

UC Davis

UC Davis Previously Published Works

Title

A Visit to the Museum: The Ovid Galleries. Review of *Die Rezeption der Metamorphosen des Ovid in der Neuzeit. Der antike Mythos in Text und Bild. Internationales Symposium der Werner Reimers-Stiftung Bad Homburg v. d. H. (22. bis 25. April 1991)* by H...

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0kn652ch>

Journal

International Journal of the Classical Tradition, 6(1)

Author

Hexter, Ralph Jay

Publication Date

1999-07-01

Peer reviewed

A Visit to the Museum: The Ovid Galleries

Die Rezeption der Metamorphosen des Ovid in der Neuzeit. Der antike Mythos in Text und Bild. Internationales Symposium der Werner Reimers-Stiftung Bad Homburg v. d. H. (22. bis 25. April 1991), Ikonographische Repertorien zur Rezeption des antiken Mythos in Europa, Beiheft 1 by Hermann Walter; Hans-Jürgen Horn

Review by: Ralph J. Hexter

International Journal of the Classical Tradition, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Summer, 1999), pp. 75-88

Published by: [Springer](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30222516>

Accessed: 13/11/2013 14:42

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Springer is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

diesem Bereich gibt. Das vorliegende Buch läßt sich in dieser Hinsicht nicht als Ersatz verwenden.

A. Koloski-Ostrow schrieb in einer Rezension (*American Journal of Archaeology* 98 [1994] 381) zur Erstausgabe: „*A work that covers so wide an area, across so many centuries will inevitably receive some criticisms from specialists.*“ Das ist richtig. Die gute Nachricht: Dieses Buch ist die Auseinandersetzung in jedem Falle wert! Es schafft Standards, auch wenn die Anordnung der Kapitel, wie gezeigt, nicht überzeugt. Hunderte von Plänen—viele von Verf. neu gezeichnet oder zumindest überarbeitet—zeigen grundsätzliche Ähnlichkeit. Sie lassen sich somit leicht lesen und vergleichen. Die Fertigstellung dieses Buches brauchte viele Jahre, und für viele Jahre wird man es auch einreihen können unter die wichtigsten Arbeiten zum Thema „Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity“.

Werner Heinz
Sindelfingen, Germany

A Visit to the Museum: The Ovid Galleries

Hermann Walter & Hans-Jürgen Horn (eds.), *Die Rezeption der Metamorphosen des Ovid in der Neuzeit. Der antike Mythos in Text und Bild. Internationales Symposium der Werner Reimers-Stiftung Bad Homburg v. d. H. (22. bis 25. April 1991)*, Ikonographische Repertorien zur Rezeption des antiken Mythos in Europa, Beiheft 1 (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1995), XV + 295 pp. + 64 plates.

This richly informative volume, with eighteen contributions in four languages (ten in German, three each in English and Italian, two in French), multiple indices and sixty-four full pages of black-and-white plates, represents the written record of an international symposium dating from April, 1991. The organizers of this and related conferences, already set to focus on specific aspects of the reception and reworking of “ancient myth” in European culture, are engaged in the massive project, sponsored by the Seminar für klassische Philologie of the University of Mannheim, to create a “repertory of pictorial representations of ancient mythology in the modern period” (“*Repertorium zur Verbildlichung des antiken Mythos in der Neuzeit*”). The “Vorwort” (VII–XV) describes the methodology of assembling and cataloguing the collection itself in some detail, which I will not address here because the technical issues involved exceed my expertise.

While the conference contributed to the ongoing work of assembling and interpreting this iconographic repertory, the printed essays also represent coherent scholarly projects. The “modern period,” as far as illustrations from printed editions of the *Metamorphoses* to be assembled in the *Repertorium* are concerned, runs from Colard Mansion’s Brugges, 1484 volume to the somewhat arbitrary cut-off date of 1800, though some of the essays collected here move well outside both *termini*. It is primarily as a collection of eighteen independent essays that I intend to survey the present volume, and that very much from the perspective of the student of Ovidian reception that I am rather than that of the art historian I am not, who would certainly draw other conclu-

sions from his or her reading. I shall also risk dilation, since it seems likely that not all readers of this journal who would be interested in such a volume will work their way through each of the eighteen essays of the collection. The book may be conceived as a series of panels opening onto topics, some well known, others obscure, many of great potential interest to all students of Ovidian reception. With this in mind, I see my role much more as that of the "docent" in the galleries of a great museum than "critic" in a strict sense. (All translations are my own; for efficiency's sake some are consciously quite paraphrastic.)

Before the gallery tour, however, some mildly critical remarks about the whole, which, by seeking to be no more than the sum of its parts, almost manages to be less. That the editors appear to have given contributors free hand in shaping their contributions, which vary greatly in length (from 6 to 27 pp.) and number of illustrations (from 1 to 18 per article), is neither here nor there. And I know from first-hand experience how difficult it is for the editor(s) of a composite volume to achieve uniformity even in bibliographical references, and in the more important formalities and, to a large extent, style, Walter and Horn have succeeded. Any progress towards unity editors can effect beyond that minimum, however difficult, can prove enormously beneficial for users. A common bibliography, even of frequently cited works, for the entire volume would have been a valuable tool in its own right, although I understand that it might be seen to reduce the viability of each author's contribution when circulated in "offprint" form. Editors might have intervened on the rare occasion when two contributors cover much the same ground, as the first two do when explaining the composition of the Berchorian corpus (Lord, 2-3; Blänsdorf 19-20). Would it not have been possible to have one definitive explanation and then a cross-reference? Not, of course, that reducing two pages would have made the entire book perceptibly shorter, but more cross-referencing might have brought interesting parallels or paradoxes to light and suggested to readers what the dominant themes of such reception studies are.

