

in London and Berlin, Little demonstrates how the playwright made the French stage directions more specific (463–64).

With this monograph, Little effectively convinces us that the successive drafts offer evidence of a heightening of interpretive ambiguity and uncertainty that blurs the line between self and other, inside and outside, reality and fiction. “Doing this”, Little concludes, “will probably not solve the questions asked by these works — Who is Godot? What happened to Mouth in the field? Is May alive or dead? — but it can help us better understand how these questions are posed” (483). For all these reasons, this volume in the BDMP series is without doubt a highly commendable and very rewarding read for those researchers interested in an in-depth foray into Beckett’s late theatre and creative mind.

Pascale Sardin

Université Bordeaux Montaigne

RICO, Francesco, ed. 2022. *Gli orizzonti dell’ecdótica. Autori, testi, lettori*. Roma: Carocci. ISBN: 978-88-290-1466-8. Pp. 389. Paper. € 35.

In the first number of the journal *Ecdótica*, which appeared in 2004 edited by Gian Mario Anselmi, Emilio Pasquini, and Francisco Rico, the term ‘ecdótica’ was defined in this way: “Tutti gli elementi che segnano l’intero cammino di un testo dall’autore ai lettori (o fruitori), sempre che tali elementi vengano contemplati nella prospettiva di un’edizione, antica o moderna, destinata allo studio della lettura, tipografica, informatica o sotto l’aspetto di un qualsiasi *tertium quid*” (5).¹ Authors, texts, and readers are thus at the center of the reflection proposed by *Ecdótica*. The same triptych — and not by chance — appears as the subtitle of an anthology, *Gli orizzonti dell’ecdótica. Autori, testi, lettori*, published by Carocci in May 2022, which aims to collect some of the most representative articles published within the journal. The purpose, as Francisco Rico explains in the introductory pages (*Introduzione*, 9–11), is to retrace the path of a text from its composition to the reader, thanks to a polyphony of voices capable of establishing a dialogue between textual studies and theoretical studies in the European and Anglo-American tradition.

1. “All elements marking a literary work’s whole path between the author and the readers (or users), as long as such elements are intended in the view of an edition — early or modern — for reading or studying, in typographical or digital form, or in whichever ‘third’ form” (my translation).

The opening two contributions are actually reviews, where the dense interaction between disciplines and methods becomes even clearer. The first article, co-authored by Lucia Castaldi, Paolo Chiesa, and Guglielmo Gorni (*Teoria e storia del lachmannismo*, 13–42; published in *Ecdotica*, 1, 2004) aims to review two books of great interest in the field: *La genesi del lachmannismo* by Giovanni Fiesoli and *La critica del testo secondo Paul Maas. Testo e commento* by Elio Montanari.² In the first essay Lucia Castaldi explains with painstaking accuracy the work of Fiesoli on Lachmann’s theory. In his book, Fiesoli investigates and evaluates “senza alcuna restrizione” (21)³ the career of the philologist Lachmann and refutes the definition of ‘Lachmann’s method’: without a rigid application of the principles enunciated by the Lachmann’s method, the systematic nature that distinguishes the method itself is therefore missing. Paolo Chiesa reviews Elio Montanari’s volume: a study, but also a tribute, in which the entire theoretical framework of Paul Maas is reappraised. Despite the value of the volume, Paolo Chiesa emphasizes some errors in the translation of the original text and the overabundance of didactic digressions and inessential statements. The article is closed by Guglielmo Gorni, who, in light of what has been said in the preceding reviews, confesses his agnosticism towards the *stemma codicum*. For Gorni, in fact, the *stemma* cannot be interpreted as a truthful drawing of the process of the text, but rather as a functional tool to restore order and logic to the tradition.

Paul Eggert’s contribution (*Questi tempi postfilologici* [. . .], 43–65) follows, offering an extended and edited version of his original text, which appeared in *Ecdotica*, 2, 2005. This is a review of D. C. Greetham’s *Theory of the Text*,⁴ considered the “*non plus ultra* della teoria editoriale degli anni ‘90” (59).⁵ Together with Greetham and thanks to the support of a large bibliography, Eggert reflects on the crisis of textual criticism that has sanctioned the victory of post-structuralism over the years, trying to understand the path to be taken to resolve the *impasse*.

