

by the reader. The advantages of this approach, as Canettieri points out, are twofold: on the one hand, it shows the textual instability, and, on the other hand, it makes the most of the critical text's "perfettibilità nel tempo" strategy (XV).

Valeria Russo
Université de Lille

Works Cited

SCHWAN, Eduard. 1886. *Die Altfranzösischen Liederhandschriften, ihr Verhältniss, ihre Entstehung und ihre Bestimmung : eine litterarhistorische Untersuchung*. Berlin: Weidmann.

CHINES, Loredana. 2021. *Filigrane. Nuovi tasselli per Petrarca e Boccaccio*. Roma-Padova: Antenore. Pp. 125. ISBN 978-88-8455-720-9, Paper € 16.

Loredana Chines's *Filigrane*¹ is the newest work by the author on Petrarch's poetic production and on the relations, both intellectual and amicable, between Petrarch and Boccaccio.² The volume is presented as a map of new information and acquisitions on the topic, which tackles the difficult task of identifying in Petrarch's and Boccaccio's works all the signs and traces of their own, at times common, idea of literature, the revival of the ancient classics and poetry. As the author makes clear in the preface, *Filigrane* aims at unveiling all the correspondences we may find through the lines of a text. Notwithstanding the considerable amount of literature on this specific matter, Chines manages to give an update on the most recent scholarly contributions, availing of a double perspective, philological on the one hand, and hermeneutical on the other.

Watermarks, as suggested by the title, refer to a definition inherited from codicology and philology, that of a translucent design stamped in a paper of manufacture to show the maker, and, similarly, that of a hidden trace to be discovered with the help of critical insight. Chines chooses to explore this field with the constant support of texts, manuscripts, and marginalia, underscoring every time all those references (called by the author "segni di particolare attenzione") which are useful to understand the connections

1. *Filigrane* is the latest book published for the book series *Arezzo-Certaldo*. See also: RICO 2012, VECCHI GALLI 2012, VEGLIA 2014, and CARRAI 2017.

2. CHINES 2000; 2004; 2010.

between the poets and their books and readings. Thus, we are presented with two authors of the *canon*, who are simultaneously examined from the points of view of their attitude as writers as well as that of readers and scholars.

Before proceeding to the examination of the chapters and main topics, three precious merits of *Filigrane* deserve mention: first, Chines adopts a clear and vivid writing style that takes nothing away from an arduous subject; second, the philological framework provides scholars and students with useful ‘work tools’ for a critical and philological analysis, even for those who are not expert in Petrarch’s and Boccaccio’s productions; and, last but not least, the continuous reliance on translations (from Latin to Italian) and the accurate bibliography, besides serving as a first-run reading, supply an example of methodological mastery.

The first of the five chapters, *Tracce ovidiane*, is divided into three sub-chapters, and points out the importance of specific interpretations of the Ovidian contribution to intertextuality in the *Decameron* and *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*. *Lo stupore di Cimone* (*Decameron* V 1), for instance, sheds light on the role of Ovid’s *Metamorphosis* in the framework of the novella; Boccaccio was particularly interested in the less famous of the Latin poet’s works (*Heroides* and *Fastorum*) and none of Boccaccio’s codices of *Metamorphoses* is nowadays extant.³ When drawing inspiration for the description of the epiphany of Ifigenia to an admiring Cimone, Boccaccio had in mind the second book of *Ars Amatoria*, which he owned (Ricc. 489), and where the Certaldese could read “Amor [. . .] et levis est, et habet geminas, quibus avolet, alas”; those words were followed, in Ovid, by the episode of the fall of Icarus. Turning to Petrarch (*Le chiome raccolte di Laura tra Dafne e Diana*, *Rvf* 52), Chines adds an original interpretation of the famous *topos* of Laura’s hair (and, specifically, the moment she ties it), an iconic image which was and still is very successful in Italian poetry, recognizing *Met.* I 474–77 as its specific ‘ipotesto’; in those verses, Dafne, managing to avoid Apollo, modestly collects her clothes and hair: “Aemula Phoebes: vitta coercebat positos sine lege capillos”. The same bashfulness of Dafne and Febe-Diana is attributed to Laura, in madrigal 52, and to Petrarch himself in *Rvf* 23, when the poet, as the hero Atteone, turns into a deer as soon as he notices Laura-Diana bathing. The binomial Laura-Dafne makes sense as long as Petrarch re-uses the ancient myth adapting it to his needs, to ‘poeticize’ his own experience. This is not exclusively restricted to Ovid’s poems. Indeed, on many other occasions Petrarch seeks for heroic and mythological characters who may embody and impersonate features of his own life both

