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ABSTRACT

Lampedusa's "Lezioni su Stendhal" (1959) contains an analysis of narrative technique that is important to a study of the formal aspects of his own Il gattopardo, aspects that were obscured by ideological criticism of the work and by the impact of the nouveau roman as against the lack of impact of the Jamesian tradition on critical opinion at the time. Information on the book's conception, composition, and publication coincides with the clues in the "Lezioni" to show that Gattopardo is the work of a craftsman fully conscious of his narrative strategy, that chapters 5 and 8 are skillfully integrated parts of a whole, and that Concetta (with Lucia of I promessi sposi and Mena of I Malavoglia, one of the great understated "heroines" of Italian literature) must be placed next to the novel's giant protagonist as the object of Lampedusa's particular attention and strategy. (OR)

In the flood of critical appraisals that followed the publication of Il gattopardo in 1958, surprisingly scant attention was paid to Lampedusa's analysis of the work of a fellow novelist, Stendhal. His lectures on Stendhal, part of a series of "lessons" he held privately for a small group of students and friends in Palermo, were published while the Gattopardo controversy was still at its fiercest. Yet they engaged the attention only of Louis Aragon, who made use of them in an article for Les Lettres françaises. This article was almost immediately republished in Italian translation in La rinascita, journal of the Communist leader Togliatti. A few months later, Aragon's remarks were made the subject of illuminating comment in a survey of French criticism of Il gattopardo, one of several articles defending the novel to appear in 1959-60 in Luigi Russo's leftist review Belfagor. The writer of that article came to the conclusion that Aragon's was the only truly critical analysis of Il gattopardo to have come out in France.

This critic's statement could easily have been intended to cover Italy as well. As in France so in Italy, the early commentators on the novel concentrated mainly on its ideological content, analyzing its presence in the historical reconstruction or in the theme of universal
decay and death that accompanies and underscores what appears to be the author's disenchanted and pessimistic view of the benefits brought to Sicily by Garibaldi's conquest or, if you wish, liberation. Though much lip service was paid to the artistic merits of the work, both by those who shared Lampedusa's dolorous fascination with the past and by those who rejected it and yet admired the effectiveness of isolated episodes and the richness of the stylistic texture, no one analyzed these merits in terms of the "craft of fiction," a craft with whose theoretical principles Lampedusa was, as we will see, remarkably well acquainted.

This was true even of Aragon, who characterized Lampedusa's discussion of the technical aspects of the novel as those of "un homme du siècle qui a connu Proust, Joyce, Virginia Woolf," but who went no further. Aragon's shock of recognition came not from discovering in Lampedusa a man completely up to date on the twentieth-century question du roman but rather from discovering in Lampedusa's reading of La Chartreuse de Parme confirmation for his own (Aragon's) contention that critics had erred in equating the intention behind Lampedusa's portrayal of the historic-political reality of post-Risorgimento Italy with the judgments overtly expressed by the protagonist, Don Fabrizio. Aragon argued that just as Stendhal, according to Lampedusa, had set out to represent an infernal world of sinister but historically accurate intrigues and cruelties but had ended up instead with "the most adorable Dantesque Purgatory," so Lampedusa may have proposed to describe "une sorte de Purgatoire de l'aristocratie sicilienne" but, "raté son coup," had come up instead with a novel which is "l'image de la perdition de cette aristocratie, l'image consciente, politique, de cette perdition, comme pouvait seul le décrire un homme qui avait fait de sa classe une critique impitoyable, une critique de gauche." Thus, Aragon's momentary attention to "Lezioni su Stendhal" bore no further fruit but led back to the principal point of dispute: Lampedusa's conscious or unconscious ideological involvement.

It is my purpose, instead, to examine the "lessons" on Stendhal for the light they shed not on Lampedusa's ideological position but on his understanding and practice of novelistic techniques. Many of the moot points on which critics ran afoul, many of the contradictory assertions that muddled their evaluation of Il gattopardo, and many sterile discussions of the precise genre or sub-genre to which the novel should be assigned are clarified or nullified in the light of Lampedusa's own affirmations. Aragon was of course
correct in using Lampedusa’s “merveilleuse explication, cette explication juste de la Chartreuse de Parme,” as he calls it, as the key to a more penetrating reading of Il gattopardo. He was correct in pointing out that like the painter who lends his own traits to the subject whose portrait he is painting, so Lampedusa, in speaking of Stendhal, was actually speaking of himself. But Aragon was not really interested in Lampedusa’s work as such. He was interested in drawing a lesson from it, in using it to show how through the conflict between an author’s overt opinion and his latent involvement, a purportedly “reactionary” work can actually and almost inevitably become “revolutionary.” As one critic put it, Aragon’s role in the Gattopardo polemic was but one skirmish in his anti-Stalinism of the 1960s, one aspect of his participation in the “cultural thaw” of those years.10

In my own approach to the Gattopardo controversy and to the relevance of “Lezioni su Stendhal” to it, I shall begin by looking at the literary climate in Italy at the time of the novel’s publication. The appearance of the first reviews of Il gattopardo coincided with the first discussions in Italy of nouveau roman. Though single works of Robbe-Grillet, Sarraute, and Beckett had received some notice earlier,11 it was only in April 1959 that the concept of nouveau roman was introduced on a large scale and with polemical intent by the Milanese avant-garde periodical Il Verri.12 In addition to the translation of Robbe-Grillet’s basic “Une Voie pour le roman futur,”13 this issue contained articles on Robbe-Grillet, Butor, and Beckett, accompanied by excerpts from their works in Italian translation.14

The following February (1960) Il Verri published a number devoted to the Italian novel. The outstanding contribution to this issue was Renato Barilli’s “Cahier de doléances sull’ultima narrativa italiana.”15 Barilli took an extremely negative view of practically all of post-World War II Italian narrative literature (neorealism), finding it below the level of acceptability for a reading public that had come to expect—or should have come to expect—something better or, at any rate, something different. In Pratolini, Cassola, Bassani, Pasolini, and others, Barilli found, in spite of obvious surface differences, the same “unimaginative and unconditional adherence to common sense,” the same spineless conformism to the underlying modes of experience accepted by the public at large. Barilli allowed the writers he mentioned their “progressive” position in the social and political arenas, but he accused them of
having done nothing to promote a deeper kind of change, change involving the very structures of experience: "the manner of conceiving time and space, of perceiving objects, of identifying and naming sentiments, of articulating the syntax of propositions."

All of this—this thorough subversion—Barilli continued, had to some extent been achieved by writers such as Joyce, Kafka, and Proust in the early part of the century, and their innovations were being continued outside of Italy in the work of the "new" novelists or "experimentalists."

The problem of the Italian novel—with or without respect to the state of the novel elsewhere—had of course been discussed before. In the years immediately preceding talk of the *nouveau roman*, for instance, the periodical *Ulisse* had published a special number (1956-57) devoted to the "fate" of the novel: "Le sorti del romanzo.

Contributors ranged from Goffredo Bellonci, man of letters and founder of the Strega Prize; to Mario Praz, dean of Italian Anglicists; and to the novelist and cultural activist, Pier Paolo Pasolini. Among the problems discussed were: realism in contemporary narrative writing; the relationship between the novel and history, between the novel and society, the novel and science, the novel, the theater and the motion picture; the Catholic novel in France, England, and Italy. Answers were sought to questions such as: What is the state of Italian narrative literature today? Is there really a conflict between content and form? If so, what shape does it take? Though a wide variety of opinions was expressed, and one participant (Luigi Bartolini) went so far as to deny the existence of novels of any kind in Italy, no one seemed aware of imminent and drastic changes either in the types of novels being written or in the theoretical premises on which they were based. The feeling of crisis, however, was present prominently only two years later in a questionnaire on the Italian novel sponsored by the review *Nuovi argomenti* (May-August 1959), of which Moravia is coeditor. Here, in the questions if not always in the answers, there is definitive evidence that a deep break in the tradition was felt to have taken place.

It is not my purpose to examine the merits of the case: whether, that is, the Italian novel was in 1959 in a worse crisis than before, whether the indigenous Italian "experimental" novels that have since been written on the model of *nouveau roman* come up to "international standards," and whether Italian literature through them has indeed caught up with the achievements of Joyce and Kafka. Strains of a familiar plaint are heard in all this: a long Italian habit of self-denigration, which at one time played itself out
almost completely in comparisons with the French cultural situation and which has now extended to include the Anglo-Saxon and Germanic worlds as well. For the purpose at hand, it is sufficient to point out that it was into this atmosphere of insecurity, self-criticism, and doubt that the immediate and phenomenal popular success of Il gattopardo burst like a scandal. The enthusiasm with which the book was read appeared to give the lie to the then current apocalyptic predictions that the nineteenth-century type of novel, the novel par excellence, was dead. To the journalistic critic who was or wished to be up to date, Lampedusa seemed at best a latecomer who had by accident written a best seller. At worst, he was the undeserving beneficiary of a wily advertising campaign conducted by that favorite of the literary establishment, Giorgio Bassani, who had known how to capitalize on the timeliness of the book’s theme in the year of the centennial celebration of Italian unity. With greater objectivity, a critic like Leone Piccioni described Il gattopardo simply as an example of “horizontal” (i.e., following the chronology of events) storytelling, which appeared at a time when the public was turning to “vertical” (i.e., digressive or in depth) narration.

Of course critics and reviewers had difficulty with Il gattopardo. It both suggested and eluded a variety of classifications. As a historical novel it inevitably called to mind I promessi sposi. But nothing in it echoed Manzoni’s quiet confidence in Providence nor his controlled distance from his characters. As a “regional” novel it was immediately connected with the work of the Sicilian writers of the turn of the century, Verga and de Roberto especially. But its overt lyricism was at odds with their programmatic desire for impersonality and objectivity. As a post-World War II novel it jarred because of its florid writing and its sympathetic portrayal of a defeated and discredited class. As a “Proustian” novel it was too firmly anchored in history, too much concerned with the non-psychological determinants of action and experience. Montale, in reviewing it for Il giorno (9 June 1959), called it the book of a “grand seigneur,” one of the last representatives of a dying if not already defunct class. It occurred to almost no one that it was also, and perhaps primarily, the book of a great connoisseur of the twentieth-century theory of the novel.

