Cossar skillfully gives both gender and class to the sometimes undifferentiated mass of the 'popolo', and shows how the rhetoric of equality becomes the pious façade behind which serious and concerted efforts are being made to shape a civic-religious social and political structure that expands the power of a male elite. Her account in Chapter Two of women working in charitable hospitals is particularly valuable because she is able to sift through the individual strands of charity, work, and vocation that we have known about but whose inter-action we have never quite probed. It is significant material, because the hospital as a place for widows to retire to, work in, and eventually find shelter in was one of the prime public spaces where one finds women acting as independent legal agents. Cossar has found that this activity was seen by some as disruptive of accepted gender norms, and that it triggered responses aimed at curbing the widow's latitude. One might have found some of this by looking at minute books or shifting statues but, by adding wills and notarial records, Cossar has moved to a far more sophisticated level of analysis. This analysis shows again that any efforts to locate the roots of civil society in medieval Italian communes must deal not only with those empowered by communal politics, but perhaps even more with those who were marginalized and silenced by them.

Cossar’s fascinating study of confraternities, hospitals, and civic religion in medieval Bergamo has significance far beyond its subject city. Deeply rooted in archival sources, and written with an eye to recent scholarship on a broader range of Italian cities, it sets a model for understanding the complex interplay of religion, class, and gender in the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance.

Nicholas Terpstra
University of Toronto


Establishing the nature of the relationship between the “sister arts” with any precision has been a particular challenge in the history of art historiography for some solid historical reasons. The intellectual movement responsible for isolating art history as a discipline worthy of “scientific” study in the nineteenth century is the intellectual movement that imposed a formulation of the aesthetic committed to the idea that the various arts are not just distinct, but discrete. It is not simply then that art historiography has not been around long enough to do justice to the Western “humanistic theory of painting”, as it was called by Renssealer Lee, but that art historiography’s very raison d’être has tended to impede attempts to accomplish that justice. As if this weren’t enough, art historical investigations of ut pictura poesis have also been dogged by not unrelated preconceptions about the relationship between theory and practice. Access to the ideas that might reveal the functional relationship between painting and poetry at the time when ut pictura poesis reigned as an art theoretical concept is only possible via a highly sophisti-
cated theoretical literature that some have argued cannot possibly be relevant to the nuts and bolts of visual arts practice.

Confounding such assumptions are those visual artists of the period who put pen to paper in an attempt to theorize about their art. The relevance of rhetoric and poetics to this literature is not just apparent from the language these artists use. Their arguments bear out the notion that there was a functioning rationale for the comparability of the various art forms that even visual artists thought was significant. Among such artists, Nicolas Poussin stands out as one of the most earnest academicians of his era whose interest in visual arts theory has, over the years, garnered the attention of certain heavyweights in the field. Investigations by Erwin Panofsky and Rensselaer Lee, for example, have been more recently followed by the detailed studies of Charles Dempsey, Elizabeth Cropper and Philip Sohm, to name a few. Poussin has also turned out to be a favourite of modern literary theorists, such as Louis Marin, who have used his example to reexamine the relation between language and image. Among a younger generation of art historians, Jonathan Unglaub weighs in in this book with his own substantial offering on the "links between Poussin's art and literary culture." As the subtitle of the book suggests, the key literary player of his study is the sixteenth-century poet and theorist, Torquato Tasso.

The significance of Tasso's poetry and poetics for the literary culture of the period has long been recognized, as has their influence in the areas of painting and theatre. What gives Unglaub's study its particular substance, however, is his willingness to go the extra mile, so to speak, by taking on how that influence actually bears out in Poussin's visual choices as a painter. Not limited to explicating Poussin's art theoretical musings through an appeal to Tasso's poetics, nor to isolating Poussin's use of subjects from Tasso's poetry, nor even to noting analogies between Poussin's forms and Tasso's language, Unglaub's book tackles Tasso's critical concepts and makes a case for how Poussin worked them out in his art. Moreover, he does so in a historically sensitive fashion. The first two chapters of the book examine the connections between Tasso's theory and what we know of Poussin's ideas about art as they were expressed in his "Definition" of painting and the posthumous Osservazioni di Nicolo Poussino sopra la pittura appended by Giovanni Pietro Bellori to his life of Poussin. The last four chapters and his conclusion are devoted to detailing the ways in which he believes Poussin applied Tasso's concepts in various paintings. Throughout, Unglaub works hard not to assume that ideas have legs by establishing contemporary spheres of influence that make Poussin's reliance on Tasso indisputable.

While Unglaub recognizes and develops Poussin's adoption of Tasso's stance on a number of significant issues such as ideal imitation, the aim of delight, and the nature of verismilitude, the concept that receives the most attention in the first two chapters is Poussin's assumption of Tasso's approach to novità. Rightly demonstrating how Tasso's understanding of novelty placed more emphasis on the realization of new expressive forms than on the invention of new subjects, Unglaub goes on to show how Poussin applied this distinction to contemporary disagreements regarding artistic originality. Both discussions appropriately clarify
the tendency of modern art historians to interpret discussions of artistic originality of the period anachronistically by being quick to overlook the relationship of rhetorical invention to the election of authoritative material both literary and, in the case of Poussin, visual.

