

**Nikola Gučetić**, *Upravljanje obitelji (The Governing of the Family)*, ed. Marinko Šišak, trans. Maja Zaninović. Zagreb: Biblioteka Scopus, 1998. Pages 355.

The work of the Ragusan Renaissance philosopher and patrician Nikola de Gozze (1549-1610) has again become the subject of scholarly interest. Different aspects of the impressive work of this philosophical eclectic, deeply immersed in the intellectual fabric of the sixteenth century, have been studied by a range of authors so far. The early years of the twentieth century saw an increasing contribution to the study of Gozze's work, notably after 1910, when the 300th anniversary of his death was celebrated. The philosophers and pedagogues of the 1960s showed a great interest in Gozze, which led to the first monograph in 1977, by Ljerka Schiffler.

The novelty of the most recent approach to Gozze rests upon an idea that his works are to be presented to the general readership by translating them into Croatian. His writings have been practically unavailable, for apart from the publications of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, no reprints were made. Moreover, a number of very interesting dialogues have been preserved in manuscript only, deposited mostly in the Vatican library. Thus every effort to bring these works to light represents both an achievement in itself and the basis for future research. In addition to the Croatian translations of the *Dialogue on Love* and *Dialogue on Beauty*, published by the periodical *Most* in 1995, we now have a translation of one of his more popular works, *Governo della famiglia (The Governing of the Family)*, published by Biblioteka Scopus, 1998. The emergence of this translation has been generally welcomed by diverse scholarly experts, leaving true evaluation to the

studies to come. The reprint of the original provides us with insight into authentic terminology which has its own historical significance, while the faithful translation of Maja Zaninović relieves the reader from the demanding reading experience of the original. Unfortunately, the authors decided to translate only the original index, failing to furnish the book with an up-to-date index and thus achieve its maximum usefulness.

This edition includes an introductory study by Marinko Šišak, who throws philosophical light on Gozze's work in an attempt to trace classical models and establish relations between Gozze and the pseudo-Aristotelian work *Oeconomica*, but also with Xenophon's treatise *Oeconomicus*. Gozze was influenced by the Neoplatonists, Marsilio Ficino and Francesco Patrizi in particular, both of whom he frequently cites. According to Šišak, Gozze was familiar with Leon Battista Alberti too, but fails to specify his leaning. Šišak primarily focuses on Gozze's concepts of husbandry, adopted mainly from antiquity. He is also concerned with the problem of the individual and his sociability, social differences, the husband-wife relationship, female defects and virtues, sexuality, childbearing and upbringing, education, Christian religion, attitudes towards servants, and the evaluation of estate and trade business. His aim is also to single out those elements of the work that in a direct manner represent the natural setting of Gozze's book: his circle of friends, meetings of the various councils of the nobility, local gossip, Dubrovnik's schools, tutors, etc. The editor, however, fails to draw the parallel between Gozze's work and scores of similar works of his contemporaries, and for this reason his study lacks a broader comparative assessment of the political and economic thought of the day. Partly based on tractates

and medieval sermons, Humanistic works show a clear tendency towards traditional views on the relationship between the sexes, on marriage and the family, as is commonly found in medieval manuals. Yet these works are made to foster a distinctively modern outlook, for they mirror the family and social reality of the period, fermenting both intellectually and economically. Fresh and radical views on these issues emerged in the former half of the sixteenth century, prior to the Counter-Reformation, which succeeded in re-establishing the traditional moral values. The prevalent interest in the household, marriage, the family, and love resulted in a variety of textual forms, including philosophical dialogues, parents' guides, genealogies, and family chronicles. Their authorship being generally reserved for men, these works primarily exhibit a masculine view of the real or ideal relationships in the household, the family, and marriage. Although modest in number, women authors were challenged by the same topics. One of the first secular texts on the subject matter, *Avertimenti di Maritaggio*, written in the fourteenth century, includes a mother's didactic advice to her newlywed daughter. Two other texts from the same century are Francesco da Barberina's *Del reggimento e costume di donne* and Paolo da Certaldo's *Il libro di buoni costumi*, characterized by a broader social scope that is rare indeed for the treatises on the family. The dawn of the fifteenth century saw the appearance of *De re uxoria*, by Francesco Barbara, and later *Regola del governo di cura familiare*, by Giovanni Diminici. *I libri della famiglia*, a renowned treatise by Leon Battista Alberti, influenced a number of authors, including Agnolo Pandolfi, who actually rewrote the third book of Alberti's work and entitled it *Il Governo della famiglia*.

