. 1.

§112. *Carlo Schanzer*, "Sovranità e giustizia nei rapporti fra gli Stati"

1. Carlo Schanzer, " Sovranità e giustizia nei rapporti fra gli Stati" (Sovereignty and justice in the relations among states), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1383 (November 1, 1929): 17–32.

On Carlo Schanzer, see Notebook 2, §120, n. 1.

§113. *On Henrik Ibsen*

1. Guido Manacorda, "Il pensiero religioso di Enrico Ibsen" (Henrik Ibsen's Religious Thought), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1383 (November 1, 1929): 58–77.

On Guido Manacorda, see Notebook 1, §72, n. 1.

§115. *Niccolò Machiavelli*

1. See Niccolò Machiavelli, *Lettere* (Florence: Società Editrice Rinascimento del Libro, 1929), edited, with an introduction, by Giuseppe Lesca and published in the series "Raccolta nazionale dei classici" (National Collection of Classics); and Giuseppe Lesca, "Lettere di Niccolò Machiavelli," *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1383 (November 1, 1929): 43–57.

2. See Edoardo Alvisi, ed., *Lettere familiari di N. Machiavelli* (Florence: Sansoni, 1883). All the bibliographical data in this note are extracted from Lesca, "Lettere di Niccolò Machiavelli"; see, in particular, p. 43 n. 1 and p. 56 n. 9.

§116. *G.B.* "La banca dei regolamenti internazionali"

1. See G.B., "La banca dei regolamenti internazionali" (International settlements bank), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1384 (November 16, 1929): 231–42.

§117. *Argus*, "Il disarmo navale, i sottomarini e gli aeroplani"

1. Argus, "Il disarmo navale, i sottomarini e gli aeroplani" (Naval dis-

armament, submarines, and airplanes), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1384 (November 16, 1929): 227–30.

§118. *Stresemann*

1. Francesco Tommasini, "Il pensiero e l'opera di Gustavo Stresemann" (The thought and work of Gustav Stresemann), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1384 (November 16, 1929): 182–96.

Gustav Stresemann (1878–1929) was chancellor (1923) and foreign minister (1923–29) of the Weimar Republic.

§119. *Encyclopedia of concepts—political, philosophical, etc. Middle class*

1. Like "*signore*," the terms "*galantuomo*" and "*civile*" may be translated as "gentleman," but such a rendering would rob them of many of the nuances to which Gramsci is drawing attention. See Gramsci's discussion of the concept of "*signore*" in Notebook 3, §46.

§120. *Catholic cultural nationalism*

1. See the unsigned article (in fact written by the Jesuit priest Mario Barbera), "Religione e filosofia nelle scuole medie" (Religion and philosophy in the secondary schools), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (June 1, 1929): 414–27. It calls for "reinstating the teaching of the perennial philosophy that is called Thomist, and that is also Italian because . . . its clearest tradition is rooted in Italy" (p. 424).

2. Lelio Socini (1525–62), also known as Socino and as Laelius Socinus, studied law at the University of Padua but soon turned his attention to ancient languages and biblical research. A series of encounters with several Italian "heretics" in northern cities (among them Vicenza) sparked his interest in the theological currents of the Reformation. In 1547 he embarked on a voyage through central Europe and visited the centers of the reformist movements. In the course of his travels and his studies, during which he corresponded with a number of major theologians, including Calvin, he started raising questions on issues that were at the core of both orthodox Catholic and Protestant doctrine: the Trinity, predestination, the sacraments, repentance, grace. Socinus also criticized the intolerance of the Calvinists in 1553 when they burned Michael Servetus at the stake for heresy. His views came to be considered heretical by both Catholics and Reformists, the Inquisition confiscated his estate, and Socinus spent the last few years of his life in Zurich. After his death, his nephew, Faustus Socinus (1539–1604), acquired his papers and further elaborated his theological views. Socinianism developed into a

theological current of some importance and was especially influential in the growth of Unitarianism.

On Vincenzo Gioberti, see Notebook 1, §47, n. 1.

3. On Carlo Pisacane, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 5.

4. I.e., the philosophical school of thought that derived its inspiration form the work of Giovanni Gentile (see Notebook 1, §15, n. 1).

§121. *France*

1. This work by André Siegfried is also listed in a set of bibliographic entries on the inside of the back cover of Notebook 2; see the Description of the Manuscript, 1:531. Gramsci also owned and read a different book by Siegfried, which he cites elsewhere in the notebooks, namely, *Les Etats-Unis d'aujourd'hui* (Paris: Colin, 1928).

On André Siegfried, see Notebook 3, §68, n. 3.

§122. *National-popular*

1. See Notebook 3, §63.

2. See *Le triple démisme de Sun Wen*, trans. and ed. Pascal M. D'Elia (Shanghai: Bureau Sinologique de Zi-Ka-Wei, Imprimérie de T'ou-Sè-Wè, 1929). See also the unsigned article published in two parts with slightly different titles: "Il riformatore cinese Suen Uen e le sue teorie politiche e sociali" (The Chinese reformer Sun Yat-sen and his political and social theories), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (May 4, 1929): 205–20; and "Le teorie politiche e sociali di Suen Uen" (Sun Yat-sen's political and social theories), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (May 18, 1929): 300–314. This same article was also used by Gramsci in his composition of Notebook 5, §51.

On the term "*triple demisme*," which is a French rendering of Sun Yat-sen's *San Min Chu I* (commonly translated into English as "Three Principles of the People), and on different versions of Sun Yat-sen's name, see Notebook 5, §51, n. 1.

On Sun Yat-sen, see Notebook 5, §23, n. 3.

On Pasquale D'Elia, see Notebook 5, §51, n. 2.

§123. *Renaissance*

1. Vittorio Rossi, "Il Rinascimento," *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1384 (November 16, 1929): 137–50. All the quotations in this note are from Rossi's article; the parenthetical interpolations and emphasis are, of course, Gramsci's.

Vittorio Rossi (1865–1938), a literary historian, taught at various universities including those of Messina, Pavia, Padua (where he also served

three years as rector), and Rome. In 1933 he became president of the highly prestigious Lincei Academy. In addition to several important studies on fifteenth- and sixteenth-century authors, he wrote a widely used history of Italian literature and produced a valued critical edition of a volume of Petrarch's Latin letters, *Familiari*.

2. I.e., the autonomous city-states that flourished in medieval Italy.

3. Gramsci had a copy of Henri Pirenne's *Les villes du Moyen Age: Essai d'histoire économique et sociale* (Brussels: M. Lamertin, 1927). For an English translation, see *Medieval Cities: Their Origins and the Revival of Trade*, trans. Frank D. Halsey (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946).

4. Ezio Levi collected his articles on the Arab influence in Spain and published them in a single volume, *Castelli di Spagna* (Milan: Treves, 1931). Gramsci alludes to this volume in Notebook 4, §92.

On Ezio Levi, see Notebook 4, §92, n. 1.

5. On Ludovico Ariosto's masterpiece, *Orlando Furioso*, see Notebook 5, §95, n. 6, and §140, n. 5; on Baldassare Castiglione and his *Cortegiano*, see Notebook 5, §55, n. 10.

6. Gramsci is echoing the observation of Karl Marx in the opening sentences of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1852). See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1979), 11:103: "Hegel remarks somewhere that all facts and personages of great importance in world history occur, as it were, twice. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second as farce."

7. On the Strasbourg oath, see also Gramsci's remarks in Notebook 3, §76, and n. 4 of the corresponding Notes to the Text.

8. A late-eleventh-century fresco in the Basilica of St. Clement in Rome depicting three servants being ordered by their master to drag a bound St. Clement along the ground, shows (somewhat in the manner of modern cartoons) the following words being uttered by the irate master: "Fili de le pute traite" ("Pull, sons of whores"). It is one of earliest-known inscriptions in the Italian vernacular.

9. In the fourteenth century, the more or less democratic system of government in the communes degenerated and was replaced by the *signoria*, wherein power was wielded by a council of notables. In the fifteenth century, the *signoria* itself faded away as many a city-state became a *principato* ruled by a strong individual or powerful family.

10. During his pontificate, which lasted from 1294 to 1303, Pope Boniface VIII made it his mission to reassert the universal supremacy of the papacy. He challenged the autonomy of France and sought to establish temporal dominion over central Italy. In the end his ambitions were thwarted by the many enemies he made; they even held him prisoner for a few days. After the death of Boniface VIII, the fortunes of the papacy plummeted. His successor, Clement V, who owed his election to Boniface

VIII's major foe, Philip IV of France, moved the papal residence to Avignon, where it remained for over seven decades.

In 1308 Henry, count of Luxembourg, was elected German king and Holy Roman emperor. In 1310 he crossed the Alps into Italy, heading toward Rome for his formal coronation. His principal goal was to bring all of Italy under his rule and to revitalize the empire. He had some important initial successes, but by the time he entered Rome in May 1312 it was clear to him that he had two major forces of resistance to contend with. One was Robert of Anjou, king of Naples and Sicily, and the other was Florence (controlled by the anti-imperial Guelfs) and its allies in Tuscany and Romagna. Although he was able to subdue some of the hostile cities, he was stricken ill and died in 1313 in the course of his military campaigns, leaving Italy almost as fragmented as he first found it. The forces of empire had fared no better than the papacy in the effort to bring Italy under unified rule.

The Emperor Louis IV, known as the Bavarian, attempted to subject Italy to his rule in a campaign that lasted from 1327 to 1328 and ended in failure. Louis IV's rival and successor to the crown of Holy Roman emperor, Charles IV, led an army into Italy in 1354. The following year he received the crown of Lombardy and was formally crowned emperor in Rome, but when he left Italy, the peninsula was as divided and fragmented as it had been before.

The "Great Schism" broke out in 1378, following the death of Pope Gregory XI. Urban VI was elected to succeed him in Rome, but within less than a year many cardinals had second thoughts and elected Clement VII, who established himself at Avignon. In subsequent years the situation became more confused, with as many as three rival claims to the papal throne. Stability was restored in 1417, when the Council of Constance elected Martin V, who returned to Rome in 1421.

11. Antonio Labriola's unfinished work "Da un secolo all'altro: Considerazioni retrospettive e presagi" (From one century to the other: Retrospections and foreshadowings) appears in his *Saggi intorno alla concezione materialistica della storia*, ed. Luigi Dal Pane (Bologna: Cappelli, 1925), of which Gramsci had a copy. The relevant passage is on pp. 45–46; for a translation, see Notebook 4, §60, n. 3.

12. On Duke Valentino (i.e., Cesare Borgia), see Notebook 5, §55, n. 2.

13. On Cola di Rienzo, see Notebook 3, §78, n. 9.

14. I.e., the poetic movement that blossomed in Tuscany during the latter part of the thirteenth century. The phrase "*dolce stil novo*" ("sweet new style") was coined by Dante; see *Purgatorio*, canto 24, line 57.

15. The "Sicilian school" of vernacular poetry had its roots in the court of the emperor Frederick II (1194–1250) and his son Manfred. It was not, however, limited to Sicily. Like Frederick himself, the "Sicilian school"

extended its influence to the north of the peninsula, at least as far as Tuscany and Romagna.

Dante writes about the spread of the vernacular from Frederick's court in *De vulgari eloquentia* (book 1, chap. 12):

> For, truly, those illustrious heroes, the emperor Frederick and his honorably born son Manfred, displayed the nobility and rectitude of their minds, as long as Fortune allowed them to, and lived like men, disdaining the life of brutes. Therefore, those who were noble of heart and gifted by God always sought to remain close to the majesty of such great princes, so that in their time whatever the most excellent minds of Italy were able with great effort to produce first shone forth in the realm of these great sovereigns, and because Sicily was the royal seat, it came about that whatever our predecessors wrote in the vernacular was called Sicilian; we, too, are firmly attached to this appellation, and our descendants will not change it.

Pier delle Vigne (ca. 1190–ca. 1249), a man of humble origins, studied in Bologna before entering the service of Frederick II. He attained great distinction as Frederick's private secretary and chancellor. In 1231 he was responsible for drafting the statutes of the kingdom, *Constitutiones regni utriusque Siciliae*. He eventually fell from favor and died in a Tuscan prison; according to Dante (*Inferno*, canto 13, lines 52–78), he committed suicide. Pier delle Vigne's surviving writings consist of a substantial body of official letters he had written in Latin and a few poems in the vernacular.

Master Berardo, i.e., Berardo Caracciolo (ca. 1230–93), born into a well-connected noble family in Naples, was a pontifical notary and diplomat who served under several different popes and wielded considerable influence in the Curia. Berardo also maintained friendly personal relations with a number of royal families. He is the author of a large body of pontifical letters and other official documents composed in medieval Latin; copies of them survive in numerous manuscripts.

16. Frederick II's son, Heinz, also known as Enzo or Enzio of Hohenstaufen (1220–72), was himself a poet of the Sicilian school, but only a very few examples of his work survive. As king of Sardinia, he led his army in an attack on Bologna in 1249, when he was taken prisoner. He remained imprisoned in Bologna for the rest of his life.

17. See Guido De Ruggiero, "Erasmo e la Riforma" (Erasmus and the Reformation), *La Nuova Italia* 1, no. 1 (January 20, 1930): 12–17. De Ruggiero's article consists of extracts from his book on the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Counter-Reformation published the same year: *Rinascimento, Riforma, Controriforma*, 2 vols. (Bari: Laterza, 1930).

On Guido De Ruggiero, see Notebook 4, §2, n. 4.

18. Vittorio Rossi, *Il Quattrocento*, 2d ed. (Milan: Vallardi, 1931).

19. Giuseppe Toffanin, *Che cosa fu l'umanesimo: Il Risorgimento della antichità classica nella coscienza degli italiani fra i tempi di Dante e la Riforma* (What humanism was: The revival of classical antiquity in the consciousness of Italians between the times of Dante and the Reformation) (Florence: Sansoni, 1929). In a November 23, 1921, letter, Gramsci asked Tatiana Schucht to order this book for him. His comments on the book in §160 of this notebook lead one to believe that he must have received it and read it.

Giuseppe Toffanin, a professor of literature at the University of Naples, was best known for his interpretation of the Renaissance as a cultural movement that—far from being secular and at odds with the spirit of Catholicism—was bound to culminate in the revitalization of the Catholic Church that took place in the Council of Trent. One of Toffanin's major historical works has been translated into English: see *History of Humanism* (New York: Las Americas, 1954).

20. See Jacob Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (1860), translated into English as *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore (New York: Penguin, 1990); Georg Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterhums oder das erste Jahrhundert des Humanismus*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1859); and J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*, 7 vols. (London: Murray, 1897–1900).

§124. *Past and present. Certain intellectuals*

1. See Notebook 2, §64.

On Raffaele Garofalo, see Notebook 1, §126, n. 1.

2. See Raffaele Garofalo, "Le scienze giuridiche nel secolo XIX" (The juridical sciences in the nineteenth century), in the book on nineteenth-century Italy edited by Jolanda De Blasi, *L'Italia e gli italiani del secolo XIX* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1930), pp. 407–30. Gramsci had a copy of this volume in prison; it consists of the texts of a series of lectures by prominent intellectuals held at the Lyceum of Florence between 1928 and 1929. The authors included in the volume are Antonio Baldini, Emilio Bodrero, Filippo Bottazzi, Filippo Crispolti, Silvio D'Amico, Jolanda De Blasi, Giuseppe De Robertis, Alberto De Stefani, Giorgio Antonio Garbasso, Raffaele Garofalo, Domenico Guerri, Arturo Marpicati, Ugo Ojetti, Ildebrando Pizzetti, Michele Scherillo, Arrigo Solmi, and Nicola Zingarelli. The editor of the volume, Jolanda De Blasi (1888–1964), was president of the Lyceum cultural center. In addition to a number of short stories and some novels, De Blasi wrote a biography of Lady Hamilton and

produced Italian prose translations of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. She also edited an anthology of literary works by Italian women writers, *Le scrittrici italiane dalle origini al 1800* (1930).

In his contribution, "Le scienze giuridiche nel secolo XIX," Garofalo wrote, among other things:

> The second half of the last century led us to materialism in philosophy, to a contempt for hierarchy and for every form of authority in politics, to a shameful attitude toward constitutional law . . . and toward all other law!
>
> Our age is witnessing the resurrection of ideals. Thanks to the revival of the worship of ideals, our Motherland is experiencing a marvelous resurgence. Without these ideals we would not have been able to escape the debasement of vile Bolshevism.
>
> It is to the supreme credit of the man who governs us that he shone among the people that mysterious light that comes from on high, and even if that light is far away, it is nonetheless as beneficial as the sidereal glimmering over a dark and unfamiliar road. (p. 428)

Toward the end of his piece, Garofalo recalls that as far back as 1902 he had hoped for the advent of a one-man dictatorship; he then concludes with a paean of praise for Mussolini: "And history is there to show the miracles performed by an individual's work, to show that sometimes *one man on his own can instill new life in people* that are half ruined and push them forward along the most difficult paths, because deep within them *he makes shine the light of glory*, the only thing that, disdainful of historical materialism, has been and will always be capable of stirring and inspiring an entire people!" (p. 430).

3. Gramsci is referring to a speech that Giovanni Gentile delivered in Palermo on March 31, 1924; the text of the speech was incorporated into Gentile's book on Fascism, *Che cosa è il fascismo: Discorsi e polemiche* (Florence: Vallecchi, 1925), pp. 41–63. In this speech, Gentile stated: "Every force is a moral force, and whatever mode of argument is used—whether it be a sermon or a cudgel—its efficacy cannot be other than that, in the final analysis, it elicits an inner response from a man and persuades him to agree" (pp. 50–51). This position was described at the time as "the philosophy of the cudgel," and Benedetto Croce attacked it in a note, "Fissazione filosofica" (Philosophical fixation) that was first published in *La Critica* 23, no. 4 (July 20, 1925): 252–56, and later included in Croce's book on culture and moral life, *Cultura e vita morale*, 2d ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1926), pp. 295–96. Gramsci, who had a copy of the second edition of

Croce's *Cultura e vita morale* in prison, discusses this attack on Gentile by Croce at greater length in Notebook 6, §112.

On Giovanni Gentile, see Notebook 1, §15, n. 1.

4. See Antonio Baldini, "Carducci, Pascoli, D'Annunzio," in Jolanda De Blasi, ed., *L'Italia e gli italiani del secolo XIX* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1930), pp. 231–54. The final section of Baldini's contribution is devoted to a consideration of the political views of Carducci and Pascoli from the viewpoint of Fascist ideology.

Antonio Baldini (1889–1962) was the author of a number of books of essays, memoirs, and literary criticism. Early in his career, he belonged to the circle of critics associated with the journal *La Ronda*. In 1931 he became editor of *Nuova Antologia*.

5. On Raffaele Garofalo's attempt to pass legislation that would have raised ground rents, see Notebook 2, §55, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

Gramsci mentions the issue concerning the segregation of prisoners in cells in a January 26, 1929, letter to his brother Carlo: "I must point out to you that next July the new penal code [written by the Fascist minister of justice, Alfredo Rocco] will go into effect and so also the new prison regulations, which probably will change the prisoners' circumstances considerably. . . . Certain allusions made in the senate, especially by Senator Garofalo in 1929, according to which the 'punitive' nature of prison ought not to be attenuated (even though Garofalo's thesis that referred in particular to segregation in cells was rejected by the government) might indicate the possibility of restrictive measures."