3. DE ROBERTIS, MONTI, PETOLETTI, TANTURLI, ZAMPONI 2013, 405.

as a poet and a man; notably, the hero Bellerophon, Omer's invention, serves as the ideal of emotions, features, resemblances: he hangs around, troubled and tormented for the death of his children, in the same way Petrarch does in *Solo et pensoso* (Rvf 35). The importance of this reference is examined in the second chapter, *Note in margine al Petrarca- Bellerofonte*, with examples of what Chines calls "l'ansia petrarchesca di proiezione del proprio volto" (21) in Petrarch's poetry, prose (*Seniles*, *De remediis*), and manuscripts. Here Chines reminds the readers about one of the most interesting of Petrarch's writing habits: as a reader and book collector he used to write his famous *marginalia* (notes containing words or phrases relevant for the annotated passage), which are, for us, precious clues to understanding the analytical depth of his studies and interpretations. The last point is of primary concern, as well shown by Chines in each chapter, when, together with cross-references, the reader finds pictures of some of the most famous of Petrarch's *codices* (see TAVOLE). Another brick in the wall of Petrarch's 'poetic memory', concerning the topic of *solitudo*, as explained previously, is the strong connection with the story of Abelard and Heloise, which Petrarch knew from the manuscript now Par. Lat. 2923. The renowned correspondence between the teacher Abelard and his disciple Heloise so attracted Petrarch's attention that he felt the need to write some of the well-known 'notes intime' on his *codex*; one of these displays, again, "*solitudo*" and regards the moment when Abelard, expelled from Saint-Denis due to his controversial work *De unitate et trinitate*, looks for a safe and quiet place away from the society. Such a theme, together with Abelard as the character, is assumed as an *exemplum*, in *De vita solitaria*, of an existence lived apart, in thoughtful loneliness. As far as Boccaccio is concerned, the episode of Abelard and Heloid is employed, Chines explains, to build the main character's features in *Decameron II 10*; Bartolomea, a young and handsome woman from Pisa, is married to Riccardo, a stuffy old judge. When Bartolomea is kidnapped by the pirate Paganino, despite being terrified at first, she comes to appreciate all Paganino's devotion and, in meeting her husband again, she confesses to be feeling the same as the pirate. This dialogue, as described through the powerful *verve* of the Certaldese, resembles a theatrical *piece*, filled with irony and enriched with the power of misunderstandings. Bartolomea's words are unscrupulous as she is depicted as a modern, open-minded young woman similarly as Heloise appears in the lines of her correspondence with Abelardo (Epist. II 10).

Given the initial consideration about the lack of a detailed critical and philological analysis of Petrarch's *Bucolicum Carmen*, the fourth chapter, *Un volto nascosto di Laura*, succeeds in revealing all the potentiality of an in-depth study of the bucolic as a poetic genre, which additionally

is the ‘meeting ground’ for Petrarch and Boccaccio’s poetry and a turning point for Italian and European literature. The *Bucolicum Carmen* project took twenty years of Petrarch’s life, this due, as Chines illustrates, first to his willingness to make a “manifesto autoesegetico” (47) out of the poem, and second to the difficulties of facing a long-standing tradition for pastoral poems, which dated back to Virgil’s *Bucoliche*.⁴ This double perspective is assumed to justify Petrarch’s long-lasting review, and, similarly, his prime concern is the call of collective history to be portrayed by his poem in both formal and conceptual effort. In other words, Petrarch made use of the bucolic genre to narrate by examples, hiding behind the allegory the truth of human life, which was to be intended as collective and unique to the same extent.