Greater regret comes when I think of the questions volume editors could have raised, or raised much more prominently, and yet did not. The project, of course, is calculated to focus attention precisely on the interface between the literary and the visual. Often the two meet on one and the same page, for example, when illustrations accompany a text of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (or one of its many vernacular offspring). Ovid's text is still behind free-standing realizations, even if at multiple removes. While some of the contributors have occasion to analyze particular instances where word and image are peculiarly resonant or, as is more often the case, when there is some striking disconnect, usually such instances are explained as the outcome of some lower-level contingency. By this I mean the fact that an enterprising publisher already owned a set of cuts he was willing to pop into a printing of a different text; or the engravers started their work with another text before their eyes; or visual artists were following a different representational tradition. All of these are true in individual cases, and offer fascinating and revealing glimpses into the modes and manners of period book production. But rarely examined by individual contributors and left absolutely unaddressed in the broad scheme, alas, are second-order questions. Can one describe the aesthetic that promoted, or at least permitted, the kind of text/image disconnect that our modern eyes find so needy of special explanation? Were there particular pleasures and potentialities in just such higgledy-piggledy productions? What other stylistic and interpretive principles were operative if not unity and cohesiveness as more recent sensibilities understand them? Of course, these are questions

that go far beyond *Die Rezeption der Metamorphosen des Ovid in der Neuzeit*, and it is not illegitimate of the editors of a book with such a title to have excluded them, particularly when they were offering contributors published space in exchange for material for the great *Repertorium*. But, really, what a shame, for few topics offer so many rich opportunities to address the kinds of questions I have raised here—and I cannot imagine I would be alone in wishing to start exploring them even before the *Repertorium* is complete.

Apropos “complete”: one might observe that there’s something conceptually un-Ovidian about the idea of a database striving for inclusiveness. Part of the essence of the *Metamorphoses* is its insouciant contingency. If Ovid could construct his own webpage today, I suspect it would offer rather surprising links and its structure would not be entirely transparent. Indeed, large sectors would be always and forever “under construction.” While we cannot expect scholars of Ovid to be Ovidian, certainly the assemblage and juxtaposition of what we already have in the volume (along with other ongoing studies) can let us think along such lines. I for one would want to explore the concinnities between, on the one hand, the kind of non-linear, often discordant text/image relationship that obtains in so many of the editions described here and, on the other, the universe of multiply variant interpretations of the *Metamorphoses* laid out in, for example, Bersuire’s *Ovidius moralizatus* (interestingly enough book fifteen of his own *Repertorium*). This constitutionally interminable analysis is rooted in a millennium of interpretive practices whereby the pleroma can never be exhaustively rendered but rather invites an unending series of partial readings the very non-continuity and contradictoriness of which only serve as further guarantee of the original’s plenitude. For this reason I would argue that appreciation of the fact that early modern Ovid reception inhabits and generates spaces of contingency, overlap, and confusion, and the claim that it is all the more Ovidian for these tangled criss-crossings is by no means—and certainly not only—a reflection of a postmodern sensibility. Indeed, Ovid and the Ovidian universe, even as they inspire reception history, challenge it to reach beyond the forms of catalogue and annal into which it all too readily slips. While the essays in the present volume do offer varied perspectives on the future fuller catalogue, they do not go as far as Ovid himself who, as de- and reconstructor of the so-called *Kataloggedicht* in his *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, emerges as one of reception history’s earliest and most severe critics. And of course, a “*repertorium*” is itself an invitation for performance.

Even if the editors of the present volume did not ask what deeper insights the series of case studies they gathered might yield, either into “reception” as a general phenomenon or into the particular temporal and geographical slice described here, one can start to do so on the basis of the material offered. What is it about these mythic stories that inspires repetition and revision, cross-cutting and contamination? Are there collective differences between Latin and vernacular texts? Are translations (Renaissance and early modern European translations of Ovid at least) particularly stimulating of the visual imagination? Indeed, what role did visualization play in the process of translation itself? Or, to raise questions of a different sort, is there some kind of transvaluation involved when Classical mythology is represented in popular arts, or is the suggestion that there is something “sublime,” even “classical,” about classical mythology itself a cultural anachronism? At the very least the essays and the volume they constitute offer tantalizing material and abundant bibliographic riches on the basis of which one could pose and begin to answer such questions.

The first essay is Carla Lord's study of "Illustrated Manuscripts of Berchorius before the Age of Printing" (pp. 1–11). The world of Bersuire manuscripts and imprints (most attributed to Trivet or Waleys) is vexed indeed; as I have noted, Lord's summary (2–3) overlaps considerably with that of the next contributor (Blänsdorf 19–20; readers interested in the complex Berchorian textual traditions may want to reference an item that appeared subsequent to the publication of Walter and Horn's volume, Frank Coulson's "A Checklist of Newly Discovered Manuscripts of Pierre Bersuire's Ovidius Moralizatus," *Scriptorium* 51 [1997] 164–186). Though the fact that individual manuscripts (and, to a lesser extent, the printed versions) offer substantially divergent texts makes it impossible to generalize about "Bersuire," Lord might have mentioned that the 1509 printing was made widely available by its reprinting by Garland in 1979 (with introductory notes by Stephen Orgel). As for illustrated manuscripts, there are but three. Impressive must be Bergamo Bibl. Civ. Ang. Mai MS Cassaf. 3.4 with its 209 illustrations. The seven illustrations from all three manuscripts (plates 1–4) are highly evocative. Lord refers in passing to "the problem of chronology for another illustrated text more directly related to Ovid, the translation of the *Metamorphoses* by Arrigo Simintendi" (4), but as she offers no reason to doubt Bodo Guthmüller's dating of the translation itself (completed by 1333/34; so Guthmüller, *Ovidio Metamorphoseos Vulgare* [as below, p. 80] 263–71), she must be referring to Florence B.N. Panciatichiani 63 itself. Lord's is one of the hardest pieces to follow; it jumps from topic to topic, leaving the impression that it has not changed much from the narrative that accompanied (so I imagine) a sequence of slides. That there is little time for a coherent argument to emerge and gather force is all the more lamentable since Lord raises interesting questions. This reviewer for one would have welcomed development and expansion of the intriguing historical paradox behind the observation (which she regards as a virtual commonplace) "that artists in the Renaissance created pagan gods who became more convincingly classical and robust in appearance during the *Quattrocento* and *Cinquecento*" (9). There are potential points of contact and contrast here with some of the insights Charlotte Schoell-Glass offers towards the conclusion of her essay on Christine de Pisan (see below, p. 79), links which it is a shame neither Lord nor the editors of the volume explored when the presentations were being readied for publication.

