REVIEWS OF BOOKS.


Leonardo Giustiniani, who thirty years ago was but vaguely known to such a scholar as D'Ancona, can today boast of a stately series of investigators. He is one of the resurrections of modern criticism that have distinctly paid. He has aroused interest as the inventor of a new form of the strambotto—the octave; as an assiduous and artistic cultivator of the themes of popular poetry, into the criticism of which his work has brought disturbing and revolutionary elements; finally as the "most significant Venetian poet before Bembo, and one of the best in Italy in the first half of the fifteenth century" (Fenigstein, p. 129). Those who have followed the activities around Giustiniani's work and Mr. Fenigstein's admirable summary of them, will probably see in Leonardo even broader titles to respect. He is, in a sense, the Philip Sydney of the Venetian Renaissance: he was the ideal gentleman of his time. He was a competent humanist, a connoisseur of art and an enthusiastic student of natural science. The devoted ascetic, delighting in saintly conversation, was no less fond of hunting and fishing; and he bore with him memories of an interesting, even a licentious youth (cf. the canzone Amante a sta fredura, Wiese's ed., no. VII).

The shrewd senator, the conscientious and popular governor, could leave his treatise on the art of war to compose a bar of music for the Virgin—or for a serenade. The successful merchant was also a skilled accountant, interested in the theory of numbers. The most eloquent orator in the Council is famous as the most keenly eulogist in the Basilica, while the clever diplomat rises to one of the highest political positions in the State. These broad interests make of him one of the best embodiments of Venetian ideals of cultured manhood; he is one of the representative minds of the Italian Renaissance.1

Giornale Storico, X, 363. One passage, p. 365, in addition to those more notable

Mr. F.'s contribution is a closely knit and carefully conducted piece of work, and is beyond question the most comprehensive and satisfactory general

---

1 For a portrayal of his life by himself, see the letter published by Sabbadini, features dwelt on at length by others, seems to me worthy of remark. This is his praise of the life in the gondola, as the most genial of occupations, which I am inclined to associate with that interesting Venetian trait studied by Segarini, Embrione, Sept., 1908, pp. 213–224, Freschi e passeggis a Venezia. Also earlier than the literary echoes of this custom cited there, is a passage in the letters of Andrea Calmo, ed. by Vittorio Rossi, Loescher, Roma, 1888, p. 277: "... si vu gustassè, anema mia, i spassi de andar al fresco in barca. . . ."
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review of Giustinian literature to date. He has not reviewed in detail the work of previous writers, but refers to them only in foot-notes. This method is in general adequate; but Note 8, p. 33, perhaps through an infelicity of style, is unfair to Foscarini. Montfaucon’s error in attributing the Liber philologicus to Giustinian was recognized by Foscarini (Della lett. veneziana, ed. 1847, p. 301, note 1). Mr. F. makes Foscarini sponsor for the error itself. The idea of the bibliography (pp. vi–vii) is, however, most unhappy. If meant to outline the literature of the subject it is scarcely half complete; if intended to offer a selected list, it has chosen the insignificant in preference to the indispensable and adds nothing to the foot-notes, which must still be consulted throughout. It deals particularly with the Latin sources, and as such should contain at least a reference to the bibliography compiled by Ortolani in his Appunti su L. G., Feltre, 1845. In place of this haphazard list of general works, such as Romanin’s history and Agostini’s Notizie, an actual list of the MSS. and published works of Giustinian would have served a purpose. And to mention another inedia—why give English parallels (p. 45) to the regular Christian designation of diabolus by “Enemy”? or carefully translate zveneto (p. 111) and say nothing about chui (p. 112)? Is this an emendation, Venetian qui, “quel,” or a misprint of the passage in Wiese, which reads dui?—di dai partiti qual dezo seguire (the reference is Wiese X, not XI)? These Venetian citations within the German text have not, apparently, received the author’s revision: in addition to very numerous harmless slips (such as tuo mano, òg; atri for s’tri, segue for segna, etc.), in the citation (p. 83) from Foscarini’s Canti popolari, nearly everything is wrong, including verse division, text and reference. The passage is found on p. 128 of the Canti as follows:

"Ga Roma fabrich Romolo e Remo;
Venezia amor, vegnudo a vela e a remo."

