

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Feminist (In) Public: *Femminicidio* and
Feminist Activism in Italy

By

Isabella Todini

May 2023

A paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts
degree in the
Master of Arts Program in the Social Sciences

Faculty Advisor: Susan Gal

Preceptor: Marshall Kramer

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
Introduction	5
Background	9
I. Theorizing the Public/Private Distinction in Italy	11
II. Disrupting the Axis	20
III. Activating Feminist Counterpublics	26
IV. Thinking Beyond the Counterpublic	34
Conclusion	40
References	43

Abstract

Giulia Cecchettin, a young Italian woman, was murdered by her ex-boyfriend in November 2023. Public outrage following her death sparked national discourse about the problem of femicide in Italy. Her older sister, Elena Cecchettin, made explicitly feminist interventions in the media and in so doing brought feminist discourse into the public sphere. In this paper, I argue that, by making her sister's murder a question of public responsibility, Elena's contributions challenged the pre-existing distinction between the public and the private and evidence the capacity for feminist discourse to be politically transformative. I use digital ethnographic methods and discourse analysis to examine media reporting, opinion articles, speeches, and other discourse objects in circulation at the time of, and following, Giulia's death to explore how discourse circulates and transforms. As I illustrate, not only can feminist discourse rethink understandings of the public/private distinction but it can also push the bounds of 'the public', calling upon a transnational counterpublic of feminists to prompt political action.

Acknowledgements

To Professor Susan Gal, for her patient support and wisdom from the first week of Language in Culture through to the submission of this thesis. Thank you for the many meetings and conversations, and for seeing this thesis through its many iterations with unending confidence in my abilities.

To Dr. Marshall Kramer, for his guidance and insight as I navigated the often-unsteady terrain of the MAPSS year, and for his determination to see his students succeed in the project of the thesis, in our academic careers, and in life beyond UChicago.

To Professor Kamala Russell, for providing the best possible introduction to the variety of shapes and forms linguistic anthropology can take, and for offering kindness and intellectual dedication in her classroom for two busy quarters.

To dear friends (near and far away!) who offered feedback on every single new topic I proposed for this thesis, of which there were numerous. Thank you for the much-needed distractions, too, when conversations about these many topics grew insufferable.

To Giulia and Elena Cecchettin. To Giulia, for the pain she suffered and the voice she can no longer use, and to Elena, for using her voice for the both of them, and for all of us.

Introduction

In early November 2023, Giulia Cecchettin left her family home to meet her ex-boyfriend, Filippo Turetta, for a meal. For more than a week following their initial departure, no trace of Giulia and Filippo was to be found. Continuous media appeals from the young adults' families urging them to contact them became pleading requests for Filippo to bring Giulia home safely, as suspicion mounted around the young woman's wellbeing. Giulia Cecchettin was murdered by Filippo Turetta on November 11, 2023. On November 18th, Giulia's body was discovered merely six kilometers from her house, having bled to death from the many knife wounds identified on her body (*La Repubblica* 2023b). Filippo was apprehended the following day, in Germany, as he attempted to flee the site of his crime. By the time Giulia's body was found, more than a week had passed since her initial disappearance, capturing, and holding Italian attention. It should come as no surprise that Giulia Cecchettin's murder sparked outrage, yet the widespread media attention this event received was entirely out of the ordinary (Camilli 2023). In the weeks and months that followed Giulia's death, debate, and discussion about femicide occupied much of the Italian media consciousness in large part, I argue, thanks to Giulia's sister, Elena Cecchettin, whose media interventions brought explicitly feminist discourse to the mainstream media and an audience of feminists and non-feminists alike. It is not an accident that Elena's speech prompted 500,000 protesters to descend on the streets of Rome, with thousands more showing up across the country. Elena and the feminists she speaks on behalf of are working to bring violence against women and femicide out of the shadows of the private sphere and into the harsh light of the public, a confrontation that has the potential to force the public to reckon with the communities it oppresses and ignores, and the violence it authorizes. I work to answer the question of how it is that feminist

discourse has the potential to be politically transformative by drawing on close readings of Elena's speeches as well as media in circulation about Giulia's murder and Elena's interventions.

I bring an analysis of the dyadic qualities of the public and the private into conversation with theories of publics, illustrating the need for semiotic analytics to be brought to bear on the relationships between publics and counterpublics. With this theoretical grounding in mind, this paper advances the claim that the politically transformative and creative potential of feminist discourse emerges when discourse successfully destabilizes distinctions between the public and the private. As I illustrate here, concepts of the public and the private are often predicated on traditional understandings of the separation of the masculinized sphere of the state and the feminized sphere of the family. In this understanding, the masculinized sphere of the state serves to uphold and protect certain members of the population over others, forming what scholars of publics describe variously as 'the public', 'the dominant public', 'the bourgeois public', among others (see Habermas 2015 Fraser 1990; Warner 2002). Those unrepresented by the state are often relegated into the private, delimiting their claims to oppression to the private sphere as well. I argue that in taking up Elena's speech we are bearing due witness to the discursive creation and mobilization of a feminist counterpublic that works to confront the dominant public and break out of the private sphere, bringing violence against women out of the dominion of the home and the family and into the political realm – into the public. Thus by bringing semiotic tools such as the concept of the 'axis of differentiation' (Gal and Irvine 2019) to bear on theories of the public and on feminist political theory, I show how Elena not only *makes public* the problem of femicide, but she also speaks to and thereby *makes a public* of feminists, bringing the discourse of a counterpublic into the public sphere and opening the door of possibility for political transformation.

Elena is not, by any means, the first feminist to make the personal political. I take up her speech, however, as an instance of discursive resistance against traditional understandings of what belongs in public or in private, and one that seeks to disrupt the boundaries between a public and a counterpublic. I am not external to the feminist discourse and the publics and counterpublics described here. As a member of the Italian feminist counterpublic, I recognize my intervention as a contribution to this discourse, an instance of uptake of Elena's demands to bring attention and action to the pandemic of domestic and gendered violence, of femicide taking place across Italy and, I add, globally. Thus, this paper seeks to illuminate the transformative potential of this discourse and to call into question the naturalized understandings of the distinction between the public and the private for the ways they may endorse and uphold violence.

While acknowledging the limitations to fieldwork I faced due to geographic distance from Italy, I have nonetheless committed to developing a robust analytic approach that allowed me to draw insights from material available to me at a distance. My approach to data collection and analysis is through digital ethnographic research and discourse analysis. I have gathered an archive of articles, social media posts, videos, and TV show episodes, as well as statistics on viewership, hashtag usage, and references to Elena and Giulia, among other data points. Through these news objects I have worked to build an immersive understanding of the events following Giulia's murder as they took place, and the conversations taking place across news outlets and forums. In the following section, I introduce in more detail the primary news sources I draw from. I also am engaged throughout this paper in what Jennifer Roth-Gordon defines as discourse analysis. She understands this as an ethnographic method that "allows us to understand that language is both intimately related to culture and central to creating and upholding social structure" (Roth-Gordon 2020: 32). She offers a framework for conducting thorough discourse analysis, outlining that "In

order to simultaneously engage in linguistic and cultural analysis, scholars must integrate: (1) linguistic features (2) interactional context (3) ethnographic context and (4) sociopolitical context” (ibid: 33). In doing this discourse analysis, I draw primarily on theoretical interventions from linguistic anthropologists such as Susan Gal and Michael Silverstein, whose work allows me to examine the discourse emanating from this event from the many angles described by Roth-Gordon. Finally, I note that where texts originally written in Italian have been translated, all translations are my own.

This essay is structured to reflect my joint interests in understanding ‘public’ insofar as it refers to the public sphere, or the act of bringing something into the public, and ‘public’ insofar as it refers to a collectivity of addressees or participants in a mass mediated audience. Consequently, the first two sections address the distinction between the public and the private. I present the public and the private as a dyad defined by specific qualities named in discourse about Giulia’s murder before analysing Elena’s speech for evidence of a reversal and dismantling of this dyad previously taken for granted. The following two sections explore the feminist counterpublics spoken to and mobilized by Elena’s speech, and the potential political ramifications of feminist discourse being made public, in front of a dominant public. Ordered this way, my paper builds from the specificities of the public/private distinction out to the potentially transformative political implications of feminist discourse, as I articulate where Elena’s speeches might take us next.

Background

What followed the news of Giulia's murder was an explosion of attention from Italian media. Hundreds of pages were written just in the week that followed the discovery of Giulia's body – about the story of Giulia's death, the protests that followed, the problem of femicide and violence against women in Italy – across national and local publications. In my work here, I draw on material gathered through what I describe as digital ethnographic research. I have read and collected an archive of Italian-language news objects – articles, photos, videos, talk show episodes, social media posts but I look to selected outlets in particular for my data.

First, I draw from two of the most widely read national newspapers, *Corriere della Sera* and *La Repubblica*. I have examined both news reports and opinion articles as I seek to understand both the way the narrative of Giulia's murder and the events that followed were reported and the opinions and responses members of the public have had to these events and reports. I have collected articles published originally in print and digitized in the publications' archives, articles published originally online, and some social media posts, where relevant. The quantity of articles published reporting on Giulia's murder and on femicide as a social issue is in itself a data point and is indicative of the enormous impact this event has had on Italian public discourse. As an example, between the 17th and 30th of November, *La Repubblica* posted over 80 Instagram posts related to femicide and/or Giulia Cecchettin, with the posts usually corresponding to an article published online or in print. Between the same dates the *Corriere della Sera* print archive contains 1,734 references to the name 'Cecchettin'. I note these statistics as emblematic of the scale of the national conversation around femicide that took place following Giulia's murder.