In the second essay, "Petrus Berchorius und das Bildprogramm der Bronzetüren von St. Peter in Rom" (pp. 12–35), Jürgen Blänsdorf asks whether the scenes on Filarete's doors to St. Peter's "derive from the Renaissance's joy in ancient materials or whether they are not rather to be interpreted from a still medieval conception of myth" (p. 13). In a helpful paragraph (17–18) Blänsdorf points readers to the major non-anonymous medieval commentaries or para-texts of the *Metamorphoses*, Arnulf of Orléans, John of Garland, and Giovanni del Virgilio. He underscores the wide diffusion of some Christian interpretations; for example, when it appears in the *Gesta romanorum* the story of Pyramus and Thisbe becomes an explicitly Christian allegory: Pyramus as Christ sacrifices himself to the lion/devil for the sake of Thisbe/soul (18). Blänsdorf emphasizes the Italian branch of Bersuire's reception (likely via the papal court at Avignon) and describes (20–21) five scenes in Filarete's design that seem most likely to derive from Bersuire. Further support comes when Blänsdorf adduces multiple cases in which the juxtaposition of scenes in Filarete likely derives from juxtapositions in Berchorius which are not to be found in the *Metamorphoses*. Though Blänsdorf's own argument suggests that one cannot circumscribe "Ovid" too clearly, refer-

ring to the wooden cow Daedalus fashioned for Pasiphae he insists, "*Ovid hatte diese Sage nicht erzählt*" (22; the assertion is repeated p. 27). It is true that Ovid doesn't narrate it in the *Metamorphoses*, nor does he ever describe the manufacture of the ersatz bovine, but the wooden cow itself is most definitely Ovidian—cf. *uacca . . . acerna* of *Ars amatoria* 1.325. Does a reference constitute a narrative? Perhaps, and certainly if we imagine a reader finding further explanation in a commentary on this or another text (e.g., *Remedia amoris* 63) or hearing a master explain it. To privilege an Ovid unencumbered by glosses over the commented Ovid is, for the medieval and Renaissance periods, potentially anachronistic.

Berchorius often provides the key to making sense of Filarete's iconography. The appearance of Actaeon and Diana, and then Actaeon half transformed into a stag, beneath St. Peter makes sense in the larger pictorial program when we understand Actaeon (following Berchorius) as Christ, his dogs the Jewish people, and Diana as Mary. Even when fully explained (as on p. 25), the sense is not fully coherent, but that is itself instructive of the reading and interpretive universe in which these particular late medieval textual and pictorial craftsmen—and the users of their works—operated. Blänsdorf formulates the well-known principle, "The purpose of Christian reading is not to understand the ancient author for his own sake or with philological exactitude in his own terms but to find a meaning in order to edify oneself" (24). Filarete's panels function themselves as *integumenta*, and not just for clever twentieth-century scholars: "The wide diffusion of Ovidian allegoresis since the beginning of the fourteenth century guaranteed that at least every cleric was capable of expounding the reliefs—and comparable ones in Florentine and Roman churches—in this fashion. Many readers ran into such allegoreses in separate sermons or moralizing manuals independent of Ovid's original Latin text or Italian translations of it" (29).

Charlotte Schoell-Glass, author of the third essay, "Verwandlungen der *Metamorphosen*. Christliche Bildformen in Ovidillustrationen bei Christine de Pizan" (pp. 36–47), distinguishes her contribution by setting forth what she herself calls a "thesis": "The transmission (*Weitergabe*) of ancient texts and images can be conceptualized as a process that leads, via various intermediate stages, to ancient form being restored to the ancient matter (*Motif*)" (36). In support of this larger argument, Schoell-Glass offers many intermediate steps and subtheses, which makes this one of the most interesting and intellectually stimulating of the pieces. Coming to Christine de Pizan right at the opening, Schoell-Glass explains that she "see[s] the reception of myth and antiquity, as we find them in unique concentration in the manuscripts of the *Epistre Othea*, as a necessary stage of *visual* approximation and appropriation (*Annäherung und Aneignung*) by means of Christian allegorization, which, establishing distance from pagan antiquity, thus enables its perception as something strange" (ibid.). Clearly this is a dialectical (cf. p. 37), even paradoxical process, and Schoell-Glass sets Christine de Pizan up strategically to introduce another historico-critical paradox. Too long, she argues, has art history regarded the "north" and "Italy" "as two separate provinces," the one "still" (*noch*) medieval, the other "already" (*schon*) Renaissance. She offers in place of this vision of "Italian early Renaissance of the visual arts and French late middle ages (even allowing for an early Parisian humanism as far as the text alone is concerned)" a very different perspective: "that the incorporation of the ancient gods and mythological figures as visual symbols represents a step—however paradoxical it might seem—towards the secularization of the gods and mythological world of antiquity" (ibid.).

Christine de Pizan, creator of so many fascinating works, may never have created one more unusual than the *Epistre Othea*. Christine was directly involved in the book's production, in which each of 100 miniatures was accompanied by four verses of text and then glosses and allegories from Christine's own hand. Among the many interesting aspects of this polyphonic hypertext is that while the "Allegorie" each end with a citation from the Bible, the "Glose" seem consistently to culminate in comparable "pagan" scripture. (The examples Schoell-Glass gives include Plato and "Hermes the philosopher.") At the conclusion to this rich article Schoell-Glass coordinates several contradictory perspectives and interpretive possibilities by integrating analysis of text, image, and the text-image relation to explain how the *Epistre Othea* represents "a significant step towards the capability of using antique forms as individual means of expression" (46).

