

Offprinted from
MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

VOLUME 108, PART 3

JULY 2013

Concordanza del Canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca. By GIUSEPPE SAVOCA and BARTOLO CALDERONE. 2 vols. Florence: Olschki. 2011. xxvi+782 pp. €85. ISBN 978-88-222-6086-4.

One of the earliest applications of computers to the study of literature was the electronically generated concordance, pioneered by Father Roberto Busa's work with IBM on the writings of St Thomas Aquinas, which led to the publication of his vast *Index Thomisticus* in fifty volumes (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1974-80). In those days concordancing software, such as Susan Hockey and Ian Marriott's Oxford Concordance Program, ran on mainframe computers through batch processing, and its outputs, like Father Busa's, were generally in printed form. By greatly facilitating the production of such a long-established scholarly tool, the

electronic concordance not only facilitated a good number of useful publications; it also opened scholars' eyes to the broader possibilities offered by computers for the study of literary, and non-literary, texts. Nowadays, however, the concordancing program and its print outputs have been largely superseded by the development of online interactive resources for textual analysis, more powerful and convenient to use, as well as saving a great deal of paper.

One wonders, therefore, why this new concordance of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* has appeared in printed form, though it is an admirable book in many ways, both on account of the quality of the printing and for much of its content. No doubt at least part of the reason is that it comes as the latest in a long series of printed concordances from the same publisher going back as far as 1987; these are mostly of twentieth-century Italian poets, all have Giuseppe Savoca as sole or joint editor, and all were apparently produced (though the present volume says little about the technical details) with the help of concordancing software. At the start of the series print output may still have been the natural choice for this sort of work; now, however, it seems an unduly restricted use of the electronic resources available.

The present volume is the third printed concordance of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, and is distinguished mainly by being based on Savoca's new and mildly controversial 2008 edition of the text, which follows very closely the version that Petrarch himself prepared, the famous Vatican manuscript Vat. Lat. 3195, partly written in Petrarch's own hand, partly in that of his secretary Giovanni Malpaghini. Savoca's edition follows with the 'greatest possible fidelity' (p. xi of the concordance) the spelling and punctuation of the original, using only a bare minimum of normalization—unlike its predecessors, which, following standard Italian editorial practice, normalized the text extensively. The two-volume publication comprises: a methodological introduction; Savoca's edition of the *Canzoniere* without the critical apparatus; word lists in alphabetical order, descending order of frequency, and by part of speech; lists of graphical and phonetic variants and of homographs; statistical information on relative frequencies; and in the second volume the concordance itself. This is a substantial piece of work and has involved a great deal more than automatic processing: entries are not simply listed by forms, but have been lemmatized and parsed by part of speech, presumably for the most part manually. As usual one line of context is given, in the order in which it appears in the text, for each occurrence of each entry, with an indication whether the context is in the hand of Petrarch or Malpaghini—useful given the edition's fidelity to the original manuscript. Different forms of the same verb, noun, or adjective are collected together under the lemma in question: *onestà* and *oneste* come under *onesto*. On the other hand, orthographical and phonetic variants appear separately: *honestà*, *honestade*, *honestate*, *onestade*, and *onestate* are all different entries—but it is presumably a mistake (manual no doubt, not electronic) that *honestà* comes under *onesto* in two cases and under *honesto* in the remainder.

All of this is potentially very useful, but it would have been more useful, more convenient to use, and more capable of further development if it had been published electronically, online or on a DVD, rather than in print. It is therefore relevant to

rehearse the benefits that an electronic version of this sort of resource could bring: that is an up-to-date dynamic version, that would allow interactive use. Savoca has listed the contexts under each heading in text order, in itself a perfectly reasonable choice; other users might have preferred to have them sorted by the different forms (*onesta, oneste, onesti, onesto*), or ordered by the immediately preceding or immediately following word, or by the copyist: an interactive resource could allow for all these alternatives. Listing graphical and phonetic variants of the same lemma separately has its justification; again, some users would find it more convenient to view them together. Instead of providing only one line of context for each occurrence of each form, an interactive version could allow the user to link directly to its place in the full text; even more usefully, given the fidelity of Savoca's edition, and Vatican Library permitting, the full text could be linked directly to an image of its manuscript source, as well as to earlier editions. An excellent example of this kind of facility is Prue Shaw's recent DVD of Dante's *Commedia*.

The information gained from these functions could of course be gained, with considerably more effort, by using Savoca's print concordance in conjunction with other printed sources. Where interactive resources bring even greater scholarly benefits is when they link texts with one another, since the kind of information concordances provide becomes a great deal more useful when placed in the context of the same kind of information about other related texts. For instance, a single integrated interactive resource would be vastly more useful than Savoca's series of separate concordances of modern Italian poets. Making Savoca's Petrarch edition part of a similar kind of resource would pose more problems, because of editorial and linguistic differences between the texts that might go into it, but that is the sort of thing that needs to be done if serious scholarly benefits are to be achieved.

As a physical book the present concordance is a beautiful example of traditional publishing. There may not be that many cases where traditional books are best replaced by digital publications; concordances, however, are definitely one of them.