It is true that Bassani in his preface had remarked that Lampedusa should “probably” be related to “several great English writers of the first half of the century (Forster, for example) with whom he must have been familiar.” But Bassani made the connection because, as he
says, these writers were in essence essayists and poets rather than novelists, and not, as he might have said equally well, because they had a distinctive approach to fiction. Francesco Orlando, the young student for whose benefit Lampedusa began his teaching activities in 1953, wrote in his reminiscences of the years of almost daily association with the novelist that he appeared to be unacquainted with critics and works of criticism after Croce, that he was not up to date on more modern developments. It is my contention, instead, that he was very much up to date but that the kind of interest in the "craft of fiction" which his "Lezioni su Stendhal" reveals had not yet reached Italy. It may be argued that when that kind of interest finally did reach Italy, it could have only an academic resonance; that by then the "experimental" novel had definitively supplanted the last offshoots of the great realistic tradition; and that the Gattopardo case was therefore sealed. Whatever the reasons, "Lezioni su Stendhal" as a key to Il gattopardo has, in spite of occasional references to it, been overlooked, and it has been overlooked, I would claim, because of unfamiliarity or insufficient familiarity on the part of Italian critics with the Jamesian tradition of criticism in the novel.

By one of those strange and recurrent accidents in historical development, Il gattopardo was written both before and after its time. For that reason it has no proper and easy place in the commonly accepted schemes of the history of the European novel. In the context of twentieth-century Italian literature, Lampedusa was original precisely because he looked back, because he belonged to a tradition that had in a sense run its course but had at the same time never had a full impact on Italian literature. It is no wonder that avant-garde critics in 1959 and 1960 misunderstood him. They were busy celebrating the demise of neorealism. The Marxists, on the other hand, were attracted by the work but read it as a historical document, a sociopolitical indictment of the "heroic" period of modern Italian history. Neither the Marxists nor the avant-garde were capable of capturing the full intention of Lampedusa's understatement. In "Lezioni su Stendhal," however, Lampedusa left the necessary clues for a more proper and comprehensive interpretation of his work.

Lampedusa deals with the whole of Stendhal's production, convinced that all Stendhal's works, including the so-called minor ones, bear the mark of an exceptional personality, a personality able to give new life even to what appeared to be outworn and no longer
valid genres. Thus he describes _Les Promenades dans Rome_ as a unique travel book that ranks as a literary work of art and _De l'amour_ as an extraordinary “physiologie” that belongs with the best in literature. But if his attention to the early _Vies_, the _Histoire de la peinture en Italie_, and Racine et Shakespeare (pp. 12-17); to _Rome, Naples et Florence, Mémoires d'un touriste_, and _Promenades dans Rome_ (pp. 17-20, 36-37); to _De l'amour_ (pp. 20-22); to the _Chroniques italiennes_ and _Armance_ (pp. 22-26, 37-38); to the unfinished _Lucien Leuwen_ and _Lamiel_ (pp. 44-47); and to the many posthumous and unpublished fragments (pp. 47-49)—if this attention reveals Lampedusa’s thorough acquaintance with the corpus of Stendhal’s work, it is to the two masterpieces that he devotes the substance and particular acumen of his analysis. _Le Rouge et le noir_ and _La Chartreuse de Parme_ are presented first together as “works of absolute first rank” (pp. 3-12) and are then discussed separately under the section heading “L’Heure des cuirassiers” (pp. 26-36 for _Le Rouge_, pp. 38-44 for _La Chartreuse_). But since this study is concerned mainly not with Lampedusa as critic of Stendhal but with Lampedusa as novelist, I propose to focus only on those passages of “Lezioni su Stendhal” in which he formulates general rules of narrative technique and applies them to Stendhal or where he uses Stendhal as a point of departure to discuss the art of fiction.

In light of the kind of criticism to which _Il gattopardo_ was later subjected, Lampedusa’s single most significant statement comes at the very beginning of the essay, when he writes that Stendhal’s two masterpieces possess a quality that the minor works for all their excellence do not. That quality is many-sidedness (poliedricità), the distinguishing feature of works of absolute first rank. For, Lampedusa says, if _Le Rouge_ and _La Chartreuse_ can from one point of view be considered (1) historical novels, they can also be considered (2) the “lyrical” outpouring of their author’s sentiments, (3) psychological case studies, (4) lessons in a certain kind of morality, and (5) models of the most difficult of styles, the style of extreme conciseness (estrema abbreviazione). Let us discuss each of these points.

Inasmuch as _Il gattopardo_ was generally recognized to be first and foremost a historical novel, we should note the meaning Lampedusa gives to the term. He ignores Scott and the novel of archeological reconstruction of the past altogether. Instead, he speaks of “novels that have become historical for us,” that portray objectively (oggettivazione) a period that was contemporary for their author...
but has become so remote for us that we can know it only through art. Thus it is possible for him to speak of both Balzac and Stendhal, chroniclers of their own times, as historical novelists. But with the difference, he is quick to add, that for him Stendhal achieved in the five hundred pages of _Le Rouge et le noir_ what Balzac failed to achieve in "twenty volumes." For it is not completeness of documentation that counts for Lampedusa, but something else. To paraphrase and compress his words, what counts is the miraculous intuition of "la couleur du temps": "in them [the five hundred pages of _Le Rouge et le noir_] there is everything: the motives, the impulses, the oppositions, the cultural richness, the time lags [gli sfasamenti], the creakings [gli scricchioli], the sense of a dawn, the 'couleur du temps' of that vital crossroads of French history" (p. 4). And echoing a feeling often expressed by critics with regard to _I promessi sposi_, he adds that other works of the period, even memoirs, bring only confirmation of Stendhal's "miraculous intuitions." Further, extending his remarks from _Le Rouge et le noir_ to _La Chartreuse de Parme_, he sees in this second novel a "tenderly ironic evocation" of pre-Risorgimento Italy, a period, according to him, almost completely ignored by writers, except for Byron in his correspondence and for some brilliant hints (felici bagliori) in the novels of Mme de Staël. "The dearth of documents with which to reconstruct human experience is staggering" (la carenza di documenti umani è sbalorditiva), he states, putting into those few words the searing recollection of the millions of lives that have passed on earth without leaving a trace of their existence. Thus, this brief passage on the historical novel contains what we might call Lampedusa's definition of its subject matter and a rapid but powerful hint of the _pietas_ out of which it is born.

We can treat the next three points as a unit. Lampedusa connects the lyrical quality of Stendhal's work, his psychological penetration, and the ethical doctrine that his novels imply and others of his works openly display with Stendhal's sense of himself and with the projection of that self into his fictional creations. Thus, Sorel is the man the ambitious Stendhal actually was; del Dongo, the noble, wealthy, beloved man he would have wished to be. Through both, Stendhal speaks directly; that is, lyrically. The other characters, those who are neither the author himself nor stand-ins for him, are given life not so much by his feelings as by his intelligence: Stendhal's much-admired psychological knowledge. The Epicurean, hedonistic ethic that paradoxically attributes greater satisfaction to the pursuit of pleasure than to its attainment and enjoyment impels Stendhal's
characters as it impelled him. These points, though Lampedusa does not present them as such, might be summarized as his comment on the autobiographical aspects of Stendhal’s novels.

This leaves us with the fifth point: Stendhal’s style, the “mortar that binds together the different stones and assures the durability of the edifice” (p. 8). It is here that we encounter the first unmistakable sign that Lampedusa’s reading of Stendhal is that of the craftsman or potential craftsman interested in the writing of fiction. His reading is not simply that of the enthusiastic reader who finds himself extraordinarily well attuned to a favorite writer’s portrayal of experience, nor is it that of the cultivated and educated reader who is at home in the critical literature that deals with his subject. Lampedusa makes a point of separating himself from the average reader, whose main concern in a novel is plot. He specifically warns that Stendhal’s works must be read with the proper attention and not merely to find out what happens in the story. He does not fix his gaze on the world created by Stendhal—though that world is completely real to him, as witness his rounded views of the characters Julien and Fabrice, Mme de Renal and Sanseverina, of the “twin figures” of M. de Renal and Count Mosca, the “absurd and attractive” Ferrante Palla, the “wooden” General Fabio Conti, the “myriad mean priests and plotters” (the descriptive epithets are all Lampedusa’s). Rather, his attention is on Stendhal in the act of creating that world. And just as he emphasized Stendhal’s involvement in his characters, playing down his much vaunted objectivity, so he now chooses as the perspective from which to examine his style not the traditional view of the “style du Code Civil” but Jean Prévost’s “style de l’improvisateur.”

Not that he ignores the “style du Code Civil” completely, for he does mention Stendhal’s disdain “pour les phrases” and his remarkable talent for economy. In the latter connection, he cites three well-known instances of quasi-miraculous understatement: Manzoni’s famous remark about the Monaca di Monza, “La sventurata rispose”; Stendhal’s no less famous “Aucune résistance ne fut opposée”; and the semicolon that contains Julien’s night of love with Mathilde.

To observe Lampedusa most intently absorbed in watching the writer at work we must follow his discussion of the “style de l’improvisateur” in some detail. The apparent spontaneity of Stendhal’s style, he says (citing Prévost), was achieved by Stendhal’s habit of “internal” composition or (in Proust’s words, which he quotes) by his ability to “raturer à l’avance.” He devotes considerable attention to an analysis of this process, reconstructing Stendhal’s efforts to
reduce to the page the data supplied by experience. With extraordinary sensitivity to the genetic moment of the process, Lampedusa points out that Stendhal aimed at eliminating everything but the "essential" from the sensations of experience themselves, and not merely from their notation on the page. Thus Stendhal's text "appears fluent, impetuous, improvised, while it was actually the fruit of long and minute elaboration" (p. 10). The elaboration, he then carefully notes, took place not on the page, "where only words can be elaborated on, but in the heat of the sensation itself, with the infallible instinct which tends to render thoughts clear before we formulate them. (They become muddy later, in writing.)" It is instructive to juxtapose this passage to Orlando's recollection that Lampedusa read him *Il gattopardo* in 1956 from what he described as a first draft. Orlando notes that this draft was so free of erasures, corrections, and insertions that he doubted that it was indeed a first attempt: "If the author spoke the truth, we must conclude that the novel was written in a state of veritable literary grace." But with a deeper and more ascetic understanding of the process of literary creation, Lampedusa shows in "Lezioni su Stendhal" that it is not a miracle that accounts for a "miraculous" work of art, but the tireless and intense effort required to give form to the chaos of experience. In Stendhal, Lampedusa says, this effort took place continuously in the mind, as memories were sifted down to offer up their essential and irreducible nuclei. The result was that extraordinary "writing in two columns, composed in equal measure of a first series of sensations expressed and transmitted, and of a second series transmitted only through an accentuated silence intended to make the attentive reader prick up his ears" (p. 11).