The subsequent paper by Neil Harris, *La sopravvivenza del libro, ossia appunti per una lista della lavandaia* (67–118; originally published in *Ecdotica*, 4, 2007), condenses one of its key points in the exergue’s sentence, taken from Brunet and focused on “la signification du mot *rare*

2. FIESOLI 2000; MONTANARI 2003.

3. I.e., “without any restriction” (my translation).

4. GREETHAM 1999.

5. I.e., “the apex of textual theory of the 90s” (my translation).

appliqué aux livres” (67).⁶ Delving into the field of textual bibliography and philology, Neil Harris reflects on the reasons for the survival, and consequently the disappearance, of ancient books. The author recalls that especially in the antiquarian context the meanings of *rare* and *valuable* — determining qualities for the preservation of a text — were confused or even superimposed. Moreover, due to unreliable repertoires and the high rate of dispersion in libraries, it is impossible to achieve an exhaustive mapping of the submerged and saved books. According to Harris, in order to understand the reason for the resilience of books, it is necessary to know the forces that destroy them (from external factors, such as environmental conditions, or internal factors, such as the size and subject matter of the book), summarized here in a “lista della lavandaia”.⁷

Debunking the myth of one printed edition being the same as another, Susanna Villari’s contribution (*Tra bibliografia e critica del testo: un esempio dell’editoria cinquecentesca*, 119–46, which appeared in *Ecdotica*, 5, 2008) aims to discuss the concept of the ‘ideal copy’ in Tanselle’s 1980 classic essay. The perfect form of the printed book should in fact derive from the *collatio* between the different surviving exemplars, anticipated by a *recensio*. In this way, a dialogue between textual criticism, descriptive bibliography, and cataloguing is allowed. Given these considerations, Villari proposes as an example the case study of Giraldi Cinzio’s *Ecatommiti*, which she has dealt with in previous works,⁸ as a demonstration of the centrality of bibliographic analysis in ecdotic practice.

On the following pages we can read Jerome J. McGann’s article (*I monaci e i giganti. Gli studi filologici e bibliografici e l’interpretazione della letteratura*, 147–69; published in *Ecdotica*, 6, 2009). Here the author traces the motivations that led to a substantial split between ecdotic and hermeneutic practices. From McGann’s perspective, in fact, textual criticism and bibliography are not merely preliminaries but principal foundations for the study of a text. In addition to these general considerations, McGann proposes his own methodological scheme for an innovative approach to the study of textual and documentary materials.

The next contribution, by Paola Italia (“As you like it”. *Ovvero di testi, autori e lettori*, 171–85; published in *Ecdotica*, 8, 2008), reflects on the breakdown of the concept of the author’s final intention, supplanted instead by the recognition of multiple intentions, each corresponding to a

6. I.e., “the meaning of the word ‘rare’ applied to books” (my translation).

7. I.e., “laundry list” (my translation).

8. VILLARI 2008, 65–94.

defined state of the text, as happens with some of the most famous authors of Italian literature: Ariosto, Tasso, Leopardi, Manzoni, just to mention a few. In a second moment, Italia shifts the attention from the text to the reader, asking what could be the most suitable editorial format to propose to a wide audience, not necessarily of professionals. The article closes with an important methodological reflection on the conversion of the philological method to the digital world.

Roger Chartier's article *Che cos'è un libro* (187–203; published in *Ecdotica*, 8, 2011) is dedicated to the definition of the 'book': in the wake of Kant's works, it attempts to define the object-book which seems to be endowed with a *soul* — ideas — and a *body* — the form of the text. Starting then from a historical perspective, Chartier investigates the process of mutation that the concepts of 'original' and 'work' have undergone, partly changing with the spread of printed books and, again, with the advent of the digital. The transition from analogue to digital has in fact changed the relationship between fragment and totality, further problematizing the definition of the book.

