



arnovit 

ARCHIVIO NOVELLISTICO ITALIANO

Dal Novellino a Basile

1 • 2016



ISSN 2531-5218

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Civitavecchia n. 1076/2016

Direttore responsabile:

Teresa Nocita

Spolia, Via Marina di Campo 19

00054 Fregene (Roma)

© 2016 Tutti i diritti riservati - All rights reserved

Direttore:

Renzo Bragantini

Comitato di Direzione:

Igor Candido (Trinity College Dublin), Maria Cristina Figorilli (Università della Calabria), Roberto Gigliucci (Sapienza, Università di Roma), Elisabetta Menetti (Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia), Teresa Nocita (Università dell'Aquila), Pietro Petteruti Pellegrino (Accademia dell'Arcadia), Pasquale Stoppelli (Sapienza, Università di Roma), Franco Tomasi (Università di Padova).

Coordinamento Editoriale:

Pietro Petteruti Pellegrino.

Comitato di lettura:

Giuliana Adamo (Trinity College)
Zygmunt Baranski (University of Cambridge and University of Notre Dame)
Paolo Cherchi (University of Chicago)
Giorgio Ficara (Università di Torino)
Elsa Filosa (Vanderbilt University, Nashville)
Manuele Gragnolati (Université Paris-Sorbonne [Paris IV])
Bernhard Huss (Freie Universität Berlin)
Andreas Kablitz (Universität zu Köln)
Joachim Küpper (Freie Universität Berlin)
Simone Marchesi (Princeton University)
Michael Papio (University of Massachusetts, Amherst)
Gerhard Regn (LMU München)
James W. Simpson (Harvard University)
H. Wayne Storey (Indiana University, Bloomington)
Susanna Villari (Università di Messina)



Indice

RENZO BRAGANTINI, *Editoriale – Introduction* p. 3

Saggi

IGOR CANDIDO, *Boccaccio sulla via del romanzo. Metamorfosi di un genere tra antico e moderno* p. 8

TERESA NOCITA, *Decameron X 10. Una lettura di Griselda secondo l'autografo hamiltoniano* p. 29

GIOVANNI FERRONI, *L'idea di fortuna nelle Novelle di Molza* p. 48

CARLO ALBERTO GIROTTO, *Novelle, facezie, apoftegmi: ancora sul tessuto narrativo della Seconda libreria di Anton Francesco Doni* p. 68

VICTORIA KIRKHAM, *The First English Translator of Straparola, Masuccio, and Ser Giovanni: William George Waters in his Victorian World* p. 114

Testi

Diavoli, esorcismi e possessioni: una storia inedita del secondo Quattrocento (ms. Antinori 130), a cura di Angela Maria Iacopino p. 165

Archivio

GABRIELE BALDASSARI, *Vicende della fortuna umanistica della novella di Cimone (Decameron V 1). La traduzione di Filippo Beroaldo il Vecchio* p. 223

Note, Discussioni, Rassegne

CHRISTOPHER KLEINHENZ – ELSA FILOSA, *Rassegna critica dell'anno boccacciano (2013)* p. 266



Recensioni e Schede

TESTI E STUDI PER EDIZIONI DI TESTI

GIOVAN FRANCESCO STRAPAROLA, *The Pleasant Nights*, ed. with an introduction by p. 290
D. Beecher, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2012, 2 vols, I, viii + 764 pp.;
II, vi + 665 pp. (MICHAEL PAPIO)

VOLUMI E SAGGI

The Decameron. Third Day in Perspective, eds. Francesco Ciabattoni - Pier p. 299
Massimo Forni, Toronto-Buffalo-London, University of Toronto Press, 2014,
268 pp. (ERMINIA ARDISSINO)

Giovanni Boccaccio in Europa, Studien zu seiner Rezeption in Spätmittelalter p. 304
und Früher Neuzeit, Hrsg. Achim Aurnhammer u. Rainer Stillers, Wiesbaden,
Harrassowitz Verlag, 2014 (ALESSANDRA ORIGGI)



GIOVAN FRANCESCO STRAPAROLA, *The Pleasant Nights*

ed. with an introduction by D. Beecher, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2012, 2 vols, I, viii + 764 pp.; II, vi + 665 pp.