6. The speech by Giovanni Gentile to which Gramsci refers is entitled "Lavoro e cultura" (Work and culture) and was delivered at the inauguration of the Scuola di Cultura Sociale (School of Social Culture) in Rome on January 15, 1922. The text of the speech was later incorporated in Gentile's book, *Fascismo e cultura* (Milan: Treves, 1928), pp. 16–37. Gramsci had a copy of this book in prison.

§125. *Types of periodicals. Critical-bibliographical surveys*

1. Gramsci had a copy of Adolfo Omodeo's basic history, intended for the schools, on the history of religion from Greek antiquity to Christianity, *Religione e civiltà: Dalla Grecia antica al cristianesimo* (Messina: Principato, 1924); he had asked for a copy of this book in a June 3, 1929, letter to Tatiana Schucht. Four years later, in a May 8, 1933, letter to Tatiana Schucht, he asked for another book by Omodeo, this one a little book on Jesus, *Gesú il Nazoreo* (Venice: La Nuova Italia, 1927), which he received shortly before leaving the prison at Turi di Bari for the clinic at Formia. Most probably, Gramsci had been familiar, even prior to

his arrest, with some of Omodeo's work on the history of Christianity; in any case, he certainly knew of those writings by Omodeo (other than the ones he owned) that were reviewed or discussed in the publications he received in prison. For example, Omodeo's work is discussed in Benedetto Croce's essay "Intorno alle condizioni presenti della storiografia in Italia. III: La storiografia della filosofia e della religione" (On the present state of historiography in Italy. Part 3: Philosophical and religious historiography) in *La Critica* 27, no. 3 (May 20, 1929): 161–76. This essay was reprinted in the appendix of Croce's history of nineteenth-century Italian historiography, *Storia della storiografia italiana del secolo decimonono*, 2d ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1930), of which Gramsci also had a copy.

On Adolfo Omodeo, who in addition to his studies on the history of religion also produced important works on nineteenth-century Italian history, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 7.

Paul-Louis Couchoud was the general editor of two book series on religion, "Christianisme" (mentioned by Gramsci in §1 of this notebook) and "Judaïsme," both published by Rieder of Paris.

2. See Alessandro Chiappelli, "Il culto di Maria e gli errori della recente critica storica" (The cult of Mary and the errors of recent historical criticism), *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1385 (December 1, 1929): 273–88; and Arthur Drews, *Die Marienmythe* (Jena: E. Diederichs, 1928).

Alessandro Chiappelli (1857–1931) wrote numerous books on a very wide range of subjects, including ancient and modern philosophy, the history of religion, and Renaissance art. He also produced a substantial body of literary criticism.

3. This article by Luigi Salvatorelli is cited in Alessandro Chiappelli's "Il culto di Maria," p. 279 n. 2.

On Luigi Salvatorelli, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 27.

§126. *Past and present. The intellectuals: the decline of Mario Missiroli*

1. Spectator (pseudonym of Mario Missiroli), "Clemenceau," *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1386 (December 16, 1929): 478–99. Gramsci also discusses the contents of this article in Notebook 4, §44.

On Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

2. See Mario Missiroli, "Sorel e Clemenceau," *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 37 (December 15, 1929). On this article, see also Notebook 4, §44.

§127. *Machiavelli*

1. M. Azzalini, "La politica, scienza ed arte di stato" (The politics, science, and art of state), in the "Notizie e commenti" (News and comments)

section of *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1386 (December 16, 1929): 540–43. As is quite evident, the parenthetical asides within the passages quoted from Azzalini's short article are Gramsci's.

2. Marsilius of Padua (ca. 1280–ca. 1343), a theologian and political philosopher, is the author of *Defensor pacis* (Defender of the peace), which he completed in Paris in 1324; it was printed for the first time in Basel in 1522. In it he set forth a secular concept of the state, arguing that the state has a natural, as opposed to a divine, basis; thus, in his view, the church has no legitimate coercive power and should in fact be subordinate to the state in the secular sphere. The primary responsibility of the state, according to Marsilius, is to maintain its own unity and to preserve law and peaceful coexistence. Furthermore, Marsilius maintained that the supreme authority in the church was the general council, which represented all the faithful and not just the ecclesiastical hierarchy. When his views became known, Marsilius took refuge in the court of King Louis IV of Bavaria to escape papal persecution. He accompanied Louis the Bavarian during his Italian expedition of 1327–28, which ended in failure. Marsilius, who in the meantime had been excommunicated for heresy, returned with Louis IV to Germany, where he spent the rest of his years. For a translation of *Defensor pacis*, see *Marsilius of Padua: The Defender of Peace*, trans. Alan Gewirth, vol. 2 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956).

3. "Public law" refers to the ensemble of laws that regulate the organization and activities of the state and of governmental entities in their relations with private citizens and with each other. As is clear from the context, Azzalini uses "public law" as a term that is virtually equivalent to "constitutional law."

4. See Notebook 5, §123, n. 9.

5. See, for example, Notebook 5, §123.

6. Ulpian (d. 228) was a famous Roman jurist under the emperor Caracalla. Extracts from his voluminous legal commentaries are reproduced in and constitute a large portion of the *Digest*, i.e., the second part of the "Corpus juris" compiled by the Roman emperor at Constantinople, Justinian (527–565).

7. For an English translation from the Sanskrit of Kamandaki's classical verse work on Indic policy, see *Kamandakiya Nitisara; or, The Elements of Polity*, ed. Manmatha Nath Dutt (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1979).

See Petrarch's letter (in Latin) to Francesco da Carrara on the duties of the prince; it is collected in the volume of epistles by the poet entitled *Seniles* (book 14, epistle 1). In Gramsci's time, a separate edition of this letter by Petrarch was available in Italian translation: *Lettera di Francesco Petrarca al magnifico Francesco da Carrara, signore di Padova: Sui doveri del principe*, trans. Giuseppe Fracassetti (Padua: Società Cooperativa

Tipografica, 1922). For an English translation, see Petrarch, *Letters of Old Age*, trans. Aldo Bernardo, Saul Levin, and Reta Bernardo, 2 vols. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992).

On Giovanni Botero and his work *Della ragion di stato* (1589), see Notebook 3, §141, n. 2.

8. On Tommaso Tittoni, see Notebook 2, §6, n. 1.

9. Gramsci's source of the extracts he quotes from Henri Bergson's *L'évolution créatrice* (1907) is a short article by L. Gessi, "L'arte come conoscenza degli individuali" (Art as knowledge of individuals), in the "Notizie e commenti" (News and comments) section of *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1384 (November 16, 1929): 536–40; see, especially, p. 537. My source for the quotations was *Creative Evolution*, trans. Arthur Mitchell (New York: Modern Library, 1944).

§128. *Lorianism. Domenico Giuliotti*

1. See Notebook 1, §25, and n. 5 in the accompanying Notes to the Text.

2. Gramsci extracted the couple of sentences quoted here from Domenico Giuliotti's introduction to his book *Profili di Santi* (Profiles of saints) from the version that was published with the title "Santi ed eroi" (Saints and heroes) in *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 37 (December 15, 1929).

On Giovanni Giuliotti, see Notebook 1, §72, n. 1.

§129. *Past and present. The Catholics and the state*

1. The unsigned article (in fact written by the Jesuit priest Enrico Rosa), "Tra 'ratifiche' e 'rettifiche': La parola del Papa" (Between 'ratifications' and 'rectifications': The pope's word), appeared in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (July 20, 1929): 97–105. It intervened in a controversy that was going on at the time concerning the interpretation of certain parts of the Lateran Pacts. Even before the treaty was formally ratified and signed on June 7, 1929, it was evident that Mussolini and the Vatican had divergent interpretations of the text of the concordat. In his article, Enrico Rosa recalled that Napoleon had violated a concordat and that his military adventurism ended with his exile on the island of St. Helena. The article was considered an insult and provocation by the Fascist authorities, and they ordered the confiscation of the issue of *La Civiltà Cattolica* in which it was published.

"Tra 'ratifiche' e 'rettifiche' " also contains some remarks concerning the national elections that were held on March 24, 1929, and resulted in a great victory for Mussolini. Specifically, it states: "It is obvious that the kinds of results achieved [in the elections], which are quite unusual in the political life of nations, were due for the most part to the universal popu-

larity of the so-called conciliation. It is likewise generally agreed, however, that it is astonishing that the crown said nothing about this in the solemn speech delivered by the king himself at the inauguration of the new legislature, the very same legislature that was to approve the Lateran Accords and implement them."

2. *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (August 3, 1929), published the text of the decree issued by the prefect of Rome on July 23, 1929, ordering the confiscation of the previous issue of the journal "because of the generally and specifically anti-Italian and anti-Fascist content of the leading article, entitled 'Tra ratifiche e rettifiche.' "

§130. *Encyclopedic notions*

1. *"Pubblico ufficiale"* describes someone employed in the legislative, judicial, or administrative apparatus. The function of an *"ufficiale dello stato civile"* is roughly equivalent to that of a county recorder.

§131. *Types of periodicals. A regular column on grammar and linguistics*

1. On Emile Littré and Ferdinand Brunot, see Notebook 3, §76, n. 8.

2. See Edmondo De Amicis's book on language, *L'idioma gentile* (Milan: Treves, 1905)—of which Gramsci owned a copy in prison—and his collection of occasional pieces, *Pagine sparse* (Milan: Lombarda, 1874.

On Edmondo De Amicis, see Notebook 1, §50, n. 3.

3. On Alfredo Panzini, see Notebook 1, §13, n. 1; and on Umberto Fracchia's periodical *La Fiera Letteraria*, see Notebook 1, §102, n. 1.

§132. *Past and present*

1. See "Cose romane" (Roman affairs) in the "Cronaca contemporanea" (Current events) section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (July 20, 1929): 170–72.

Cesare Maria De Vecchi (1884–1959) joined the Fascist movement in Turin in 1919 and quickly emerged as one its most prominent figures. A major and vocal representative of the conservative Catholic and monarchist current within the Fascist Party, De Vecchi was elected to parliament in 1921, and in the following year he played a leading role in the march on Rome. In 1923 he was named governor of Somalia, a post he held for five years, during which he engaged in a number of not very successful military adventures that were meant to reinforce and expand Italy's imperial presence in Africa. He was appointed ambassador of Italy to the Vatican after the signing of the Lateran Pacts. Between 1935 and 1936, De

Vecchi served as minister of education; later he became governor of the Dodecanese Islands. He was also a member of the Fascist Grand Council.

§133. *Catholic Action. The "Workers' Retreats"*

1. "Come il popolo torna a Dio: L'opera dei 'Ritiri Operai' " (How the people turn to god: The "Workers' Retreats" Organization), in the "Rivista della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (July 20, 1929): 150–58.

2. The edition of Ignatius Loyola's *Esercizi spirituali* (Florence: Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, 1928) that also contains the text of Ignatius Loyola's *Autobiography* and an introductory essay by Giovanni Papini is mentioned in a different part (p. 149) of the "Rivista della stampa" section of the same issue of *La Civiltà Cattolica* in which the cited article on the Workers' Retreats is published. For English translations of Ignatius Loyola's works, see *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, trans. Anthony Mottola (Garden City, N.Y.: Image Books, 1964), and *The Autobiography of St. Ignatius Loyola*, trans. Joseph F. O'Callaghan (New York: Fordham University Press, 1992).

3. The reference to the article "I 'Ritiri Operai' in Italia" (The 'Workers' Retreats' in Italy) is extracted from "Come il popolo torna a Dio."

4. The book *Come il popolo ritorna a Dio, 1909–1929: L'opera dei Ritiri e le Leghe di Perseveranza in Roma in venti anni di vita* (How the people are returning to God, 1909–1929: The Retreats Organization and the Leagues of Perseverance in Rome during their twenty years of existence), published by the Workers' Retreats Organization of Rome in 1929, is the main topic of the article "Come il popolo torna a Dio."

§134. *Religious movements*

1. The reflections in this note may have been triggered by an unsigned article, "Pace per mezzo delle chiese?" (Peace through the churches?), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (July 20, 1929): 106–15. On the same topic, see also Notebook 5, §17.

§135. *The Italian Risorgimento. Lamennais*

1. On Hughes-Félicité-Robert de Lamennais, see Notebook 1, §71, n. 1.

2. "Il padre Roothaan e il La Mennais," *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (August 3, 1929): 221–18.

3. Johann Philipp Roothaan (1785–1853), who was born in Amsterdam, joined the Society of Jesus in 1804, when it was still suppressed virtually everywhere except in Russia. Pope Pius VII restored the order in 1814;

Russia, on the other hand, banned it within its borders in 1820, compelling Roothaan to move to Switzerland. In 1823 he was sent to Turin to serve as rector of a newly founded college. Roothaan became the twenty-first superior general of the Jesuits in 1829. He revitalized the order, strengthening its adherence to the principles of its founder, Ignatius Loyola, and raising the level of intellectual preparation of its members. The number of Jesuits doubled under his leadership; the society had five thousand members at the time of his death.

4. Gramsci was certainly aware of at least two such articles (both unsigned): "Il P. Giovanni Roothaan e gli studi sacri della prima metà del secolo XIX" (Father John Roothaan and theological studies during the first half of the nineteenth century), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (July 20, 1929): 126–34; and "La fortuna del La Mennais e le prime manifestazioni di Azione Cattolica in Italia" (The fortunes of Lamennais and the earliest manifestations of the presence of Catholic Action in Italy), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 81 (October 4, 1930): 3–19. The second of these two articles is discussed in Notebook 6, §188, and Notebook 7, §98.

§136. *Encyclopedic notions*

1. All three words mean "Renaissance" and literally "rebirth." As is clear from the rest of the note, Gramsci is interested in the recurrent use of the prefix "*ri-*" (in English, "re-"), particularly in words employed to describe the Risorgimento, which literally means revival, rebirth, or reawakening.

2. The phrases "*riscossa nazionale*" and "*riscatto nazionale*" have often been used in association with the Italian Risorgimento. These words have acquired many nuances that are difficult to convey through a literal rendering into English. "*Riscossa nazionale*" may be translated as "national reawakening" or "recovery" but "*riscossa*" also means, especially in this context, "revolt" or "insurrection." Furthermore, the adjective "*riscosso*" means "freed" or "liberated." "*Riscatto nazionale*" is best translated, perhaps, as "national redemption."

3. "*Ripresa*," in this context, means "revival" or "renewal."

4. I.e., "born" and "awakened" (or "roused"), respectively.

5. I.e., "comes to" or "recovers consciousness"; also "frees itself."

§137. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists. The case of Abbé Turmel of Rennes*

1. See Enrico Rosa S.J., *L'Enciclica "Pascendi" e il modernismo: Studi e commenti*, 2d ed. (Rome: Editrice Civiltà Cattolica, 1909), of which Gramsci had copy in prison. The case of Abbé Turmel is discussed on pp. 300–321.

2. Gramsci came across the reference to Louis Saltet's exposé of the Turmel case in *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* in an unsigned article, "La catastrofe del caso Turmel e i metodi del modernismo critico" (The catastrophe of the Turmel case and the methods of critical modernism), in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 81 (December 6, 1930): 434–45 (see especially p. 437). Gramsci deals with this article in detail in Notebook 6, §195, where he also lists the fifteen different pseudonyms used by Abbé Turmel.

§138. *Emperor worship*

1. Giuseppe Messina's "L'apoteosi dell'uomo vivente e il cristianesimo" (Christianity and the apotheosis of a living man) was published in two parts in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (August 17, 1929): 295–310, and (September 21, 1929): 509–22.

2. I.e., Alexander the Great.

3. Messina, "L'apoteosi dell'uomo vivente," part 1, p. 297.

§139. *Encyclopedic notions*

1. See Notebook 5, §136.

2. I.e., "Restoration."

3. The Council of Trent was convened by Pope Paul III in 1545 and completed its work in 1563.

§140. *Americanism*

1. Giuseppe Attilio Fanelli's book *L'Artigianato: Sintesi di un'economia corporativa* (Rome: SPES, 1929) sets forth the notion that the system of small industries as operated by the Italian artisan class embodied the basic principles of corporative economics advocated by Fascist ideologues.

2. See the unsigned review-article "Problemi sociali" (Social problems), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (August 17, 1929): 328–35.

3. Quoted in ibid., p. 329. The parenthesis is Gramsci's.

4. Quoted in ibid., p. 330.

5. Ludovico Ariosto (1474–1533) published the first version of his chivalric romance *Orlando Furioso*, in forty cantos, in 1516, and the final version, comprising forty-six cantos, in 1532. Torquato Tasso (1544–95), who was strongly influenced by Ariosto's work, composed *La Gerusalemme liberata*, a heroic poem in twenty cantos on the First Crusade, between 1565 and 1575. The two poems share many technical characteristics, and both were immensely popular.

6. Ludovico Muratori (1672–1750) studied at Modena, where he acquired a profound appreciation of the historical-critical methods of the

French Maurists. His research focused primarily on the Middle Ages, and early in his career, when he worked at the Ambrosiana library in Milan, Muratori started publishing selections of texts he had discovered among the manuscripts of the library. His next major project was a collection (accompanied by a basic critical apparatus) of all the chronicles, diaries, and other documents that would enable a reconstruction of Italian history from 500 to 1500. The outcome was a twenty-eight volume work entitled *Rerum italicarum scriptores* (1723–50). At the same time, Muratori was compiling another very important work, a series of studies on the customs and institutions of the Italian Middle Ages, which he published in six volumes under the general title *Antiquitates italicae medii aevi* (1738–42). For less specialized or more general readers he composed the *Annali d'Italia*, a twelve-volume work published between 1744 and 1749 in which he attempted to provide a comprehensive and unified history of the Italian peninsula. Muratori was also keenly interested in the moral and cultural issues of his own time, and some of his other writings constitute important critical interventions on those issues. In some of these writings, and particularly in *Della regolata devozione* (On well-ordered devotion), he fought against superstition and sought to promote enlightened moral reform: this work was the main reason that he was accused of Jansenism and incurred the ire of the Jesuits.

Girolamo Tiraboschi (1731–94), a Jesuit, worked for many years in the Este archives in Modena. He produced a number of works pertaining to the history of Modena that were based on his archival researches. Tiraboschi's major work, for which he is primarily remembered, was a comprehensive and extremely erudite history of the literature of the Italian peninsula from antiquity through the seventeenth century, which he started in 1772 and completed a decade later.

Cesare Baronio (1538–1607) had a very successful ecclesiastical career. A follower of Saint Philip Neri he was made cardinal by Pope Clement VII in 1596 and the following year became the Vatican librarian. Baronio's reputation as a historian stems from his twelve-volume *Annales ecclesiastici*, a detailed account of the history of the church from its beginning up to 1198, which is based on an impressive compilation and analysis of archival documentary materials, many of them previously unknown or ignored.