The date hitherto accepted for Giustinian’s birth is 1368, but this has always led to difficulties (cf. Wiese, Zeits. für rom. Phil., XVII, 256). Mr. F. attacks this further on the ground that the marriage of Leonardo’s mother at fifteen, his own at seventeen, and the composition of the poems in the Galeazzo MS. at fourteen, are improbable. There remains to be explained the statement of Leonardo himself that “his nineteenth year offered him to the State.” Mr. F. doubts whether this refers to his admission to the Maggior Consiglio in 1407. But he has no positive suggestion for the reference. He might possibly have added that the presentation of a young man for the proof and acknowledgment of his right to the patriciate or to the cittadinanza originaria usually took place around nineteen and was called precisely an “offering.” Mr. F. does not state very clearly his reasons for accepting the date 1383. We are left to infer that Leonardo married not younger than twenty-one, and we know the date of the marriage: 1405. This assumes that he entered the council in 1407 at the regular age of twenty-five. His eldest brother, Lorenzo, was born in 1380. Mr. F.’s confirmation of his hypothesis (already advanced by Wiese) has much probability. But two further inquiries may be in point: may Leonardo’s aggregation to the Council at the earliest legal moment and his unusually early marriage have been caused by Lorenzo’s determination to enter the cloister? May the poems in the Galeazzo MS. have been written in the already stamped volume
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long after it passed from Galeazzo's ownership? If Leonardo were born in 1388, he could have been not yet thirty at the time of the Zeno eulogy, 1418; this could account for the presence of "twenty" in that inaccurate oral tradition recorded by Egnazio (p. 38). Of course the orator's references to his own age in the speech itself are mere rhetorical modesty.

With some of Mr. F.'s general statements it is difficult to agree. It can hardly be said that Venetian usage expected the marriage of the eldest son (p. 7). Venice never recognized the principle of primogeniture: all the sons had equal property and political rights. Hence enormous fortunes and family dispositions were obviated. But to prevent, on the other hand, the dwindling of estates, a custom grew up automatically, by which the brothers lived together and only one married. This was usually the younger. Naturally the eldest son had a political preference from the very fact of age and experience and from a tendency not to favor too many of the same family. Of course this was a custom not a law, and exceptions are numerous according to the exigencies of particular cases. The failure of the elder brother, Lorenzo, to marry, is therefore not surprising. His retirement opened the way to the careers of Marco and Leonardo.

To deduce from Leonardo's statement that his political preferment was unsought, that he was a prominent possibility for the Dogeship, is probably excessive. This expression of Leonardo smacks of that feigned modesty of which humanistic correspondence is full, and is no gauge of his actual popularity. To be sure, the office of Procurator of San Marco was often a stepping-stone to the throne. But this was a period of intense political activity in Venice, with grave questions at stake. Men of stronger bias and aggressiveness than Leonardo were favored for the highest position. His most conspicuous traits were social tact and administrative competence. There is little evidence of his capacity as an enthusiastic leader. He is not of the type of Mocenigo and Foscarì, who were guiding Venice at this period. Nor was the problem before them of so inevitable an answer as Mr. F. would have us believe. Venetian decline begins from the adoption of Foscarì's policy of imperialism in preference to Mocenigo's theory of peaceful commercial expansion.

In connection with Leonardo's political career, we may suggest that the statement that he was a member of the Council of X from 1428 till 1445 is surprising. Constitutionally, the election was for not more than one year. The "headship" was not for one person, as Mr. F. seems to imply (pp. 12-14), but for three, and the duration in office not for one sitting but for three months. It is not a question of chairmanship: the capi were a sort of executive committee.

