Estelle Lingo’s study of François Duquesnoy has two related goals. The first is to revise critical appreciation of this artist, who once worked under Bernini’s direction but later came to be seen as a leading representative of an alternative trend in Italian baroque sculpture. Her second project is to trace historically the distinct appreciation for a Greek artistic mode in Roman cultural life of the seventeenth century, a mode arguably essential to Duquesnoy’s particular aesthetic.

For Lingo, Duquesnoy is not simply an important baroque classicist, a label applied to the artist by Rudolf Wittkower. Rather, the sculptor stands at the beginning of a studied appreciation of Greek sensibility, an attitude that would lead to the Grecian idealism of Winckelmann and eighteenth-century aesthetics. Lingo successfully establishes that certain scholars and connoisseurs of Duquesnoy’s time attempted to distinguish Greek from Roman properties in ancient sculpture. In this task they followed the lead of ancient writers — of Pliny, Quintilian, and Pausanias primarily. Artists and collectors, especially from the cultivated circle around Nicolas Poussin, settled on a variable set of features considered identifiably Greek. These included the famous “Greek profile” — the continuous straight line tracing the profile of the forehead and nose. Nudity was sometimes considered a characteristic of Greek statues in opposition to cloaked Roman examples. Somewhat more difficult to define was the “subtle contour” attributed to Greek sculpture, again contrasted with the hard and distinct outline of Roman works. As Lingo demonstrates, the important fact is that such categories existed, not that they were consistently applied to actual works of art or that seventeenth-century connoisseurship corresponded with that of the eighteenth century (or with that of today).

The book is divided into four chapters. The first provides the basic coordinates of Duquesnoy’s career, his early training, and his intellectual circle. It introduces the notion of the Greek ideal as a subject of historical inquiry in early modern Europe. And it concentrates on Duquesnoy’s small-scale bronze statuettes as embodiments of this value. Chapter two focuses on Duquesnoy’s tomb sculpture, particularly the two tombs with putti in S. Maria dell’Anima
and his reliefs incorporated in a Neapolitan tomb designed by Francesco Borromini. Again Duquesnoy’s dialogue with ancient sculpture is again an important theme. Chapter three discusses the “cult statue” and the Greek style. Here Lingo treats Duquesnoy’s two most famous works, the statue of St. Andrew for the crossing of St. Peter’s and the equally influential statue of St. Susanna for S. Maria di Loreto. With these two monumental sculptures, the selective emulation of antiquity is complicated by the dominating presence of Bernini. The final chapter, “Reflections on Greek Art and the Greek Manner before Winckelmann,” serves as a sort of coda. It follows scholarly interest in Greek art and culture from the sixteenth century to the early eighteenth, culminating in a discussion of Winckelmann’s ideas on the subject.

An enlightening aspect of Lingo’s book is her treatment of Duquesnoy’s Netherlandish roots, a subject that surfaces in several chapters. Frequently referred to by the author as “the Fleming,” Duquesnoy came from the Low Countries and socialized extensively with the community of Flemish expatriates in Rome. His first significant patron, Pieter Visscher (Pietro Pescatore) was a compatriot, and his two major tombs in S. Maria dell’Anima were for two Flemings. Duquesnoy shared a house with the interesting but little-known painter Karel Philips Spierinck from the Low Countries. And he later shared space with Jean Baptiste Claessens, another painter from the Netherlands. More intriguing was his early training with his father, Jerome I Duquesnoy, an important Brussels sculptor who practiced a classicizing manner reminiscent of Cornelis Floris, the great Antwerp sculptor of the mid-sixteenth century. Lingo relates François Duquesnoy’s interest in Greek and Roman art to earlier antiquarian interest in the Low Countries, particularly that of the Liège painter Lambert Lombard. Lombard had been to Rome, where he had sketched numerous ancient statues and reliefs. Back in Liège, he established an academy in which he helped train a generation of Netherlandish classicizing painters including Frans Floris, perhaps Antwerp’s leading artist and the brother of the equally influential sculptor Cornelis. Lombard was very much an intellectual, engaging in philological and numismatic investigations in his pursuit of both Roman and Greek antiquity.

By introducing Lambert Lombard and Netherlandish antiquarian studies, Lingo suggests a pan-European context for François Duquesnoy’s art. He was after all a contemporary of Peter Paul Rubens, a man who knew Rome well, was highly educated, active as a connoisseur of ancient art, and appreciated as
an authoritative voice on questions of ancient custom. Duquesnoy follows in the tradition of Giambologna, the greatest sculptor of the second half of the sixteenth century and also a Fleming. It seems that even in the century before Winckelmann, the question of Greek and Roman artistic manner — and the values that these represented — were of broad European concern.
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When Christopher Mackay published his two-volume study and bilingual edition of Henricus Institoris and Jacobus Sprenger’s Malleus Maleficarum in 2006, it deservedly met with universal acclaim. Now Mackay and Cambridge University Press have issued the English-language translation, together with a shorter, more accessible introduction, in an affordable single volume that will prove invaluable for students and general readers interested in this notorious text.

Those of us who have worked with any of the early Latin printings of this seminal articulation of early witchcraft theory have long appreciated that the translation made by Montague Summers in 1928 is wretched. Aside from the wooden syntax and non-idiomatic English, Summers’ work is deeply compromised by the fact that he approached the Malleus believing that the conception of witchcraft sketched out on its pages was real. Indeed, he was convinced that the sheer number of first-hand accounts of maleficium recounted in the writings of premodern demonologists, when read in conjunction with the seemingly analogous testimony that could be adduced from various pre-Christian sources, spoke to the reality of witchcraft. As he pointed out in the preface to the first edition of his translation, “witchcraft is an evil thing, an enemy to light, an ally of the powers of darkness, disruption, and decay”; it is “a vast political movement, an organized society which was anti-social and