

European Perspectives
A Series in Social Thought and Cultural Criticism

Lawrence D. Kritzman, Editor

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

For a complete list of books in the series, see page 229.

SUBALTERN SOCIAL GROUPS

*A Critical Edition
of Prison Notebook 25*

Antonio Gramsci

*Edited and translated by
Joseph A. Buttigieg and Marcus E. Green*

§<1>. *Davide Lazzaretti*. In an article published by the *Fiera Letteraria* of 26 August 1928, Domenico Bulferetti mentions some elements of Davide Lazzaretti's life and cultural formation.¹ Bibliography: Andrea Verga, *Davide Lazzaretti e la pazzia sensoria* (Milan: Rechiedei, 1880); Cesare Lombroso, *Pazzi ed anomalie*^a (this was the cultural custom of the day: instead of studying the origins of a collective event and the reasons why it was widespread, why it was collective, one isolated the protagonist and limited oneself to producing his pathological biography, all too often using points of departure that were unverified or open to a different interpretation. To a social elite, the components of subaltern groups always have something barbaric or pathological about them). The volume *Storia di David Lazzaretti, Profeta di Arcidosso* was published in Siena in 1905 by one of Lazzaretti's major disciples, the former friar of the order of St. Philip Neri, Filippo Imperiuzzi; other apologetic writings exist but, according to Bulferetti, this is the most noteworthy. The "seminal" work on Lazzaretti, however, is Giacomo Barzellotti's, which in its first and second editions (published by Zanichelli) was titled *Davide Lazzaretti*; it was amplified and partially revised in subsequent editions that were published (by Treves) under the title *Monte Amiata e il suo Profeta*.² In Bulferetti's opinion, Barzellotti maintained that the causes of the Lazzarettist movement were "all particular and attributable solely to the state of mind and the culture of the people over there,"³ stems "partly from his natural affection for beautiful native places (!) and partly from the influence of the theories of Hippolyte Taine."⁴ It is, however, easier to see Barzellotti's book, which has shaped Italian public opinion on Lazzaretti, as nothing more than a manifestation of literary patriotism (for love of country!—as they say) that

^a In the manuscript, Gramsci erroneously recorded the title as *Pazzi e anormali* on the basis of Bulferetti's article.

spawned the efforts to conceal the causes of the general discontent that existed in Italy after 1870 by providing narrow, individual, folkloristic, pathologic, etc., explanations of single explosive incidents. The same thing happened, on a larger scale, with regard to "brigandage" in the South and the islands.

The politicians have not concerned themselves with the fact that the killing of Lazzaretti was savage in its cruelty and coldly premeditated. (Actually, Lazzaretti did not die in combat but was quite simply shot. It would be interesting to know what secret instructions the government sent to the authorities.) Despite the fact that Lazzaretti died exalting the republic (the tendentiously republican nature of the movement, with its potential to spread among the peasantry, must have had a major impact on the government's determination to assassinate its leader), even the Republicans ignored the issue (check and confirm)—maybe, because the republican tendency of the movement was bizarrely mingled with religious and prophetic elements. Nevertheless, this hodgepodge is, precisely, the main distinctive feature of the Lazzaretti incident since it demonstrates its popularity and spontaneity. One must say, moreover, that Lazzaretti's movement was related to the Vatican's *non expedit*⁵ and showed the government the kind of subversive-popular-rudimentary tendency that could arise among the peasantry as a result of clerical political abstentionism; it also showed that, in the absence of normal political parties, the rural masses sought local leaders who arose out of the same masses blending religion and fanaticism with a set of demands that, in basic form, had been brewing in the countryside. Another political factor to bear in mind: the left had been in government for two years⁶ and its rise stirred the people's hopes and expectations that were bound to be frustrated. The fact that the left was in power may also help explain the lukewarm opposition to the criminal murder of a man who could be portrayed as a reactionary, a supporter of the papacy, a clericalist, etc.

Bulferetti observes that Barzellotti did not conduct research on Lazzaretti's cultural formation, even though he refers to it. Otherwise, he would have noticed that an abundance of leaflets, pamphlets, and popular books printed in Milan was reaching even Monte Amiata at that time. (!? How does Bulferetti know this? Besides, anyone familiar with the life of peasants, especially in the old days, knows that "abundance" does not necessarily explain the breadth and depth of a movement.) Lazzaretti was an insatiable reader of these materials, which his occupation as a carter enabled him to procure. Davide was born in Arcidosso on 6 November 1834 and worked in his father's occupation until 1868 when he converted from his blasphemous ways and went into seclusion to do penance in a cave in the Sabine area, where he "saw" the ghost of a warrior who "revealed" himself to be Lazzaretti's ancestral father, Manfredo Pallavicino, the illegitimate son of a French king, etc. A Danish scholar, Dr. Emilio Rasmussen,⁷

discovered that Manfredo Pallavicino is the main character in a historical novel by Giuseppe Rovani titled, precisely, *Manfredo Pallavicino*.⁸ The plot and episodes of the novel are transmitted intact in the "revelation" in the cave, and out of this revelation comes the beginning of Lazzaretti's religious propaganda. Barzellotti, however, had thought that Lazzaretti was influenced by legends from the fourteenth century (the adventures of the Sieneese king, Giannino), and Rasmussen's discovery led him only to insert in the last edition of his book a vague allusion to Lazzaretti's reading—but without mentioning Rasmussen and leaving intact the section of the book devoted to King Giannino. Nevertheless, Barzellotti examines the subsequent development of Lazzaretti's mind, his travels in France, and the influence exercised upon him by the Milanese priest Onorio Taramelli, "a man of fine intelligence and wide learning" who had been arrested in Milan—and, later, escaped to France—for having written against the monarchy. Davide got his republican impulse from Taramelli. Davide's flag was red, with the inscription "The Republic and the Kingdom of God." During the procession in which he was killed, on 18 August 1878, Davide asked his followers whether they wanted the republic. To their loud "yes," he responded: "The republic begins from this time forth in the world, but it will not be the republic of 1848; it will be the kingdom of God, the law of Justice that has succeeded the law of Grace." Davide's response contains some interesting elements that must be connected to his memory of Taramelli's words: his desire to differentiate himself from 1848, which had not left good memories among the peasants of Tuscany, and the distinction between Justice and Grace.

The drama of Lazzaretti must be linked to the "exploits" of the so-called bands of Benevento that occurred around the same time:⁹ the views of the priests and peasants involved in the trial of Malatesta were very similar to those of Lazzaretti's followers, as one can see from the court records. (Cf., for example, Nitti's book on *Socialismo Cattolico*, which refers, appropriately, to the bands of Benevento; check whether it mentions Lazzaretti.)¹⁰ In any case, until now, the drama of Lazzaretti has been examined solely from the point of view of literary impressionism, whereas it deserves a politico-historical analysis.

Giuseppe Fatini, in *Illustrazione Toscana* (cf., *Il Marzocco* of 31 January 1932), draws attention to the Lazzarettism that has survived to this day.¹¹ After Davide's execution by the Carabinieri, people believed that every trace of Lazzarettism had been dispersed once and for all, even on the slopes of Amiata in the province of Grosseto. In fact, however, the Lazzarettists, or Jurisdavidic Christians, as they prefer to call themselves, are still around; for the most part, they are to be found in the village of Zancana, in the municipality of Arcidosso, with some converts scattered in nearby hamlets. The World War gave them a new reason to consolidate their bonds around the memory of Lazzaretti, who, in their view, had

foreseen everything, from the World War to Caporetto,¹² from the victory of the Latin people to the birth of the League of Nations. Every so often, the faithful venture outside their little circle with propaganda pamphlets addressed to the "brothers of the Latin people" that include some of their Master's many previously unpublished writings (some of them poetic) that are jealously guarded by his followers.

But what do the Jurisdavidic Christians want? A person not yet graced by the capacity to penetrate the secret language of the Saints will find it hard to understand the essence of their doctrine. It is a mixture of religious doctrines of the past with a heavy dose of vaguely socialist-sounding maxims and generic references to the moral redemption of man—a redemption that requires a complete renewal of the spirit and of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. The final article (XXIV) of the "Symbol of the Holy Spirit," which constitutes a kind of "Creed" for the Lazzarettists, states that "our founder David Lazzaretti, the anointed of the Lord, judged and condemned by the Roman Curia, is really Christ, Leader and Judge, in the real and living figure of the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ in the world, the Son of Man who has come to bring to completion the abundant Redemption of all mankind by virtue of the third divine law of Justice and general Reform of the Holy Spirit, which will reunite all men in the faith of Christ within the bosom of the Catholic Church in a single point and a single law in confirmation of divine promises."¹³ There was a time, after the war, when the Lazzarettists seemed to be heading down "a dangerous path" but they were able to draw back before it was too late and gave their full support to the victors. What makes the religious phenomenon of the Amiata worthy of attention and study, in Fatini's view, is definitely not the Lazzarettists' disagreements with the Catholic Church—"the sect of papal idolatry"—but, rather, the tenacity with which they defend the Master and Reform.

Cf. Notebook 3, §12, and Notebook 9, §81.

§<2>. *Methodological criteria.* The history of subaltern social groups is necessarily fragmented and episodic. In the historical activity of these groups there is, undoubtedly, a tendency toward unification, albeit in provisional stages, but this tendency is continually interrupted by the initiative of dominant groups and, therefore, can be demonstrated only if a historical cycle completes its course and culminates in success. Subaltern groups are always subject to the initiatives of the dominant groups even when they rebel and rise up; only "permanent" victory breaks their subordination, but not immediately. In fact, even when they seem triumphant, subaltern groups are only in an anxious defensive state (as can be demonstrated by the history of the French Revolution up to, at least,

1830).¹ Every trace of autonomous initiative by subaltern groups, then, should be of inestimable value to the integral historian. This kind of history, therefore, must be handled in the form of monographs and for each monograph one needs to gather an immense quantity of material that is often hard to collect.

Cf. Notebook 3, §14.

§<3>. Adriano Tilgher, *Homo faber*. A history of the concept of labor in Western civilization. Rome: Libreria di Scienze e Lettere, 1929. L. 15.¹

Cf. Notebook 1, §95.

§<4>. *Some general notes on the historical development of subaltern social groups in the Middle Ages and in Rome.* In his essay "Elementi di 'verità' e di 'certezza' nella tradizione storica romana" (included in the volume *Confronti storici*), Ettore Ciccotti makes some references to the historical development of the popular classes in the Italian Communes; these references merit special attention and separate treatment.¹ The wars among the Communes created the need to assemble stronger and bigger military forces, allowing as many people as possible to bear arms. This gave the commoners an awareness of their own power and, at the same time, consolidated their ranks (in other words, it helped stimulate the formation of close-knit, united groups or parties). The fighting men remained united even in peacetime, which enabled them to make their services available and later, as their solidarity intensified, to pursue their own goals as well. We have the statutes of the "Societies of Arms" that were established in Bologna apparently around 1230; the nature of their union and their mode of organization start to become clear. Toward the middle of the thirteenth century there were already twenty-four of them, located in the various city districts where the members lived. Their purpose was not only to perform the political function of defending the Commune against external threats, but also to provide all commoners with the protection they needed from the aggressions of the nobles and the powerful. The chapters of their statutes—for example, those of the Society of Lions, as it was called—have such titles as "De adiutorio dando hominibus dicte societatis..." "Quod molestati iniuste debeant adiuvari ab hominibus dicte societatis." Religious requirements were attached to their civic and social obligations; besides the oath, these included communal attendance at mass and at formal prayers. Other communal obligations, similar to those of the religious confraternities—assisting the poor, burying the dead, etc.—rendered the

union increasingly steadfast and tightly knit. In order to be able to carry out their work, these Societies then created councils and appointed officers—in Bologna, for ex., four or eight "*ministeriales*" modeled on the organizational plan of the Association of Guilds or on the older Commune system, over time their importance extended beyond the confines of the Societies themselves and they became constitutive parts of the Commune.

At first, *milites* joined these societies on an equal footing with the *pedites*—nobles as well as commoners—though in smaller numbers. Little by little, however, the *milites*—i.e., the nobles—tended to set themselves apart as they did in Siena or, in certain circumstances, they were expelled as in Bologna in 1270. As the movement of emancipation gained ground, however, going beyond the boundaries and structures of these Societies, the popular element started demanding and obtaining participation in the major public offices.² Increasingly the people formed themselves into a real political party and in order to improve the efficacy and cohesion of their actions they gave themselves a leader: "the Captain of the people," an office that Siena seems to have derived from Pisa, and that in name as well as function betrays both its military and political origins and purposes. The people who had already, from time to time, armed themselves, gathered together, organized themselves, and having taken up distinct positions of their own, but only sporadically, now started constituting themselves as a separate body that gave itself its own laws. They used their own bell to call meetings: "*cum campana Communis non bene audiatur*."³ They clashed with the Podestà⁴ whose right to make public proclamations they challenged and with whom the Captain of the people stipulated "peaces." When the people failed to obtain the desired reforms from the Commune authorities, they seceded, with the support of prominent individuals from the Commune, and after forming an independent assembly they began to create their own magistracies similar to the general systems of the Commune, to award jurisdiction to the Captain of the people, and to make decisions on their own authority, giving rise (from 1255) to a whole legislative organization. (These data pertain to the Commune of Siena.) The people succeeded, at first in practice and later formally, in forcing the inclusion into the general Statutes of the Commune of provisions that had previously applied only internally to those registered as the "People." The people then came to dominate the Commune, overwhelming the previous dominant class, as they did in Siena after 1270, in Bologna with the *Sacratum* and *Sacratissimi* Codes, in Florence with the "Codes of Justice." (Provenzan Salvani was a nobleman in Siena who placed himself at the head of the people.)

Most of the problems of Roman history pointed out by Ciccotti in his previously cited study (apart from the verification of "personal" episodes,

such as Tanaquil's,⁵ etc.) are related to the experiences and institutions of subaltern social groups (tribune of the plebs,⁶ etc.). The method of "analogy" affirmed and theorized by Ciccotti could therefore produce some "presumptive" results: since subaltern groups lack political autonomy, their "defensive" initiatives are constrained by their own laws of necessity, which are simpler, more limited, and more politically restrictive than the laws of historical necessity that govern and condition the initiatives of the ruling class. Often, subaltern groups are originally of a different race (different religion and different culture) than the dominant groups, and they are often a mixture of different races, as in the case of the slaves. The question of the importance of women in Roman history is similar to the question of the subaltern groups, but up to a certain point; "masculinism" can be compared to class domination only in a certain sense and, therefore, has greater importance for the history of customs than for political and social history.

Another research criterion must be taken into account in order to bring into relief the inherent dangers of the method of historical analogy as a criterion of interpretation: in the ancient and the medieval state, both politico-territorial and social (the one is but a function of the other) centralization was minimal. The state was, in a certain sense, a mechanical bloc of social groups and, often, of different races. Within the ambit of politico-military concentration, which came acutely into play only at certain times, the subaltern groups had their own separate life, their own institutions, etc. The latter sometimes functioned as state institutions, which made the state a federation of social groups with various nonsubordinate roles, so that in times of crisis the phenomenon of "two governments" became extremely conspicuous. The only group excluded from any organized collective life of its own, in the classical world, was that of the slaves (and nonslave proletarians), while in the medieval world it was the proletarians, serfs, and peasants. Nevertheless, even though, in many respects, the slaves of antiquity and medieval proletarians found themselves in similar conditions, their situations were not identical: the uprising by the Ciompi⁷ certainly did not have the same impact that would have been produced by a similar uprising of the slaves in antiquity (Spartacus, who demands to join the government in alliance with the plebs, etc.). Whereas in the Middle Ages it was possible to have an alliance between the proletariat and the people and, even more, proletarian support for the dictatorship of a prince, there was nothing of the sort for the slaves in the classical world. The modern state replaces the mechanical bloc of social groups with their subordination to the active hegemony of the ruling and dominant group, it thus abolishes certain autonomies, which, however, will be reborn in other forms, as parties, trade unions, cultural associations. The dictatorships of our time legally abolish these new forms of

autonomy as well, and try hard to incorporate them into the activity of the state: the legal centralization of the entire life of the nation in the hands of the dominant class becomes "totalitarian."

Cf. Notebook 3, §16 and §18.

§<5>. *Methodological criteria.* The historical unity of the ruling classes is found in the state, and their history is essentially the history of states and groups of states. It would be wrong to think, however, that this unity is merely juridical and political, even though such forms of unity are also important and not just for formal reasons. In concrete terms, the fundamental historical unity stems from the organic relations between the state, or political society, and "civil society." The subaltern classes, by definition, are not—and cannot be—unified until they are able to become a "state": their history, then, is intertwined with the history of civil society, it is a "disjointed" and intermittent function of the history of civil society and, thus, of the history of states or groups of states. One must, therefore, study: (1) the objective formation of the subaltern social groups through the developments and the changes occurring in the sphere of economic production; the extent of their diffusion; and their descent from preexisting social groups whose mentality, ideology, and goals they preserve for a certain period of time; (2) their active or passive adherence to the dominant political formations; their efforts to influence the programs of these formations in order to impose their own demands; and the consequences of these efforts in determining processes of decomposition and renewal, or neoformation; (3) the birth of new parties of the dominant groups to maintain the consent of the subaltern social groups and to keep them under control; (4) the formations created by the subaltern groups themselves to press claims of a limited and partial kind; (5) the new formations that assert the autonomy of the subaltern groups, but within the old framework; (6) the formations that assert complete autonomy, etc.

These phases can be listed in even greater detail, with intermediate phases or combinations of several phases. The historian has to record and account for the line of development toward complete autonomy, starting from the most primitive phases; he must take note of every manifestation of the Sorelian "spirit of cleavage."¹ Therefore, the history of the political parties of subaltern groups is also very complex because it must include all the repercussions of party activities across the entire terrain of subaltern groups as a whole and the repercussions on the attitudes of the dominant group. It must also include the repercussions of the much more effective actions—because they are propped up by the state—of the dominant groups on the subaltern groups and their parties. Among the

subaltern groups there will be one that exercises or tends to exercise a certain hegemony through a party; this must be established by studying the developments of all the other parties as well, insofar as they include elements of this hegemonic group or of the other subaltern groups that are subject to its hegemony. Many criteria of historical research can be constructed by studying the innovative forces that led the national Risorgimento: these forces seized power and joined together in the modern Italian state by struggling against certain other forces and with the help of certain auxiliaries or allies.² To become a state, they had to subordinate or eliminate the former and obtain the active or passive consent of the latter. The study of the development of these innovative forces—from subaltern groups to leading and dominant groups—must, therefore, look for and identify the phases through which they gained autonomy from the enemies they had to defeat, as well as the phases through which they gained the support of the groups that actively or passively assisted them, for this whole process was historically necessary for them to join together and become a state. The level of historical-political consciousness progressively attained by these innovative forces in the various phases is, in fact, measured by both of these yardsticks—and not just by the yardstick of their separation from the previously dominant forces. Usually, the latter is the only criterion employed and the result is a one-sided history or, at times, a failure to understand anything, as in the case of the history of the peninsula since the time of the Communes. The Italian bourgeoisie proved incapable of uniting the people around itself and this was the cause of its defeats and the interruptions in its development. In the Risorgimento, too, this narrow egoism prevented a quick and vigorous revolution like the French one. This is one of the most important problems and serious causes of difficulties in producing the history of subaltern social groups and, hence, the [past] history of states.

Cf. Notebook 3, §90.

§<6>. *The slaves in Rome.* (1) A casual observation by Julius Caesar (*Bello Gallico*, I, 40, 5) reveals that the core group of slaves who joined Spartacus's rebellion consisted of Cimbri prisoners of war; these rebels were wiped out. (Cf. Tenney Frank, *Storia economica di Roma*, Italian trans., Ed. Vallecchi, p. 153.)¹ See, in the same chapter of Frank's book, the observations and conjectures on the different destinies of the slaves of various nationalities and, insofar as they were not destroyed, their likelihood of survival: they either assimilated into or even replaced the indigenous population.

(2) In Rome, slaves could not be recognized as such. When a senator once proposed that the slaves be given a distinctive dress, the Senate defeated

the measure fearing that the slaves might become dangerous if they came to realize their great number. (Cf. Seneca, *De Clem.*, I, 24 and Tacitus, *Annali*, 4, 27.)² In this episode one finds the political-psychological reasons that determine a series of public displays: religious processions, corteges, popular assemblies, different kinds of parades and, to some extent, also elections (the participation by some groups in elections), and plebiscites.

Cf. Notebook 1, §98, §99

§<7>. *Indirect sources. "Utopias" and so-called "philosophical novels."* They have been studied as part of the history of the development of political criticism, but one of the most interesting aspects to consider is their unwitting reflection of the most basic and most profound aspirations of subaltern social groups, including the lowest strata, albeit through the minds of intellectuals governed by different concerns. The body of publications of this kind is enormous, if one also takes into account books of no literary or artistic merit, in other words, if one approaches this as a social phenomenon. Hence, the first question arises: Does the (relatively) mass publication of this kind of literature coincide with distinct historical periods, with the symptoms of profound historical changes? Can one say that this is like a collection of indefinite and generic *cahiers de doléance* of a particular type?¹ It is also noteworthy that that some of this literature expresses the interests of the dominant or deposed groups and has a backward-looking and reactionary character. It would be interesting to compile a list of these books: "utopias" in the strict sense, so-called philosophical novels, books that attribute to distant and little-known, but real, countries particular customs and institutions that are meant to be contrasted with those of one's own country. T. More's *Utopia*, Bacon's *New Atlantis*, Fénelon's *The Island of Delights* and *Salento* (but also the *Telemachus*), Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, etc.² In Italy, the reactionary works to remember include the unfinished pieces by Federico De Roberto³ and by Vittorio Imbriani (*Naufregazia*, fragment of an unpublished novel with a forward by Gino Doria, in *Nuova Antologia*, 1 August 1934).⁴

[2] In his article on "Federico Cesi linceo" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 August 1930, Giuseppe Gabrieli⁵ asserts that there is a historico-ideological connection between the Counter-Reformation (which, according to Gabrieli, opposed the individualism stimulated by Humanism and, unleashed by Protestantism, posited the Roman spirit (!) of collegiality, discipline, corporation, and hierarchy for the reconstruction (!) of society), the Academies (like the Lincei started by Cesi,⁶ that is, the collegial work of scientists, quite different from that of the university centers, which remained medieval in their methods and structures), and the ideas and the boldness

of the great theories, the palingenetic reforms, and the utopian reconstructions of human coexistence (the *Città del Sole*, the *New Atlantis*, etc.).⁷

This connection is too forced, mechanical, one-sided, and superficial. There is a stronger case one can make that the most famous utopias originated in Protestant countries and that, even in the countries of the Counter-Reformation, utopias are rather an expression—the only one possible and in certain forms—of the "modern" spirit that is essentially opposed to the Counter-Reformation. (All of Campanella's work is a document of this "underhanded" effort to undermine the Counter-Reformation from within. Besides, like all restoration, the Counter-Reformation was not a homogenous bloc, but a substantial, if not formal, arrangement between the old and the new.) Utopias are produced by individual intellectuals whose lineage, formally, goes back to the Socratic rationalism of Plato's *Republic*, and who essentially reflect, albeit in a very distorted way, the latent instability and rebelliousness among the large popular masses of the time. They are, in the end, the political manifestos of intellectuals whose goal is to reach the perfect state. We must also take into account the scientific discoveries of the time, as well as scientific rationalism, which starts to emerge, precisely, during the Counter-Reformation. Machiavelli's *Prince*, too, was a sort of utopia (cf. apropos, some notes in another notebook).⁸ One can say that Humanism itself—that is, a certain individualism—was a terrain that favored the rise of utopias and politico-philosophical constructions. With the Counter-Reformation, the Church definitively cut itself off from the "humble" masses in order to serve the "powerful." Through utopias, individual intellectuals sought a solution to a set of problems vitally important to the humble; that is to say, they sought a connection between the intellectuals and the people. They must, therefore, be seen as the earliest historical precursors of the Jacobins and the French Revolution, the event that brought an end to the Counter-Reformation and disseminated the heresy of liberalism that proved much more effective against the Church than the Protestant heresy.

[3] Ezio Chiòrboli's article on Anton Francesco Doni in *Nuova Antologia* of 1 May 1928: a very interesting profile of this publicist, very popular in his time (the sixteenth century), witty, caustic, with a modern attitude.⁹ Doni dealt with innumerable issues of all kinds, anticipating many scientific innovations. In today's terms, his inclinations would be considered (vulgar) materialist. He mentions the importance of the facial angle and the specific signs of criminality two centuries before Camper (Petrus, Dutch, 1722–1789).¹⁰ He discussed the functions of the intellect and the parts of the brain delegated to them two and a half centuries before Lavater (Johann Kaspar, Swiss, born in Zurich, 1741–1801) and Gall (Franz Joseph, German, 1758–1828).¹¹ He wrote a utopia, *Mondo pazzo o savio*¹²—"an imaginative social reconstruction that is painted with many of the iridescences and anxieties that are red-hot in the socialism

of our time"¹³—which he may have derived from More's *Utopia*. He knew More's book; he published it himself in Lando's translation. "Yet, the invention is no longer the same, just as it is not the same as that of Plato in the *Republic*, nor of any other obscure or unknown writer; he made it himself, changed it, refashioned it to his own purposes, so that he has actually given life to something different that is truly his own—and he is so gripped by it that it shows forth here and here in some detail or in some sentiment both in the *Marmi* and, with increasing frequency, in subsequent major and minor writings."¹⁴ For Doni's bibliography, cf. Chiòrboli's edition of *I Marmi* published by Laterza in the "Scrittori d'Italia" series¹⁵ and the Doni anthology in the "Più belle pagine" published by Treves.¹⁶

(4) Shakespeare's *Tempest* (the opposition between Caliban and Prospero, etc.; the utopian nature of Gonzalo's speeches). Cf. Achille Loria, "Pensieri e soggetti economici in Shakespeare" in the *Nuova Antologia* of 1 August 1928, which can be used as a first selection of passages in Shakespeare that deal with sociopolitical issues and as indirect evidence of the way the common people of the time thought. Apropos of *The Tempest*, see Renan's *Caliban* and *L'Eau de Jouvence*.¹⁷

Cf. Notebook 3, §§69, §71, §75 and §113

§<8>. *Scientism and residues of late Romanticism*. One should look at the tendency of leftist sociology in Italy to concern itself intensely with the problem of criminality. Is this linked to the fact that Lombroso joined the leftist trend, as did many of his most "brilliant" followers who, at the time, seemed to be the supreme expression of science, and who exerted influence with all their professional distortions and focus on specific issues?¹ Or is this a residue of the late Romanticism of 1848 (Sue and his novelistic lucubrations on criminal law)?² Or is it that, in Italy, certain intellectual groups were impressed by the large number of bloody crimes and thought that they could not proceed further without first explaining "scientifically" (that is, naturalistically) this "barbaric" phenomenon?

Cf. Notebook 1, §27

FIRST DRAFT NOTES OF NOTEBOOK 25