The fourth essay, Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich's "Die Holzschnitte zum *Ovidio Methamorphoseos vulgare* in ihrem Textbezug" (pp. 48–57), has a narrower purview. She establishes that there are clear cases where the woodcuts are based on Giovanni dei Bonsignori's often paraphrastic version rather than on Ovid's original. "The illustrator worked directly from the volgarizzamento" (52). Huber-Rebenich makes the interesting observation that even though the woodcuts never represent any aspect of the allegorical sense(s) Bonsignori, sticking to the "literal," gives, nonetheless some of them are incomprehensible without reference to the text (53). All the more amazing, then, that these woodcuts, so closely based on Bonsignori's rendering, were used in more than one printing of Ovid's original Latin *Metamorphoses*.

Bodo Guthmüller's "Bild und Text in Lodovico Dolces *Trasformationi*" (pp. 58–78) represents one of the most substantial contributions to the collection. Guthmüller is the author of *Ovidio Metamorphoseos Vulgare: Formen und Funktionen der volkssprachlichen Wiedergabe klassischer Dichtung in der italienischen Renaissance* (Boppard am Rhein, 1981), in my view one of the most valuable volumes in any language on late medieval and early Renaissance reception of Ovid (with information on a much wider range of topics, as its title just begins to suggest), and his wide learning and scholarly precision are employed to good effect here. He argues strongly against some (mis)information now widely disseminated in the 1979 Garland reprint of a Venice, 1568 printing of *Le Trasformationi*. While some of Guthmüller's polemic against series editor Stephen Orgel has the tone of a vitriolic humanist dispute—"Beide Angaben sind falsch (wie die meisten Aussagen, die Orgel zu den *Trasformationi* macht): . . ." (63)—what emerges in Guthmüller's explanation of a very complex bit of printing history is quite fascinating. The choice of the 1568 printing was "unfortunate" as an example of Dolce's work, since by 1568 Dolce had died and this printing didn't even come from the same publisher. (Against Orgel's claim, Guthmüller asserts that both *argomenti* and *allegorie* appeared first in the 1561 edition and that both were Dolce's work.)

It is of course the illustrations that are at the center of the dispute. Guthmüller rejects some of Orgel's identifications of individual woodcuts, but ultimately the many discrepancies go back to a more complex state of affairs illuminating both the way business pressures impacted the production of such books in the sixteenth century and the wider universe of vernacular reception. Due to the desire of the printer, Giolito, who had already published Dolce's version of books 1–3 in 1554, to get Dolce's complete version to market before Anguillara's appeared, it seems that he had the illustrator, Giovanni Antonio Rusconi (c. 1520–87), start on the cuts before Dolce's translation was actually complete. (It is almost by accident that we learn from a contemporary

critic, Ruscelli, that the illustrations in Dolce's *Transformationi* are the work of Rusconi, who also illustrated Vitruvius.) At this point Rusconi could have worked from either Bonsignori's version (1375–77; ed. princ. 1497) or Nicolò degli Agostini's (1522). It is no wonder, then, that there would be discrepancies between Dolce's text and Rusconi's cuts, because both of these earlier Italian "translator"s had worked not (or at least not only) from Ovid "but either directly or indirectly from an explanatory Latin prose paraphrase of the *Metamorphoses* that was composed at the University of Bologna in 1322–23, to be precise the *Expositio* of the professor of grammar and rhetoric Giovanni del Virgilio, which included numerous mythological stories that Ovid only referred to or omitted altogether in the *Metamorphoses*" (69). Let me second here Guthmüller's call for a new edition of del Virgilio's *Expositio*, and for some studies that begin to track his own sources, which will certainly include a vast number of commentaries of Ovid, among other authors, in addition to the standard mythographic compilations.

Guthmüller's painstaking research establishes yet more connections. It becomes clear that Rusconi paid a great deal of attention to the illustrations of 1497 and 1522, both of which he must have had before him (73–4). The work of careful comparison permits Guthmüller to speak decisively on the important ways in which Rusconi expressed his own originality, both in deciding *what* to illustrate—for this he read the text(s) as well as looked at earlier illustrations—and in deciding how to do so. For example, in accordance with contemporary taste, he moved decisively away from the earlier habit of presenting as (apparently) simultaneous what were obvious successive moments in a story (76–7). In contrast, Rusconi picked one moment to illustrate in any given woodcut.

Ghislaine Amielle, also the author of an important book (*Recherches sur des Traductions françaises des Métamorphoses d'Ovide illustrées et publiées en France à la fin du XVe siècle et au XVIe siècle*, Caesarodunum: Textes et Images de l'Antiquité, 1 [Paris, 1989]), offers the collection's shortest essay, "Les Métamorphoses illustrées en France au XVI^e siècle" (pp. 79–84). She boldly characterizes the marginalia accumulating across the editions she surveys (*Bible des Poètes de Metamorphoze*, 1493; *Grand Olympe des histoires poétiques . . .*, 1532–70; *Trois Premiers Livres de la Métamorphose . . .*, 1556), marginalia that include many an apocryphal invention, as "so much dross (*scories*) of an active reading that sufficiently proves that Ovid was the victim of his own success" (79). In the course of this suggestive essay she hints at a type of visual intertextuality when she notes that woodcuts originally created for Sebastian Brant's 1502 *Aeneid* were deployed for Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the 1532 *Grand Olympe* (81). Her major interest, however, lies in the crossing of images and texts within the Ovidian tradition. She asks whether the repetitions of images, even within one work, can function as "tropes" or point to exemplary interpretations, but is reluctant to insist that readers (or editors) always realized the "polyvalence, thus polysemy" of the images: "The role traditionally granted to illustration consists in aerating the text while explicating it" and "It is more probable that the public was in the habit of reading the plates selectively" (82). She leaves her own reader eager for further exploration of a potentially productive area, that nexus of illustrations, emblemata, and the *ut pictura poesis* debate, which she mentions a propos of Barthélémy Aneau's 1556 edition and the *Imagination Poétique* of 1552 (82f). (Aneau was the translator of *Met.* 3 published with Clément Marot's *Met.* 1–2.)