As readers of these pages certainly know already, Giovan Francesco Straparola (ca. 1480 – ca. 1558?) occupies a particular place in the history of *novellistica* on account of his two-volume work, *Le piacevoli notti* (1551 and 1553). Like Basile, he has often been credited with spurring the Renaissance boom in fairy tales, especially those that feature magically produced denouements, and with blazing a fertile trail for subsequent authors such as Charles Perrault and the brothers Wilhelm and Jacob Grimm. The work enjoyed remarkable success; it was reprinted about twenty times in Italian in its first half-century and spread throughout Europe in French, Spanish and German translations. More than a few of his tales have even attained a degree of renown that some may find surprising. The story of Costantino Fortunato and his cat (11.1) gave birth to the malleable tale that is very widely – thanks to Perrault’s rewriting – known as *Puss in Boots*; another (2.1), featuring a prince born as a pig, appears in the Grimms’ story with the title *Hans My Hedgehog* and is partially responsible for the nascent popularity of the *Beauty and the Beast* motif; a third (5.2), which tells the story of Adamantina and the *poavola magica*, is acknowledged for its importance to the story of *The Goose That Laid the Golden Egg*, although, in my personal opinion, the Grimms made no improvements on it whatsoever. There are still others, but we all have our favorites.

Having dispatched the preliminaries essential to the present review, we must step back a bit to gain a full appreciation of Donald Beecher’s contribution to the study of the *Piacevoli notti*. This is because no new discussion of its author can take place, it seems to me, without a brief review of his central role in what has been described elsewhere as a «scholarly slugfest».¹ The critical conflagration began in earnest after Ruth B. Bottigheimer published her 2002 study entitled *Fairy Godfather: Straparola, Venice, and the Fairy Tale Tradition*. Of the arguments she put forward, two seemed to disconcert scholars in particular. The first was her confessedly conjectural reconstruction of Straparola’s biography.² The second derives from her literary typology. Bottigheimer identified one specific type of story that she labeled as the «rise tale» (which «tell[s] of heroes and heroines who began their lives in real poverty, but who achieve riches and attain a throne, catapulted upward by a marriage mediated by magic»)³ and whose invention she attributes exclusively to Straparola.⁴ In themselves, these criteria for the categorization of tales cause no problem at all. The thornier bit stems from what she builds upon them:⁵

The rise tale plot as Straparola envisaged it was altogether new to Europe’s storytelling tradition and cannot be found anywhere in Europe before Straparola created it. In saying «altogether new» and «Straparola created it», I consciously reject a deeply ingrained and widespread prej-

udice against the concept of the literary creation of tales that have long been defined as quintessentially «folk» in nature.

These words can be considered tantamount to a sort of ideological manifesto, which is precisely how they were taken by colleagues in her own and related fields. The issue at stake, of course, is the very influence of the oral tradition on literary studies. Bottigheimer goes on, «Folk genesis of European fairy tales was a manufactured notion that nineteenth-century nation-builders desperately needed to support their shaky ideological enterprise» (*Fairy Godfather*, p. 6). The responses, as you may imagine, came swiftly from literary scholars and folklorists alike. Dan Ben-Amos, who has dedicated his entire career to folk literature, sums up the general concern as follows:

Implicit in this statement of advocacy is her own desire to unseat European oral narrative tradition from its position of primacy, at least as far as fairy tales are concerned, and to accord European literary authors a creative role in the formation of the fairy-tale tradition.⁶

This fiery debate, which must have flared up precisely during the early to middle phases of Beecher's work on the present two-volume revised translation,⁷ has subsequently focused the attention of everyone interested in Straparola precisely upon that point where entire disciplines intersect like the overlapped circles of a Venn diagram. The *Piacevoli notti*, whose humor and daring once made it an authentic bestseller, has been transformed once again into the object of literary curiosity and ethnographical investigation.

In short, Straparola's rise tales in particular, and fairy tales in general, have taken center stage in a much larger conversation that is now centered on his role in what is a significant moment in several disciplines. Indeed, *novellistica* is one of the fields most interested in the evolution of this controversy. Donato Pirovano, who has produced excellent research on Straparola's collection, including an important edition for Salerno,⁸ perhaps represents a perspective somewhere between the poles of the argument. He embraces its innovative qualities while simultaneously placing the whole of its contents within the context of pre-existing patterns of influence:⁹

The *Piacevoli notti* indeed represented a new and peculiar book, both for the wide spectrum of its narrative forms and eminently for the choice of treating the folk story as a literary genre. The folk story of fairies was thenceforth an enjoyable widespread night entertainment.

