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Citer ce compte rendu

Marvell’s poem to portraying the potential inherent within Catholic women’s literary communities.

Together, Lay’s four chapters, as well as her introduction and epilogue, refute the obsolescence of Catholic women to early modern literary culture. Connections between texts and authors occasionally appear somewhat inconclusive, but this is, as Lay indicates herself during a discussion of Mary Champney(s), perhaps a result of the “omissions that have erased Catholic women from English literary history” (9). In fact, some of Lay’s most interesting arguments involve just such cases, including the possibility that the nun Mary Champney, whose life is detailed within the anonymous *The Life and Good End of Sister Marie*, is actually the Mary Champneys raped by George Puttenham and then abandoned by him in Antwerp. *Beyond the Cloister* compellingly reveals the productivity of reading the lives and writings of Catholic Englishwomen and the need to take “alternative paths through literary history” (160).

KARALYN DOKURNO
University of Manitoba


This collection of articles on Francesco Patrizi da Cherso (1529–97) opens with a solid contribution by Maria Muccillo that contextualizes the man’s character and culture by analyzing his studies, philosophy, way of thinking, and works. Muccillo points out how, in his university years in Padua, Patrizi moved from Aristotelianism and the study of medicine to philosophy. Using the didactic method he had learned from the humanist doctor Giovanni Battista dal Monte (1498–1551), Patrizi organized knowledge in a logical-deductive manner that led to his *Città felice* (1551) and his later works, *Dialoghi dell’istoria* (1560) and *Della Retorica dialoghi dieci* (1562), where he reaches back to Lorenzo Valla (ca. 1407–57) in order to “bring order and light to the writings of the ancient historians” (22; my translation). Patrizi uses the same method a few
years later in his *Discussiones peripateticae* (1571, 2nd ed. 1581). His stand in favour of Platonism is evident in his appreciation of a dialectic that is contrary to Aristotelian argumentation, as we see in his *L’amorosa filosofia* (composed in 1577, published for the first time in 1663), as well as in his studies of the universe (*Nova de universis philosophia*, 1591), of physical space (*De rerum natura libri*, 1587), and of military art (*Parallelus militari*, 1594–95).

The relationship between history and philosophy is the focus of Marie-Dominique Couziné’s analysis of the *Dialoghi della storia* (1560). Patrizi submits history to a philosophical and, following Ficino, Neoplatonic reflection. Time is the crucial element because without time there is no history. Time is the *sine qua non* and measure of history. The duty of the historian is to place action in time. The historian must use dialectic and etymology in order to arrive at the essence of history, which is memory, “Ariadne’s thread” in the labyrinth of definitions.

Kateřina Šolcová continues this examination of Patrizi’s views on history by comparing his *Della historia* with Giovanni Pontano’s dialogue *Actius* (1499). In his dialogue, Pontano emphasizes the relationship between history and poetry and rhetoric. Patrizi, instead, points out that a historian must analyze cause and effect, all the while combining accuracy with precision and stylistic formality.

Luka Boršić highlights the history of Patrizi’s philosophy by analyzing his *Della historia* against the *Discussiones peripateticae* and the *Nova de universis philosophia*. In these works, philosophy can be personal research into “the things themselves” (105) or the study of other people’s opinions by way of the Socratic method. Patrizi opts for the latter.

*Maresio*, the seventh text in the *Dialoghi della retorica*, is the focus of Stefano Gulizia’s contribution. An analysis of the close connection between oratory and political constitutions hides the nostalgia for a stable form of government. In *Maresio*, a republican regime corresponds with an advancement of rhetoric, while the opposite is true under a tyranny. *Maresio* is thus a debate on the advantages of various political regimes, but also a form of oceanography in which Patrizi travels from example to example as if through an archipelago.