The seventh essay, Carmen Ravanelli Guidotti's "Le *Metamorfosi* 'vulgari' d'Ovidio sulla maiolica italiana" (pp. 85–97), citing other studies (e.g., Calvesi), considers the

sheer number of images in circulation (it has been estimated that c. 7500 volumes with woodcuts were produced between 1467 and 1530 in Italy alone) and argues that these represented a revolution in the marketing and availability of mass-produced images (86). Ravanelli Guidotti links the popular editions of vernacular works with woodcuts (including the Bible, histories of Rome [including but not limited to the authentic Roman historian, Livy], Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and the emblem books) to the important issue of a gendered reading public. "We are dealing after all with a clientele that found satisfaction in classics filtered through a popularized and 'historiated' reading, one to which the female public was also inclined, a public that had already learned over several decades to love chivalrous romances in particular and to whom those editions of the *Metamorphoses* assimilated to the genre of amorous romance were frequently explicitly dedicated" (89). The sharing of woodcuts among a variety of works of this sort implies "a certain homogeneity of taste and perception of the literary material" (89). The balance of the article presents selected Ovidian images and treatments on majolica, a medium which also represents the transmission of Ovidian stories for a popular—which is certainly not to say ignorant—audience.

With the eighth essay, Françoise Bardon's "Les Peintures de Métamorphoses à Venise au début du XVI^e siècle" (pp. 98–114), we turn from majolica to painting. Bardon insists (quite rightly) on the act of painting as a new contextualization, a setting of an Ovidian story in a particular time and place, in this case, sixteenth-century Venice. The pastoral scenes among the paintings she describes can be linked with the bucolic mode then in favor (e.g., Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, published in Venice in 1502, or the Latin *Eglogues* of Pomponio Gaurico of 1509; 103). But this is also a Venice under severe pressure, with not a few of the elite seeking refuge on the mainland. Bardon discovers in any number of objects "*un sens vénitien*" (105). As she describes an Orpheus by the circle of Giovanni Bellini, now in the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. (figure 29b in the volume), we see how "fragmentary Ovidian images" (106)—"ovidemes" we might dub them—are manipulated to convey new senses. "Ovid" has become a language, a discourse that floats relatively free of the Ovidian texts themselves. For a contemporary theory of multivalency Bardon instanced early on in her article the interpretative modes of Leone Ebreo, who explained how the ancient poets wove many "intentions" or "senses" into their poems, the literal sense like the rind on the outside of a fruit and then two or more within like the meat (102). Any and all of these senses can be active at virtually any historical moment. The puzzle for scholars today is to know what was in fact activated at each specific instance.

The ninth essay is Francesca Cappelletti's "L'uso delle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio nella decorazione ad affresco della prima metà del Cinquecento. Il caso della Farnesina" (pp. 115–28). Cappelletti adduces a series of late fifteenth-century/early sixteenth-century treatises and other texts in which theorists recommend, or there emerges in correspondence between patrons and artists, the choice of mythological themes, often Ovidian, for decoration. The sixteenth-century palace emerges as a "microcosm" (cf. 124). The creation of the world is a natural thematic, more tractable (particularly for decoration in a villa) in the Ovidian than in the Biblical vein. She offers a close analysis of Baldassare Peruzzi's frieze (ca. 1510) for Agostino Chigi's study, in which the motifs of "love, death and music" are emphasized. The labors of Hercules have particular significance for Chigi (127), for in 1508, he was granted by Siena privileged use of the Port' Ercole, one of Hercules' "foundations," aetiologically speaking (128). (As Cappel-

letti explains in a concluding note, the dependence on—among other sources—Hyginus well in advance of the 1535 editio princeps of his *Fabulae* points to the mythographer's circulation in these circles in manuscript.)

The tenth essay, Antonie Wlosok's "Junos Abstieg in die Unterwelt (Ovid, *Met.* 4.416ff) in illustrierten Handschriften des *Ovide Moralisé* und in frühen Drucken der *Metamorphosen*" (pp. 129–49), is the work of an author who has a record of distinguished publications both on Classical and Christian Latin literature. Wlosok pays much closer attention to the text and texts than most of the other contributors, adducing considerable material accessible only in manuscripts. On 131 and the following pages, we have a close analysis of the restructuring of the fables into explicable portions. (I refer interested readers to my own reflections on issues of segmentation in "Medieval Articulations of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: From Lactantian Segmentation to Arnulfian Allegory," *Mediaevalia. A Journal of Medieval Studies* 13 [1988] 63–82 and "The *Allegari* of Pierre Bersuire: Interpretation and the *Reductorium morale*," *Allegorica* 10 [1989] 49–82.) From 138 on she turns to illustrations of the cycle, which fall at the beginning and end of a ca. 150-year period, from Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. 0.4, with over 450 miniatures (1315–1325) to a manuscript in the Bibliothèque nationale (1470/80). While the former represents "exegesis of the Ovidian underworld in the service of Christian moral theology" (141), the latter (B.N. fr. 137; 144ff.) tends to the secular without classicising; comparable scenes of the 1497 woodcuts reveal classicizing touches. Like many of the contributions in the volume, there is little by way of an ultimate conclusion, but the insights offered along the way make this one of the stronger pieces. The in-depth diachronic analysis of miniatures concerning this one story permits Wlosok to make more concrete historical assertions such as the stylistic distinctions referenced above. Wlosok's vivid descriptions suggest how splendid it would be to have a complete publication of the *Ovide moralisé*, with its miniatures in color—and perhaps the world of the internet and the "digital scriptorium" will make something like this a reality quite soon. Wlosok's analysis leaves the reader with another realization: it is utterly impossible to speak of the *Ovide moralisé* as a translation, or even version of the *Metamorphoses*, without referring to its illustrations.

