

readers who come to this book out of interest in the question with which Linton opens the work (the quality of family sentiment) may also find themselves asking questions about the social components of this consolatory activity that are not taken up in the book. It would have been particularly interesting to have learned more about the educational mechanisms by which the skill of poetry writing was transmitted.

The list of questions one may have while reading Linton's book should not detract from the scholars' impression of the quality of the analysis regarding questions that are actually targeted in the book; indeed, that one can develop so many areas of inquiry based on her research suggests the centrality of the topic and precisely the ways that Linton has opened up its discussion for future researchers.

John Whenham and Richard Wistreich, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Monteverdi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. xxi + 358 pp. + 23 illus. \$36.99. Review by STEVEN SAUNDERS, COLBY COLLEGE.

The patrimony of this outstanding collection of essays on the seventeenth-century's most renowned composer is clear: the dedication to Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune, editors of the venerable *Monteverdi Companion* (London: Faber, 1968) and its revised version, *The New Monteverdi Companion* (London: Faber and Faber, 1985), signals that this "companion to the companions" will consist of equal measures of emulation, competition, and homage. *The Cambridge Companion* is similar to its forerunners in one respect: its authors form an impressive cadre from the A-list of Monteverdi scholars. Yet the Cambridge volume is at once more comprehensive and accessible than the earlier Monteverdi companions. That the resulting book can be read with profit by both lay readers and specialists is a tribute both to the contributors' considerable acumen and to the editors' thoughtful design.

That overarching structure consists of three intertwining strands, the first chronological: chapters on Mantua (Roger Bowers) and Venice (Ian Fenlon) introduce the social, political, and economic conditions under which Monteverdi worked during the two primary phases of his career. These two articles serve loosely as introductions to seven

chapters surveying the major works of Monteverdi's oeuvre: the early compositions (Geoffrey Chew), the third through sixth books of madrigals and *Scherzi musicali* (Massimo Ossi), *Orfeo* (Joachim Steinhauer), the *Mass and Vespers of 1610* (Jeffrey Kurtzman), the seventh and eighth book of madrigals (Tim Carter), the Venetian sacred music (John Whenham), and the late operas (Ellen Rosand).

These distinguished scholars generally concentrate on summarizing previous work on these repertoires and on introducing basic problems in Monteverdi research. For example, Chew's essay provides a lucid introduction to the ideas of musical imitation, emulation, and intertextuality; Ossi's contribution on the Mantuan madrigals neatly summarizes his distinguished earlier work on these pieces; and Kurtzman's article provides a thoughtful digest of Monteverdi's duties as a composer of sacred music at Mantua, along with an admirable review of the vexed questions surrounding the so-called *1610 Vespers*.

Despite this clear effort to address a wide readership, nearly all of the authors manage to float fresh ideas or to present new findings. For example, Tim Carter's essay—an example of the author's customary combination of meticulous scholarship, wide-ranging curiosity, and keen wit—uses the Habsburgs' well-known motto *Bella gerant alii, tu felix Austria nube* (Let others wage wars, you happy Austria marry) as a key to reading the division of the *Eighth Book of Madrigals* into *canti guerrieri* and *amorosi*. Carter's suggestion that "Monteverdi quite literally composes [the motto] into his collection" (186), which was dedicated to the Habsburg Emperor Ferdinand III, is persuasive, even though the motto itself was not widely used with reference to the Habsburgs until the eighteenth-century. Similarly, Monteverdi scholars will recognize a subtle, and not altogether consonant counterpoint between Jeffrey Kurtzman's and Roger Bowers's contributions—one that renews their ongoing contretemps over matters of Monteverdi scholarship. At issue in this case are precisely what Monteverdi meant when he asked to be named "Director of Music both of the chamber and of the church" at Mantua in his first surviving letter (28 November 1601), and which venues outside the ducal palace were probable sites for the performance of his early sacred compositions. Finally, John Whenham's discussion of the sacred works published in anthologies

provides, in less than four pages, the best overview yet of this overlooked portion of Monteverdi's output.

