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Introduction

‘The poetry of Dante may be considered as the bridge thrown over the stream of time, which unites the modern and ancient world’

(Percy Bysshe Shelley, A defence of poetry).

The *Divine Comedy*’s critical fortune is the longest and richest enjoyed by any poem written in a vernacular language. The poet had died just a year earlier, shortly after completing his masterpiece, when in 1322 his son Jacopo deemed it necessary to provide his father’s readers with a gloss that would contribute to the appreciation of its “deep and true meaning”:

Aciò che del frutto universale novellamente dato al mondo per lo illustre filosofo e poeta Dante Allighieri fiorentino con più agevolezza si possa gustare per coloro in cui il lume naturale alquanto risplende senza scientifica apprensione, io Iacopo suo figliuolo per maternale prosa dimostrare intendo parte del suo profondo e autentico intendimento. (Inf., Nota)\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) © 2013 University of Notre Dame
[In order for you to enjoy with greater ease the universal fruit given anew to the world by the illustrious Florentine philosopher and poet Dante Alighieri, I, his son Jacopo, intend to show—for those in whom the natural light shines quite without systematic learning—part of its deep and genuine meaning by using maternal prose.]

Jacopo’s commentary opened the gates to a flood of critical works on the Comedy: commentaries, glosses, lectures, and every kind of academic study which to this day continue to enrich the critical reception of the “sacred poem.” There was only one period when this flood somewhat abated: the relative disinterest of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century scholars, which resulted in a clear decrease in the tradition until a new surge of popularity in the 1800s. So central and definitive is this scholarly approach to the Comedy that from the early manuscripts to modern printed editions, the poem has usually been offered with a commentary that explains a text described and perceived as otherwise too obscure to be accessible to an unmediated reading.2

Among the Comedy’s early commentators were prestigious writers such as Boccaccio and Torquato Tasso, intellectuals of the standing of Landino and Castelvetro, the lay diplomat Guglielmo Maramauro, and the Carmelite friar Guido da Pisa. Their works canonized Dante as the greatest voice of modern vernacular culture, as a philosopher and scholar of great knowledge,3 and as the father of a new poetic language who had not only written to morally educate his readers, but also to instruct them in the eloquence of the vernacular language: “Fines vero alii qui possunt assignari in hoc opere sunt tres: Primus, ut discant homines polite et ordinate loqui; nullus enim mortalis potest sibi in lingue gloria comparari” (The aims of this work can be considered as three. Firstly it teaches men to speak properly and elegantly; no man can be compared to [Dante] with regard to linguistic greatness).4

The tradition of literary criticism that Dante’s work generated not only erected a monument to him but also, and more important, revolutionized the study of literary texts. The Comedy was the first text written in a language other than Latin to attract such obsessive critical attention. No other vernacular text had ever been deemed worthy of study to the same extent and in such different environments, from the monasteries to the universities and from the court to the city. Whether or not Dante de-
served such canonization (and of course we think he did), the early critics visibly contributed to the sustained success of the poem and the establishment of Dante as an auctoritas.

Once included in the canon of auctores by his first commentators, the study of the Comedy required the use of further auctoritates, of sources we would now say, which could help expand the meaning of the poem’s richly connotative words. This necessity brought a man like Guglielmo Maramauro to acknowledge the effort involved in glossing Dante. The commentator revealed how he had to familiarize himself with Dante’s library and consult a long list of essential theological, philosophical, classical, and historical sources, as well as the already rich secondary literature published on Dante:

E bene che io sollo da me stesso non sia messo a volere exponere questa altissima opera: io vidi lo scripto de Iacomo de la Lana, el qual è assai autentico e famoso, e quel de miser Gratiolo Bambaioli da Bologna. . . . E tanto con l’aiuto de questi esposituri, quanto con l’aiuto de miser Zoa Bocacio, e de miser Francesco Petrarca, e del pivan Forese e de miser Bernardo Scanabechi, io me mossi a volere prendere questa dura impresa. Ancora me fu necessario, per compire questa opera, vedere recapitulare e studiare li infrascripti libri, videlicet: Tito Livio, Gregorio, Augustino, Ambrosio, Ieronimo, la Biblia, el Maestro de le Istorie, el Magistro de le Sententie, Vincentio Ystoriaurum, Ugo de San Victore, Isodero, Pap[i]a, san Tomaso d’Aquino, Iosepo, Orosio, Lactantio, Macrobio, Policrate, Svetonio, Boetio, Sedulio, Casiodoro, Seneca, Tulio, Quintiliano, Vegiecio, Sollino, Platone, Aristotile, Frontino, Plinio, Salustrio, Iustino, Iulio Florio; item el Maestro de la Spera, el Speculo de astrologia, el Computo, Tolomeo, Albumasar. Ancora me fu de necessità rivedere Vergilio, Oratio, Ovidio, Lucano, Plauto, Terentio, Iuvenale, Perseo, [Eu]stacio Venusino. E sopra tuto ciò me fo de necessità de vedere la Cronica de Gervasio, Eutropio, Valerio, Alexandro, Panteon, la Martiniana, Fulgentio, Ioanne De apologiis, Ma[rta]no Capella, Alino, la Poetria de Aristotile, el libro De proprietatibus rerum, Avicena e la Geomancia de Satelliense.