The eleventh essay, Claudia Cieri Via's "Diana e Atteone. Continuità e variazione di un mito nell'interpretazione di Tiziano" (pp. 150–160), surveys the various deployments of figures in the classic scene of Actaeon surprising Diana in her bath and the reflexes of a variety of textual details therein. Cieri Via's most sophisticated reading seems to be of Titian's "Death of Actaeon," now in London (plate 41). In Diana's fierce movement Cieri Via finds "perhaps a negative judgment on the gods' aggressivity and compassion for humans overwhelmed by fate, adhering to the ultimate meaning of the Ovidian tale. In the Actaeon episode death constitutes a choice on the part of the hunter, who, as soon as he sees himself in the fountain and becomes aware of his metamorphosis, comes face to face with a dilemma. 'Quid faciat?': should he confront offended shame or death? The drama of Actaeon resides in fact in the self-realization, by means of the reflexion, of his own moral degradation in the face of which his choice of death becomes an affirmation of his humanity. . . ." (159). I cite Cieri Via's subtle exposition at some length because it well exemplifies the way analysis of much later recreations of classical works can, through careful comparison and contrast of multiple sensibilities, advance our appreciation of all the stages of reception involved.

In the twelfth essay, "Ovidian Fantasies. Pictorial Variations on the story of Mars, Venus and Vulcan" (pp. 161–72), Jan L. De Jong explores cases in which artists, wheth-

er they knew the original Latin or a vernacular version of an Ovidian episode, chose—for whatever reason or reasons—to depart from it. In evoking viewers' appreciation of "the painter's wit," "he" (*sic*, without comment) picks up on a particularly Ovidian trait: *ingenium*. (One recalls Quintilian's judgment that Ovid was *nimum amator ingenii sui*.) De Jong shows how some artists found ways—usually by means of invention—of rendering the spirit of the joke in Ovid (as in Homer) while eschewing any attempt at direct representation. One significant departure occurs when Parmigiano follows Ovid, not Homer: Homer reports that the goddesses specifically kept away from the scandalous scene of Aphrodite trapped in adultery with Ares (*Od.* 8). But Parmigiano, illustrating as it were Ovid's silence on this point—for Ovid omits any specific comment comparable to Homer's decorous observation—has the gods drag the goddesses to view the trapped couple! De Jong goes on to show that by 1584 Titian would be criticized for just such creative intention in his *Venus and Adonis* (Prado; pl. 46b). His concluding point is quite clear and very well taken: the "philological" pretensions of scholars from the late sixteenth century on should not limit—anachronistically—our appreciation of the inventiveness of earlier creative artists (170–71). I would add the further, somewhat paradoxical point that often it is only an awareness of subsequent hypercriticisms that make us aware of former freedom and artistic license.

The thirteenth essay is Heidi Marek, "Der Diana-Bildteppich im *Musée des Antiquités* in Rouen vor dem Hintergrund der *Dialoghi d'amore* des Leone Ebreo und der *Discours philosophiques* von Pontus de Tyard" (pp. 173–92). Marek explores the Neoplatonic allegory beneath a now dispersed series of tapestries executed for Diane de Poitiers. The historical context can be fixed quite precisely to 1524, when Diane requested François I to pardon her father for his part in a conspiracy against the throne. The pardon was dramatically granted at the very last minute, though not without certain charges being made against Diane's "honor." The scene reflects a notably early response to Callimachus' *Hymn to Diana*, and Marek's revision of long-standard identifications is persuasive. But Marek's major point is to move beyond contemporary political allegories to the deeper natural and moral allegories—for, as she argues, "sixteenth-century humanists followed in the tradition, already well-established in the middle ages, of multi-level allegorization of mythological material" (178). Some references are subtle: the laurel tree on the river bank, Marek argues, evokes Apollo's first love Daphne, and thus adds another virginal thread to the tapestry. Hermetic emblems are perhaps more surprising, and the Egyptian gods Horus and Seth are (via Plutarch's *de Iside et Osiride*) interpretable as yet another image of Mars and Apollo, whose figures here both point to Henri II. Clearly, only a "learned initiate" ("*eingeweihten Gelehrten*," 181) could have created the symbolic program of this tapestry, and indeed of the whole series.

The fourteenth essay, Udo Reinhardt's "Andromeda und Angelica. Zum Motiv *Königstochter-Held-Ungeheuer* in der literarischen und bildlichen Tradition des Abendlandes" (pp. 193–213), also offers a vast amount of material quite distinct from the Ovidian tradition, beginning with a more thorough review of the ancient pictorial tradition than other articles in the volume. Andromeda presents an interesting case where the "dark centuries" (199) don't break the iconographic chain, thanks particularly to the continuity of the astronomical tradition and its representatives. After this unusually (and perhaps unnecessarily) detailed account of ancient material, Reinhardt reaches the "*Neuzeit*," more or less. The depiction of Perseus' battle with the sea monster in Christine de Pisan's *Épître d'Othea* now shows the distinct impress of the

story of St. George and the dragon, a Christianized version of the myth (200). At the end of the fifteenth century, the Ovidian version started to have more direct impact on the details of renderings, especially via the woodcuts in the Venice, 1497 edition of Bonsignori's *Ovidio metamorphoseos vulgare* (201). (Reinhardt refers to many, many more versions than can be depicted in this volume, so this article will be of value to the art historian more than to the general reader who—unless s/he is doing a special research project—will hardly be able to search out and study all the images.) Bernard Salomon's 1557 Lyons series of *Metamorphoses* illustrations was very influential, and not less so because of the very free way he illustrated the text. Salomon departs from Ovid and Ovid as illustrated in Bonsignori, for example, where Perseus flies by means of winged booties à la Mercury, and puts Perseus on Pegasus for the battle with the sea monster, a rare variant in the ancient period. At a juncture such as this, such finely-grained investigations pay off: Reinhardt argues that while the Franco-Flemish basic type of the late Gothic (Perseus as mounted knight) might underlie Salomon's innovation (indeed departure from the Ovidian text), there was a specific impulse from Italy: "the latest literary variant of the Perseus-Andromeda theme in the form of Ariosto's Renaissance epic, *Orlando furioso*" (202–03), in particular Ruggiero's rescue of Angelica. And as Reinhardt indicates, Ruggiero aboard the hippogryph was a favorite subject of illustration as early as the Venice 1532 edition of Ariosto. That illustration of a text so indebted to Ovid impacts illustration of Ovid's own text is a nice twist in the history of reception and tradition, and a neat illustration itself of "feedback" in the circuitry.