Five articles written from viewpoints other than the traditional life-and-works perspective constitute the book's second strand. Anthony Pryor's thought-provoking "Approaching Monteverdi: His Cultures and Ours" is a tour de force, an extended meditation on the ways in which modern points of view shape, distort, and transform our picture of Monteverdi. Among the fascinating topics he explores are the meanings attached to being an "Italian" composer in the Seicento; the distorting influences of modern ideologies of authorship, genius, and originality; the historically mutable categories of serious versus popular music; and the uses (or rather, misuses) of models of history based on notions of progress and civilization. In the midst of these ruminations on historiography, Pryor manages to work in not only new contributions to Monteverdi's biography, but also a telling demonstration of the novelty of the aria "Possente spiritu" from *Orfeo*, its surface similarities to Caccini's "Qual trascorrendo" notwithstanding. Tim Carter's contribution on "Musical Sources" offers cautionary tales regarding the problematic nature of the sources for Monteverdi's music, most notably his discovery that a later state of the first edition to *Orfeo* includes no fewer than fifty-four stop-press corrections. Carter also demonstrates the utility of thinking about the ways in which printed sources reflect their lost manuscript exemplars, or *Stichvorlagen*. Paola Besutti surveys "Spaces for Music in Late Renaissance Mantua," reconstructing the architecture of many of the spaces in which Monteverdi's works were first heard, and Suzanne Cusick provides a unique state-of-the-field survey that traces the influence of so-called "new musicologies" on Monteverdi scholarship. Cusick singles out the roles that Gary Tomlinson, Ellen Rosand, and Susan McClary played in introducing strains of new criticism, new historicism, and gender studies to Monteverdi studies. Ironically, few of the other essays in the volume evidence these trends. Most are methodologically traditional, showing few traces of critical theory, feminist scholarship, or the other approaches Cusick discusses. Indeed, even the approaches to music analysis in the *Cambridge Companion* are generally long-established ones. Most of the essays hew to traditional tonal descriptions of Monteverdi's harmonic practice. Hardly any of

the authors draw on Eric Chafe's hexachord-based approach to tonal organization or acknowledge Harold Powers' influential work on tone and mode. The last of the five complementary essays, Richard Wistreich's "Monteverdi in Performance" is not a practical treatment of seventeenth-century performance practice, though he does offer a few suggestions about performance matters, but rather an astute introduction to the resources, performers, and musical traditions with which Monteverdi worked.

Six *intermedi*, short analytical essays examining single works, form the third strand in the book's organization. Labeling these essays *intermedi* by analogy to the musical-dramatic interludes that divided the acts of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century dramas was a felicitous rhetorical touch. Nevertheless, these analyses function less as interludes than as appendages. They are invariably written by the author of the immediately preceding chapter and isolate a work from that chapter's repertoire for extended treatment. There is something invigorating about watching established scholars (Chew, Ossi, Kurtzman, Carter, Whenham, and Rosand) return to well-known compositions, still finding new and original things to observe. The understandable exception is Ellen Rosand's *intermedio* on Act V, scene 10 from *Il ritorno d'Ulisse*, drawn from her monumental *Monteverdi's Last Operas: A Venetian Trilogy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), which appeared at virtually the same time as the *Cambridge* volume.

Three additional features round out *The Cambridge Companion*. A seven-page chronology of Monteverdi's life and works by John Whenham condenses and updates the similar section of Silke Leopold's *Monteverdi: Music in Transition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). The emphasis that Whenham places on Monteverdi's activities as a church musician provides an illuminating corrective to Leopold's overview, which tended to emphasize the composer's secular output. Whenham also contributes a useful list of "The Works of Monteverdi: Catalogue and Index" that lists works arranged chronologically by date of publication, as well as entries for lost works, interleaved(?) by date of performance. Finally, there is a brief and judiciously chosen discography by Richard Wistreich.

The emphasis on Monteverdi's music makes *The Cambridge Companion to Monteverdi* a worthy counterpart to Paulo Fabbri's standard

biography, *Monteverdi*, trans. Tim Carter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), in which the music receives rather short shrift. The book's structure leads to some inevitable redundancies when the volume is read front-to-back, but editors manage to keep these to a minimum, and in any case, many readers will consult articles separately or out of order. Ultimately, the *Cambridge Companion* provides a lucid scholarly introduction to Monteverdi's music, a succinct overview of the current state of scholarship, and enough nuggets of new research to keep even Monteverdi specialists engaged.

Laura A. Lewis. *Hall of Mirrors: Power, Witchcraft, and Caste in Colonial Mexico*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003. xvi + 262 pp. \$79.95 cloth; \$22.95 paperback. Review by PATRICIA M. GARCÍA, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

Laura A. Lewis's *Hall of Mirrors: Power, Witchcraft, and Caste in Colonial Mexico* begins with the first of many case histories of men and women accused of engaging in, directly or indirectly, witchcraft in sixteenth and seventeenth century Mexico. Lewis relates the story of a free black woman, Adriana Ruíz de Cabrera, accused of witchcraft in the court of the Holy Office of the Inquisition. In some witness accounts, she uncovered thefts and lost items for those who sought her services. In others, she was hired to seek revenge on the enemies of her clients. Adriana's defense was her proclaimed Christianity, especially since she had been raised in a Spanish household. Adriana further noted that her accuser, another free black woman named Ana María de Concepción who had rented a room in her boarding house and subsequently stolen from other boarders, was not to be trusted not only because she was a "lying cheat" but also "because ... she is a black [woman] [*negra*]" (2). Lewis uses this seemingly ironic argument to point out Adriana's understanding of caste as she positions herself as, in her lawyer's terms, a "*clean living* black woman" in opposition to Ana María. Ultimately, Adriana was freed when Ana María admitted to lying, thus confirming Adriana's accusations. Ana María never believed that the Inquisition would take her claims seriously, as she was from the "*monte*" or the wild space of the hills or backwoods, and,