l'idée d'empire dans la pensée politique de Tommaso Campanella. Selon Campanella, l'Italie du XVIIe siècle se trouve coincée entre une légitimité impériale issue de la papauté et de Rome, et l'existence d'un empire « réel » représenté par la monarchie espagnole.

*Idées d'empire* dévoile la variété des discours et méthodes utilisées pour comprendre la complexité de la notion d'empire à différentes échelles entre le XIVe et le XVIIe siècle. Paradoxalement, ce fil conducteur est la plus grande faiblesse de cet ouvrage. En effet, c'est à cause de la pluralité des sujets d'étude que l'ouvrage manque de cohérence thématique. Dans l'essai introductoire, Crémoix et Fournel écrivent : « …l'étude de la question impériale peut… contribuer àposer différemment la *vexata quaestio* de la naissance de l'État moderne… » (14). Mais la complexité du sujet engendre un certain manque de profondeur dans les discussions sur le développement de l'idée de l'état-nation et de sa coexistence avec les *idées* d'empire au début de la modernité (à l'exception du texte de Juan Carlos D'Amico dans la deuxième section). Même si la plupart des auteurs montrent avec méticulosité les particularités de la notion qu'ils abordent, ces réflexions ne présentent pas une valeur conceptuelle capable de dévoiler la relation entre « les idées » d'empire et les processus de naissance et développement de l'État moderne.

**MAURICIO SUCHOWLANSKY**  
University of Toronto


In the last decades the name Giovan Battista Andreini (1576-1654) has slowly regained some of the significance it held in the Baroque era. A few of the works of this important *homme de théâtre* have been republished in modern editions in recent years in Italy. With this edition of *Amor nello specchio* (1622), English speakers will be able for the first time to read a play by the son of Isabella Andreini, the first international European diva.

In this handsome volume Jon R. Snyder proposes an edition of the Italian text of *Love in the Mirror* with a facing translation accompanied by a detailed introduction, a rich critical apparatus of notes, and a thorough bibliography. The inclusion of a work by a male author in the collection *The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe* is justified by its unusual theme. The play revolves around the passionate, consensual love affair between its two female protagonists, Florinda and Lidia, two ladies from Florence. This comedy, very enjoyable to read, contains standard comical scenes in the spirit of *commedia dell'arte*, but also some highly unusual material. The scene that gives the play its title shows Florinda first deeply involved in admiring her own reflection in her mirror, then falling in love with another image captured by her looking glass—that of a youth at a window. This young man turns out to be Lidia.
The writing for the female roles throughout the play is very strong. Virginia Ramponi, Florinda à la scène and Andreini’s wife à la ville, was one of the great divas of the first half of the seventeenth century. She was the performer who, called at the last minute to create the part of Arianna in Monteverdi’s eponymous opera, sang and acted it so convincingly that “ne fu pur una Dama che non versasse qualche lagrimetta al suo pianto” (Follino, cited in A. Soleriti’s Gli albori del melodramma, Milan, 1905). For this actress, Andreini wrote the most prominent monologues of the play. Opposite her, the performer playing the part of Lidia would have had to display a virtuosity of her own, as she switches gender from scene to scene, playing both Lidia and her brother Eugenio (who claims to be a hermaphrodite). The scenes of Bernetta, the bawdy maid of Florinda, are also very striking, with a strong subversive tone directed against the patriarchal order.

Snyder acknowledges that his version of the Italian text is indebted to the Italian edition of the play curated by Salvatore Maira and Anna Michela Borracci for Bulzoni (1997). Therefore, the more important features of this North American edition lie squarely in the introduction and the translation of the play. The most noteworthy element of the introduction is certainly the sweeping panorama that Snyder offers of Andreini’s life and times. In a few remarkable pages, Snyder succeeds in imparting the complex, interconnected forces that shaped the life of a playwright of the Baroque era, not to mention the intellectual debates, the dramaturgical issues, and the societal tensions of the time. I don’t remember having read before such a rich and nuanced depiction of Italian theatre in the Baroque age in such a concise form.