Second, I pay close attention to two talk shows – *Domenica In* and *Dritto e Rovescio* – both aired on November 19th, the day Turetta was apprehended and the day after Giulia's body was

found. November 19th was a Sunday and thus not typically a major news reporting day for Italian TV; the programs with the most viewership that day were the Association of Tennis Professionals World Tour final match and a game show called *Affari Tuoi*, claiming 5.4 million and 4.8 million viewers, respectively (Buonocore 2023). However, with 3.3 million viewers at peak viewership, the third most viewed show was *Domenica In*, a talk show hosted every Sunday by Mara Venier. Besides a later episode centered around the national song competition San Remo, this has been the most viewed episode of the 2023-2024 season of the show, undoubtedly because the first hour of the three-hour show is dedicated entirely to a discussion of Giulia's murder, and the consequences for Italian society. The talk show *Dritto e Rovescio* attracted upwards of 1.1 million viewers, far less than *Domenica In*, but in airing later in the day featured a statement given by Elena Cecchetti following the vigil held for her sister, a statement which I deem to be a critical piece of discourse that has in many ways shaped the unfolding of public response to Giulia's murder and the problem of femicide more broadly.

This leads me to my third outlet, by which I refer to statements made directly by Elena, either through social media posts or through media interviews and interventions. Elena's contributions address both the personal loss of her sister as well as the societal circumstances she identifies as problematic or linked to her sister's death. I pay attention to Elena's response over others from the Cecchetti family because of the explicitly political and feminist nature of her interventions, and because her responses have been in large part what the public has reacted to and published responses to. I also believe, as I will argue later in this paper, that Elena's contributions do the most discursive work in shifting the qualities of the public sphere and the political action made possible within it. Where necessary, I also include material from smaller news outlets or social media posts.

Section 1: Theorizing the Public/Private Distinction in Italy

Though Sunday is typically a slow news day, a day for catching up on soap operas and word-game shows, the 19th of November was not a slow Sunday. Filippo Turetta was found and arrested near Leipzig after passing drivers noticed his car parked with the lights off in the emergency lane on the A9 highway. Not much more is known about Turetta in that moment; even his lawyer, interviewed remotely on the talk show *Domenica In*¹, has no news to share. *Domenica In* is a weekly program broadcasted every Sunday by the state-owned radio station Rai1, and is presented by Mara Venier, a 73-year-old Italian actress and public figure. Venier opens this particular episode of the show by dedicating the first segment to Giulia Cecchettin who, by the time the show airs, has become the object of nearly every publication or program in circulation. A commentator on *Davide Maggio*, a website that publishes and analyzes TV viewership statistics, even complains that these TV presenters have “wallowed in Giulia’s crime”² (Francesco, *Davide Maggio* 2023). Venier hosts five guests in the first segment of the episode – Alberto Matano, Roberta Bruzzone, Simonetta Matone, Rita Dalla Chiesa, and Matilde D’Errico – a range of journalists, politicians, and a television director. Presumably selected as representatives of *Domenica In*’s audience’s perspectives and opinions on the story of Giulia’s femicide and its aftermath, the group discusses interviews with various Cecchettin family members and lawyers connected to both families, reports from journalists on the ground at the Cecchettin family house and outside the precinct where Turetta was taken, and slideshows of videos and pictures of Giulia set to emotionally evocative instrumental music.

The commentary on the show revolved largely around the responsibility of the family to predict or prevent male violence against women, and the affective education that boy should

¹ Sunday In.

² “hanno sguazzato sul delitto di Giulia” (Francesco, *Davide Maggio* 2023)

receive within the home before they enter into society. The tension between the private sphere of the family and the public sphere of the political, social world emerges throughout the episode, but a contribution by Simonetta Matone is especially revealing. Simonetta Matone is an Italian ex-judge and politician who is currently a member of the Chamber of Deputies and is affiliated with the right-wing political party, *Lega Nord per L'Indipendenza della Padania*³ (more often referred to simply as *Lega* or *Lega Nord*). As the discussion shifts towards signs of Turetta's abusive behavior that his family might have missed, Matone intervenes. "In all the cases of serious mistreatments that I have dealt with in my unfortunately extremely long professional life, the perpetrator was the classic *maschio Italic*o [Italic man], as I define it, in the worst sense, fruit and son of a *madre Italic*a [Italic mother] ...I have never met seriously abusive and seriously disturbed subjects who had normal mothers"⁴ (Matone 2023). Matone's claim about the provenance of abusive behavior in men and her efforts to locate unregulated violence within the family prompts the question – how is the family positioned as a foil to society in Italian discourse, and what can this tell us more broadly about the distinction between the public and the private? While there are other qualities of the private sphere that define it, I begin from the family as I work to parse out the distinction between the public and private by developing a dyadic framework of understanding. By drawing on moments of discourse from the *Domenica In* episode, as well as other media in circulation about Giulia's femicide, and political speech found elsewhere, I identify qualities of the public and the private that are described and instantiated by well-known Italian figures and

³ Northern League for the Independence of Padania.

⁴ "“In tutti casi di maltrattamenti gravissimi di cui mi sono occupata nella mia purtroppo lunghissima attività professionale, il soggetto era il classico maschio Italic, così lo definisco, nella peggiore accezione, frutto e figlio di una madre Italic...Io non ho mai incontrato soggetti gravemente maltrattanti e gravemente disturbati che avessero però delle mamme normale” (Matone 2023)

explore how these might represent a model for the distinction between the public and the private as conceived of by many Italians.

To distinguish between public and private is an act that appears, on the surface, instinctive and self-evident. We operate with assumptions about the boundaries between the public and private, about what is appropriate, suited, or belonging to one realm or the other, and even that the terms may refer unequivocally to specific realms. Despite the seemingly self-explanatory nature of these categories, they are unstable and often contextually defined – what is public in one context may be deeply private in another. In her article, “A Semiotics of the Public/Private” (2002), Susan Gal describes public and private as “co-constitutive cultural categories” (Gal 2002: 80), rather than “particular places, domains, spheres of activity, or even types of interaction” (ibid). I am interested in building a dyadic understanding of the relationship between the public and the private because I see the two spheres as existing in direct tension with one another, but I do so by taking this dyad as “only a model of the social reality. This model represents in effect the anthropologist’s hypothesis about ‘how the social system works’” (Leach 1954: 8). As Edmund Leach notes in his own work, structural frameworks function precisely because they are models illustrating patterns evident to the social scientist but do not necessarily account for the messiness of real human life (it is precisely this messiness that allows Elena’s speech to be transformative, something I will address in full in the following section). Nevertheless, we can identify ideal models of social organization and use them productively for analysis. Here, I examine how the social worlds of Italians “oscillate between two polar types” (ibid: 9) – in this case, between the public sphere and the private sphere. I draw on Susan Gal and Judith Irvine’s conceptual tool – axis of differentiation – to examine the qualities of the public and private that emerge in media discourse in Italy.

An axis of differentiation is a sociolinguistic tool employed by speakers of all kinds to draw ideological comparisons between “two contrasting multidimensional *images*” (Gal and Irvine 2019: 119). Here, I take the public/private distinction as an axis of differentiation, within which particular “paired, contrasted qualities” of the public and the private spheres are defined and set into relation with each other. Using discourse from the *Domenica In* episode referenced earlier, as well as pieces of discourse from other popular Italian media sources, I identify key image pairs in common Italian understandings of the public and the private. The public and the private are a particularly slippery pair to define as they are not “some ubiquitous and constant structural opposition, but...a field of disagreement and conflict in which they very facts of constant use, discussion, and contention produce and reproduce a sense of continuity” (Gal and Kligman 2000: 41). Thus, I recognize my own analysis as identifying models of the public and the private, but models that emanate from a politically transformative site. As journalists at the state-owned public broadcasting company Rai describe, politicians today believe that “if they control the media, they will change the cultural narrative in Italy” (@ajlisteningpost and @tariqnafi 2024).

Italy has been and remains a country whose governance, social attitudes, and norms are deeply inflected with Catholic ideology and practice (Murgia 2011; Parmigiani 2019; Salvatici 2002), with ideas about virtuous comportment emanating from the private sphere, in this case primarily the family. This is not new; for Thomas Aquinas, “the basis of society is the family” (Slavin 1933: 136), and within the family, “the home is perfect when the relationships are perfect” (ibid: 137). Thus, as Simonetta Matone would concur, if the relationships in the family are imperfect, or members of the family are not practicing good virtues, society itself will be poisoned by the evil of the dysfunctional family. From the *madre Italica*, symbol of the private, familial, feminized sphere, emerges the *maschio Italico* who brings the evil of the family into the good,

public, state-oriented sphere. Below, I articulate these analogies as they being to appear in this discourse.

if evil emerges from the family, therefore:
evil : family : : good : state

AND if evil emerges from the *madre Italica*, therefore:
evil : female : : good : male

therefore:
evil : family : female : : good : state : male

Matone’s description of the *maschio Italico* who is “fruit and son of a *madre Italica*” evokes Paolo Mantegazza, Italian neurologist, and anthropologist who, in 1887, writes that “The son is a living member of the mother...even when the fruit has fallen from the branch that nourished it, it does not cease to be held within the maternal embrace” (Mantegazza 1887: 158). Here, “the image of the hidden interior of the mother – that is the womb” (Melandri 2019: 37) represents both the internal, private sphere, and the locus of a genealogy of evil. Figure 1 below illustrates the dyadic model of the relationship between the public and the private that I see beginning to form. As I progress through this section, I will continue to build on this model and show how the axis of differentiation comes to take shape.