It is likely that most readers of this review find nothing troublesome in such a characterization. We all know that scholars like Di Francia, himself both literary scholar and ethnographer, have traditionally placed Straparola within the wide waves of Boccaccio's wake. Pio Rajna, a master of sources, recognized him as one of the first to codify oral tales probably originating in the Orient.¹⁰ In *novellistica*, this sort of compatible combi-

nation goes back as least as far as Vittorio Imbriani. Bottigheimer, however, has now taken significant steps toward ascertaining where one field begins and another ends.¹¹

In their terminologies, traditional histories of fairy tales generally conflate two terms, «fairy tale» and «folk tale». Interchanging the two terms leads to terminological misunderstandings and results in confounding difficulties for any discussion of fairy and folk tales. It's therefore necessary to distinguish clearly between folk tales and fairy tales and to clarify their differing histories and separate identities.

Despite what seemed to be symbiotic dual roles in comparatists like Toldo, Rajna and Rua, readers who open the pages of Beecher's new edition are now often interested in drawing dividing lines in their reevaluation of the full range of exegetic schools, from Proppian formalism to what Pitre called *demopsicologia*, from sociology to aesthetics, and from literary studies to folklore. Rather than a splintering, however, one could consider this expansive exegesis as a continuation not only of the debates between Benedetto Croce and Riccardo Dusi, but also of the enduring interconnectedness of fairy tales and folklore.¹²

Beecher diplomatically describes the debate, without actually taking a firm stand in either camp, saying «It has been a bracing polemic» (1:48). By eclectically citing one here and another there, he manages to maintain a generally agreeable level of neutrality among the combatants. He admits Bottigheimer's claim that Straparola was the first to compose what she calls rise tales (2:127) but rather more often cites Ziolkowski's descriptions of Straparola's sources elsewhere (1:47, 56, 208, 219, 289, 701) and even tries to find common ground between the two of them (1:283). Of Bottigheimer's conjectural biography of Straparola Beecher makes only brief mention (1:718). In sum, he seems to me to be methodologically much closer to the folkloristic approach:

Ziolkowski is concerned with finding tales that qualify as true fairy tales before the time of Straparola and Basile, and cites the *Asinarius* as a prime example. Yet disagreement remains whether or not fairy tales can actually be defined independently of the folk tale at any time. (1:289)

More than once, he refers to Peter Burke¹³ in ways that suggest a real sensitivity to an ethnographic approach and reinforces that impression with numerous citations of Jack Zipes. Perhaps the most important of these is related specifically to the problem of ideology, where he underscores the sociological import of these tales, while denying their commonly subversive content (1:61-62), which many have come to expect whenever a carnival atmosphere arises, thanks mostly to Bakhtin whom Beecher almost completely disregards (but see 1:19 and 61). Instead, he reminds the reader of Greenblatt's warning that book culture can cause significant damage to folk culture and concludes: «Straparola [...] was decidedly among the earliest to turn popular culture into book culture, and what is worse, to deliver it to the elite for their own social ends» (1:64). This type of perspective undeniably privileges scholars of folklore. Nevertheless, «My work

is not as a folklorist per se», Beecher explains, «but as an editor of tales with affinities to a world of tales» (1:48). This world, he goes on, depends upon contextualization, which opens the way for the discussion of traditionally folkloristic analysis:

I do not see the investigation of structural motifs as incompatible with many other forms of study, whether comparative, thematic, mythological, stylistic, or cultural, all of which are pursued in my commentaries. (1:50)

In the case of Straparola specifically, whose biography is demonstrably quite scant, the direct applicability of this sort of contextualization is difficult to judge. As a result, Beecher is (productively) free to suggest no small number of possibilities in his commentaries, which are certainly the lion's share of his work on the *Piacevoli notti*, insofar as the translation presented here (a subject to which we shall return) is based upon the one Waters' did in the nineteenth century.