[It was right for me not to wish to expound this most excellent work all by myself: I turned to the text by Jacomo della Lana, which is very valuable]
by the end of the fifteenth century, secondary literature on the Comedy had become so substantial that Dante had acquired a unique position of prominence in the influential medieval and early modern tradition of commentary, a standing that no other poet has ever managed to gain. The effects of this literary event on the history of culture are clearly perceived by many, but its implications have been less well understood and analyzed. The greatest impact of Dante’s privileged position in European literary history has been felt at a linguistic level. The commentary tradition, as Guido da Pisa’s words quoted above show, identified Dante as the father of the Italian language and contributed to the adoption of the Florentine vernacular as the literary language of the Italian peninsula. Moreover, the extraordinary critical attention of the Dante commentary tradition inevitably granted the Comedy remarkable creative influence. No later poet could avoid his literary ghost, just as no medieval poet could silence the classical echoes of Virgil and Ovid. The unwavering reception of the Comedy, its continuous success among readers of all backgrounds and nationalities, is the result of its promotion by its earliest and most re-
cent critics, who continue to enhance the fame and the merits of this unique poetic tour de force.

While all this is acknowledged by contemporary Dante scholars, the critical tradition under discussion has further and subtler bearings on the study and understanding of literary phenomena. First, the examination of the Dante commentary tradition offers a unique opportunity to observe the changes that have affected exegetical and critical practices of literary texts through centuries of reception and scholarship. Second, and more specifically, it allows the observation of such developments from a very privileged viewpoint. As a result of the fact that Dante was the first vernacular poet to attract extensive scholarly attention, commentaries on the *Divine Comedy*, at least the early ones, are often at the avant-garde of literary criticism per se. Scholars who have contributed to this tradition can be seen to be testing and applying interpretive models from other fields and developing a new critical language for the analysis of poetry in their commentaries. For instance, Iacomo della Lana, one of the first Dante commentators, noted that to expand on the poem’s subject matter and form (*ad intelligenzia*), a method used by commentators of other sciences (“li espositori in le scienzie”) would be necessary:

Ad intelligenzia della presente Comedia sì come usano li espositori in le scienzie è da notare quattro cose. La prima cioè la materia overo subietto della presente opera. La seconda cosa quale è la forma e onde tolle tale nome overo titolo del libro. La terza cosa quale è la cagione efficiente. La quarta cosa ed ultima quale è la cagione finale overo a che utilitade ell’è diretta e sotto quale filosofia ella è sottoposta.8

[To expand on the present *Comedy*, we should take into consideration four elements, as commentators of other sciences do. The first is its subject matter. The second is its form, whence it takes its name, that is its title. The third is its efficient cause. The fourth and last thing is its purpose, its usefulness, its underlying philosophy.]

Thanks to this kind of methodological osmosis, not only Dante but also vernacular literature in general soon gained the authority granted to other, “nobler” subjects and attracted serious scholarship. Metaliterary
language also found a stimulus. Dante’s use of metaliterary terminology and technical inventiveness invited the development of a critical lexicon, of new definitions and categories. Boccaccio, for example, felt compelled to explain the poet’s use of the term *cantica* in a specialist fashion:

In support of this conclusion, in my opinion, one must take into consideration how musicians compose their works, combining beats short and long, sharp and flat, mixing them with appropriate and measured proportions, and calling their arrangements a “canto,” just as poets do—not only those who write in Latin but also, indeed, those who, like our author, compose in the vernacular. In creating poetry, poets take into account the varying nature of their verses, of the definite and fixed number of metrical feet in them, and of their precise and limited number of words and consonants. We see such a process in the present poem; each verse comprises the same number of syllables and each third verse repeats the same consonance of the preceding one with which it rhymes. It therefore follows that such verses, or works that comprise verses, can be given the name that musicians use for their own works, namely “canto,” as we said earlier. Hence, a composition that is made up of
many cantos can be called a ‘canticle,’ that is, something that contains several cantos.]

