"Il Decameron di Domenico Caronelli" by Antonio Ferracin opens a volume of fascinating and varied scholarship. With meticulous reporting of variants, Ferracin compares Caronelli’s text in Vaticano Rossiano 947 to that of Parigiano Italiano 482, one of the authoritative Decameron manuscripts. Dated 1395 and characterized by frequent re-elaborations that simplify the narration and syntax, the Caronelli Decameron is closer to manuscripts of the Veneto tradition: Italiano X, 14 (6950), Biblioteca Marciana, Venice; and 952 (XXI, E, 3), Biblioteca del Seminario Patriarcale, Venice. Ferracin’s research challenges Branca’s stemma: none of the Veneto manuscripts depends exclusively on the Paris or Berlin manuscripts or on one another; shared variants point to a corrupt model, an intermediary between the Paris and Berlin manuscripts.

Two articles make differing assessments of Edvige Agostinelli and William Coleman’s edition of Boccaccio’s Teseida delle nozze d’Emilia (2015). Carlo Delcorno, in “Una nuova proposta per il Teseida,” praises the work almost without exception: based on Salvatore Battaglia’s critical edition of Boccaccio’s autograph Acquisti e Doni 325 (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence), the edition relies on new technologies to restore previously illegible passages. Following Agostinelli’s 1986 proposal, the editors read the Oratoriana manuscript C.F. 2.8 (Biblioteca Oratoriana, Naples) as a fifteenth-century copy of a beta branch of the stemma that represents the author’s mature vision of the work, and they rely on the manuscript to edit the Autograph.

Francesca Malagnini rejected Agostinelli’s proposal in 2012. In her article “Due manoscritti: La questione delle illustrazioni,” which focuses exclusively on the paratexts of the Autograph and Oratoriana manuscripts, the scholar presents ample evidence to demonstrate that the Oratoriana is not a revision of the Autograph. Instead, it diminishes the subtle complexity of the program of poetry, gloss, and illustration of the earlier version. With her conclusion confirmed by recent textual research by Martina Mazzetti, Malagnini suggests that the 2015 edition, based on a flawed interpretation of the Oratoriana, is misleading.

Three articles address the narration of the Decameron. Matteo Pace, in “L’Amore di Cimone. Tradizione medica e memoria cavalcantiana in Decameron V 1,” offers a serious proposal to address the difficulties of interpreting Cimone’s brutality in pursuit of his beloved. Cimone’s “conversion” by love does not lead to virtue but to the single-minded pursuit of the desire of the anima sensitiva,
an amor *furiosus* that is presented as the influence of Mars in Cavalcanti’s *canzone*. Pace’s argument is based on the story’s complex lexical intertextuality with Cavalcanti’s *Donna me prega*, and especially Dino del Garbo’s gloss of the poem. Gian Domenico Mazzocato, in “Martellino riscritto: a proposito del *Decameron* riformato dal Cieco d’Adria,” presents the first story of the second day from Cieco’s 1588 revision of the *Decameron*. In the original, Martellino’s logic of acquisition or of the marketplace, in this case also a sacrilege, is laughed off by the signore at the end. Cieco rereads the story exclusively in a religious key, and in line with his other *Decameron* revisions, he rewrites Martellino as the impersonator of a female singer, excising any blasphemous implication. The juxtaposition of Cieco’s work with the original makes vivid the subtlety, sophistication, and breadth of Boccaccio’s vision.

Finally, in her article “Il Duca del Brabante e Messer Torello, cavaliere ‘senza’ leone. Intorno a una fonte inedita di *Decameron* X, 9,” Veronica Gobbato addresses the unresolved question of the source for the plot of Ser Torello’s crusade adventure. Gobbato makes a strong case for the *Liber de introductione loquendi*, composed by the Dominican friar Filippino da Ferrara in the second quarter of the fourteenth century. Boccaccio could have been familiar with this compendium of conversational themes for preachers, but more convincing are the numerous points of contact in the friar’s tale of the Duca del Brabant and Ser Torello, including taking up the cross, falconry, imprisonment, the use of a magical agent to return home, the assistance of an intermediary to reenter the domestic space, the disguised presence at the wife’s remarriage, and the ring in the chalice to permit recognition.

Two articles discuss aspects of the *Genealogie deorum gentilium*. In “La *Genealogia* e il De Montibus: due parti di un unico progetto,” Carla Maria Monti offers a persuasive analysis of the correlation of the genesis and structure of the two works, written shortly after Boccaccio’s first meeting with Petrarch. Focusing on the prefaces, Monti traces multiple textual links between them; the second work, virtually ignored in modern scholarship although it survives in 64 manuscripts, was intended as a pedagogical guide to help students identify and locate the geographical features of the stories recounted in the *Genealogie*, and also as a respite after the exertion of writing the greater work. The scholar also lingers on Boccaccio’s fascinating discussion of the novelty of his labour, the many difficulties Boccaccio faces as he confronts the task of writing the *Genealogie*, and his defence of ancient poets in the *Prohemium*. In “Il *De Somno (et somniis)* di
Boccaccio, “on chapter 31 of the first book of the Genealogie, Attilio Bettinzoli presents Boccaccio’s familiarity with a vast array of ancient works and his cautious and interdisciplinary pursuit of understanding. Boccaccio’s chapter closes with the debate over the truth of dreams intact.

Space does not allow comment on Elsa Filosa’s valuable elucidation of the act of condemnation for conspiracy that moved Boccaccio to write the Consolatoria a Pino de’ Rossi; an examination of the curious iconography of Semiramis in the Sala baronale del Castello della Manta a Saluzzo by Aki Ito; Angelo Piacentini’s detailed rhetorical and metrical analysis of a Latin poem, copied and attributed to Thomas Aquinas by Boccaccio in the Zibaldone Laurenziano, possibly with a question mark as if he doubted the attribution; and finally, Kenneth P. Clarke’s thought-provoking discussion of Petrarch’s Walterus, cupidus, and curiosus in a portrait that makes allusions to Ulysses and meditates on his own identity as writer.
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As the title suggests, the subject matter of this book is the road less travelled by literary critics with regards to writers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, writers who have been either neglected or given insufficient attention. Antonio Lucio Giannone intends to compensate for this bias by bringing together 11 essays that were previously published in journals between 2009 and 2015. The first three discuss the diary of Sigismondo Castromediano (1811–1895); the next five deal with the literary activity of Ada Negri (1870–1945), Vittorio Bodini (1914–1970), Anna Maria Ortese (1914–1998), Rina Durante (1928–2004), and Nicola G. De Donno (1920–2004); the final three are concerned with aspects of the writings of Luigi Russo (1892–1961), Mario Marti (1914–2015), and Donato Valli (1931–2017). The common denominator is the focus on novelists, poets, and critics from Southern Italy, as well as on the presence of the “meridione” in the works discussed. Giannone, who teaches modern Italian literature at the University of Lecce, specializes in the literary production of the southern regions.