Lampedusa describes this technique of suggestion as characteristic of Stendhal, but it is of course no less characteristic of Lampedusa himself, of whose novel it can be said that in spite of its success as a best seller it is dedicated, as is the Chartreuse, "To the happy few."

When Lampedusa returns to the subject of the two novels the second time in the "Lezioni" (p. 26), he moves at once to place the discussion within a broader frame of reference. He no longer focuses on the characteristics of Stendhal's works (the five points just considered) but on the more general questions of narrative technique. While the earlier set of remarks is therefore useful as a key to the affinities that draw *Il gattopardo* and the novels of Stendhal together, this second set serves to confirm the impression
of technical control, of conscious craftsmanship that accompanies a careful reading of the novel. Lampedusa’s “reading” of Stendhal and his acquaintance with the tools for critical analysis of narrative technique converge to throw the formal—as against the ideological—aspects of Il gattopardo into strong relief.

Lampedusa starts out by recognizing the uselessness of repeating praise of Stendhal’s gifts as a poet, a psychologist, and an “evoker” of milieus. But if there is little point in repeating what has already been said and about which there is general agreement, he continues, there is every reason for turning to the why (il perché) of Stendhal’s greatness—for examining, that is, his technique of expression. “In art,” Lampedusa states axiomatically, “the possibility of communicating is everything” (p. 27). And again later: “In art the ‘technique of execution’ is everything, for the artist is nothing more than a fellow [tizio] who knows how to express himself” (p. 34). In the case of the novel the specific problems of expression are (1) the treatment of time, (2) the concretization of the narrative situation (concretizzare la narrazione), (3) the suggestion of milieu, and (4) the treatment of dialogue. Although Lampedusa lists the problems in this order, he does not discuss them thus. For as soon as he is forced to touch upon (5) the position of the narrator, it becomes obvious that the central and crucial consideration, the pivot around which all else revolves, is “point of view,” a term he does not use but a concept he describes perceptively and at length.

We can omit the details of Lampedusa’s exposition of these five points, except to note a few significant observations. In connection with the first point, he mentions specifically as tools of suggestion to indicate the expansion of narrative time (rallentamenti nel ritmo della narrazione): reference to the succession of the seasons (Tolstoy’s method in “the immortal chapters” [p. 28] telling of the progressive estrangement of Anna and Wronski); the use of the imperfect tense; observations on physical changes; and the celebration of anniversaries.

With respect to the fifth point, the position of the narrator, he speaks of the three expedients by which the old writers (not further identified) placated their scruples on omniscience: the epistolary form; first-person narrative in which the protagonist knows his own inner life; and first-person narrative in which he is presumed to be endowed with the power of interpreting his own thoughts and also those of the other characters.

Lampedusa warns that passing time must be suggested or alluded to incidentally, almost secretly (di sfuggita e quasi di nascosto), for time in a novel is not the time of a “train schedule” (p. 28), and that
first-person narrative in which the protagonist also knows the inner life of other characters is fraught with dangers that only a genius like Proust can brave with impunity. As for Stendhal, he "chose the quickest and proudest way: to simplify, we may call it the way of having God tell the story. In the garb of a deity, Stendhal knows the most hidden thoughts of every character, pointing them out to the reader who shares in his omniscience. Stendhal leaves nothing in shadow, except what he chooses not to say in order to heighten the emotion" (p. 29).39

This whole passage is as important as the discussion of Stendhal's style to which we referred earlier. Both statements are crucial for a proper understanding of Il gattopardo: the first directs attention to Lampedusa's use of understatement, the second is a clue to the reason that inclined him to third-person narrative. Together they bring into relief the role of the reader, a point to which Lampedusa refers specifically: "This technique [Stendhal's telling of the story as though he were God] of almost unbelievable subtlety results in the complete fusion of author, character, and reader. The latter is no longer an outsider [estraneo] who watches the action but almost always one of the protagonists of the action itself" (p. 30).40

The remaining three technical problems dealing with expression are concerned essentially with the concretization of the action, with turning theme into plot. Here Lampedusa's most significant remark has to do with the treatment of dialogue. In Stendhal, he points out, "there is not one instance of a famous dialogue" (p. 33). This he attributes to the fact that Stendhal avoided the "error of so many novelists (including some of the greatest!) who reveal a character's inner life through what he says." In real life, Lampedusa continues, "verbal revelation" almost never occurs: we understand people through "their actions, their glances, their stammering, the entwining of their fingers, their silences or their sudden speech, the color of their cheeks, the rhythm of their step" (p. 33). Thus, Lampedusa illustrates, Stendhal reports not Julien's words in refusing to marry Elisa, but their gist. This permits him to interject his own implied comments so as "to rectify what has been said," to unmask the intention that words so often hide or misrepresent—"words which are always the chase or impudent masks of a person's inmost being" (p. 34).41

It follows quite naturally that as the usefulness of direct discourse is discounted, the importance of stream of consciousness (monologo interiore, as Lampedusa calls it) increases. Stendhal's recourse to stream of consciousness in order to reveal the motives behind an
action differs, according to Lampedusa, from use of the same technique in Proust, Joyce, and Virginia Woolf. This is because *Le Rouge et le noir* is not only "a lyrical effusion and a novel of psychological analysis" but also a portrait of its time and a story filled with deeds and actions. In such a story (i.e., in a historical novel), stream of consciousness can never become an end in itself but must remain subordinated to the narrative intentions of the storyteller. "The action of Ulysses," says Lampedusa, "lasts twenty-four hours and is a simple, ordinary action; yet its reading takes at least five times as long, in spite of Joyce's magnificent efforts at concentration. But his efforts are directed toward verbal concentration. Stendhal's instead aim at obtaining a concentration of the substance [concentrazione sostanziale] of the psychological moments. Of each of these he has kept only the essential, and only in a second moment did he subject it to the distillation of his style, one of the most agile [svelto] in existence. The 'interior monologues' of Stendhal's characters are extremely brief: just a few lines. The transitions between them and the rest of the story are handled with a few indirect expressions, forming a kind of gentle slope that connects the two kinds of exposition" (p. 31).

The relatively few passages from Lampedusa's "Lezioni su Stendhal" on which I have based these remarks were selected for the strong light they shed on Lampedusa's conscious art in *Il gattopardo* and have been rearranged in such a way as to form a kind of statement on the poetics of the novel. In conclusion, I wish to call attention to one final point: Lampedusa's conviction, which may at first seem paradoxical, that much of the negative criticism leveled at *Le Rouge et le noir* upon its publication must be attributed to Stendhal's technical achievement (*potenza di tecnica*). The accusation of moral indifference, the view that Stendhal had actually written an apologia of Julien's ruthless opportunism, derives, according to Lampedusa, not from the inherent depravity of the "monstrous" Julien but from the ability with which he is portrayed: "In comparison with Dorian Gray, Lafcadio, Morel, and even the Reverend Slope, Julien is a little angel. . . . Insignificant rogues like Julien can be found by the thousands in life and by the dozens in literature. But he is one of the very few who have been described with a technique such as to render all his (after all, banal) evil sunlike [solare, i.e., all-encompassing] for the reader. . . . We are not dealing with a monster but with a character who is monstrously alive" (p. 35).

Readers of *Le Rouge et le noir*, Lampedusa continues, have also
been disturbed by Julien's death, which seems to them unmotivated psychologically, slovenly in execution, and consequently an artistic failure. Again, on the strength of his own critical analysis, Lampedusa differs from this opinion. For him, the ending of the book is one of its greatest merits. It is not only the logical conclusion of the basic narrative situation but also proof of Stendhal's fundamental honesty as a writer, for his interest in Julien had come to an end the moment Julien had achieved the goal of his quest, the moment his pursuit of happiness had been satisfied. Stendhal's haste to kill off the character once he had no further use for him results for Lampedusa in "an ending without equal, tragically suggestive" (p. 36). Finally, Lampedusa comes back to a reflection that runs like a leitmotiv through much of "Lezioni su Stendhal": the uselessness of trying to explain beauty and artistic achievement to those who have insufficient sensitivity to perceive them. In this, of course, he no more than echoes Stendhal, who had resigned himself to being misunderstood in his own time and had looked into the future for readers who would finally penetrate his intention—his craft—and proclaim him a master.

Except for three articles published in 1926-27, Lampedusa's extant works belong to the brief span of time between his return in the summer of 1954 from a literary gathering in northern Italy and his death in July 1957. Of the short pieces collected in 1961 in the volume Racconti, "Il mattino di un mezzadro" (presumably the first chapter of a new novel to be entitled I gattini ciechi) and "I luoghi della mia prima infanzia" are related to the subject matter of Il gattopardo, while "La gioia e la legge" and "Lighea" are autonomous short stories. Bassani, in his preface to Il gattopardo, gives "between 1955 and 1956" as the period during which the novel was written, but in an interview published more recently he changes the first date to 1954 so that it coincides with Lampedusa's return from the meeting at San Pellegrino Terme, where his cousin Lucio Piccolo had won recognition for a volume of poetry and where he himself had come into contact "with the writing of the 1950's" (Bassani, Banti, Vittorini, Cassola, and others). Orlando reports that he began his daily readings of the manuscript at Lampedusa's request "in one of the early months of 1956." Three distinct drafts of the novel have been preserved: a handwritten one (1955-56), the one read by Orlando; a typewritten one (1956), copied by Orlando and corrected by Lampedusa; and a longhand copy of the latter (1957), made by Lampedusa himself and bearing on the frontispiece the words Il gattopardo (completo). It was the typewritten copy that was submitted to Mondadori,
Einaudi, and Feltrinelli, and (with the addition of two chapters) served as the basis for the printed text when Bassani accepted the work for publication by Feltrinelli. However, after type had already been set and the proofs were about to be read, Bassani also obtained the longhand copy and incorporated some of its variants into the printed text. He was later to summarize his work of revision in these terms: “Everything new in the manuscript copy I put into the book or, if you like, nothing new in the 1957 version fails to be there.” In addition, he “corrected or supplied” punctuation.

