



UNIVERSITY  
OF WOLLONGONG  
AUSTRALIA

2017

# Editors' Introduction

Sabrina Tosi Cambini

Fabio Frosini

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ro.uow.edu.au/gramsci>

### Recommended Citation

Tosi Cambini, Sabrina and Frosini, Fabio, Editors' Introduction, *International Gramsci Journal*, 2(3), 2017, 2-16.

Available at: <http://ro.uow.edu.au/gramsci/vol2/iss3/4>

---

# Editors' Introduction

## **Abstract**

Editors' Introduction

## **Keywords**

Editors' Introduction

# *Introduction*

## *The human and the political: being with Gramsci*

Sabrina Tosi Cambini and Fabio Frosini

*Sabrina Tosi Cambini, Fabio Frosini and the journal's editor, Derek Boothman, dedicate this number of the "International Gramsci Journal" to the anthropologists whom we have lost over the last year: Giulio Angioni, Clara Gallini, Antonio Buttitta, Ugo Fabietti, Tullio Seppilli, and Amalia Signorelli. The last-named in this list, together with Angioni and Gallini, were directly involved in producing this issue of the IGJ. The latter two were to have contributed with interviews, already at an advanced stage of preparation while Amalia Signorelli had announced a text bearing the title TheUndigested Agglomerates. We are grateful to all of them for having illuminated the discipline of anthropology and inaugurated irreplaceable lines of research.*



### 1. *Why Gramsci?*<sup>1</sup>

In the negative present-day times, when a whole generation of anthropologists are leaving us, teachers who had shaped the discipline of anthropology itself in Italy, this issue of the IGJ review on *Gramsci and Anthropology* comes as a homage paid to the past and the future – the awareness of seeking to be inside historical processes, with the readiness and courage to respond to ever more arduous challenges, in order to contribute to building a more just world. To ask oneself how to honour the lessons we have learnt from these teachers of ours is, for the two of us, most of all to think of anthropology – as Tullio Seppilli indicated – as a “research into the very heart of society, its problems and its injustices. [It is] an anthropology that aims to ‘understand’, but also to ‘act’, ‘to become involved’” (2014, 74). These are trajectories that require the intellectual to impregnate her/his own biography with

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 1 of this *Introduction* is by Sabrina Tosi Cambini and section 2 by Fabio Frosini.

study and battles, taking positions, namely a full circularity between theory and practice.

During the university sociology courses at Urbino in the 1990s, and the evenings spent at the student-organized retrospective movie sessions, the *Prison letters* constituted my first – very personalized – encounter with Gramsci. The first resonance to be awakened was that of Gramsci the man, followed by his deep human sense of political struggle and its method and, finally, the realization of the total consistency between the choices he made and his own thought:<sup>2</sup> his life was the concrete translation of his writings, incarnated in the first place by himself located within the field of action of reality. Even from within the prison walls he managed to intervene in and on the world, transmuting analysis itself into praxis, given that praxis is the way in which man as a socio-historical agent comes to know and transform the world, thanks to the use of his own knowledge and to the thickness of his relation with the historical context.

This initial intimacy has remained ever-present in my approach to Gramsci, almost as a reverence. As, first, my training and, then, my scientific research came ever closer to and ever more immersed in a critical consciousness and in political involvement, there grew in my interest, located as it was inside and not outside affairs, the consideration of Gramsci as a master on the same level as others who, in flesh and blood, are or have been such.

I began to feel him near not at all just in thought, but as an example. The figure of the organic intellectual which he theorized, and which substantially corresponded to himself, more and more came to represent the fixed reference for developing a critical, reflective and political look on society. Other than indicating, Gramsci revealed the method for understanding, acting, transforming. This *molecular transformation* (see the letter of 6 March 1933 to Tatjana) which outlines a microphys-

---

<sup>2</sup> “Gramsci makes a choice of class [...] In our sphere of imagination today, how can we collocate, Gramsci’s original choice of collocating himself, of going to place himself (starting off from a sort of petty-bourgeois rebellionism, which might have led to other, different outcomes) in that context of a restricted and risky, but also fruitful, visual angle that we may define as the working-class point of view? Further, to remember Gramsci without remembering his youthful, definitive choice, would be a vain and sterile memory” (Asor Rosa, 1987).

ics of power and its processes of incorporation, anticipating Foucault, is perhaps the most immediate, and through this perhaps still the most disconcerting, description of what happens to each of us in interaction with our own social environment:<sup>3</sup> of how no one among us is immune to this process, and thus of the need to enquire into what takes place within ourselves, before looking at what happens outside ourselves, in order to understand – and seek to escape from – the mechanisms of hegemony, in particular from that *consent*, which has been thrown into relief by that extremely complex concept itself, but which much of the literature has debilitated not only at the level of theory but also in its most revolutionary force.