Authorial philology is also the focus of Claudio Giunta's article (*La filologia d'autore non andrebbe incoraggiata*, 205–20; published in *Ecdotica*, 8, 2011). As already argued by Paola Italia in the previous pages, the concept of author's intention is supplanted by the recognition of multiple intentions. In accordance with Giunta, the theory of authorial intention becomes even more blurred if it is attributed to manuscripts or printed traditions. For this reason, the author believes in the need of a "discrete" philology (205), whose methods must be adapted to the type of textual tradition each time. However, philological *discretion* must also be exercised at the critical edition stage, where each philologist must be able to separate what is important from what is not. In this way, philology will be able to achieve "rilievo reale" (210) in the social field, breaking away from the solipsistic myth that surrounds it.

In the previous pages the contributors reflected on the definition of the 'book'. Peter Robinson in his contribution (*Il concetto di opera nell'era digitale*, 221–54; published in *Ecdotica*, 10, 2013) considers the different meanings of 'work'. From an historical viewpoint, Robinson considers the gradual detachment between 'work' — defined as "un insieme di testi per cui si ipotizza esista una relazione organica, in termini di atti comunicativi che presentano" (246)⁹ — and 'document'. In fact, the two concepts diverge

9. I.e., "a group of texts for which an organic relationship is hypothesized, in terms of featured communication acts" (my translation).

especially in the field of the digital, where the focus on the document seems far greater. Finally, the author proposes no less than five challenges, which can be read as possibilities, offered by the digital world itself and which could join the two concepts of ‘work’ and ‘document’.

Up to this point, the collection has offered numerous reflections on the concepts of ‘text’ and ‘work’ and their relationship with the concepts of *author* and *reader*. Even a publisher, however, can be considered an author insofar as they are responsible for a “*corpus che si compone di tutti i libri che pubblica*” (270). These words are taken from the interview that Paola Italia and Francisco Rico conducted with Roberto Calasso, editor and publisher of Adelphi, repropounded in this volume under the title: *Filologia editoriale. Roberto Calasso in dialogo con Paola Italia and Francisco Rico* (255–77, published in *Ecdotica*, 11, 2014). In this valuable contribution, Calasso offers a masterly example of editorial philology, describing the process of the text up to its arrival to the reader in the light of his experience at Adelphi.

With Massimo Bonafin’s article, *La filologia (romanza) al tempo della crisi degli studi umanistici* (279–95, already published in *Ecdotica*, 11, 2014), we return to the discussion about the isolation of the philological discipline and its relegation to the margins of cultural discourse. Among the solutions, Bonafin prefers a “filologia del lettore” (289) to a text-centered philological method. This new approach will have a spin-off in the layout of editions that will have to explain to the reader not only *how* but, according to Bonafin, above all *why* the text is transmitted.

The preparation of an edition faithful to philological criteria could show its difficulties especially in relation to theatrical texts: a text in constant movement in fact deletes any philological ambition, declaring its impotence because “nessuna filologia potrà mai essere ‘filologia dell’attimo fuggente’” (301).¹⁰ This is what Anna Scannapieco states in her contribution, *Sulla filologia dei testi teatrali* (297–331, published in *Ecdotica*, 15, 2018), emphasizing the need for an ecdotic method designed specifically for theatrical texts. Certain peculiar characteristics of this type of text, such as the concept of the author (which imply also the *noluntas auctoris*) and the concept of work, or the variants of staging, disrupt the traditional principles of philology. Looking at the recent edition dedicated to De

10. I.e., “No textual criticism can ever be ‘seize-the-moment’ philology!” (my translation).

Filippo as a winning ecdotic solution,¹¹ Scannapieco ends her contribution by mentioning her work on Goldonian theatre.¹²

The relationship between the document's materiality, authorship, and authority is at the center of Hans Walter Gabler's contribution, *Oltre la centralità dell'autore nell'edizione scientifica* (333–61, published in *Ecdotica*, 15, 2018). More specifically, the author seeks to demonstrate the fallacy of the author-centered approach. On the contrary, a text-centric approach is proposed, where the attention is concentrated on “come si manifestano materialmente i documenti” (355),¹³ focusing on the concept of textual validation. Such an approach infers the primacy of the materiality of the text, of which the author would instead play a role of function.