The matter would probably have rested there if, in examining the possibility of making a critical edition of the by then famous work, Carlo Muscetta had not some years later reopened the question of the two manuscripts by suggesting melodramatically that readers had not been supplied with the genuine and authentic product. A new controversy stirred the Italian literary world and led to the publication of a second edition of the novel. Its foreword, by Gioacchino Lanza Tomasi, Lampedusa’s adopted son, rehearses once again the history of publication and describes at length and in detail the divergences between the 1957 manuscript and the first edition. These divergences, however illuminating, do not concern us here. As a matter of fact, of the very considerable mass of background material now available on the conception and execution of the novel, a small part only is relevant to the rereading of Il gattopardo in the light of “Lezioni su Stendhal” that interests us here.

There is, first, the information that was supplied by Lampedusa’s widow with respect to the novel’s long period of incubation. Bassani quotes her as saying that “twenty-five years ago [Lampedusa] announced his intention of writing an historical novel set in Sicily at the time of Garibaldi’s landing at Marsala and revolving around the figure of his paternal great-grandfather, the astronomer Giulio di Lampedusa. He was constantly thinking of it, but he never actually sat down to write it.” Secondly, there is Gioacchino Lanza Tomasi’s recollection of the original tripartite division of the novel, each division marked by the lapse of twenty-five years: 1860, Garibaldi’s landing at Marsala; 1885, the death of the prince (in the final version of the novel the episode was moved to 1883, but the actual date of the great-grandfather’s death was 1885); 1910, “the end of everything.”

While the princess’s words bear witness to the fact that if the book was in the end the product of intense and regular application, it had actually been in the making for a quarter of a century; Lanza Tomasi’s call attention to the equally significant fact that the
last chapter, considered superfluous and unsuccessful by the majority of critics, who all read the novel as the story of its protagonist, was from the beginning part of the overall scheme.\textsuperscript{54} As far as the other chapter found perplexing by critics (the present chapter 5) is concerned, though not part of the original plan, it too belongs to Lampedusa's own vision of his work as it appears in the 1957 \textit{Il gattopardo (completo)}.\textsuperscript{55} The inequalities and disproportions perceived by many critics no doubt exist. According to Lanza Tomasi's report, the three Donnafugata chapters (about half of the book as we have it today), not to speak of the scene at the ball and the chapter on Father Pirrone at San Cono, were not part of the original conception,\textsuperscript{56} a state of affairs that must inevitably have left traces in the novel. But rather than speak of disproportions and inequalities, most frequently attributed to Lampedusa's presumed inexperience or to the fact that his completion and revision of the novel might be supposed to have been cut short by death, it would seem more profitable to take the book as it is, in the very form in which it won wide popular success, and to examine it along the lines suggested by Lampedusa's own statements on narrative technique. Only after considering such matters as Lampedusa's (1) treatment of time, (2) his presentation of milieu, (3) the point of view from which he tells the story, and (4) his handling of dialogue should we examine such other questions as (5) the type of novel it can primarily be said to be and (6) the nature of its message and (7) its style.

To attempt the comprehensive analysis just outlined would take us far beyond the limits of the present essay. I shall, however, in conclusion, consider two problem areas to which critics have returned time and again: the relevance or discrepancy of chapter 5, and the significance, appropriateness, or incongruence of chapter 8. Though ultimately the judgments made depend on one's view of the overall form or structure of the work, these two chapters present sufficiently differentiated problems to permit us to consider them as separate and independent case studies. Because it is more closely and obviously related to the novel's ideological content, chapter 5 has received the greater share of attention. Chapter 8, instead, has been rapidly dismissed as an unfortunate afterthought on the part of the author, who was presumably torn between a biographically centered and a cyclical concept of the historical novel.

Chapter 5 is the first chapter of the novel in which the prince does not occupy center stage.\textsuperscript{57} At its end, when Father Pirrone returns
to Palermo, the hierarchy is reestablished and the prince again becomes the major god of his household. During the two-day visit to his native village, however, Father Pirrone is given the opportunity to talk and act on his own initiative: his reflections on the political changes taking place echo the prince’s colloquy with Chevalley; his arrangement of a marriage for his niece parallels the prince’s “swallowing of a toad” in the latter’s negotiations for the marriage of Tancredi. Father Pirrone’s visit marks an anniversary, that of his father’s death fifteen years before. Lampedusa’s retrospective look at the priest’s family background—something he had not been able to do when the character was first introduced—is thus deftly justified, and the introductory pages in which don Gaetano’s business activities and Father Pirrone’s childhood and youth are rapidly recalled show no signs of artifice or strain.

The sense of the unchanging continuity of life and of the momentary surface disturbance brought by the recent “liberation” of Sicily (chapter 5 is dated February 1861, a mere three months after the preceding one) is expressed by two “objective correlates,” mirror images of identical objects that function in the prince’s milieu: the dog Romeo, “great-great-grandson” of a dog that had romped with the boy Saverio, and the tricolor cockade that Father Pirrone’s nephew Carmelo “had had the bad taste” of putting in his cap as a sign of rejoicing. The chapter forms a diptych: Father Pirrone answers the old herbalist’s question about the reactions of the nobility to the revolution that is undermining its privileges; and Father Pirrone smooths over a revengeful seduction and one brother’s “dirty trick” on another, by convincing his sister to give her daughter the proper dowry. With understated irony, Lampedusa reduces Father Pirrone’s audience to one sleeping man, no doubt intending to show thereby that truth can be revealed only when there is no chance of its being heard: “now [that no one was listening] he could talk freely, without fear of being misunderstood, and he talked so as to fix in the concrete pattern of phrases the ideas that were dimly milling about in his mind” (p. 232). More overtly, Lampedusa calls attention to the parallelism between the love antics of the rustics Angelina and Santino and Angelica’s and Tancredi’s retracing of the stops on the carte du tendre by remarking on the residue of unpleasant impressions that his visit has left in Father Pirrone: “that brutal love affair whose culmination had come during Saint Martin’s Summer [November 1860 was also the time of Angelica’s and Tancredi’s exploration of the abandoned rooms at Donnafugata], that miserable half of an almond grove
grabbed back by means of a premeditated courtship, showed him the rustic, sordid side of other happenings that he had recently witnessed" (p. 246). But before we reach this explicit statement at the very end of the chapter, the sophisticated reader has been free to draw his own conclusions from the careful balancing of mood and event, of characters and comments.

We have seen already that chapter 5 is one of the two chapters that were not part of the original manuscript read by Bassani. Bassani came upon the chapter later, in the longhand version, and decided to use it in spite of the princess's objection. "I found that it was essential to the structure of the novel. This sort of descent to hell is a fundamental clue to understanding Fabrizio and Sicily," he is quoted as saying in the 1970 interview. The princess, it seems, would have preferred to keep the chapter, together with the scene of the ball, to which she had herself called Bassani's attention, for inclusion in a possible publication of Lampedusa's shorter pieces. But she may of course also have been influenced by what Lanza Tomasi remembers of Lampedusa's own hesitation about the chapter, which displeased him because, contrary to his usual practice, it was "explicit" rather than "implicit," providing a kind of "gloss" to the prince's behavior rather than permitting it to express itself simply through the narration of events.58 It is interesting to note once again that Lampedusa's judgment as reported here is based on a consideration of technique, on an awareness of the importance of the choice of point of view in storytelling. But it is equally interesting to note that he seems to have shared with Bassani, at this point at least, the conviction that the prince is after all the one and only center of the novel.

Simonetta Salvestroni, whose two articles in Filologia e letteratura are to date the most comprehensive and, I would say, most satisfactory discussions of Il gattopardo, advances a different hypothesis, and buttresses it with a rare, if not unique, reference to "Lezioni su Stendhal." By asking herself how Lampedusa succeeded in giving movement and complexity to what is essentially a static situation, she discovered elements of a thoroughly worked-out pattern in which scenes in which bitterness and pessimism predominate alternate with others which mark a recovery of serenity. Chapter 5 thus counterbalances the taste of ashes left by the prince's encounter with Chevalley at the end of chapter 4 and lightens the atmosphere before the depressing observations on the decline of his class and on the inevitable sinking of all men into old age and death that the prince makes during the festivities at the ball of the Ponteleones in
chapter 6. The passage from “Lezioni su Stendhal” reads as follows: “But in the course of a novel, especially if it is composed of tense psychological probing and of a hurried action, moments of pause must be provided for the reader. Obviously, it always takes less time to read a novel than to write it, and even if the author did not feel the need to pause for himself, he must not forget that the reader needs it. If the reader fails to find these oases in which to rest, he will close the book at the least appropriate moment and reopen it when the accumulated energy has evaporated. Every great author of long works has provided these breathing spaces: Homer, with his interpolated episodes; Dante, always; Ariosto, with his rough technique, breaking a story off at its high point to turn to other inventions [fanfaluche] destined to be trimmed in their turn; Cervantes and Mme de Lafayette, by inserting secondary stories; Richardson and Thackeray, by speaking themselves in lieu of their characters.”

Thus, for Simonetta Salvestroni chapter 5 is not only a pendant to and a parody of the main story but also a break in the narrative, a determined turning away from the main character and the lesser characters disposed about him in the guise of satellites. Or to put it in Lampedusa’s own terms, chapter 5 is a major device for the expansion of narrative time, for creating what he called “rallentamenti nel ritmo della narrazione.”

These, then, are some of the thematic and formal reasons that can be adduced to support the idea that chapter 5 is an integral part of the novel and that Lampedusa might perhaps have changed parts of it but would not have abandoned it altogether. Of course, these reasons become apparent only after we discard the preconceived notion that the unity of Il gattopardo depends on the continuous presence of the protagonist on stage. How deeply rooted this notion is (a notion the title of the book itself does not help dispel) can be seen in the fact that although chapter 6 was, like chapter 5, an afterthought, and felt by Bassani to be stylistically inferior to the rest of the novel, it was never seriously considered de trop: the presence of the prince was enough to mute any nascent negative impressions. And yet, not only the book’s original tripartite plan and the report that Lampedusa once planned to call it Ultime luci (“Last Lights,” a theatrical, cinematic allusion that would not have been inappropriate, although far less economical and striking than “The Leopard”) but especially its inclusion of another chapter that does without the prince—these facts should have alerted the critics that they might possibly have overlooked something.