Figure 1.

Qualities of the Private	Qualities of the Public
(produces) Evil	(produces) Good
Family	State
Female	Male

Much of the conversation in the November 19th episode of *Domenica In*, and in news articles published around the same time, centers around the question of recognizing signs of abuse or toxic behavior in relationships, and about the educational endeavors that must be undertaken to

reduce violence against women. This reeducation is consistently identified as the responsibility of the family, in line with the analogy described earlier. Rita Dalla Chiesa, an Italian center-right politician, TV presenter, and guest on *Domenica In*, argues during the episode that “the respect [children] see at home is that which they will bring forward in their lives, because if you see your father treating your mother with love, treating your sister with love, treating her with respect, you will do exactly the same thing”⁵ (Dalla Chiesa 2023). In an interview published in *Corriere della Sera*, Italian Minister of Justice Carlo Nordio, reiterates that “If first the families and then the schools don’t teach respect for the dignity and liberty of others, the boy feels entitled to do what he wants” (Nordio, in Piccolillo 2023). Aquinas argues much the same; “a well-regulated family life is a necessary condition for a prosperous society” (Slavin 1933: 136). If the family encourages or condones violence and disrespect, these miseducated sons will stain the public sphere with the violence learned in the family. I understand this to mean that unregulated and regulated violence are placed in opposition to each other; it is the family’s responsibility to control the unregulated violence within the private sphere such that it becomes regulated once it enters the public. In Figure 2, I summarize these arguments and build on the axis of differentiation that is being used to define and characterize the public and private spheres.

Figure 2.

Qualities of the Private	Qualities of the Public
(produces) Evil	(produces) Good
Family	State
Female	Male
Unregulated violence	Regulated violence

⁵ “perché il rispetto che loro vedono dentro casa e quello che poi si porteranno dietro nella vita, perché se tu vedi tuo padre, che tratta con amore tua mamma, che tratta con amore tua sorella, che la tratta con rispetto, tu farai esattamente la stessa cosa” (Dalla Chiesa 2023).

That collective or state responsibility is never explicitly assumed in *Domenica In*, in the *Corriere* interview or in much of media reporting on the case⁶ is itself indicative of an attitude that cannot conceive of an individual instance of femicide as symptomatic of a larger, collective devaluation of women. Matone adds another contribution to the debate, apologizing first for bringing politics into the conversation before advocating for what “this government” – Giorgia Meloni’s *Fratelli D’Italia*⁷ – is doing to combat femicide. Mara Venier, host of *Domenica In*, interrupts Matone to reassure her: “Can I just say, Simonetta, I’d say, in this case we’re talking about femicide, there is neither left nor right”⁸ (Venier 2023), to which she receives a resounding applause from the studio audience. Though Matone begins to introduce a state policy that is supposedly designed to prevent femicide through education programs in school (Camilli 2023), Venier’s interruption serves as a reminder that, despite what feminists in the 1970s may have tried to tell us, the political need not bear on personal matters, on questions of violence and harm between two individuals. In this way, yet another analogy is created. If the left and right are political, as Venier seems to argue, then femicide is decidedly not political, “neither left nor right”. Femicide thus understood is a personal problem, a problem located in the private sphere where it is the concern of the individual, not of the collective. Figure 3 includes the addition of these dimensions of the public and the private to create a rich image of the conceptual distinctions between the public and the private in circulation in Italian media.

⁶ See, for example, @theperiodoff’s post critiquing the absence of the word ‘*femminicidio*’ in describing Turetta’s crime, an absence which minimizes the fact of femicide being an instantiation of structural violence against women (@theperiodoff 2023; Radford and Russell 1992).

⁷ Brothers of Italy.

⁸ “*Ti posso dire, Simonetta, lo dico, in questo caso siamo parlando di femminicidio, non c’è ne destra ne sinistra*” (Venier 2023).

Figure 3.

Qualities of the Private	Qualities of the Public
(produces) Evil	(produces) Good
Family	State
Female	Male
Unregulated violence	Regulated violence
Personal	Political
Individual	Collective

The axis described here is not merely a product of the discourse taking place in one episode of one talk show, but rather, it is representative of pervasive Italian ideas about the qualities of and distinction between the public and the private state. This is true across Italian history, argues Lea Melandri, who illustrates that “the violability of the female body belongs to history, to our Graeco-Roman-Christian history...[it] is a function of the birth of the polis, of the sexualized division of labor, of the separation between home and city, family and state” (Melandri 2019: 52-53). These ideas persist beyond the conversation about femicide; Italy’s current prime minister and co-founder of the far-right political party *Fratelli D’Italia* (FdI) was well known far before her election as PM for her promises that FdI would “defend God, the nation, and the family”⁹ (Gilioli 2018) and for her FdI campaign posters featuring an image of Meloni with slogan “Defend the traditional family”¹⁰ (De Gregorio 2018). These slogans reflect similar sentiments to those described in the axis I have outlined here – the state’s commitment to upholding the values of the traditional Catholic family, values that feminize the private, personal sphere and masculinize the public, political spheres¹¹. However, in a case such as Giulia’s femicide, the very fact of the discussion

⁹ “*difenderemo Dio, la patria e la famiglia*” (Gilioli 2018)

¹⁰ “*Difendi la famiglia tradizionale*” (De Gregorio 2018)

¹¹ Meloni in fact asks that she is called *Il Presidente del Consiglio* using the masculine pronoun rather than *La Presidente* with the feminine pronoun (Storni 2022)

taking place in public media, in the public sphere creates an opportunity for these apparently crystallized conceptions of the public and private spheres to be rethought. The very act of making a femicide public is a chance to radically challenge the privacy previously inscribed in female bodies, female pain, and female power, as I will illustrate in the following section.

Section 2: Disrupting the Axis

Elena Cecchettin is 24, she has dark brown-black hair, dark eyeliner framing her lash line, and a silver septum piercing. Her personal style is consistent with her Instagram feed whose cohesive grayscale color scheme clearly evidences intentional, attentive curation and cultivation (or evidence of her dedication to worshipping Satan, as some right-wing *Lega* politicians choose to believe¹²). She is as articulate and precise with her words as she is with her sense of style. On November 19th, hours after Filippo Turetta has been arrested and after the episode of *Domenica In* discussed in the previous section has aired, she is interviewed live on a talk show called *Dritto e Rovescio* (approximately, Front and Reverse). *Dritto e Rovescio* is a program broadcast by “the leading private TV publisher in Italy” (Media For Europe 2024) and a network founded by Silvio Berlusconi, Mediaset. Though *Dritto e Rovescio* typically airs weekly on Thursdays, it underwent a trial period in October and November 2023 that involved airing an extra episode every Sunday (Falcioni 2023). Thus, it is by chance that the episode in question aired the day Turetta was arrested, and it is clear that this news, along with the news of the discovery of Giulia’s body, has deeply informed the November 19th episode.

Elena is introduced by the journalist Ilaria Mura, and she begins by saying “I wanted to send out a message, and I hope it may be heard by as many people as possible”¹³ (Cecchettin 2023). In less than two full minutes, Elena accomplishes a tremendous intervention, not only in the debate to follow on the episode of *Dritto e Rovescio*, but also in a widespread, perhaps national, conversation about the locus of blame for Giulia’s murder, and the steps needed to take to prevent future femicide from occurring (her full statement can be found in the appendix). Where Simonetta

¹² As one headline reads, “Regional *Lega* counsellor against Giulia’s sister: “Patriarchy is nonexistent, Elena is dressed as a satanist, that is the real evil”” (*La Repubblica* 2023b). (*Consigliere regionale della Lega control la sorella di Giulia: “Patriarcato inesistente, Elena vestita da satanista: quello è il vero male”*” (*La Repubblica* 2023b)).

¹³ “*Io volevo lanciare un messaggio, e spero che possa essere audita da più persone possibile*” (Cecchettin 2023).

Matone on *Domenica In* opted to place this blame on the *madre Italica*, and in so doing reinforced an existing axis of differentiation separating public and private by dividing the political from the familial and associating the family with the personal, the violent, and the evil, Elena Cecchetti's speech reveals this axis to be malleable, and ideologically worth shifting. I focus my analysis in this section entirely on Elena's speech, close reading it in order to identify three key moments in which she challenges the relations set out by Italian cultural notions of public and private as described in the previous section and poetically reverses aspects of the public/private axis.