*This custom was general enough to attract the attention of many visitors to Venice; and it seems that the community of life led to certain social evils; see Molmenti, Storia di Venezia nella vita privata, Bergamo, 1908, III, 41-42 and especially 424.

*The statement (p. 13) that this was the second highest office in the state needs limitations: strictly speaking, the Grand Chancellor, the "Doge of the people," came next in rank after the Doge. In matters of influence, of course, the patrician alone counted.

* P. 13: "Venedig war somit gezwungen in die Terraferma einzudringen."

* A complete statement of these matters may be found in Romanin, Lessons di storia veneta, Firenze, Le Monnier, 1873, I, p. 281.
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When Mr. F. asserts that the Greek preceded the Latin Renaissance in Venice and that “Greek first introduced the Venetians into the spirit of Antiquity” (p. 29), can he be ignoring the long residence of Petrarch in Venice and the Veneto—this scarcely a quarter-century before the advent of Emmanuel Chrysoloras? Petrarch’s most noteworthy defence of Plato is precisely of Venetian inspiration; yet Petrarch was not a Greek scholar. As for the introduction of Greek into Italy, we may recall from Novati that the movement proceeded not only from sacred literature and from commerce, but also from a movement of considerable importance emanating from Ireland, where the classical tradition was protected from barbarian disturbance during the Invasions. Irish monks were established in Calabria and North Italy.

The mediocrity of Venetian humanism is due less to the practical bourgeois spirit of the Republic—does Venice then show less the passion for art and beauty than the rest of Italy?—than to the liberal ideals of culture which the conditions of the State enforced. The freedom of political and commercial activity engrossed much creative energy. This does not attain in purely academic fields the specialized excellence that the parasitic culture of the Renaissance reached in the other Italian courts. Venetian culture is assimilative rather than creative: it is diffused and balanced rather than intense. This explains the numerous “names and naught but names” (p. 30) of Venetian humanists. For the rest, is not Leonardo himself an example of that rounded liberal culture that nowhere rises above mediocrity? Further, we must not forget the proximity of Padova and Venice. The leisure of the rich nobles was spent in the villas of Terraferma, at Treviso, at Bassano, along the Brenta. How much of really Venetian activity is absorbed in the more congenial circles of the university suburb?

Probably Mr. F. attaches too much literalness to the content of the humanistic production of Giustiniani. His criticism of painting (p. 20); his praises of his friends; his religious moods, these all deal with concepts and forms imposed by the traditions of the time and are as far from life as the language in which they were expressed. There is also nothing distinctive in Guarino’s praise of the Zeno epitogy, which Muratori printed in full precisely because it was brief; nor in the homage of Barzizza, who was Leonardo’s senior in letters. This humility of Barzizza moves us the less in proportion as Giustiniani’s rôle as the patrician and the Maecenas is emphasized. It is difficult to concede Leonardo’s special love for Nature on the slender basis of the sentences adduced (p. 65; the passage is in Giornale Storico, X, p. 365). It is significant that he compares the scene before him to a painting, and (p. 20) that he considers the human art the greater of the two. There is no hint there of the all-sufficiency of life from the mere fact of living that we find in the true poets of nature: or of the absorbing delight in the world of Petrarch. For in the poems of Giustiniani, where there was room for greater expansiveness, Nature appears only in the triteness of conventional symbols.

