mathematics, anyone interested in reorienting the relations of numbers, letters, shapes, and words will find this book to be a treasure trove.

ALEXANDER BERTLAND

Niagara University

Raffaele Lampugnani. *La prima traduzione italiana de La Celestina: Primo commento linguistico e critico agli inizi del Cinquecento*. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 2015. Pp. 171+xxii. ISBN 9788822264237.

Raffaele Lampugnani's precise philological study compares the first Italian translation of the Spanish masterpiece commonly known as *La Celestina*, made by Alphonso de Hordognez in 1506, to the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, attributed to Fernando de Rojas and first published in its 21-act version in 1501. Lampugnani's aim is to come to a deeper appreciation of the style, method of translation, and attitude of Hordognez by analyzing his translation from the inside, without presuming to formulate "conclusioni risolutive" outside the text under examination (153).

Departing from Hordognez's introductory letter to the 1506 translation, Lampugnani offers in the first chapter a convincing and admirably detailed biography of the translator, including Hordognez's warm support of Pope Alexander VI and antipathy for the Borgia successor Julius II. He further follows in the first chapter Hordognez's connections to several interlocutors from Baldassar Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier*, filling in the gaps of the translator's cultural interactions in Urbino, Rome, and Valencia. The second chapter catalogues the 13 subsequent editions of the *Celestina* containing Hordognez's translation and the mention of seven others that Lampugnani categorizes as "dubbi essendo irreperibili" (13).

Chapters 3–5 define and parse Hordognez's method of translation. Lampugnani demonstrates how Hordognez endeavours to remain faithful to the content of the text. His Italian lexicon, morphology, and syntax mirror quite closely those of the original Spanish, if anything erring on the side of translating too literally—in some cases offering hispanisms that are false friends (i.e., *no auemos dormido sueno* remains "non hauemo possuto dormire sogno" in the Italian translation, though the expression, Lampugnani notes, would be more accurately

rendered “non abbiamo potuto chiudere occhio,” 55). Hordognez also de-emphasizes his presence as translator by assisting his reader with glosses containing cultural information to bridge possible gaps in understanding.

After this grounding in the translator's method, the way is cleared for an analysis of what Lampugnani calls Hordognez's literary style in the sixth and seventh chapters. Lampugnani permits his readers to see the implicit moral or religious judgment that the translator conveys in his rendering of *errar* as ‘peccare’, or in the array of terms used to translate *pagol/pagal/buen pagol/pagar* (‘remuneration’, ‘pagamento’, ‘bon merito’, ‘essere puniti’) or *pena* (‘culpa’, ‘punitione’, ‘passione’, ‘alteratione’, ‘dolore’), for instance (78). Moreover, Lampugnani lightly corrects previous scholars (M. Lacalle; K. Kish) in a footnote for characterizing Hordognez's translation as an error when he treats the rendering of “*¿Que un tan excelente don sea por mi posseydo?*” ‘che così eccellente donna sia per me posseduta’ [...] L'eufemismo, è ovvio, non va a genio al traduttore che preferisce parlare chiaro; un dono non si ‘possiede’, ma una donna sì!’ (82). Lampugnani also critiques Stephen Gilman's *The Art of La Celestina* for drawing conclusions about the style of Rojas when the object appears to be Hordognez's translation style (103). In terms of Hordognez's style, Lampugnani limits himself to critiquing only his habit of unnecessarily finishing many expressions from the original because to do so sacrifices the *Celestina*'s linguistic spontaneity (113; for example: “*esta en casa otro que mas quiero, mas gracioso que tu*” “e unaltro in casa: che piu che te amo: e piu gratio e bello che non sei tu” [110], or “*quanto tenia mejores dientes*” “quando hauea meglio denti che adesso” [111]). Overall, Lampugnani concludes that Hordognez's style is “costante” and “particolare,” demonstrating “una sensibilità viva (anche se a volte pedante)” (140).

The important takeaways from Lampugnani's study also include that Hordognez views the *Celestina* as a moral anti-exemplum. Hordognez mutes or leaves out entirely some religious references (“*¿Oyes sus tristes cantares? ¿Rezando lleuan con responso mi bien todo...?*” becomes “triste lamenti? con pianto & dolore?” 144), while he embellishes with Petrarchan touches other passages: “Hordognez raffigura l'amante Calisto, non in procinto di entrare nell'orto (*quando entre por estrena*) come nell'originale, ma adagiato serenamente fra i fiorellini: “Tutti gigli con le rose fuor gitando freschi odori du Calisto seripose” (145). Lampugnani also concurs with some previous scholars that the *Celestina* seems to have had little influence beyond Niccolò Machiavelli's *Mandragola*, selected other plays, and its mention by Carlo Emilio Gadda. While beyond the bounds that Lampugnani sets

for his study, it seems to me that Rojas's *romanzo dialogato* had a notable influence beyond Italian theatre, offering a model for characterization and elements of narrative in Italian *novelle* and prose romances of the Cinquecento.

SHERRY ROUSH

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Alexandra Collier. *Women, Rhetoric, and Drama in Early Modern Italy*. New York: Routledge, 2017. Pp. 282. ISBN 9781472478818.

The ancients gave us the genres of comedy and tragedy. As explained in *Women, Rhetoric, and Drama in Early Modern Italy*, dramas produced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were of three types: comedy, tragedy, and tragicomedy in the pastoral mode. Tragicomedy was an invention of the sixteenth century, generated by the tendency of Italians to experiment with new writing forms. In addition to the development of a new genre, women were becoming authors in their own right. Thus, women's issues and perspectives received expression from personal sources.

Author Alexandra Collier examines surprising contributions by writers of this period while not neglecting male-authored representations of female protagonists, for example the play by Ruzante (also known as Angelo Beolco), *L'Anconitana*. She pays particular attention to the pro-feminist aspects of this play, a Renaissance comedy. The play is also unique as one of the first dramatized examples of female cross-dressing. Surprisingly, the quest for women's education and financial independence are serious modern issues that are broached in this male-authored early comedy.

The first female-authored comedy, *Li Buffoni*, by Margherita Costa, focuses on the unhappy marriage of Meo, Prince of Morocco, and Marmotta, Princess of Fessa. According to critics, the inspiration for these characters is drawn from Costa's experience at the Medici court of Ferdinand II and Vittoria della Rovere. Costa's writing is recognized for its outspoken, assertive nature and its noncompliance with the rules of patriarchal society. Collier posits that Costa's dramatic construction of the female-centred and female-governed realm of Marmotta's Fessa, standing independent of Meo's Morocco, was inspired by the villa of Poggio Imperiale, where Grand Duchess della Rovere forged a court of her own, apart from her consort's in Florence.