§141. *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*

1. "La lunga crisi dell'*Action Française* e sue cause" (The long crisis of *Action Française* and its causes), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (September 7, 1929): 423–30.

2. The book by the bishop of Agen, Monsignor Sagot du Vauroux, *La trop longue crise de l'Action Française* (Paris: Bloud, 1929), which consists

of an unqualified attack on the French ultraconservative movement, is treated most favorably and at considerable length in "La lunga crisi dell'*Action Française* e sue cause."

3. "La lunga crisi dell'*Action Française*," p. 426.

4. Ibid., p. 423.

5. On Charles Maurras and the *Action Française* movement, see Notebook 1, §14, n. 1.

6. "La lunga crisi dell'*Action Française*," p. 427.

On the Catholic integralists, see Notebook 5, §1, n. 1.

7. See Notebook 5, §14, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially n. 15, on Boulin's anti-Jesuit publications.

8. Mariano Rampolla del Tindaro (1843–1913), born in Sicily and ordained priest in 1856, had already accumulated a great deal of experience in the diplomatic affairs of the church by the time Pope Leo XIII made him cardinal and secretary of state in 1887. Rampolla pursued some policies that incurred the wrath of the ultraconservative and intransigent currents within Catholicism. In particular, in the early 1890s he attempted to prepare the ground for a rapprochement between the Holy See and the Italian state by opening indirect channels of communication with the government of Prime Minister Rudinì, an effort that proved fruitless. What angered the integralists even more, however, was Rampolla's execution of Leo XIII's policy toward France, a policy that normalized relations between the Holy See and the republic, encouraged the participation of Catholics in the political life of the nation, and effectively marginalized the monarchists while distancing the church from the *Action Française* movement and other ultraconservative currents. Furthermore, Austria regarded the Vatican's normalization of relations with France as detrimental not only to its own interests but to the Triple Alliance as a whole: i.e., to Italy and Germany as well. For this reason, during the conclave of 1903, when Rampolla was most likely to have been chosen to succeed Leo XIII, Austria took measures to block his election to the papacy.

9. On Leo XIII's policy of *ralliement*, see also Gramsci's comments in Notebook 5, §18, and the corresponding Notes to the Text, especially n. 3.

10. Giuseppe Zanardelli (1826–1903), who had held ministerial positions in several cabinets, was prime minister from 1901 to 1903.

11. See Francesco Salata's history of the diplomatic relations pertaining to the question of the status of Rome from the time of Cavour to the period of Italy's membership in the Triple Alliance, *Per la storia diplomatica della questione romana*, vol. 1, *Da Cavour alla Triplice Alleanza* (Milan: Treves, 1929), especially pp. 176–89, 227–34, and 251–52. Gramsci had a copy of this volume in prison.

12. "La lunga crisi dell'*Action Française*," pp. 427–28. The parenthesis is Gramsci's.

13. On *Sillon*, see Notebook 5, §1, n. 5.

14. On Jacques Bainville, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 36.

15. "La lunga crisi dell'*Action Française*," p. 428..

16. The parenthetical interpolation is Gramsci's. For additional remarks on the conservative Catholic weekly *Fede e Ragione* (published in Florence)—which Gramsci also mentions in Notebook 5, §11—see Notebook 7, §107.

17. "La lunga crisi dell'*Action Française*," pp. 428–29.

18. Gramsci had a copy of a book by the French Catholic conservative Henri Massis, *Défense de l'occident* (Paris: Plon, 1927), and he commented on it at some length in one of his letters; see Notebook 5, §89, n. 4. See also Gramsci's comments on Henri Massis in Notebook 6, §195.

19. On Enrico Rosa's response to the open letter addressed to him by Ugo Ojetti, see Notebook 1, §24, and especially Notebook 5, §66, and n.1 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

§142. *Philosophical novels, utopias, etc.*

1. The Jesuits, the last of the major Catholic religious orders to arrive in South America, received permission from King Philip III of Spain to set up missions in Paraguay in 1608. They remained in the country for just over a hundred and fifty years, during which they established thirty missions and developed an efficient, centralized system for administering them. The missions run by the Jesuits became virtually self-contained, planned communities; everything was regulated and thoroughly organized: housing, education, working hours, recreation. From an economic standpoint, at least, the missions (or reductions, as they were called) proved tremendously successful. Their economic success and internal social cohesion also made them relatively autonomous entities, thus rendering them suspect in the eyes of the Spanish colonial authorities. The Jesuits were expelled from Paraguay by order of King Charles III in 1767.

2. In his book *Il cristianesimo felice della Compagnia di Gesú nel Paraguai*, 2 vols. (Venice: G. Pasquali, 1743–49), Lodovico Antonio Muratori documents what he terms the "happy Christianity" practiced in the Jesuit missions in Paraguay. In all likelihood, Gramsci came across a reference to this work in a short article, "I martiri dell'America meridionale" (The martyrs in South America), in the "Rassegna della stampa" (Review of the press) section of *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (September 7, 1929): 431.

On Lodovico Antonio Muratori, see Notebook 5, §140, n. 6.

3. See Pietro Colletta, *Storia del reame di Napoli dal 1734 fino al 1825*, vol. 1 (Capolago: Tipografia Elvetica, 1834), pp. 224–28. Gramsci borrowed this book from the prison library during his period of incarcer-

ation in Milan, and he described it as "excellent" in an April 4, 1927, letter to Tatiana Schucht. For an English translation, see *History of the Kingdom of Naples: 1734–1825*, 2 vols., trans. Susan Horner (Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1858).

In late 1789 the Bourbon king of Naples Ferdinand I established a planned community on the hill of San Leucio near Caserta. The "Codice" or set of organizational rules that was drafted for the community resembled, in many respects, the blueprint for a utopian community. One writer described the planned community as "a socialist colony in Bourbon kingdom." In his history of Naples, Colletta states that the "colony" was a great success: its silk products were of the highest quality, and its initial population of just over two hundred quadrupled in forty years.

On Pietro Colletta, see Notebook 4, §62, n. 1.

§143. *The international function of Italian intellectuals*

1. "La politica religiosa di Costantino Magno" (The religious policy of Constantine the Great), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (September 7, 1929): 412–22.

2. Jules Maurice's *Constantin le Grand: L'origine de la civilisation chrétienne* was published by Editions SPES of Paris in 1924.

3. Luigi Salvatorelli's *Costantino il Grande* (Rome: Formiggini, 1928) was published as volume 103 in the series "Profili" (Profiles). Salvatorelli's book is cited in "La politica religiosa di Costantino Magno," p. 413 n. 2.

On Luigi Salvatorelli, see Notebook 1, §44, n. 27.

§144. *Encyclopedic notions*

1. On Charles Maurras, see Notebook 1, §14, n. 1.

§145. *Past and present. Primitive and nonprimitive Christianity*

1. "I novelli B.B. martiri inglesi difensori del primato romano" (The newly beatified English martyrs, defenders of the primacy of Rome), *La Civiltà Cattolica* 80 (December 21, 1929): 483–94.

2. "I novelli B.B. martiri inglesi," p. 485. The emphasis is Gramsci's.

3. Ibid., p. 486. The emphasis is Gramsci's.

§146. *Political-military leadership in the war of 1914*

1. Gramsci had a copy (which however is not preserved with his other books) of the Italian translation of a novel by Petr Nikolaevich Krassnoff (more commonly transliterated as Krasnov): *Dall'aquila imperiale alla*

bandiera rossa (Florence: Salani, 1929). The novel was also translated into English; see P. N. Krassnoff, *From the Two-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag: 1894–1921*, 4 vols., trans. Eric Law-Gisiko, et al. (Germany: Olga Diakow, 1923).

The prison authorities initially prohibited Gramsci from reading Krassnoff's novel. On August 25, 1930, Gramsci wrote to his brother Carlo instructing him to file a petition with the appropriate authorities to allow Gramsci to receive a number of books that had been denied him. Among the books listed by Gramsci in the letter to Carlo is the one by Krassnoff, which he describes as "a novel by the former Cossack general Krassnoff, now a Czarist émigré in Berlin; it is published by Salani side by side with the novels of Carolina Invernizio." The letter was withheld by the prison warden at Turi and never reached Carlo. Consequently, in September 1930 Gramsci sent a petition directly to Mussolini. Gramsci's draft of the petition is in the manuscript of Notebook 2; see the Description of the Manuscript, 1:526–27. His petition was granted, and he received the disputed books, as he himself confirmed in a December 1, 1930, letter to Tatiana Schucht.

2. The views of the German general and former head of the Reichswehr, Hans von Seeckt (1866–1936), are mentioned in an article (which has three asterisks in place of the author's name), "Della guerra e della pace" (On war and peace), in *Nuova Antologia* 66, no. 1426 (August 16, 1931): 409–25; see especially p. 420.

§147. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*

1. Gioacchino Volpe's history of the Middle Ages, *Il Medio Evo*, was published by Vallecchi in Florence in 1926.

On Gioacchino Volpe, see Notebook 2, §100, n. 3.

2. Riccardo Bacchelli, "Le molte vite" (Multiple lives), *La Fiera Letteraria* 4, no. 27 (July 1, 1928). The parenthetical exclamations and question mark are obviously Gramsci's.

On Riccardo Bacchelli, see Notebook 1, §32, n. 9.

§148. *Past and present. Inquiries on youth*

1. *La Fiera Letteraria* conducted an "inquiry" in which it asked a number of intellectuals for their views on contemporary youth. The responses, published in eight separate issues, always under the same title, "La nostra inchiesta sulla nuova generazione" (Our inquiry on the new generation), appeared as follows: responses by Alessandro Chiappelli, Ferdinando Pasini, and Alfredo Panzini in 4, no. 49 (December 2, 1928);

responses by Antonino Anile, Agostino Lanzillo, Giuseppe Lombardo Radice, Francesco Orestano, and Luigi Tonelli in 4, no. 50 (December 9, 1928); responses by Corrado Barbagallo, Emilio Bodrero, Giuseppe Maggiore, and Giovanni Vidari in 4, no. 51 (December 16, 1928); responses by Balbino Giuliano and Nicola Zingarelli in 4, no. 52 (December 23, 1928); responses by Vincenzo Arangio Ruiz, Bindo Chiurlo, and Bernardino Varisco in 4, supp. to no. 52 (December 30, 1928); response by Francesco Biondolillo in 5, no. 1 (January 6, 1929; responses by Nicola Festa, Dino Provenzal in 5, no. 2 (January 13, 1929); and responses by Mario Attilio Levi, Ettore Allodoli, and Cesare Cattaneo in 5, no. 4 (January 27, 1929). An editorial article summarizing and commenting on the results of the inquiry, "Ad'inchiesta finita: La gioventù di oggi" (Conclusion of an inquiry: Today's youth), was published in *La Fiera Letteraria* 5, no. 7 (February 17, 1929).

In the two passages quoted in this note, the emphases are Gramsci's.

2. Agostino Lanzillo (1886–1952) became active in politics as a revolutionary syndicalist and shared some of the views of Georges Sorel, with whom he had personal contact. He vigorously advocated Italy's intervention in the First World War, at the end of which he joined and played an active role in the earliest Fascist formations. When the Fascists came into power, Lanzillo expressed some important disagreements with official economic policy. Excluded from the inner circles of power, he pursued an academic career as an economist and in 1935 became rector of the Istituto Superiore di Economia e Commercio in Venice.

3. On Giuseppe Lombardo-Radice, see Notebook 1, §123, n. 2.

§149. *Past and present. Education*

1. See three articles by Mario Missiroli that appeared in consecutive issues of the journal"Gli studi classici" (Classical studies), *Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 31 (November 3, 1929); "Lo studio del latino" (The study of Latin), *Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 32 (November 10, 1929); and "Abbasso l'estetica" (Down with aesthetics), *Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 33 (November 17, 1929).

On Mario Missiroli, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 12.

2. On the reform of the national educational system masterminded by Giovanni Gentile (and commonly referred to as the "*riforma* Gentile"), see, inter alia, Notebook 4, §50, nn. 1 and 2, and Notebook 4, §53, n. 6.

3. The parenthesis is Gramsci's.

4. Giuseppe Modugno's response to Mario Missiroli's articles appeared under the title "Studi classici" (Classical studies) in *L'Italia Letteraria* 2, no. 8 (February 23, 1930).

§150. *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals. Risorgimento*

1. On Vincenzo Gioberti, see Notebook, §46, n. 1.

2. Gramsci is alluding to Francesco De Sanctis's portrayal of Italians as "Guicciardinian men" whose individualism rendered them incapable of forming a society and a nation. See De Sanctis's essay "L'uomo del Guicciardini" (The Guicciardinian man) in his *Saggi critici*, ed. P. Arcari (Milan: Treves, 1924), 3:28–49. This three-volume edition of De Sanctis's critical essays was among the works Gramsci had in prison.

3. See Gramsci's comparisons between the Moderate Party and the Action Party in, among other places, Notebook 1, §43 and §44.

§151. *Linguistics*

1. "La lingua nei tempi di Dante e l'interpretazione della poesia" (The language in Dante's times and the interpretation of poetry), Giuseppe S. Gargàno's review of Enrico Sicardi's book on the Italian language in Dante, *La lingua italiana in Dante* (Rome: Casa Editrice Optima, 1929), appeared in *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 15 (April 14, 1929). Gramsci also discusses Sicardi's book and Gargàno's review in Notebook 4, §82.

2. See Karl Vossler, *Positivismus und Idealismus in der Spachwissenschaft* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1904). Gramsci most probably read the Italian version of this work by Vossler—*Positivismo e idealismo nella scienza del linguaggio*, trans. V. Gnoli (Bari: Laterza, 1908)—when he was studying linguistics at the University of Turin. From Vossler's "aesthetic analysis" of La Fontaine's fable *Le corbeau et le renard* (on pp. 224–37 of the Italian edition of his work), Gramsci is specifically recalling the following passage (p. 228 of the Italian edition, from which this is translated): " '*Tenait en son bec un fromage*': others would have said '*un morceau de fromage.*' But what matters here is only quality. The fox wants it precisely because it is cheese. Furthermore, others, in place of *son bec*, would have said *dans le bec*. But by attaching *bec* to the possessive pronoun (which is quite unusual in French) the author evokes an image of calm and complete possession so that the subsequent loss of the cheese will appear all the more painful." Gramsci is suggesting that Vossler failed to consider that in seventeenth-century French the use of the possessive pronoun was not "quite unusual."

§152. *Utopias, philosophical novels, etc.*

1. Adolfo Faggi, "*Erewhon*," *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 9 (March 3, 1929).

§153. *Popular literature*

1. This note may have been prompted by Giuseppe Gargàno's article "Il vario atteggiarsi di un poeta dialettale: Ferdinando Russo" (The various masks of a dialect poet: Ferdinando Russo), *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 9 (March 3, 1929).

Ferdinando Russo (1866–1927) a Neapolitan fiction writer, journalist, and playwright, is best remembered for his poetry, in which he displayed the richness of expression of the Neapolitan dialect and conveyed vivid images of life in his native city.

§154. *Father Bresciani's progeny. Cardarelli and* La Ronda

1. See Luigi Russo's short article "Parere su De Sanctis" (An opinion on De Sanctis) in the "Commenti e schermaglie" (Comments and debates) section of *La Nuova Italia* 1, no. 10 (October 20, 1930): 432–33.

Vincenzo Cardarelli (1887–1959), a poet, was one of the founders of the literary journal *La Ronda*, in 1919. Advocating a return to the sobriety and austerity of the classical tradition, he was severely critical of writers he regarded as sentimental and of many important innovative authors of his time, including Gabriele D'Annunzio, Giuseppe Ungaretti, and the futurists. He also expressed negative critical views of De Sanctis and those inspired by him, such as the circle associated with *La Voce*.

On Luigi Russo, see Notebook 1, §35, n. 2.

2. Vito Fornari (1821–1900), a Catholic priest and writer, was a purist and an advocate of classical propriety. He attained prominence during the post-1848 period of reaction. His writings include *L'arte del dire* (1857), in which he expounded an orthodox, rigidly classical theory of rhetoric and poetics, and a three-volume work—*Della vita di Gesù Cristo* (1869–93)—on the universal and transhistorical significance of Christ's presence in the world.

On Francesco De Sanctis, see Notebook 1, §96, n. 3.

3. On the Crusca Academy and its dictionary, see Gramsci's comment in Notebook 3, §145, and the corresponding Notes to the Text.

4. There is no evidence that Gramsci read Lorenzo Montano's booklet *Il perdigiorno* (The idler), but he certainly read Montano's preface to it, which was published under the title "Agli amici della Ronda" (To My Friends of *La Ronda*) in *La Fiera Letteraria* 4, no. 28 (July 1, 1928). Gramsci also must have read the comments on the book made by Giovanni Titta Rosa in his article "Giorante di letture. VII: Montano" (Days of reading. VII: Montano), *La Fiera Letteraria* 4, no. 44 (October 28, 1928).

Lorenzo Montano was the pseudonym used by Danilo Lebrecht (1893–1958), a poet, prose writer, and scholar of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century culture. Montano was a frequent contributor to *La Ronda*.

§155. *Father Bresciani's progeny*

1. "Per un'unione Letteraria europea" (For a European literary union), *La Fiera Letteraria* 4, no. 37 (September 9, 1928).

§156. *Folklore*

1. Gramsci's source of information on Ermolao Rubieri's classification of popular songs is an article by Giuseppe Gargàno, "Definizioni e valutazioni di poesia popolare" (Definitions and assessments of popular poetry), *Il Marzocco* 34, no. 18 (May 5, 1929).

Ermolao Rubieri (1818–79), a political activist who participated in the uprisings of 1848 and in later revolutionary activities inspired by the movement for the liberation and unification of Italy, also served as a member of parliament for some years. In 1876 he retired from political life to devote himself to writing and research. In addition to historical plays and some other political-historical works, he wrote a history of popular poetry in Italy, *Storia della poesia popolare italiana* (1877).

§157. *Sicily*

1. Gramsci extracted all the information and quotations used in this note from the segment of Bottai's essay on Verga (which he wrote for the specialized review *Studi Verghiani*) that was published in *L'Italia Letteraria* 1, no. 28 (October 13, 1929), under the title "Un saggio di Giuseppe Bottai su Verga politico" (An essay by Giuseppe Bottai on Verga's politics).

Giuseppe Bottai (1895–1959), a founding member of the Fascist Party, was elected to parliament in 1921; the following year he commanded a column of Blackshirts during the march on Rome. From early on, Bottai had a special interest in journalistic, editorial, and cultural activities. In 1923 he launched *Critica Fascista*; other journals he founded included *Archivio di Studi Corporativi* and *Primato*. He also established the School of Corporative Studies at the University of Pisa. Bottai became a member of the Fascist Grand Council in 1926, and he held important ministerial positions during the Fascist dictatorship: he was minister of corporations from 1929 to 1932 and minister of education from 1936 to 1943. He was the architect of the School Charter of 1939, a reform of the national educational system (especially at the primary level) that was meant to enable the schools to help forge "the new Fascist man."