Similarly, Guido da Pisa, an accomplished Latin scholar, often applied to the text what we would now call “close reading,” and was keen to record his observations regarding the style of the poem or the different types of hendecasyllables employed by Dante to instruct his readers in matters of rhythm. In addition, the exegetical tradition on the Comedy continuously displays an interest for commentary as a genre, paying attention to its functions, its rules and conventions. Guido’s Expositiones et glose are methodically divided into sections that include the deductio textus de vulgari in latinum (summaries and translations of the subject matter in Latin), the expositio lictere (a careful commentary on the text and its sources), a list of comparationes, where metaphors and similes are explained, and notabilia (appendixes, explorations of specific terms and figures, and even indexes of names and subjects). Five centuries later, Gabriele Rossetti would offer even clearer guidelines to explain his modes of reading as well as the function of his commentary’s structure and methodology:

Introduzione. Varj sono i fini {di queste} delle note aggiunte: I. L’esporre qualche cosa d’importanza che possa contribuire a far abbracciare di un’occhiata il sistema della Divina Commedia, o di alcuna sua parte essenziale; II. Il rischiarar maggiormente col raziocinio e con l’autorità quel che nelle note al testo ho talvolta non pienamente dimostrato, per timor di riuscir lungo; III. Il dichiarare se qualche interpretazione, che potrebbe credersi mia, perchè poco comune, sia di alcun altro commentatore antico o moderno; IV. Il confutare alcune erronee opinioni già troppo radicate, o da lungo tempo spacciate, o di recente sostenute, perchè non faccian ombra allo spirito del lettore; V. Il fare utili osservazioni intorno alla lingua, e giustificare qualche novità grammaticale da me introdotta nella interpretazione: il che sarebbe riuscito di peso e deviamento sotto il testo; VI. Il dar notizia di fatti storici che possano fare pienamente conoscere ciò che nel Poema e nel Comento è sol di passaggio accennato; VII. Il mettere in veduta qualche erudizione opportuna che abbia una stretta connessione col poema; il che sarebbe sembrato
esuberante nel corso del canto; VIII. Ed altro ed altro ancora, che possa contribuire a sparger lume su quel che precede, o quel che segue. Da ciò è chiaro che la lettura di queste note riuscirà (o ch’io spero) di utilità e diletto.  

[Introduction. There are various purposes for these added notes: I. To explain something important that can help to embrace the whole system of the Divine Comedy, or any of its essential parts; II. To further enlighten, using reason and authority, what I did not fully explain, for fear of being prolix; III. To clarify when some unusual interpretation, which could be taken for mine, is by some other ancient or modern commentator; IV. To refute any false opinions already too well-established, or for a long time passed off, or recently sustained, so they do not obfuscate the spirit of the reader; V. To make useful observations about the language, and justify some new grammar introduced in my interpretation, which would have been a burden and distraction below the text; VI. To report about historical facts that can fully explain what is only vaguely mentioned in the poem and commentary; VII. To highlight some appropriate erudite information that has a close connection to the poem, which would have been redundant while dealing with a single canto; VIII. And much more intended to shed light on what precedes or what follows. Hence, it is clear that the reading of these notes will be (or at least I hope) of utility and enjoyment.]

The study of the Dante commentary tradition also highlights how, with the passing of time, the relationship between commentators of different ages evolves, becoming at times tense and problematic. Whereas early commentators considered it valuable to accumulate multiple interpretations of their predecessors to create compendia of the extant “secondary literature” on Dante, modern literary scholarship on the Comedy is often keen to depart from the tradition and mark its originality, its new conquests, labeling the commentaries of the past faulty and ignorant. Modern commentaries are also used more explicitly to pursue critical controversy. Such for example is the case of J. Berthier, who accused both antiqui et moderni for their lack of method and understanding. In his view, nineteenth-century Dante commentators and scholars had become insensitive to the theological dimension of the Comedy (its “bone mar-
row,” according to Father Berthier), thereby betraying a lack of historiographical awareness. For him the poem was a *translatio* of scholastic ethics:

