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On 6–8 June 2007, an international conference organized by Péter Farbaky, Joseph Connors, Louis A. Waldman, and Ildikó Fehér was held in Florence at the Villa I Tatti. The conference’s aim was to examine the artistic and intellectual exchanges between Renaissance Italy and Hungary. Farbaky and Waldman’s anthology of 22 essays is thematically organized around the Villa I Tatti conference’s structure and includes essays from the conference as well as additional work on the Hungarian Renaissance.

The editors divide the richly illustrated text into four thematic sections: “The Study of the Hungarian Early Renaissance in Humanism and Art,” “The Flow of Ideas: Exchanges and Encounters in Literature and Humanism,” “Matthias Corvinus and His Court: The Library, the Residences, and the Artists,” and “Sculpture at the Court of Buda: Art, Antiquity, and Political Ideals,” all of which include an astounding number of colour illustrations and maps. Each section, the titles of which are relatively self-explanatory, consists of a balanced pairing of English and Italian language essays rooted in literary, historical, and art historical methodologies. The diversity is commendable and reflects the popular trend in early modern studies.

As the book title suggests, the essays are primarily concerned with establishing Italian — specifically Florentine and Roman — connections to the Hungarian court, either through direct contact by visiting artists and scholars or through secondary routes of exchange. Contributors show how Matthias and his successors used the arts to affirm kingship and a new court culture based on humanistic philosophies and ideas. The authors clearly articulate these suppositions throughout. To establish these connections, many of the essays are concerned with issues of attribution and identification of artistic works or treatises still extant in Hungary. Unless clearly signed or documented, a work’s link to a specific individual or workshop is often difficult to affirm. Such is the case in Dániel Pócs’s identification of a classical sculpture fragment as Pan. Through careful analysis of the extant documents and the materiality of the object itself, Pócs convincingly argues that the small remnant of the sculpture’s leg was from a statue of Pan given to Matthias by the Italian court
of Lodovico il Moro. Although Póc modestly admits that his findings are not absolute, his examination is sound, including his equally informative discussion of the fountain by Andrea del Verrocchio that was sent to the Hungarian court. Nevertheless, Póc places an important classical artifact in Hungary, affording local artists the opportunity to examine ancient sculpture first-hand and not through tertiary or secondary contact points, with minor Italian artists like Domenico di Francesco di Jacopo. Through tedious archival work, Louis A. Waldman documents Francesco’s previously unknown visit to, and work in, the Hungarian court. Waldman’s essay also contains an important contribution: the appendices of archival documents. The transcriptions are a welcome inclusion as they offer access to rare materials.

Other attributions and identifications presented within the text are less fully agreed upon. For example, Mária Prokopp and Zsuzsanna Wierdl attribute a fresco fragment to Sandro Botticelli, using highly circumstantial information. The crux of their argument rests upon the identification of at least one of the frescoes in the Archiepiscopal Palace at Esztergom as the work of the Florentine. Specifically, they rely upon their interpretation of the name “Magister Albertus pictor florentinus” and the monogram “MB” on the Temperance fresco. Previously, authors have identified these references as relating to either Filippo Lippi or Mariano Botticelli, respectively; the latter was Sandro’s father, the former Sandro’s teacher. While the volume’s editors are skeptical of Prokopp and Wierdl’s attribution, they present the scholars’ work to allow others to draw their own conclusions.

Although Farbaky and Waldman’s anthology is rich in data, making it very useful for Renaissance scholars, the text has shortcomings, particularly in its presentation of knowledge dissemination among European territories. The anthology does not address the cyclical practices of cultural exchange; instead, it subscribes to the belief that Italian intellectual and artistic cultures influenced the Hungarian courts with limited trickle-back affect. Indeed, there is little reflection on the influence of Hungarian intellectuals or their community on Florence (beyond Waldman’s concluding essay), where these individuals commissioned artworks or actively produced them. This is unfortunate, given the recent work of Thomas Dandelet and others who have examined more complex exchange networks occurring not only between Italy and the rest of Europe, but also among the continental courts (not to mention the colonial territories). Such research indicates the porous boundaries
of exchange — allowing, for example, analyses of the influence of Iberian patrons on the urban and artistic developments of post sixteenth-century Rome to be documented. With these intellectual frameworks in mind, the rich and well-researched data presented by the authors can, and hopefully will, be expanded to take into account the more complex networks of exchange between Hungary and Italy — and, thus, offer a wonderful companion to Farbaky and Waldman’s significant text.

C. Cody Barteet, Western University


In *Politicizing Domesticity*, Laura Lunger Knoppers traces the production and deployment of representations of royal domesticity through the upheavals of revolution, republic, and restoration. Focusing on the politicization of domesticity in depictions of sovereign power in England from the 1630s to the 1660s, Knoppers’s project challenges the notion that public and private constitute mutually exclusive spheres, and her methodology uses the same sharply focused lens to scrutinize literary, political, and domestic texts, discourses, and images. Commencing with an interrogation of the idealized domestic bliss that scholars have long recognized as fictive in Caroline portraits of the royal couple and family, Knoppers argues that these highly crafted images demonstrate the monarchical appropriation of domesticity as a powerful tool of political propaganda that was particular to the volatile turbulence of the seventeenth century but would subsequently become a lasting hallmark of the British monarchy.

Initially, Knoppers concentrates on portraiture of the royal family, suggesting that representations of the fertile union between Charles I and Henrietta Maria may have elicited, particularly in times of increasing tension and stress, precisely the fears they were intended to allay. Knoppers provides detailed analyses of George Marcelline’s depiction of the royal couple in the