Reinhardt is certainly correct when he says that "Perseus on Pegasus" corresponded to baroque sensibilities and that one could hardly imagine Perseus with those winged booties serving to represent Henri IV in a complimentary French woodcut of 1594 (204). Perseus flew on the seventeenth-century French stage by both means: on Pegasus in Corneille's *Andromède* (1650; Corneille addresses the change from Ovid in his preface) and with winged sandals in Lully's opera *Persée* (1682). Reinhardt carries the survey of representations of the theme to the second half of the twentieth century. Indeed, in a brief epilogue added in 1993 Reinhardt advances even further into the realm of modern popular culture and adduces comic book versions as well as the 1979 film *Clash of the Titans*. Reinhardt concludes his piece thus: "The old myths live on and continue to be influential as long as they reconfigure themselves in constant transformation: as the expression of each period" (211). True enough; that the myth keeps reappearing is quite clear. But Reinhardt's account leaves one feeling that there is nothing "mythic" about the story beyond its sheer revivability.

Reinhardt's is a piece which is broad rather than deep; it provides the *Stoff* of which rather more interesting questions could be asked. For example, it would have been quite interesting if the author had addressed the perennial questions about the status and value of motif studies. The richness of Reinhardt's broad diachronic survey makes a *prima facie* case for value, but in just such a context a description of the way this kind of study works would have been welcome. Is it purely heuristic, in other words, does the survey of one version after another merely sharpen our eyes for variation so that we can appreciate more fully any individual instantiation of the motif? Or does the existence of variation in so many details and along so many parameters establish something akin to a linguistic field in which a particular version "signifies" by the difference(s) it marks on that field? Obviously, this at once raises the question of the status of the field, of the motif itself: is it not the literary historian who has set the bounds and organized the survey of this particular motif who thereby creates the field?

Volume-editor Hans-Jürgen Horn's own contribution, "Die *Tetrasticha* des Johannes Posthius zu Ovids *Metamorphosen* und ihre Stellung in der Überlieferungsgeschichte" (pp. 214–224), is one of the more textually oriented and casts a spotlight on the series of epigrammatic Latin and German verses which Posthius penned to accompany the 178 woodcuts effected for Siegmund Feyerabendt, a Frankfurt printer, by the Nürnberg artist Virgil Solis after originals created for a 1557 edition by Bernard Salomon, master of the Lyons school of woodcutting. Posthius' verses exemplify an art (or craft) of "drastic" compression, the Latin epigrams passingly "ingenious" (*genial*, 217), the German *Knittelvers* quite crude (at least to my ears). The woodcuts were important parts of the original editions, though Horn does not press very far in the direction of analyzing any particular link between the illustrations and the *tetrasticha*, or the appeal of the whole for a reading public. There are along the way suggestions of Feyerabendt's ever-shifting marketing strategies; while such a topic may not obviously fit the present collection, it would certainly have offered a welcome perspective. Horn does correct certain oft-repeated bits of bibliographical misinformation about the complex relationship between and among the many editions and versions emerging from Feyerabendt's press. One minor point: access to Albrecht von Halberstadt's original Middle High German version of the *Metamorphoses* still remains pitifully fragmentary, but since the nineteenth-century discoveries of ca. 420 verses, to which Horn refers (p. 215), three more fragments have come to light, one of which yields another 116 verses. (These were published in Martin Last, "Neue Oldenburger Fragmente der *Metamorphosen-Übertragung* des Albrecht von Halberstadt," *Oldenburger Jahrbuch* 65 [1966] 41–60.)

The sixteenth essay, by Maria Moog-Grünewald, "Benserades *Metamorphoses en rondeaux*. Eine emblematische Bearbeitung der ovidischen Verwandlungsgeschichten" (pp. 225–38), is reported to be a shortened if updated version of a chapter in the author's 1979 book. We are now fully in the seventeenth century; Benserade's *rondeaux* appeared in 1676. With copper-plate engravings (of which only one is reproduced), this production exemplifies the emblem book of the period. However much the emblem and *Metamorphoses* traditions were related, Moog-Grünewald asserts that Benserade's *Metamorphoses en rondeaux* is in fact the first and only case of "a work that presents the entire *Metamorphoses* in emblems" (226) even as it has affinities to the closely-related phenomenon, the book of fables (228), popular along with emblems from the sixteenth well into the eighteenth century. There is a distinction to be made: "in the emblem book the picture is primary and draws its moral from the picture, while the moral lesson is presented briefly and succinctly. While since the seventeenth century the fable was regularly presented with an illustration, nonetheless it transmitted its moral, point, or philosophical teaching by means of extensive narrative" (228).

Like La Fontaine, master of the genre of the fable, Benserade was a court author. Indeed, it was Louis XIV who requested him to prepare his treatment of the *Metamorphoses* (229). With La Fontaine Benserade shared a collaborator in the engraver Chauveau. The number of scenes has now risen to 226; the brief Latin inscriptions often point to the general moral. Procris' fatal jealousy is summed up with the cliché "*credu-la res amor est*" (227). As Moog-Grünewald points out, the *rondeau* is itself anything but a serious form (230), and Benserade's *Metamorphoses en rondeaux* gestures towards the universe of the "travesty" even as it reminds us that if there is anything missing in this very full volume, it would be the travesty tradition of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. (Interestingly, the illustrator of Benserade's Ovidian *rondeaux* also did the copper-plate engravings for Scarron's *Virgile travesti* [229]). This is not, per-

haps, surprising, since the entire genre deserves more attention than it currently receives. In my view, the ironic-satiric perspective of the rondeaux might have made a more interesting focal point than Moog-Grünewald's catalogue of the various orders in which interpretive and narrative elements can appear in the rondeaux; as it is, it comes in only as the essay nears its end (esp. 233–36).