Gal and Irvine describe the possibilities for change and transformation of the ideological underpinnings of signs and comparisons and rely on their preestablished concept of the axis of differentiation to explore how such transformations may be possible. They suggest that "By proposing new comparisons in historically novel circumstances, participants change the categories and instantiations of axes, which in turn changes their abstract conceptualizations and their later enactments" (Gal and Irvine 2019: 138). Elena's speech, in proposing new figurations of the comparisons made within the public/private distinction – such as the distinctions between individual and collective responsibility, or the distinction between a crime of passion and a crime of power – reveals the way that "Such ideological permutations reframe social relations and reconstruct the social organization in which they happen" (ibid). I argue that the work Elena does is far more than just "fractal pivoting" (ibid: 154), or "an interactional move that changes the social actor's perspective, switching (usually temporarily) to the other side of the invoked axis" (ibid). Rather than switching her own perspective, Elena attempts to discursively reverse the entire axis, permanently, such that the actors around her might change their own perspectives in response to the axial change. This is possible precisely because the axis outlined in the previous section is a model; even when discourse appears to naturalize the distinctions between the public and the

private, reversal and transformation is still possible. Edmund Leach's approach to structuralism explains that "Each individual of a society, each in his own interest, endeavors to exploit the situation as he perceives it and in so doing the collectivity of individuals alters the structure of the society itself" (Leach 1954: 8). Thus, in what follows, I attend to Elena's treatment of distinctions between good and evil, passion and power, and silence and action, reading them as sites of potential political transformation made possible through the dissemination of feminist discourse.

Elena mobilizes her position as culturally and socially immersed in Italian culture to challenge the distinction between public and private that is naturalized in contemporary Italy. Gal and Irvine argue that an interactional move such as challenging or reverse the elements of an axis of differentiation is possible for an actor such as Elena if they have "knowledge of the typical conjectures discursively linked to their institutional location", knowledge that is "an indispensable part of claiming (or rejecting) that location and the stereotypes of self and others it establishes" (Gal and Irvine 2019: 153). The first move in Elena's speech that she uses to destabilize and challenge Italian understandings of and reactions to femicide is through her claim that Filippo Turetta, her sister's murderer, "is not a monster...he is a healthy son of a patriarchal society". In setting up this contrast, Elena does two key things – she creates a comparison between a 'monster' and a 'healthy son', one that can be productively mapped onto the good/evil distinction presented in the previous chapter, and in characterizing him as a 'healthy son of the patriarchy' she positions Turetta in the public sphere. The contrast between 'monster' and 'healthy son' aligns with a mirror image of the good/evil distinction that Italians such as Simonetta Matone imagine exists. Where Matone understands evil as a product of miseducation in the family, and thus a product of the private sphere, Elena understands evil as a product of cultural and societal education, thus a product of the public sphere. By reversing this image, and characterizing Turetta as the natural

outcome of a patriarchal society that enables violence against women, she makes the argument that femicide “should not be seen as an inherent consequence of a momentary [or individual] *rampage* of madness” (Melandri 2019: 52).

Violence against women is not a uniquely Italian phenomenon, but Italy is infamous for a history of gendered violence baked into Italian ideals of honor and masculinity, of expressions of possession that get confused for expressions of love (see, for example, Bertone and Ferrero Camoletto 2011; Latza Nadeau and Mortensen 2024; Parmigiani 2019; Schettini 2022; Zambelli, Mainardi, and Hajek 2018, among many others). In particular, “gender discrimination and high levels of tolerance of male chauvinism in Italian society” (Parmigiani 2019: 28) account for violent and oppressive attitudes and behaviors by men towards women. Violence, as Giovanna Parmigiani’s research in Southern Italy uncovers, “[structures], in a fundamental, almost ontological manner, the particular ways of [women’s] being in the world, and of “being women” in general” (ibid: 31). In her chapter “*La violenza maschile contro le donne*” (“Male violence against women”; 2022), Laura Schettini offers a historical overview of Italian male violence against women. As I argued in the previous section, so too does Schettini locate the “history of violence against women in the Italian context” as interconnected to “the history of the family, the principal theatre of gendered violence as much in the past as in the present”¹⁴ (Schettini 2022: 137). It is this history of private gendered violence, of honor killings (Schettini 2022), of inequality in the family that Elena is referring to when she asserts that “femicide is not a crime of passion, femicide is a crime of power. Femicide is a murder by the state”. This is the second move, I argue, that she makes to upend the public/private distinction. Her claim contrasts with the work that Matone does on *Domenica In* to place blame on the family, or even on the individual mother.

¹⁴ “*la storia della famiglia, il principale teatro delle violenze di genere tanto nel passato quanto nel presente*” (Schettini 2022: 137)

Where Matone identifies one singular woman as a metaphoric representative of the source of evil and violence in all abusive men (the *madre Italica*), Elena negates this blame, arguing that the point of origin is not passion, which belongs in the private sphere, but rather its opposite, power, a feature of the public sphere in her conception and the state, which is also characteristic of the public sphere. In this way, Elena does not upend the entirety of the axis set out in the previous section but instead mobilizes particular relations, such as the state/family distinction, to challenge and reverse other aspects of the public and private spheres.

The third intervention Elena makes in her speech creates a contrast between two forms of action in response to Giulia's death. At the end of her speech, she makes a request of her audience: "for Giulia, I ask you not to have a minute of silence, for Giulia burn everything". I argue that this transforms the individual nature of a minute of silence as a response to death into a collective response in the form of 'burning everything', understood figuratively. In turn, this move from an individual response to a collective response corresponds with a move from the personal to the political, serving as an echo of the now decades-old feminist slogan, "the personal is political". I borrow Parmigiani's understanding of Italian feminist projects to argue that this transformation from personal to political, from individual to collective such that the personal is forced into the public sphere, is a claim to a type of visibility not often afforded feminists and women in Italy (Parmigiani 2019). In Parmigiani's ethnographic context, feminists manipulate their visibility to different ends, depending on the public they are engaging with and their objectives. I understand Elena to be not only staking a claim to a type of visibility as unmissable as a raging fire, but to also be invoke violence in a way that reverse the distinction between unregulated and regulated violence described in the previous section. If the state refused to regulate the violence against women that pervades even the private sphere, she is calling for and making a threat of an

unregulated response, emerging from within the traditionally feminized private sphere out into the public. This final line also makes implicit reference to a poem written in 2011 by Cristina Torres Cáceres in response both to the particular instance of Mara Castilla's femicide, and in response to the many victims of femicide across Latin America (Mouriquand 2023). Cáceres's poem, referenced by Elena both in her letter and in a post reshared on her Instagram story and saved in a highlight on her profile entitled "giulia", ends with the lines "If tomorrow it is me, if tomorrow I don't return, mother, destroy everything. If tomorrow is my turn, I want to be the last" (Cáceres 2011). It is through metricalization, or "forms occurring as equivalent units for repetition and elaboration" (Silverstein 2023: 34)– replacing "destroy everything" with "burn everything" - that she makes this intertextual link (Silverstein 2023), once again reinforcing her move to render femicide a collective pain and problem, rather than an individual one.

Thus, in this section I have worked to illustrate three exemplary ways that Elena Cecchetti's speech on the November 19th episode of *Dritto e Rovescio* works to radically transform Italian ideas about the distinction between public and private. Her efforts reverse the comparisons set out in the axis of differentiation in the first section and imbue the axis with feminist ideology that challenges the very notion of a private sphere being entirely separable from a public sphere. In the following section, I turn to uptakes of Elena's speech to make sense of who exactly she is speaking to, and how they receive her transformative moves.

Section 3: Activating Feminist Counterpublics

Elena finishes her speech, and the *Dritto e Rovescio* studio is silent – we see only Paolo Del Debbio who does not clap, but asks, in the disinterested tone he maintains throughout the episode, “What does ‘burn everything’ mean?”. There is a pause, he repeats his question, the connection between the studio and Ilaria Muro, who is reporting live from outside the Cecchettin house, seems unstable. Muro repeats the question to Elena and suggests that she means it “as an idea”. Elena responds, “Of course, it’s a metaphor to overturn this system...and to do so such that Giulia is the last. It means overturn everything and seek justice”. Muro adds, “A sort of cultural revolution, in short”. “Exactly”, says Giulia. The studio is still silent, Del Debbio minimally responsive. Has anyone even heard the radical accusations that Elena has put forward? Then Del Debbio calls on Carmelo Abbate to respond to Elena. Abbate, an Italian journalist, declares that he must stand up, and in doing so elicits (finally) an applause from the studio audience.

“I’m standing out of respect and because it’s not every day that you hear a person, with pain inside, get at the core of the issue this lucidly, to locate the issue culturally, with an extreme lucidity, with absolutely sensible words, that I agree with from the first to the last, from the patriarchal society to all of these every day acts that in some way prepare for the act of femicide and that us men, but also women, underestimate and don’t condemn socially or legally.”¹⁵ (Abbate 2023).

Abbate’s response is the first of many forms of uptake of Elena’s speech. On November 25th, the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women (General Assembly

¹⁵ “*mi alzo per rispetto e perché non succede tutti giorni di sentire una persona, con il dolore dentro, centrare in modo così lucido il tema, central culturalmente, con una lucidità estrema, con parole assolutamente senate, che condivido dalla prima all’ultima, dalla società patriarcale a tutti quei gesti che nella vita quotidiana in qualche modo preparano l’atto del femminicidio e che noi uomini, ma anche le donne, sottovalutiamo e non condanniamo socialmente e legalmente*” (Abbate 2023).