Chapter 8 takes place twenty-seven years after the death of the
prince and fifty after the opening pages of the book. Of the Salina family only the girls survive: Carolina, Caterina, Concetta, and Chiara, their married sister in Naples, of whom there had been no mention earlier. Angelica, too, whose forty-year marriage to Tancredi "had erased all traces of the Donnafugata accent and manners" (p. 315), is in her seventies. Like chapter 5, chapter 8 moves between two main episodes: the official inspection of the private chapel at Villa Salina, in accordance with the new regulations of the Papal Curia, and the visit to Concetta of Tassoni, erstwhile comrade-in-arms of Tancredi and now an aged senator. Like chapter 5, but with greater force of impact, chapter 8 ends with the new experiences of the two days (13-14 May) whose events it recounts echoing through the psyche of its protagonist, this time however with the grand conclusiveness of the final chords of a heroic symphony. The word Fine, centered on the last page of the 1957 manuscript, is corroboration of the completo we read on the title page. In omitting the word, the English edition respects a publisher's sensitivity to the quaintness of its use in a modern novel but betrays Lampedusa's own intention of emphasizing the fully conscious aspect of his technique of composition.

If chapter 5 is in some respects, as we have seen, an anniversary chapter, chapter 8 is almost exclusively so. There is first of all and most obviously the celebration being planned to mark the 1860 conquest, or liberation, of Palermo. It is an occasion for which visitors are expected to arrive from all parts of Italy and in which the Salinas are to participate in an official capacity. Angelica is a member of the Board of Patrons and the young Fabrizio will march down Via Libertà in frock coat as part of the parade. "Don't you think that's a first-rate idea? A Salina will render homage to Garibaldi. It will be a fusion of the old and new Sicily," Angelica says to Concetta (p. 314), thus underlining for the last time one of the principal public themes of the novel.

Equally obvious is the parallelism of the dates, May 1860 and May 1910, that stand at the beginning of the first and last chapters respectively: not only do they state the fifty-year lapse, but none of the other six chapters takes place in the month of May. A closer look reveals that the day of the month corresponds as well. In chapter 1, which is filled with allusions to the beleaguered state of Sicily between the uprising of 4 April in Palermo and Garibaldi's landing at Marsala on 11 May, the precise date 13 May appears in the course of a landscape description made from the vantage point of the prince's observatory (p. 53). It is stated incidentally, almost in passing; "di
sfuggita e quasi di nascosto,” as we have already quoted Lampedusa as writing apropos the treatment of time in the novel. In chapter 8 we find the precise date 14 May spelled out during the description of the cardinal’s visit to the Salina household to make arrangements for the required examination of the relics (p. 324). As in chapter 1, the date enters surreptitiously and elusively while the reader’s attention is engaged elsewhere.

What is particularly significant about 13-14 May, however, is that it is not the date of the fall of Palermo (27 May, presumably the day for which the celebrations to commemorate the exploits of Garibaldi’s Thousand are being planned) but a date with a private meaning in the history of the Salina family. Yet the proximity of the two dates and Lampedusa’s skilful interweaving and blending of references to historical and individual destiny muddy the waters sufficiently to make the novel’s concealment or disclosure of meaning entirely dependent on the reader’s capacity of penetration. And this in spite of the fact that there is a moment in the account of Tassoni’s visit to Concetta at which the author intervenes with his own statement of the perspective from which the episode should be read. Of Concetta’s youthful love for Tancredi, Lampedusa writes at this point: “But as someone who recovered from smallpox fifty years before still bears the marks of the illness upon his face although he may have forgotten its pain, so she bore in her present tormented life the scars of her by now historical disappointment, historical indeed to the point that its fiftieth anniversary was now being officially celebrated” (pp. 319-20, italics mine).

For chapter 8 is Concetta’s chapter. Just as Father Pirrone was finally allowed to speak and act on his own in chapter 5, so in chapter 8 is the spotlight finally and unequivocally on the prince’s daughter. That she has become both an unappealing and a pathetic figure, “fat and imposing in her stiff black moiré . . . with contemptuous eyes and an expression of resentment above her nose” (p. 304), must not blind us to this fact. In spite of the fanfare of political celebrations and in spite of the feeling of nausea Lampedusa so ably imparts to the reader through his reflection on the fate of the Church, religion, and taste in the Italy of democracy, 62 this is the great “family” chapter of the book, the point at which the historical novel most clearly makes way for the deep psychological insights of the bourgeois novel. It is the chapter of leave-taking, the enforced discarding of the objects of a naïve and superstitious piety that clutter the Salina chapel, and the voluntary rejection of the “mummified memories” (p. 311) that make Concetta’s room a place of torture to her. At the end, when
“the little heap of moth-eaten fur” (p. 311) that had been Bendicò forty-five years before, turns from “the only memory of [Concetta’s] past that did not awaken painful feelings in her” (p. 312) to the only thing left in the utter emptying out of all her feelings still capable of evoking a shadow of uneasiness in her, and she orders it thrown out, we have truly reached that “end of everything” we had not reached at the prince’s deathbed. Thus, Concetta and not Tancredi, nor yet the blooming Angelica, is revealed to be the figure most closely related to the prince and second in importance only to him for a full explication of the novel’s meaning.

And indeed, in retrospect, it becomes obvious that in spite of the central group—the giant prince; the gay, self-affirming, opportunistic Tancredi; the opulently beautiful and confident Angelica—in whom the fictional elements of the story find expression, Concetta has actually never been far from Lampedusa’s focus of interest. With repeated insistence but at the same time extraordinary discreetness he has directed the reader’s attention to her time and again.

She appears first in chapter 1, with what will become characteristic understatement, when in the course of a flashback her father remembers an audience granted him by Ferdinand II: the king’s godchild, she is the only one of the prince’s offspring to be mentioned by name (p. 27). Her second appearance in chapter 1 is at the Salinas’ midday table: the prince surmises that she is anxious about Tancredi, who has just left to join the invaders, and Lampedusa quotes him as thinking, “They would make a fine couple. But I fear Tancredi will have to aim higher, by which of course I mean lower” (p. 58).

Against the background of the prince’s rediscovery of the perennially unchanged attractions of Donnafugata and his perception of some alas! altered social and economic circumstances, chapters 2 and 3 recount his betrayal of his daughter in favor of Angelica and Concetta’s own double rejection of Tancredi: the first time at the dinner table when he tells a vulgar soldier’s tale about the forcing of a convent (pp. 101-3), the second during the Salinas’ visit to the Convent of the Holy Spirit (p. 107). Concetta’s realization of what has happened fails to reach the level of consciousness at this point, but in the final paragraph of chapter 3, when she is the only one who does not look up when her father crosses the girls’ sitting room and she does not hear “the vigorous, rapid steps that announce his arrival thirty feet away” (p. 160), Lampedusa has created one of those “accentuated silences intended to make the attentive reader prick up his ears,” a silence which surely places this episode next to Manzoni’s “La sventurata risposte” and Stendhal’s “Aucune résistance ne fut opposée,” cited in
“Lezioni su Stendhal” as instances of quasi-miraculous understatement.

The many pages devoted in chapter 4 to Chevalley’s visit to Donnafugata and those that follow Tancredi and Angelica in their voyage of erotic discovery through the maze of used and abandoned apartments of the palace—these pages have diverted all critical attention from the rest of the chapter. The public themes of the historical novel, which reach their acme in the long monologue in which the prince rejects the Piedmontese envoy’s invitation to participate in the new government of united Italy by becoming a member of its senate, and the love theme of the romance, whose high point of optimistic life-affirmation is placed in the hortus conclusus of a magic place where time stands still, have overshadowed other aspects of the story being told. The chapter, which takes place only one month after the preceding one, shows the situation that has crystallized after Angelica’s engagement to Tancredi. Remorseful over his abandonment of Concetta, Tancredi brings a young fellow officer, the Lombard Cavriaghi, on a visit to Donnafugata: he hopes that Concetta may follow his own example and let self-interest and common sense rule her heart. But Concetta is deaf to Cavriaghi’s wooing: “she looked at the sentimental little count with icy eyes, in whose depths one could even read a bit of contempt” (p. 195).

It is no surprise then to find Concetta again in chapter 7, unmarried and forty. Already on the way toward assuming the position of leadership in the family (“hegemony,” Lampedusa calls it not without a touch of irony), a position which will later earn her the nickname of “La Grande Catherine” from one of her nephews (p. 304), it is she who has accompanied her father to consult a specialist in Naples and it is she who insists that a priest be called to his deathbed. In the prince’s balance sheet of his life, in which the “happy moments” are no more than “golden specks” on “the immense ash-heap of liabilities” (p. 294), Concetta figures as having provided him with the satisfaction of having one day discovered her beauty and character to be those of “a true Salina” (p. 296). But with another deft, almost imperceptible touch, Lampedusa notes what it cost her to be a true Salina: she is the only one of those gathered at the prince’s bedside—his son Francesco Paolo, his daughter Carolina, Tancredi, and Fabrizietto, but not Angelica—who does not weep (p. 297). It is a step in that process of petrification of feeling that had begun with the repeated numbing “transitions from a secret, warm world to an open, frozen one” (p. 175) and that had made it possible for her to live with the pain of the double betrayal of her father and Tancredi.
Thus chapter 8, which has been judged by most critics as the application of an unimaginative and overworked device for finishing off the novel by calling attention to its cyclical aspect, is the celebration of that member of the Salina family who has been most obviously sacrificed to the inexorable laws of historical development which, according to sound naturalistic doctrine, entrust the future to the "fittest." Beside the prince, oversize protagonist whose physical presence and philosophical reflections fill the pages until his death, Lampedusa has placed a quiet, cruelly overshadowed figure whose inner life actually explodes in the space he has created around her. The final chapter recapitulates her story, as Senator Tassoni unwittingly brings her a message from the long-since-dead Tancredi, "transmitted across that morass of time the dead can so rarely ford" (p. 317). And together with the recapitulation comes also the interpretation: in rapid succession, insights born of depth psychology show Concetta that "there had been no enemies, but one single adversary, herself" (p. 320). Throughout, Lampedusa's sympathy, which in the course of the novel had so often been on the prince's side, is unmistakably on Concetta's: hers is the story of "the desperate" (p. 320). That she may not be every reader's idea of a "heroine" is quite another matter: neither Lucia in I promessi sposi nor Mena in I Malavoglia, the other two great understated heroines of Italian literature, has had a particularly good press.