From the point of view of demonstrating Poussin's application of Tasso's poetics, the most successful of Unglaub's chapters is the one dedicated to Poussin's employment of Tasso's understanding of narrative unity. Relying to some degree on later academic discussions of *The Israelites Gathering Manna*, Unglaub is nonetheless able to make a compelling case that Poussin consciously thought through the problem of how to apply the essentially Aristotelian demand for narrative unity to the perceptual synchrony of the pictorial field. Especially convincing is Unglaub's discussion of how Poussin managed to incorporate the Aristotelian concept of *peripeteia*, or narrative reversal, into his portrayal of *The Israelites Gathering Manna*. In Unglaub's view, Poussin accomplished this by establishing a before and after sequence in the painting ultimately governed by the unifying action of God's reversal of the Israelites' predicament through his gift of manna. What Unglaub's discussion makes especially clear is that Poussin's involvement with Tasso's poetics was not in any way superficial or limited. He clearly believed that painting and poetry were operatively similar, even if structurally different.

To my mind, Unglaub's success in this chapter is partly due to the fact that Poussin's application of Tasso's principles in this particular instance accords easily with the understanding of Aristotelian poetics we have come to associate with the Renaissance. As Bernard Weinberg and, more recently, Thomas Puttfarken have demonstrated, the 1540's were very significant years in the history of the Western reception of the *Poetics* due to new Latin and Italian translations of the work by Alessandro Pazzi and Bernardo Segni respectively, not to mention the resultant flowering of a strong commentary tradition. According to this view, it was at this time that many of the key terms and concepts of the *Poetics*, such as imitation, invention, unity of action, the superiority of poetry over history, the importance of plot, and the qualities of *peripeteia* and recognition, were brought to bear on a pre-existing Horatian tradition. The result was a strict emphasis on narrative unity that more or less defined European poetics until the twentieth century.

While these themes were certainly significant for Tasso, as Unglaub demonstrates, some of the other concepts in his *Discorsi* were far less up to date, though perhaps no more than those of many of his colleagues. Unglaub's discussion of Galileo's critique of Tasso raises an issue that was in fact central to an alternative reading of the *Poetics* from the later Middle Ages by Averroes that was, nonetheless, still very much in use and often referenced by Tasso. As Unglaub observes, Galileo criticized Tasso for the obscurity of his figurative language. Unlike the clarity and amplitude of language achieved by Ariosto in the *Orlando furioso*, Tasso's language in the *Gerusalemme liberata* was disproportionate, obscure, and lifeless. As is apparent from Unglaub's account of the quarrel that raged over the superiority of Ariosto and Tasso as poets, Galileo's opposition of clarity and obscurity was a standard point of critique. At issue, however, was not, as Unglaub suggests, whether or not one or the other had achieved a kind of empirical clarity in their
poetry, but whether they had accomplished enough sensual affect in their poetry to make it effective as a mode of demonstration. The context for this distinction was not poetry's relation to "reality," but poetry's relation to philosophy as a mode of conveying knowledge. This association was fundamental to the Averroistic interpretation of the Poetics which had categorized poetry as a part of logic for the ability of its metaphors to move an audience to a psychological acceptance of any given proposition. In this context, clarity is a reference to the achievement of enargeia, where enargeia gauges simultaneously a metaphor's visual, affective, and propositional success.

Because Unglaub is very careful in his reading of Tasso, many features of the Averroistic tradition come through in his analysis of Tasso's ideas. For example, he does describe Tasso's comparison of poetic imitation to dialectic, and his understanding of Tasso's approach to invention absolutely reflects the connections of invention in this tradition to an ordered memorial inventory of subjects. The implications of this tradition for the functional relationship of painting and poetry, however, are not particularly developed despite Tasso's old school reverence for allegory. What Unglaub's particular success with his analysis of Poussin's visual application of peripeteia in The Israelites Gathering Manna suggests to me is that we are still predisposed to see what fits with what we know. If we are being successful at getting away from interpreting Renaissance ut pictura poesis via the isolationist imperative of formalism, we are still, it seems, prone to privilege a particular understanding of Aristotelian poetics in the Renaissance that fits well with our own epistemological assumptions about the objective character of the natural world artists imitate.
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Il tema principale del libro di Mariani si annuncia già nel titolo che ci propone una lettura di Manzoni che va dal "solito" al "vero." "Un libro che muta radicalmente una visione critica sostenuta per un secolo e mezzo"(7). La "strategia espositiva" di Mariani è quella di introdurre le sue tesi fondamentali e poi spiegare capitolo per capitolo, in forma di dialogo con due secoli di critica manzoniana ed, in particolare, con un critico tra i più recenti che Mariani stima "tra i più intelligenti," Mario Pomilio (11).

La tesi e l'errore della critica tradizionale si riassume in una visione della storia di un disegno provvidenziale del primo Manzoni che la critica insiste nel vedere riflessa nel maturo Manzoni, e specie nel romanzo. Per Mariani, invece, una visione religiosa e teleologica non rientra nella realtà storica se questa non gliela presenta. Questo è quanto succede, per esempio, ne I promessi sposi dove la Storia non offre più questa consolazione all'autore come era apparso nelle prime opere, "nel fervore neofita" degli Inni sacri. Qui, infatti, operano le credenze dei person-