2000), over 500,000 protesters descended on the streets of Rome to protest violence against women, with thousands more in other cities across Italy (Carrer 2023). A press release from *Non Una di Meno* (Not One Less) calling for participation in the protests notes explicitly that this mobilization does not represent a “ritual moment” but rather “the precipitation of a daily mobilization – in schools, in workplaces, in neighborhoods, alongside feminist and transfeminist anti-violence centers – which with the discovery of Giulia Cecchettin’s body is spilling over into spontaneous processions in the squares of all of Italy”¹⁶ (*Non Una di Meno* 2023). *Non Una di Meno* is the Italian chapter of *Ni Una Menos*, a feminist movement against violence against women that originated in Argentina and whose name translates to “Not One Less”, referring to the demand for “Not One Woman Less, Not One More Death” (Prusa, Garcia Nice, Soledad: 2020). Beyond protests and vigils for Giulia, hundreds of articles were written in the week following Giulia’s death. Similarly, posts tagged with #elenacecchettin abound on Instagram and X, and a simple Google search for ‘elena cecchettin’ calls up nearly 400,000 results. The reach of this case cannot be understated.

In this section, I examine uptake of Elena’s speech in order to argue that she activates and mobilizes a feminist counterpublic. Having determined in the previous section that Elena’s speech works to upend the distinction between public and private that may otherwise have been going unchallenged in Italy, I use this section to characterize the (counter)public that Elena addresses as feminist, and to explore the discursive power of speaking to a particular public as a means of disseminating ideology and potentially destabilizing the supremacy of the so-called ‘dominant public’. Using literature on both publics and counterpublics, I briefly examine what a ‘public’ may

¹⁶ “*Non un momento rituale, quindi, ma la precipitazione di una mobilitazione quotidiana – nelle scuole, nei posti di lavoro, nei quartieri, al fianco dei centri anti violenza femministi e transfemministi – che con il ritrovamento del corpo di Giulia Cecchettin si sta riversando in cortei spontanei nelle piazze di tutta Italia*” (*Non Una di Meno* 2023).

be, in the classic Habermasian sense, before taking up in more depth the work of scholars such as Nancy Fraser and Michael Warner as they work to theorize counterpublics. In sum, this section seeks examples of uptake of the transformations Elena begins to enact on the distinction between public and private outlined in Section 2 and argues for these uptakes to be read as constitutive of a feminist counterpublic that is mobilized by Elena's speech.

For Jürgen Habermas, a philosopher writing in the second half of the 20th century, the public sphere emerged as a mediator between the private sphere and the state, as a space in which educated men with shared interests in property ownership could meet to discuss their ideological and political investments. Thus construed, “through the vehicle of public opinion [the public sphere] put the state in touch with the needs of society” (Habermas 2015: 30-31). The public sphere he describes is, of course, not representative of the entirety of society or its interests; the rational-moral barriers for entry into the public sphere meant that, “despite the rhetoric of publicity and accessibility, that official public sphere rested on, indeed was importantly constituted by, a number of significant exclusions” (Fraser 1990: 59). This is one of the central arguments put forward by feminist theorist Nancy Fraser, who challenges Habermas's view of the public sphere by exposing the ideology inherent to his view that “rests on a class- and gender-biased notion of publicity, one which accepts at face value the bourgeois public's claim to be *the* public” (ibid: 61) and the exclusions that ideology entails. Her intervention, therefore, is through the concept of the ‘subaltern counterpublic’, or “parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses, which in turn permit them to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs” (ibid: 67). Elsewhere, Michael Warner pushes this understanding of counterpublics further, adding that “it is not clear that all counterpublics are composed of people *otherwise* dominated as subalterns” (Warner 2002: 57), but

regardless of their subaltern status, “participation in such a public is one of the ways by which its members’ identities are formed and transformed” (ibid).

Elena’s speech has the potential to be discursively transformative because she is mediating between the Italian dominant public, who presumably share the understanding of the public/private distinction set out in Section 1, and a feminist counterpublic, understood as a “[space] of circulation in which it is hoped that the poesis of scene making will be transformative, not replicative merely” (Warner 2002: 88). She is able to communicate directly to this counterpublic by making her ideological stance explicit. Stancetaking, or “performances through which speakers may align or disalign themselves with and/or ironize stereotypical associations with particular linguistic forms” (Jaffe 2009: 4). By manipulating dominant understandings of the public/private distinction, Elena makes her feminist stance explicit and opens up the possibility for others to take up her stance, which “uptake may take the form of audience/interlocutor stances of alignment, realignment, disalignment” (ibid: 8). Elena herself is also engaged in uptake of other feminist discourse in circulation; discourse is in constant movement and evolution and speakers can mobilize pieces of discourse across speech situations to create intertextual references and alignments.

Elena’s descriptions of Filippo Turetta in her *Dritto e Rovescio* speech can be read as an attempt to align with a transnational feminist counterpublic. She refers to the sympathetic portrayals of Turetta in the media, portrayals that cast him as a mentally ill or unstable “monster”, and in so doing explain and excuse his crime as an individual abnormality rather than as part of a widespread pattern of violence against women. Elena’s assertion that “he is not a monster...he is a healthy son of a patriarchal society” directly echoes a slogan that was published on the *Non Una di Meno* website in 2018 and is still in use in marches and protests. The slogan, “*Il maschio*

violento non è malato è figlio sano del patriarcato”, translates directly to “The violent man is not sick, he is a healthy son of the patriarchy” and reappears with other iterations that replace “the violent man” with “*Lo stupratore*” (the rapist) and “*Il fascista*” (the fascist). As Warner notes about publics, despite being self-organized, a public “in fact requires preexisting forms and channels of circulation...[and] selects participants by criteria of shared social space...habitus, topical concerns, intergeneric references, and circulating intelligible forms” (Warner 2002: 75). Elena, thus, is both indexing her membership in this transnational feminist public and her attempt to address this public. The use of specific language that derives from feminist counterpublics, according to Fraser, allows us to “recast our needs and identities, thereby reducing, although not eliminating, the extent of our disadvantage in official public spheres” (Fraser 1990: 67). Through the (re)use of the slogan in her speech, Elena participates in and reinforces “the possibility of decontextualization and strategic recontextualization” (Gal and Woolard 2001: 8) and works to authorize herself in the face of the potential presence of the dominant public in her audience.

Publics are grounded in processes of uptake and circulation that allow discursive stances and ideologies to be disseminated and shared by groups of people otherwise unconnected to one another. Warner’s analysis of publics identifies “*the reflexive circulation of discourse*” (Warner 2002: 90) as a core quality of a public, adding that “a public is understood to be an ongoing space of encounter for discourse” (ibid). I argue that Elena engaged multi-directionally with a feminist public, not merely through the uptake she received in the studio immediately following her speech but also through the long-lasting public presence she has had in Italian media. Michael Silverstein notes how circulation operates – it “is not random but *emanates* from ritual nodes of value production and network connectivity” (Silverstein 2023: 150). I argue that Elena’s speech becomes a ritual node of value production as it gets taken up by the media and publics around her. The day

after giving her speech, *Corriere Della Sera* published a near-word for word version of the speech, with Elena’s name in the by-line, allowing her words to reach an even broader audience. Besides being reshared on social media – the top posts tagged with #elenacecchettin all feature direct or paraphrased quotations from her November 19th speech, as well as speeches she has given elsewhere, such as at Giulia’s funeral or even more recently on May 12th at an international publishing fair in Torino – Elena’s words have been written about and circulated by national newspapers. Warner claims that, “In modernity, politics takes much of its character from the temporality of the headline, not the archive” (Warner 2002: 97). In examining headlines of news reports and op-eds written in the days, weeks, and months following Giulia’s murder and Elena’s speech, it becomes clear that the feminist counterpublic mobilized by Elena continues to threaten the boundaries of the dominant public as her speech continues to circulate. Headlines published following Elena’s speech include “Giulia Cecchettin, a private pain transforms into public mourning”¹⁷ (Imarisio 2023a); “What’s different about the femicide of Giulia Cecchettin”¹⁸ (Camilli 2023); “Violence against women is a male question”¹⁹ (Pisani 2023); “The patriarchy still exists, this is the turning point”²⁰ (Postiglione 2023); “The normality of violence and the revelation of Elena”²¹ (Melandri 2023b); “Femicide is the word of the year 2023”²² (Treccani 2023); “Violence against women and the struggle against the patriarchy: finally something moves”²³ (Calloni 2024) – among hundreds of others. This uptake of discourse emanating from Elena, and the feminist counterpublic she is a part of, is located, I argue, in the dominant public sphere, as many of the articles in circulation are published by national newspapers with vast readership. Thus,

¹⁷ “*Giulia Cecchettin, un dolore privato si trasforma in lutto pubblico*” (Imarisio 2023a).

¹⁸ “*Che c’è di diverso nel femicidio di Giulia Cecchettin*” (Camilli 2023).

¹⁹ “*La violenza contro le donne è una questione maschile*” (Pisani 2023).

²⁰ “*Il patriarcato esiste ancora, è il momento della svolta*” (Postiglione 2023).

²¹ “*La normalità della violenza e la rivelazione di Elena*” (Melandri 2023b).

²² “*Femminicidio è la parola dell’anno 2023*” (Treccani 2023).

²³ “*Violenza sulle donne e lotta al patriarcato: finalmente qualcosa si muove*” (Calloni 2024).

these national news publications, in the act of circulation feminist discourse, are participating in challenging the distinctions between public and private as Elena sought to do and are challenging normative ideas about what discourse is permitted in the public sphere.