For me as an anthropologist the connection between the micro- and macro- dimensions, a central node of my emic and etic speculation, is represented by the definition of those exceptionally subtle yet such powerful threads that bind lives to the coercive configurations of the State and of cultural hegemonies.

Fundamental in this is the tightening of the grip of power over lives, but also the capacity to understand the nature of the mechanisms at work in that small dimension, which ensures that the reproduction of the relations of power does not fall apart at the political level. To bring into focus that hegemonic circularity in precise contexts allows us then to single out the key points of the mechanisms and processes in operation so as to be able to work on them. This is an unsparing operative work of the intelligence.

In reading the *Prison Letters* and *Notebooks* in parallel – which nowadays is a matter of course for Gramsci scholars, as the best way to understand his thought – there clearly emerges the two-fold dimension of that reflective turn of Gramsci's thought, here too well in advance of the theorizations of the second half of the twentieth century. One re-

---

<sup>3</sup> “Gramsci's letters are the diary of a man subjected, in an inhuman historical and political battle to a great, tragic, concrete experiment of destiny on the soul and body of a being in flesh and blood”. When Giacomo Debenedetti pronounced these words, in awarding the 1947 Viareggio literary prize to the *Prison Letters* (in a speech published only much later in 1972: cf. Debenedetti 1972), and spoke of Gramsci's *human method*, at the centre of which was the concept of *molecular*, the famous above-mentioned letter to Tatjana, which contained the metaphor of the shipwrecked, had not yet been published and saw the light of day only in 1965.

flectivity is turned on us, as a given historically determinate and determined society, and the second on the self, as primary and ultimate fount in which the mechanisms of power concentrate, reproduce and exert their effect. This is not a general and generic power, of the type on which discussion too often focuses, but one that is well incarnated by the men and the women of the institutions and their productions. In Gramsci's own words: "As I once told you, I don't like to cast stones into the darkness; I want to feel a concrete interlocutor or adversary" (letter to Tatjana of 15 December 1930: Gramsci 1965, 390; 1994, Vol. I, 369).

Spurred on by Italian anthropology's renewed interest in the figure of Antonio Gramsci, I proposed to Fabio Frosini that together we should organize a session within the Third Congress of the Italian Society of Applied Anthropology,<sup>4</sup> dedicated to Gramsci. The congress lent itself well, in my view, to hosting the session, since it centred on the public use of anthropology, including its interdisciplinarity. In once again "drawing near" to Gramsci it seemed to me necessary, on the one hand, to continue along the road indicated in the special number, *Gramsci ritrovato* ("*Gramsci found again*") of the review "Lares",<sup>5</sup> namely that of a non-improvised dialogue with the historical and philosophical sciences (which had never really wholly distanced themselves from

---

<sup>4</sup> The congress was held in the city of Prato on 15-17 December 2015, in collaboration with the PIN-University Pole of Prato and the IRIS.

<sup>5</sup> This number of "Lares", edited by Antonio Deias, Giovanni Mimmo Boninelli and Eugenio Testa, contains the contributions at two meetings of study on Gramsci held at Nuoro in 2007 and 2008, which constituted important stages in this recent renewed closeness of Italian anthropology to Gramsci (Pizza 2010). Indeed – here it is sufficient to think of Ernesto De Martino and of Alberto Maria Cirese and then of their pupils – a sort of three-decades-long removal of Gramsci from the discipline took place, which has been interrupted every so often over the last decade by a number of texts and seminars (including one of Gianni Pizza's at Perugia), then a certain interest in *Cultural, Subaltern and Postcolonial Studies*, thanks in particular to Miguel Mellino, followed by the above-mentioned number of "Lares" and, recently, Riccardo Ciavolella's seminars at the EHESS in Paris. The great international expansion of Gramsci's thought has for some time been at the source of a whole series of conceptual innovations, subtracting his thought from its original collocation within the heritage of the PCI and deeply enriching its historical and disciplinary references. It has also given rise, or at least risked giving rise, to confusion, due – above all in the Anglophone world – to a scanty attention paid to the sources and historical and social context in which Gramsci grew and worked; to these, however, in Italy in the same years there has corresponded a certain interest shown by a number of disciplines, to which reference has been made in the case of anthropology.