At the end of "Lezioni su Stendhal" Lampedusa turns for a last time to a comparative evaluation of Stendhal's two masterpieces. He remarks wryly that his listeners were troubled by his having at one time singled out Le Rouge et le noir for the highest praise, while he had more recently assigned that place of preeminence to La Chartreuse: "it is true that I changed my mind. My irrepressible historiographical tendencies had misled me; as an aesthetic document of an historical period Le Rouge et le noir is of greater merit. From a lyrical, artistic, and human point of view it is La Chartreuse that excels" (p. 49). These two aspects of the type of novel with which Lampedusa was concerned, aspects which find their separate and equal embodiment in his view of Stendhal's two masterpieces, are the inseparable poles around which his own Il gattopardo finds its unity.
NOTES


2. Louis Aragon, “Le Guépard et la Chartreuse,” Les Lettres françaises, 18-24 February 1960, pp. 1 and 8. Aragon read “Lezioni su Stendhal” in the selective translation that appeared in Stendhal Club, 2, no. 6 (January 1960), 155-68, as “Notes sur Stendhal.” The French translation is divided into two parts. The first part, “Le Rouge et le noir,” starts with page 27 of the original Paragone article and omits the long theoretical digression (pp. 27-29) in which Lampedusa broadens the discussion of narrative time by referring to other novels, War and Peace and Anna Karenina especially. The translation resumes on page 29 with the passage analyzing Stendhal’s treatment of time in Le Rouge et le noir; occasional brief omissions up to page 36 are indicated in the customary fashion. The second part in Stendhal Club, “La Chartreuse de Parme,” covers pp. 38-44 of the original, omitting a number of remarks the unidentified translator must have deemed irrelevant to the discussion of Stendhal. As is to be expected, these are often the very remarks most valuable for an understanding of Lampedusa’s intentions in his own novel.

3. Louis Aragon, “Il Gattopardo e la Certosa,” Rinascita, 17, no. 3 (March 1960), 223-26. It is not my purpose here to discuss the official opinion of the Italian Communist Party with respect to // gattopardo, and I am therefore making no mention of other articles that appeared in Rinascita.

4. Ivos Margoni, “Il gattopardo in Francia,” Belfagor, 17, no. 3 (March 1960), 531-43. Other articles appearing in Belfagor were Luigi Blasucci’s review of Il gattopardo, 14, no. 1 (January 1959), 117-21; Luigi Russo’s “Analisi del Gattopardo,” 15, no. 5 (September 1960), 513-30, and his “I luoghi del Gattopardo,” 16, no. 1 (January 1961), 90; and the review article by Giuseppe Stammati, “Gattopardeschi e no,” 15, no. 2 (March 1960), 160-70. More recently, again in the pages of Belfagor, Gaetano Trombatore took his cue from the novel for his “Considerazioni sulla narrativa siciliana,” 9, no. 1 (January 1965), 1-10; and Gualtiero Todini contributed a good summary of Lampedusa’s total production, with discriminating assessments of the criticism to which it has given rise, “Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa,” 25, no. 2 (March 1970), 163-84.

5. Aragon, “Le Guépard et la Chartreuse,” p. 1. The three names were mentioned by Lampedusa himself in one of the passages that appeared in Stendhal Club.

6. Aragon had stated this view in an earlier article, “Un Grand Fauve se lève: Le Guépard,” Les Lettres françaises, 17-23 December 1959, where he wrote: “Un livre n’est pas achevé par son auteur, il l’est par le lecteur, par la philosophie du lecteur. Voilà pourquoi je m’étonne qu’on ne semble pas comprendre que Le Guépard étant un fait, il s’agit de savoir l’interpréter, selon ce qu’on pense, et non selon ce qu’en penserait l’agnosticisme sicilien, ou même une certaine dégénérescence de la pensée critique, fort caractéristique d’un déclin de classe, qui n’est plus celui de l’aristocratie. . . . Ils ont vaincu, ces garibaldiens. Le ‘cocu’ n’aura pas été Garibaldi. Le victoire des ‘Piémontais’ n’aura pas été une occupation comme une autre mais l’unité italienne. Le mouvement de l’histoire s’est emparé de la Sicilie au point d’effondrer les plafonds des Ponteleone avec une bombe américaine . . . . Le sens que prendra l’œuvre de Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa ne saurait être que celui de l’histoire. Les individus peuvent bien être agnostique, l’œuvre de leurs mains et de leur
cœur leur échappe, elle entre dans le grand brasement des choses réelles, s’y inscrit, devient objet de connaissance. Et Le Guépard ne dira pas à l’avenir l’immobilisme sicilien, mais le mouvement des hommes que, comme don Fabrice, Giuseppe Tomasi saluait, à sa façon, et peut-être et certainement au-delà de ce qu’un don Fabrice a pu voir.”

7. To understand the analogy it is necessary to quote Lampedusa (“Lezioni su Stendhal,” pp. 39-40) more fully: “tutti noi conosciamo ed amiamo il Purgatorio dantesco. Quanti di noi però hanno riflettuto che esso rappresenta un luogo di pena, che in esso le anime soffrono dei tormenti paragonabili a quelli infernali? Ogni lettore, credo, voglio sperare, giunge all’ultimo canto con l’impressione di aver attraversato una regione di pacata serenità, sempre illuminata da un benigno sole. Così non è, liste dei tormenti alla mano. Così è per la maggior parte dei lettori, in virtù dell’arte di Dante. So benissimo che Ernesto IV è un immondo personaggio, delineato ricalcando le figure di Francesco di Modena, di Francesco II d’Austria e del giovane Carlo-Alberto; so che di ‘fiscali Rassi’ la terra (e l’inferno) sono pieni, so che la Torre di Parma è un luogo di supplizio degno del Piranesi e del resto desunta tanto dalla realtà di Rubiera che dalle narrazioni di Pellico e Maroncelli circa lo Spielberg, mi rendo conto che il conte Mosca è un perfetto ritratto di quei ministri e ministrucoli, assolutamente egoisti e privi di scrupoli, copia ridotta e peggiorata del loro grande modello Metternich, mi accorgo di quanti tradimenti, pastille avvelenate e colpi di pugnale è tessuta la trama del romanzo; dirò di più, so benissimo che Stendhal voleva indignare il lettore contro tali uomini e tali metodi. Lo so, ma affermo che non me ne importa niente; in quanto a me, Stendhal ha fallito il colpo: voleva dipingere l’Inferno, ha creato il più adorabile Purgatorio dantesco” (italics mine).

8. Aragon, “Le Guépard et la Chartreuse,” p. 8. Note especially the passage italicized in note 7 above, which shows Lampedusa’s awareness of the two levels of latent involvement and overt statement in La Chartreuse de Parme: the society Stendhal describes is the object both of his reprehension and of his nostalgia, though obviously not for the same reasons. It is also amusing to note Aragon’s brand of widespread rhetoric: “une critique impitoyable” can only be “une critique de gauche”!

su Stendhal, in cui par lecito intravvedere, per trasparenti allusioni, un suggerimento e una guida alla lettura del Gattopardo.”


12. In resuming publication after the war, the Almanacco letterario Bompiani devoted a section of its 1959 number to “Le punte dell’avanguardia” (pp. 261-74). This included brief articles on the Italian experimentalists, the French “nouveau roman,” German literature in the “year zero,” the British “angry men,” American “hipsters,” and electronic music. The section was separate from and in addition to the usual annual reports on literary and artistic developments in different European countries. Since the Almanacco Bompiani for any given year is issued in the last months of the preceding year, its attention to “nouveau roman” preceded Il Verri’s and it should be given this credit.


15. Barilli’s “Cahier de doléances” is now included in his La barriera del naturalismo (Milan, 1964).

16. For Barilli’s position see also his “Le struttore del romanzo,” in Gruppo 63 (Milan, 1964). By and large, Angelo Guglielmi shares Barilli’s views: see “Avanguardia e sperimentalismo,” in Gruppo 63; now also in Avanguardia e sperimentalismo (Milan, 1964).

17. Edoardo Sanguineti’s Capriccio italiano (Milan, 1963) was the experimental novel that created the greatest furor in Italy. Raefsaale La Capria’s Ferito a morte (Milan, 1961), which could well be called an experimental novel in the same sense, precedes the days of nouveau roman. For other experimental narrators, see the Gruppo 63 anthology and Vent’anni d’impazienza: Antologia della narrativa italiana dal ’46 ad oggi, ed. Angelo Guglielmi (Milan, 1965), which latter provides a historical overview. For a statement regarding the problem of Italian literature “catching up” with the great European innovators of the early part of the century, see Barilli’s “Le struttore del romanzo.” A word should perhaps also be said about the earlier group of essentially linguistic experimenters (P. P. Pasolini and his collaborators in the periodical Officina), but inasmuch as they belong to a different moment in the development of the new avant-garde, their relation to the Gattopardo polemic would require separate treatment. On some of these points, see my own “Gadda, Pasolini, and Experimentalism: Form or Ideology?” in From Verismo to Experimentalism, ed. Sergio Pacifici (Bloomington, Ind., 1969), pp. 239-69.

18. A good part of the novel’s initial success must be attributed to the circumstances of its publication. As the posthumous work of an unknown writer, it had a very special appeal for the popular imagination catered to by mass publications such as the illustrated weeklies. For a sketch of the critical reception,
see Felcini's "Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa" (note 9 above), pp. 261-64.

19. Reflection on the essence of Bassani's own work would indicate that it was not commercialism that prompted his evaluation of Il gattopardo.

20. Leone Piccioni, La narrativa italiana tra romanzo e racconti (Milan, 1959), pp. 132-34; the essay is now part of Piccioni's Pazienza e impazienza (Florence, 1968). The "in-depth" as opposed to "chronology of events" characterization of Lampedusa's storytelling technique has received important corroboration in David's seminal work, La psicoanalisi nella cultura italiana (note 9 above), though from a psychological rather than "formal" point of view.