On the novelist Giovanni Verga, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 28.

2. On Francesco Crispi and his politics, see Notebook 1, §43, n. 10.

3. Nunzio Nasi (1850–1935), a popular politician and member of parliament from Trapani in Sicily, held his first ministerial position in the

cabinet of Luigi Pelloux. Later, Prime Minister Giuseppe Zanardelli named him minister of education, a post he held between 1901 and 1903. Following the fall of Zanardelli's government, Nasi was accused of fiscal mismanagement during his tenure as minister. An inquiry was launched, and his enemies in parliament (among them, the prime minister Giovanni Giolitti) had enough votes to strip him of parliamentary immunity and authorize a criminal investigation into his affairs. Nasi was put on trial and in 1908 was sentenced to eleven months in prison. His Trapani constituents, who believed Nasi to be a victim of political persecution, reelected him to parliament several times and held public demonstrations when he was barred from returning to his seat in the Chamber of Deputies.

§158. *Lorianism. Altimetry, good morals, and intelligence*

1. Ludovico Zuccolo's little-known work *Il Belluzzi o La Città felice* (Belluzzi; or, The happy city) was reprinted by the Bologna firm, Zanichelli, in 1929, in its series "Curiosità letterarie" (Literary curiosities) under the general editorship of Amy Bernardy.

Ludovico Zuccolo (1568–1630), a political thinker, spent nine years at the court of Urbino and is known to have traveled to Venice and Spain. He is remembered primarily for the theory of the state that he expounded in his work *Della ragion di Stato* (1621), wherein he argued that politics constitute an autonomous, amoral sphere. Croce described him as one of "the true continuers of Machiavelli."

2. On Loria's "theory" of altimetry, see Notebook 1, §25, and nn. 2 and 4 in the corresponding Notes to the Text.

3. The source of the information and quotations in this note—and of the hypothesis that Zuccolo's *La Repubblica di Evandria* (The Republic of Evandria) was influenced by Thomas More's *Utopia* and was the basis for Zuccolo's later work *Il Belluzzi*—is an article by Giuseppe Gargàno: "Un utopista di senso pratico: Il *Belluzzi* di Ludovico Zuccolo" (A utopian with a practical sense: Ludovico Zuccolo's *Il Belluzzi*), *Il Marzocco* 35, no. 5 (February 2, 1930).

§159. *Risorgimento. The first Italian Jacobins*

1. The information in this note is garnered from an article by Arturo Pompeati: "Cultura e poesia nell'Italia napoleonica" (Culture and poetry in Napoleonic Italy), *Il Marzocco* 35, no. 5 (February 2, 1930).

Giulio Natali (1875–1965), the author of *Cultura e poesia in Italia nell'età napoleonica*, a book on poetry and culture in Italy during the Napoleonic era published as part of Sten's "Studii e Saggi" (Studies and Essays) series, was professor of Italian literature in Rome and later in

Catania. A specialist in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Italian literature and cultural history, Natali published numerous books, including one on the life and thought of Francesco Lomonaco, *La vita e il pensiero di Francesco Lo Monaco* (1912).

Francesco Lomonaco (1772–1810) studied medicine in Naples and was strongly influenced by the ideas of Condillac. He was a member of the Jacobin leadership that helped establish the Parthenopean republic in 1779. When the republic collapsed, he fled to France, where he presented the minister of war, Carnot, with the *Rapporto sulle segrete cagioni e su' principali avvenimenti della catastrofe napoletana* (Report on the hidden causes and the main events of the Neapolitan catastrophe), in which he denounced the Bourbons for their brutality but also severely criticized the French military leaders for abandoning the Neapolitan republicans. In the conclusion of his report, Lomonaco asserted that Italy needed not only to gain independence but also to become a single, unified country. Lomonaco returned to Italy, and in 1805 he started teaching at the military school in Pavia. His writings include several volumes of biographies of famous Italians.

§160. *Renaissance*

1. Giuseppe Toffanin's *Che cosa fu l'umanesimo: Il Risorgimento della antichità classica nella coscienza degli italiani fra i tempi di Dante e la Riforma* (What humanism was: The revival of classical antiquity in the consciousness of Italians between the times of Dante and the Reformation) was published in Florence in 1929 by Sansoni in its series "Biblioteca Storica del Rinascimento" (Historical Library of the Renaissance).

Gramsci asked for a copy of this book (cited earlier in this same notebook) in a November 23, 1931, letter to Tatiana Schucht. See Notebook 5, §123, n. 19.

2. The Italian word used here is "*riscossa*," a word Gramsci specifically discusses in Notebook 5, §136.

3. Toffanin, *Che cosa fu l'umanesimo*, pp. 134–35.

4. On Vittorio Rossi's article, "Il Rinascimento," *Nuova Antologia* 64, no. 1384 (November 16, 1929): 137–50, see Notebook 5, §123.

5. See Giuseppe Toffanin's books on the end of humanism, *Fine dell'umanesimo* (Turin: Bocca, 1920), and on the sixteenth century, *Il Cinquecento* (Milan: Vallardi, 1928).

§161. *Encyclopedic notions. "Ascaro"*

1. "*Ascaro*" (both singular and plural) in Italian, like "askari" in English, is a somewhat derogatory term that literally refers to an indige-

nous African soldier or policemen in the employ of a colonial administration. In Italy the term was applied figuratively to members of small political parties or groups that served as auxiliaries of the big parties.

2. "*Crumiro*" in Italian is used contemptuously in precisely the same sense as the English "scab": i.e., a strikebreaker.

SEQUENCE OF NOTES BY TITLE OR OPENING PHRASE

NOTEBOOK 3

PAGE		
5	§1	*The French intellectuals*
6	§2	*Julien Benda*
8	§3	*German intellectuals*
9	§4	*Emmanuel Berl*
11	§5	*America*
13	§6	*What do the young think?*
14	§7	The people (oh!), the public (oh!)
14	§8	*Father Bresciani's progeny*
15	§9	*The academy of Ten*
16	§10	*Proudhon and the Italian literati (Raimondi, Jahier)*
17	§11	*Americanism*
18	§12	*David Lazzaretti*
20	§13	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Alfredo Panzini:* Vita di Cavour
21	§14	*History of the dominant class and history of the subaltern classes*
21	§15	*Ettore Ciccotti*
22	§16	*Political development of the popular class in the medieval commune*
24	§17	*1917*
24	§18	*History of the subaltern classes*
25	§19	*The problem of the young*
25	§20	*Documents of the times*
25	§21	*Italian diplomacy before 1914*
26	§22	*Lorianism*

26	§23	*Loria*
26	§24	*Risorgimento motifs. Sicilian separatism*
27	§25	*The role of Catholics in Italy (Catholic Action)*
29	§26	*America and Europe*
29	§27	*Prince Karl Rohan*
29	§28	*Types of periodicals*
30	§29	*Catalogo dei cataloghi del libro italiano*
30	§30	*Another bibliographical publication*
30	§31	*Types of periodicals*
31	§32	*"Rendre la vie impossible"*
32	§33	*Some causes of error*
32	§34	*Past and present*
33	§35	*Giuseppe Rensi*
34	§36	*Cultural matters*
34	§37	*Father Bresciani's progeny*
34	§38	*Father Bresciani's progeny. A. Panzini:* Vita di Cavour
39	§39	*Past and present*
39	§40	*Reformation and Renaissance*
40	§41	*Father Bresciani's progeny*
40	§42	*Past and present*
43	§43	*Past and present*
43	§44	*Past and present*
44	§45	*Past and present*
44	§46	*Past and present*
47	§47	*Political science and the positivists*
48	§48	*Past and present. Spontaneity and conscious leadership*
52	§49	*Cultural topics. Ideological material*
53	§50	*Concordat*
53	§51	*Past and present*
54	§52	*The pillories of virtue*
54	§53	*Past and present. Influence of the romanticism of French serials*
55	§54	*Emilio Bodrero*
56	§55	*Past and present. Otto Kahn*
56	§56	*The concept of organic centralism and the priestly caste*
57	§57	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Papini*
57	§58	*Types of periodicals. The* Voce-Leonardo *type*
58	§59	*Past and present. The intellectual influence of France*
58	§60	*Past and present*
59	§61	*The struggle between generations*
59	§62	*Past and present*
61	§63	*Father Bresciani's progeny*
65	§64	*Father Bresciani's progeny*

65	§65	Massimo Lelj, *Il Risorgimento dello spirito italiano: 1725–1861*
65	§66	*Lorianism and the baroque style. Paolo Orano*
66	§67	*Gerrymandering*
66	§68	*Americanism*
67	§69	*Utopias and philosophical novels*
67	§70	*Frère Vedremo*
67	§71	*Utopias and philosophical novels*
68	§72	*Science columns*
69	§73	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Luigi Capuana*
70	§74	*Giulio Bertoni and linguistics*
72	§75	*Utopias and philosophical novels*
72	§76	*The question of the language and the Italian intellectual classes*
76	§77	*The clergy, church property, and analogous forms of personal or real property*
76	§78	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Popular serial novels*
78	§79	*The question of the language*
78	§80	*The particular chauvinism of the Italians*
79	§81	*Federico Confalonieri*
80	§82	*French and Italian historical culture*
82	§83	*Past and present*
83	§84	*The death of Vittorio Emanuele II*
83	§85	*Arturo Graf*
84	§86	*Lorianism. Alfredo Trombetti*
86	§87	*Regarding the formation of the Italian intellectual classes in the early Middle Ages*
90	§88	*The study of the historical formation of the Italian intellectuals*
90	§89	*Lorianism*
91	§90	*History of the subaltern classes*
92	§91	*Father Bresciani's progeny. The book fair*
92	§92	*Federico Confalonieri*
93	§93	*Giovanni Cena*
93	§94	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Polifilo*
93	§95	*Father Bresciani's progeny*
94	§96	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Popular novels*
95	§97	*The concordat*
95	§98	*Spartacus*
96	§99	*The law of numbers*
96	§100	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Popular literature*
96	§101	*Father Bresciani's progeny. The antipopular or nonpopular-national character of Italian literature*

96	§102	*Past and present. School of journalism*
97	§103	*The Risorgimento and the revolutionary classes*
97	§104	*Popular literature. An anthology of writings by American workers*
98	§105	*Lorianism. American peanuts and oil*
98	§106	*Prof. H. de Vries de Heekelingen*
99	§107	*The social classes in the Risorgimento*
99	§108	*The personal equation*
99	§109	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Italo Svevo and Italian littérateurs*
100	§110	*Equipping the nation*
100	§111	*Lorianism*
101	§112	*Corrado Barbagallo*
101	§113	*Utopias*
101	§114	*Past and present*
102	§115	*International function of the Italian educated classes*
102	§116	*International function of the Italian educated classes*
104	§117	*Italian emigration and the cosmopolitan function of the Italian educated classes*
104	§118	*National history and the history of culture (European or international)*
105	§119	*Past and present. Agitation and propaganda*
106	§120	*Antonio Fradeletto*
107	§121	*Father Bresciani's progeny*
107	§122	*Italian diplomacy. Costantino Nigra and the Treaty of Wuchali*
108	§123	*The pitiful Italian*
108	§124	*Emigration*
109	§125	*Luigi Castellazzo, the Mantua trial, and the other trials under Austrian rule*
111	§126	*The formation of the Italian educated classes and their cosmopolitan function*
111	§127	*The Risorgimento*
111	§128	*Machiavelli and Emanuele Filiberto*
111	§129	*Italian diplomacy*
112	§130	*Italian culture*
112	§131	*Italian diplomacy*
112	§132	*Lorianism. Paolo Orano*
113	§133	Carlo Flumiani, *I gruppi sociali: Fondamenti di scienza politica*
113	§134	Piero Pieri, *Il regno di Napoli dal luglio 1799 al marzo 1806*
113	§135	*History and antihistory*
114	§136	*Father Bresciani's progeny*

114	§137	*The formation of the Italian intellectual class*
115	§138	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Alfredo Panzini*
116	§139	*Past and present*
116	§140	*Catholicism and secularism. Religion and science*
117	§141	*The international function of Italian intellectuals*
118	§142	*The limits of state activity*
119	§143	*1914*
119	§144	*Renaissance*
119	§145	*Italian and French culture and the academies*
120	§146	*Kipling*
120	§147	*Italian intellectuals. Carducci*
120	§148	*The negative popular-national character of Italian literature*
121	§149	*Popular literature. Verne and the literature of marvelous adventures*
122	§150	*Popular literature. Emilio De Marchi*
122	§151	*Negative popular-national character of Italian literature*
123	§152	*"Spectator" = Mario Missiroli*
123	§153	*Popular literature. Notes on the detective novel*
124	§154	*The negative national-popular aspect of Italian literature*
125	§155	*The new architecture*
126	§156	*Lorianism. Trombetti and the monogenesis of language*
128	§157	*Separation between leaders and led*
129	§158	*The historical conjuncture of 1848–49*
129	§159	*Risorgimento*
129	§160	*The economic structure of Italy*
130	§161	*Leo XIII*
130	§162	*The historical conjuncture of 1848–49*
131	§163	*Alessandro Luzio's "history" of the Risorgimento*
131	§164	*Notes on the religious movement. The editorial staff of* La Civiltà Cattolica
133	§165	*Italo Toscani*
133	§166	*Past and present*

NOTEBOOK 4

137	§1	If one wants to study a conception of the world . . .
139	§2	*De Man's book*
140	§3	*Two aspects of Marxism*
144	§4	*Machiavellianism and Marxism*
144	§5	*Historical materialism and practical criteria or canons of historical and political interpretation*
147	§6	*Roberto Ardigò*

149	§7	*Superstructures and science*
150	§8	*Machiavelli and Marx*
151	§9	*A repertory of Marxism*
152	§10	*Marx and Machiavelli*
152	§11	*Fundamental problems of Marxism*
153	§12	*Structure and superstructure*
154	§13	*Notes and critical observations on the* Popular Manual
155	§14	*The concept of "orthodoxy"*
156	§15	*Croce and Marx*
158	§16	*The teleology of the* Popular Manual
158	§17	*Immanence and the* Popular Manual
159	§18	*The technique of thinking*
161	§19	*The "technical instrument" in the* Popular Manual
161	§20	*Croce and Marx*
162	§21	*The technique of thinking*
162	§22	*Croce and Marx. The value of ideologies*
163	§23	*The* Popular Manual *and sociological laws*
163	§24	*The Restoration and historicism*
164	§25	*Notes on the* Popular Manual
166	§26	*The* Popular Manual *and the "ultimate cause"*
166	§27	*Teleology*
166	§28	Antonino Lovecchio, *Filosofia della prassi e filosofia dello spirito*
166	§29	*Machiavelli*
167	§30	*De Man's book*
168	§31	*By Georges Sorel*
172	§32	*The* Popular Manual
173	§33	The passage from *knowing* to *understanding* to *feeling* . . .
174	§34	*Apropos of the appellation of "historical materialism"*
174	§35	*On the origin of the concept of "ideology"*
175	§36	*Criteria of "literary" judgment*
176	§37	*Idealism-positivism. ["Objectivity" of knowledge]*
177	§38	*Relations between structure and superstructures*
188	§39	On the *Popular Manual*
188	§40	*Philosophy and ideology*
189	§41	*Science*
191	§42	*Giovanni Vailati and scientific language*
192	§43	*The "objectivity of the real" and Prof. Lukács*
193	§44	*Sorel*
194	§45	*Structure and superstructures*
196	§46	*Philosophy—politics—economics*
197	§47	*The objectivity of the real and Engels*
198	§48	*Henri De Man's book*

199	§49	*The intellectuals*
210	§50	*The common school*
214	§51	*Brains and brawn*
215	§52	*Americanism and Fordism*
220	§53	*Concordats and international treaties*
225	§54	*1918*
225	§55	*The educational principle in elementary and secondary school*
231	§56	*Machiavelli and the "autonomy" of the phenomenon of politics*
232	§57	*Vincenzo Cuoco and passive revolution*
233	§58	[*Popular literature*]
233	§59	[*History of the subaltern classes*]
233	§60	*Cultural topics*
234	§61	*Philosophy-ideology, science-doctrine*
235	§62	*Military and political craft*
236	§63	*The Sorel-Croce correspondence*
236	§64	*"History and Antihistory"*
236	§65	*Past and present*
237	§66	*The military element in politics*
240	§67	*The relative greatness of powerful nations*
240	§68	*Il libro di don Chisciotte* by E. Scarfoglio
241	§69	*On political parties*
242	§70	*Sorel, the Jacobins, violence*
242	§71	*Science*
242	§72	*The new intellectual*
243	§73	*Lorianism*
243	§74	*G. B. Angioletti*
243	§75	*Past and present*
244	§76	*Vittorio Macchioro and America*
245	§77	*Types of periodicals*
246	§78	The question of "structure and poetry" in the *Divine Comedy* . . .
248	§79	*Criticism of the "unexpressed"?*
249	§80	Pliny records that when Timanthes of Sicyon painted . . .
249	§81	The date of Guido Cavalcanti's death . . .
250	§82	*Guido's disdain*
251	§83	Vincenzo Morello. *Dante, Farinata, Cavalcante*
254	§84	The "renunciations of description" in the *Divine Comedy*
255	§85	One of the "Sotto la Mole" columns, entitled "Il cieco Tiresia" . . .
256	§86	I am transcribing some passages on the topic of Cavalcante and Farinata . . .