After history, it’s poetry’s turn. Luc Deitz takes us through the *Della poetica*, published in part in Patrizi’s lifetime in the wake of two other of his works, the *Discorso della diversità de furori poetici* (1553) and the *Della rettorica dieci dialoghi* (1562). Deitz focuses on the *Deca ammirabile*, probably composed
around 1587. Knowing about Patrizi’s anti-Aristotelianism, already voiced in the *Deca disputata* that precedes the *Ammirabile*, we are not surprised that he seeks to overturn all the principles advanced in the *Poetica*. Poetry is created by translating emotional chaos into rational order: Patrizi finds in the *mirabile* (wonderful) that which rouses *meraviglia*, and this is what gives meaning to poetry.

Ivana Skuhala Karasman and Luka Boršić discuss four women who, at different times, appear in Patrizi’s life. Although it seems that Patrizi never married, he had an intellectual relationship with the painter Irene di Spilimbergo, the singer Tarquinia Molza, Duchess Lucrezia d’Este, and a still unidentified “Madama” (perhaps Dianora Pugliese) with whom he seems to have engaged in an unsuccessful book business.

Tarquinia Molza is the main subject in the unfinished *Amorosa filosofia*, here analyzed by Jacomien Prins. In describing the banquet Molza attends and sings at, Patrizi discusses his theory of a new musical aesthetics and emphasizes the relationship between the cosmos and music using the Pythagorean doctrine of the harmony of the spheres.

Other contributions to the volume examine in greater detail the more scientific aspects of Patrizi’s works. Barbara Bartocci focuses on the relationship between Patrizi and Paolo Beni (ca. 1552–ca. 1626), colleagues in Rome and members of the Accademia Aldobrandini, and on the critical use Beni made of Patrizi’s works. Jan Makovský discusses the *Della nuova geometria* (1587) and the difficulties in harmonizing mathematics and philosophy on the basis of the idea of a *continuum* from the perspective of a critique of Aristotelian thought. Matjaž Vesel analyzes the difficult relationship between Patrizi and Johannes Kepler (1571–1630) in matters of astronomy, on account of their differing opinions on the movements of the stars—in spirals according to Patrizi, in ellipses according to Kepler.

The collection is brought to a close by three articles: Tomáš Nejeschleba on Jan Jessenius’s alleged plagiarizing of Patrizi’s works; Jan Čižek on the spread and reception of Patrizi’s works in central Europe thanks to Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588–1638), who was the teacher of John Amos Comenius; Petr Pavlas on the analysis of the Platonic “book of the mind” from the perspective of the history of ideas and, in particular, of the metaphor.

Scholars of Renaissance philosophy, well aware of the diatribes between Platonists and Aristotelians, will find in this collection a fine example of how
the analysis of an author’s entire works can shed light on an intellectually “intense” figure. Non-specialists will have the opportunity to discover an author who, though in many ways still not well known, was in fact a much admired intellectual of his time.

ELENA BRIZIO
Georgetown University (Fiesole Campus)

Rico, Francisco.  
I venerdì del Petrarca. Seguito da “Profilo biografico del Petrarca” in collaborazione con Luca Marcozzi.  

“Of all who lived during or before his time, none offers a life as fully documented as Petrarch’s. Yet such details mostly derive from his direct testimony, and include conflicting and always more or less re-elaborated elements that, by veiling or manipulating historical data, aim at building an ideal autobiography.” (69) With this statement, which echoes a previous one by Ernest H. Wilkins, Catalan philologist Francisco Rico inaugurates his account of Petrarch’s life (written in collaboration with Luca Marcozzi). It constitutes the second part of a very enjoyable work whose first part, Petrarch’s Fridays, carries the book’s main title.

Francesco Petrarca (or simply Petrarch according to the English version of his name) was born in Arezzo in 1304 to a Florentine notary who was at that time exiled from his native land for the same reason as Dante. Even Petrarch’s name and dates are subject to elaboration and to discrepancy between his writings, documents, and biographers—which proves how slippery is the ground for modern specialists.

Taking inspiration from how Petrarch moulded his own biography, Rico noticed that in many instances of Petrarchan oeuvre, one weekday always peeps out: Friday. As a typically penitential day, a day of fasting and meditation in the Catholic tradition, Friday for Petrarch used to represent the temporal background for fundamental facts, either positive or negative. For that reason,