22. In his anthology, Letteratura dell'Italia unita, 1861-1968 (Florence, 1968), Gianfranco Contini with considerable acumen placed Lampedusa among the "Solariani," the writers most closely associated with the literary ideals of the review Solaria (1926-1936). In thus removing Il gattopardo from the cultural contexts of the period in which it was published and returning it to the time of its conception, Contini emphasizes the Proustian elements of the novel: psychological analysis, memory, "le temps retrouvé." In this sense the publication of the book in 1958 was anachronistic because it came too late.

23. I have been unable to see Pietro Citati's review in Il punto, 24 January 1959. According to Barilli (La barriera a del naturalismo, p. 203), Citati sees in Lampedusa a Proustian writer, "a keen connoisseur of twentieth-century techniques." Barilli himself discounts the importance of technical devices in Il gattopardo, although he does note (p. 209) the presence of certain "modern" features: introspective analysis, the casual treatment of time, cynical and ironic commentary. Instead, he emphasizes the regionalistic aspects of the novel which he sees as a kind of continuation of Il vicerè. For a very brief indication on Proust as against De Roberto in the formation of Lampedusa, see Arnaldo Bocelli, "Tomasi di Lampedusa," Enciclopedìa italiana, appendix III (1961).


25. Francesco Orlando, Ricordo di Lampedusa (Milan, 1963), p. 57. Orlando mentions one exception, Georges Poulet's La Distance intérieure (Paris, 1952). Everything we know of Lampedusa's cultural formation tends to prove Orlando wrong on this point. But what does he actually mean by "after Croce"? Many of the works with which Lampedusa was acquainted did indeed find their way to Italy only "after Croce," but Lampedusa's range was cosmopolitan, not limited by what was available in Italian translation only.

26. One of the earliest presentations of the "craft of fiction" to the Italian reading public that I know of was made by Remo Ceserani in Almanacco letterario Bompiani, 1966. In an article bearing the deceptive title "Manuali americani sulla narrativa," Ceserani reviewed specialized works on fiction, scholarly periodicals, and textbooks, using them to illustrate the theoretical premises of the vast bulk of American fiction written in the first half of the
twentieth century. If we were to inquire why Italian interest in this area of criticism was so late in developing, we would have to point to Croce's opposition to the concept of literary genre in criticism, and more inclusively to the idealistic and romantic devaluation of technique in art; on this last point specifically, see Marina Forni Mizzau, *Tecniche narrative e romanzo contemporaneo* (Milan, 1965). While Croce was both a "close" reader and a defender of "pure" poetry, he shied away from the rhetorical kind of criticism that had such an important role in discussions of the novel in Anglo-Saxon countries. However, when the history of Italian theories of the novel is someday written, much significant and unexpected material will come to light. As far as the period between the two wars is concerned—seminal years for the contemporary Italian novel—it is sufficient to turn from academic to what was once called "militant" criticism, or from Croce and the Croceans to a "cultural free lancer" (the epithet is Montale's) such as Giacomo Debenedetti, to enter into a radically different formative environment. In contrast to the vast majority of the critics of his time, Debenedetti had a very strong interest in the novel, so much so that in the latter part of his life, when he had turned to university teaching, he devoted six courses to the twentieth-century novel. His lecture notes are now available in Giacomo Debenedetti, *Il romanzo del Novecento* (Milan, 1971). For an analysis of Debenedetti's literary activities, see Francesco Mattesini, *La critica letteraria di Giacomo Debenedetti* (Milan, 1969). There are some interesting observations in David's *La psicoanalisi nella letteratura italiana*, pp. 322-25 especially, although David is concerned primarily with the Freudian component of Debenedetti's culture. On *Il romanzo del Novecento* and on the related collection of essays, *Il personaggio uomo* (Milan, 1970), see Marco Forti, "Debenedetti postumo 'in valuta oro,' " *Paragone*, April 1971, pp. 82-93. For a good rapid survey of the situation of narrative literature in Italy in the twentieth century, see Valerio Volpini, *Prosa e narrativa dei contemporanei dalla "Voce" all'Avanguardia* (Rome, 1967).

27. Henry James is of course not unknown in Italy. Only recently, however, has there been any interest in him as a critic and theorist and this interest is strictly limited to academic circles. Agostino Lombardo, founder in 1955 of the journal *Studi americani*, translated and introduced James's prefaces to his novels, *Le prefazioni* (Venice, 1956), a collection first gathered together by R. P. Blackmur in the anthology, *The Art of the Novel* (1947). Lombardo also published *L'arte del romanzo* (Milan, 1959), James's critical essays on other writers. In reviewing *Le prefazioni in Il mondo* (18 September 1956), Salvatore Rosati, another Anglicist, regretted that in his preface Lombardo had not gone deeper into an evaluation of the contemporary significance of James, but concluded that his essay was "tra quanto di più compiuto, penetrante, e impegnativo si è scritto in Italia sul grande romanziere americano." In order to reconstruct James's reputation in Italy, a series of articles written by Emilio Cecchi for *La tribuna* in 1921 and 1922 is of fundamental importance; some of these articles have since been published in Cecchi's *Scrittori inglesi e americani*, 2 vols. (Milan, 1962 and 1964) and his *Aiuola di Francia* (Milan, 1969). In considering the failure of Italian critics to evaluate Proust properly, for instance, Cecchi at one point writes: "la gran questione è che l'Italia, rispetto alla conoscenza degli scrittori stranieri si divide essenzialmente in due tribù: la tribù, poco numerosa, degli entusiasti, degli eterni catecumeni, sempre a bocca aperta aspettando che ci caschi dentro qualcosa; e costoro si
arrabbian come maladetti [sic], se vi azzardate ad avvertirli che invece di un
fico hanno inghiottito una buccia, o anche peggio; 2a la tribù degli ignoranti:
e naturalmente comprende i critici più numerosi, i quali si accorreranno di
Proust, o di Meredith, o di James, sì e no fra trent'anni" ("Libri nuovi e usati,"
La tribuna, 7 July 1922). But if we look closer at exactly what Cecchi felt
that Italian critics ignored, we find that he is not concerned with James the
theoretician of the novel but with James the psychological analyst: "Ma era
stato dato all'uomo interno un écorché più crudo ed esasperante" (10 Novem-
ber 1922). In placing Proust within the tradition of narrative literature, Cecchi
suggested a historical perspective that transcends linguistic and national
barriers: because Meredith and James were virtually unknown to French as
well as to Italian readers, says Cecchi, a huge gap seemed to exist between the
last group of great French novelists (Balzac, Flaubert, the Goncourt) and
Proust. This gap, Cecchi insists, was filled by the work of Meredith and, above
all, James. But again, it is the "esperienze psicologiche e stilistiche ehe appunto
s'intendono sotto i nomi d'un Meredith e d'un James" that Cecchi has in mind,
and not those other techniques that "Lezioni su Stendhal" shows Lampedusa
to have been acquainted with. One final fact may be referred to as emblematic
of the situation: E. M. Forster's Aspects of the Novel was not translated into
Italian until 1963, as Aspetti del romanzo (Milan) and with an unsigned preface
by none other than Debenedetti.

28. Note 22 above shows how the publication of Il gattopardo in 1958 was
anachronistic in the sense that it came too late; note 26, instead, shows how
it was anachronistic because it came too early. For a good statement of the
equivocations and ambiguities that accompanied the publication, see Furio
Felcini's "Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa" (note 9 above), pp. 252-53, and
his "Dieci anni del Gattopardo: Bilancio e prospettive," Cultura e scuola, 25
(1968), 55-66.

29. Lampedusa, "Lezioni su Stendhal," p. 4. For the sake of continuity in
my exposition I have translated all quotations, but because of Lampedusa's
exceptionally vivid lexical choices, I have sometimes included the original
Italian expression.

30. Readers of Manzoni are well acquainted with the expression of that
sentiment and with his repeated efforts to find a narrative form (history? the
historical tragedy? the historical novel? ) in which the inner life of historical
personages can be expressed. In the Discorso storico sopra alcuni punti della
storia longobardica (1822), which belongs to the most important period of his
activity, for instance, he writes: "Un'immensa moltitudine d'uomini, una serie
di generazioni, ehe passa sulla terra, inosservata, senza lasciarci traccia, è un
tristo ma importante fenómeno" (end of ch. 2). The various stages of the
introduction to I promessi sposi offer further documentation on this point. As
far as Lampedusa himself is concerned, he writes in "I luoghi della mia prima
infanzia" (Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa, Racconti, Milan, 1961, p. 104)
that all men should be required at a certain point in their lives to write their
memoirs: "il materiale che si sarebbe accumolato dopre o quattro genera-
zioni avrebbe un valore inestimabile: molti problemi psicologici e storici che
assillano l'umanità sarebbero risolti. Non esistono memorie, per quanto scritte
da personaggi insignificanti, che non racchiudano valori sociali e pittoreschi
di prim'ordine."

31. Jean Prévost, La Création chez Stendhal: Essai sur le métier d'écrire et
Prevost distinguishes between two classes of writers (p. 23): "Du point de vue de la technique, on peut distinguer les prosateurs, surtout les romanciers, en deux grandes classes. Les uns se consacrent en artisans à leurs œuvres, se sacrifient à elles, tâchent que cette œuvre vaille mieux qu'eux, la mettent au-dessus d'eux par des recommen-ements acharnés. Les autres, au lieu de travailler sans cesse leurs manuscrits, travaillent sur eux-mêmes, raturent le vif, s'affinent par la culture et par l'expérience, s'exercent à tous propos, fût-ce par des badinages ou par des œuvres inégaless, et deviennent enfin capables d'improviser. Chacune de leurs pages, fût-elle dictée en quelques minutes et échappée de leurs mains sans ratures, peut résumer autant de travail que la page de l'artisan minutieux; mais c'est un travail plus lointain. Le Voltaire de Ferney, Stendhal, Gobineau, Gérard de Nerval sont des exemples de cette sorte d'hommes, qui peuvent exprimer en quelques pages écrites à la diable les longs progrès et les affinements de leur esprit." Lampedusa's admiration for Prévost is unqualified: "E necessario leggere (quando si sia conosciuta l'intera opera di Stendhal) il magnifico libro di Prévost" (p. 10), but a careful comparison of Lampedusa's and Prévost's formulations of similar ideas convinces me that Lampedusa is not paraphrasing Prévost but is either taking Prévost as a point of departure for some of his own observations or, more probably, has found corroboration in Prévost for some of his own intuitions about Stendhal. This can be seen, for instance, in the passage on the manner of suggesting milieu (see note 38 below), which echoes Prévost's observations on description in Stendhal (p. 257). Lampedusa's debt to Prévost would deserve further study.