Gramsci).<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, it was necessary to strengthen this renewed disciplinary interest by way of a reflection and a practice able to give rise, through Gramsci, to a detailed and operative debate on the present, having its methodological and a disciplinary side, while also having a cultural and political nature.

The panel *L'unità della teoria e dalla pratica. Gramsci vivente nelle pratiche e nelle applicazioni delle scienze umane e sociali oggi* (*The unity of theory and practice. Gramsci alive in the practices and applications of the human and social sciences today*) thus included contributions not exclusively from anthropologists but, in an interdisciplinary framework, from scholars coming from the humanistic and social sciences, who had come to know Gramsci through the study of his writings and thereby seeking to connect his stimulating reflections and his particular conceptual galaxies (to name but a few: hegemony, organic and traditional intellectuals, organicity, national-popular, living philology, molecular) to an approach that tends to that “unity of theory and practice” (Gramsci 1975: Q11, §54, p. 1482; Gramsci 1975, 364), which is so central to his lesson.

The phrase from the *Prison Letters* quoted earlier is anticipated by a summary that Gramsci himself gave of the meaning he assigned to study: “... even thinking ‘disinterestedly’ is difficult for me, that is studying for study’s sake. [...] Ordinarily, I need to set out from a dialogical point or dialectical standpoint, otherwise I don’t experience any intellectual stimulation”. indeed, for Gramsci a theory has no sense if detached from concrete historical reality, theoretical concepts must be “an expression” of phenomena, which are never crystal-clear but represent a sort of portion of that reality whose confines are given by the perspective that one adopts. Not only this, but theory is solidly anchored to the empirical configurations of a given historicized society, and it is with what constitutes this latter that it has to measure itself.

---

<sup>6</sup> It was in fact Giorgio Baratta, as Pietro Clemente underlines in his editorial to the number of “Lares”, who considered “that the Cirese who wrote of Gramsci in the 1969 *Concezioni del mondo, filosofia spontanea e istinto di classe* (*Conceptions of the world, spontaneous philosophy and class instinct*), then revised in the 1970s, and who continued the dialogue with him in various successive essays [...], could again be a reference point for once more finding Gramsci and reading him in a key that is simultaneously both Italian and international” (Clemente 2008: 243).

In producing, together with Fabio Frosini, this number of the “International Gramsci Journal”, beginning from that session and the debate that developed within it,<sup>7</sup> our aim has been to give greater breadth to Anthropology’s relationship with Gramsci, not neglecting in this context its link either with other disciplines or with other cardinal aspects of the work from which this stems: the “profoundly political nature of his intellectual project in the prison notebooks” (Crehan 2010, 24; originally Crehan 2002, 8), and knowledge which, for Gramsci, must have a transformational vocation. Where, then, is Gramsci, and in what way is he a participant in the living context of contemporaneity, thought and acted by the intellectuals of the human sciences in their practical and applied engagement? This question sums up in essence the overall meaning that we have wanted to give to that session, one that returns here in a number of the articles, while we have at the same time enriched the scenario by means of contributions that enquire from closer-up into the historical relationship between Italian anthropology and Gramsci, in order to have a reflection that opens up roads for answers to the questions posed by the present.