Mr. F.’s analysis of the vernacular poetry of Leonardo Giustiniani is an excellent piece of work. We should be inclined only to dwell with greater in-

---

6 Mr. F. says: “Die Freude an die Natur war für Leonardo Giustiniani nicht der Ausdruck einer bloss vorübergehenden Stimmung: sie war ihm Lebensbedürfnis.”
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existence on his relations to the Dugento. He is much more in sympathy with Guinicelli and Davanzati than with Petrarch or his followers. If he feels the Trecento at all, it is rather of the bourgeois poets, of Faiimelli or Soldanieri or Antonio Pucci that he reminds us. He is thoroughly familiar with the popular poetry of the thirteenth century: and philosophically he connects the Dolce Stil Nuovo with Michael Angelo. With his leanings toward the older Italian spirit should be associated his rather scanty use of classical analogies (p. 65), which is certainly not due to ignorance, but rather to a sobriety of taste the more remarkable when we recall that Giustiniani is a contemporary of Il Saviozzo. In view of this simple popular tone of Leonardo's work, we have a right to grave doubts as to the authenticity of Mr. Ortolani's additions to the list of the strambotti.

Those published in the Appunti are in the manner of an arrant Petrarclism, entirely foreign to the rest of the poems known. We miss a careful treatment of this question in the work before us. For the Leandride, however, a rather beautiful poem of the early Quattrocento, in the style of Boccaccio's verse romances, Mr. F., following others, notably Lazzarini, is emphatic in rejecting Giustiniani's authorship. The attribution had originally in its favor principally the fact that Leonardo is about the only Venetian poet with genius enough to have written it. Mr. F.'s negative proof is as conclusive as one has a right to expect. But is the somma gravità of the author's brother necessarily a reference to a specific office—a bishopric? Why not, to his general dignity as a famous saint?—It is difficult to see how the "concept of morality [in Giustiniani] is Venetian" (p. 114). The conspicuous motive to conduct is reputation, good name; but this is regular already in the Dugento and in Provence.—P. 125: Leonardo was not only writing lude in 1429: he was then enjoying a certain reputation for them (cf. Sabbadini, op. cit.).

Mr. F.'s note (p. 83), identifying the liagò with the altana is inexact. The altana was a hanging balcony, while the liagò was the outside staircase (of which examples still remain in Venice) capped by the sheltered sun-room. Both the altana and the liagò figure in Wiese VII. Developments in architecture have introduced fundamental changes in the meanings of these terms. Liagò appears also in the form dinagò, though the exact relation of the words has not been made clear. With the gradual disappearance of the outside sun-room, this latter name passed over to the glass bay-window (cf. Boerio), which served a similar domestic purpose—that of a pleasant sitting room. Meanwhile the altana came to designate the enclosure on the roof, yielding to overone in its other sense. In zudia-e, an epithet applied to the uncomplaisant lover (p. 116), the connotation and semantic origin is in the meaning "faithless," as shown by the frequent adjunct eretico and longer definitions: Wiese (p. 12): "Ai me, ch'io cridi—A la tua fede zudia; (p. 99) : Donna: De si tui sacramenti—Che me farà rasone? Amante: Donna, non haver temanza!—Credéresti forsì che zudeo io stia?—Ancor may hai cognoscenza! Non credere che zurassi la busa. (P. 149):

1 For the discussion and Ortolani's defense, see a note in Giornale Storico, XXXIII, p. 453 and Fenigstein, p. 81.

Reviews of Books

Fane vendetta—De sta zudia perfida e crudele. (P. 275): Non adoro altro dio—Che la tua faza bella—Sun doventà zudio—Per ti, mia chiara stella."

In contrast with the condensed and much worked matter of Mr. Fenigstein, we have the rather light treatment of Maffio Venier by Professor Ruggieri. Here the substance of Venier's work is dealt with in categories of the most general kind; and the various poems are considered seriatim with little attempt at synthesis. It is an account rather than a study of Venier's production, and the subject is far from being exhausted. Aside from a well ordered bibliography, offering a starting point for future investigators, the most valuable portion of the work is the biography, which is a real contribution based on inaccessible sources.