The shortage of information regarding Straparola's life (cf. 1:75), which we have now mentioned a couple of times, not only affects the literary and historical interpretation of his works, but also provides a substantial mandate to cast a wide exegetic net over the *Notti* because no one can definitively establish the degree to which the work was shaped by its author's own creativity. Indeed, Beecher suggests that the collection of tales «problematizes what constitutes an author» (1:4). We may think of him as a sort of plagiarist, compiler or pioneering folklorist in his own right (1:1-8, 24). The sociological and ideological problems we reviewed above again come into play for obviously reasons. Each side is deeply invested in a particular vantage point. Literary scholars are intrigued by Straparola's creativity, but folklorists find such interventions to be a «betrayal» (1:42) and would even be tempted to see later appearances of a given motif not as a further step in the novella tradition, but rather as additional proof of the underlying oral tradition's inherent appeal (1:43-44). Beecher is acutely cognizant of this perspective and I believe it is for this reason that he is at times concerned with the accuracy of Straparola's «transmission» of oral narratives. In fact, by casting Straparola's tales as «transcriptions» (1:45) that record ethnographic «data» (1:48), Beecher transforms the lukewarm assessments of Giuseppe Rua and Vittorio Rossi (1:43-44) into invaluable bits of evidence – «this may be a smoking gun» (43) – for arguing that Straparola's chief contribution was ultimately anthropological. Having alluded earlier to Milman Parry's work on Homer (1:45), he later emphasizes the primacy of the folktale and invites his reader to find in the *Notti* traces of lessons in evolutionary psychology, even where Straparola himself may have been unaware of their full import (1:52-55). This line of scholarly inquiry, whether one finds it irresistibly enticing or excessively speculative, largely informs the tone and content of Beecher's commentaries, which follow each tale. He explains his criteria for selection by explaining that «the data in the commentaries points to a centuries-long pattern of literary borrowing from the story traditions of the “folk” on the part of many medieval and Renaissance writers» (1:38). At the same time, however,



nearly all of the annotations [...] are predicated on the reality of th[e] vast network of storytelling, the work of oral traditions reaching back to antiquity and outward to remote regions of the world where traces exist of the same stories told by Straparola (1:47).

He frequently provides the Aarne-Thompson-Uther classification number for tales but seldom the Thompson (and Rotunda) motif code as Pirovano does.¹⁴ His inclusive commentaries not only make room for stories distant in time and place from Straparola, but also many others that are significantly closer. It is undeniable that such a demand exists for this type of commentary and, indeed, one can even point quite clearly to a specific instance. In Ziolkowski's review of Bottigheimer's *Fairy Grandfather*, he writes.¹⁵

I have no doubt that Straparola's work is important and that it would be invaluable to have annotations to it on the order of what Bolte and Polívka provided for the Grimms' fairy tales – an as-yet imaginary reference work that could be entitled *Anmerkungen zu den Piacevoli Notti* (Notes on the Pleasant nights). One attraction of such annotations would be that they could be concerned equally with sources and influences.

While Beecher did not put together anything quite so dense as the five-volume commentary of Johannes Bolte and Georg Polívka, it seems hard to believe that anyone else will get closer in our lifetime. Those more inclined toward the exclusively literary approach will probably find the editions of Pirovano (2000) and Rua (1927) to be more comforting.¹⁶ Folklorists and those without Italian, on the contrary, will undoubtedly find much more of interest here.

Inasmuch as one of the most widely encouraging aspects of the Bottigheimer debate is the resultant new interest in Straparola,¹⁷ I am particularly happy that Beecher's volume will further this healthy influx of new ideas. Indeed, I am similarly hopeful that Beecher's work will correct some long standing issues in folklore studies related to Italy. For example, Mary Beth Stein, a Germanist, writes:¹⁸

In spite of the importance of Basile and Straparola for the development of the European fairy tale, there was relatively little interest in Italian folk literature until the end of the 19th century, when Benedetto Croce (1866-1952) translated Basile's *Pentamerone* from Neapolitan dialect into Italian. The Italian equivalent of the Grimms' *Children's and Household Tales*, *Fiabe italiane* [sic], appeared only in the middle of the 20th century through the effort of the novelist Italo Calvino.