To locate Gramsci in this present, as we know, implies a highly risky operation requiring, as Giorgio Baratta so effectively summed up in confronting the questions posed by Balibar, “a shift, a translation of Gramscian categories into a profoundly different economic and political, and therefore cultural, situation, one that was neither foreseen nor foreseeable by Gramsci” (Baratta 2003, 191). But possibly it was this Sardinian leader himself who indicated how to go beyond him. In that immensity constituted by the *Notebooks*, one may find living thought in movement restored to us, a theorization in other words that feeds on contradiction, giving shape to the non-categories that subvert the principle of non-contradiction. This is a constant dialectic through which the prismatic nature of reality is restored. And the incomplete nature

---

<sup>7</sup> In the order of their presentations, the participants at the panel were Riccardo Ciavolella (in the form of a written contribution), Giuseppe Cospito, Alessandro Deiana, Lelio La Porta, Rocco Lacorte (written contribution), Emiliano Alessandrini, Vanessa Bilancetti, Miguel Mellino (written contribution), Michele Fiorillo, Antonio De Meo (written contribution), Veronica Redini, Natalia Gaboardi, Nadia Breda. Last, we were honoured by the presence of Amalia Signorelli at the session.



itself of the *Notebooks* (by analogy with the ‘incomplete’ works of Michelangelo) opens up the possibility, perhaps by pressurizing the optimism of the will more than the pessimism of the intelligence, that Gramsci will not remain a lonely figure among the intellectuals.

## 2. *This number*

The dossier that we present here contains fifteen essays, interventions and interviews. The underlying idea has its origin, as recalled in the first part of this *Introduction*, in the idea that a renewal of interest in Gramsci by anthropology – understood as a disciplinary study – could not and should not remain confined within the well-defined limits of academia, but must be corroborated by measuring up to the wider context of the social sciences. The necessity to measure ourselves against the *present*, understood in all its structural thickness, presupposes the ability to avoid facile impressionistic shortcuts consisting in putting disparate phenomena together into one sole category, which in this way loses any heuristic value: in other words interpreting them from the starting point of one sole critical perspective, as if everything could be understood from an anthropological, or sociological, or historical etc., stance.

To bring theory and practice, history and theory, past and present, towards each other therefore means in our view setting into motion a discourse that of necessity does not stop here, but which will acquire a meaning if it serves to lead along a common road those who are interested in a non-improvised reaffirmation of Gramsci within the panorama of present-day critical thought.

We have said that of necessity the discourse does not stop here. In the time limits we set ourselves, within the terms that the facts themselves establish, our effort has in the first place consisted in providing some of the elements – in this navigation on the high seas in which today everyone, willy-nilly, is involved – that allow us to pinpoint our position in the map, in other words first of all to acquire some reference points for finding our bearings. The different sections into which

we have divided the dossier give the approximate coordinates within which, today or tomorrow, we will have to move.

The first part of the dossier, then, documents how, under various headings and starting from very different queries, Gramsci today provides anthropology with a fruitful analytical instrument. The second part gives a deep vertical insight in an almost monographic way into the historiographical constellation represented by the way in which Gramsci “entered” the discourse of Italian anthropological and ethnological studies, i.e. starting from the discussion on folklore initiated by an intervention in 1949 by Ernesto De Martino (*Intorno a una storia del mondo popolare* [Regarding a history of the popular world], published in “Società”, the theoretical journal of the time of the PCI). The third part gives examples of a number of possible disciplinary intersections among the questions arising from anthropology, in the first place the rich and problematic one of “subalternity” in relation to “hegemony”, and perspectives having other origins, such as pedagogical or historical-political and literary questions. Finally, the fourth part brings together a number of interventions which – in a more agile way, and in one case in the form of an interview – touch on all the questions present in the previous three sections: subalternity, the autonomy of the popular classes and also Gramsci’s Karstic presence in Italian anthropological science, and the relationship between culture (in the anthropological sense) and other disciplinary contexts such as law.

The essay by Elizabeth L. Krause and Massimo Bressan, *Via Gramsci: Hegemony and War of Position in the Streets of Prato*, starts off from the xenophobic turn in Prato, an important and also industrial district, which is also particular because of its very high presence of immigrant workers, to a great extent Chinese, which lies at the basis of its extraordinary economic expansion. In just a few decades, the town has not only grown but in the 2009 elections its dominant political orientation shifted at the municipal elections of 2009 from left to right. Anthropologists are then faced with a dual question, that may be summed up along the axes of globalization and the conflict among “classes”. A realistic understanding of these phenomena requires a preliminary critique of the simplifications to which the Gramscian concept of hegemony has been subjected in the way it has been received in the An-

glophone world, freeing it from the “culturalism” with which it has been impregnated in order to have it once again discover the richness of its origins. First of all this means its nexus with pedagogy and ethics and, secondly, its essential link with *institutions* of civil society, which function as the mediators of state power and which, insofar as they are “private” organisms, are however always open to different forms of orientation. For this reason the authors use the plural (“wars of position”) to underline this political opening that the concept of hegemony impresses on power, if used correctly for its analysis.