Venier is a sample of the Venetian courtier: his career represents persistent tugs at the various wires attached to lucrative positions, most of which he failed to attain. His exploitation of the clerical robe is by no means exceptional, of course: and when he finally arrived in the archbishopric of Corfu, he displayed occasionally a decency that does him credit. He dabbled with some success in diplomacy and was capable of arousing deep affection in high places, especially at the Florentine court, under the patronage of his romantic compatriot, Blanca Capello. His diplomatic status was perplexing even to his contemporaries, and he was specifically charged with being a spy, acting in behalf of Florence. Mr. Ruggieri comes to his rescue in a warm denial (p. 47), but this defence, like, for that matter, the accusation itself, rests on rather weak evidence. The express denial of Francesco I is worthless, as coming from the most interested party next to Venier. The Republic at any rate never took Venier over-seriously. Yet he was one of those men whom Venice liked to see advanced at foreign courts, as a means of strengthening her own influence and popularity, and as convenient sources of information in case of need.

As a poet, Venier is famous for the authorship of the most widely read poem in the Venetian dialect: La Strazzosa. In it a man of the people describes the joy of life with his ragged but beloved wife. There is great realistic power and much sensibility; above all, a note of domestic purity that charms. Nevertheless La Strazzosa is not a democratic poem. It belongs to that well stocked genre of verses in which a long series of Venetian nobles sang the charms of their washerwomen, their cooks and their scullions. Here La Strazzosa is a masterpiece. As a social document, it shows the reverse side of Petrarchism, where the poets, surfeited with the insipid beauty of painted Lauras, struggled to get back to natural and uncultivated types, sought in the grime of the kitchen or in the squalor of the poor house. The rest of Venier's work presents in substance all the mediocrity of Petrarchism; but his dialect gives to these worn themes that appearance of originality, which forceful figures, derived from the people, produce.

In the last number of the Giornale Storico, just arrived, A. Oberdorfer publishes notes on Giustiniani as a Humanist. He objects to the form Gius-
tinian, preferring Giustiniano or Giustinian. Why then not a pure Venetian form Zustinian? And his rejection of Fenigstein's suggestion of 1383 seems as excessive as the latter's categorical affirmation. After all, 1383 is "comodo per la critica."
Venier is the author of a classic tragedy, Idalba, of which Mr. Ruggieri has discovered a second redaction. The differences in the two forms seem to me to suggest an hypothesis as to the inspiration of the play, worthy of consideration. In the first draft, we have the disinherition of a princess, Idalba, in favor of another relative, Delida. War results, though against Idalba’s will. In the fight her lover is killed, and she becomes a suicide.—In the second working, Delida is disinherited and Idalba is raised to the throne. In the result, Delida is victorious. Idalba’s father is executed and her husband is placed on trial. Idalba herself is accused, and failing to flee the country, is at last condemned. After long hesitation on the part of Delida, who at first refuses to permit the execution, Idalba is sacrificed to “ragion di stato” — What at first was a mere romantic tragedy has become a struggle of character, where the interest of pity centers in Idalba, but where the motive will-power is in Delida. Is this combat of queens for the throne, this trial and condemnation of the one by the other, an echo of the tragedy about to be consummated in England? Idalba was complete in 1585 and Venier died in 1586. The play may originally have been suggested by the circumstances attending the advent of Elizabeth to the throne. But the struggle between her and Mary the Catholic is forgotten as the dramatic career of Mary Queen of Scots unfolds. If the second redaction of Idalba is influenced by these important events, it is not only one of the earliest tragedies devoted to Mary’s history: it is also a prediction of that solution of her case at which Elizabeth was to arrive in 1587.

Mr. Ruggieri had not been following the Cronaca of the Giornale Storico when he wrote note 2 on p. 77. The literature he there cites is nearly two centuries out of date.

But he has written a valuable and interesting book.