The section of the introduction that I found less satisfying, however, is the coverage of the afterlife of the play. Snyder writes an enthusiastic and detailed analysis of the film by Salvatore Maira by the same title of Andreini’s play, yet only a few scenes of Andreini’s comedy are actually performed in the film (which by the way had its avant-première at the Toronto International Film Festival in 1999). On the other hand, the important production of L’Amore allo specchio directed by Luca Ronconi in Ferrara in 2002 is evoked in a much more cursory manner than it deserves: Ronconi is, after all, the most important living Italian stage director. The fact that Mariangela Melato interpreted the part of Florinda seems significant, and the reader might find it interesting to understand how Ronconi succeeded in producing a play with a cast of twenty. In fact, Ronconi first produced Amor nello specchio in 1987 in a theatre school context, and then, again, established a partnership with a theatre school for the Ferrara production. These points are not backstage minutiae but should be seen as important in an edition of the play that has the ambition to propose Love in the Mirror for potential productions.

In his translation, Snyder keeps, perhaps wisely, a similar distance with performance issues. He translates the property list that appears at the end of the original edition of the play but avoids opening the Pandora’s Box of the literary status of a text still profoundly shaped by commedia dell’arte performance practices. Although his bibliography mentions Richard Andrew’s Scripts and Scenarios: The Performance of Comedy in Renaissance Italy (1993) and Robert Henke’s Performance and Literature in the Commedia dell’Arte (2002), Snyder doesn’t elaborate on what
possible translation strategies could be used with this kind of text. He leaves it to the practitioners to adapt his translation for performance, as he proposes “a version that could be transformed ... into a performance text” (33, emphasis added). Thus, he avoids making radical choices (for instance, rendering the passages in Bolognese dialect into Cockney), and his elegant version has the merit of being very close to the Italian original, often cleverly paraphrasing the text if a joke or allusion risked being lost in translation. Overall, I imagine that English-speaking readers will find this edition of *Love in the Mirror* at the same time very useful and exciting, and will be left wishing for more editions of plays by Andreini and his contemporaries.

GUILLAUME BERNARDI
Glendon College, York University


The thesis of this book is that Vico, who was steeped in rhetoric and who indeed was a teacher and a theorist of rhetoric, experienced after 1720 something of a crisis. Marshall opines that on that year Vico came to understand that the classical conception of a rhetoric tied to the Greek *polis* was inadequate for modern times. Thus, he “sublimated” the “rhetorical politics”, which he had inherited from Aristotle and Quintilian, into a new technique. Drawing inspiration from Homer’s epics, which were originally poems sung in the marketplaces and fairs of Greece, Vico grasped the need for a new rhetoric that would link together words and deeds. This new insight into language responded to the realities of Naples and hopefully would provide the “conditions of possibility” for future political action. Marshall finds in Vico a variant of what Gramsci called a “philosophy of praxis.”

This central thesis allows Marshall to reject the old, superannuated scholarly debates on Vico as either an anti-modern or as an Enlightenment thinker. On the contrary, so does Marshall write, Vico belongs fully to the economy of early eighteenth-century Naples, a city in which he felt isolated and marginal, an intellectual without any purchase in the political discourse and critical decisions. This existential (but not political) sense of rootedness in the concrete, historical terrain of Neapolitan life, devoid, as it was at that time, of democratic institutions, so does Marshall argue, forced Vico to think anew and reflect on ways in which the space of political action could be retrieved. The claim of lack of political institutions in Naples overstates the case. In reality, Vico’s writings consistently evoke public spaces—the university, the academies, bookstores, marketplaces, the judicial fora, theatres — thus investing literature with a public value. These spaces constitute places of debates, exchanges, and decisions by self-styled elites. But the detail is meant to suggest that the overall argument of this book, although it is not without a certain appeal, does not really deal with Vico. Rather, it comes forth as a