Veronica Redini’s article “*Un nuovo tipo umano*”. *Per una antropologia del lavoro industriale a partire da “Americanismo e Fordismo”* (“*A new type of human*”. *Towards an anthropology of industrial work starting from “Americanism and Fordism”*) sets off from the analyses in Gramsci’s Notebook 22 on Americanism and Fordism to show how contemporary capitalism work according to a complex weft of conditionings and influences that embrace the spheres of production and reproduction as an *ensemble*. Here too, the case studied – Italian entrepreneurs in Romania – offers, but with a reversal of roles, the same *décalage* between cultures and temporality as can be seen in Prato, here too giving the possibility of underscoring the utility of the category of hegemony for the critical understanding of the processes of dominion and subordination.

Redini’s contribution refers to a conceptual paradigm close to Foucaultian and post-workerist suggestions, one which presses her to emphasize not only “how capitalism proceeds simultaneously with the production of commodities and of the subjectivities of the labour force”, but also to read the production of a “new type of human” evoked by Gramsci in relation to Fordism, as a great “disciplinary project” that is organic to the logics of contemporary capitalist development.

Alessandro Simonicca’s essay, *Recuperare la scalarità del denso, tra resistenza e studying up* (*Recouping the Scalarity of Thickness, between Resistance and Studying up*) may in some ways juxtaposed with that of Krause and Bressan (not by chance, both essays start with a discussion of Kate Crehan’s 2002 book *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology*) in the sense that he interrogates the epistemological premises of the that allow an escape from a dual dichotomy: the one that exists between exteriority

and being-at-one in the anthropologist's insight into the culture being studied, and that between resistance and subordination within each culture. The point where these two levels meet, and which in this sense could help to overcome both, is identified in the notion of "civil society": "... the continual conversion of past and present opens up to a meaning of 'civil society' neither instrumental only to dominion (not necessarily the State), nor only antagonistic to power. There exists a 'war of position' that is simultaneously the mirror and the locus of its own decomposition in differentiated social movements, whose formation responds to two basic models, on the one hand *cooptation* of and into the ideological hegemony of power and, on the other, the constitution of a movement or movements of *counter-resistance* that leads to opposition or refusal, in order to reach other forms of political freedom".

The same perspective – which I would define dialectical – is also found in the article by Alessandro Deiana, *Folklore come egemonia: Comprendere la cultura popolare; riconoscere la subalternità; lottare sul terreno della cultura? (Folklore as Hegemony. Understanding Popular Culture; Recognizing Subalternity; Fighting on the Terrain of Culture?)*. The author sets off from the premise that in order to realistically understand folklore, this latter cannot be separated off from hegemony: folklore expresses as much the forms of life of the popular classes as the exercise over them of a hegemony which, precisely, institutes them as subalterns and therefore incapable of leaving folklore itself behind.

With Roberto Beneduce (*History as Palimpsest. Notes on Subalternity, Alienation and Domination in Gramsci, De Martino and Fanon*) we come to the part dedicated to history, even though in this particular case the author's interest goes, rather, to a method of a comparative type, appropriate for the emergence of another method, able to show the way in which the subalterns, the popular world, the oppressed, rewrite – as would be said in a palimpsest – their own "discourses" under the text that has already been written by the dominant classes. With this end in view – basing himself on Althusser and on other recent writings by Livio Boni – the author suggests adopting a "symptomatic" approach, in the dual sense of a search for the non-said and an enquiry into the forms of the pathologizing of the lower social classes, realized by the

hegemonic construction operative on each occasion. In this case, too (Beneduce's recourse to Chakravarty suggest this latter annotation), there comes into play not so much a refusal or acceptance of an approach of a dialectical type as, instead, the need for a redefinition of the dialectic itself.

