gola (ch. 5) to the tyrannicidal context and implications of Lorenzino de' Medici's *L'Aridosia* (ch. 6); from the Florentine exequies for Michelangelo (ch. 7) to the "death of comedy" in Francesco D'Ambra's *La Cofanaria* (ch. 8) and the "revenge of the Gothic" in Girolamo Bargagli's *Dialogo dei giuochi* (ch. 9).

Throughout these chapters, the author claims to be following a line of development that moves from the rhetorical intentions of Jacopo Nardi to the oneiric quality of Leonine Rome, where "images mattered more than facts" (81). Having delineated such a movement, Gareffi then proceeds to point out how "theatre, like a mirror, unites material reality with imagined reality" (99). Death, the great leveller, then enters on stage with the pageantry organized for Michelangelo's exequies. The author claims this event rings the death knell of the *festa*, just as Francesco D'Ambra's *Cofanaria* puts comedy to rest (303).

The volume is richly annotated, with ample and clear notes. They offer the reader a variety of further readings, both in primary and secondary sources. They also give a wealth of information that is, otherwise, not easily available. Given the amount of material covered by the author, it is not surprising that some slips have occurred — I will limit myself to one correction and one complaint. It has now been established beyond a doubt that Lorenzo de' Medici's play *Rappresentazione di SS. Giovanni e Paolo* was written and performed in 1491, not 1489 as Gareffi claims on several occasions. The correct dating was established by Hamilton A. Mathes in his "On the Date of Lorenzo's *Sacra rappresentazione di S. Giovanni e Paolo* Febr. 17, 1491" *Aevum. Rassegna di scienze storiche linguistiche e filologiche* 25.1 (1951): 324-28. Secondly, it is disappointing to find sexist references still present in contemporary scholarly writings. On several occasions in this volume Laura Battiferri, the most celebrated woman poet of sixteenth-century Florence, is referred to as "Ammannati's wife," with no mention of her own name. Surely Battiferri merited to be recognized on her own right as an individual, and not merely as a man's wife.

In its complexity and far-reaching views this volume provides a novel and inspiring contribution to our understanding of festive celebrations in the sixteenth century. Although the author has limited his observations to a Florentine context (which for him includes Leonine Rome), his conclusions can inform our understanding of theatre and festivity in much of Renaissance Europe.

KONRAD EISENBICHLER

Victoria College, University of Toronto

Daniel Javitch. *Proclaiming a Classic: The Canonization of Orlando Furioso*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991. Pp. x, 205.

The gist of this important new study is neatly encapsulated in its title. The book examines how certain readers in the sixteenth century argued that Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* was equal or even superior to the ancient classical epics which constituted one set of touchstones by which the poem was judged in the late Renaissance. This process of the poem's canonization as an authoritative text would eventually earn it the status of a classical work, even though it was composed in a vernacular language. The *Furioso* thus became the Italian tradition's first long narrative poem to be promoted as a modern classic.

This phenomenon occurred, Javitch makes clear, because the Italian readers of the day needed a classical epic in their own language. A poem of such status conferred upon their vernacular tradition instant nobility.

There is much in *Proclaiming a Classic* to interest the student of the literary traditions of early modern Italy and England (the last chapter deals with Harington's Elizabethan translation of Ariosto). But the book deserves a wider audience, primarily for the discussion of canonicity that underlies much of its argument. On the question of canon formation, Javitch takes the side of those theorists who argue that classicism, indeed canonicity itself, is a result of cultural production. Specific needs and ideologies shaped the formation of the canon in the Renaissance; readers, critics, academicians, not to mention the publishers of a poem like Ariosto's, performed a vital role in this canonizing process. As Javitch notes in his conclusion: "The rapidity of its canonization can be attributed to the need, which the *Furioso* evidently met, for a vernacular narrative poem that measured up to ancient heroic poetry" (163). Sixteenth-century Italian readers could boast of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, but not until the publication of Ariosto's poem (and the accompanying favorable editorial publicity) could they claim to have a poem comparable to the epics of ancient Rome and Greece. Ariosto, described repeatedly by sixteenth-century critics as the new Vergil, in the *Furioso* created what one critic went so far as to call a "quasi *Iliade novella*" (163).