My aim here is to draw attention to the possible influence of Alberti's treatise *I libri della famiglia* on the work of Gozze. Alberti founded his work on several basic concepts: time, property, honor, virtue, and fortune, the motive of his writing being unsettled family matters. Specifically, Alberti was not a legitimate member of the distinguished Florentine family whose name he bore. Although unusual in a variety of aspects, his work served as a model of many an author, pursuing topics related to household, family, and married life. It cannot be entirely clear whether Gozze borrowed directly from Alberti, but the similarity between some of their statements is more than striking. He shares Alberti's opinion on a fairly earned and moderate state of wealth, arguing forcefully against usury, in accordance with the medieval Church canons. In *The Governing of the Family*, Gozze promotes the old/new idea of the advantages of land ownership. In his opinion, trade cannot compare with owning land, for "although more profitable, it does not stir the spirit as husbandry does." Just as Alberti had dreamed 150 years before him, Gozze also had a vision of an autarkic, self-sufficient estate, which could provide one with all one needed except salt. Gozze seems to repeat the words of his predecessor when he asserts that the owner of an estate will lack nothing: "he can always help himself to good wine, home-made bread, oil, firewood, honey, and meat, for he possesses herds, butter, cheese, vinegar, boiled wine, fruit, vegetables, dried meat, and a lot more, contributing to the comfortable, contented, and merry life of a family." At the outset of the sixteenth century, Dubrovnik was approaching the climax of a long period of prosperity based on maritime commerce. Exactly when the Mediterranean trade business was reaching its peak, the idea of "re-

turning to the land” was raising in popularity, having been fostered in Europe since the fourteenth century. The estate represented security and protection against uncertain ways of the trade business, and it was particularly treasured in Humanism as a place of retirement and contemplation away from the busy affairs of public life and business. The new sensibility towards the estate epitomized the noble identity, affirming the power of the nobility.

Other elements of this work imply that Gozze, while discussing the family, had his noble class in mind. His ideal family lives isolated and beyond society. Hardly ever does he mention relatives or the social circle that the family belongs to. Such an idyllic, compact, unique, and closely-knit family is far from real life in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It is envisaged as an ideal of the period, a non-existent sanctuary from the trials and insecurity of Gozze’s time. Scores of Ragusan wills cast light on this ideal and its true background: fathers throw curses and blessings in their effort to attain family harmony and the continuity of their offspring. Yet a brief glance at the court records reveals that families most often argued over property. Apart from man’s pursuit of security, I see another reason which contributed to the creation of the ideal of a wealthy, unique, and well-ruled family. Only the richest and most powerful families could even partially reach that ideal—those who owned palaces and country villas, land, servants, and well-stocked storehouses, those who enjoyed prestige and political power. Therefore, the ideal of a stable and strong family was closely related to class, status, and political power. Order and hierarchy in the family determined order in the society—that is, the balance between the political and social interests of different groups, foremost

between the aristocracy and the commoners. It is interesting to note that Gozze fails to cite his fellow citizen Benedikt Kotruljević, who had written about the merchant household and family more than a century before him. Although patterning after the same models and sharing their views on the home, marriage, upbringing, property, religious pursuits, and many other topics, Gozze simply overlooked his predecessor, for the family he spoke about was not just any well off family of Dubrovnik. Never stating it explicitly, and yet remaining loyal to the terminology of his models, Gozze limited his discussion to the members of his class alone. Contrary to the Humanistic questioning of individual nobility and hereditary values, the Ragusan reality was still infused with conservatism. Marinko Šišak points to Gozze’s accentuated sense of social justice, relating it to his Christian principles. Judging by this particular work and his complete opus, Gozze undoubtedly finds his place among the less prominent advocates of the Counter-Reformation. As the Dubrovnik of Gozze’s day fostered clear-cut Catholic ideas and values, he dedicated only a few pages to the subject matter, considering Catholic teaching a constituent part of family life and upbringing. As for his sense of social justice, it was greatly limited by the hierarchic social relations in the Republic of Dubrovnik, which were certain to reflect upon the household life too. According to the laws of the Republic, everyone was equal before the court. This, however, did not imply complete equality, for participation in politics and all the privileges stemming from it were the exclusive monopoly of the patriciate. In *Governo della famiglia* and especially in *Dello stato delle Repubbliche*, Gozze states his clear view on the unquestioning justness of the social hierarchy and the monopoliza-

tion of political leadership by the patriciate. In his discussion on the education of children, he holds that the *artes liberales* should exclusively be taught to *figliuoli de' buoni cittadini e de' nobili*. His attitude towards servants is generally drawn from literature, but also reflects the day-to-day life of the wealthy household of the Gozze family. The inferior position of servants (and women, to a smaller extent), down to animals and objects, made them entirely dependant on the decisions of the master of the household. Gozze, as the master, considers that servants are not to be treated as equals, but should be kept in obedience through kind ways, but through fear and terror as well.

