

man is thus made available to English language students.

This volume is not a history of Poland-Lithuania in the early modern period, but it was not intended as a textbook. It is an invitation to discussion on the form of government of Poland-Lithuania in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries through the perspective of new methodological proposals developed by early modern historians. It is also the first English language book on this period and topic since the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, with a substantial contribution of historians on both sides of the former "Curtain."

Let me end with a very personal comment. While I consider the whole volume to be of great value, it was Jûratë Kiaupienë H (ÿ—□s chapter which was the biggest eye-opener for me. I must confess, much to my regret and that of my students, that for many years I have taught the history of the Polish-Lithuanian union as a voluntary act, backed actively by the lesser Lithuanian nobility. I am truly grateful that we can put away some of the old textbooks and study the history of Poland-Lithuania from several perspectives, not just the Polish one.

The book is very well edited and prepared for readers who may be new to the topic. It carries the necessary guides to the varying use of place names (English, Polish, Lithuanian, Byeloraussian, Ukrainian, German and Russia), several maps, chronology and genealogical table of Polish monarchs, and a glossary of terms. In the opinion of this reviewer, the volume should find its way to all early modern European university seminars, not just those devoted to the Central and Eastern peripheries of Europe.

Emmanuelle Hénin. *Ut Pictura Theatrum: Théâtre et peinture de la Renaissance italienne au classicisme français*. Geneva: Librairie Droz S.A., 2003. 707 pp. + 70 illus. \$179. Review by KIKI GOUNARIDOU AND JESSICA RUSSELL, SMITH COLLEGE.

The comparison between theatre, the literary genre closest to the image, and painting, both of which *represent*, was so obvious to thinkers of the Renaissance and classical France that they took it for granted and did not even think to formulate an *ut pictura theatrum*. Hénin's book seeks to rectify this gap and to show how today's *ut pictura poesis* depends on the earlier *ut pictura theatrum*.

Most often, Aristotle states the *paragone*, as Hénin calls it, of theatre and painting as a proportional analogy: $A/B=C/D$. This is a comparison of relationships within the two arts: for example, drawing is to color (in painting) as tale is to character (in tragedy). Hénin's book traces the *paragone* within the larger discourse on painting and poetry. In this new look at the *topoi* of the *paragone*, both Aristotle's analogies themselves and a parallel in the function of these ideas within the two arts reveal the latent influences that the arts exercised on each other. In taking stock of the *topoi*, Hénin's synthetic methodological approach, combining thematic (or structuralist) and historical approaches, demonstrates the continuity of the reflection on the comparison throughout the centuries.

This study is focused on the period between the rediscovery of the *Poetics* around 1550 and the treatise of Du Bos (1719), which marks both the complete assimilation of the *topos* and its shift towards a more subjective critique. It should be remembered, however, that the tradition roots itself in antiquity at both the philosophic and the practical levels. The result (*aboutissement*) of the *topoi* occurs in the eighteenth century, but by then they correspond to another logic: that of the spectacular and of the search for a language which speaks directly to one's sensitivity through images and which simplifies its message to reach the larger public.

The organization of the book follows the fundamental three-way split of the rhetoric among the *inventio*, the *dispositio*, and the *elocutio*. This schema also permeates the Renaissance treatises on painting and theatre, as it had, centuries earlier, organized the *Poetics*. This rhetorical tripartition permits one to see three areas in which the comparison between the two arts developed: the content of the representation, the display of the image, and the demand of expression. If the image is created in regard to a glance, as demanded by Aristotle, this is because it is destined for the spectator, whom it must move in order to accomplish its proper effect, the purgation of passions. These passions however are transmitted by way of a rigid protocol. The expression of the *paragone* thus prepares the ground for the rupture carried out by Riccoboni and Diderot, while stopping just before "real" modernity.

