limiti di applicabilità al poema dantesco delle pratiche esegetiche e delle tecniche ermeneutiche che venivano riservate nel Medioevo allo studio della Bibbia (e ben presto estese anche allo studio degli auctores), e che possiamo riunire sotto la denominazione generale di ‘allegoresi’” (8).

The essays can be divided into three separate groups. The first examines the semiotic (M. Corti), rhetorical (G.C. Alessio) and cultural (E. Costa) context within which Dante’s theory of allegory evolved. The second group explores Dante’s actual practice of allegory in his major creative works: the Vita Nuova (M. Picone), the Convivio (A. D’Andrea), and the Commedia (Z. Barański and A.A. Iannucci). The final two essays study the reception of Dante’s allegory, both iconographical (J.I. Friedman) and literary (G. Caravaggi). By privileging method over idea, textual practice over theory, this volume fills a lacuna in contemporary Dante studies and at the same time brings into sharper focus the polysemous nature of the poet’s work.

Index of names and of manuscripts.


Pietropaolo’s study focuses on critics of Dante in the last three decades of the seventeenth century and the first three of the eighteenth; it deals with considerations both of an extra-textual nature, and of literary ideology. The divisions of this study coincide with the geographical identification of four cultural provinces (the southern critics, Rome and the papal states, the northern scholars, and Tuscany). In each division an introduction which places the regional critics within an historically defined intellectual context is followed by close, individual analyses of their writings. This format allows both for an assessment of the theoretical and methodological development of individual critics, and for a perspective of the diverse ideological developments of Dante criticism in the larger geographical and historical milieu.

As his title suggests, Pietropaolo (here, for the first time) places Vico (whose position in the text is not privileged) within the critical context of his own era, bringing to the fore scholars whose contributions to Dante criticism have previously been ignored or given only cursory study. Pietropaolo demonstrates that “in the specific field of Dante criticism” Vico’s contemporaries “are not unworthy of his company and cannot be made to disappear in his shadow” (386).

Notes following each chapter document sources. An appendix gives editorial data on editions of Dante’s works available during the period studied.