It is in the context of the ongoing discussion on canonicity that Javitch suggests a response to the biggest question of all: "What is a classic?" From his analysis of the fortune of the *Furioso*, one deduces that a classic in literature (I think the same definition would apply to other arts as well) is a work that is repeatedly called upon to be the locus of a culture's discussion of those issues which are of greatest concern to it. That is, a classic is a text like the Bible or the *Oresteia* or Ariosto's *Furioso* to which succeeding generations put new and urgent questions. The more frequently and the more urgently the questions are put, the more classical the status of the work. Thus, each generation according to its needs reconfirms the authority of canonical works or confers canonical status on works that were disregarded by previous generations. The guiding question underlying such a process changes from "What is a classic?" to "What makes a classic?" or, in Javitch's terms, "What leads one to proclaim a classic?"

The classical element in Ariosto's poem is not a roster of vague qualities such as cosmic harmony, untroubled objectivity, ironizing energy, which previous generations of critics have upheld. Rather, the *Furioso* harbors the classical inasmuch as it is a site for the discussion of issues of the utmost importance to its readers. In the academic circles of sixteenth-century Italy, as Javitch documents with finesse, those issues were first and foremost of a literary theoretical nature. And therein lies the value of Javitch's research to scholars of literary theory who do not normally cast their nets as wide as the Renaissance. For the urgency of the questions asked of the *Furioso* in the sixteenth-century debates calls to mind our own contemporary concerns with matters of literary theory.

Javitch sets up this discussion in the opening chapter by presenting the different kinds of evidence that support his claim about the *Furioso*'s canonization during the century. Print records and censuses document that the poem was a best-seller, its popularity almost immediate and lasting well into the next century. Conor Fahy's recent work on the third and final edition of the *Furioso* (*L'OF del 1532*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1989) confirms Javitch's hunch about the anticipated success of the poem in Ariosto's own day. The third edition, published in 1532, was brought out in an unusually large run of some 3000 copies. This expectation of a wide readership is borne out over the following

decades with dozens of new editions printed after the poet's death in 1532. The editions of the *Furioso* physically assume the shape of classical editions with commentaries and paratexts (e.g., the life of the poet, lists of classical allusions, historical sketches), yet another indication of the classical status of Ariosto's poem. And like the classical literature that was coming to light in the Renaissance, Ariosto's work had its horde of imitators.

The greater part of the book (ch. 2-7) explores the literary debates surrounding the *Furioso* over the course of the sixteenth century. In these chapters Javitch traces the development of the claims for and against the classicism of Ariosto's poem, which can be reduced, for the sake of brevity, to three phases in the sixteenth century: 1) a body of commentaries on the classical allusions that the poet makes; 2) critical discussions of the *Furioso* (sometimes embedded in long entries within commentaries) as a classical or anti-classical poem; 3) evidence of the *Furioso*'s reverse influence on the reception of the classics later in the century. Readers familiar with Javitch's research on Ariosto will recognize his enviable knack for disentangling the positions of critics who are often less than clear. In addition to his straightforward exposition of sixteenth-century criticism on the *Furioso*, Javitch examines the suppositions, literary prejudices, cultural hegemonies that influenced the writings of Giraldi, Pigna, Fornari, Dolce, Minturno, Sassetti, Salvati, among others. Readers may be surprised to witness the quickening of material, which the critical tradition has long since dismissed as dead.

Javitch's analysis is enhanced by his familiarity with issues of textual bibliography, a relatively new area of scholarly expertise which Italian critics have begun to call "filologia dei testi a stampa" (see the useful review article on this critical approach by A. Casadei, *Lettere Italiane* 44.1 [1992]: 93-103). At every turn, Javitch shores up the argument with references to the physicality and materialistic dimensions of the texts under discussion. He discusses commentaries, for example, not only in terms of their content but also with regard to their impact on the literal shape of printed versions of poems. The layout of the *Furioso* on the page in Giolito's 1542 edition bespeaks the printer's attempt to recreate the visible appearance of a classical text, to imply that the text is a classic in its own right. Javitch's research is full of insightful glimpses of the texts under discussion.