Oggi, secondo noi, si suole fermarsi un po’ troppo esclusivamente alla sola esposizione laicale, e non si va, quanto sarebbe necessario, all’esposizione più midullata e intrinseca. Il medesimo fatto s’incontra negli studi biblici. . . . Ma, scusatе! Se Dante è teologo scolastico, come tutti dicono, ne segue che quei signori, i quali si dicono dantisti, ma non sanno niente di catechismo, nonché di Teologia scolastica, non possono, senza impertinenza, tentare un’interpretazione del poema sacro, nè discutere le nostre pretensioni, perché non possono giudicare o condannare le cose che non sanno, argomentando contro quelli che scambio le studiano.11

——

[Today, in our opinion, it is customary to stay a little too exclusively on a specific secular elucidation, without attempting, as it would be necessary, a more in-depth and intrinsic one. The same fact is evident in biblical studies. . . . Well, excuse me! But if Dante is a scholastic theologian, as everyone says, it follows that those gentlemen, who repute themselves to be Dante scholars, but know nothing of catechism, or scholastic theology, may not, without impertinence, try to interpret the sacred poem, nor discuss our claims, because they cannot judge or condemn things they do not know, arguing against those who instead study them.]

On the other hand, even if *dantisti* of all ages had contributed to the interpretation of the poem, for the Dominican scholar the *moderni* had made genuine giant steps in the philological establishment of details and facts about the author and his text.

In his commentary Berthier also highlighted the nature of his critical approach through the careful use of technical keywords, thus displaying a sophisticated awareness of the impact of methodology and ideology on critical discourse. His would be, in his own words, a new type of commentary: an archaeological reconstruction of Dante’s culture, a new exegesis focused on the lost world of Dante.12

In other words, as these brief notes suggest, reading, studying, and analyzing the Dante commentary tradition teaches us not only how different readers have read the *Comedy* but also how the practice of reading has
changed: it opens a window onto how scholarly studies on literature have
developed, how critical debates move backwards and forwards, how the
genre of commentary has evolved and devolved to shape the reception of
literary texts. It demonstrates how ideology influences literary criticism.
It also reveals how and why our critical dictionary changes, how ways of
creating textual meaning differ from generation to generation. The focus
of Dante readers’ moves from theology to science, from science to politics,
from style to sources; and each of these moves perpetuates the story both
of Dante and of his readers, proving what we have come to expect — that
a text is also the history of its reception.

The study of the Dante commentary tradition has had at least one
additional essential impact on medieval Italian studies: it helps us write
an interesting chapter on the intricate intellectual history of Italy (and, in
some cases, beyond). Each commentator has left a testimony of different
intellectual milieus, schools, trends, and personalities. If Barzizza’s com-
mentary reveals how literature was used at court, Castelvetro’s echoes the
influence of the Reformation and Guido da Pisa’s the character of Car-
melite scholarship.

The more the inestimable value of this corpus emerges, the greater
the interest in the Dante commentary tradition. Interest in it has matured
considerably especially over the past decade or so. This is exemplified by
two recent monumental projects: the Edizione Nazionale dei Commenti
Danteschi, which aims at publishing new critical editions of the vast cor-
pus of glosses and commentaries on the Comedy produced during seven
centuries of Dante scholarship; and the Censimento dei Commenti
Danteschi, which will offer a complete survey and analysis of the entire
manuscript and print tradition of the Dante commentaries.13 These ini-
tiatives follow the creation in the 1980s of the Dartmouth Dante Project,
a searchable online database of seventy Dante commentaries, conceived
and directed by Robert Hollander.14

The renewed attention paid by textual critics to both the material
and historiographical aspects of this facet of Dante’s reception finds its
roots in the groundbreaking studies of scholars such as Mazzoni,15 Bel-
lomo, and Barański, who called for a new appreciation of the exegetical
tradition of the Comedy which would go beyond the utilitarian approach
to the commentaries practiced by previous scholars, who mainly used
medieval and Renaissance commentaries on the *Comedy* to solve hermeneutic cruces. Such piecemeal appropriation, in the view of the three scholars mentioned, failed to take proper account of the partial nature of any interpretation, and, as a consequence, recourse to the commentaries was often methodologically flawed, neglecting to consider the glosses as exegetical projects with specific cultural and often ideological agendas. In this regard, the current project of the Edizione Nazionale to create critical editions of the Dante commentaries is very much a move in the right direction as it will provide a fundamental platform for further studies on the intrinsic value of the glosses, as well as on the reception of Dante per se.