In Part One of the book, "Portraits of the Theatre," Hénin explains that, throughout the Renaissance and the classical period, theorists debated whether dramatic *mimesis* or pictorial *mimesis* was superior and used various measures for proof. In his *Poetics*, Aristotle rests drama's mimetic superiority over the

epic's on the ability of drama to represent directly: while the epic imitates actions with words, drama imitates them with actions. The *Ut pictura theatrum*, arising from Aristotelian metaphors and their reworking, reaffirms the unity of painting and theatre. Its theorists characterize the modalities of representation in both arts by the same traits: the illusion of presence linked to the use of natural signs, to concentration, and to the economy of means. But if theorists agree on the global validity of the parallel, they all propose different classes of imitative arts.

Aristotle states that representation provides a double pleasure: a cognitive pleasure, based on recognition of the object represented, and a totally aesthetic pleasure created purely by the artist's talent. According to Maggi and Lombardi (1550) and, later, Castelvetro, painting pleases only if it reproduces faithfully a particular object, while tragedy imitates universals and builds a generic *mimesis* through character types. Aristotle, after classifying mimetic arts according to their mode and their instrument, distinguishes representations according to their object. This hierarchy of genres, sketched by Aristotle, is reborn at the beginning of the seventeenth century by Giovanni-Battista Agucchi, who reactivates the Aristotelian hierarchy in order to apply it to modern painting. A series of antitheses that cover all the dimensions of representation accompanies the rigidifying of the hierarchy of genres. Comedy represents specific simple objects, and tragedy, heroes and kings; comedy uses a medium style, tragedy a sublime one; comedy imitates invented characters, tragedy real ones; comedy stages the passage from misfortune to happiness, tragedy, the reverse; and comedy provokes laughter, tragedy, fear and pity. This hierarchy becomes an ideological norm and any transgression is considered a crime against art.

In Part Two, "The Theatrical Image: From Unity to Unities," Hénin observes that, in Renaissance Italy, perspective, just recently invented by painters, is applied progressively to theatre, which, in turn, contributes to the rise of the illusionist stage. From its beginnings, illusionist perspective is linked in an indissoluble way to the idea of a single vanishing point and point of view. The illusionist stage, theorized by Serlio, organizes itself entirely around the function of a privileged point of view. The spectator can occupy many places, not all equally favorable: the prince's box is placed at an ideal distance, and all the other positions are more and more unfavorable the farther they are from the ideal line.

Aristotle's example of "an enormous animal," the Aristotelian analogy between narrative and the body of a very large animal, serves moreover as a theoretical basis for the unity of time and place (the length of the animal becoming the duration of the story and the space of the stage) and the unity of action (the unification of multiplicity in a complex and ordered totality, like the parts of the animal). On the other hand, it is almost impossible to separate the theory of unity of action from that of episodes. Aristotle advised the playwright to include episodes (action which diverges from the main plot) in his tragedies in order to make them more agreeable, but also decreed that the episode play a structural role and not just an ornamental one. The episode paves the way for Le Brun and Félibien to formulate, around Poussin's *La Manne*, a theory of *péripéties* that allows the painter to break temporal unity and show different phases of an action. The painter is not just excusable for having broken the rules—he is laudable for having applied to his painting the fundamental rule of tragic composition: *la péripétie*, that is, the reversal of action from happiness to unhappiness (or vice-versa). In pictorial practice and theory, from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, the placement of characters in a painting directly reflects their place in the story and is important to the unity of action, because the secondary figures correspond to secondary actions or episodes.

In Part Three, "Ut Pictura Theatrum: The Theatre of Passions," Hénin suggests that verisimilitude gradually becomes confused with the category of *decorum*. *Decorum* involves the relationship between the object and the public and relationships within the object. These two parameters however are often in conflict: one is founded on unalterable essences while the other varies with the public's tastes. Although "general expression" is theorized as such only in the second half of the seventeenth century, it is entirely anticipated by the concept of *decorum*. The critique of the mixing of genres serves as the link between *decorum* and general expression and is a preponderant theme in both pictorial and dramatic treatises. If unity of tone is indispensable to the functioning of a representation and to the reception of its message, what happens when genres mix? If life is made of laughter and tears, a theatre seen as the mirror of life must provide an image of this mix. Le Brun annexes the theory of modes into the discourse on *decorum* and uses it for the distinction of genres and the critique of their mixing. Le Brun's interpretation is doubly restrictive: not only is the theory of modes presented as a purely negative

theory of seemliness, but the identification of the modes with propriety removes *catharsis* from the discussion.