The seventeenth essay, by the volume's other editor, Hermann Walter, "Fundgeschichte und Echtheit der sog. Fede-Gruppe" (pp. 239–51), examines the case of a statue of two young lovers, now lost but much admired in the late eighteenth century, to judge from the copies and representations that seem to derive from it. The pair has been variously identified as Caunus and Byblis, Salmacis and Hermaphroditus, and Amor and Psyche. Certainty is not possible, and a complicated case is rendered more complex still by reports of a restorer's work, but Walter does make the point that even the full collection of Ovid illustrations in Mannheim does not in the end prove much help, since the illustrations form a separate and surprisingly closed tradition (246). While the case for Caunus and Byblis is attractive from many points of view, Walter adds to the standard view—that the pair are Amor and Psyche—consideration of a panel from the Endymion sarcophagus now in the Metropolitan Museum in New York. It would, I believe, serve no purpose to summarize his analysis in more detail here, though it is worth noting that there are tantalizing reports that the group might in fact be the same as a statue damaged in a fire in Rendsburg in 1931 and that more than one photo of it may survive. Walter reports (251, n. 58) a discovery published as late as 1994; who knows if the statue itself might yet come to light?

The eighteenth and final essay is J.B. Trapp's "Portraits of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance" (pp. 252–78); broad in purview, it serves as a fitting conclusion to the volume. Trapp provides a brief survey of the traditional likenesses of other Augustan authors, Virgil and Livy in particular, before turning to the case of Ovid. Of none of these do we possess any authentic image. Of the numerous heads of Ovid in "medieval manuscripts and early printed books" the "ultimate models are late Antique author portraits" (255). In the wake of Petrarch, Ovid as poet gains his laurels, too. When we come to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, desire for antiquity outpaced the reliability of source material. Various images that came to light were each in turn regarded as authentic likenesses; the inscription on one Lydian coin was tampered with to yield Ovid's name (in Greek). As Trapp points out, through the nineteenth century "fancy" guided artists improvising new images. Trapp then turns to specific analysis of images, starting with a striking one in clm 2599 from Aldersbach in Niederbayern (c. 1200). On f. 107v, Ovid appears with Horace. The monitory hexameter runs "*Me dampnavit amor. Moneo, sis cautus amator.*" There he is bearded, as he is in Vêrard's *Bible des poètes* (p. 263), but more often, and certainly in the plates Trapp has selected, he appears beardless, like the type of youthful lover in amatory works his poetry so deeply inspired. With very few exceptions, "manuscripts of the Latin Ovid seldom have any great number of illustrations," portraits included. "The first fully illustrated Ovid codices contain not the Latin text of the *Metamorphoses*, but the French *Ovide moralisé*" (258–59).

Early printers were somewhat casual. Ovid, like other classical authors, was often "shown in the guise of a contemporary university teacher, sometimes flanked by his commentators," and sometimes likenesses identifiable as deriving from the portraits of others, including Dante and Petrarch, were passed off as Ovid (268). Not a few have prominent noses, as one would expect of someone whose cognomen was Naso.

The activities of fifteenth-century printers from Ovid's own *patria* Sulmo are particularly fascinating (266–67). From 1410 Ovid appeared on the city's arms along with the initials S.M.P.E. which stand for "*Sulmo mihi patria est*" of *Tr.* 4.10.3. Quite unusual is the image of Ovid writing on a tree trunk by the rocky shores of the Euxine that accompanied a *Tristia* printed in Venice in 1511 (269; plate 62a). (I note that however far from Rome, Ovid is depicted as having put on his laurel crown to write.) Trapp generously offers seventeen illustrations, but he describes a good many more, and only those readers who track down and study the full series of images will appreciate this piece's full value. Trapp also provides information on issues like Ovid's tomb he more fully treats in earlier articles (e.g. "Ovid's Tomb: The Growth of a Legend from Eusebius to Laurence Sterne, Chateaubriand and George Richmond," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 36 [1973] 35–76, rptd. with corrections and additions in Trapp's *Essays on the Renaissance and the Classical Tradition* [Aldershot, 1990], art. iv.)

The volume concludes with full indices (of manuscripts and incunables, persons historical and mythological, and topics). The paucity of obvious typographical errors in so long and complex a book (p. IX, ¶3, l. 2: "*manigfaltigen*" for "*mannigfaltigen*"; p. 16, n. 10: "arrangementst" for "arrangement"; p. 38, n. 5, l. 2: for volume "5," read "51"; first line of p. 174 is a typographic doublet; p. 228, l. 4: "*übenimmt*" for "*übernimmt*") gives testimony to the extraordinary care the contributors and editors took with the preparation of this valuable volume.

Ralph J. Hexter
Departments of Classics and Comparative Literature
University of California, Berkeley

Virgil Between the Wars*

Theodore Ziolkowski, *Virgil and the Moderns* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), XV + 274pp.

Richard Jenkyns has recently argued rightly that Virgil "is probably the most influential poet who ever lived."¹ Only a poet of transcendent gifts who embraced and defined a wide variety of genres could have influenced such disparate types as Milton and Marlowe, Arnold and Gide. C.S. Lewis told us the reason: Virgil stands at the beginning of the European tradition, not the end of the Homeric mythical tradition. It was Virgil who established the European paradigms of pastoral, didactic and epic, not Theocritus, Hesiod, or Homer. Nevertheless, there is a long and distinguished list of Virgiliomastics. Any poet who lists among his detractors Byron ("that harmonious plagiarist and miserable flatterer"), Goethe ("a propagandist and mere versifier"), Ezra Pound ("His hero is a stick who would have contributed to *The New Statesman*"), or

* The author of this review article and the editor of this journal regret the circumstances beyond their control that have caused this review article to appear so long after the book's publication.

1. Richard Jenkyns, "The Legacy of Rome" [= Introduction] in: Idem, ed., *The Legacy of Rome: A New Appraisal* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992) 16.