The semantic of Petrarch’s poetic vocabulary is one of the most challenging and complex issues; given the number of originals we have for his works, a paleographical analysis is necessary to comprehend the poet’s rewriting process. Chines, thus, underscores the importance of technology as an investigative tool in cases like the one she reports, regarding the variants of the name *Dafne* in *Bucolicum Carmen III*. Thanks to ultraviolet rays Chines succeeds in finding traces of Petrarch’s reconsiderations on how to refer to Laura’s pseudonyms, each time with a different shade of meaning. Boccaccio, for his part, took advantage of the polysemy and the richness of the Aretine poet, to build the figure of Ifigenia who appears as an epiphany to Cimone staring at her (*Decameron V 1*), showing, once again, his debt towards his model.

In the last chapter, *Ombre, parole e silenzi. Petrarca e Giovanni*, Chines focuses on the figure of Giovanni Petrarca in his father’s epistles, starting with the less famous but not less dramatic ‘nota obituaria’ the poet wrote in his manuscript, *Virgilio Ambrosiano*. Petrarch’s words, as presented, are laconic and bare, yet evocative and meaningful. As far as we know Giovanni and Francesco Petrarca (son and father) had a troubled relationship caused by the immoderation and disobedience of the first one; the author of the *Canzoniere* had never clearly written the name Giovanni when referring to his son, except for this occurrence. Aiming to reconstruct a truthful picture of Giovanni, Chines interprets the words and silences of Petrarch’s letters with special attention to the texts and their translation from Latin. Nevertheless, the insensibility and reticence

4. For instance, Petrarch’s careful consideration of the dualistic nature of the eclogue itself, on his *Virgilio Ambrosiano* A79 inf., F. 2v he wrote: “idest geminum sensum habens: licteralem scilicet et allegoricum” (47).

Petrarch pretends to show might be a consequence of his pain and torment for how disappointing his son had been in life, dying young before he could experience a real behavior change, a “mutatio in melius”. Otherwise, this pain, as a philosophical and universal issue, finds space in the dialogical treatise *De Remediis* (II 44); Chines’s investigation, from this standpoint, is summed up with a few final considerations on the importance, for Petrarch and Boccaccio, of focusing the reader’s attention and critical inquiry on multiple issues, looking at the two poets and their texts as a complex system: on the one hand, their entire poetical production and, on the other, their *modus operandi*, their *habitus* as readers themselves, interpreters, editors, and scholars.

Rosamaria Laruccia
University of Bologna

Works Cited

- CARRAI, Stefano. 2017. *Boccaccio e i volgarizzamenti*. Roma-Padova: Antenore.
- CHINES, Loredana. 2000. *I veli del poeta*. Roma: Carocci.
- , ed. 2004. Francesco Petrarca, *Lettere dell'inquietudine*. Roma: Carocci.
- . 2010. “Di selva in selva ratto mi trasformo”. *Identità e metamorfosi della parola petrarchesca*. Roma: Carocci.
- DE ROBERTIS, Teresa, Carla Maria MONTI, Marco PETOLETTI, Giuliano TANTURLI and Stefano ZAMPONI, eds. 2013. *Boccaccio autore e copista*. Catalogo della mostra, Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 11 ottobre 2013–11 gennaio 2014. Firenze: Mandragora.
- RICO, FRANCESCO. 2012. *Ritratti allo specchio (Boccaccio, Petrarca)*. Roma-Padova: Antenore.
- VECCHI GALLI, Paola. 2012. *Padri. Petrarca e Boccaccio nella poesia del Trecento*. Roma-Padova: Antenore.
- VEGLIA, Marco. 2014. *La strada più impervia. Boccaccio fra Dante e Petrarca*. Roma-Padova: Antenore.

CONTI, Fulvio, ed. 2021. *Il Sommo italiano. Dante e l'identità della nazione*. Roma: Carocci. Pp. 244. ISBN 9788829011506, Hardback €18.

In the year that marks the 700th anniversary of the death of Dante, Fulvio Conti dedicates an exhaustive volume to “the way in which Dante has been used, through the last three centuries, to decline the identity of the nation” (14). From the “revival” of Dante, that dates to the end of the XVIII century, to the “public use” of him in later times, Conti traces a recent his-