On December 20th, left-leaning political magazine *L'Espresso* named Elena Cecchetti Person of the Year for 2023. The magazine, with a readership of nearly 1,000,000 readers (Audipress 2022), is one of the most widely read weekly magazines in Italy, announced that they had selected Elena – “the sister of all of us”²⁴ (Sgreccia 2023) – because “Her words about the patriarchy and rape culture have imprinted upon a family pain the figure of collective responsibility for the long chain of femicides that have marked the year we are about to leave behind us”²⁵ (ibid). Evoking the same reversal and transforming a “family pain” into “collective responsibility”, *L'Espresso* not only takes up Elena’s speech but also amplifies it, working to turn Elena into a public figure. This decision comes just a month after Elena’s speech, revealing the speed at which her discourse circulated and had ideological impact on the Italian media and public. For Warner, “The more punctual and abbreviated the circulation, and the more discourse indexes the punctuality of its own circulation, the closer a public stands to politics” (Warner 2002: 96-97). The rapid uptake of Elena’s speech such that she could be named Person of the Year (note that *‘femminicidio’* was also named Word of the Year by Treccani Institute) and the subsequent online discourse around the significance (or misguidedness) of the award, I argue, constitutes politics as Warner understands it. The feminist discourse emanating from Elena and her feminist counterpublic has been authorized by *L'Espresso*, and therefore holds the potential to come face

²⁴ “*La sorella di tutti noi*” (Sgreccia 2023).

²⁵ “*Le sue parole sul patriarcato e la cultura dello stupro hanno impresso a un dolore familiar la cifra della responsabilità collettiva per la lunga catena di femminicidi che hanno scandito l’anno che stiamo per lasciarci alle spalle*” (ibid).

to face with a broader public, creating the possibility for the dissemination of feminist discourse and ideology into the public sphere.

The enrapture of the Italian media public with Giulia's murder and with the Cecchettin family more broadly evidences a public concern with femicide that lay dormant until being activated by Giulia's murder and by interventions such as Elena's. Nancy Fraser describes this phenomenon, writing that "insofar as these counterpublics emerge in response to exclusions within dominant publics, they help expand discursive space" (Fraser 1990: 67). Where discussions about the responsibility of the state and the patriarchy in perpetuating violence against women had previously been discouraged from the Italian dominant public sphere, the responses to Elena's speech here evidence an expansion of the discursive space. The 'private' sphere into which discussions of violence against women are relegated bleeds into the public sphere, forcing the Italian public to reckon with that which has been privatized and ignored. Elena speaks from her feminist counterpublic out to the public, to the dominant public that excludes and silences feminist (and even female) voices, not unlike Habermas's bourgeois public sphere, and in the act of transgressing publics she calls into question the very definition of 'public' itself. She has challenged the naturalized understanding within the Italian public of women as private property of men, of violence as an act of passion or love, and of women's pain as a domestic, familial question rather than a public one. More than that, as this section has illustrated, Elena's efforts are taken up by actors from within and beyond her feminist counterpublic, inviting the possibility for Italian discourse and politics to be radically transformed.

Section 4: Thinking Beyond the Counterpublic

Just under three weeks after the discovery of Giulia’s body, Turetta’s arrest, and Elena’s speech, a funeral is held for Giulia, in her home city of Padova. Among others, Elena and Gino Cecchettin – Giulia’s father – deliver speeches addressed, at times, directly to Giulia, and to the public of eight thousand attendees in Padova (Imarisio 2023b), and nearly 3.7 million viewers watching on television at home (Pasquini 2023). Gino Cecchettin “spoke for eight minutes, doing politics in the highest sense of the term”²⁶ (Imarisio 2023b) reports Marco Imarisio for *Corriere della Sera*. In his speech, Gino names and locates responsibility in many areas of Italian social and political life: “families, school, civil society, the media world”²⁷ (Cecchettin 2023), and echoes much of what he and Elena have both said elsewhere. He uses his status as a white, middle-class male and patriarch of his family to transmit Elena’s discourse to a public beyond the feminist counterpublic she speaks to. “I turn first to the men, because we should be the first to demonstrate that we are agents of change against gendered violence”²⁸ (ibid). Much as Elena argued that men should hold each other to account for their acts of harassment and violence towards women, Gino urges: “Let’s talk to the other men we know, challenging this culture that tends to minimize violence by seemingly normal men”²⁹ (ibid). Lea Melandri, Italian feminist theorist and journalist reflects on the funeral and Gino’s speech and remarks that “It took the figures of a father and a daughter to pierce the armor of what have until now been familial roles, to call into question the ‘normal’ made of atavistic prejudices that “privatized” and “naturalized” historic relations of power”³⁰ (Melandri

²⁶ “Gino Cecchettin ha parlato per otto minuti, facendo politica nel senso più alto del termine” (Imarisio 2023b)

²⁷ “famiglia, scuola, società civile, mondo dell’informazione” (Cecchettin 2023).

²⁸ “Mi rivolgo per primo agli uomini, perché noi per primi dovremmo dimostrare di essere agenti di cambiamento contro la violenza si genere” (ibid).

²⁹ “Parliamo agli altri maschi che conosciamo, sfidando la cultura che tende a minimizzare la violenza da parte di uomini apparentemente normali” (ibid).

³⁰ “È toccata alle figure di un padre e di una figlia aprire una breccia in quella corazza che sono stati finora i ruoli familiari, mettere in discussione la ‘normalità’ fatta di pregiudizi atavici che ha “privatizzato” e “naturalizzato” rapporti storico di potere” (Melandri 2023a).

2023a). Taken together, Gino and Elena's speeches and the discourse they generated have worked to render Giulia's femicide an event of political and social significance. In doing so, they also reverse the relationship between mother and son outlined in the first section of this paper and introduce the potential for discourse to be politically transformative via a relationship between father and daughter.

It is from the transformative potential of Gino and Elena's discourse that I open this final section and look towards the political landscape beyond the chronicles of Giulia Cecchettin's murder. Elena's speech, as I argued earlier, successfully created and mobilized an Italian (and international, via *Non Una Meno/Ni Una Mas*) counterpublic of feminists who shared in her ideological drive to redefine the public and the private, and to render a private, individual crime a public, social, and political problem. However, by nature of her political and social position – including being a young woman – Elena is not an archetypal member of the public so understood by theorists such as Habermas, who imagines the public to be male and bourgeois, or theorists such as Warner and Fraser, who understand the public to operate via the exclusion of minority or oppressed categories of people. Thus, in this section I argue that Gino Cecchettin is uniquely positioned, as an inherent member of the dominant public, to bring the ideological shifts preempted by Elena into the dominant public sphere. By straddling both the feminist counterpublic activated by Elena, and the dominant Italian public he inhabits by default, Gino represents the possibility for ideologies in circulation in the public sphere to be challenged and potentially reshaped. I start by examining the role of violence in the dominant public sphere, in an attempt to make sense of how it is that violence against women has been considered private, something that both Elena and Gino call into question in their speeches. I do this to build an understanding of how discourse around violence has shifted following Giulia's death, a shift that Gino takes up and puts forward,

in his speech and beyond. I then examine how the dominant public might be altered as a result and suggest implications this may have for Italian politics moving forward.

That bodies, politics, and violence are enmeshed with one another appears as a constitutive aspect of human social life, both historically and in the contemporary period. Jenny Pearce, in her book *Politics Without Violence?* traces a genealogy of violence and how it came to be that politics and violence are intertwined such that the state has a monopoly on violence, a claim she examines via Weber and social theorists after him. Pearce usefully identifies that “violence belongs to our sense making bodily selves, with origins in our social body” (Pearce 2020: 151) and characterizes violence as a product of social lives and organizations (ibid: 180). She traces one of the origins of the monopolization of violence to the emergence of “impersonal intra elite relationships” (ibid: 188). “Elites”, she argues, “were able to replace personal privileges with an impersonally defined set of rights...Violence management in this form, enables elites to enhance their return from society’s productive resources” (ibid). The elite that Pearce describes as taking advantage of and participating in what would ultimately come to be “(legitimate) monopolization” (ibid: 189) of state violence is likely the same elite that Habermas imagines in his concept of the public sphere. As a link between the state and the dispositions of society at large, the elite of Habermas’s public sphere would have had the capacity to shape thinking and practice around the use of violence (Habermas 2015). In fact, as Pearce notes, “The emergence of differential capacities to organize power over others is consistent with those who emphasize the way ‘elite’ male dominance and ‘elite’ male coalitional strategies [such as rational-critical debate in salons (Habermas 2015: 45-46)] evolved” (Pearce 2020: 180). Of course, violence against women and violence in general is far older than Habermas’s bourgeois public and other publics examined here. However, as the state evolved to take on the responsibility of regulating public violence, it follows that this state

regulation will protect the privileged dominant public (in this case, men) over other counterpublics. Efforts to render femicide a public issue in Italy and to shift Italian attitudes around violence against women from considering it a private question to a political, public question are also efforts to denaturalize the ways that “everyday violences against dominated ‘others’ and which generate multiple spaces of insecurity for some citizens are ignored” (ibid: 190). However, despite the discursive force of Elena’s speech, from her vantage point as a member of a feminist counterpublic rather than the dominant Italian public it is far more challenging to provoke widespread political change in the public sphere.