32. On Henri Brulard, which he reread in 1955, Lampedusa writes: "Vi è una immediatezza di sensazioni, una evidente sincerità, un ammirevole sforzo per spazzar via gli strati successivi dei ricordi e giungere al fondo. E quale lucidità di stile! E quale ammasso di impressioni tanto più comuni! Vorrei cercare di fare lo stesso" ("I luoghi della mia prima infanzia" [note 30 above], p. 103; italics mine). Attention to this passage is also called by Felcini ("Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa," p. 255), whose use of the minor works to throw light on Il gattopardo is extremely successful.


34. On this point see the perceptive remarks of David, La psicoanalisi nella letteratura italiana, p. 541.

35. Jeffrey Meyers, "The Influence of the Chartreuse de Parme on Il gatto- pardo," Italica, 44 (1967), 314-25. Meyers finds the influence in the theme of the evasion from reality through reverie, the significance of astronomy, the meaning of the prison cell and the observatory, the feeling of the futility of political strife, and the scenes of the audience with the Bourbon king that re- call a similar scene with the prince of Parma. Meyers' is a dreary academic exercise, and a good comparison of the two novels remains to be done.

36. Lampedusa uses the image of taking a clock apart to describe the type of analysis to which he is subjecting Stendhal: "E come smontare un orologio: osservando nel loro giusto ordine le mollette, le ruote dentate, gli scatti, le viti e i perni vi renderete conto di come avvenga il movimento. Potrete anche provarvi a rimontare l'orologio e questo si metterà a camminare se . . . se avrete un vostro tempo da far segnare alle lancette. Questa però è una condizione che nessuno potrà aiutarvi ad adempiere. O c'è o non c'è" ("Lezioni su Stendhal," p. 27). The metaphor describes to perfection Lampedusa's critical self-awareness:
his analysis of narrative technique will be vindicated when he finds his own "time" to tell.

37. However, Lampedusa's reading of *La Chartreuse* (see especially p. 42) shows how form can point up ideology.

38. Lampedusa emphasizes the importance of "men, institutions, and customs" rather than "landscapes and buildings" for defining milieu but finds it difficult to identify the specific techniques used by Stendhal: "Stendhal non dispone della minuzia necessaria a descrivere edifici e mobili con la meticolosità da regista cinematografico dalla quale talvolta Balzac ha saputo estrarre grandiosi effetti poetici. Però questi mobili e questi edifici egli li suggerisce, non so davvero come, nella maggior parte dei casi; quando Julien penetra nella camera di M. me de Rénal alla sua uscita dal seminario, il senso di oscurità, di afa, di rinchiuso e di cattivo odore è reso inequivocabilmente, come, però, non lo so" (p. 32). There seems to be some confusion, perhaps of a semantic nature or the result of compression, in Lampedusa's discussion of milieu. Anyway, it seems to be no accident that the French translator of the passage for *Stendhal Club* substituted the word "atmosphère" for the "ambiente" of the original, rather than use "milieu."

39. A reminiscence and restatement of Flaubert's famous words "L'auteur, dans son œuvre, doit être comme Dieu dans l'univers, présent partout et visible nulle part"; see the *Correspondance* (Paris, 1922), I, 486. It is interesting to note that Lampedusa uses the word "onniveggenza" to express the idea of omniscience, thus underlining the "seeing" in "knowing."

40. On the collaboration between author, protagonist, and reader, see also Lampedusa's remark on Stendhal's first use in *Rome, Naples, et Florence* of the technique to achieve it ("Lezioni su Stendhal," p. 19).

41. For an excellent stylistic analysis of *Il gattopardo*, one that shows how Lampedusa himself used words exactly to this end, see Salvestroni's "La struttura e lo stile del Gattopardo" (note 9 above), pp. 227-37.

42. The distinction between the concepts of stream of consciousness and interior monologue (the first a fairly recent manner of psychological interpretation, the second an old literary technique for rendering the content of the psyche) is now rather well established. However, confusion in terminology persists, and it is because of this confusion that Lampedusa makes a connection between Stendhal, Proust, Joyce, and Virginia Woolf on this point. Again, a consideration of the situation of Italian criticism in the area of the novel is relevant here: Debenedetti, for instance, discusses the concepts of stream of consciousness and interior monologue at length (*Il romanzo del Novecento* [note 26 above], pp. 594-616), basing himself on Wellek and Warren's *Theory of Literature*, which was translated into Italian in 1956.

43. The three articles, which appeared in the Genoese review *Le opere e i giorni*, are on Paul Morand, W. B. Yeats, and Julius Caesar. See Giuseppe Quattriglio, "Le radici del Gattopardo," *Giornale di Sicilia* (Palermo), 2 April 1970.

44. Lampedusa's literary activities, this time in the form of "lessons" on English literature from the Anglo-Saxon period to T. S. Eliot and Christopher Frye, had actually begun even before his visit to San Pellegrino Terme. In the French series of "lessons" Bassani reports having seen notes on Mérimée and Flaubert in addition to those on Stendhal.

45. "Siamo tutti Siciliani," *Giornale di Sicilia*, 13 January 1970. The article,


47. "Siamo tutti siciliani."


49. This was the edition referred to in note 19 above. Hereafter cited simply as *Il gattopardo (completo).*

50. Lanza Tomasi mentions "thousands" of divergences, mostly irrelevant or of minor importance: the use of "Don Fabrizio" for "Il Principe," inversions in word order, omissions of occasional parenthetical or redundant expressions, the alternating use of capitals and small letters in titles such as "Don Fabrizio" and "don Calogero," adjustments in figures or distances for greater precision, elimination of an occasional word borrowed from some technical jargon, a different criterion for punctuation (Lampedusa favored the use of semicolons to separate independent sentences that are all part of the same thought unit, and he used commas to mark pauses rather than to set off logical and grammatical units). The two more substantial changes consist of omissions in the description of the bathing room at Donnafugata and of additions to the enumeration of the furnishings of the "torture" apartment in chapter 4.

51. Bassani, introd., *Il gattopardo* (see note 24 above), p. 11. Henceforth all page references to this first edition will be cited in the text, the translations being the present writer's.


53. Early readers were not a little intrigued by the report that Lampedusa wrote the book at his club in Palermo, the Circolo Bellini, to which he would go with clocklike regularity every day early in the morning and remain there until three in the afternoon.

54. What was not part of the original scheme, aside from the three Donnafugata chapters, were chapters 5 and 6.

55. The chapter at the ball, too, is in the 1957 manuscript, although Bassani actually received it separately from the princess to add to the 1956 typescript he had. This chronological detail regarding its provenance may have influenced Bassani in his judgment of its inferiority to the rest of the book.

56. It is important to note that the original conception already included a section devoted to the time after the prince's death.

57. The only other places in the novel where the prince does not occupy center stage are in the Angelica/Tancredi "love cyclone" of chapter 4 (also criticized by some for being tangential), and in chapter 8.

58. Lanza Tomasi, introd., *Il gattopardo (completo),* pp. xii-xiii. Orlando's *Ricordo di Lampedusa* (note 25 above), pp. 46-58, contains an illuminating discussion of Lampedusa's understanding of *explicit* as against implicit or *understated* art, and of "fat" as against "thin" writers. Paradoxically, the very implicitness or allusiveness Lampedusa strove for is found irritatingly obvious, "slick," and "trivial" by Andor Gomme in his "Irony and The Leopard," *Oxford Review,* no. 6 (1967), pp. 23-35.

59. "Lezioni su Stendhal," p. 51. I have gone back to the original source for the quotation, which appears in an inexplicably garbled version in Salvestroni's "La struttura e lo stile del *Gattopardo*" (note 9 above), p. 218.
The reason I feel justified in making this statement is that Lanza Tomasi's comment on the explicitness of chapter 5 concerns, strictly speaking, only "the apology of an aristocrat made by Father Pirrone to the sleeping herbalist." The chapter, as we have seen, has other dimensions beside the ideological one.

Felcini, "Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa" (note 9 above), p. 251.

Among the themes that link chapters 1 and 8, the religious one, concretized in customs of worship within the family setting, is particularly strong. Tightly interwoven with it is the theme of the decadence of taste, again concretized, this time in the art objects that surround the scenes of worship: the pre-Revolutionary mythological figures that decorated the walls, ceiling, and floor in the drawing room of chapter 1 have given way in chapter 8 to a painting of the Tranquillo Cremona school, variously interpreted as representing the Madonna of the Letter or a girl reading a letter from her lover. The relationship between the sacred and the profane persists, but its "objective correlative" is now a typical example of the bourgeois taste of the great age of liberalism.

The process is described by Lampedusa by degrees. It reaches its high point in the sentence: "Her father's portrait was just a few square inches of canvas, the green chests [in which her trousseau had been stored fifty years before] just a few cubic feet of wood" (p. 326).

Between chapter 4 and chapter 6 Concetta appears only once, during the ball. The significant reference to her, underlining the betrayal theme, occurs while the prince is dancing with Angelica: "He felt a twinge at his heart: he was thinking of the proud and defeated eyes of Concetta. But it was a brief pain: at every turn [of the waltz] a year fell from his shoulders" (p. 271).

Her mother had also abandoned Concetta; see pp. 123-24.

It is curious to note that David (La psicoanalisi nella cultura italiana, pp. 539-44), who carefully lists and evaluates Lampedusa's use of the technical vocabulary of psychoanalysis, should have failed to remark the obvious psychoanalytical character of Concetta's gaining of insight.

Since the writing of this essay, Simonetta Salvestroni has published a full-length study on Lampedusa, Tomasi di Lampedusa (Florence, 1973), of which pp. 17-24 deals with the "Lezioni." In an apparent modification of what she thought earlier (see note 9 above), she concludes that in his analysis of Stendhal Lampedusa described the novel he (Lampedusa) would have wanted to write, not the one he succeeded in writing. "It would be an error," she states, "to use these pages as a sure guide to understand all the narrative procedures that appear in Il gattopardo" (p. 20).