In editing the unpublished work of Riccardo Selvatico, whose name was not fortunate enough to appear in the study of Nani-Mocenigo (Letteratura veneziana del secolo XIX), Mr. Fradeletto has rendered a service of friendship and affection. His introductory essay, Riccardo Selvatico e la sua generazione, analyses the temper of the Venetian mind during the period of reconstruction; it outlines the evolution of Selvatico’s genius and describes briefly his career as a man and a politician (Selvatico became sindaco of Venice and deputato alla camera). He relates as a first hand observer the interaction of Selvatico’s work with that of Giacinto Gallina and Giacomo Favretto and the cooperation

---

1 Mr. R. considers the unedited Idalba the earlier redaction (p. 112), because “i difetti riscontrati nell’ Idalba stampata sono più appartenenti nell’ Idalba inedita, massime rispetto alla stile... “Tutto sommato l’ Idalba inedita ha più rettorica, ha più impronta di esercitazione letteraria.” In spite of Mr. R’s great authority as a specialist with first hand information, this hypothesis, based on impressionistic grounds, does not seem to be borne out by the substance of the two plays; where, judging from Mr. R’s summaries, the unedited text has by far the greater dramatic interest. There is also the MS. title, Tragedia nova—of course not absolutely conclusive. Finally the historical background to the plot, which we consider here. Mr. R’s light treatment of this important question is paralleled by similar inadequate discussions of Venetian poetry and of the drama before Venier.
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of all three with the actors Angelo and Marianna Morolin in creating a distinctive and artistic Venetian stage.

The edition comprises three plays (one incomplete) and a short series of dialect poems—notable here Le tabachine—as a short study of a local trait, and a Nino-nuna with In morte d'una bambina,—verses in popular manner but of fine tone. The comedies are models of current dialect speech and in them the question of Venetian orthography seems for once to have been satisfactorily decided.

The third of the series, I morti, is really but the dialect plan of a play intended for rewriting in Tuscan. It is a study in psychology: a wife, cruelly treated, dies. The unfaithful husband, who has rushed into a second marriage, returns now to a passionate adoration of the dead woman—a passion in fact as productive of evil as his original infidelity had been. The second, I recini da festa, "Earrings," treats the theme of the rich but irascible father, led by the helpless innocence of an infant, to pardon the runaway marriage of his son to a poor girl. This play has no dramatic interest, but it has great keenness of observation and gentleness of manner. To Mr. Fradeletto's observations on the first, La bozeta de ogio, "The Spilling of Oil Brings Bad Luck," we may add the following suggestions: The play is a mosaic of Goldenian themes, suggested principally by Il Bugiardo, Le Barufe Chiosote and L'Avaro. But Selvatico has carefully pondered his art and while his plot revolves about lies and misunderstandings, the falsehoods and mistakes go back to fundamental character traits: in Cate to avarice, in Anzoleta and Bortolo to onestà, a desire to save at all costs the reputation of the family. Piero and Bepo are gondoliers with weaknesses for drink and gaming but thoroughly good fellows. Taken as a class, the characters stand for impulsive honesty, but they are totally unable to resist the temptation to gain good ends by bad means. Hence all the trouble. The "observation is superficial" (p. 10) in the sense that the characters are types, invented to stand for certain traits, and in the sense that the play has after all a mechanical framework. But in the detailed scenes, this is scarcely true; the conduct of the barufa (I, 7), the reading of Sior Tomis by Bepo and Piero (II, 1), Cate's narrative of the rich lady's refusal to kneel beside her at mass (II, 2),—these bits are perfect in their genre. For the rest, the comedy registers a broad social judgment: it recognizes the social problem that exists, when, through poverty and helplessness, fundamentally honest natures are driven to complete ethical irresponsibility.

A. A. L.


This paper is announced as the introduction to a series the purpose of which is the reconstruction of the original Roland. The author hopes by methods of literary criticism to be able to fashion a text which will be open to fewer objections than those we already possess. "Although the Chanson de Roland has been studied for three-quarters of a century, many of its problems, including several of the most important ones, are as yet unsolved. In the opinion of the present writer, however, a great number of these problems are solvable if the following thesis be proved—that the original Chanson de Roland was a poem of marked and consistent technical excellence"