The present collection was conceived almost a decade ago to bring together scholars who were directly involved in the philological editorial project of the Edizione Nazionale and those who had long been engaged in the study both of Dante’s glosses considered as historical and intellectual documents and of the methodological implications of the archaeological reconstruction of such traditions. The gestation of this project has been long, but the place of this volume in the recent process of “reevaluation” of the commentary tradition is still unique. No other volume collects essays devoted to both methodological problems and single commentaries; no other volume gathers scholars from different continents with the intention of attracting the interest of the English-speaking academic world to Dante’s exegetical tradition. The Dante commentary tradition is not the private affair of a small group of dantisti but a phenomenon that deserves to be appreciated by all those who study the development of critical discourse, the theory of reception, and the history of intellectuals.

Our volume seeks to reconsider several of the most important Dante commentaries in their historical, intellectual, and cultural context by bringing together some of the most innovative and distinguished scholarship in the field. While providing new critical perspectives from which to consider the critical strategies developed by commentators to deal with the many questions posed by the *Comedy*, the book also examines how Dante commentators developed interpretive paradigms which contributed to the advancement of literary criticism and the creation of the Western literary canon. Dante commentaries illustrate the evolution of notions of “literariness” and literature, genre and style, intertextuality
and influence, literary histories, traditions and canons, authorship and readerships, paratexts and textual materiality. Contributors address a series of vital research questions: How can the study of the exegetical tradition on the Comedy aid our understanding of the complex dynamics of interpretation? What do the critical choices made by Dante’s interpretive communities tell us about the readers themselves? Finally, what is the impact of critical trends on the processes of literary fruition? In addition, contributors investigate the relationship between illustration, exegesis, commission, patronage, and political affiliation on the creation of commentaries.

The volume includes methodological essays which explore theoretical aspects of the tradition as a whole, as well as case studies of individual commentaries, some of which were illustrated. Methodological essays concentrate mainly on theoretical questions: namely, the creation of a taxonomy for categorizing typologies of commentaries; the relationship between commentators and readers, as well as the connections linking different types of glosses and the materiality of textual transmission; the interplay between written and visual commentaries; the impact of patronage on the forms of exegesis; the impact of textual revision on the ontological status of literary texts.

The essays which approach the question of the Dante commentary tradition by looking at case studies give an account of the modus operandi of Dante’s exegetes by relating these to the cultural, ideological, and political agendas of the community of readers and scholars to which the commentators belonged. These essays also call into question some of the dominant critical approaches to several of the most important early glosses to Dante’s poem. Two essays focus on textual critical matters and therefore, given the technical nature of the language employed, have not been translated.

Contributions are presented in chronological order, on the basis of the date (supposed or ascertained) of composition of the commentaries discussed. Since the conference held at the University of Manchester, some of the essays—those by Bellomo, Battaglia, Mazzucchi, and Pertile—have appeared in Italian in specialist publications. These contributions have been translated specifically for this volume and made available to a wider scholarly audience.
G. Eliot once wrote, “All meanings, we know, depend on the key of interpretation.” Exhausting the meaning of Dante’s *Comedy* is luckily beyond our reach, but our search for the keys is perhaps a worthwhile revenge.

**Notes**

1. Jacopo Alighieri, *Chiose all’“Inferno”* (ca. 1322). This and other commentaries are cited here from the online editions uploaded to the Dartmouth Dante Project.


3. Boccaccio, Dante’s greatest admirer and promoter in Florence, considered him as such: “E però egli primieramente dalla sua puerizia nella propria patria si diede agli studi liberali e in quelli maravigliosamente s’avanzò, per ciò che, oltre alla prima arte, fu, secondo che appresso si dirà, maraviglioso loico e seppe retorica, si come nelle sue opere apare assai bene; e per ciò che nella presente opera apare lui essere stato astrologo, e quello essere non si può senza arismetrica e geometria, estimo lui similemente in queste arti essere stato ammaestrato. Ragionasi similemente lui nella sua giovaneza avere udita filosofia morale in Firenze e quella maravigliosamente bene avere saputa: la qual cosa egli non volle che nascosa fosse nello XI canto di questo trattato, dove si fa dire a Virgilio: ‘Non ti rimembra di quelle parole, / con le quali la tua Etica pertratta’, quasi voglia per questo s’intenda la filosofia morale in singularità essere stata a lui familiarissima e nota. Similemente in quella udi gli autori poetici, e studiò gli istoriografi, e ancora vi prese altissimi principi nella filosofia naturale, si come esso vuole che si senta per li ragionamenti suoi in questa opera avuti con ser Brunetto Latino, il quale in quella scienza fu reputato solenne uomo” (One must know, therefore, that from his childhood in his homeland he gave himself over to the study of the liberal arts and remarkably distinguished himself in the first of them before going on to become, as we shall say below, a marvelous logician and master of rhetoric, which is quite clear in his works. Since it is evident in the present work that he was an astrologer which is a title that cannot be obtained without mathematics and geometry, I believe that he was similarly learned in both of these arts as well. It is said, moreover, that he studied moral philosophy in Florence during his youth.
and that he did particularly well in it. This is a fact that he chose not to hide in the eleventh canto of this work where he has Virgil ask: “Don’t you remember those words, / With which your Ethics treats . . .” almost as if to say that moral philosophy, above all else was especially well known and familiar to him. Likewise, he studied poets of moral philosophy and historians and even learned the highest principles of natural philosophy, which he means to show us in this work through his conversation with Brunetto Latini, who was highly respected in that field) (Giovanni Boccaccio, *Esposizioni sopra la Commedia di Dante* [ca. 1373–75], *Inferno*: Intro. Nota). For a good English translation of and commentary on this fundamental commentary, see M. Papio, *Boccaccio’s Expositions on Dante’s “Comedy”* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), here at 43–44.


