A. D. Scaglione. *Ars Grammatica*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1970.

This relatively short book, each page of which is the fruit of long and dedicated research, is divided into four chapters. The first is a historical and bibliographical introduction, the second studies the Latin subjunctive, the third the Italian subjunctive and the fourth is devoted to Alberic of Montecassino and the ablative absolute. The book ends with an appendix which includes a review of Henry Desmond's book (*The 'De Grammatico' of St. Anselm: The Theory of Paronymy*, 1964), previously published by Professor Scaglione in *Romance Philology*, XIX (1966). The appendix is conceived as a sort of conclusion. To a certain extent, however, it may also represent an invitation to interpret the preceding chapters as a critical response to several basic questions already singled out by A. Scaglione, when he first tried to organize into an organic whole the imposing quantity of gathered materials. Many a reader, as a matter of fact, will be impressed by the amount of data Professor Scaglione has been able to include in his remarkably lucid treatment of a complicated matter. In the first chapter, he manages to give, in about thirty pages, a complete, precise picture of the history of the discipline, with a full assessment of the merits and the limitations of the scholars who preceded him, from the beginning of the last century to the present. The first chapter, in my opinion, should be of interest not only to linguists, but to any student of Classical and Romance languages. The other chapters are more technical and specialized. The specialization is apparent from the very choice of the subjunctive, both in Latin and in Italian, as well as the ablative absolute, as subject matter. Through the study of the subjunctive, Professor Scaglione succeeds in documenting and dating the predecessors of certain forms (e.g. *erint*, pp.57-63), that is to say, to write "history" in the fullest sense of the term, by going over the whole range of the Latin grammarians, from the 2nd to the 17th century, with a quick glance at the 18th and 19th centuries. It is, therefore, a discriminating selection which allows Professor Scaglione to establish a connection between the Latin normative tradition and that of the Italian grammarians. In Italian, A. Scaglione, always searching for a sense of the history of the discipline, starts from the first *Grammaticabetta* (which is perhaps by Alberti, but certainly of the 15th century) and goes as far as the studies of the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, in order to conclude that, in opposition to what happens for Latin, "the grammar of the Italian vernacular remained, after the Cinquecento, more often than not in the hands of *mestieranti*, little curious, and less capable, of deep commitment and fresh starts" (p. 130). The chapter devoted to the ablative absolute according to Alberic of Montecassino is more limited in scope, but still very perceptive. One can recommend this valuable contribution of Aldo Scaglione to the study of *Ars Grammatica* as a model combination of erudition and critical sophistication.

MARIA PICCHIO SIMONELLI, *Boston College*

David Orr. *Italian Renaissance Drama in England Before 1625*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1970. Pp. ix, 141. \$6.

Professor Orr is convinced that a reassessment of the major source-studies like those of Baldwin, Gregg, Muir, and others, examined collectively rather than separately, yields evi-

dence which contradicts the commonly accepted notion of a preponderant Italian influence on English drama. He argues that the Italian dramatic texts that can be positively identified as sources used by the English playwrights are so few as to raise serious doubts about their purported impact. For similar reasons, Orr is inclined to minimize the role usually assigned to Italian theorists like Cinthio in shaping English drama. Instead, he would propose the old theory that the Italianate plays are not necessarily of Italian derivation but a consequence of the lesson learned from Plautus, Terence, and Seneca without Italian intermediaries. Thus, in both countries, comedy and tragedy exhibit similar structural patterns because the same models were followed. But can the same be said to explain the emergence of new types like tragicomedy and pastoral drama? Orr's answer is that even these hybrid forms can be viewed as products of similar preconditioning forces operating in both countries, namely, medieval religious and popular drama.

Appealing as this novel approach may be, one has the distinct feeling that, owing to its positivistic orientation, it overlooks the elusive nature of cultural interrelations, which often defy statistical evaluation. The validity of the author's findings seems to be lessened, furthermore, by his partiality to authorities who lend support to his viewpoint at the expense of the exponents of Italian influence, often rejected without sufficient reason. More objectionable is the uncritical acceptance of obsolete source-studies whose information is very frequently erroneous. Such a procedural flaw tends to render even more provisional the character of the author's conclusions. More careful proofreading might have helped reduce the numerous misspellings in the Italian texts and the bibliographical inaccuracies that mar this otherwise provocative book.

FLORINDO CERRETA, *University of Iowa*

D. S. Chambers. *Patrons and Artists in the Italian Renaissance*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1971. Pp. xxxv, 22. \$7.95.

The increased interest of students, at both the graduate and undergraduate level, in the history of art has persuaded publishers that there is a market for books on art that go beyond the simple, illustrated biographies of artists and periods. The volume under review, by Dr. David Chambers, Lecturer in Renaissance Studies at the Warburg Institute, is just such an example of the newer, more academic publications. Published as one in the series "History in Depth," it takes as its subject documents, and documents on a problem that clearly could be, or should be, a crucial element in our understanding of the development of Renaissance art. Such a subject is mired in problems. Beside the art of the Renaissance, or the material provided by the writings of the Renaissance, what documents can tell us is often meagre and frustratingly unhelpful on the very points that are of most interest. What Dr. Chambers has provided, and it is an achievement that should by no means be underestimated, is a collection of such material that is not only comprehensive but that can serve to indicate what and how much we have of such documentary evidence about the working of artists in the Renaissance.

Dr. Chambers divides the material into four general categories – clerical, guild, civic and what is called "princely and private patronage" – that, to quote the author "have been gov-