Speech in public, and assembly around that speech is a critical form of political action, making Gino Cecchettin’s speech at Giulia’s funeral a possible site for the instigation of political change. His position enables him to speak to his peers within the dominant sphere in a way that Elena is unable to, exemplified when he calls out to the men listening, or to the political institutions he believes should take responsibility for violence against women. As uptake of Gino’s speech continues to circulate, the effects of his intervention in the dominant sphere appear even more prominently. Nancy Fraser notes that “public opinion is considered efficacious if and only if it is mobilized as a political force to hold public power accountable, ensuring that the latter’s exercise reflects the considered will of civil society” (Fraser 2007: 22). On March 5th the publisher Rizzoli released a book by Gino Cecchettin, entitled *Dear Giulia*³¹ (Cecchettin 2024). The book “interrogates the most brutal effects of a patriarchal cultura that still surrounds us and finds the words to remember who Giulia was and what [Gino] learned from her”³² (Rizzoli 2024). Just as Gino’s speech at Giulia’s funeral worked to appeal to political and public responsibility for

³¹ *Cara Giulia* (Cecchettin 2024).

³² “interroga sugli esiti più efferati di una cultura patriarcale che ancora ci riguarda e trova le parole per ricordare chi era Giulia e cosa ha imparato da lei” (Rizzoli 2024).

minimizing violence against women, I argue that this book is yet another instantiation of his efforts to make strategic use of his position in the public sphere to extend the transformative potential of the discourse set out by Elena.

If a discursive event such as Gino Cecchetti's speech may be able to begin to bridge the gap between feminist counterpublics and dominant publics, what might this mean for the politics taking place in the dominant public sphere moving forward? As I close this section, I think briefly through the public sphere along political lines, asking what kind of politics takes place in the public sphere, and how acts such as Gino and Elena's discourse could destabilize the power established in the dominant public sphere. Public sphere theory and political philosophy that theorizes about the political realm are united in the understanding that the political and, perhaps too the public, realms of life are constituted solely by nature of there being actors participating, in a multiplicity, in discourse and politics together (Zerilli 2005: 20). That which emerges out of and sustains the public sphere is power; "politics involves power, only power as that which is "generated when people gather together and 'act in concert,' [and] which disappears the moment they depart" (*HC*, 244)" (ibid: 21). If the possibility for actors from a feminist counterpublic to break into the dominant public, interrupting and shaping discourse, and therefore politics, taking place in the public sphere, then perhaps there is the possibility for radically transformative ideological shifts to take place. Perhaps Elena's work to reverse Italian understandings of the distinction between public and private may be taken up beyond the spheres she is a member of and may make its way into Italian politics broadly construed. If, as Arendt presents it, politics is "a world question or, more precisely...a world-building activity" (ibid: 22), what might the political world Elena is building come to look like?

Judith Butler, writing about assembly as a mode of political action, claims that “acting in concert can be an embodied form of calling into question the inchoate and powerful dimensions of reigning notions of the political” (Butler 2015: 9) and that discourse that works to “establish “the people” in one way or another is a bid to have a certain border recognized” (ibid: 5). By calling out to an international feminist movement in her speeches, Elena is making a bid to have a transnational public of feminist recognized. As Nancy Fraser points out, Habermasian “public sphere theory has been implicitly informed by a Westphalian political imaginary: it has tacitly assumed the frame of a bounded political community with its own territorial state” (Fraser 2007: 8). Thus, for politics in the public sphere to be efficacious it should not exceed the bounds of the national or attempt to speak to non-citizens. But Elena’s project pushes beyond this, creating the possibility for discourse to traverse national boundaries.

It may yet be too early to tell what the implications for Italian feminism and Italian politics the Cecchettin family’s interventions might have. However, I have attempted in this section to tease out elements of politics and publics that present challenges or avenues for future ideological change for feminists in public sphere. It is in itself impactful for a man like Gino Cecchettin to circulate feminist discourse so explicitly in the dominant public sphere, especially in a country such as Italy with such restrictive and defined understandings of the separation between what is public and what is private. Hence, I argue that this may be symptomatic of a tidal change in the functioning of the political, public sphere in Italy. It remains to be seen exactly how these changes will take shape.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have worked to examine the potential for feminist discourse to be transformative – semiotically, altering our understandings of the qualities of the public and the private, and politically, changing the public's feminist ideology is capable of reaching. In bringing together theorizations of public with conversations about the construction of the distinction between the public and the private, I have introduced a view of public as discursively built and manipulable, and I have demonstrated the capacity for feminist discourse to substantively challenge social boundaries that appear concrete, such as the distinction between public and private.

In the first section, I constructed an axis of differentiation that parses the qualities of the public and the private spheres, as they are traditionally understood in Italy. I drew on discourse from the talk show *Domenica In*, as well as articles published in Italian newspapers, and political slogans, in order to reinforce the many dyadic relationships that I see existing in Italian conceptions of the public/private distinction.

In the second section, I used a close reading of Elena Cecchetti's speech on the show *Dritto e Rovescio* to argue that she actively reverses the axis of differentiation outlined in the first section. Her speech challenges the dyads taken for granted in Italian understandings of the qualities that make up the public and private spheres, and her speech represents a quintessential piece of feminist discourse that threatens to destabilize the status quo.

In the third section, I examined uptake of Elena's speech, looking for moments of circulation following her initial intervention on *Dritto e Rovescio*. I argued that she mobilized and spoke directly to a feminist counterpublic and brought feminist discourse into Italian media in a novel, or at the very least, an unusual way. In doing so, she pushes up against the boundaries of

the dominant public, suggesting the possibility for feminist discourse to be politically transformative.

Finally, in the fourth section, I pointed towards the political implications that the dissemination of feminist discourse and ideology in the dominant sphere might have. I took up Gino Cecchetti as a potential agent to bridge the gap between the feminist counterpublic and the Italian dominant public, and I illustrated the ways that his interventions – such as his speech at Giulia’s funeral, and his recently published book – have the potential to disrupt the boundaries of the dominant public.

The overarching ambition of this thesis has been to complicate the straightforward distinction between the public and the private that circulates in Italian understandings, and to dovetail the nuanced reshaping of the public/private distinction taking place here with an interrogation into how publics are formed, called upon, and expanded. I have shown, ultimately, that the borders of the dominant public can be frayed by feminist discourse, a type of discourse that carries with it, inherently I would argue, a vision of the public and the private that works to bring a multiplicity of voices into the public sphere, rather than simply a handful, imbuing it with the potential for radical political change.

As I began to point to in closing the final section, Elena is never *just* speaking to an Italian feminist public. Beyond the movements and public figures she invokes, Elena explicitly names and accuses the patriarchy, a structural force that characterizes and shapes contemporary life across the globe by privileging white, heterosexual cis male supremacy above all else. As Nancy Fraser reminds us: “Where such structures [like patriarchy] transgress the borders of states, the corresponding public spheres must be transnational” (Fraser 2007: 8). My work here leaves much to be explored as far as the creation of publics beyond the bounds of the nation. How is it that

global movements gain traction such that someone like Elena Cecchetti can meaningfully invoke a *Non Una di Meno* slogan, a slogan which in turn exists only because of the movement's genesis in the Latin American feminist movement *Ni Una Mas*? How, as an anthropologist, might one even approach a theory of the public equipped with a wide enough lens to capture political forces and their uptake across countries and continents? As a member of a diasporic Italian feminist public myself, how do I make sense of this paper as a piece of discursive uptake of Elena's speech, the very thing I am attempting to analyze here? What I aim to indicate with these many questions is the enormous possibility for an expanded concept of 'the public,' and of 'publics' opened up by this paper. As our political and social worlds become increasingly globally minded, mediated by the Internet and transcontinental travel, there seems to me an urgency to the development of new theories of the public that make sense of how movements organize and take shape, such that we might continue to organize ourselves even more effectively in the future.

References

- @AJLISTENINGPOST & @TARIQNAFI 2024. Journalists at Italy's Rai have staged a strike this past week. *Instagram* (available on-line: https://www.instagram.com/p/C6zPSPxri_2/, accessed).
- BALZANO, M. 2024. Contro i femminicidi: la sindrome degli annunci. *Corriere Della Sera*, 12 January.
- BERTONE, C. & R. FERRERO CAMOLETTO 2011. Bringing Masculinity Into the Picture: Understanding the Gendered Dimensions of (Hetero)Sexuality in Italy. *Annales* **21**.
- BUONOCORE, M. 2023. Ascolti TV | Domenica 19 Novembre 2023. Boom per Sinner (29.5% – 5,5 mln su Rai1, 6.4% – 1,2 mln su Sky). Lea vince ma con il 16.3%, Terra Amara stabile (15.3%), Fazio 10.8-9.6%, Del Debbio cresce (7.7%). Record Venier. *Davide Maggio* (available on-line: <https://www.davidemaggio.it/archives/226032/ascolti-tv-domenica-19-novembre-2023>, accessed).
- BUTLER, J. 2015. *Notes towards a performative theory of assembly*. (The Mary Flexner lectures of Bryn Mawr college). Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard university press.
- CALLONI, M. 2024. Violenza sulle donne e lotta al patriarcato: finalmente qualcosa si muove. *Corriere Della Sera*, 21 January.
- CAMILLI, A. 2023. Che c'è di diverso nel femminicidio di Giulia Cecchettin. *L'Essenziale*, 21 November.
- CARRER, L. 2023. Le foto della manifestazione nazionale contro la violenza sulle donne. *Wired*, 25 November (available on-line: <https://www.wired.it/gallery/donne-violenza-corteo-25-novembre-foto-roma-non-una-di-meno/>, accessed).
- CECCHETTIN, G. 2023. Il papà di Giulia Cecchettin: "Voglio sperare che la sua morte produca pace e un vero cambiamento". *Il Manifesto*, 6 December.