These words come from the *Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales*,¹⁹ edited by Jack Zipes, whose works are commonly credited with the revival of interest among strict Anglophones in work related to overlooked parts of Europe.²⁰ Unfortunately, while German work on German subjects is rarely missed among North American folklorists, the same cannot be said for things Italian. Only efforts such as Beecher's, which are multidisciplinary and wide-ranging, can provide information where it is lacking and, particularly in the case of



Straparola, bring our colleagues in other fields up to date. However, the sad flipside of this phenomenon – inevitable in collections of information like encyclopedias or commentaries appended to the seventy-three tales presented here – is that it will be easy for readers to dip in here and there, whereas Beecher’s notes and commentaries really do deserve to be read straight through. The only quibble I had with the interpretive paratext had already been foreseen by Beecher himself:

The reading for these annotations was carried out in three Canadian libraries [...] and in eight of the many libraries at the University of Bologna, supplemented by some 250 titles sent to my own university through the Inter-library Loan System over a three-year period. [...] In consequence, each reference carries its own full bibliographical documentation – the alternative to citing three or four different editions of the same work in a bibliography and encoding all the footnotes to designate which. [...] If this merits an apology, you have it. (1:85-86)

Admitting that I secretly somewhat admire his casualness, I would have preferred to be able to see his bibliography all in one place, together with a final index of names at least, so that I could search for specific characters, places or critics in the two large tomes that together comprise nearly 1500 pages. At the same time, though, readers who pop into the commentaries as they might in a reference volume will never notice. Those who do prefer to read straight through will conversely see on occasion certain repetitions. For example, mentions of Vladimir Propp appear only a handful of times, but two contain quite similar phraseology:

Together, these many tales of the «master-thief» type presuppose an early oikotype, or «forme internationale» to use Propp’s term, which may be teased out by computational inference from the many surviving versions. (Tale 1.2; 1:186)

And

The followers of Vladimir Propp, in particular, have sought to find not only the «forme internationale» or oikotype of the story by statistical means, but a sense of its original form. (Tale 11.1; 2:428)

Why the French form is used, I do not know. Perhaps a nod to Lévi-Strauss or Todorov. At any rate, this is a tiny peccadillo and many will never notice. Those who do not notice, however, would have been better served by running headers bearing the number of the day and tale rather than just its English title.

A few words must now be said about the English text. Beecher adjusts Waters’ arrangement of the texts to match Pirovano’s, but «Waters remains substantially present in a text which is still essentially his» (1:83) and «the poems and enigmas in the Waters translation remain largely unchanged» (1:85). His explanation for this is, on the whole, convincing:

Because of the authority and elegance of these translations, the prospect of retranslating Straparola initially seemed both audacious and unnecessary. Readers would be served best by a fully annotated edition of this classic, for it carries a stylistic cachet of considerable imagination and grace. (1:81)

The new version is significantly fresher than its ancestor and deserves great praise. Additionally, we should not forget that Waters had left some parts bereft of an English version, preferring French as in other Victorian publications where it seemed more appropriate. In each of those passages, Beecher supplies a seamless passage that in no way disturbs the predominant enjoyable style. I understand the choice to leave Waters' poetry unmodified but would have much appreciated newer versions because Waters took rather more poetic license in verse than he did in prose. Beyond the hundreds of changes he made to the previous translation, Beecher also corrected certain mistakes and misapprehensions. The glitches are very few, but for the sake of completeness I shall mention one that Beecher himself had brought up in passing in the introduction (1:83). The tale in question (8.1) features a young man who can magically transform himself into other forms. Here he is a horse:

Straparola	Waters	Beecher
Giunto il cavallo al fiume, subito nell'acqua si lanciò; e trasformatosi nel pesce squallo, s'attuffò nell'onde.	As soon as the horse had come to the river's brink, it rushed at once into the water, and forthwith changed its form to that of a small fish, and straightway sought the deepest part of the stream.	No sooner had the horse come to the riverbank than it rushed instantly into the water and immediately changed itself into a little fish and sought out the deepest part of the stream.