257 §87 Since one should not care a hoot about the solemn task . . .
258 §88 *Shaw and Gordon Craig*
259 §89 *Cultural topics*
259 §90 *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*
260 §91 *The cosmopolitan character of Italian intellectuals*
261 §92 *Cultural topics*
261 §93 *Intellectuals. Brief notes on English culture*
264 §94 *Concordat*
264 §95 *History of the subaltern classes*

NOTEBOOK 5

267 §1 *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*
269 §2 *Rotary Club*
272 §3 *Owen, Saint-Simon, and Ferrante Aporti's infant schools*
273 §4 *Saint-Simonism, Freemasonry, Rotary Club*
273 §5 *Catholic social action*
273 §6 *Past and present*
273 §7 *On Catholic "social thought" . . .*
275 §8 *America and the Mediterranean*
275 §9 *Lucien Romier and Catholic Action in France*
275 §10 *Catholic Action in Belgium*
276 §11 *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*
276 §12 *The Risorgimento. Solaro della Margarita*
277 §13 *Catholic Action*
277 §14 *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*
281 §15 *Lucien Romier and Catholic Action in France*
281 §16 *Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*
282 §17 *The Pan-Christian movement*
282 §18 *Catholic social thought*
283 §19 *Catholic Action in Italy*
283 §20 *Machiavelli and Emanuele Filiberto*
284 §21 *For the history of the Italian workers' movement*
284 §22 *Catholic Action in Germany*
285 §23 *Brief notes on Chinese culture*
292 §24 *Past and present. Respect for the national artistic heritage*
292 §25 *Machiavelli and Manzoni*
292 §26 *Father Bresciani's progeny. Alfredo Panzini*
293 §27 *Father Bresciani's progeny*
294 §28 *Ideology, psychologism, positivism*
294 §29 *East-West*
294 §30 *The international function of Italian intellectuals*

295	§31	*On the Italian national tradition*
296	§32	*Ugo Foscolo and Italian literary rhetoric*
296	§33	M. Iskowicz, *La littérature à la lumière du matérialisme historique*
297	§34	*Past and present*
297	§35	*Risorgimento*
297	§36	*Past and present*
297	§37	*The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*
298	§38	*The non-national-popular character of Italian literature*
298	§39	*Skepticism*
299	§40	*Pirandello*
299	§41	*Vocational guidance*
300	§42	*The tradition of Rome*
302	§43	*The episode of the arrest of the La Gala brothers in 1863*
302	§44	*T. Tittoni*, "Ricordi personali di politica interna"
304	§45	*Enrico Catellani*, "La libertà del mare"
304	§46	*Claudio Faina*, "Il carburante nazionale"
305	§47	*Catholic Action*
305	§48	*Domenico Spadoni*, "Le società segrete nella rivoluzione milanese dell'aprile 1814"
305	§49	*Bernardo Sanvisenti*, "La questione delle Antille"
305	§50	*Brief notes on Japanese culture*
308	§51	*Brief notes on Chinese culture*
310	§52	*Domenico Meneghini*, "Industrie chimiche italiane"
310	§53	*Reformation and Renaissance. Nicholas of Cusa*
311	§54	*Father Bresciani's progeny*
313	§55	*Romagna and its role in Italian history*
316	§56	*Catholic Action*
316	§57	*Catholic Action in the United States*
316	§58	*Catholic Action*
317	§59	*Catholic Action in Germany*
317	§60	"La schiavitù del lavoro indigeno" (by A. Brucculeri)
318	§61	*Rotary Club*
320	§62	The editorial staff of *La Civiltà Cattolica*
320	§63	*Father Bresciani's progeny*
322	§64	*Church and state in Italy before the conciliation*
323	§65	*Risorgimento. The historical conjuncture of 1848–49*
324	§66	*Father Bresciani's progeny. Ugo Ojetti and the Jesuits*
327	§67	*Catholic Action*
327	§68	Monsignor Francesco Lanzoni, *Le Diocesi d'Italia . . .*
328	§69	*Encyclopedic notions*
328	§70	*The state is the church*
329	§71	*The nature of the concordats*

330 §72 *Past and present*
330 §73 *Politico-military direction of the war*
331 §74 *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*
332 §75 *Maggiorino Ferraris and life in Italy from 1882 to 1926*
333 §76 *On the crisis of 1898*
333 §77 *Garibaldi's crossing from Sicily to Calabria in 1860*
333 §78 *Monasticism and feudalism*
334 §79 *A. G. Bianchi,* "I clubs rossi durante l'assedio di Parigi"
334 §80 *Sorel and the Jacobins*
335 §81 *Past and present. Territorial distribution of the Italian population*
335 §82 *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*
337 §83 *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*
337 §84 *Popular literature*
337 §85 *Development of the bourgeois spirit in Italy*
338 §86 *England*
339 §87 *Political-military leadership in the war of 1914–18*
341 §88 *On the Italian Risorgimento. Michele Amari and Sicilianism*
343 §89 *Gabriele Gabbrielli,* "India ribelle"
344 §90 *Brief notes on Islamic culture*
346 §91 *Renaissance and Reformation*
348 §92 *Italian diplomacy*
348 §93 *Eighteenth-century Italian morals*
349 §94 *The negative popular-national character of Italian literature*
349 §95 *Fifteenth-century and sixteenth-century man*
350 §96 *The negative national-popular character of Italian literature*
350 §97 *The intellectuals*
350 §98 *Postwar history*
351 §99 *German armament at the time of the armistice*
351 §100 *The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*
352 §101 *Father Bresciani's progeny. Filippo Crispolti*
353 §102 *Italian literature. The contribution by bureaucrats*
353 §103 *Popular literature. Theater*
354 §104 *The sixteenth century*
355 §105 *Americanism*
356 §106 *Luigi Villari,* "Il governo laburista britannico"
357 §107 *Italy and Palestine*
357 §108 *Sicily. The Sicilian Pantheon of San Domenico*
357 §109 *Sicily*
358 §110 *France and Italy*
358 §111 *The Italian Academy*
358 §112 *Carlo Schanzer,* "Sovranità e giustizia nei rapporti fra gli Stati"
358 §113 *On Henrik Ibsen*

358	§114	*Encyclopedia of concepts—political, philosophical, etc. Postulate*
359	§115	*Niccolò Machiavelli*
359	§116	*G.B.*, "La banca dei regolamenti internazionali"
359	§117	*Argus*, "Il disarmo navale, i sottomarini e gli aeroplani"
360	§118	*Stresemann*
360	§119	*Encyclopedia of concepts—political, philosophical, etc. Middle class*
361	§120	*Catholic cultural nationalism*
361	§121	*France*
361	§122	*National-popular*
362	§123	*Renaissance*
374	§124	*Past and present. Certain intellectuals*
374	§125	*Types of periodicals. Critical-bibliographical surveys*
375	§126	*Past and present. The intellectuals: the decline of Mario Missiroli*
377	§127	*Machiavelli*
382	§128	*Lorianism. Domenico Giuliotti*
383	§129	*Past and present. The Catholics and the state*
383	§130	*Encyclopedic notions*
384	§131	*Types of periodicals. A regular column on grammar and linguistics*
385	§132	*Past and present*
385	§133	*Catholic Action. The "Workers' Retreats"*
386	§134	*Religious movements*
387	§135	*The Italian Risorgimento. Lamennais*
387	§136	*Encyclopedic notions*
388	§137	*Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists. The case of Abbé Turmel of Rennes*
388	§138	*Emperor worship*
389	§139	*Encyclopedic notions*
389	§140	*Americanism*
391	§141	*Catholic integralists, Jesuits, modernists*
394	§142	*Philosophical novels, utopias, etc.*
394	§143	*The international function of Italian intellectuals*
394	§144	*Encyclopedic notions*
395	§145	*Past and present. Primitive and nonprimitive Christianity*
395	§146	*Political-military leadership in the war of 1914*
395	§147	*The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals*
396	§148	*Past and present. Inquiries on youth*
397	§149	*Past and present. Education*
397	§150	*The cosmopolitan function of Italian intellectuals. Risorgimento*
398	§151	*Linguistics*

398 §152 *Utopias, philosophical novels, etc.*
399 §153 *Popular literature*
399 §154 *Father Bresciani's progeny. Cardarelli and* La Ronda
399 §155 *Father Bresciani's progeny*
399 §156 *Folklore*
400 §157 *Sicily*
400 §158 *Lorianism. Altimetry, good morals, and intelligence*
401 §159 *Risorgimento. The first Italian Jacobins*
401 §160 *Renaissance*
402 §161 *Encyclopedic notions. "Ascaro"*

NAME INDEX

Abbo, Pietro, 44, 448
Abbott, E., 540
Abetti, Giorgio, 461
Abramovich, Rafael, 572
Acerbo, Giacomo, 411, 502, 658
Adams, John, 408
Adler, Alfred, 167, 560
Adler, Max, 140, 167, 427, 441, 529, 550
Adrian IV, 637
Aeschylus, 54, 489
Agapetus I, 331
Agliardi, Antonio, 28, 423
Agnelli, Giovanni, 200, 570
Ainslie, D., 540, 583, 584
Alberti, Leon Battista, 315, 338, 347, 349, 652, 653, 666, 671
Aldington, Richard, 407
Alexander, Sidney, 653
Alexander I (king of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, 1921–1929, and king of Yugoslavia, 1929–1934), 590
Alexander II (emperor of Russia, 1855–1881), 508
Alexander III (pope), 637
Alexander III, the Great (king of Macedonia, 336–323 B.C.), 388, 693
Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia), 313, 484, 651
Allodoli, Ettore, 699
Alvaro, Corrado, 17, 416
Alvisi, Edoardo, 359, 678
Amari, Michele, 341–43, 667–68
Amaro, L., 494
Amatucci, Aurelio Giuseppe, 331, 662
Amendola, Giovanni, 532
Amette, Léon Adolphe, 281
Amicucci, Ermanno, 82, 484, 485
Ancus Marcius, 419
Anderson, E., 548
Andler, Charles, 169–70, 551–52
Andoux, Marguerite, 98
Andrea da Barberino, 460
Andriulli, Giuseppe, 112, 506
Angeli, Diego, 174, 553
Angioletti, Giovanni Battista, 146, 243, 532, 594
Aniante, Antonio, 297, 640
Aniello, Tommaso, *see* Masaniello
Anile, Antonino, 699
Ansaldo, Giovanni, 39, 699
Antici, Adelaide, 352, 673
Antonelli, Pietro, 108, 502
Antonielli, Ugo, 85
Aporti, Ferrante, 272, 620–21
Arcari, Paolo, 34, 413, 421, 434, 600, 700
Ardigò, Roberto, 55, 147–49, 298, 454, 525, 533, 641
Arese, Francesco, 131
Ariaghi, C., 587
Arias, Paolo Enrico, 249, 603
Ariosto, Ludovico, 355, 612, 672, 675, 681, 693
Aristotle, 200, 290, 431, 636
Arrighi, Cletto, *see* Righetti, Carlo

Ascoli, Graziadio Isaia, 70, 470
Atkinson, N., 233
Auber, Daniel, 478
Augustine of Hippo, Saint, 57, 198, 456, 608
Azzalini, M., 377–81, 687–88

Babeuf, François-Noël, 169, 551
Baccelli, Guido, 83, 485
Bacchelli, Riccardo, 14, 395, 412–14, 626, 698
Bachi, Riccardo, 24, 419
Bacon, Francis, 67, 465
Bainville, Jacques, 81, 393, 484, 696
Bakunin, Mikhail Aleksandrovich, 15, 413, 414
Balbo, Cesare, 117, 129, 510, 516–17
Baldini, Antonio, 374, 684, 686
Balsamo, Giuseppe (also known as Cagliostro), 348, 671
Balzac, Honoré de, 124, 451
Balzani, Ugo, 337, 666
Bandiera, Attilio, 99, 494
Bandiera, Emilio, 99, 494
Baratieri, Oreste, 108, 502
Baratono, Adelchi, 166, 549
Barbadoro, Bernardino, 295, 636
Barbagallo, Corrado, 22, 101, 233, 418, 496, 536–37, 585–86, 699
Barbano, O. M., 83, 485
Barbarich, Eugenio, 102–103, 497
Barbaro, Umberto, 139, 529
Barbera, Mario, 176, 293, 329, 555, 661, 679
Barberis, 98, 493
Barbi, Michele, 255, 257–58, 600, 605, 610–11
Barbiellini-Amidei, Bernardo, 243, 594
Barbusse, Henri, 10, 98, 409–10, 493
Baroncelli, Piero, 301, 643–44
Baronio, Cesare, 391, 694
Barrès, Maurice, 7, 107, 407–8, 501
Bartoli, Matteo Giulio, 70–71, 85, 91, 468–70, 486, 488
Barzellotti, Giacomo, 18–20, 416–17
Barzilai, Salvatore, 304
Basta, Giorgio, 102–3, 497–98
Battaglia, Felice, 549
Baudelaire, Charles, 326, 457
Bauer, Otto, 31, 427
Bazin, René, 34, 434–35
Becque, Henry, 355, 675
Bellarmine, Robert, 223, 579
Bellonci, Goffredo, 68, 466
Belluzzo, Giuseppe, 328, 660
Beltrami, Luca, 93, 292, 489, 633
Bemporad, Enrico, 43, 445
Benda, Julien, 6–8, 407–8
Benedict of Norcia, Saint, 332–33, 473, 662
Benedict XV, 279–80, 322, 623, 625, 657–58
Benes, Edvard, 331, 662
Benigni, Umberto, 267–69, 278–81, 617–19, 625
Benini, Rodolfo, 191, 564
Benoist, Charles, 150, 533
Beolco, Angelo, *see* Ruzzante
Béranger, Pierre-Jean de, 63, 460
Berardo Caracciolo (also known as Master Berardo of Naples), 370, 683
Berge, André, 5, 407
Bergin, Thomas G., 570
Bergson, Henri-Louis, 7, 140, 294, 298, 381, 407, 440–41, 540, 564, 635, 641, 689
Berkeley, George, 563
Berl, Emmanuel, 6, 9, 407, 409
Bernanos, Georges, 34, 435
Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Jacques-Henry, 37, 437
Bernardo, Aldo, 689
Bernardo, Reta, 689
Bernardy, Amy, 400, 703
Bernheim, Ernst, 144, 531, 532
Bernstein, Eduard, 169–70, 550–52
Bertalanffy, L. von, 310, 649
Bertarelli, Ernesto, 68, 466
Bertelli, Luigi, *see* Vamba
Berth, Edouard, 568
Berti, Giuseppe, 582, 652
Bertoni, Giulio, 70–71, 468–70
Bertram, Johannes Adolf, 317, 655
Bevione, Giuseppe, 270, 323, 620, 658
Bex, 303
Bianchi, Augusto Guido, 334, 663–64
Bianchi, Michele, 63, 459
Biancoli, Bruno, 466
Bibbiena (pseudonym of Dovizi, Bernardo), 355, 675
Biggini, Carlo Alberto, 118, 510–11
Bigongiari, D., 581

Billot, Louis, 278, 625
Biondolillo, Francesco, 699
Bismarck, Otto von, 240, 627
Bissolati Bergamaschi, Leonida, 304, 346, 670
Blanc, Charles Louis, 54, 453
Blanqui, Louis-Auguste, 169, 551
Blasi, Ferrucio, 469
Bloch, Joseph, 546, 559–60
Blondel, Maurice, 619
Boccaccio, Giovanni, 511
Bodrero, Emilio, 16, 55, 415, 453–54, 684, 699
Boïeldieu, Marie Jacques Amand, 353–54, 674
Boito, Arrigo, 457
Bollea, Luigi Cesare, 35, 436–37
Bombacci, Nicola, 323, 441–42, 658
Bonfadini, Romualdo, 109, 504
Bonghi, Ruggero, 63, 236, 459, 590
Bongiorno, A., 540
Boniface VIII, 368, 681, 682
Bonneff, L., 98
Bonneff, M., 98
Bonomelli, Geremia, 28, 422–23
Bonomi, Ivanoe, 322–23, 646, 657–58
Bonomi, Paolo, 28, 305
Boothby, Guy Newell, 94, 490
Bordiga, Amadeo, 448, 456
Borgese, Giuseppe Antonio, 68, 465
Borgia, Cesare, 151, 313, 315, 369, 534, 651, 682
Borsa, Mario, 234, 586–87
Botero, Giovanni, 117, 381, 510, 689
Bottai, Giuseppe, 400, 702
Bottazzi, Filippo, 684
Botti, Mario, 257, 610
Boulanger, Georges-Ernest, 560–61
Boulin, Abbé, 278, 392, 625, 695
Bourget, Paul, 34, 175, 434, 554
Bournac, Olivier, 298
Boussenard, Louis-Henri, 77, 478
Boutet, Edoardo, 93, 489–90
Bovio, Corso, 243, 592–93
Brahmabandhav, 132, 520
Brancaccio, Nicola, 111
Brandes, Georg, 294, 635
Brandileone, Francesco, 87, 341–43, 487, 667–68
Bresciani, Antonio, 14, 20, 34, 37, 40, 57, 61, 65, 69, 76, 92, 93, 94, 96, 99, 107, 114, 115, 146, 292, 293, 311, 320, 324, 352, 399, 412, 417, 434, 436, 437, 439, 456, 458, 461, 466, 476, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 494, 501, 508, 509, 634, 650, 656, 659, 673, 701, 702
Bricarelli, Carlo, 320
Brookes, Richard, 630
Brown, Alison, 653
Brucculeri, Angelo, 131, 198, 273–74, 299, 316, 317, 320, 389, 519, 521, 569, 621, 622, 623, 642, 653, 654, 655, 656
Bruers, Antonio, 38, 323–24, 438, 658
Bruno, Giordano, 159, 311, 539, 584
Brunot, Ferdinand, 74, 384, 476, 690
Bucco, Ercole, 441
Bukharin, Nikolai, 441, 532–35, 539, 541–42, 553–54, 566–67
Bulferetti, Domenico, 18–19, 416, 584
Bull, George, 653
Buonaiuti, Ernesto, 268–69, 507, 619–20
Burckhardt, Jacob, 374, 684
Busnelli, Giovanni, 320
Butler, Samuel, 398

Cabanis, Pierre-Jean-Georges, 175, 554
Cabiati, Attilio, 68, 465
Cadorna, Luigi, 421
Caesar, Julius, 95, 108, 240
Cafiero, Carlo, 15, 413–14, 417
Cagliostro, *see* Balsamo, Giuseppe
Caillaux, Joseph-Marie, 56, 456
Cairnes, John Elliot, 191
Calabresi, Carlo, 133, 520
Calderoni, Mario, 564
Calles, Plutarco Elias, 207, 571
Calligari, Ernesto, 321
Calvin, John, 679
Calza, Arturo, 107, 501
Cambon, Victor, 40, 440
Camerana, Giovanni, 457
Cameroni, Agostino, 28, 423
Camis, Mario, 162, 544
Campanella, Tommaso, 117, 465, 510, 584
Campello della Spina, Paolo, 302, 645
Camper, Petrus, 72, 471
Campi, Scipione, 102
Campus, Giovanni, 70–71, 470
Canaletti Gaudenti, A., 233
Cangrande della Scala (of Verona), 666