While printers and their scholarly associates may have labored to make the *Furioso* look like a classic, the clearest indication of the poem's growing popularity was the quantity of critical discourse it generated. This was due in large part to the debate over its status as a classicizing poem, which, at its most simplistic, was an argument between neo-Aristotelians and everyone else over the degree to which the *Furioso* did or didn't abide by rules governing the epic genre. The rules in question were a combination of critical ideas deduced from Aristotle's *Poetics* and Horace's *Ars Poetica*. One strategy to make the poem legitimate was to claim that it was like a canonical epic of antiquity, a position that could lead a critic like Pigna to interpret Ariosto's life (in addition to his poem) as Vergilian (39-41). Another tactic directly in response to Aristotelian criticism of the *Furioso* was to turn the argument around and claim that the poem was a new kind of long narrative, not an epic but a romance, a theory propounded most vigorously by Giraldi Cinzio in the middle of the century. Proponents of this argument pointed to classical models of romance-like narratives such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as precedents for the *Furioso*'s interlaced narrative (see ch. 4). This line of argument could lead no less a critic than Lionardo Salvati, the guiding force behind the foundation of the Accademia della Crusca, to revise his interpretations of the classical poems themselves in the 1580s (see ch. 6). In a curious role of reversed influence, readings and translations of some

classical poems began to be influenced by the *Furioso*.

Proclaiming a Classic is primarily an investigation into a crucial moment in European literary history. But it is also a study of the theoretical implications of that moment in the late Renaissance when the engaged discussions of a few (inspired, to be sure, by the literary tastes of the many) determined the initial shaping of the modern literary canon. That so few readers nowadays are familiar with Ariosto's *Furioso* (almost no one outside the academy knows the poem) suggests that it no longer is part of the canon, i.e., there is no consistent effort at present to proclaim it a classic. And yet, although this is not Javitch's primary goal, *Proclaiming a Classic* may contribute to the rehabilitation of the *Furioso* among modern readers. It certainly should earn the poem a new audience with those readers who profess an interest in contemporary theory.

DENNIS LOONEY

University of Pittsburgh

Kenneth R. Bartlett. *The English in Italy 1525-1558. A Study in Culture and Politics*. Genève: Slatkine, 1991 (Biblioteca del viaggio in Italia 39). Pp. viii, 249.

Proporre studi e testi, conferire, insomma, alla letteratura di viaggio dignità e spessore di 'genere' è intento del Centro interuniversitario di ricerche sul "Viaggio in Italia": suo punto di forza la collezione "Biblioteca del viaggio in Italia", dove il noto studioso canadese Kenneth R. Bartlett in qualche modo completa l'indagine già iniziata da George B. Parks in *The English Traveller to Italy* (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1954), che si ferma appunto al 1525.

La scelta del periodo da indagare non è casuale: pochi sono gli studi che trattano dei rapporti anglo-italiani prima del 1558; sicché occorre, sostiene Bartlett, illuminare "the years of the Marian diaspora to indicate how the knowledge of and interest in Italy and Italian culture at the court of Elizabeth had developed in part abroad in Italy itself, cultivated by educated young laymen, mostly Protestants" (3). Cinque i capitoli in cui il volume si articola, ognuno dei quali dedicato ad una delle categorie in cui Bartlett suddivide i viaggiatori inglesi che della loro permanenza in Italia hanno lasciato testimonianza: pellegrini, preti e prelati; studiosi e studenti; viaggiatori/avventurieri; esuli; studenti/cospiratori.

Come nel Medioevo anche nel Cinquecento l'Italia veniva visitata dai pellegrini che si recavano in Terrasanta; e come nel Medioevo i viaggiatori attendevano alla stesura di testi di viaggio, come fecero Sir Richard Guildford, Sir Richard Torkington e Andrew Boorde, per citare i più significativi. Il diario di Guildford si segnala perché in esso appare la prima testimonianza di quell'apprezzamento del mondo antico che caratterizzerà gli anni successivi; quello di Torkington apre la lunga serie di impressioni su Padova e Venezia, lasciate dai viaggiatori inglesi del Cinquecento. Andrew Boorde, religioso e medico, è invece degno di menzione perché il suo testo segna l'avvio di tutta quella letteratura posttriformistica tesa a vilipendere la penisola italiana. I religiosi e i pellegrini che si recano a Roma costituiscono il gruppo più numeroso di viaggiatori inglesi; a Roma già nel 1362 era stato aperto un ospizio inglese, utilizzato anche come sede dai diplomatici in visita al Papa e dove risiedette nel 1524 lo stesso Thomas Cromwell. Con la re-