Beecher explains how the final version came about:

Both sharks and waves hardly pertain to rivers. Waters sensibly translates this passage [as above] to avoid the anomalies. Moreover, the shark would be pursued by a tuna fish, which, without consulting specialists, doesn't seem to be the natural predator of sharks. One might say that he betrayed the literal sense but he enhanced the logical coherence of the story [...] and I opted to follow him. (1:83)

First, we should note that the fish Straparola here calls a *squallo* likely has nothing to do with sharks, for that meaning really belongs to modern Italian usage. In the middle of the 1500s, a *squalo* (with one *l* or two) was most probably the chub (*squalius cephalus cavedanus*),²¹ which lives in fresh water and grows to a bit over two feet in length. It was called *squal* in the Trentino and *squalo* in Tuscany and farther south.²² Thus, the narrative coda «sought the deepest part of the stream» really is not present in Straparola. Those with Italian will, at any rate, already use the original.



Beecher's *Piacevoli notti*, it seems to me, does not aim principally at the Italian-speaking audience who will no doubt continue to reach first for Pirovano's edition. Its real contribution is to be found in the notes and its ideal audience is presumably folklorists rather than Italianists. The debates between a sociocultural, folkloristic approach and a more strictly literary one will presumably continue to exist, and it certainly is not Beecher's responsibility to heal this rift. For the former cohort, as another reviewer notes,²³

Beecher's *Nights* is a monumental achievement that will become a fundamental resource for folk- and fairy-tale studies, as well as for the study of the boundaries between high and popular culture and for the exploration of the interchange between written and oral narrative.

For the latter, as Bottigheimer herself says, «It is perhaps unfortunate that Beecher gives so little credence to the growing acceptance of the literary sources of Straparola's tales».²⁴ For the majority of readers who, I suspect, find themselves between the two extremes, Beecher's *Pleasant Nights* probably offers a little something for everyone.