Canova, Antonio, 326
Cantù, Cesare, 608
Capello, Bianca, 77, 478–79
Caprioglio, Sergio, 513
Capuana, Luigi, 69, 466–67, 591
Caracalla (Roman emperor, 211–217), 688
Caracciolo, Mario, 339–40, 667
Carano-Donvito, Giovanni, 587
Cardarelli, Vincenzo, 399, 701
Carducci, Giosuè, 110, 120, 145, 227, 300, 312, 374, 443, 458, 504, 512, 532, 581, 591, 642, 650, 671, 686
Carini, Giacinto, 357, 676–77
Carlo Alberto di Savoia (king of Sardinia, 1831–49),131, 324, 516–17, 519, 661
Carlo Emanuele III (king of Sardinia, 1730–1773), 35, 436
Carlo Felice di Savoia (king of Sardinia, 1821–31), 494
Carlyle, Thomas, 590
Carnot, Lazare, 704
Caroncini, Alberto, 434
Carr, H. Wildon, 555, 636
Carrara, Francesco da, 688
Casanova, Giovanni Giacomo, 348
Casati, Carlo, 131
Casati, Gabrio, 130, 227, 516, 518, 581
Casati, Giovanni, 114, 320–21, 508, 656–57
Casella, Mario, 70, 470
Casini, Tito, 460
Cassel, Gustav, 130
Cassiodorus, 331, 332, 662
Castellani, Alberto, 288–91, 632–33
Castellazzo, Luigi, 109–10, 503–04
Castiglione, Baldassare, 315, 347, 349–50, 653, 671, 672, 675, 681
Catellani, Enrico, 304, 646
Cattaneo, Carlo, 30, 425
Cattaneo, Cesare, 699
Cavalcanti, Cavalcante, 246–48, 250, 252–53, 256, 595, 597–99, 601–2, 605–7
Cavalcanti, Guido, 246–50, 252–53, 597–99, 601–3
Cavallera, Ferdinando, 260, 612
Cavina, Luigi, 313–14, 651–52
Cavour, Count (Camillo Benso), 20–21, 34, 36–38, 129, 225, 398, 406, 417–18, 436, 438, 517, 518, 580, 695
Cecchi, Emilio, 68, 465
Cena, Giovanni, 83, 93, 485, 488
Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de, 672
Cesarini-Sforza, Widar, 118–19, 511
Cesi, Federico, 67, 465
Ceva, B., 564
Charlemagne, emperor, 73, 75, 88, 367, 487
Charles I of Anjou (king of Naples and Sicily, 1246–1285), 449
Charles II the Bald (king of the West Franks, 843–877, and emperor, 875–877), 475
Charles III (king of Naples [as Charles VII], 1734–1759, and king of Spain, 1759–1788), 97, 696
Charles III, the Fat (king of Swabia, 876–887, and emperor, 881–887), 76
Charles IV (king of Bohemia, 1346–1378, and Holy Roman emperor, 1355–1378), 368, 478, 682
Charles V (king of Spain [as Charles I], 1516–1556, and Holy Roman emperor, 1519–1556), 349, 484
Charlotte Napoleon, princess, 174, 553
Chénier, André, 478
Chesterton, G. K., 122, 124, 515, 669
Chiappelli, Alessandro, 375, 687, 698
Chiòrboli, Ezio, 72, 471–72
Chiurlo, Bindo, 699
Chu Hsi, 438, 629, 632
Cialdini, Enrico (duke of Gaeta), 37, 438
Cian, Vittorio, 107, 349–50, 500, 672
Ciccotti (Scozzese), Francesco, 43, 447
Ciccotti, Ettore, 21–22, 24, 418–19, 527, 546
Cicero, Marcus Tullius, 228
Cicognani, Bruno, 124, 515
Cione, Edmondo, 116–17, 509–10
Cipolla, Carlo, 46, 448
Cirspolti, Filippo, 352
Citanna, Giuseppe, 249, 603
Clemenceau, Georges, 141, 169, 193, 375–76, 464, 530, 567, 687
Clement V, 681
Clement VII, 81, 484, 682, 694
Cocchia, Enrico, 91
Cola di Rienzo, 77, 370–71, 478, 682
Colletta, Pietro, 236, 394, 587, 696, 697
Collingwood, R. G., 584
Collodi, Carlo (pseudonym of Carlo Lorenzini), 445
Colonna Fiumedinisi, Gabriele, 358, 677

Columbus, Christopher, 79, 126, 296
Comisso, Giovanni, 100, 495
Compagni, Dino, 247, 602, 604
Compagnoni, Giuseppe, 175
Comte, Auguste, 48, 303, 476, 645
Condillac, Etienne-Bonnot de, 175, 528, 554, 704
Condorcet, Antoine-Nicolas de, 437
Confalonieri, Federico, 79–80, 92, 109–10, 132, 483, 488, 504, 519
Confalonieri-Cassati, Teresa, 79
Confucius, 289, 291, 630
Congreve, Richard, 645
Constantine the Great, 75, 388, 394, 496, 697
Coppola, Francesco, 29, 107, 424, 501
Corbino, Orso Mario, 466
Cormon, Eugène, 490
Cornaggia Medici Castiglioni, Carlo Ottavio, 28, 423
Corradini, Enrico, 107, 109, 293–94, 501, 502, 558, 634
Cortese, Nino, 97, 492–93
Cosmo, Umberto, 256–57, 526, 596–97, 607–11
Costa, Andrea, 15, 31, 413, 429
Costantini, Celso, 309
Couchoud, Paul-Louis, 268, 375, 619, 687
Coulange, Louis, 619
Couplet, Philippe, 287, 629
Craig, Gordon, 258, 611
Credaro, Luigi, 311
Crémieux, Benjamin, 299, 495, 641–42
Crespi, Angelo, 234, 586
Crispi, Francesco, 99, 106, 109, 357, 485, 494, 498, 503, 677, 702
Crispolti, Filippo, 34, 352, 435, 669, 673, 684
Crivelli family, 131
Crivellucci, Amedeo, 532
Croce, Benedetto, 7, 27, 29, 51, 71, 82, 113, 114, 117, 125, 139, 140–41, 144, 145, 151, 156, 157, 159–60, 161–62, 166, 171, 175, 176, 194, 196, 200, 231–32, 233, 236, 246, 249, 256, 261, 326, 337, 343, 354, 374, 407, 417, 422, 432, 469, 470, 471, 484, 488, 507, 510, 515, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 535, 536–37, 538, 539–40, 542, 543, 544, 545, 547, 548, 552, 553, 554, 567, 568–69, 577, 581, 582–83, 584, 586, 588–89, 595, 597, 599, 600, 603, 610, 612, 640, 642, 668, 670, 675, 685, 686, 687, 703
Croizier, P., 393
Crosby, Ernest, 122, 512, 514
Cuoco, Vincenzo, 232, 524, 584
Czobel, E., 528

Da Como, Ugo, 79–80, 483
D'Adda, Carlo, 131
Da Glemona, 287
Dal Pane, Luigi, 586, 682
D'Amico, Silvio, 684
D'Ancona, Alessandro, 342, 668
D'Annunzio, Gabriele, 107, 169, 374, 462, 515, 552, 671, 686, 701
Dante Alighieri, 21, 100–1, 247–48, 250–55, 257–58, 320, 326, 338, 368, 369, 370, 398, 445, 461, 475, 483, 496, 525, 570, 581, 595–608, 610, 611–12, 635, 665, 666, 673, 682, 683, 700, 704
Danton, Georges-Jacques, 94
Danzi, Guglielmo, 243, 594
Da Pozzo, Giovanni, 604
Darwin, Charles, 543
Daudet, Léon, 59–60, 458
Da Urbino, Paciotto, 102
D'Azeglio, Luigi Taparelli, 53, 450
D'Azeglio, Massimo Taparelli, 35, 36, 129, 297, 352, 436, 517, 640, 673
Dazzi, Manlio Torquato, 337, 666
De Amicis, Edmondo, 384, 690
De Bernardi, Mario, 21, 418
De Blasi, Jolanda, 374, 684, 686
Deborins, Abraham, 566
De Bosdari, Alessandro, 25–26, 111–12, 421, 505
De Canal, Bernardo, 503
De Castro, Giovanni, 34
Decourcelle, Pierre, 77, 477
Defoe, Daniel, 546
De Launay, Gabriele 516
Del Chiaro, Giuseppe, 132, 519, 656
D'Elia, Pasquale, 309–10, 362, 648, 680
Della Rocca, Enrico Morozzo, 37, 437
Della Torre, Luigi, 321
Del Lungo, Isidoro, 247, 249, 601–3
Del Vecchio, Giorgio, 13, 410–11
De Maistre, Joseph, 67, 465

De Man, Henri, 31, 49, 139, 167, 171–72, 174, 175, 183, 198, 428, 449, 528, 529, 549, 550, 552–53, 554, 558, 569, 570
De Marchi, Emilio, 122, 513
De Molinari, Gustave, 334, 664
De Moreau, E., 275
De' Negri, Enrico, 566
Denikin, Anton Ivanovich, 221, 577
Dennery, Adolphe, 490
De Pietri Tonelli, Alfonso, 235, 587
Depresle, Gaston, 98, 493
Depretis, Agostino, 106, 485, 498
D'Ercole, Pasquale, 473
De Robertis, Giuseppe, 684
Dersofi, Nancy, 675
De Rubris, Marcus, 297
De Ruggiero, Guido, 21, 139, 143, 156, 374, 418, 466, 529, 531, 536, 587, 683, 684
De Sanctis, Francesco, 15, 145, 246, 247, 252, 349, 350, 399, 413, 421, 510, 512, 532, 597, 598, 600, 605, 608, 671, 700, 701
De Sanctis, Gaetano, 84, 321, 486, 657
De Sarlo, Francesco, 433
Descartes, René, 530
De Stefani, Alberto, 684
De Stefano, Antonino, 268, 269
Destutt de Tracy, Antonine-Louis-Claude, 175, 554
De Vecchi, Cesare Maria, 385, 452, 690–91
Devoto, Giacomo, 85, 486
Dewey, John, 244, 632
Di Borio, Maria (pseudonym of Countess Maria Gauthier Panzoja), 34, 435
Di Giacomo, Giacomo, 16, 415
Di Giacomo, Salvatore, 236, 590
Di Martino-Fusco, Mario, 487–88
Diocletian (Roman emperor, 284–305), 496
Disraeli, Benjamin, 360, 579
Domandi, Mario, 509
Donati, Luigi, 466
Doni, Anton Francesco, 72, 471–72
D'Ors, Eugène, 32, 429
Dorso, Guido, 39, 438–39
Dostoyevsky, Feodor, 409, 459
Dovizi, Bernardo, *see* Bibbiena
Doyle, Arthur Conan, 121
Drews, Arthur, 375, 687
Dreyfus, Alfred, 207
Ducati, Bruno, 344, 346, 669
Ducati, Pericle, 84, 85, 86, 126, 486
Duchesne, Louis-Marie-Olivier, 327, 659–60
Duguet, Roger, *see* Boulin, Abbé
Du Halde, Jean-Baptiste, 287, 630
Duhamel, Georges, 570
Dumas, Alexandre, 37, 61, 77, 313
Dunois, Amédée, 527
Durkheim, Emile, 582
Durtain, Luc (pseudonym of André Nepven), 66, 464
Dutt, Manmatha Nath, 688

Edwards, Stewart, 664
Egerton, Francis, 667
Einaudi, Luigi, 68, 191–92, 234, 465, 532, 564, 586
Elizabeth I (queen of England, 1558–1603), 440
Ellero, Pietro, 264, 613
Emanuele Filiberto (duke of Savoy), 35, 111, 283–84, 436, 505, 627–28
Engels, Friedrich, 39, 138–39, 140, 159, 166, 172, 184, 186, 188–89, 194, 197, 413, 418, 439, 450, 451, 453, 527, 528, 534, 539, 540, 544, 546–48, 551, 552, 558, 559, 560, 561–62, 565, 566, 568, 569, 584, 585, 641, 681
Ennius, Quintus, 228
Enriquez, Federico, 466
Entwistle, Harold, 580
Erasmus, Desiderius, 142–43, 374, 530
Ercole, Francesco, 577
Erkes, Eduard, 288–89
Ermini, Filippo, 73, 75, 332, 473, 662
Eugenius IV, 650
Euripides, 408
Everboeck, Cornelius, 272

Faggi, Adolfo, 120–21, 122, 291, 399, 512–13, 514, 554, 633–34, 700
Faina, Claudio, 304, 647
Fallières, Armand, 376
Falqui, Enrico, 146, 532
Fambri, Paulo, 83, 485
Fanelli, Giuseppe Attilio, 389–91, 693
Farina, Giulio, 540

Farinacci, Roberto, 453
Farinata degli Uberti, 80, 246–48, 250–54, 256–57, 483, 597–99, 601, 605–7
Farini, Luigi Carlo, 437
Farnese, Alessandro (duke of Parma), 102–3, 497
Farnese, Ranuccio, 102
Fatini, Giuseppe, 110, 504
Fedele, Pietro, 16, 26, 34, 55, 246, 321, 415, 422, 454, 578, 657
Federzoni, Luigi, 107, 501, 658
Fénelon, François de Salignac de la Mothe, 67, 464–65
Ferdinand I (king of the Two Sicilies, 1815–1825), 587, 668, 697
Ferdinand II, the Catholic, of Aragon, 484, 651
Ferdinand II (king of the Two Sicilies, 1831–1859), 588
Ferdinando I de' Medici, 479
Fermi, Enrico, 640
Fernbach, David, 559
Ferrando, Guido, 261, 612–13
Ferraris, Maggiorino, 332–33, 663
Ferrer Guardia, Francisco, 93, 489
Ferrero, Guglielmo, 22, 48, 66, 233, 418, 448, 462–64, 586
Ferretti, Giovanni, 352, 673
Ferri, Enrico, 48, 108, 448, 502
Ferrucci, Francesco, 81, 484
Festa, Nicola, 699
Feuerbach, Ludwig, 143, 299, 641
Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 114
Finck, Franz Nikolaus, 288, 631–32
Finocchiaro, Maurice, 583
Fioresi Dondini, Lyna, 438
Fisch, Max H., 570
Flammarion, Camille, 459
Flint, F. S., 669
Flumiani, Carlo, 113, 507
Fogazzaro, Antonio, 317, 655
Fontaine, Nicolas, 277–78, 280–81, 316, 618, 624, 626, 654
Fontenay, Paolo, 61
Ford, Henry, 40, 216, 217, 439, 575
Forgacs, David, 458
Forges Davanzati, Roberto, 107, 501
Forke, Alfredo, 289–90, 632
Formiggini, Angelo Fortunato, 133, 332
Fornari, Vito, 399, 701
Forni, Cesare, 452
Forzano, Gioacchino, 77, 481
Foscolo, Ugo, 144, 151, 252, 296, 300, 439, 531, 533, 604, 637–38, 642
Fouché, Joseph, 128
Fourier, François-Marie-Charles, 551, 553
Fourmont, Etienne, 287, 630
Fournol, Etienne, 66, 462, 464
Fowkes, Ben, 543, 546
Fracassetti, Giuseppe, 688
Fracchia, Umberto, 62–63, 92, 384, 458–59, 488, 690
Fradeletto, Antonio, 106, 499, 500
Francesco I de' Medici, 478
Francioni, Gianni, 406, 527, 616
Francis Joseph I (emperor of Austria, 1848–1916), 109, 504, 588
Francis of Assisi, 608
Frank, Hans, 8, 408
Frank, Leonhard, 9, 408
Frank, Tenney, 95, 491
Fraser, Elizabeth, 664
Frattini, Pietro, 109, 503
Frederick I, Barbarossa (Holy Roman emperor, 1155–1190), 81, 295, 484
Frederick II (Holy Roman emperor, 1220–1250), 295, 371, 637, 682–83
Frederick II, the Great (king of Prussia, 1740–1786), 231, 582
Frenaye, Frances, 668
Freud, Sigmund, 9, 175
Frisella Vella, Giuseppe, 275, 623
Fubini, Elsa, 513
Fueter, Eduard, 337, 666
Fülop-Miller, René, 426
Fumagalli, Maria Giuseppina, 304, 646

Gabbrielli, Gabriele, 343–44, 668–69
Gaboriau, Emile, 124, 477
Gabotto, Ferdinando, 436
Gabrieli, Giuseppe, 67, 465
Gaio, *see* Orvieto, Adolfo
Gajda, Rudolf, 187, 561
Galetto, Leo, 474
Galilei, Galileo, 466, 636, 637
Gall, Franz Joseph, 72, 471
Gallarati Scotti, Tommaso, 34, 434, 485, 655
Galletti, Alfredo, 346, 670
Galpin, Alfred, 600, 605

Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand, 344, 669
Gangale, Giuseppe, 39, 439
Garbasso, Giorgio Antonio, 684
Gargàno, Giuseppe, 250, 292, 398, 401, 604, 634, 638, 640, 700, 701, 702, 703
Gargiulo, Alfredo, 124, 146, 515, 532
Garibaldi, Giuseppe, 17, 333, 414, 436, 502, 503, 505, 663, 667, 677
Garofalo, Raffaele, 48, 374, 448, 684, 685, 686
Gary, Judge, 56, 455
Gasparri, Pietro, 275, 317, 329, 623, 655, 661
Gatto Roissard, Leonardo, 43, 447
Gautama, 290
Gauthier Panzoja, Countess Maria, *see* Di Borio, Maria
Gauthier, Pierre, 479
Gaya, L., 320
Gemelli, Edoardo Agostino, 578, 579
Gendel, E., 478
Gennari, Luciano, 34, 434
Gentile, Giovanni, 34, 114, 141, 166, 188, 192, 232, 326, 329, 374, 397, 415, 432, 433, 434, 469, 470, 510, 511, 532, 549, 553, 555, 562, 571, 578, 579, 580, 581, 584, 660, 661, 680, 685, 686, 699
Gentiloni, Vincenzo Ottorino, 417, 558
Gerosa, Pietro, 608, 609
Gerratana, Valentino, 405, 523, 525, 616
Gerry, Elbridge, 462
Gessi, L., 689
Gewirth, Alan, 688
Ghiron, Isaia, 302, 644
Gide, André, 6
Gioberti, Vincenzo, 129, 130, 131, 132, 323, 324, 361, 398, 475, 486, 516–17, 518–19, 658, 680, 700
Gioda, Mario, 451, 452, 453
Giolitti, Giovanni, 27, 43, 106, 304, 333, 418, 422, 446, 498, 646, 703
Giordani, Pietro, 174, 554, 587
Giovanni da Procida, 52, 449
Giuliano, Balbino, 699
Giulini, Alessandro, 348, 671
Giulini family, 131
Giuliotti, Domenico, 321, 382–83, 657, 689
Giusti, Giuseppe, 300, 642
Giustiniano, Pompeo, 102
Glaeser, Ernest, 9
Glei, R., 650
Gnoli, V., 700
Gobetti, Piero, 39, 244, 273, 438–39, 466, 568, 594, 595, 622
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 6, 166, 236, 548, 590
Gogol, Nikolai V., 459
Gohier, Urbain, 280
Gompers, Samuel, 29, 455
Gonzaga, Aloysius, 520
Gonzalez Palencia, Angel, 261, 612
Gorgerino, Giuseppe, 273, 622
Gori, Agostino, 284, 628
Gorky, Maxim, 459, 480
Goya y Lucientes, Francisco José de, 32, 429
Graf, Arturo, 83, 485, 608
Gramsci, Carlo, 426, 427, 429, 436, 526, 544, 604, 643, 686, 698
Gramsci, Delio, 473, 513, 581, 654, 655
Gramsci, Giuliano, 473, 513, 654, 655
Gravina, Manfredi, 98, 493
Grayson, Cecil, 653
Grayson, Margaret, 653
Graziosi, Bartolomeo, 503
Gregory IX, 637
Gregory XI, 682
Groethuysen, Bernard, 315, 652
Guarino, Guido A., 653
Guéhenno, Jean, 10, 410
Guerrazzi, Francesco Domenico, 63–64, 95, 412, 460, 490
Guerri, Domenico, 684
Guicciardini, Francesco, 26, 116, 316, 338, 413, 421, 509, 653
Guidi, Angelo Flavio, 83, 485
Guidobaldo da Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino, 653
Guillaume, James, 15, 414
Guillon, Sylvestre, 296, 638
Guinigi, Paolo, 295
Guizot, François-Pierre-Guillaume, 585
Guterman, N., 98, 493
Guzzo, Augusto, 255, 605

