
Renaissance and Reformation
Renaissance et Réforme



Schlitt, Melinda (ed.). Gifts in Return: Essays in Honour of Charles Dempsey

Sally Hickson

Volume 36, Number 2, Spring 2013

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1091155ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v36i2.20185>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Hickson, S. (2013). Review of [Schlitt, Melinda (ed.). Gifts in Return: Essays in Honour of Charles Dempsey]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 36(2), 201–203. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v36i2.20185>

© Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies / Société canadienne d'études de la Renaissance; Pacific Northwest Renaissance Society; Toronto Renaissance and Reformation Colloquium; Victoria University Centre for Renaissance and Reformation Studies, 2013

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

se dégage à la lecture de l'étude de Rouget est celle d'une volonté de contrôle presque total de la part de Ronsard sur ses ouvrages (qu'il considérait comme ses « enfants »), tout le long de son existence et jusqu'à la veille de sa mort.

Il nous semble que la valorisation du côté commercial constitue bien l'un des éléments de nouveauté de ce *Ronsard et le livre (II)*. Si, d'une part, comme nous l'avons dit, Rouget cherche à définir les stratégies éditoriales mises en œuvre par Ronsard, de l'autre il s'applique aussi à vérifier leur efficacité, en mesurant le succès remporté par chaque ouvrage. Le nombre des éditions successives étant plus significatif, à ce propos, que celui des exemplaires tout court, le critique ne se contente pas de procéder à un recensement complet des exemplaires existants (dont certains n'avaient pas encore été localisés), mais tâche aussi d'identifier les éditions ou impressions auxquelles ils appartiennent, afin d'émettre des hypothèses quant aux conditions probables de la circulation des ouvrages de Ronsard à son époque.

Dans ce volume, dont la qualité la plus remarquable est sans aucun doute l'aspiration à l'exhaustivité, Rouget nous montre donc que la production du chef de file de la Pléiade s'inscrit dans un contexte éditorial où les détails, même les plus menus (en apparence), sont porteurs d'une signification et relèvent d'une stratégie et d'une concertation. Le critique nous rappelle en somme que c'est en bonne partie grâce à sa familiarité avec le monde de l'imprimé que le poète sut bâtir son œuvre, en la préservant le plus possible des risques de corruption propres à la longue chaîne de production et de diffusion du livre, et asseoir durablement sa renommée.

DANIELE SPEZIARI, *Université de Milan / Université de Reims Champagne-Ardenne*

Schlitt, Melinda (ed.).

Gifts in Return: Essays in Honour of Charles Dempsey.

Essays and Studies 30. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2012. Pp. 490 + 95 ill. ISBN 978-0-7727-2130-3 (paperback) \$37.

Once, many years ago, I had the opportunity to attend a graduate student presentation and discussion at the Villa Spelman, at that time owned by Johns

Hopkins University and under the direction of Charles Dempsey and Elizabeth Cropper. Charles Dempsey was the student's supervisor and, when the presentation was over (it had been about some problem in Renaissance painting), he proceeded to ask a series of questions and to make observations that to me, at the time, seemed rather incomprehensible. He kept asking the student when particular artists were born. The student didn't know; Dempsey mused that it would be nice to know, and then the discussion moved on to other things and eventually we all drank wine in a magnificent room that spilled out into the gardens. Years later, I understood Dempsey's point perfectly. He'd been trying to make the student aware of generational imperatives—of the fact that not all Renaissance artists were born at the same time and that, when they met at some key moment in the past (as Leonardo, Raphael, and Michelangelo had done in Florence), their relative ages pointed to a myriad of circumstances, experiences, aspirations, and desires. This is important, and too often overlooked, when we speak about the past.

The publication of a Festschrift is a moment like that Florentine collision of the Renaissance; a circumstance of meeting at a particular juncture—at the apex or, one hesitates to say, end of one career and the beginning or middle of others. Everyone within such a book is related through a vast web of lives, intelligences, and interests that intersect, overlap, and interweave and that are not immediately apparent to the wider reading audience. When taken together, however, they deepen our understanding of the scholar being honoured. Accordingly, the essays in this collection mirror Dempsey's multiplicities and interests and influences, stretching from the age of Boccaccio and Giotto (C. Jean Campbell and Thomas Willette) to Malvasia and Gregorio Lazzarini (Elizabeth Cropper and Karen-edis Barzman). Along the way are stops for a notable hagiography of Mantegna (Stephen J. Campbell), reflections on Caravaggio's *Death of the Virgin* (Francis Gage), and insights into Poussin, Egypt, and Rome (Ingrid D. Rowland). Other contributors—Carl Brandon Strehlke, Jane Tylus, Giancarlo Fiorenza, Kim E. Butler, Alessandra Galizzi Droegel, Melinda Schlitt, Elena Calvillo, Giovanna Perini Folesani, Pamela M. Jones, Peter M. Lukehart—attest to the company that Charles Dempsey keeps: original, rigorous, and influential scholarship that reveals the best methods of art historical inquiry.

Dempsey's bibliography and awards span 50 years, from his 1963 dissertation into the twenty-first century. In all of his work, he seeks to shed new light on the meaningful relationships between words and pictures, re-invigorating

the syntheses and transcendences that are at the heart of the humanistic disciplines. These essays are a reminder of the value of those endeavours and the richness of their possibilities. As Leonardo said, “the noblest pleasure is the joy of understanding.”

SALLY HICKSON, *University of Guelph*

Shannon, Laurie.

The Accommodated Animal: Cosmopolity in Shakespearean Locales.

Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2013. Pp. xv, 290 + 29 ill. ISBN 978-0-226-92417-5 (paperback) \$26.

Reading Laurie Shannon’s *The Accommodated Animal*, I was reminded of Margaret Atwood’s “The Animals in That Country,” which is routinely read as a reflection of the disparities between “old” and “new” worlds, civilization and wilderness, or culture and nature. But Atwood’s poem also provokes the questions that Shannon’s study poses in its exploration of the disjunction between pre- and post-Cartesian creaturely dispensations: Do animals possess the subjective powers of feeling, thought, and communication? Do they have faces and gazes? Are they entitled to justice, sovereignty, and dignified lives and deaths? Or are they merely objects, mindless mechanical automatons whose lack precludes any notion of their cosmic citizenship or political participation? Citing Bruno Latour’s contention that the modern constitution entrusts scientific power with the representation of objects, and political power with the representation of subjects, Shannon frames these philosophical questions by asserting that the beast-machine doctrine sanctioned by the Cartesian imperative, *cogito ergo sum*, renegotiated a transformation in the status of animals from political subjects to scientific objects, an ontological shift that effectively disanimated animals by rendering them faceless.

Beautifully written and carefully researched, *The Accommodated Animal* adds to a growing body of scholarship that brings historical questions to bear on animal studies, challenging the modern (but puzzlingly anti-Darwinian) binary that would position animals and humans as creaturely opposites. Erica Fudge and Bruce Boehrer have separately demonstrated how actively the line