The next three articles (*Gramsci in antropologia politica. Connessioni sentimentali, monografie integrali e senso comune delle lotte subalterne* [*Gramsci in Political Anthropology. Connections of Feeling, Integral Monographs and Common Sense of Subaltern Struggles*] by Riccardo Ciavolella; *Popolo, popolare, populismo* [*People, Popular, Populism*] by Fabio Dei and *Gramsci's "Prison Notebooks" and the 're-foundation' of anthropology in post-war Italy* by Gino Satta) show a certain compactness if for no other reason than, as a reference point, they take the "node" to a large extent represented by Ernesto De Martino's adoption, at a certain period of his intellectual life, of an explicitly Gramscian perspective. This above-mentioned circumstance gave a very precise direction to Italian anthropology in which the question of the *autonomy* of the culture of folklore entered directly into relation with the question of hegemony, and of the type of relation that "progressive" culture ought to have established between "people" and high culture, in which Marxism obviously has a role. This opening, of a "populist" type, present in the culture of the Italian left – and absent in others, as for example in the French case – explains not only a series of otherwise inexplicable interventions (suffice it to think of *Scrittori e popolo* [*Writers and People*] by Alberto Asor Rosa), but locates the Italian discussion which has always been, so to speak, on a plane that not only goes beyond the horizon of a "class politics" in the narrow sense, but also – as in the acute recognition of Fabio Dei – beyond any historical-materialist approach to politics that remains enmeshed in the nets of economism.

The third part brings together contributions in which the subalternity-hegemony axis is declined in relation to disciplinary fields in which anthropology intertwines with other subjects. This part opens with an article by Eugenio Testa *L'incanto del serpente. Gramsci in contrappunto tra Giorgio Baratta e Alberto M. Cirese* (*The snake charm. Gramsci in counterpoint between Giorgio Baratta and Alberto M. Cirese*), which reconstructs the dialogue between these two figures in Gramscian studies who, at the be-

hest of Baratta, began a fruitful dialogue starting in Spring 2008 which, moving through philosophy, philology and anthropology, between methods and contents, between past and present, made an important contribution to the reintroduction of Gramsci into the Italian anthropological debate. Cirese, together with De Martino, is in effect the other great protagonist of “anthropological Gramscism” in Italy. Cirese, a generation younger than De Martino and, above all, having a very different and, from certain points of view, opposed intellectual heritage, as from the 1960s created conceptual and enquiry spaces, between which a great part of the second wave of research in Italy flowed, after the first one – due to De Martino – beginning in the immediate post-war years, had broken. Not by chance, Cirese’s name comes back in many other contributions, but it is here especially that he, alongside Baratta, was the protagonist of a memorable seminar in the Sardinian city of Nuoro, in Spring 2008, which, together with the previous year’s seminar, again in Nuoro (both hosted by the local Higher Regional Institute of Ethnology), gave rise to a series of monographic dossiers in the review “Lares” which helped to pinpoint – to use that image again - the state of research in Italy and its link with its own past.

Lelio La Porta’s article *Lo studio “disinteressato” come nuovo terreno applicativo della scienza dell’educazione* (“Disinterested” study as a new applied terrain for the science of education) focuses attention on the school, seen as a laboratory in which the translation into practice of the connection between education, philosophy and common sense may be realized as a basis for culture in the anthropological sense. The criterion of “disinterestedness” here assumes a crucial importance, since within it there is the condensation of a relationship between theory and practice, between science and common sense, between master and disciple, which attempts to escape the dual reduction of the master to a controller and verifier of the acquisition of a series of notions and fields of knowledge, and of the disciple as merely a passive product of a purely functional training, without any inherent meaning.

The contribution of Roberto Dainotto – *Filosofia, filologia e il “senso delle masse”* (*Philosophy, Philology and the “Sense of the Masses”*) – starts from a very brief passage in Gramsci, contained in Notebook 1 and relating

to Marx and Hegel, in their respective relationship to the State and politics. On the basis of a precise reconnaissance of the sources available to Gramsci, the author shows how that one passage contains a question around which Gramsci concentrates the greater part of his efforts of study and understanding in the *Prison Notebooks*. This involves the nexus between State and hegemony, in other words the way in which the exercise of hegemony produces subalternity, in a mechanism that it is hard to escape from. We are here dealing with a subject at the centre of the totality of the other interventions, the relationship between dominion and the production of consent, etc., and the merit of this contribution lies not only in having shown in all its depth its presence in the pages written by Gramsci, but also in putting these pages into relation with the whole history of the working-class movement, which has always gone in the direction of an alternative different from the one between “subversivism” and “integration”, between sectarianism and reformism.