Hagemann, L., 650
Halévy, Daniel, 170, 242, 538
Halsey, Frank D., 659, 681
Hamilton, Emma, 684

Hamp, Pierre, 10, 98, 409
Harnack, Adolf von, 327, 659, 660
Harris, Paul P., 620
Harvey, E. C., 551
Hauptmann, Gerhart, 9, 409
Haye, T. D., 635
Hegel, G. W. F., 53–54, 143, 159, 161, 169, 170, 195, 232, 328, 361, 450, 540, 543, 565, 582, 583, 584, 608, 681
Heiler, Friedrich, 132, 519
Heinz (or Enzo) of Hohenstaufen (king of Sardinia 1239–1272), 371, 683
Hella, Alzir, 298, 640
Helvétius, Claude, 554
Henry VI (Holy Roman emperor, 1191–1197), 637
Henry VI (king of England, 1422–1471), 262
Henry VII of Luxemburg (Holy Roman emperor, 1312–1313), 368, 666, 682
Henry VIII (king of England, 1509–1547), 395
Herdtrich, Christian, 287, 629
Heron, Germain, 650
Herriot, Edouard, 281, 626
Herzen, Alexander, 15, 414
Hesiod, 292, 293, 635
Hilferding, Rudolf, 427, 441
Hoare, Quintin, 445, 575, 583
Hobsbawm, Eric J., 416
Hoby, Thomas, 653
Homer, 454, 600
Honorius III, 637
Horace, 147, 217, 576
Horner, Susan, 697
Hu Shih, 290, 632, 633
Hugo, Victor, 11, 59, 76, 124, 358, 414, 452, 457, 476, 477, 480, 515, 677
Hulme, T. E., 449, 538, 592

Ibsen, Henrik, 65, 78, 358, 481–82, 678
Ignatius of Loyola, 385, 691, 692
Imperiuzzi, Filippo, 18, 416
Innocent IV, 637
Innocent VI, 478
Intorcetta, Prospero, 287, 629
Invernizio, Carolina, 63, 452, 460, 480, 698
Irnerius, 665
Iskowicz, Marc, 296, 638

Jacuzio, Raffaele, 264, 613
Jahier, Piero, 16, 415
Jaja, Donato, 584
James, Henry, 495
James, William, 244, 638
Jaurès, Jean, 10, 193, 409, 553, 567
Jemolo, Arturo Carlo, 225, 577, 580
Jerome, Saint, 331
Joan of Arc, 122
Jones, Leslie Webber, 662
Jorio, Domenico, 317
Joseph Bonaparte (king of Naples, 1806–1808, and king of Spain, 1808–1813), 174, 493
Joyce, James, 99–100, 494–95
Julien, Stanislas, 287, 631
Julius II, 81, 313, 484, 651
Jullian, Camille, 300–1, 643
Justinian I (Byzantine emperor, 527–565), 688

Kahn, Otto, 56, 454, 455
Kaller, Maximilian, 284, 628
Kamandaki, 381, 688
Kant, Immanuel, 51, 158, 166, 515, 563
Kareyev, Nikolai I., 426
Kautsky, Karl, 161, 441, 572
Kemmerer, Edwin Walter, 130
Kepler, Johannes, 636
Keynes, John Maynard, 130
Kipling, Rudyard, 120, 512
Kitchener, Herbert, 513
Kolchak, Aleksandr, 561
Krassnoff, Peter, 395, 697–98
Krupskaya, Nadezhda Konstantinovna, 568
Kuliscioff, Anna, 413, 446, 447

Laberthonnière, Lucien, 619
Labriola, Antonio, 30–31, 140, 166, 233, 369, 426, 427, 509, 529, 549, 586, 682
Labriola, Arturo, 116, 558
Lacointe, Félix, 392
Lactantius, 228
La Fontaine, Jean de, 398, 443, 700
La Gala, Cipriano, 132, 302, 519, 644
La Gala, Giona, 132, 302, 519, 644
Lamarmora (or La Marmora), Alfonso Ferrero, 37, 437

Lamartelière, Jean-Henri-Ferdinand, 353, 674
Lamartine, Alphonse de, 642
Lambruschini, Raffaello, 272, 621
Lamennais, Hugues-Félicité-Robert de, 387, 617, 691
La Montagne, Harvard de, 281, 626
Lamport, F. J., 514, 674
Lando, Ortensio, 72, 471
Lanzillo, Agostino, 396–97, 699
Lanzoni, Francesco, 327, 659
Lao-tzu, 72, 291, 472–73, 631
Larbaud, Valéry, 495
La Salle, Robert Cavelier, 440
Laski, Harold J., 552
Lassalle, Ferdinand, 328, 418, 527, 546, 660
Lavater, Johann Kaspar, 72, 471
Laviosa, Antonino, 185, 559
Lavoisier, Antoine-Laurent, 196, 568
Lavrov, Pëtr N., 426
Law-Gisiko, Eric, 698
Lawrence, D. H., 495
Lazzareschi, Eugenio, 294
Lazzaretti, David, 18–20, 416
Leblanc, Maurice, 477
Lebrecht, Danilo, *see* Montano, Lorenzo
Lelj, Massimo, 65, 462
Lenin, V. I., 49, 167, 187, 196, 427, 441, 449, 508, 527, 555, 557, 560, 561, 568, 572
Lensi, Alfredo, 338, 666
Leo X, 675
Leo XIII, 130, 282, 392, 423, 461, 518, 612, 618, 624, 627, 645, 649, 695
Leonardo da Vinci, 52, 440, 652
Leoncavallo, Ruggiero, 481
Leone, Enrico, 558
Leopardi, Giacomo, 352, 671, 673
Leopardi, Monaldo, 673
Lesca, Giuseppe, 359, 678
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 249, 300, 599, 603, 642
Leverton, Stanley, 319
Levi, Ezio, 261, 301, 363, 612, 644, 681
Levi, Mario Attilio, 699
Levin, Saul, 689
Levinson, André, 408
Lewis, Sinclair, 162, 544, 676
Lilley, A. Leslie, 619
Linati, Carlo, 100, 355–56, 495, 586, 676
Lisio, Giuseppe, 337, 666
Littmann, Enno, 126, 516
Littré, Emile, 74, 303, 384, 476, 645, 690
Livingston, A., 540
Livingstone, R., 565, 566
Livy, 90, 108, 487–88, 666
Locke, John, 554
Lodi, Teresa, 292, 633
Lo Gatto, Ettore, 39, 351, 439, 673
Loisy, Alfred, 619
Lombardo-Radice, Giuseppe, 396–97, 536, 556, 699
Lombroso, Cesare, 18, 48, 416, 448
Lomonaco, Francesco, 401, 704
London, Jack, 459
Longobardi, Ernesto Cesare, 558
Loria, Achille, 26, 101, 161, 176, 184–85, 191, 382–83, 400, 422, 497, 542, 543, 559, 564, 703
Lorizio, F. E., 300, 642
Losacco, Michele, 311, 650
Loubet, Emile, 376
Louis IV, the Bavarian (Holy Roman emperor, 1328–1347), 368, 478, 682, 688,
Louis XI (king of France, 1461–1483), 377
Louis XII (king of France, 1498–1515), 484, 651
Louis XIV (king of France, 1643–1715), 60
Louis-Philippe (king of the French, 1830–1848), 357
Louis the German (king of the East Franks, 826–876), 475
Lovarini, Emilio, 354, 674, 675
Lovecchio, Antonino, 166, 548
Lovera di Castiglione, Carlo, 273, 621, 622
Lucian, 54
Lukács, Georg, 192, 565–67
Lumbroso, Alberto, 26, 348, 421, 670
Lumbroso, Giacomo, 26, 421–22
Luther, Martin, 142
Luxemburg, Rosa, 31, 141, 197, 428, 530, 565, 569
Luzio, Alessandro, 109, 110, 131, 148, 503, 504, 518, 519, 533

Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 160
Macchioro, Vittorio, 244, 595
MacDonald, James Ramsay, 56

Machiavelli, Niccolò, 33, 111, 141, 144, 150–51, 152, 166–67, 221, 231, 283–84, 292, 313, 315, 316, 338, 349, 350, 355, 359, 369, 377–82, 418, 429, 430, 431, 500, 505, 531, 533–34, 549, 582, 608, 627, 633, 637, 651–52, 666, 678, 687, 703
Macola, Ferruccio, 109, 503
Madini, Pietro, 58, 457
Maeterlinck, Maurice, 49, 143, 449, 531
Maffi, Pietro, 657
Maggiore, Giuseppe, 699
Malagodi, Giovanni, 157, 537, 538
Malaparte, Curzio, 15–16, 414–15, 426, 453
Malatesta, Errico, 20, 413, 417, 511
Malot, Hector-Henri, 452
Manacorda, Guido, 358, 678
Mandragone, Cristoforo, 102
Mann, Heinrich, 9
Manzi, Alberto, 353–54, 674
Manzoni, Alessandro, 63, 86, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 175, 236, 248, 249, 292, 326, 384, 412, 434, 439, 459, 467, 468, 473, 478, 479, 487, 496, 512, 514, 516, 544–45, 554, 581, 600, 602, 633, 670, 675
Maramaldo, Fabrizio, 81, 484
Maravigna, Pietro, 111
Marchand, Jean-Baptiste, 513
Marchesi, Concetto, 75, 476
Marchesini, Giovanni, 147, 299, 533, 641
Marcucci, Alessandro, 93, 488
Margueritte, Paul, 409
Margueritte, Victor, 10, 409
Marianna de Leyva, 479
Marietti, Giovanni, 350, 672, 673
Marinetti, Filippo Tommaso, 640
Marinozzi, Federico, 520
Mario, Alberto, 147, 533
Marpicati, Arturo, 684
Marquardt, Joachim, 101, 496–97
Marsh, David, 653
Marsilio da Carrara, 666
Marsilius of Padua, 377, 688
Martignetti, Pasquale, 562
Martin V, 682
Martinelli, Renzo, 447
Martinet, Marcel, 98
Martini, Ferdinando, 35, 63, 111, 436, 459–60, 505
Martire, Egilberto, 669
Martov, Yurii, 215, 572
Marx, Karl, 15, 31, 51, 53, 138–39, 140–43, 150–51, 152–53, 154, 155, 156–57, 158–59, 161, 162, 166, 169, 170, 175, 176, 184–87, 191–92, 193, 231, 232, 299, 413, 418, 427, 428, 429, 450–51, 453, 477, 527, 530, 533, 534, 536, 537–38, 539, 540, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546–47, 548, 549, 551, 552, 555, 558–59, 560, 561, 568, 569, 582, 585, 641, 681
Masaniello (pseudonym of Tommaso Aniello), 77, 478
Masaryk, Tomás Garrigue, 39, 439
Mascagni, Pietro, 481, 640
Massaja, Guglielmo, 64, 461
Massari, Giuseppe, 131, 518
Massis, Henri, 344, 394, 669, 696
Mastriani, Francesco, 63–64, 460
Mataloni, G. M., 268, 278, 625
Mathiez, Albert, 178, 181–82, 556
Maude, A., 545
Maude, L., 545
Mauriac, François, 34, 435
Maurice, Jules, 394, 697
Maurigi, Roberto, 677
Maurois, André, 579
Maurras, Charles, 81, 175, 278, 282, 391, 392, 393–94, 407, 408, 458, 483, 554, 618, 625, 626, 695, 697
Maximilian I (Holy Roman emperor, 1508–1519), 484, 651
Mayo, I. F., 512, 514
Mazzali, Guido, 39, 439
Mazzini, Giuseppe, 79–80, 99, 131, 233, 361, 381, 398, 414, 494, 498, 538, 644, 677
Mazziotti, Matteo, 131
Mazzoni, Guido, 93, 116, 120, 489, 512
Mazzucchelli, Mario, 77, 478
McColgan, M., 566
Meda, Filippo, 114, 304, 320, 508, 533, 646, 657
Ménage, Gilles, 127, 516
Meneghini, Domenico, 310, 649
Menelik II (emperor of Ethiopia, 1889–1923), 108, 502
Meozzi, Antero, 260–61, 612
Mercier, D., 281
Mercurio, 270

Meredith, C. M., 582
Messina, Giuseppe, 388, 693
Messineo, Enrico, 400
Metastasio, Pietro, 434
Metternich, Klemens, Fürst von, 585
Michel, Ersilio, 284
Michelangelo Buonarroti, 440, 637
Michelet, Jules, 414
Michels, Robert, 58, 456, 644
Middlemore, S. G. C., 684
Miglioli, Guido, 304, 621–22, 646
Migliore, Benedetto, 101, 496
Mignosi, Pietro, 321, 657
Mikhaylovsky, Nikolai K., 426
Milano, Agesilao, 588
Milano, Paolo, 167, 549–50
Miles, H., 579
Mill, John Stuart, 191, 635
Mille, Pierre, 5–6, 407
Minghetti, Marco, 639
Minocchi, Salvatore, 619
Mioni, Ugo, 64, 96, 259–60, 461, 491, 611
Mirafiori, Rosa Vercellana Gerrieri, countess of, 36
Mirbeau, Octave-Henri-Marie, 480
Misciatelli, Piero, 518
Missiroli, Mario, 13, 34, 39, 113, 123, 141, 150, 168, 169, 171, 193–94, 244, 375–77, 397, 406, 410, 411, 435, 438–39, 507–8, 514, 530, 533, 550, 567, 578, 594–95, 687, 699
Misson, François-Maximilien, 111
Mitchell, Arthur, 689
Modugno, Giuseppe, 397, 699
Moffatt, James, 660
Mohammed, 345
Molière, Jean-Baptiste Poquelin, 355
Molitor, Jean-Philippe, 450, 528
Mommsen, Theodor, 101, 496, 497
Mondolfo, Rodolfo, 139, 166, 466, 528, 539, 549
Monicelli, Tomaso, 93, 490
Monnot, René, 619
Montale, Eugenio, 99, 100, 495
Montanari, Carlo, 109, 503
Montano, Lorenzo, 399, 701
Monte, Giovanni Battista, 102
Montecuccoli, Raimondo, 103, 498
Montépin, Xavier Aymonde, 63, 77, 460, 477
Montesquiou-Fezensac, François, 630
Monti, Vincenzo, 34, 434
Morara, Luigi, 520
Moravia, Alberto, 100
More, Thomas, 67, 72, 401, 471, 703
Morello, Vincenzo, 246, 251–54, 526, 600, 604, 605, 611
Morgan, John Pierpoint, 56, 455
Morhange, P., 98, 493
Morison, M., 635
Mortara, Giorgio, 335, 664
Mortier, Alfredo, 354, 675
Mottola, Anthony, 691
Mowrer, Edgar Ansel, 355, 676
Muller, Albert, 274–75, 622
Murat, Joachim [king of Naples 1808–1815], 493
Muratori, Ludovico Antonio, 391, 693–94, 696
Mussato, Albertino, 337, 666
Mussi, Francesco Cazzamini, 457
Mussolini, Benito, 25, 406, 411, 417, 419, 420, 426, 429, 432, 433, 443, 447, 451, 454, 455, 459, 485, 502, 510, 511, 528, 541, 571, 592, 594, 623, 625, 658, 678, 685, 689, 698

Napoleon III [Louis-Napoléon, emperor of the French 1852–1870], 35, 36, 38, 174, 187, 240, 283, 357, 437, 438, 453, 478, 494, 550, 561, 627, 639, 677
Napoleon Bonaparte, 60, 103, 128, 174, 178, 232, 240, 328, 354, 493, 546, 647, 668, 689
Nasi, Nunzio, 400, 702–3
Natali, Giulio, 401, 703–4
Natoli, Luigi, 26, 27, 422
Nenni, Pietro, 43, 447, 511, 593
Nepven, André, *see* Durtain, Luc
Nerbini, Giuseppe, 95
Neri, Philip, Saint, 18, 694
Nettlau, Max, 15, 414
Newton, C., 409
Newton, Isaac, 636
Niccodemi, Dario, 77, 452, 463, 479–81
Niccolini, Fausto, 488
Nicholas of Cusa, 310–11, 649–50
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 7, 297, 382, 394
Nigra, Costantino, 20, 107–8, 305, 501
Nissim, Lea, 100, 495

Nitti, Francesco Saverio, 43, 333, 424, 445–46, 463, 646
Nobile, Umberto, 420
Nordau, Max, 7
Nosari, Adone, 243, 594
Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey, 458, 583
Nunziante, Ferdinando, 337, 665

Oberdan, Guglielmo, 236, 588–89
O'Callaghan, Joseph F., 691
Ohnet, Georges, 480
Ojetti, Ugo, 62, 68, 324–26, 344, 394, 459, 466, 659, 684, 696
Okey, Thomas, 586
Olgiati, Francesco, 140, 530
Omodeo, Adolfo, 375, 686–87
Omodeo, Angelo, 43, 446–47
Orano, Paolo, 65, 112–13, 462, 507, 558
Orczy, Emmuska, 94, 490
Orestano, Francesco, 398, 699
Oriani, Alfredo, 241, 591–92
Orlando, Vittorio Emanuele, 341–43, 499, 667–68
Orsini, Felice, 38, 438, 494
Orvieto, Adolfo, 93–94, 355, 490, 675
Orvieto, Angiolo, 292–93, 490, 634
Owen, Robert, 272, 551, 553, 620

Padovani, Umberto Antonio, 323, 658
Pagani, Carlo, 130, 131, 518
Pagliaro, Antonino, 635
Palazzi, Fernando, 115, 509
Paléologue, Georges-Maurice, 38, 438
Pallavicino, Giorgio, 109, 504
Palmerston, Lord, 130
Palmieri, Enzo, 64, 460
Palmieri, Giuseppe, 587
Pancrazi, Pietro, 116
Pandolfini, Agnolo, 349, 671
Panin, Nikita Ivanovich, 665
Panin family, 337, 665
Panizzi, Antonio, 336, 664–65
Pantaleoni, Maffeo, 235
Panzini, Alfredo, 20–21, 34–38, 115, 116, 292, 293, 384, 406, 417, 436, 437, 438, 509, 634, 690, 698
Papini, Giovanni, 57, 63–64, 119, 297, 321, 359, 385, 413, 456, 460, 511, 532, 564, 638, 657, 691
Paratore, Giuseppe, 129, 517
Pareti, Luigi, 84, 486
Pareto, Vilfredo, 160, 191–92, 540–41, 564
Parini, Giuseppe, 96, 348, 492, 671
Pascal, Blaise, 434
Pascoli, Giovanni, 374, 496, 670, 686
Pasini, Ferdinando, 698
Pasqualigo, Father, 269
Passarge, Clara, 469
Pastore, Ottavio, 474
Paul, Cedar, 427, 428, 549, 558, 569
Paul, Eden, 427, 428, 549, 558, 569
Paul III, 693
Pavolini, Corrado, 666
Pedrazzi, Orazio, 298, 640
Péguy, Charles, 98
Peirce, C. S., 638
Pekár, Gyula, 94, 490
Pelloux, Luigi Girolamo, 303, 485, 646, 703
Penman, B., 545
Pepe, William, 668
Périer, Casimir, 376
Perino, Edoardo, 95, 490
Perrone, Lina, 400
Persano, Count Carlo Pellion di, 37, 438
Peter I, the Great (czar and emperor of Russia, 1696–1725), 204
Peter III the Great (king of Aragon, 1276–1285, and king of Sicily, 1282–1285), 449
Petrarch, 336, 347, 370, 381, 511, 600, 665, 681, 688–89
Petrillo, Alfredo, 322–23, 657
Petrini, Domenico, 586
Petrus Placentinus, *see* Piacentino
Pettazzoni, Raffaele, 305, 308, 647–48
Phaedrus, 228
Philip, André, 66, 198, 464, 570, 576, 676
Philip III (king of Spain, 1598–1621), 696
Philip IV, the Friar (king of France, 1285–1314), 682
Philippe, Charles Louis, 98
Piacentino, 336, 665
Pia dei Tolomei, 64, 461
Pieraccini, Gaetano, 109
Pier delle Vigne, 370, 683
Pieri, Piero, 113, 492, 507
Pierro, M., 496