At the end of the book, Gozze refers to Baldassare Castiglione, speaking highly of his *Il Cortegiano*. Several copies of this work circulated in Dubrovnik in the mid-sixteenth century, and Gozze came across one of them. Inclined towards the aristocracy, the court and courtiers were being beyond his liking, Gozze grounded his praise of Castiglione's book on one of the "novelties" it brought, and that was the question of the stability of political power, an ideal he found in his own Republic. Despite all his love for philosophy, he remained loyal to the political ideas and tradition of his city, best discerned in the work *Dello stato delle Repubbliche*, as well as in his tractate on family. His words describing the satisfaction derived from intellectual solitude, as opposed to running the affairs of the state, most certainly conceal a profound inner delight from passing idle hours at his Trsteno summer residence. He viewed this *otium* as a reward for service to the Republic, as he himself did take part in the political apparatus of the Republic, having been elected rector as many as seven times. The family envisaged by Gozze is a patrician family, in which all things run ac-

ording to an established social order and whose fate is to be ruled. It is not by chance that the Dubrovnik of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries knew nothing of the family chronicles and *ricordi* that were such popular forms in contemporary Italy. Reasons for their emergence could be sought in the declining stability of the government and in changes thanks to which citizens were given a literary opportunity to compete with the nobility for an analogous form of prestige. There is no doubt that the Ragusan nobility treasured the family and family relationships to such an extent that it was often given priority in everyday life, but the Republic remained the highest ideological aspiration, the first and ultimate paragon of noble identity.

I would also like to draw attention to the husband-wife relationship, which Gozze sees as the foundation of family and household. The spouses, however, are not equal in their duties, although he himself had a remarkable relationship with his wife, Marija de Gozze. He does not blindly follow the medieval misogynic attitude, but leans towards the opinion that a wife is not a person *sui iuris*, but a creature to be governed by her husband in every way. Created for life within the home walls, she is to keep silent, obey her husband, embellish herself with nothing but virtue, and not "paint her body" and perfume it with "shameless odours." Girls' education, meant to prepare them for the life of a lady of the house, mother, and obedient wife, was limited to the accomplishment of domestic skills and Christian principles. Contrarily, across the Adriatic in Italy, women were gradually acquiring not only an equal position in society but a privileged one as well, as described in Aonio Paleari's *Dell' economia o vero del governo della casa*, Alessandro Piccolomini's *Orazione in lode delle donne*, *La Raffaella*, and *De la*

*institutione di tutta la vita de l'huomo nato nobile e in città libera*, Sperone Speroni's *Della cura familiare* and *Dialogo d'amore*, in the Castiglione's above-mentioned *Il Cortegiano*, and many others. In defense of Nikola Gozze, one should say that although his work mirrors the old, conservative ideas and patterns, his life-style was characterized by a new outlook. His wife Marija and friend Cvijeta Zuzorić indulged just as equally in the cultural pursuits at Gozze's estate in Trsteno and took part there in dialogues on love and beauty. One should also point out the injustice Marinko Šišak did to Marija Gozze by denying her the authorship of the foreword to her husband's book on meteorology, in which Marija courageously argued against the public opinion of Dubrovnik, in defense of her friend Cvijeta Zuzorić. Speaking boldly of the relationship between the genders and stating her view on the problem, Marija became the only woman of Renaissance Dubrovnik and Croatia to take her place among the Humanistic feminists so numerous in Italy of the first half of the sixteenth century.

These commentaries on *Governo della famiglia* related to the contemporary society of Dubrovnik and Europe should be understood as historiographic complements to the philosophical analysis that supplements the new Croatian edition. After all, it is through the interdisciplinary approach that we will achieve a more complete picture of this and any other source. I believe that diverse interpretations such as these will be stimulated by the Croatian translation of Gozze's treatise.

Zdenka Janeković-Römer

**Gjuro Baglivi**, *De fibra motrice et morbosa / O zdravom i bolesnom motoričkom vlaknu* (On the nature and disorders of motor fiber). Zagreb: *Prometej* and *Medicinski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu*, 1997. Pages 434.

First published in Rome in 1702, Gjuro Baglivi's most important treatise on medical theory, *De fibra motrice et morbosa*, has recently appeared in Croatia in a bilingual edition, faithfully translated into Croatian by Augustin Pavlović.

It is the first comprehensive and up-to-date study of the life and work of Gjuro Armen Baglivi (1668-1707), a highly reputed Dubrovnik-born physician. This reprint of his great work is accompanied by a most thorough discussion of Mirko Dražen Grmek—"The life, work, and historical significance of Gjuro Baglivi"—in which the author epitomizes his long-established consideration of Baglivi's life and work. Grmek is also the author of a bibliography of Baglivi's works, as well as of a select bibliography of major publications concerning Baglivi's life and work. The book contains an interesting contribution by Stjepan Kراسić, in which Kراسić presents the course and results of his research on Baglivi's burial site in the church of St. Marcel in Rome.

Gjuro Baglivi was born in Dubrovnik in 1668 as Gjuro Armen, the son of a petty Armenian merchant. Being an extremely gifted child, he attended the Jesuit *Collegium Ragusinum*, but a tragic course of family events soon engendered his departure from Dubrovnik in 1684. He joined his foster parents in Lecce and was to study medicine in Naples and Salerno under a new surname Baglivi. In the 1690s he pursued his scholarly career at Italian universities, working with the noted M. Malpighi. He was eventually rewarded with the post of professor at