We thus arrive at the last part of the dossier which, as has been said, brings together interventions and an interview that extend – but more rapidly – to all the subjects mentioned in the other parts. Piergiorgio Solinas’s contribution (*Egemonia e gerarchia, tracce nei “Quaderni del carcere: Hegemony and Hierarchy, traces in the “Prison Notebooks”*) may be read as an annex to Dainotto’s article, in the sense of developing the methodological implications of the latter from an anthropological stance. Analogously, Luigi M. Lombardi Satriani’s article (*Pluralismo degli ordinamenti giuridici e la “nuove” credenze popolari gramsciane: la sfida della modernità: Pluralism of the Juridical Set-up and the “New” Gramscian Popular Beliefs*), by bringing out the notion of implicit law, of informal juridical production, bound up with the popular world and with the concrete life experience of the masses, also opens up a reflection on the ways in which it may be possible to produce form of “popular belief” which may escape the official hegemonic system. The dossier closes with two contributions. The first consists of a precious note from Eugenio Testa *Sul “Registro gramsciano” di Alberto Maria Cirese (On the “Gramscian Register” of Alberto Maria Cirese)*, a project which over the course of a decade (1975-1985) involved scholars from Turin, Florence, Siena, Rome and Cagliari in producing an anthropological lexis of the *Prison*

*Notebooks*. The second is an interview with Pietro Clemente (*Gramsci ed io: Gramsci and I*) which runs through all the nodes present in the dossier itself, relating them to the anxieties of Italian society in the second half of the twentieth century, with its cultural battles, with the relationship between youth movements and the official left parties, and finally with the irruption of a “contemporaneity” whose traits are hard to recognize but which, as said at the start, must still possess a “thickness” of its own.

This number of the journal closes with a review that a young French scholar, Anthony Crézéguet, has dedicated to the last book by André Tosel, who died recently (14 March 2017). For many years, Tosel was a student of Gramsci’s thought, and this long and impassioned review, as well as rendering homage to the figure and work of its subtle interpreter, the impassioned teacher, the intellectual *engagé*, the Marxist intellectual, aspires to reopening a real discussion in France on the meaning of the *philosophy of praxis*.

### *Bibliography*

Asor Rosa A. 1964, *Scrittori e popolo. Saggio sulla letteratura populista in Italia*, Roma, Samonà e Savelli.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1987, *Il Principe e i poveri*, «da Repubblica», 11 aprile 1987.

Baratta G. 2003, *Le rose e i quaderni. Il pensiero dialogico di Antonio Gramsci*, Roma, Carocci.

Clemente P. 2008, *Prima voce*, in *Editoriale a tre voci*, “Lares”, 74, 2008, n. 2, pp. 241-244.

Crehan K. 2002, *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2010, *Gramsci, cultura e antropologia*, trad. it. di F. Cezzi, Lecce, Argo, 2010.

Debenedetti G. 1972, *Il metodo di Antonio Gramsci. Appunti del 1947 per un saggio sulle “Lettere dal carcere”*, “Rinascita-Il contemporaneo”, 39, n. 6, pp. 15-19.



De Martino E. 1949, *Intorno a una storia del mondo popolare subalterno*, "Società", 5, n. 3, pp. 411-435.

"Lares" 2008, monographic number *Gramsci ritrovato*, ed. A. Deias, G. M. Boninelli and E. Testa, 74, n. 2.

Gramsci A. 1965, *Lettere dal carcere*, ed. S. Caprioglio and E. Fubini, Torino, Einaudi.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1971, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. and trans. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell-Smith, London, Lawrence and Wishart and New York, International Press.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1975, *Quaderni del carcere*, critical edition of the Istituto Gramsci, ed. V. Gerratana, Torino, Einaudi.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1994, *Letters from Prison*, ed. F. Rosengarten and trans. R. Rosenthal, New York, Columbia University Press.

Pizza G. *Prefazione all'edizione italiana*, in K. Crehan (2010, *cit.*).

Seppilli T. 2014, *Come e perché decidere di "fare l'antropologo": una personale case history nella brasiliana São Paulo degli anni Quaranta*, «L'Uomo. Società Tradizione Sviluppo», 39, n. 2, pp. 67-84; DOI: 10.7386/79674.