- 2024. *Cara Giulia*. Rizzoli Libri.
- DE GREGORIO, A. 2018. Meloni: «Difendo le famiglie tradizionali». Ironia sui social. *Corriere Della Sera*, 23 January.
- FRASER, N. 1990. Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. *Social Text* **25/26**, 56–80.
- 2007. Special Section: Transnational Public Sphere: Transnationalizing the Public Sphere: On the Legitimacy and Efficacy of Public Opinion in a Post-Westphalian World. *Theory, Culture & Society* **24**, 7–30.
- GAL, S. 2002. A Semiotics of the Public/Private Distinction. *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* **13**, 77–95.
- GAL, S. & J. T. IRVINE 2019. *Signs of difference: language and ideology in social life*. Cambridge, United Kingdom; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- GAL, S. & G. KLIGMAN 2000. *The politics of gender after socialism: a comparative-historical essay*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- GAL, S., K. A. WOOLARD, & AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (eds) 2001. *Languages and publics: the making of authority*. (Encounters v. 2). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2000. 54/134. *International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women*. United Nations.
- GILIOLI, F. 2019. Elezioni. Meloni: ‘Difendo le famiglie tradizionali, italiane e che fanno figli’. *La Repubblica* (available on-line: <https://video.repubblica.it/dossier/elezioni-politiche-2018/elezioni-meloni-difendo-le-famiglie-tradizionali-italiane-e-che-fanno-figli/294986/295603>, accessed).

- HABERMAS, J. 2015. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. John Wiley & Sons.
- IMARISIO, M. 2023a. Giulia Cecchettin, un dolore privato si trasforma in lutto pubblico. *Corriere Della Sera*, 31 December.
- 2023b. I funerali di Giulia Cecchettin: le lacrime, il «rumore», il discorso del padre: «Ora sei una stella». *Corriere Della Sera*, 6 December.
- JAFFE, A. 2009. Introduction: The Sociolinguistics of Stance. In *Stance*, 1–28. Oxford University Press (available on-line: <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331646.001.0001/acprof-9780195331646>, accessed 5 December 2023).
- LA REPUBBLICA 2023a. Consigliere regionale della Lega contro la sorella di Giulia: “Patriarcato inesistente, Elena vestita da satanista: quello è il vero male”. *La Repubblica*, 21 November.
- 2023b. Giulia Cecchettin è morta dissanguata dopo la coltellata al collo nel parcheggio. Turetta interrogato per 9 o... *La Repubblica*, 1 December, Cronaca.
- LATZA NADEAU, B. & A. MORTENSEN 2024. Italy grapples with its patriarchal history as femicide cases shock the nation. *CNN World*, 9 March (available on-line: <https://www.cnn.com/2024/03/09/europe/italy-grapples-patriarchy-femicide-shock-intl/index.html>, accessed).
- LEACH, E. 1954. *Political Systems of Highland Burma*. Beacon Press.
- MANTEGAZZA, P. 1887. *Le Estasi Umane*. Milano: Paolo Mantegazza.
- MEDIA FOR EUROPE 2024. 2023 Full Year Results Presentation 18th April 2024 (available on-line: <https://www.mfemediaforeurope.com/en/events/77/2023-nine-months-results-presentation.html>, accessed).

- MELANDRI, L. 2019. *Love and violence: the vexatious factors of civilization*. (SUNY series in contemporary Italian philosophy). Albany: SUNY Press.
- 2023a. Gino Cecchettin e il senso politico dell'amore. *Il Manifesto*, 7 December.
- 2023b. La normalità della violenza e la rivelazione di Elena. *Il Manifesto*, 23 November.
- MOURIQUAND, D. 2023. How a Peruvian poem has become the Italian anthem denouncing violence against women. *euronews.culture* (available on-line: <https://www.euronews.com/culture/2023/11/25/how-a-peruvian-poem-has-become-the-italian-anthem-denouncing-violence-against-women>, accessed).
- MURGIA, M. 2011. *Ave Mary: e la Chiesa inventò la donna*. (Einaudi). Torino: Einaudi.
- NON UNA DI MENO 2023. Transfemminista ingovernabili contro la violenza patriarcale.
- NONUNADIMENO 2018. SLOGAN E CANZONI NON UNA DI MENO. *Non Una di Meno* (available on-line: <https://nonunadimeno.wordpress.com/2018/11/20/slogan-e-canzoni-non-una-di-meno/>, accessed).
- PARMIGIANI, G. 2019. *Feminism, violence, and representation in modern Italy: 'we are witnesses, not victims'*. (New anthropologies of Europe). Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- PASQUINI, E. 2023. Ascolti TV | Martedì 5 dicembre 2023. Cresce Un Professore (21.7%). La Coppa Italia si ferma al 10.3%. Bene Iene (9.9%) e Floris (8%). L'ultima di Boomerissima al 4.9%. Affari Tuoi sfiora i 5,5 milioni (25.3%). Il 50.6% per i funerali di Giulia Cecchettin (Rai1 31.7%, Canale5 18.9%). *Davide Maggio* (available on-line: <https://www.davidemaggio.it/archives/226504/ascolti-tv-martedi-5-dicembre-2023>, accessed).

- PEARCE, J. 2020. *Politics without violence? towards a post-Weberian enlightenment*. (Rethinking political violence). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- PICCOLILLO, V. 2023. «Faremo una guida per riconoscere tutti i segnali spia» Nordio: nuove norme? Utili, non risolutive. *Corriere Della Sera*, 20 November, Primo Piano, 11.
- PISANI, M. C. 2023. La violenza contro le donne è una questione maschile. *Corriere Della Sera*, 24 November.
- POSTIGLIONE, V. 2023. Il patriarcato esiste ancora, è il momento della svolta. *Corriere Della Sera*, 24 November.
- PRUSA, A., B. GARCIA NICE & O. SOLEDAD 2020. "Not One Women Less, Not One More Death." Feminist Activism and Policy Responses to Gender-Based Violence in Latin America. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* (available on-line: <https://gjia.georgetown.edu/2020/08/12/not-one-women-less-not-one-more-death-feminist-activism-and-policy-responses-to-gender-based-violence-in-latin-america/>, accessed).
- Puntata del 19 novembre 2023. *Dritto e Rovescio* (available on-line: https://mediasetinfinity.mediaset.it/video/drittoerovescio/puntata-del-19-novembre_F312803901002101, accessed).
- Puntata del 19/11/2023 2023. *Domenica In* (available on-line: <https://www.raiplay.it/video/2023/11/Domenica-In---Puntata-del-19112023-4da7c70c-2c34-47c0-97d6-21b70727252c.html>, accessed).
- RADFORD, J. & D. E. H. RUSSELL (eds) 1992. *Femicide: the politics of woman killing*. New York: Toronto: New York: Twayne; Maxwell Macmillan Canada; Maxwell Macmillan International.

- RIZZOLI 2024. Cara Giulia. *Rizzoli Libri* (available on-line: <https://www.rizzolilibri.it/libri/cara-giulia/>, accessed).
- ROTH-GORDON, J. 2020. Situating Discourse Analysis in Ethnographic and Sociopolitical Context. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Discourse Studies* (eds) A. De Fina & A. Georgakopoulou, 32–51. (1st edition). Cambridge University Press (available on-line: https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/9781108348195%23CN-bp-2/type/book_part, accessed 28 January 2024).
- SALVATICI, S. (ed) 2022. *Storia delle donne nell'Italia contemporanea*. (1a edizione). (Freccce **346**). Roma: Carocci editore.
- SCHETTINI, L. 2022. La violenza maschile contro le donne. In *Storia delle donne nell'Italia contemporanea* (ed) S. Salvatici. (1a edizione). (Freccce **346**). Roma: Carocci editore.
- SGRECCIA, C. 2023. Elena Cecchetti persona dell'anno, L'Espresso in edicola. *L'Espresso*, 20 December.
- SILVERSTEIN, M., E. S. CARR, S. GAL & C. V. NAKASSIS 2023. *Language in culture: lectures on the social semiotics of language*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- SLAVIN, R. 1933. St. Thomas and His Teaching on the Family. *Dominicana XVIII*, 135–141.
- STORNI, J. 2022. La Crusca: Meloni andrebbe chiamata la Presidente del Consiglio. L'articolo al maschile è un ritorno al passato. *Corriere Della Sera*, 1 November.
- @THEPERIODOFF 2023. Non fare clic baiting sui casi di violenza sulle donne. *Instagram* (available on-line: <https://www.instagram.com/p/C0MiYPWs9Zi/>, accessed).
- TRECCANI 2023. Femminicidio è la parola dell'anno 2023. *Treccani* (available on-line: <https://www.treccani.it/magazine/atlante/societa/femminicidio-e-la-parola-dell-anno-2023.html>, accessed).

WARNER, M. 2010. *Publics and counterpublics*. (1. paperback ed., 3. print, 4. print). New York, NY: Zone Books.

ZAMBELLI, E., A. MAINARDI & A. HAJEK 2018. Sexuality and power in contemporary Italy: subjectivities between gender norms, agency and social transformation. *Modern Italy* **23**, 129–138.

ZERILLI, L. M. G. 2005. *Feminism and the abyss of freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.