The volume ends with a contribution by the founder of *Ecdotica*, Francisco Rico. With his article, *Il primo resoconto e alcuni aspetti della composizione per forma* (363–75, published in *Ecdotica*, 18, 2021), we come back to the field of Textual Bibliography. Indeed, the author aims to demonstrate the influence of the composition by form, an editorial practice widely used since the age of *incunabula* and in large parts of Europe. Thus, debunking the vulgate of the lack of success of this publishing technique, Francisco Rico guides us in reading Alonso Victor de Paredes's work, *Institución y origen del arte de la imprenta y reglas generales para los componedores*, a fundamental text that reveals several aspects about the earliest printing techniques and practices.

The volume reviewed here is, therefore, an anthology that, despite the strong heterogeneity of themes and subjects, manages to maintain its coherence, focusing on the triptych of author, text, and reader, already mentioned several times in these pages. In its pages, moreover, different critical methods and hermeneutic approaches are compared, put to the challenge of the new digital field. Far from being a self-praising commemoration, this special volume hopes and encourages the emergence of new debates, promoting multidisciplinary without ever neglecting a special regard for the reader: features that have characterized *Ecdotica*'s approach over these many years.

Ilaria Burattini
Università di Bologna

11. DE FILIPPO 2007.

12. SCANNAPIECO 2000.

13. I.e., “how documents materially manifest themselves” (my translation).

Works Cited

- DE FILIPPO, Edoardo. 2007. *Il Teatro*, edited by Nicola DE BLASI and Paola QUARENGHI. Milano: Mondadori.
- FIESOLI, Giovanni. 2000. *La genesi del lachmannismo*. Firenze: SISMEL-Edizioni del Galluzzo.
- GREETHAM, David. 1999. *Theories of the Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MONTANARI, Elio. 2003. *La critica del testo secondo Paul Maas. Testo e commento*. Firenze: SISMEL-Edizioni del Galluzzo.
- SCANNAPIECO, Anna. 2000. "Scrittoio, scena, torchio: per una mappa della produzione goldoniana". *Problemi di critica goldoniana*, VII: 25–242.
- VILLARI, Susanna. 2008. "Un prontuario grammaticale in un 'errata corrigé' cinquecentesco: le 'tavole degli errori' dell'edizione monregalese degli *Ecatommiti*". *Filologia e critica*, 33.1: 65–94.

TRETTIEN, Whitney. 2021. *Cut/Copy/Paste: Fragments from the History of Bookwork*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Pp. 328. ISBN 9781517904081, Hardback \$112.00. ISBN 9781517904098, Paper \$28.00.

Whitney Trettien's *Cut/Copy/Paste: Fragments from the History of Bookwork* is many things: ambitious, multimodal, savvy, aesthetically pleasing, erudite, playful, and very mildly frustrating (as most ambitious works are). It is at once a work of literary criticism on a handful of minor early modern English works and an investigation into the material conditions of those works and their creation. It should be emphasized that these two aspects are methodological and conceptually intertwined for Trettien, as she borrows from media archaeology, D. F. McKenzie's "sociology of texts", and, broadly speaking, philology, to examine instances of what she calls "bookwork". Bookwork is meant to be interpreted in two ways: it "gestures toward all the conceptual labor that springs out of books" (19) as well as the "actual labor of making a codex" (20). The body of the book comprises three chapters, titled "Cut", "Copy", and "Paste". These chapters are preceded by an introduction — which lays out the book's methodological underpinnings and hints at an ethical inheritance from feminism, queer theory, and postcolonial studies — and followed by a short epilogue.

Trettien projects backward the concepts of makerspaces and collaboratories onto her early modern objects of inquiry, an approach she calls a "tactical anachronism" (37). This allows her to tease out the lines of collaboration and communication facilitated by particular places: