
After the volumes dedicated to the writings of Carlo Emilio Gadda (by Paola Italia), Alessandro Manzoni (by Giulia Raboni) and Gabriele D’Annunzio (by Cristina Montagnani and Pierandrea De Lorenzo), the Carocci series “Filologia d’autore”, directed by Simone Albonico, Paola Italia, and Giulia Raboni, is now enriched with a further contribution dedicated to the writings of Francesco Guicciardini. Following the pattern of the previous books of the series, Paola Moreno’s volume traces the writing features of one of the most significant historical voices of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, starting from his library and his manuscripts in order to investigate the entire draft process of Guicciardini’s works as they are progressively shaped by his reflections.

In the first of the book’s six chapters, the reader is introduced to Moreno’s conception of Guicciardini’s writing as a “knowledge tool” (“strumento di conoscenza”) and as a process that matures in the private dimension of his life, itself inflected by his intense political involvement in the Italian Wars. As Moreno observes, “the philologist who has the privilege of having access to these papers observes in vitro the daily exercise of an intellectual research, aiming [. . .] to combine, through the writing process, a need for concreteness and truth with the intrinsic ambiguity and opacity of the reality” (9). From this standpoint, Moreno highlights two “paradoxical aspects” (7) of Guicciardini’s profile: first, the intense conceptual and formal effort he puts into drafting his writings that stands in sharp contrast with his choice not to publish any of his works; and second, the public function of his letters that served as a “vehicle for spreading” (8) his ideas as opposed to the private nature of his works never intended for circulation.

Such writing phenomenology is witnessed in the many materials and manuscripts that are the object of investigation in the book’s second chapter. Here, Moreno introduces the reader to the archive of casa Guicciardini in Florence, whose development Moreno reconstructs diachronically in addition to mapping the materials kept in the Archivio di Stato di Firenze (as is the case of the so called ‘Carte Stroziane’), in several Florentine libraries (Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Biblioteca Moreniana, Bibli-
teca Marucelliana and the Archivio Buonarroti), and in foreign archives (namely in the Académie Royale de Belgique and in the Morgan Library in New York).

Moreno's reconstruction of Guicciardini’s library offers an important avenue into his works and enhances the analysis of his methodology. This reconstruction targets the writers referred to in Guicciardini’s manuscripts, chiefly historians both classical, such as Tito Livio and Giovanni Villani, and contemporary, such as Girolamo Borgia, Paolo Giovio, Andrea Mocenigo, and Bernardo Rucellai, as well as other less prominent writers. Among the many sources identified and glossed by Moreno are Cicero’s *De oratore* and the so called “estratti savonaroliani”, a group of papers that cast light on the evolution of the author’s thought from the *Storie fiorentine* to the *Storia d’Italia*. Such papers are also important witnesses of Guicciardini’s linguistic evolution, seen, for example, in some of his word lists composed under the influence of Bembo’s *Prose della volgar lingua*. Moreno’s analysis of the author’s manuscripts offers a faithful image of Guicciardini’s approach to his sources while also foregrounding the value of archival materials as witnesses to the author’s use of his library and the value of writing as “strumento di fissazione della memoria” (“a tool of memory’s fixation”).

Alongside the many sources whose attribution and identification remain difficult, Guicciardini’s papers contain explicit references to works that are part of what Moreno calls his “mental library” (26). In these cases, Moreno’s analysis of Guicciardini’s sources is carried out through the close study of his manuscripts, most notably the historical texts, his *Ricordi*, but also his *Storia d’Italia*, the autobiographical writings, and the letters, so that a map of Guicciardini’s readings appears to emerge from the author’s own papers. Moreno’s investigation highlights how the sources are reflected in his manuscripts, offering clues to trace the introspective process carried out by the author and allowing us to see his relationship with his sources in greater depth. Indeed, as Guicciardini moves toward the final version of his works, quotes from and references to the texts he read become rare so that the relevant *auctoritates* are evoked rather than inscribed. Guicciardini’s *ars citandi*, clearly outlined in the volume, explains the basis of Guicciardini’s entire historical approach: experience plays a key role in a human life and cannot be separated from the knowledge collected in books and authors from the past. Guicciardini’s manuscripts are the field on which the author reflects on his sources, linking them with his own experience of the world.

Moreno’s analysis focuses on Guicciardini’s creative process and concerns both his writing habits — afterthoughts, deletions and textual integrations — as captured by the documents and the material aspects of the
latter as manifested in the writing contributions of his secretary-scribe. Indeed, specific traces of the collaboration between Guicciardini and his secretary-scribe are observable in the documents encompassing several different textual typologies, including the letters, the dialogues, the *Ricordi*, and the historical writings. After the material and stylistic description of the letters that are part of a wide *corpus*, Moreno focuses on the way the same words reoccur in the letters with different formulations and combinations. Among the most interesting textual aspects observed by Moreno is the elaboration of the letter, whose draft is almost always copied by his secretary-scribe who, in the original version, sets up the layout and adds the closing formula. On each letter-draft Guicciardini includes instructions to his secretary-scribe about the disposition and division of the text, as in the case of the missive sent in 1525 to Cesare Colombo, the representative close to Pope Clement VII who will read it, in which he directs his scribe to keep separate the part of the text addressed only to Colombo. This textual practice reveals the public dimension of the letters — linked in particular to the period from 1526 to 1527, when the historian served as the Pope’s lieutenant — collected in a letterbook that is part of the files of the *Carte di Francesco Guicciardini* and of the *Carte Stroziane*. Furthermore, Moreno points out that certain passages also crop up in the letters with a formulation that seems shared by the different textual typologies and according to a process based on the strong interaction among the author’s works.

The philological framework of this volume is completed by Moreno’s reflection on the writing process of Guicciardini’s main historical works: the *Storie fiorentine*, the *Cose fiorentine* and the *Storia d’Italia*, to which an extensive section of the fourth chapter is dedicated. The evolving changes and amendments to such works — corrections, interventions, references to specific sources — are highlighted in order to show how the manuscript of the *Cose fiorentine*, allegedly written from 1527 to 1530, displays more interventions in comparison to the *Storie fiorentine*, dating to 1508–1509. As Moreno notices, the writing of the *Commentari della luogotenenza*, the first nucleus of the *Storia d’Italia*, further materializes the methodology Guicciardini experimented with in the *Cose fiorentine*. The dynamics of the writing process grow in complexity during the drafting of *Storia d’Italia*, several textual samples of which Moreno analyses. Along with the attempt to define the text, Guicciardini carries on linguistic research that answers to the need of finding a form that reflects the complexity of the reality. Records and notes from the *Prose della volgar lingua* by Pietro Bembo and lists of words testify to the tension between the language proposed by Bembo and that widely recognized by the Florentines.
Come lavorava Guicciardini includes a chapter outlining the editorial stages of the Storia d’Italia’s opening sections. Moreno points out that Guicciardini devoted special attention to the initial sections of his works and that several archival versions of these survive. The first nucleus of Guicciardini’s main historiographical work is identifiable in the Commentari della luogotenenza, followed by a second version that the historian elaborates in seven manuscripts leading to the final draft of the work kept in the MS. Laurenziano Palatino CLXVI. The challenging case study of the work’s incipit is structured in two sections: the description of the manuscripts that presents the drafting of certain passages of the Storia d’Italia (the so-called recension); and the analysis of the thematic nuclei of the preamble. Here Moreno considers two key passages of the incipit elaborated by the author, the first one regarding Italian prosperity before the invasion of the French; and the second one identifiable in the Principium, where the historian explains why he decided to write his work. Finally, through the comparison of three groups of manuscripts, Moreno establishes the deeply intertextual nature of these documents, thus allowing scholars to correctly distinguish and assess variants.

The volume concludes with a chapter focused on a case study in which two different editions of the beginning of the Storia d’Italia are proposed with the aim of showing both microtextual and macrotextual interventions: the first typology follows the criteria of the author’s philology, the second one is a semi-diplomatic edition of the text versions that lead to the final version. Moreno proposes the critical edition of the text, taken from the first manuscript, in which the beginning of the Storia d’Italia is present, followed by the semi-diplomatic editions of the other versions of the text, in order to highlight the signs of the author’s writing process. Such in-depth philological analysis of the work’s preamble is further refined through the digital edition https://guicciardini-storia-italia.huma-num.fr/storia-it.html, developed by an international équipe gathered by Paola Moreno, that significantly improves our knowledge of the text’s genesis and better outlines the evolution and the main turning points in Guicciardini’s thinking.

Within this philological framework, Come lavorava Guicciardini represents an important resource for any scholar who wishes to fully understand Guicciardini’s tortuous writing and creative path and its connections to a complex historical period, of which the Florentine author is one of the most rational interpreters.
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