12. “L’illustrazione ha, quanto si è potuto osservare, il carattere archeologico, di modo che il lettore abbia sott’occhio ciò che vide Dante in tempo suo,
dove informi la sua fantasia d’immagini dantesche, siccome abbiamo tentato
di rimettere nella mente del lettore la dottrina stessa dell’Allighieri” (The com-
mentary, as observed, has an archaeological aim, so that the reader can see what
Dante saw in his own time, what informed his imagination and imagery, in the
same way we have tried to remind the reader of the poet’s doctrine and knowl-
edge) (G. Berthier, La Divina Commedia con commenti secondo la Scolastica, In-
ferno: Nota).

13. Censimento dei commenti danteschi, 1: I commenti di tradizione mano-
scritta (fino al 1480), ed. E. Malato and A. Mazzucchi, 2 vols. (Rome: Salerno,
2011); and Censimento dei commenti danteschi, 3: Le “Lecturae Dantis” e le edizioni
delle Opere di Dante dal 1472 al 2000, ed. C. Perna and T. Nocita (Rome: Salerno,
2013). Some of the commentaries published by the Edizione Nazionale dei Com-
menti Danteschi by Salerno Editrice, Rome, are (here in order of publication
(2001); Chiose filippine, ed. A. Mazzucchi (2003); A. Cesari, Bellezze della Com-
media di Dante Alighieri, ed. A. Marzo (2003); Matteo Chiromono, Chiose alla
Commedia, ed. A. Mazzucchi, 2 vols. (2004); Niccolò Tommaseo, Commento alla
Commedia, ed. V. Mariucci, 3 vols. (2004); Federigo Zucchi, Dante historiato
da Federigo Zuccaro, ed. A. Mazzucchi, 2 vols. (2004); Chiose Palatine (Ms. Pal. 313
della Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze), ed. R. Abado (2006); Alessandro Vellutello,
La Comedia di Dante Alighieri con la nova esposizione, ed. D. Pirovano, 3 vols. (2006);
Vittorio Rossi, Commento alla Divina Commedia, con la continuazione di Salvatore
Frascino, ed. M. Corrado, 3 vols. (2008); Francesco Torraca, Commento alla Divina
Commedia, ed. V. Marucci, 3 vols. (2009); Iacomo della Lana, Commento alla

14. In addition to the online Dartmouth Dante Project, Robert Hollan-
der’s contribution to the study of the commentary tradition includes several
publications. See for example: “A Checklist of Commentators on the Commedia
(Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993); Boccaccio’s Dante and the
Shaping Force of Satire (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997); “Dante
and His Commentators,” in The Cambridge Companion to Dante, 2nd ed., ed. R.
Jacoff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 270–80. Dartmouth is
now renewing the website and will relaunch it by the end of 2013.

15. See, by F. Mazzoni: “Guido da Pisa interprete di Dante e la sua fortuna
e la crisi nell’interpretazione della ‘Divina Commedia,’” in Dante e Bologna nei
tempi di Dante (Bologna: Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1967), 265–306; “Il
culto di Dante nell’Ottocento e la Società Dantesca Italiana,” Studi danteschi 71
(2006): 335–59. For Barański and Bellomo, see above notes 2, 5, 6. A scholar
who has recently contributed to the study of the Dante commentary tradition is
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