In the *Poetics*, *catharsis* is defined as unclearly as *mimesis*. The most common interpretation is that tragedy, in acclimating the spectator to terror and pity, liberates him from these two emotions. Painful passions are transformed into pleasure when experienced in a filtered form. Hénin's definition of tragedy designates purgation as the goal towards which representation should aim. The theory of modes affirms the autonomy of pictorial *catharsis* in basing it not only on the drama of characters but also on pictorial means such as color and light. *Catharsis* no longer depends on the story represented, but on a direct communication of the passions. Rhetoric rests on the communication of a passion through impersonation. According to Horace, only the actor who is truly moved can give to his face the expressions that communicate true passions. Thus the sympathy linking the creator to his works prolongs itself directly in the spectator. This principle of empathy simplifies the functioning of *catharsis*: instead of being the result of a series of parameters of the story (the goodness of the characters, the nature of the reversal, etc), spectacular *catharsis* (both pictorial and stage) is produced by simple contagiousness and consists in identification with the image of laughter or of tears. The principle of empathy describes a chain of mimetic passions.

In conclusion, while proposing to explore an unexplored field, Emmanuelle Hénin has tried to put into communication several fields and to inscribe them within a larger perspective: whence, as Hénin herself argues, the work's necessary incompleteness, linked to the amplitude of a *corpus* susceptible to an infinite extension; whence also its summary, schematic, and even systematic character. There is a multitude of tracks that deserve to be pursued, and in this measure, Hénin proposes, her book's conclusion can only be a beginning.

This enlargement of critical perspectives rests, however, on a restriction that is not negligible and that Hénin recognizes: before speaking of the parallel between painting and poetry, one must remember that this *poesis* is first and foremost dramatic, because Plato and Aristotle speak only of drama. Even more, the *paragone* holds an intrinsic coherence within itself, because it involves not a comparison of the same to an other but rather of the same to the same.

The perfect reciprocity of the original parallel can be summed up in the reversibility of the two fundamental concepts, the *scène-tableau* and the *tableau-*

scène, in other words, in the invention of the concept of the painting to designate all representation, pictorial or theatrical. This double invention of the painting-stage and of the stage-painting introduces a certain number of ruptures in the concept of representation, ruptures which are probably not confirmed completely until Diderot's century. The most obvious are the divorce between the representation and the public, the naming of the object-painting and the object-stage, or even the substitution of a relationship of separation (if not of distance) with a relationship of participation which prevailed in religious imagery. Another field to be explored, also at Hénin's suggestion, is the reception of a representation, which plays an important role in the formation of classical theory.

Hénin explains that her book, out of concern for coherence, has deliberately left out the debates on the purgation of the passions, even though this notion plays the role of final causality in representation. And lastly, she affirms, only a mastery of these debates will allow one to understand the Renaissance and classical conceptions of the role of the actor. We agree with Hénin; the book is an indisputable classic. She has given us the gift of an invaluable survey and an ingenious methodology: art and theatre historians should now borrow from and continue the in-depth study of *Ut Pictura Theatrum*.

T. R. Langley. *Image Government: Monarchical Metamorphoses in English Literature and Art*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2001. 256 pp. + 6 illus. Review by STEPHEN GLEISSNER, WICHITA ART MUSEUM.

Langley's study of transformations in the imagery of power in seventeenth-century England departs from two scholarly articles written more than a generation ago: E. R. Wasserman's "Nature Moralized: Divine Analogy in the Eighteenth Century," *EHL*, 20, 1953 and Edgar Wind's "Julian the Apostate at Hampton Court," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 3, 1939-40. Wasserman asserted that prior to the Restoration of 1660, images of authority, particularly those of kingship, were perceived in the same manner as they had been since the Elizabethan period: analogically. Thus, when a ruler was compared with the sun, the audience assumed a palpable similitude or correspondence between the two so that one could be substituted for the other. The imagery of the Tudor and Early Stuart monarchs, thinks Langley (through Wasserman), was imbued with a sense of dignity and credibility of