Pietro di Parenzo dell'Incisa in Valdarno, 336, 665
Pietromarchi, Luca, 674
Piffl, Friedrich, 281
Pignatelli, Francesco (prince of Strongoli), 97, 492–93
Pilo, Rosolino, 357, 677
Pintor, Fortunato, 93, 489
Pirandello, Luigi, 17–18, 69, 100, 299, 312, 415, 467–68, 640, 641–42
Pirenne, Henri, 327, 363, 659–60, 681
Pirou, Gaëtan, 234–35, 587
Pirri, Pitro, 320
Pisacane, Carlo, 361, 414, 680
Pisani, Vittore, 126, 516
Pistelli, Ermenegildo, 100, 495–96
Pius V, 618
Pius VII, 691
Pius IX, 78, 233, 277, 278, 302, 323–24, 416, 475, 483, 585, 617, 622, 624, 627, 645, 654
Pius X, 28, 267, 277, 278, 279, 305, 317, 393, 423, 486, 617, 618, 620, 625, 692
Pius XI, 275, 277, 285, 317, 321, 325, 329, 385, 578, 625, 627, 661
Pizzetti, Ildebrando, 684
Plato, 72, 114
Plautus, 228, 354
Plekhanov, Georgy Valentinovich, 30–31, 427
Pliny (the Elder), 249, 601, 603
Pocar, Ervino, 426
Poe, Edgar Allan, 121–22, 124, 457
Poggi, Alfredo 118, 166, 510, 511, 549
Poincaré, Raymond, 348
Polifilo, *see* Beltrami, Luca
Polybius, 350
Poma, Carlo, 109, 503
Pompeati, Arturo, 260, 612, 703
Ponson du Terrail, Pierre-Alexis, 37, 38, 63, 77, 124, 437, 452, 460, 477
Poulaille, Henry, 98, 493
Pound, Ezra, 495
Praga, Emilio, 457
Prampolini, Camillo, 139, 441
Prémare, Joseph-Henri, 287, 630
Prezzolini, Giuseppe, 14, 82, 160, 191, 198, 297, 349, 413, 466, 484, 532, 540, 564, 570, 638, 671
Prina, Giuseppe, 305, 647
Prospero, Ada, 545
Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, 11, 16, 170–72, 184, 191, 194, 334–35, 414, 415, 553, 561, 664
Provenzal, Dino, 117, 510, 699
Puccini, Giacomo, 481
Puccini, Mario, 65, 461

Quincy, Josiah, 9, 408

Radcliffe, Ann, 77, 124, 477
Radek, Karl, 441
Radetzky, Joseph, 503
Raimondi, Giuseppe, 16–17, 415
Rajna, Pio, 604
Rambaldi, P. L., 110, 504
Rampolla del Tindaro, Mariano, 392, 695
Raphael (Raffaello Sanzio), 326
Rapisarda, Antonio, *see* Aniante, Antonio
Rasmussen, Emilio, 19–20
Rattazzi, Urbano, 129, 438, 516, 517
Reinach, Salomon, 193
Remarque, Erich Maria, 9
Rémon, Maurice, 544, 676
Rémusat, Abel, 287, 630–31
Renan, Ernest, 7, 101, 193, 497, 530, 595, 635
Rensi, Giuseppe, 33, 430–34
Rèpaci, Francesco Antonio, 43, 447
Rèpaci, Leonida, 447
Restelli, Francesco, 131
Rezzara, Nicolò, 28, 305
Ribezzo, Francesco, 90–91, 488
Ricardo, David, 191
Ricci, Federico, 658
Ricci, Umberto, 24, 419
Richebourg, Emile, 77, 95, 452, 477, 490
Richelmy, Carlo, 107–8, 501, 502
Ricolfi, Alfonso, 349, 671
Righetti, Carlo, 457
Rignano, Eugenio, 30, 425
Riso, Francesco, 677
Riva, Giovanni, 304, 646
Rivetta, Pier Silvio (Toddi), 322, 657
Rizzi, Fortunato, 346–47, 669
Robert of Anjou (king of Sicily, 1297–1343), 682
Roberts, David D., 583
Robespierre, Maximilien, 94, 376, 478, 556

Robinson, Daniel N., 635
Rocca, Massimo, 452, 453
Rocco, Alfredo, 29, 264, 424, 613, 686
Rodinò, Giulio, 304, 646
Rodolico, Niccolò, 99, 465, 494
Roger II (king of the Norman kingdom of Sicily, 1112–1154), 668
Rogers, Harr, 270
Rohan, Karl, 29, 423, 424
Rolland, Romain, 344
Romani, Fedele, 246, 247, 600
Romier, Lucien, 66, 275, 281, 464, 623, 626
Roothaan, Johann Philipp, 387, 691–92
Rosa, Enrico, 132, 268, 278, 281, 324–26, 344, 383, 388, 394, 519, 616, 618, 619, 624, 659, 689, 692, 696
Rosa, Gabriele, 80, 483
Rosengarten, Frank, 513, 575, 596, 601, 643
Rosenthal, Raymond, 513, 643
Rosini, Giovanni, 253, 479, 605
Rosmini Serbati, Antonio, 175, 233, 554, 585, 608
Rosselli, Carlo, 443
Rossi, Joseph, 600, 605
Rossi, Vittorio, 362–72, 374, 401, 680, 684, 704
Roth, J., 449, 592
Rothschild, Mayer Amschel R., 103
Rotta, Paolo, 310, 649
Rougemont, François, 287, 629
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 392, 430, 437, 458
Rovani, Giuseppe, 19, 417, 457
Rovini, A., 423, 424
Rubieri, Ermolao, 399, 702
Rubinstein, N., 421
Rudinì, Antonio Starabba, Marquis di, 303, 304, 645–46, 695
Rudolf II (Holy Roman emperor, 1576–1612), 497
Ruiz, Vincenzo Arangio, 257, 610, 699
Russell, Bertrand, 190, 563–64
Russo, Ferdinando, 399, 701
Russo, Luigi, 246, 254–55, 257, 399, 418, 466, 600, 605, 610, 701
Ruta, Enrico, 106, 498
Ruzzante (pseudonym of Angelo Beolco), 354, 674, 675
Ryazanov, D., 427, 428, 569
Sagot du Vauroux, 391, 694
Saint-Just, Louis-Antoine-Lion, 94, 478
Saint-Simon, Claude-Henri de Rouvroy, 54, 272, 414, 453, 551, 620
Salandra, Antonio, 111, 112, 323, 505, 506, 658
Salaris, E., 350, 672
Salata, Francesco, 110, 392, 504, 695
Salgari, Emilio, 16, 34, 415
Sallust, 108
Saltet, L., 388, 693
Salvani, Provenzano, 24
Salvatorelli, Luigi, 331–32, 375, 394, 662, 687, 697
Salvemini, Gaetano, 59, 119, 178, 233, 297, 346, 457, 458, 511, 556, 585, 638, 670
Salvioli, Giuseppe, 233, 585
Sand, Georges, 11, 122, 354
Sand, Maurice, 354
Sanesi, Ireneo, 354, 675
Sangiuliano San Giuliano, Antonino Paternò Castello, Marquis di, 112, 506
Sangnier, Marc, 618
Sanna, Giovanni, 233, 585
Sansovino, Francesco, 349, 672
Santarosa, Santorre De Rossi di, 494
Santucci, Antonio, 425
Sanvisenti, Bernardo, 305, 647
Sardelli, Giuseppe, 520
Sassoli de' Bianchi, Guido, 322
Savarese, Nino, 100
Saviotti, Gino, 96
Savonarola, Girolamo, 369
Savorgnan di Brazzà, Francesco, 78, 483
Scarfoglio, Edoardo, 240–41, 591, 592
Scarlatti, Amerigo, 111, 505
Scarsellini, Angelo, 503
Schanzer, Carlo, 358, 678
Scherillo, Michele, 684
Schiappoli, Domenico, 225, 580
Schiavi, Alessandro, 139, 529, 549
Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich, 124, 353, 514, 548, 674
Schipa, Michelangelo, 295
Schlund, Erhard, 284–85, 628
Schmidt, Conrad, 560
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 188
Schucht, Julia, 460, 473, 585, 654
Schucht, Tatiana, 405, 412, 426, 438, 454, 464, 469, 470, 473, 476, 481, 484, 487,

492, 516, 523, 526, 528, 536, 537, 564, 575, 585, 586, 595, 596, 597, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 607, 609, 610, 615, 616, 631, 641, 652, 684, 686, 697, 698, 704
Scialoja, Vittorio, 26, 29, 422, 424
Sciascia, M., 649
Scribe, Eugène, 478
Secchi, Angelo, 64, 461
Seeckt, Hans von, 395, 698
Seghezza, Felice, 270
Segrè, Carlo, 336, 665
Segura y Saenz, Pietro, 656
Sella, Quintino, 35
Selver, Paul, 662
Seneca, 96, 476
Serao, Matilde, 591
Serbelloni, Gabrio, 102
Serpieri, Arrigo, 419
Sertoli, Mario, 166, 549
Servetus, Michael, 679
Servius Tullius, 419
Shakespeare, William, 101, 120, 122, 123, 497, 514, 554
Shaw, George Bernard, 122–23, 246, 258, 512, 514, 599, 600, 611
Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 458
Sicardi, Enrico, 250, 398, 604, 700
Siegfried, André, 66, 356, 361, 464, 676, 680
Sighele, Scipio, 48, 448, 449
Silva, Pietro, 111, 505, 507
Simmel, Georg, 582
Singleton, Charles S., 602, 603
Sisto di Borbone-Parma, prince, 112, 506
Slataper, Scipio, 297, 413, 638–39
Smith, Adam, 191
Smith, Alfred E., 654, 316
Smith, Huntington, 677
Socinus, Faustus, 679
Socinus, Laelius, 361, 679
Söderblom, Nathan, 132, 519
Soderini, Piero di Tommaso, 151, 533–34
Solari, Gioele, 119, 511
Solaro della Margarita, Clemente, 273, 276–77, 323, 324, 622, 624, 658
Solmi, Arrigo, 684
Sonnino, Giorgio Sidney, 304, 424, 501, 506, 646
Sorani, Aldo, 258, 425, 512, 611
Sorel, Georges, 58, 98, 112, 123, 139, 140, 141, 150, 157, 168–72, 193–94, 235, 236, 242, 301, 334–35, 376–77, 449, 456, 457, 507, 514, 528, 530, 538, 550–51, 552, 557, 561, 567–68, 588, 589, 592, 595, 644, 664, 699
Sorrentino, Lamberti, 12–13, 410
Spadoni, Domenico, 305, 647
Spartacus, 25, 95, 491
Spaventa, Bertrando, 232, 584
Specchia, Orazio, 466
Spellanzon, Cesare, 331, 662
Speri, Tito, 109, 503
Spinola, Ambrogio, 102
Spirito, Ugo, 191, 192, 564, 577, 578, 583
Sraffa, Piero, 526, 596, 607, 609, 620
Stamboliyski, Aleksandr, 590
Stammler, Rudolf, 582
Stanghellini, Arturo, 236, 589
Stanley, John L., 552
Starkenburg, Heinz, 546, 559, 560
Stendhal, 6, 175
Strachan, W. J., 655
Stresemann, Gustav, 360, 679
Stuart, Roberto, 303
Stuparich, Giani, 297, 638, 639
Sturzo, Luigi, 657
Suardi, Gianforte, 27–29, 303, 304, 305, 422, 646, 647
Sue, Eugène, 11, 54, 76, 233, 450, 451, 452, 460, 477, 480, 514
Sundar Singh, 133, 520
Sun Yat-sen, 286, 308–310, 362, 628–29, 648, 680
Suter, M., 649
Svevo, Italo, 99–100, 494–95
Swift, Jonathan, 67
Sylvester II, 76
Symonds, John Aldington, 374, 684
Synge, John Millington, 495

Tacitus, 96, 108, 476
Tagore, Rabindranath, 669
Taine, Hippolyte-Adolphe, 19, 175, 294, 434, 554, 635
Tajani, Filippo, 271
Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles-Maurice de, 128, 328
Tanaquil, 24, 419
Taramelli, Onorio, 20
Tarchetti, Iginio Ugo, 457
Tarchiani, Nello, 479, 666

Tardieu, André, 66, 464
Targioni Tozzetti, Teresa, 297, 640
Tarozzi, Giuseppe, 166, 548, 549, 585
Tarquinius Priscus, 419
Tarquinius Superbus, 419
Tasso, Torquato, 467, 693
Taylor, Frederick Winslow, 200, 215, 570, 574
Tazzoli, Enrico Napoleoni, 109, 503
Tchertkoff, V., 512, 514
Téniers, David, 243
Terrence, 354
Thérive, André, 384
Thiers, Marie-Joseph-Louis-Adolphe, 169, 550
Thomas, Albert, 273, 621
Thomas Aquinas, Saint, 361, 427, 530
Thovez, Enrico, 349, 671
Tildon, Freeman, 676
Tilgher, Adriano, 96, 113–14, 125, 466, 492, 507–8, 510, 515–16
Timanthes of Sicyon, 249, 601, 603
Timpanaro, Sebastiano, 68, 466
Tiraboschi, Gerolamo, 391, 694
Titta Rosa, Giovanni, 398, 701
Tittoni, Tommaso, 27–28, 302–4, 348, 358, 381, 422, 462, 644–46, 670, 676, 678, 689
Tittoni, Vincenzo, 302, 644
Toesca, Pietro, 598–99, 600, 603
Toffanin, Giuseppe, 374, 401–2, 616, 684, 704
Togliatti, Palmiro, 441–42, 444
Tolstoy, Leo, 116, 120, 121, 122–23, 162, 344, 409, 459, 512, 514, 545
Tommaseo, Niccolò, 292, 633
Tommasini, Francesco, 360, 679
Tonelli, Luigi, 69, 466–67, 699
Torr, D., 546, 560
Torretta, Laura, 337, 665
Toscani, Italo, 43–44, 133, 447, 520–21
Trabaudi Foscarini De Ferrari, Foscarina, 120, 512
Trenta, Galvano, 295
Treves, Claudio, 41, 43, 440–41, 442–43, 578
Tritonj, Romolo, 357, 676
Trombetti, Alfredo, 84–86, 126–27, 486, 516
Trotsky, Leon, 30, 215, 426–27, 571–72, 574–75
Trozzi, Mario, 440
Turati, Filippo, 43, 48, 431, 441, 443, 445, 446–47, 448, 452, 593
Turgenev, Ivan, 459
Turmel, Joseph, 388, 692–93
Tyrrell, George, 619

Ugoni, Filippo, 79
Ulpian, 379, 688
Unamuno, Miguel de, 462
Ungaretti, Giuseppe, 14, 146, 243, 411, 515, 532, 594, 701
Urban VI, 682

Vailati, Giovanni, 191–92, 196, 564
Valdès, Juan de, 142, 530
Valentino, *see* Borgia, Cesare
Valera, Paolo, 452
Valli, Luigi, 100, 496
Valois, Georges, 98, 187, 194, 561, 567–68
Vamba (pseudonym of Luigi Bertelli), 100, 496
Van Laun, H., 635
Van Rossum, Willem, 281
Varaldo, Alessandro, 352, 673
Varisco, Bernardino, 699
Veo, Ettore, 78, 482
Verdi, Giuseppe, 457
Verga, Andrea, 18, 416
Verga, Giovanni, 400, 445, 590, 591, 702
Vergerova, Z., 575
Verne, Jules, 34, 77, 121–22, 337, 415, 478, 512–13, 665
Vico, Giambattista, 22, 232, 434, 543, 570, 584
Vidari, Giovanni, 699
Vildrac, Charles, 98
Villari, Luigi, 356, 676
Virgil, 250, 597, 600
Virgilii, Filippo, 108, 109, 502, 503
Visconti-Venosta, Emilio, 108, 501
Vittorini, Elio, 146, 532
Vittorio Amedeo II (king of Sicily, 1713–1720, and king of Sardinia, 1720–1730), 111, 436, 505
Vittorio Emanuele I (king of Sardinia, 1802–1821), 494
Vittorio Emanuele II (king of Sardinia, 1849–1861 and king of Italy 1861–1878),

35–36, 83, 111, 147, 333, 436, 437, 485, 517, 580, 581, 640, 663, 677
Voigt, Georg, 374, 684
Volpati, Carlo, 434
Volpe, Gioacchino, 82, 395–96, 458–59, 484, 698
Volpi, Giuseppe, 56, 455
Volpicelli, Arnaldo, 577, 578, 582
Volta, Alessandro, 174, 518
Voltaire, 392, 393, 516, 582
Vorländer, Karl, 167, 549
Vossler, Karl, 71, 255, 398, 470, 605, 700
Vries de Heekelingen, H. de, 98, 494
Vuoli, Romeo, 357, 676, 677

Wagner, Richard, 7
Warburg, Paul, 56, 455
Wassermann, Jacob, 9, 408, 409
Waters, Mary-Alice, 428, 569
Weaver, William, 467
Weber, Max, 106, 498–99
Wechssler, Eduard, 6, 407
Wells, H. G., 121, 300, 337, 512, 642–43, 665
Werfel, Franz, 9, 408
White, D., 635
Wieger, Léon, 289, 632
William I, the Bad (king of Sicily, 1154–1166), 637
William II (emperor of Germany, 1888–1918), 106
Williams, Orlo, 14, 412, 414
Wray, F., 410

Xavier, Francis, 306
Xenophon, 235

Yeats, W. B., 495

Zambelli, Giovanni, 503
Zanardelli, Giuseppe, 485, 695, 703
Zanetti, Girolamo, 674
Zankov, Aleksandr, 240, 590–91
Zazo, Alfredo, 113, 507
Zibordi, Giovanni, 139, 441, 529
Zingarelli, Nicola, 684, 699
Zinoviev, Grigory Yevseyevich, 566
Zivkovic, Petar, 240, 590
Zoccoli, Ettore, 15, 414
Zola, Émile, 9–11, 409–10
Zuccolo, Ludovico, 400–1, 703
Zweig, Stefan, 9, 297, 640