MICHAEL PAPIO



Note

- ¹ M. HIXON, *Rewriting History* (rev. of R. BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Tales: A New History*, Albany, NY, SUNY P, 2009), «Children's Literature», XXXVIII, 2010, pp. 231-236: 231. Cf. J. HOWARD, *From «Once Upon a Time» to «Happily Ever After»*, «The Chronicle of Higher Education», 2009, LV, 37, pp. B6-B8. In addition to the reactions mentioned later in this paragraph, consider also: G. ADAMS, *Father of the Literary Fairy Tale: Giovanfrancesco Straparola* (rev. of R. BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Godfather: Straparola, Venice, and the Fairy Tale Tradition*, Philadelphia, U of Pennsylvania P, 2002), «Children's Literature», 2004, XXXII, pp. 209-215; C. BACCHILEGA, rev. of R. BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Godfather*, «Western Folklore», 2007, LXVI, 3-4, pp. 383-385; S. MAGNANINI, rev. of R. BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Godfather*, «The Sixteenth Century Journal», 2004, XXXV, 2, pp. 627-629.
- ² C. CARMINATI objects: «Bottigheimer builds a completely fictitious biography, supported by no philological or documentary verification» (rev. of BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Godfather*, «Marvels & Tales», 2004, XVIII, 2, pp. 317-320: 317). Cf. D. BEN-AMOS, *Straparola: The Revolution That Was Not*, «Journal of American Folklore», 2010, CXXIII, 490, pp. 426-446.
- ³ R. BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Godfather*, p. 1.
- ⁴ Bottigheimer identifies a similar combination of motifs, to which she refers using the name «restoration tale» (in which «heroes or heroines begin life amid wealth and privilege, are forcibly expelled from luxury into a life of squalor and struggle, and are restored to their initial status [principally through magic] at the story's end», R. BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Godfather*, p. 11). Though this type appears very similar, she notably believes that it belongs to a different genealogy (R. BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Tales*, pp. 10-11; ID., *Fairy Godfather, Fairy-Tale History, and Fairy-Tale Scholarship: A Response to Dan Ben-Amos, Jan M. Ziolkowski, and Francisco Vaz da Silva*, «Journal of American Folklore», 2010, CXXIII, 490, pp. 447-496: 448 and 450).
- ⁵ R. BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Godfather*, p. 6.
- ⁶ D. BEN-AMOS, *Straparola*, p. 428. See also J. ZIOLKOWSKI, *Straparola and the Fairy Tale: Between Literary and Oral Traditions*, «Journal of American Folklore», 2010, CXXIII, 490, pp. 377-397, and F. VAZ DA SILVA, *The Invention of Fairy Tales*, «Journal of American Folklore», 2010, CXXIII, 490, pp. 398-425.
- ⁷ We shall refer to the work presently under review within parentheses, by volume and page number. Beecher notes that he dedicated at least three years to the project (1:85), which was published in 2012.
- ⁸ G. F. STRAPAROLA, *Le piacevoli notti*, 2 vols., a cura di D. Pirovano, Roma, Salerno, 2000.
- ⁹ D. PIROVANO, *The Literary Fairy Tale of Giovan Francesco Straparola*, «The Romanic Review», 2008, XCIX, 3-4, pp. 281-296: 282.
- ¹⁰ P. RAJNA, *Le fonti dell'Orlando furioso*, Firenze, Sansoni, 1876, p. 389.
- ¹¹ BOTTIGHEIMER, *Fairy Tales*, p. 4.
- ¹² See: A. M. CIRESE, *Folklore in Italy: A Historical and Systematic Profile and Bibliography*, «Journal of the Folklore Institute», 1974, XI, 1-2, pp. 7-79; D. BEN-AMOS, *Introduction: The European Fairy-Tale Tradition between Orality and Literacy*, «The Journal of American Folklore», 2010, CXXIII, 490, pp. 373-376.
- ¹³ P. BURKE, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1999.
- ¹⁴ In STRAPAROLA, *Piacevoli notti*.
- ¹⁵ ZIOLKOWSKI, *Straparola and the Fairy Tale*, p. 380.
- ¹⁶ And of course the other research of the latter: G. RUA, *Intorno alle Piacevoli notti dello Straparola*, part 1, «Giornale storico della letteratura italiana», XV, 1890, pp. 111-151; ID., *Intorno alle Piacevoli notti dello Straparola*, part 2, «Giornale storico della letteratura italiana», XVI, pp. 218-283.
- ¹⁷ Cf. G. ADAMS, *Father of the Literary Fairy Tale*, p. 215.
- ¹⁸ M. B. STEIN, *Folklore and Fairy Tales*, in *The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales*, ed. J. Zipes, Oxford, Oxford UP, 2000, pp. 165-170: 169.
- ¹⁹ Despite the fact that the Oxford volume contains numerous misspellings of Italian words, suggesting a priori an incomplete or distorted picture, Nancy Canepa's entry is well done. (See N. CANEPA, *Italy*, in *The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales. The Western Fairy Tale Tradition from Medieval to Modern*, ed. J. Zipes, Oxford, Oxford UP, 2000, pp. 252-265). Canepa, a widely respected Italianist, here and elsewhere has provided a far more accurate picture. See N. CANEPA, *Italian Tales*, in *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Folktales and Fairy Tales*, ed. D. Haase, Westport, CT, Greenwood P, 2008, pp. 504-508, which is of comparable format, though lamentably surrounded by a text similarly peppered throughout with misspellings of Italian words.
- ²⁰ E.g., J. ZIPES, *The Great Fairy Tale Tradition: From Straparola and Basile to the Brothers Grimm*, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 2001.
- ²¹ See A. DALBY, *Food in the Ancient World from A to Z*, London, Routledge, 2003, p. 86.
- ²² L. SCOTTI, *La distribuzione dei pesci d'acqua dolce in Italia*, Roma, Civelli, 1898, pp. 18-19. The *squali* in the Bacchiglione river reach a maximum weight of only three kilos, which corresponds well to the European chub, and to a fish that could be readily eaten by a tuna. See G. B. TORROSSI, *Gli animali utili e nocivi ai pesci della provincia di Vicenza*, Vicenza, Rumor, 1887, p. 29.
- ²³ L. MASONI, rev. of G. F. STRAPAROLA, *The Pleasant Nights*, 2 vols, ed. D. Beecher, Trans. W. G. Waters, Toronto, U of Toronto P, 2012, «Marvels & Tales», 2015, XXIX, 1, pp. 147-149: 149.
- ²⁴ R. BOTTIGHEIMER, rev. of G. F. STRAPAROLA, *The Pleasant Nights*, 2 vols, ed. D. Beecher, Trans. W. G. Waters, Toronto, U of Toronto P, 2012, «Renaissance Quarterly», 2014, LXVII, 1, pp. 330-331: 331.

